|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Satisfactory** | **Poor** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Engineering Project**   * Problem Identification * Potential Customers Identified * Customer Requirements Prioritized and with Metrics * Performance Specifications * Value Proposition / Alternative System Concept | Solution & approach demonstrate the total use of the engineering design process.  **30** | Many aspects of the engineering design process are apparent.  **26** | Some aspects of the engineering design process are apparent.  **24** | Few aspects of the engineering design process are apparent.  **21** | Solution & approach do not appear to have followed the design process.  **18** |
| **Documentation**   * Consistent/Flows * Logical/Accurate * Professional (no typos, has proper citations, third person used) * Benchmarking Documented * Tables/figures properly labeled and cited / described in text * Uses in-line citations for both external sources (e.g. web/books) and internal sources (e.g. figures, tables) * Uses communication tools such as diagrams/figures, sketches, models * Facts & Evidence Provided to Support Conclusions * Bulleted text clearly explained * Decision Matrix shown * Gantt Chart / Project Plan Provided | Written documentation was always clear and concise and used a technical writing style. There were no spelling / grammar errors. Information was well formatted and always flowed smoothly and in a logical manner. Numerous diagrams / figures were appropriately used to illustrate the text. References were always included and properly cited & formatted.  **50** | Written documentation was usually clear and concise and generally followed a technical writing style. There were 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.  **44** | Written documentation was sometimes clear and concise with few spelling / grammatical errors. The technical writing style was not consistently followed. Some information flowed smoothly and in a logical manner. Some diagrams were used to accompany the text. Some errors in referencing / citing were made.  **40** | Written documentation was unclear and overly wordy or missing significant detail. It was not in a technical style (e.g. “diary style”). 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.  **35** | Written documentation contained few details and was unclear. Information was not organized. Writing style was informal / casual. No diagrams or illustrations were included or were improperly used. References were not used or were incomplete or missing.  **30** |
| **Overall Quality**   * Attention to Detail * Workmanship * Attitude * Equal Member Contributions | Clearly demonstrates effort in terms of attention to detail, and workmanship.  **20** | Mostly demonstrates effort in terms of attention to detail, and workmanship.  **18** | Demonstrates some effort in terms of attention to detail, and workmanship.  **16** | Demonstrates effort in terms of attention to detail, and workmanship.  **14** | Demonstrates little effort in terms of attention to detail, and workmanship.  **12** |