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| Project: | Reviewer:  | Date: |

| ***Criteria*** | ***Exceeds Expectations93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)*** | ***Matches Expectations87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B), 80-82 (B-)*** | ***Fair77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C), 70-72 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvements67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)*** | ***UnacceptableBelow 65 (F)*** | ***Raw Numerical Score*** | ***Weight*** | ***WeightedClick Ctrl-A and F9*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Background:-** Sponsor & Customers- Problem & Motivation- Project History as needed | Demonstrates a comprehensive and insightful understanding of all relevant background information. | Demonstrates a clear understanding of relevant background information.  | Begins to demonstrate some evidence of background information. | Demonstrates limited understanding of background information. | The background information is unclear or is not included. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.60 |
| **Long-Term Objectives:**- Project outcomes- Expected benefits | Long-term outcomes and expected benefits are very clear and reflect the customer’s needs. | Long-term outcomes and expected benefits are mostly clear and reflect the customer’s needs. | Long-term outcomes and expected benefits are somewhat clear and reflect some of the customer’s needs. | Information on long-term outcomes and expected benefits is limited. | Long term outcomes and expected benefits are not included, are incorrect and/or unclear. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.60 |
| **Semester Objectives:**- S.M.A.R.T.- In scope- Out of scope | All of the semester objectives are realistic, very clear, and consistent with the long-term objectives. | The semester objectives are realistic, clear, and consistent with the long-term objectives.  | Some of the semester objectives are realistic, clear, and consistent with the long-term objectives. | The semester objectives are ambiguous and/or indicate a lack of understanding. They are inconsistent with the long-term objectives. | The semester objectives are stated without clarification or description. They are unclear and/or unrealistic. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| **Engineering Tools and Methods:** | The technical approach is comprehensive, very clear and realistic. It indicates a deep understanding of the work plan. | The technical approach is clear and realistic, and conveys an understanding of the planned work. | The technical approach is somewhat clear. Several engineering tools/methods are identified. | The technical approach is limited. Additional tools/methods are needed to solve the problem. | The technical approach is unclear and/or not relevant for solving the problem. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| **Initial Deliverables and Dates:**- Deliverables, not tasks- Dates | Deliverables are well-defined and readily correlate with the semester objectives. All dates reflect a good first approximation to the project schedule.  | Many deliverables and few tasks are presented. It is generally easy to correlate them with the semester objectives. Most dates reflect a good first approximation to the project schedule.  | Some deliverables and some tasks are presented. It is somewhat difficult to correlate them with semester objectives. Some dates reflect a good first approximation to the project schedule. | Few deliverables and many tasks are presented. It is difficult to correlate them with the semester objectives.Dates are not realistic for the project schedule. | Tasks, not deliverables, are presented. It is very difficult to correlate them with the semester objectives. A project timeline is not included.  | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| **Documentation:**- Clarity, logical flow and organization - Technical writing (grammar, spelling, typos, third-person) references and citations - Appropriate use of tables and figures, including labeling, citing in the text. | The report is clear and concise, using logical formatting with little or no spelling / grammatical errors. The technical writing style flows smoothly. Many tables / diagrams / figures are used to illustrate the text. In-line citations with appropriate references are included. | The report is usually clear and concise, and uses a technical writing style with few spelling / grammatical errors. Information usually flowed smoothly and logically. Numerous tables / diagrams / figures are included to clarify the text. References are often used and appropriately cited. | The report has some ambiguities and some spelling / grammatical errors. The technical writing style is inconsistent. Some tables / diagrams accompany the text with some errors in referencing / citing. | The report is unclear, overly wordy or lacks technical details. The information does not flow smoothly; a “diary-style” is utilized. Few tables / diagrams are included and are not described in the text. References and citations are missing or incomplete. | The report contained few details, is unclear and lacks organization. The writing style is informal / casual. Tables / Diagrams (or illustrations), and references, are not included.  | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **Overall** | 1.00 | 1.20 |