**Project Name: Reviewer: Date:**

| *Criteria* | **Exceeded Expectations** | **Match Expectations** | **Less Than Expected (Fair)** | **Need Improvements** | **Failure** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Introduction**** *Background and Customer Needs Analysis*
* *Technology Assessment*
* *Concept Generation and Selection*
* *Engineering requirements/metrics*
 | Sections from the Status report 1 are improved (comments addressed, better figures/graphs, updated requirements, style improvements including fonts, wording, organization). | Sections from the Status report 1 are somewhat improved (comments addressed, better figures/graphs, updated requirements, style improvements including fonts, wording, organization). | Sections from the Status report 1 are not significantly improved (comments addressed, better figures/graphs, updated requirements, style improvements including fonts, wording, organization).. | Sections from the Status report 1 are not improved or absent (comments addressed, better figures/graphs, updated requirements, style improvements including fonts, wording, organization). | Sections from the Status report 1 are absent. |
| **System Design** | System aspects of the problem are clear with subsystem requirements and subsystem interfaces well defined. System integration tasks are identified in detail.  | System aspects of the problem are mostly clear with subsystem requirements and subsystem interfaces defined. System integration tasks are identified. | System aspects of the problem are only partly clear with subsystem requirements and subsystem interfaces partly defined. System integration tasks are incomplete.  | System aspects of the problem are not clear with subsystem requirements and subsystem interfaces poorly defined. System integration tasks are incomplete or unclear.  | System aspects of the problem are unclear. Subsystem requirements and subsystem interfaces ill or not defined. System integration tasks are missing.  |
| **Technical progress*** Preliminary design calculations
* Technical difficulties
* Technical risk
 | Technical information is very relevant to the assigned topic. Information is complete and analysis and insight provided. Technical difficulties are clear and risk abatement plans are clear and in place. | Technical information is relevant to the assigned topic. Information is mostly complete, and some analysis and insight provided. Technical difficulties are mostly clear and risk abatement plans are identified. | Technical information is somewhat relevant to the assigned topic. Information is partially complete. Analysis and insight are weak. Technical difficulties are partly clear and risk abatement plans are partly clear. | Technical information is minimally relevant to the assigned topic. Information is in complete. Analysis and insight weak or missing. Technical difficulties are not clear and risk abatement plans are not clear  | Technical information is missing or not relevant to the assigned topic. Analysis and insight not provided. Technical difficulties not identified, and no risk abatement is identified.  |
| **Schedule*** Semester milestones
* Deadlines and deliverables – short term
* Project risk
 | Semester milestones are SMART and relevant. Deadlines and deliverables SMART and relevant. Immediate term – by next sponsor review – are SMART. | Semester milestones are mostly SMART and relevant. Deadlines and deliverables mostly SMART and relevant. Immediate term – by next sponsor review – are mostly SMART. | Semester milestones are partly SMART and relevant, or incomplete. Deadlines and deliverables partly SMART and relevant, or incomplete Immediate term – by next sponsor review – are partly SMART. | Semester milestones are not SMART or relevant. Deadlines and deliverables not SMART or relevant. Immediate term – by next sponsor review – are not SMART or missing.  | Semester milestones are absent. Deadlines and deliverables are missing. Immediate term – by next sponsor review – are missing.  |
| **Communication*** Consistent and logical flow and organization
* Professional (conforms to PPT standard format, readable, not too many woods, fully annotated figures)
* Tables/figures properly labeled and cited/described in text
* Appropriate use of references and citations
* Appropriate use of diagrams, figures, sketches, models
* Facts and evidence provided to support conclusions
 | The report is consistently clear and concise, using an abbreviated PPT appropriate writing style and with little or no spelling/grammar errors. Well formatted and always flows smoothly, in a logical manner. Numerous diagrams/figures appropriately used to illustrate the text. In-line citations with proper references were always included. | The report is usually clear and concise, generally uses abbreviated PPT appropriate writing style with few spelling or grammar errors. Information usually flowed smoothly and in a logical manner. Many diagrams/figures were included to clarify the text. References were often used and properly cited. | The report is generally clear and concise with a few spelling / grammatical errors. The abbreviated PPT appropriate writing style was not consistently followed. Information generally flowed smoothly and in a logical manner, but some parts were difficult to follow. Some diagrams were used to accompany the text. Some errors in referencing/citing were made. | The report is unclear and overly wordy or missing significant detail. It was not in a technical style (e.g. “diary-style”). The information did not flow smoothly and a logical structure was not often used. Few diagrams were included and were not properly related to the text. Few or incomplete references were used, and citations were missing or incomplete. | The report contained few details and was unclear. Information was not organized. The PPT appropriate writing style not concise, not readable, not organized. Familiar and casual terms used. No diagrams or illustrations were included or were improperly used. References were not used or were incomplete or missing. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |