

Scoring Sheet for ME491 Final Report

Project Title:

Evaluator:

	Excellent 4			Good 3			Acceptable 2			Deficient 1		
	4	3.8	3.5	3.3	3	2.7	2.3	2	1.7	1.3	1	0.7
Title Page Info												
Effective communication												
Content quality												
Staying within page limits												

Title Page Information [Refer to PDS Document] (5 points)

- Level-1: Many missing or incorrect information, badly formatted
- Level-2: Some missing or incorrect information, poorly formatted
- Level-3: minor problems
- Level-4: No errors, no typos, well-formatted

Communication (40 points)

- Level-1 (Worst quality)
 - Generally a very poorly written and unacceptable report (communication aspects)
 - Many spelling and grammar errors
 - Generally informal style
 - Poor organization
 - No separation of various information categories
 - Confusing headings
 - Headings do not match content
 - Bulleted items not properly formatted
 - Does not follow the required format (see PDS Document)
 - Much effort and re-reading is needed to figure out the main points
 - Writing emphasizes many unrelated or unimportant information such as:
 - Team-related issues
 - Complaints and excuses
 - How important this class is and how much they are learning
 - Lecturing about the design process, project management, etc.
 - Presenting the information in a chronological style
 - The style is inconsistent as in a haphazard cutting and pasting of incompatible information.
 - The report uses many unnecessary jargon
 - Information that should be in the body of report is presented in appendices or vice versa.

- Does not use good figures, charts, or tables to make the material easier to understand. Or, graphics quality is poor.
- Figures and tables are used but not referenced in the text
- Figures or tables lack proper caption or axis labels
- Missing bibliography when needed
- Level-4: (Best Quality)
 - Generally a superior report (communication aspects). Ideas are well articulated and arguments are convincing. The report is terse and concise.
 - No spelling and grammar errors
 - Professional writing style is used
 - Information is well organization into sub-headings
 - Follows the required format (see PDS Document)
 - No effort is needed to figure out the main points
 - Writing avoids unrelated or unimportant information and is well-focused on the facts related to design work.
 - The style is consistent and flows well throughout.
 - The report avoids unnecessary jargon
 - Information placed in attachments are well selected
 - Figures, charts, or tables are used to make the material easier to understand. The selection of figures and the graphics quality is superb.
 - Figures and tables are used and referenced in the text
 - Figures and tables have proper caption and labels and are very easy to comprehend.
 - There is a bibliography and it is properly formatted

Content Quality (50 points):

- Has the report adequately identified the customers and customer needs?
- Quality of the PDS including the selection of engineering criteria and targets for customer requirements?
- Do the indicator engineering criteria make sense? Are the bases for selecting targets reasonable?
- Quality of the top-level project plan. Are the milestones consistent with the design process milestones? At least having the following: (PDS, Internal/External Search or Research/Brainstorming, Concept Selection, Detailed Design or Engineering, Prototyping and testing, and Documentation). Are the timelines adequate? Are there adequate lower-level project plans?

Staying within page limits (5 points): See the “ME491 Final Report Document”.