Project/Team Name:

Reviewer Name: Date:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Exceeded Expectations* 4.0 (A), 3.67 (A-)** | ***Met Expectations* 3.33 (B+), 3.00 (B), 2.67 (B-)** | ***Less Than Expected* 2.33 (C+), 2.00 (C), 1.67 (C-)** | ***Needs Improvement* 1.33 (D+), 1.00 (D)** | ***Failure* 0.00 (F)** | ***Raw Numerical Score*** | ***Weight*** | ***Weighted***  ***(Click Ctrl-A and Press F9)*** |
| Introduction and Background  - Customer, Needs, Benefits, & Project History | The background information is very clear. | The background information is mostly clear. | The background information is somewhat clear. | The background information is unclear. | Insufficient background information presented | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| Formulating an engineering problem based upon needs and benefits | It was very clear what the team planned to solve and why. | It was mostly clear what the team planned to solve and why. | It was somewhat clear what the team planned to solve and why. | It was somewhat unclear what the team planned to solve and why. | It was not conveyed what the team planned to solve and why. | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| Identification of design requirements, specifications, and constraints | The requirements and justification were very clear. | The requirements and justification were mostly clear. | The requirements and justification were somewhat clear. | The requirements and justification were unclear. | The requirements and justification were not presented. | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| Application of appropriate and contemporary design methods - Developing multiple concepts | Solution and approach demonstrated the total use of the engineering design process. | Many artifacts of the engineering design process were applied. | Some artifacts of the engineering design process were applied | Few artifacts of the engineering design process were applied. | Solution & approach did not follow the engineering design process. | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| Demonstration of the proposed solution, such as prototype, simulation, etc. | The demonstration clearly showed that the team solved the engineering problem. | The demonstration showed that the team solved many aspects of the engineering problem. | The demonstration showed that the team solved some aspects of the engineering problem. | The demonstration showed that the team solved few aspects of the engineering problem. | The demonstration failed to show that the team solved the engineering problem. | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| Evaluation of the proposed solution - Validation  - Verification - Performance - Quality - Appropriate methods | The proposed solution was fully and systematically tested/evaluated using appropriate approaches. | Many features of the proposed solution were systematically tested/evaluated using appropriate approaches. | Some features of the proposed solution were tested/evaluated using appropriate approaches. | Few features of the proposed solution were tested/evaluated. Approaches used may not be appropriate. | The proposed solution was not tested, and its performance was not evaluated. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| Overall Communication - Completeness - Correctness - Clarity - Conciseness | Always clear, accurate, and complete. It was very easy to understand. | Mostly clear, accurate, and complete. It was mostly easy to understand. | Usually clear, accurate, and complete. It was sometimes difficult to understand. | Frequently unclear, inaccurate, and/or incomplete. It was frequently difficult to understand. | Mostly unclear, inaccurate, and/or incomplete. It was very difficult to understand. | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **Total** | 1.00 | 0.00 |

**Please provide comments below:** (If you need more space, please use the backside)**:**

|  |
| --- |
| What aspects of the project were impressive? |
| What were possible opportunities for improvement? |

**Thank you very much for providing your feedback. Please email the completed form to mastev@rpi.edu.**