|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Satisfactory** | **Poor** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Engineering Project**   * Mission statement * Problem Identification * Customer Identified * Customer Requirements Prioritized and with Metrics * Performance Specifications * Value Proposition / Alternative System Concept * Modeling with Test / Analysis | Solution & approach demonstrate the total use of the engineering design process.  Safety issues are addressed in the specifications, design and implementation.  **30** | Many artifacts of the engineering design process are present. Safety issues are addressed in the specifications & design but may not have been carried to implementation.  **26** | Some artifacts of the engineering design process are present. Safety issues are addressed in the specifications but may not have been carried to design & implementation.  **24** | Few artifacts of the engineering design process are present. Safety issues are partially addressed in the specifications, design or implementation.  **21** | Solution & approach do not appear to have followed the design process. Safety issues were not visibly addressed.  **18** |
| **Documentation**   * Properly Utilizes Template * 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) * Supports / contributes to the message * Uses communication tools such as diagrams/figures, sketches, models * Facts & Evidence Provided to Support Conclusions * Bulleted text clearly explained | Report is always clear and concise, used a technical writing style and has no spelling / grammar errors. Well formatted and always flows smoothly, in a logical manner. Numerous diagrams / figures appropriately used to illustrate the text. In-line citations with proper references were always included.  **50** | Report is usually clear and concise, generally uses a technical writing style with 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** | Report is 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** | Report is 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** | Report 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** |