

**Project Name:**

**Reviewer:**

**Date:**

**Time:**

**Section:**

**I. Team Presentation**

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i> 93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)	<i>Meets Expectations</i> 87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B), 80-82 (B-)	<i>Fair</i> 77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C), 70-72 (C-)	<i>Needs Improvements</i> 67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)	<i>Unacceptable</i> Below 65 (F)	Score	WTD Score
<b>Introduction (10%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders</li> <li>Sponsor’s motivation</li> <li>Customer needs</li> <li>Customer benefits</li> </ul>	It was very clear why this project is important for the stakeholders.	It was usually clear why this project is important for the stakeholders.	It was somewhat clear why this project is important for the stakeholders.	It was unclear why this project is important for the stakeholders.	It was not conveyed why this project is important for the stakeholders.		
<b>Problems (15%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project History</li> <li>Semester goals</li> <li>Technical problems to be solved</li> </ul>	It was very clear what the team plans to do and why.	It was usually clear what the team plans to do and why.	It was somewhat clear what the team plans to do and why.	It was clear what the team plans to do and why.	It was not conveyed what the team plans to do & why.		
<b>Requirements (15%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Functional</li> <li>Non-Functional - Performance, Size, and Usability</li> <li>Justification</li> </ul>	Requirements and justification were very clear.	Requirements and justification were usually clear	Requirements and justification were somewhat clear.	Requirements and justification were not clear.	Requirements and justification were not presented.		
<b>Technical Approach (25%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Choice of Core technology</li> <li>System Architecture</li> <li>Feasibility</li> </ul>	Technical approach is very clear and appears to be sound.	Technical approach is usually clear and appears to be sound.	Technical approach is somewhat clear and appears to be sound.	Technical approach is unclear and/or questionable.	Technical approach was inappropriate or not presented.		
<b>Progress and Plan (15%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary Results</li> <li>Awareness of open Issues</li> <li>Next steps</li> </ul>	Much progress was made. Next steps were realistic and clearly defined.	Good progress was made. Most of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined.	Some progress was made. Many of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined.	Slight progress was made. Some of the next steps were realistic and not well defined.	No progress was made. Next steps were unrealistic, unclear, or not presented.		
<b>Poster (20%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contents</li> <li>Structure / Reading</li> <li>Visual presentation</li> <li>Grammatical and spelling errors.</li> </ul>	Information was complete, clear, and very easy to follow. There were no writing errors.	Information was complete, usually clear, and usually easy to follow. There were minimal writing errors.	Information was complete, somewhat clear, and flowed well. There were some writing errors.	Information was unclear. There were noticeable writing errors.	Information was incomplete.		
					Total		

**What aspects of the project were impressive? (required)**

**What are possible opportunities for improvement? (required)**

**Project Name:**

**Reviewer:**

**II. Individual Presentation**

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i> 93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)	<i>Meets Expectations</i> 87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B), 80-82 (B-)	<i>Fair</i> 77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C), 70-72 (C-)	<i>Needs Improvements</i> 67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)	<i>Unacceptable</i> Below 65 (F)
<b>Technical Understanding (50%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Information</b> - Accuracy - Completeness</li> </ul>	Speaker demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of technical details <b>and</b> the overall project.	Speaker demonstrated a proficient understanding of technical details <b>and</b> the overall project.	Speaker demonstrated a limited understanding of technical details <b>and</b> the overall project.	Speaker did not demonstrate an understanding of technical details <b>or</b> the overall project.	Speaker does not understand technical details <b>and</b> the overall project.
<b>Presentation (50%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verbal</b> (volume, tone, pace, fillers, etc.)</li> <li>• <b>Non-Verbal</b> (gestures, posture, eye contact, etc.)</li> <li>• <b>Openness</b> - Defensiveness - Argumentativeness</li> </ul>	It was effortless to understand; there were no distracting mannerisms.	It was usually easy to understand; there were no distracting mannerisms.	It was somewhat easy to understand; there were few distracting mannerisms.	It was difficult to understand; there were some distracting mannerisms.	It was very difficult to understand; there were many distracting mannerisms.

**Students**

<b>First Name &amp; Last Name</b>	<b>Technical Understanding</b>	<b>Presentation Points</b>	<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>Comments (Required)</b>

**Any additional comments about the project?**