**Project Name: Reviewer: Date:**

| *Criteria* | **Exceeded Expectations** | **Match Expectations** | **Less Than Expected (Fair)** | **Need Improvements** | **Failure** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Executive summary***   * *Background and problem* * *Technical approach* * *Concepts* * *System* * *Progress* | The summary is clear, complete. | The summary is mostly clear, mostly complete | The summary is difficult to follow, partly complete. | The summary is incomplete, has errors, and/or is difficult to understand. | Many elements are missing, and the summary is very difficult to understand. |
| **Introduction**   * Customer needs * Engineering requirements * Design review takeaways * Engineering tasks | Customer needs are complete, clear and linked to engineering requirements. Engineering requirements are numerical, or the tasks needed to make them numerical are outlined. Feedback from the PDR is translated into actionable items. Some engineering work has been done and the conclusions are summarized clearly. | Customer needs are mostly complete, clear and linked to engineering requirements. Some engineering requirements are numerical. Some feedback from the PDR is translated into actionable items. Some engineering work has been done and presented. | Customer needs are partly complete, clear and linked to engineering requirements. Few engineering requirements are numerical. Some feedback from the PDR is recognized but not translated into actionable items. Little engineering work has been done and presented. | Customer needs are mostly incomplete, unclear or not linked to engineering requirements. Few engineering requirements. Feedback from the PDR is not addressed. Very little engineering work has been done and presented. | Customer needs and engineering requirements are skeletal. Feedback from the PDR is not acknowledged. No engineering work is evidenced. |
| **Communication**   * Consistent and logical flow and organization * Professional – proper spelling grammar, executive summary is under 1 page. * 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 appropriate writing style and with little or no spelling or grammar errors. Well formatted and always flows smoothly, in a logical manner. Diagrams/figures appropriately used to illustrate the text. In-line citations with proper references were always included. | The report is usually clear and concise, using appropriate writing style and with few spelling or grammar errors. Well formatted and usually flows smoothly, in a logical manner. Diagrams/figures used to illustrate the text. In-line citations with proper references were included. | The report is less than clear and concise, with spelling or grammar errors. Diagrams/figures used to illustrate the text may be inadequate. In-line citations with proper references are incomplete. | The report is unclear and verbose. Significant spelling or grammar errors. Diagrams/figures used to illustrate the text are inadequate or inappropriate. inadequate. In-line citations are incomplete. | The report is unclear and confusing. Significant spelling or grammar errors. Diagrams/figures used to illustrate the text are missing. In-line citations are missing. |