Conceptual Design Review (40 pts)

	Exemplary (100%)	Proficient (80%)	Developing (60%)	Deficient (30%)
Slide				
Clarity (3 pts)	Text and images are an appropriate size and legible. The main points are immediately visible.	Some elements of the slide may be difficult to read or understand due to improper sizing, but the slide is understandable.	The slide is difficult to interpret due to improperly sized information or poor organization.	Text and images are missing, unreadable, or so poorly sized/organized that the main points cannot be identified.
Content (5 pts)	The slide identifies the user and their needs**, demonstrates the ideation process with sketches from all team members**, **and explains the prototyping strategies used to show how the design achieves the stated goal**.	The slide explains the user's experience or the way the design works, but does not connect the two ideas, and it does not present a clear strategy for prototyping.	The slide does not provide meaningful insight into the thought process behind the design or user experience.	The slide does not identify the user or their needs, includes no ideation sketches, and does not explain any prototyping strategy.
Presentation				
Clarity (3 pts)	When discussing the slide and presenting the prototype, the group is well prepared. All group members participate.	The team is generally clear with their explanations but occasionally relies on reading from slides or notes.	The team's presentation is significantly hampered by reading from slides or notes and does not address the audience.	The team is unprepared, only one person speaks, or the delivery is incoherent and does not engage the audience.
Content (5 pts)	The group stays on message and fully explains their thought process. This includes identifying the user group, describing the ideal user experience, **outlining key prototyping strategies, and presenting the next steps toward developing the prototype for the upcoming review**.	Some parts of the thought process are explained clearly, but other sections are missing or underdeveloped.	The presentation is missing significant details and does not help the audience to understand the team's thought process.	The presentation does not explain the user group, user experience, prototyping strategies, or next steps, leaving the thought process unclear.
Prototype				
Compliance with physical requirements (5 pts)	Prototype follows the physical requirements established in the project 1 description.	Prototype follows most of the physical requirements, with a clear explanation as to how the final version will be constructed in compliance with the physical requirements.	Multiple physical requirements are not followed, plans to change the prototype to be in compliance are underdeveloped or missing.	The prototype does not follow the physical requirements from Project 1 and lacks explanation of how compliance will be achieved.
Completeness and functionality (8 pts)	The prototype is functional, and the assessment of its mechanical feasibility demonstrates the key motions that will be	The prototype is a mostly complete representation of the final design, one motion may not be completely constructed,	The prototype is incomplete and does not replicate the motions of the proposed final design.	he prototype is missing major components or motions and cannot demonstrate

	present in the final design.	or is constructed in a different way.		feasibility of the final design.
Consideration of user experience (5 pt)	There is clear evidence of how multiple design decisions help to achieve the desired emotions for the user.	The prototype may have 1 or 2 design choices that help achieve the desired emotions, but some elements were not considered.	There is a lack of evidence that the desired user experience was a major design consideration.	No evidence is provided that user experience was considered in the design decisions.
Design questions addressed by prototype (6 pts)	The prototype clearly demonstrates an attempt to answer key design questions. The team addresses how data gathered from the prototype will be used to refine the final version.	Design questions are discussed, but it is not clear how the prototype helps to generate useful information that can be used to refine the final version.	There is no clear evidence that the prototype was developed to answer any key design questions.	The prototype does not address key design questions and does not generate useful data for refinement of the final version.