Iteration Report Requirements

Context

The intent of the Iteration Report is to reveal how the team purposefully goes about developing their design towards their goals. (Iterations do occur for spontaneous insights but we want to see an intentional iteration cycle documented here.) The intentional/purposeful iteration should:

1. Have a purposefully selected aspect/component of the design to assess or refine (clearly linked to your Design Objectives and Constraints)
2. Be based on a Prototype (remember that this includes a wide range of options)
3. Acquire useful data/information by either soliciting external input or some other sort of systematic analysis; e.g. experimental evaluation/testing, analytical evaluation, external feedback, simulation, new research results or some other source of useful information
4. The resulting outcoming information is carefully reviewed for useful insights, both for the intended design evaluation but also for any other unexpected discoveries
5. The resulting insights are then used to develop a design change/revision that is clearly stated, well-considered (backed by reason or logic), and leads to a design change that is evident in a new Prototype.

Use the provided template, and demonstrate good MS Word skills, to document **one Good Design Iteration**. Submit the resulting report through Gradescope as a PDF.

Visuals of design prototypes are expected to play **a very important part** of this report so be sure to include quality figures, well-captioned and referenced in your description of how your design evolved.

Use this report to document a significant Design iteration and not a trivial one. *Trivial design iterations will garner poor scores in most of the following rubric.*

Rubric

	Weight	Unacceptable [0, 1, 2, 3]	Below expectations [4, 5, 6]	Meets expectations [7, 8]	Exceeds expectations [9, 10]	Score [0-10]	Weight-ed Score
Pre-iteration Design	**20%**	Presentations of pre-iteration design misses key elements or details and is vague or confusing WRT the part(s) / feature / functionality being "evaluated" in this iteration.	Presentations of pre-iteration design misses a key element or is vague overall. Insufficient emphasis on the part(s) / feature / functionality being "evaluated" in this iteration.	Pre-iteration design clearly presented with an emphasis on the part(s) / feature / functionality being "evaluated" in this iteration.	Exceptional coverage of pre-iteration design including details on, and reason why, part(s) / features / functionality are being evaluated in this iteration.		
Prototype and Goal	**20%**	Poor description of the prototype evaluated, and unclear what and how it was being assessed, very trivial design attribute, or no results shared.	Vague description of the prototype evaluated and how and what was being assessed and why. Assessment of something more trivial or limited results included.	Clear and concise description of the prototype and how the prototype was evaluated, what was being assessed, why assess it, and summary of results.	Insightful and very effective description of the prototype evaluated, how & what was being assessed and why (linked to design criteria), and the results.		
Inform-ation Acquired and Derived Insights	**25%**	Inadequate and vague descriptions of the evaluation results. Unsubstantiated or very poor insights based on the results.	Weak descriptions of evaluation results. Limited insights drawn and presented. Weak relationship between insights and results.	Clear descriptions of evaluation outcomes the resulting insights that impacted the evolution of the design.	Excellent coverage of all insights and their source(s) in the results that impacted the evolution of the design.		
Resulting Design Change or Revision	**25%**	Incomplete and confusing coverage of the design changes, their connections to the insights or the expected outcomes.	Somewhat incomplete or confusing coverage of the design changes and/or driving insights. Weak or vague indications of expected outcomes.	Clear review of how your design evolved based on identified iteration insights with expected outcomes.	Exceptional overview of design changes with clear links to noted insights and expected outcomes.		
Quality	**10%**	Numerous spelling or grammar errors and/or presented in a style that is very difficult to follow or parse. Little or no referencing of included tables or figures and no external references. Grey template guidelines not removed.	Poor writing style making it difficult to identify the intended point and/or containing spelling or grammar errors. Limited referencing of included tables or figures and poor external references. Most grey template guidelines removed.	Concise, clear, and logical presentation of information including good grammar and spelling. Good use of references, proper use of captions for tables and figures. Grey template guidelines removed.	Exceptionally effective writing style, easy to understand and follow and very informative. Superior use of external references, and cross-references to properly captioned tables and figures. Grey template guidelines removed.		
	100%					**Total Score**	