**Project Name:**

**Reviewer:**

**Date:** **Time: Section:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Exceeds Expectations93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)*** | ***Meets Expectations87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B), 80-82 (B-)*** | ***Fair77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C), 70-72 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvement67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)*** | ***UnacceptableBelow 65 (F)*** | **Raw** **Num.****Score** | **Wt.** | **Wt.****Score** |
| **Introduction*** Stakeholders
* Client’s motivation and expected benefits
 | All users and stakeholders are identified, along with a critical analysis of their potential problems. | Many users and stakeholders are identified, along with an analysis of their potential problems. | Some users and stakeholders are identified, along with some their potential project challenges. | Few users and stakeholders are identified, and there is limited analysis of their potential challenges. | Users and stakeholders are not identified; there is no analysis of their potential problems. |  | 0.10 |  |
| **Semester Goals*** Project History
* Semester goals and  deliverables
* Technical problems to be solved
 | Semester goals and deliverables are specific, measurable, actionable, and clear.  | Semester goals and deliverables are actionable and clear.  | Semester goals and deliverables are presented with some explanation.  | Semester goals and deliverables are unclear. The deliverables will not confirm that all objectives are met.  | Semester goals and deliverables are not presented. |  | 0.10 |  |
| **Customer Needs, Technical Requirements, Constraints, andMeasurable Specifications**  | All the information presented is relevant to the project. It is easy to understand what the team will do and why. Customer needs and tech requirements are clearly conveyed. | Most of the information presented is relevant to the project. Customer needs and tech requirements are presented. It is understood what the team will do and why. | Some of the information presented is relevant to the project. Some of the customer needs do not have matching tech requirements. | The information is incomplete. The technical requirements are not quantifiable. | Project needs and requirements are not presented. |  | 0.10 |  |
| **Design Concept Generation*** Multiple concepts (solutions)
* Selection criteria
 | Concept space appears to include all reasonable options for all system functions. Selection criteria are well-defined; scores are clearly explained.  | Concept space appears to include good breadth for all system functions. The selection process appears to be appropriate for the project. | Concept space appears to be reasonable but not comprehensive. Some selection criteria are poorly defined (do not match the specifications). | Concept space appears to be limited. The selection process was conveyed, but has some flaws. | Concept space appears to be inadequate. The selection process appears insufficient. |  | 0.15 |  |
| **Technical Approach**• Choice of core  technology• System architecture• Design feasibility* Supporting evidence
 | The technical approach and system architecture are very clear. Evidence is provided to confirm feasibility.  | The technical approach and system architecture are explained, and both are feasible. Some evidence is provided that supports design feasibility. | The technical approach and system architecture are presented. Insufficient evidence is provided to confirm design feasibility. | The technical approach or system architecture is not explained. **OR** The feasibility is questionable. | The technical approach and system architecture are not explained. |  | 0.20 |  |
| **Progress and Plan*** Preliminary Results
* Awareness of open Issues
* Next steps
 | Much progress is made. The next steps are realistic and clearly defined. | Good progress is made. Most of the next steps are realistic and well-defined. | Some progress is made. Some of the next steps are summarized. | Limited progress is made. Some of the next steps are not well defined. | No progress is made. The next steps are unrealistic, unclear, or not presented.  |  | 0.15 |  |
| **Communication (PPT)*** Contents
* Organization
* Figures/Graphics/ Tables
* Grammatical and spelling errors.
* References, as appropriate
 | The information is complete, very clear, and organized with clear slide titles. Visual aids enhanced the presentation. There are no writing errors. | The information is organized and clear. Most of the visual aids enhanced the presentation. There are minimal writing errors. | The information is sometimes hard to follow. Some visual aids were used to clarify key points. There are some writing errors. | Information is incomplete, unclear and/or disorganized.Insufficient visual aids are used.There are noticeable writing errors. | Information is difficult to follow – owing to missing technical information and a lack of visual aids. There are numerous writing errors. |  | 0.20 |  |
| **Total** | **1.00** |  |
| **What aspects of the project are impressive? (Required)** |
| **What are possible opportunities for improvement? (Required)** |
| **If you need more space, please use the back of this paper.** |