Senior Design Project Evaluation Form *(Updated Dec 26, 2016)*

Students:

1…… 3…… 5……
2…… 4…… 6……

Supervisor:……. Project Title:…….. Evaluator:……....

Phase	***Criteria***	***Max Grade***	***Grade***	***Metrics***	***Grading Guidelines***
Report Documentation(30)	Language and Clarity	5		• How proper the grammar and the language of the report. • Ex: Use of passive tense. • Ex: Connecting sentences properly.	• 5: Excellent Language, minor mistakes • 3-4: Mild issues in the language, still readable. • 0-2: Serious issues to the extent of being unreadable
	Format and Flow	10		• Include a Table of Contents • Whether it includes all needed sections: Introduction, Background, AND/OR literature Review, Design, Discussion, and verification of the Results, Analysis, and Conclusion • Proper Format for captions and tables. • Proper Referencing • Page numbering • Inclusion of block diagrams and flow charts, if applicable. • Good quality images • Appendices –if needed	• 9-10: Excellent formatting and completeness. All expected chapters and sections are fully included, and all metrics are adequately addressed. • 7-8: Minor mistakes in formatting. All chapters and sections are included. But not all metrics are adequately addressed. • 5-6: Mild issues in the formatting. However, chapters and sections are included. Not all metrics are adequately addressed. • 3-4: Serious issues in formatting. Not all chapters and/or sections are properly included. • 0-2: Poorly formatted document and not all chapters are properly included. (Documentation is a Skeleton)

	Design Requirements Realistic Constrains Engineering Standards	15		• The documentation clearly explains, considers, and discusses the design requirements, realistic constraints, and relevant engineering standards. • Design requirements, realistic constraints, and relevant engineering standards are clearly quantified and discussed when considering design options. • Documentation clearly includes the verification of the achieved design according to design requirements, realistic constraints, and engineering standards. • It includes enough details in each section to clearly describe the project	• 12-15: Excellent details and discussion for the design requirements, realistic constraints, and engineering standards. They were clearly taken into account and detailed in the design options section and have been quantifiably validated in the design and results chapters. • 9-11: Design requirements, realistic constraints, and engineering standards are clearly presented, discussed, and validated; however, minor issues are present in the design options section or in the design and results chapters. • 5-8: Not all design requirements, realistic constraints, and engineering standards are clearly presented. • 3-4: Some design requirements, realistic constraints, and engineering standards are not clearly addressed and validated. • 0-2: Design requirements, realistic constraints, and engineering standards are not addressed adequately.
Overall Design (25)	Design Choices	15		• Design requirements, realistic constraints, and relevant engineering standards are clearly taken into consideration during the evaluation of design options and approaches. • Design decisions are taken based on clear and quantified measures and indicators.	• 13-15: Good design decisions are made based on the design requirements, realistic constraints, and engineering standards. • 10-12: Two or more non-optimal design decisions. • 6-9: Several bad design decisions. • 0-5: Many bad decisions or even one killer decision.
	Completion According to Requirements, Constraints, and Engineering Standards	10		• Whether the project achieved the design requirements	• 10: Match what was required in the initial project proposal. • 8-9: Minor functionality is unachieved due to unforeseen circumstances. • 4-7: Minor functionality is unachieved. • 0-3: A lot of missing pieces from the initial project proposal.
Demo – Group (25)	Working Prototype/ Simulations	15		• Whether the Hardware or software is actually working or not.	• 14-15: Fully functional, no issues. • 10-13: Functional with Glitches. • 7-9: Not functional due to uncontrolled circumstances. • 4-6: Not a functional prototype • 0-3: Not a complete prototype. Missing major requirements of the design.

	Professional Finishing	10		• Quality of the software and/or hardware implementations.	• 8-10: Excellent finishing and packaging for hardware. Well-formatted and documented code for software. • 4-7: Mild issues with implementation. • 0-3: Serious issues with implementation.

			Per Student Assessment						
Phase	***Criteria***	***Max Grade***	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	***Notes***	***Guideline***
Demo – individual (20)	Presentation Skills	5						• Fluency • Style	• 5: Excellent & fluent. • 4: Good presentation skills, the student is very tense. • 3: Moderate presentation skills, • 2: Week skills, the student is not prepared. • 0-1: Completely unprepared, reading slides.
	Deep Understanding	10						• Confidence • Quality of answers to committee questions	• 8-10: Answer all questions or logically think about complicated questions. • 6-7: Answer some questions and fail to answer the rest. • 4-5: Not able to answer reasonable questions, and have the wrong approach. • 0-3: Flawed response to simple questions.
	Team Work filled by the supervisor	5							• 4-5: Collaboration with the team and made an expected contribution to the project. • 2-3: Below expectation, but has some teamwork capabilities & has some contribution to the project. • 0-1: Unable to work with a team and minimal contribution to the project
Total		100							