Systems Engineering Detailed Design Evaluation

| | Missing | Poor | alled Design Evalua Fair | Good | Excellent |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| System Description | No system description present | Minimial system description | System description is very unclear or has significant omissions | System description is a little unclear or some aspect is missing | Description of the system is clear and concise giving the reader a clear idea of the project |
| Drawings/ Diagrams | No drawings present | Drawings provide virtually no information to help the builder | Drawings have significant omissions, making it difficult for a manufacturer to build | Drawings are unclear in some minor area | Drawings give clear description of the system and include units so that a 3rd party can build it easily |
| Temporal Model | No temporal model present | Minimal temporal modeling | Significant omissions in the temporal model | Temporal model is missing on minor aspect | A clear temporal model (like a flow chart or state diagram) is present and supports the concept of operations |
| Assembly Instructions | No assembly instructions present | Instructions do not help assemble the system | Instructions ok, but there are some significant issues | Instructions are pretty good, but some areas are problamatic | Assembly instructions are clear and make it easy for a 3rd party to build your system |
| Installation Instructions | No installation instructions present | Instructions do not help install | areas missing or unclear | Some small aspects of the installation are missing or unclear | Installation instructions clearly describe how the system will be installed at the museum. A 3rd part should be able to do easily the installation with these instructions. |
| Bill of Materials | No bill of materials present | Minimal bill of materials that is not particularly useful | Significant holes in the bill of materials | Bill of materials is missing some minor areas | Bill of materials clearly specifies all parts and sources used for constructing the system |
| Fault Recovery | Fault recovery not addressed | Minimal description of the fault recovery | Some major fault states missing | Some minor fault states missing | There is a clear description of how faults will be handled and of any degraded operational modes of the system |
| Traceability | No traceability to requirements and conceptual design | Only minimal traceability present | Many areas are not traceable back to requirements | Traceability is mostly present, but some areas missing. | There is very clear traceability from design decisions to the underlying requirements |
| Engineering Practices | Document does not contain a revision history or any referencing | Document is either missing a revision history or nothing is referenced. | Document contains a revision history and some references exists, but they are minimal. | Document contains a revision history but references are a little light | Document contains a revision history, and proper references to both external documents and internal sections |
| Readability/ Organization | Document is a jumble and impossible to follow | Document is legible, but there are many spelling, grammatical or logical errors making it very difficult to follow. | Organization of document is confusing or prose is too convoluted, making the document more difficult to read and understand | Document is well organized, but there are some areas that are confusing. Also, document could be too long and repetitive. | There is a logical flow to the document and prose is clear and concise. |