Client Meeting 2 Rubric (Ver. 2024-09-27)

Project Name: **Reviewer:** **Date:**

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations 93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)	Matches Expectations 87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B), 80-82 (B-)	Fair 77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C), 70-72 (C-)	Needs Improvement 67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)	Unacceptable Below 65 (F)	Raw Numeric Score	Wgt.	Score
Project Overview • *Background* • *Objectives* • *Needs, requirements, and metrics*	The background information and project objectives are clear. The needs, requirements, and metrics are clear.	The background information and project objectives are mostly clear. The needs, requirements, and metrics are mostly clear.	The background information and project objectives are presented. Some needs, requirements, and metrics are presented.	The background information and project objectives are vague. Critical needs requirements. And metrics are missing.	The background information and project objectives are not presented.The needs, requirements, and metrics are not presented.		0.10	
Design Concepts • System Architecture Design • Multiple Concepts • Selection Criteria	The concept space appears to include all reasonable options for all system functions. Multiple concepts are presented for all system functions. Selection criteria are well-defined; scores are clearly explained.	The concept space appears to include good breadth for all system functions. Multiple concepts are presented for most of the system functions. The selection process seems appropriate for the project.	The concept space appears reasonable but not comprehensive. Multiple concepts are presented for some system functions. Some selection criteria are poorly defined (they do not match the specifications).	Concept space appears to be limited. Multiple concepts are presented for a few system functions. The selection process was conveyed, but it has some flaws.	Concept space appears to be inadequate. Multiple concepts are not presented. The selection process seems insufficient.		0.40	
Technical Progress • Preliminary design calculations • Technical challenges (risks) • Demo	The technical information is complete and very relevant to the project. It provides insight and analysis, and the technical challenges are clear.	The technical information is relevant to the project and mostly complete. Some analysis and insight are provided, and the technical challenges are mostly clear.	The technical information is somewhat relevant to the project but incomplete. Analysis and insight are weak, and technical challenges are vague.	The technical information is not relevant to the assigned topic or is incomplete. Analysis and insight are not provided. Technical challenges are incomplete and ill-defined.	The technical information, analysis, and insights are not provided. Technical challenges have not been identified.		0.10	
Project Status (Schedule) • Semester milestones • Deadlines and deliverables • Evidence to support the status is present in the slides	Semester milestones, deadlines, and deliverables are SMART and relevant. The evidence to support the status is clear.	Semester milestones, deadlines, and deliverables are mostly SMART and relevant. The evidence to support the status is mostly clear.	Some semester milestones, deadlines, and deliverables are partly SMART, relevant, or incomplete. The evidence to support the status is vague.	Semester milestones, deadlines, and deliverables are not SMART or relevant. The evidence to support the status is incomplete and ill-defined.	Semester milestones, deadlines, and deliverables are not presented. No evidence to support the status exists.		0.15	
Communication • Consistent and logical flow and organization • Appropriate use of tables, diagrams, figures, sketches, and models labeled and explained on the slides. • Responses to questions • Verbal and non-verbal communication	The presentation is always clear and concise, flowing smoothly and logically. Diagrams/figures are appropriately used to clarify the presentation and are always labeled/explained on the slides. The team answers questions knowledgeably, thoroughly, and confidently. It is effortless to understand the speakers; there are no distracting mannerisms.	The presentation is clear and concise, using an appropriate writing style with few spelling or grammar errors. Information usually flows smoothly and logically. Many diagrams/figures are included to clarify the presentation. It is easy to understand; there are a few distracting mannerisms.	The presentation is generally clear, with some spelling / grammatical errors. The abbreviated PPT appropriate writing style is not consistently followed. Poor information organization sometimes makes some parts of the presentation difficult to follow. Some diagrams are included. Some distracting mannerisms exist.	The presentation is unclear, overly wordy or missing supporting technical details. It used a "diary-style" (vs. a technical style). The information does not flow smoothly and lacks a logical structure. A few diagrams are included that are not properly related to the presentation. Numerous distracting mannerisms exist.	The presentation contains few details and insufficient facts and evidence. An appropriate writing style is not utilized, and the terminology is casual and not technical, making it challenging to follow and understand. Diagrams or illustrations are not included or are improperly used. Many distracting mannerisms exist.		0.25	
						Total	1.00	

Comments (Optional)