|  | **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** |