

EE486 Design Review 4

Documentation

RUBRIC

General Information

- Grading:* Group = $\sum [\text{group}]_i$. For groups with four members, the member score will be exactly the individual section score. For groups of three members, the members score will be a weighted average of the member done and the group done (but assigned as individual) section scores, $[\text{individual}] \cdot \frac{2}{3} + [\text{individual}_{(\text{done by group})}] \cdot \frac{1}{3}$.

Cover Page and Table of Contents [group]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 15)	Average (16-18)	As Expected (19 - 20)
Explanation:	No cover page or table of contents is present.	Either the cover page or the table of contents is complete, but one is missing. OR Both are present, but neither is complete.	The cover page includes the team name, members, logo, and contact information. AND Includes page numbers and section headings.

Introduction Paragraph [group]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 15)	Average (16-18)	As Expected (19 - 20)
Explanation:	The report makes no mention of what the project is and who is on the team.	The report identifies the project (by title only), but not the team.	The report identifies the project and the team, with a short, but complete, description of the project. This includes enough detail such that the reader is left knowing exactly why this project is being done.

Describe your client's problem [individual]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 79)	Average (80-89)	As Expected (90-100)
Explanation:	Motivation and technical objectives were not well-stated, developed, or appropriate for the project; they were not thorough or linked together well.	Motivation and technical objectives were generally well developed, appropriate for the project, and linked together. Some were missing or inadequate.	Motivation and technical objectives were thorough, well developed, and logically linked together. A few may not be as thorough, well developed, or logically linked.

Describe your design process (subsystems) [individual]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 79)	Average (80-89)	As Expected (90-100)
Explanation:	Subsystems did not capture the behavior or structure of the system, and reflected an inadequate understanding of the system.	Subsystems approximated the behavior or structure of the important aspects of the system, but there were some efforts not captured, and/or had inappropriate complexity.	Subsystems accurately captured the behaviors or structure of the important aspects of the subsystem and were of appropriate complexity for the problem.

Project constraints [individual]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 79)	Average (80-89)	As Expected (90-100)
Explanation:	Unable to describe adequately how more than one realistic constraint impacted the design the each subsystems.	Able to describe adequately how two or three realistic constraints impacted the design of the majority of the subsystems.	Able to fully describe how three or more realistic constraints impacted the design of nearly all of the subsystems.

Metrics of success (WBS) [individual]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 79)	Average (80-89)	As Expected (90-100)
Explanation:	Not able to adequately describe nor report the activities, tools, and outcomes in a majority of the steps in the design process used.	Able to adequately describe and report activities, tools, and outcomes in the majority of the steps in the design process used.	Able to fly describe and report activities, tools, and outcomes in nearly all of the steps in the design process used.

WBS Status Update [group]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 15)	Average (16-18)	As Expected (19 - 20)
Explanation:	Current status of the subsystems is not discussed and/or not presented in a final WBS format.	The current status of the WBS is clearly presented, and accurately reflects the majority of the subsystems.	The current status of the WBS is clearly presented, and accurately reflects the activities and tasks of nearly all subsystems.

Conclusion [group]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 15)	Average (16-18)	As Expected (19 - 20)
Explanation:	No conclusion is included.	The conclusion is brief and recaps the project, but doesn't go deeper.	This conclusion leaves the reader knowing where the team is at with the project, and it should leave the reader with confidence that even if parts might not be going exactly as planned, there is a clear plan to address any such concerns.

Overall Report Format / Spelling and Grammar [group]:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 15)	Average (16-18)	As Expected (19 - 20)
Explanation:	Does not follow a report format, or loosely only follows some the requirements of the report format.	Follows a report format. AND Has multiple spelling or grammatical errors. It may also be obvious that different team members did different parts and didn't read each others sections.	Follows the report format. AND Has very few spelling or grammatical errors. The report is easy to read, and appears to have been a joint effort that everyone was involved in.