


ECE297 M4 Design Document Grading Rubric

Team ID: ____ Date: ____ CI: ____

	Exceeds Requirements	Meets Requirements	Below Requirements
			
Revisions and Editing	1. Revisions are careful and detailed 2. Revisions demonstrate a superior understanding of genre and audience 3. Revisions show a high level of critical thinking 4. Writing is clear, highly economical, and free of error	5. Revisions are reasonably careful 6. Revisions demonstrate an understanding of genre and audience 7. Revisions show evidence of critical thinking 8. Writing is mainly clear and free of error	9. Little or no attempt to make meaningful revisions 10. Revisions show little attention to genre and audience 11. Revisions show little or no evidence of critical thinking 12. High level of error in writing
New Design Decisions	13. Effectively discusses all important Milestone 4 design decisions 14. Convincingly explains importance of decisions to the project 15. Effectively argues for the decisions 16. Effectively compares decisions to alternatives 17. Paragraph types are appropriate and varied 18. Tables and figures are expertly integrated into report 19. Writing is clear, highly economical, and free of error	20. Discusses all important Milestone 4 design decisions 21. Satisfactorily explains importance of decisions to the project 22. Satisfactorily argues for the decisions 23. Satisfactorily compares decisions to alternatives 24. Paragraph types are generally appropriate 25. Tables and figures are well integrated into report 26. Writing is mainly clear and free of error	27. Fails to discuss all important Milestone 4 design decisions 28. Poor understanding of relevance of decisions to the project 29. Ineffective argument for the decisions 30. Unconvincing comparison of decisions to alternatives 31. Paragraph types are often inappropriate 32. Tables and figures are poorly integrated into report 33. High level of error in writing
References	34. Carefully researched 35. Excellent choice of discipline-specific sources 36. All citations are included and follow IEEE format	37. Satisfactory research 38. Sources are acceptable 39. All citations are included and closely follow IEEE format	40. Insufficient research 41. Sources are not credible in the discipline 42. Citations are missing or do not follow IEEE format
Appendices	43. Material in appendices is highly appropriate 44. Appendices are very well organized 45. Graphical material is concisely explained and, where necessary,	47. Material in appendices is generally appropriate 48. Appendices are well organized 49. Graphical material is reasonably well explained and, where necessary, referenced	51. Inappropriate material in appendices; either should be in body of report or is irrelevant 52. Appendices are poorly organized 53. Graphical material is poorly explained and/or lacks reference

	properly referenced 46. All material in appendices is effectively referred to in body of the report	50. All material in appendices is referred to in body of the report	citations 54. Some appended material is not referred to in body of the report
Lessons Learned	55. Introductory paragraph provides exceptionally clear sense of purpose 56. Body paragraphs identify highly specific areas of challenge or opportunity in the three assigned areas 57. Strategies for improvement are highly thoughtful and feasible 58. Writing is highly concise, clear, and correct	59. Introductory paragraph provides a reasonable sense of purpose 60. Body paragraphs are mostly specific and address the three assigned areas 61. Strategies for improvement are thoughtful and realistic 62. Writing is reasonably concise, clear, and correct	63. Introductory paragraph offers little sense of purpose 64. Body paragraphs are too general or fail to address the three assigned topic areas 65. Strategies for improvement are incomplete, superficial or unrealistic 66. Writing lacks concision and clarity 67. Writing has a high level of error
Performance Evaluation	68. Methodology is very clearly and concisely written 69. Analysis draws exceptionally clear conclusions for the test conditions 70. Analysis is highly concise and writing is free of error 71. Graphs are properly labeled and are effectively integrated into report	72. Methodology is reasonably clear and concise 73. Analysis draws reasonably clear conclusions for the test conditions 74. Analysis is adequately concise and free of writing errors 75. Graphs are labeled and reasonably well integrated into report	76. Methodology is unclear and/or lacks concision 77. Analysis is incomplete or conclusions fail to correlate with results 78. High level of error in writing 79. Graphs lack labels and/or are poorly integrated into report

Mark: _____

Further comments: