**Project Name: Reviewer: Date:**

| **Criteria** | **Exceeded Expectations** | **Match Expectations** | **Less Than Expected (Fair)** | **Need Improvements** | **Failure** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * Background and Customer Needs Analysis
 | All users and stakeholders are identified along with critical analysis of potential issues. Issues are prioritized based upon the level of impact and probability. | Most users and stakeholders are identified along with critical analysis of potential issues. | Many users and stakeholders are identified, along with an analysis of potential issues. | Some users and stakeholders are identified, but little or no analysis of potential issues. | No users and stakeholders are identified, and little or no analysis of potential issues. |
| **Technology Assessment*** Relevant to the project
* Analyses and implication
* Usefulness
* Engineering Standards
 | Information is very relevant to the assigned topic. Implications for project decisions are very clear and critical for moving forward with the project.  | Information is mostly relevant to the assigned topic. Implications for project decisions are mostly clear and useful in the project.  | Information is usually relevant to the assigned topic. Implications for project decisions are somewhat clear and somewhat useful in the project.  | Information is insufficient and/or hardly relevant to the assigned topic. Implications for project decisions are somewhat unclear.  | Information is irrelevant to the assigned topic.  |
| * Requirements, Constraints, and Engineering Specifications
 | All relevant requirements and constraints are identified, prioritized, and translated into clear measurable engineering specifications. | Most critical requirements and constraints are identified. Some non-critical requirements missed. Many of the requirements are translated into measurable engineering specifications. | Many of key requirements and constraints are identified and translated into measurable engineering specifications. | Some requirements and constraints are identified and translated into measurable engineering specifications. | Customer needs are not translated into clear requirements. Most of the requirements are not translated into measurable engineering specifications. |
| * Concepts Generation and Selection
* Multiple concepts/solutions
 | Concept space appears to include all reasonable options for all functions. Selection criteria are well defined, and scores are clearly explained.  | Concept space appears to include good breath for all functions. Selectin process appears to appropriate for the given project. | Concept space appears to be reasonable but not comprehensive. Selection process exists, but some selection criteria are poorly defined (may not match with the specifications). | Concept space appears to be limited. Selection process exists but has some flaws. | Concept space appears to be inadequate. Selection process appears inadequate. |
| * Preliminary Design
 | The preliminary design fully demonstrates use and understanding of the engineering design process. | The preliminary design is supported by many artifacts of the engineering design process are present. | The preliminary design is supported by some artifacts of the engineering design process. | The preliminary design is supported by a few artifacts of the engineering design process. | The preliminary design does not appear to have followed the design process. |
| * Project Plan
 | A S.M.A.R.T. plan containing both key and detailed tasks is presented. SMART = Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, & Timely | Most key tasks included in the project plan and many tasks are divided into subtasks.  | Many key tasks are included in the project plan.  | Some key tasks are included in the project plan.  | No meaningful plan is presented. |
| **Additional Consideration*** Specified needs *with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental,* ***and*** *economic*.
* Justification for issues that do not apply to the project
 | It is comprehensive, and the issues are realistic. | It covers a good breadth, and the issues are mostly realistic. | It covers a reasonable breadth, and the issues are usually realistic. | It includes some obvious issues that are usually realistic. | Few obvious issues are superficially addressed.  |
| * Consistent and logical flow and organization
* Professional (grammar, no typos, proper citations, third-person used)
* 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 a technical 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 a technical writing style with few spelling/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 technical 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 writing style was informal/casual. No diagrams or illustrations were included or were improperly used. References were not used or were incomplete or missing. |