UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design - Requirements Report Rubric

Project: _____

Date: _____

Score: ____/21

	3 - Expert	2 – Practitioner	1 - Apprentice	0 - Novice
Visual Format and Organization Score: Language	 Group has used the suggested template. The document is visually appealing and easily navigated. Appropriate typography and usage of white space are used as appropriate to separate blocks of text and add emphasis. Sentences are complete 	 Group has used the suggested template. The document is organized. Use of white space and typography help the reader navigate the document, although the layout could be more effective. Mostly, sentences are 	 Group may or may not have used the suggested template. Errors in the Table of Contents are present. Within sections, the order in which ideas are presented is occasionally confusing. In a few places, errors in sentence structure and 	 Group has not used the suggested template. The document is not visually appealing and there are few "cues" to help the reader navigate the document. There is no apparent ordering of paragraphs. Errors in sentence
(Word Choice, Grammar) Score:	 and grammatical. They flow together easily. Words are chosen for their precise meaning. Engineering terms and jargon are used correctly. No misspelled words are present. 	 complete & grammatical; they flow together easily. Any errors are minor and do not distract the reader. Repetition of words and phrases is mostly avoided. Mostly, terms/jargon are used correctly with some attempt to define them. There are one or two misspelled words. 	 sentence structure and grammar distract the reader and interfere with meaning. Word choice could be improved. Occasionally, technical jargon is used without definition. There are a few misspelled words. 	 structure and grammar frequently distract the reader. There is unnecessary repetition of the same words and phrases. There is an overuse of jargon and technical terms without definition. There are many misspelled words.
Capabilities Score:	 All items are assigned a unique identifier (i.e. CAP001). Items represent functionality of the end product, but are not necessarily bounds on the product. These are not requirements, constraints, or specifications. 	 Many, but not all items are assigned a unique identifier. Most items represent functionality of the end product, but are not necessarily bounds. A few capabilities appear to be constraints or specifications. 	 Few, if any, items are assigned a unique identifier. Listed capabilities do not fully describe the desired operation of the system. Many capabilities appear to be constraints or specifications. 	 No items are assigned a unique identifier. Listed capabilities do not describe the desired operation of the system.
Requirements Score:	 All items are assigned a unique identifier. Functional req.: Specify specific behaviors/ workings of the system: calculations, technical details, sizes, data use and processing. Non-functional req.: Specify specific behaviors of the system or criteria that can be used to judge the operation of system. 	 Many, but not all items are assigned a unique identifier. For the most part, functional requirements identify the workings of the system. For the most part, non- functional requirements identify specific behaviors of the system. 	 Few, if any, items are assigned a unique identifier. Specific bounds on the problem are not specified, or are poorly specified. If specific bounds are offered, many seem unrealistic. 	 No items are assigned a unique identifier. Listed requirements do not bound the desired workings of the system. If specific bounds are offered, most seem unrealistic.
Demo Test Plan Score:	 Plan describes the tests and test steps needed to demonstrate the capabilities of the device. Each test indicates which capability is being verified. All capabilities are verified by at least one test. 	 Plan describes the tests and test steps needed to demonstrate most of the capabilities of the device. Most capabilities are verified by at least one test. 	 Plan describes a few tests and test steps needed to demonstrate some of the capabilities of the device, but the plan in not thorough. Many capabilities are verified by at least one test. 	 Plan describes a very small number of tests and test steps needed to demonstrate a small part of the capabilities of the device. Tests poorly demonstrate capabilities of system.
Acceptance Test Plan Score:	 Plan describes complete test steps needed to verify that the requirements have been met. Each test verifies at least one specific requirement. All reqmts. are verified by one or more test. Plan consists of specific tests, each w/detailed test steps, and each noting which requirement is addressed. 	 Includes most tests needed to verify that the requirements have been met. Most requirements have been verified by at least one test. Most tests have detailed test steps, with each noting which requirement has been addressed. 	 Plan describes a few tests and test steps needed to demonstrate some of the requirements of the device, but the plan in not thorough. Many requirements are verified by at least one test. 	 Plan describes a very small number of tests and test steps needed to verify system requirements of the device. Tests poorly verify the system requirements.
Use of Subject Matter Experts and Sources Score:	• Prior work and sources of requirements are acknowledged by referring to people, assumptions, and background.	• With an occasional oversight, prior work & sources of requirements are acknowledged by referring to people, assumptions & bkground.	• On several instances, sources of requirements are not stated when appropriate.	• Little attempt is made to identify the source of requirements.

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design – Planning Rubric

Project:		Date:	Score	:/ 18
	3- Expert	2 – Practitioner	1– Apprentice	0 – Novice
Format and Heading Score:	 Group has used suggested format. Project title, date, and revision number are correct 	• Group has not used suggested format or the project title, date, and revision number are incorrect, but report is still readable.	• Group has not used suggested format. Project title, date, and revision number are not correct.	• Effort is difficult to follow due to formatting.
Product Design and Implementation Score:	 Sufficient time and good plan are identified for the design. Sufficient time is assigned for the implementation of the project. 	• The time allocated for the design, and the working plans are realistic, but some key tasks are missing.	• The time allocated for the design, and the working plans are not realistic. Minor tasks are identified with the appropriate time.	• The time allocated for the design, implementation, and the working plans are not realistic, and key tasks are missing.
Tasks, Time of effort and Resources Identified Score:	 All of the conceivable tasks needed for the project have been identified and listed, and have at least one team member identified as the assigned resource. All tasks have been given an appropriate amount of effort (man hours) to complete. 	 All tasks and resources have been listed, but some are not realistic. Some tasks have missing team member assigned to the resources. Estimates are realistic 	 While resources and some tasks have been listed, some are not realistic, and some tasks are missing from the effort. Some estimates are not realistic 	 Tasks have not been listed. Resources are not realistic. Tasks are missing from the effort. All tasks have not been given an appropriate amount of effort (man hours) to complete.
Sponsor and Mentor Effort Score:	• The appropriate effort (task and time) of the Sponsor and the Mentor have been identified.	 The task and time of the Sponsor has been identified. Some of the task and time effort of the mentor has been identified 	 The task and time of the Sponsor has been identified. While the task and time effort of the mentor has not been identified 	• The effort (task and time) of both Sponsor and mentor have not been identified.
Item Description and project Flow of the schedule plan Score:	 The work breakdown structure and schedule items match. The correct precedence and project flow have been identified. 	 The work breakdown structure and schedule items mostly match. The correct precedence and project flow have been identified. 	 The work breakdown structure and schedule items poorly match. The project flow is poor and illogical. 	 The work breakdown structure and schedule items do not match. The schedule does not have the appropriate precedence Project flow is poor and illogical.
Risks and Responses Identified Score:	 Appropriate risks have been identified with the appropriate responses. Risks have been scored based on appropriate probability. 	 Appropriate risks have been identified with the appropriate responses. Some risks have been scored. Some risks have no response plans. 	 Few risks have been identified Risks have not been appropriately scored. Some risks have no response plans 	• Risks have not been identified

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design – Financial Rubric

Project:		Date:	Score	:/ 18
	3- Expert	2 – Practitioner	1– Apprentice	0 – Novice
Format and Heading Score:	 Group has used suggested format. Project title, date, and revision number are correct 	• Group has not used suggested format or the project title, date, and revision number are incorrect, but report is still readable.	• Group has not used suggested format. Project title, date, and revision number are not correct.	• Effort is difficult to follow due to formatting.
Bill of Material Item Description and completeness Score:	 Item description, quantity, price per unit, total price, and vendor name have all been identified in the bill of material. BOM is complete. It includes all materials that should be in the device and project. 	• Almost 75% of the parts needed to complete this project have been identified in the BOM.	• Almost 25% of the parts needed to complete this project have been identified in the BOM.	 Item description, quantity, price per unit, total price, and vendor name have not been specified in the bill of material. BOM is incomplete.
Bill of Material Total cost	 The total cost has been calculated. The total cost includes the cost of all parts, final assembly, and subassemblies. 	• The total cost has been calculated, but it is not complete.	• The total cost includes the cost of some parts.	 The total cost has not been calculated. The total cost does not include the cost of all parts, final assembly, and subassemblies.
Score: Budget Plan for Development tools and Labor Score:	• The Budget plan includes all Labor cost, all development materials (i.e. tools, software, books, etc.) needed to complete the project.	 All labor hours have been included in the budget plan. Some of the development tools have been listed in the budget. 	• Some labor hours have been listed in the budget plan.	 .Development tools has not been identified Labor hours have not been listed in the budget.
Final Budget plan Score:	 Cost from the Bill of Material matches the budget plan cost. The budget plan includes all Development cost. 	 Cost from the Bill of Material matches the budget plan cost. The budget plan does not include the Development cost. 	• . The budget plan includes some of the Development cost.	• Budget plan is not available
Purchase order Score:	• All the parts needed to complete the project have been listed in the Purchase order	• Almost all parts needed for the project were identified in the purchase order.	• Some of the parts needed for the project were identified in the Purchase order.	• The Purchase order was not submitted on time.

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design - Engineering Notebook Rubric

Project: _____

Date: _____

Score: ____ / 24

	3 - Expert	2 - Practitioner	1 - Apprentice	0 – Novice
Notebook Mechanics Score:	 Student name, phone number and email address are included inside front cover Project sponsor and project year are included inside front cover Table of contents has been maintained Entries are sequential and any blank space has been crossed out 	 Student name, phone number and email address are included inside front cover Project sponsor and/or project year have not been included Table of contents has been maintained Entries are sequential and any blank space has been crossed out 	 Student name, phone number or email address is missing Table of contents has not been maintained, some content is not referenced Some blank space has not been properly treated in the notebook 	 Most contact information is missing The table of contents is confusing or not present The notebook has non- sequential entries Pages have been skipped in the notebook
Intellectual Property Maintenance Score:	 The notebook is written completely in pen The notebook is legible to the reviewer All pages have been signed by the author All entries by the author are dated 	 The notebook is written completely in pen The notebook is not completely legible to the reviewer All pages have been signed by the author All entries by the author are dated 	 The notebook is not written completely in pen, some entries are in pencil The notebook is not completely legible to the reviewer One or two pages are missing either signature or date 	 Most notebook entries are in pencil The notebook is not legible to the reviewer Three or more pages are missing either signature or date
Supplemental Material Score:	 Appropriate supplemental material is included in the notebook Supplemental material is affixed permanently to the pages of the notebook as described in the course notebook guidelines 	 No supplemental material is included Supplemental material is improperly affixed in one instance The material has been affixed well enough to stay in the notebook 	 Supplemental material is improperly affixed in more than one instance The material is in danger of being lost, but is included for submission 	 Supplemental material is obviously required but not included Supplemental material is obviously required, was attached and is now missing
Project Progress Score:(x 3) Weighted Score:	 The project is well documented in the notebook The notebook has obviously been maintained as an ongoing project, not rewritten as a secondary exercise A non-expert engineer could recreate the work done to date and continue the project 	 The project is fairly well documented in the notebook The notebook has been partially maintained as an ongoing project, with some rewriting A non-expert engineer could recreate the work done to date with some additional research and continue the project 	 The project is not well documented in the notebook The notebook has been rewritten from other notes A non-expert engineer would have difficulty recreating the work done to date, causing a project delay while recreating missing information 	 The project is not documented in the notebook The notebook is incomplete, confusing or otherwise useless to someone other than the author A non-expert engineer would have to restart the project to assure proper results
Project Research Score:(x 2) Weighted Score:	 There is evidence of basic discovery in the notebook. Multiple areas of engineering study have been integrated and applied to the project The technical basis for the project is of high quality, with possibly publishable results 	 There is evidence of new engineering that has been done to expand on or integrate undergraduate topics Undergraduate concepts have been applied properly to the project A basis for executing the project successfully has been presented 	 Some undergraduate level material has been improperly applied to the project No work to expand student understanding or capability is evident The notebook does not provide a complete technical basis to execute the project 	 No original engineering work is present Incomplete knowledge of undergraduate courses is evident The technical content of the notebook indicates little or no effort was made to solve basic problems associated with the project

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design – Status Report Rubric

3 - Expert 2 – Practitioner 1 - Apprentice	0 - Novice
	G 1 1 1 1
Visual Format,suggested template.suggested template.have used the suggested• Sentences are complete• Mostly, sentences aretemplate.	 Group has not used the suggested template. Word choice is poor. There are many misspelled words.
Score:	
Work Completedearlier reports are now completed or at least addressed.plans from earlier reports are now completed or at least addressed.plans from earlier reports are now completed or at least addressed.• Accomplishments related to the Requirements and Capabilities document have been identified.• Many, but not all, accomplishments related to the Requirements and Capabilities document have been identified.• Few, if any, accomplishments related to the Requirements and Capabilities document have been identified.• Few, if any, accomplishments related to the Requirements and Capabilities document have been identified.• Many, but not all, accomplishments are explained thoroughly enough to be reproduced.• Many, but not all, accomplishments are explained thoroughly enough to be reproduced.• Few, if any, accomplishments are explained thoroughly enough to be reproduced.• Many, but not all, short identified and• Many, but not all, short comings are identified• Few, if any, short comings are identified	 No previous plans from earlier reports are now completed or at least addressed. No accomplishments related to the Requirements and Capabilities document have been identified. No accomplishments are explained thoroughly enough to be reproduced. No short comings are identified and requirements above as
Score:*3= requirements change requests have been submitted. and requirements change requests have been submitted. requirements change requests have been submitted.	requirements change requests have been submitted.
Issuesthat require the assistance of the faculty mentor, sponsor, or course instructor have been clearly identified.problems or road blocks that require the assistance of the faculty mentor, sponsor, or course instructor have been clearly identified.road blocks that require the assistance of the faculty mentor, sponsor, or or course instructors have been clearly identified.• Risk assessment document has been• For the most part, the• Little work has been done to update the risk	 No problems or road blocks that require the assistance of the faculty mentor, sponsor, or course instructor have been clearly identified. No work has been done to update the risk
PlansGantt and Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) document have been followed and are on schedule.plans defined in the Gantt and WBS document have been followed and are on schedule.defined in the Gantt and WBS document have been followed and are on schedule.• Adjustments to the schedule and WBS have• Many, but not all, adjustments to the schedule and WBS have• Many, but not all, adjustments to the schedule and WBS have• Many, but not all, adjustments to the• Many, but not all, adjustments to the	 assessment document as needed. None of the plans defined in the Gantt and WBS document have been followed and are on schedule. No adjustments to the schedule and WBS have been made as necessary.
Score: been made as necessary. schedule and WBS have been made as necessary. necessary.	
with faculty mentor andan appropriate amount of communication with mentor and sponsor.adequate attempt to communicate with 	 Group has made no attempt to communicate with mentor and sponsor. Mentor has not signed status report.
Score:	

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design - Poster Presentation Evaluation Rubric (Semester 1)

Project: _____

Date: _____

	3 - Expert	2 - Practitioner	1 - Apprentice	0 – Novice
Poster Mechanics Score:	 The poster is exceptionally attractive in terms of design, layout, and neatness. Graphics are easily viewed and are related to the topic, making the material easier to understand. There are no grammatical mistakes on the poster. 	 The poster is acceptably attractive. Most graphics are easily viewed and relate to the topic. There is one grammatical mistake on the poster. 	 The poster is a bit messy. Many graphics are not clear or are too small. There are two grammatical mistakes. 	 The poster is distractingly messy or very poorly designed. It is not attractive. Graphics do not relate to the topic. There are more than two grammatical mistakes on the poster.
Technical Details Score:	• High level of relevant detail is presented to allow the audience to make judgments about the content. The details are not so elaborate that the presentation becomes tedious.	• Sufficient technical detail is included to enable the audience to understand the nature of progress.	• In places, the information was too detailed or was lacking.	• Significant amounts of technical detail are lacking or inadequate so that the audience cannot appreciate the progress that has been made.
Design and Planned Implementation Score:	• Presentation includes thorough description of design and planned implementation of the design, including expected results.	• Presentation includes sufficient information to assess the value of the design.	• Presentation does not include enough information to assess design.	 Design seems disorganized and not well conceived.
Presentation Level Score:	 The audience's interests are piqued and well considered. The audience's attention has been drawn and engaged. 	 The audience's knowledge level and interests have been considered. The audience's attention has been maintained. 	 Some opportunities for adjusting the presentation level for the audience have been missed. The audience's attention is weak. 	 The knowledge level of the audience has not been considered. The audience is not paying attention.
Handling of Questions Score:	• Presenters demonstrate full knowledge of the material and can explain and elaborate on expected questions.	• Presenters have sufficient knowledge of the material to answer expected questions.	• Presenters have difficulty answering expected questions beyond a rudimentary level.	Presenters cannot answer expected questions.
Professional Interaction Score:	 All team members are dressed in a professional manner, as would be expected for a job interview Team members are polite and engage the reviewer with appropriate conversation 	 One team member is dressed inappropriately Team members are polite and engage the reviewer with appropriate conversation 	 More than one team member is dressed inappropriately Team members are impolite, make inappropriate comments or otherwise make the reviewer uncomfortable speaking with the group 	• Anyone from the team makes a derisory, sexist or otherwise unprofessional comment that could lead to disciplinary action when employed

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design – Written Report Rubric – Semester I

	3 - Expert	2 – Practitioner	1 - Apprentice	0 - Novice
Content	Content of the report	Content conveys most of	Content conveys much of	Content conveys little of
content	conveys all of the detail	the project detail.	the project detail.	the project detail.
	of the project and device.	• An engineer might be	An engineer would have	 An engineer would not b
Score:	 An engineer can build the project based on the 	able to build the project based on the report.	difficulty building the project based on the	able to build the project based on the report
	report.	based on the report.	report	based on the report
Visual Format	The document is visually	 The document is 	Errors in the Table of	The document is not
and	appealing and easily navigated.	organized.	Contents are present.	visually appealing and there are few "cues" to
Organization	 Appropriate typography 	 Use of white space and typography help the 	 Within sections, the order in which ideas are 	help the reader navigate
C	and usage of white space	reader navigate the	presented is occasionally	the document.
	are used as appropriate to	document, although the	confusing.	• There is no apparent
Score:	separate blocks of text and add emphasis.	layout could be more effective.		ordering of paragraphs.
Language	Sentences are complete	• For the most part,	 In a few places, errors in 	Errors in sentence
(Word Choice,	and grammatical. They	sentences are complete	sentence structure and	structure and grammar
Grammar)	flow together easily.	and grammatical, and	grammar distract the	frequently distract the
Oraillinai)	 Words are chosen for their precise meaning. 	they flow together easily. Any errors are minor and	reader and interfere with meaning.	reader.There is unnecessary
	 Engineering terms and 	do not distract the reader.	 Word choice could be 	repetition of the same
	jargon are used correctly.	 For the most part, terms 	improved.	words and phrases.
	 No misspelled words are 	and jargon are used correctly with some	Occasionally, technical	 There is an overuse of jargon and technical
Score:	present.	attempt to define them.	jargon is used without definition.	terms without definition.
Score		• There are one or two	There are a few	There are many
		misspelled words.	misspelled words.	misspelled words.
Technical	 High level of relevant detail is provided to 	 Sufficient detail is provided to allow another 	 An accomplished engineer would have 	 Significant amounts of detail are missing. An
Details	allow other engineers to	engineer to continue	difficulty carrying	engineer would have
	understand the design, re-	development with some	forward the design	little use of the report to
	create the choices made	minor backtracking	without significant work	continue the project.
	and to continue the development of the	necessary.	to understand what has been done.	
	solution if necessary		occin done.	
Design and	• There is a thorough	 Drawings and design 	 Not enough design 	 The design as
Documentation	description of the theory of operation, design	details are present but a description of the theory	documentation to carry forth the design without	documented may not work.
	details (CAD Drawings,	is insufficient.	significant investigation	 Implementation plan is
	Schematics,	 Can be implemented 	 Difficult to implement 	lacking.
	Pseudocode/flow charts)			
	 Easy and ready to implement 			
Equations,	 All equations are clear, 	 Most equations are 	 Most equations are 	There may be
Numerical	accurate, and labeled.	accurate and clear. Most	accurate. Too many	inaccuracies within the
Usage, and	All variables are defined and units specified.	variables are defined and units specified. With	variables are not defined. Discussion regarding the	equation. Little or no attempt is made to make
Illustrations	Discussion regarding the	some minor exceptions,	development and usage	it easy for the reader to
	equation development is	adequate discussion	of the equation is unclear.	understand the use of an
	stated.All figures, graphs,	regarding the equation development is stated.	 In some cases, illustrations are not 	equation or its derivationFigures, graphs, charts,
	charts, and drawings are	 For the most part, 	conveying information	and drawings are of poor
	accurate, consistent with	illustrations are accurate,	clearly.	quality, have numerous
	the text, and of good quality. They enhance	consistent with the text, and of good quality.	 While items are labeled, references to these items 	inaccuracies and mislabeling, or may be
	understanding of the text.	 All items are generally 	are missing.	missing.
	All items are labeled in	labeled in accordance	C C	 There is no corresponding
Score:	accordance with	with engineering standards and are referred		explanatory text for included items.
	engineering standards and are referred to in the	to in the text.		included hems.
	text.			
Use of	 Prior work is asknowledged by 	 With an occasional oversight prior work is 	 On several instances, references are not stated 	 Little attempt is made to aakpowledge the work of
references	acknowledged by referring to sources for	oversight, prior work is acknowledged by	references are not stated when appropriate.	acknowledge the work of others.
	theories, assumptions,	referring to sources.	 Bibliographical entries 	 Most references that are
	quotations, and findings.	With some minor	are not complete.	included are inaccurate of
	 References are exact with author, journal, volume 	exceptions, references are exact with author,		unclear.
	number, page number,	journal, volume number,		
Score:	and year.	page number, and year.		
Use of	Information is placed	 Appendices are used 	While appendices are	Appendices were not
appendices	appropriately in either the main text or an appendix.	when appropriate.Selection and/or extent of	present, material in appendix is not referred	utilized when appropriate.
	 Appendices are 	 selection and/or extent of material in appendix may 	to properly in text.	 There is unnecessary
Score:	documented and	not be optimal.	 Content in appendix is 	inclusion of detailed
	referenced in the text.		not complete.	information in the main

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design - Project Presentation Evaluation Rubric (Semester 2) Project: ______ Date: _____ Score: ____/27

	3 - Expert	2 - Practitioner	1 - Apprentice	0 – Novice
Poster Mechanics Score:	 The poster is exceptionally attractive in terms of design, layout, and neatness. Graphics are easily viewed and are related to the topic, enhancing the presentation There are no grammatical mistakes on the poster. 	 The poster is acceptably attractive. Most graphics are easily viewed and relate to the topic. There is one grammatical mistake on the poster. 	 The poster is a bit messy. Many graphics are not clear or are too small. There are two grammatical mistakes. 	 The poster is distractingly messy or very poorly designed. It is not attractive. Graphics do not relate to the topic. There are more than two grammatical mistakes on the poster.
Technical Details Score: (x 2) Weighted Score:	• High level of relevant detail is presented to allow the audience to make judgments about the content. The details are not so elaborate that the presentation becomes tedious.	• Sufficient technical detail is included to enable the audience to understand the nature of progress.	• In places, the information was too detailed or was lacking.	• Significant amounts of technical detail are lacking or inadequate so that the audience cannot appreciate the progress that has been made.
Design and Planned Implementation Score:(x 2) Weighted Score:	• Presentation includes thorough description of design and implementation of the design, including results.	• Presentation includes sufficient information to assess the value of the design and its implementation.	• Presentation does not include enough information to assess the value of the design and its implementation.	• Design and implementation seems disorganized and not well conceived.
Presentation Level Score:	 The audience's interests are piqued and well considered. The audience's attention has been drawn and engaged. 	 The audience's knowledge level and interests have been considered. The audience's attention has been maintained. 	 Some opportunities for adjusting the presentation level for the audience have been missed. The audience's attention is weak. 	 The knowledge level of the audience has not been considered. The audience is not paying attention.
Handling of Questions Score:	• Presenters demonstrate full knowledge of the material and can explain and elaborate on expected questions.	• Presenters have sufficient knowledge of the material to answer expected questions.	• Presenters have difficulty answering expected questions beyond a rudimentary level.	• Presenters cannot answer expected questions.
Project Demonstration Display Score:	• A model, prototype, documentation set or computer simulation is present that enhances the reviewer's understanding and augments the presentation of results	• A model, prototype, documentation set or computer simulation is present that supports the presentation of results	• A model, prototype, documentation set or computer simulation is present but it is unclear to the reviewer that it is relevant to project results	• There is no work product displayed by the team
Professional Interaction Score:	 All team members are dressed in a professional manner, as would be expected for a job interview Team members are polite and engage the reviewer with appropriate conversation 	 One team member is dressed inappropriately Team members are polite and engage the reviewer with appropriate conversation 	 More than one team member is dressed inappropriately Team members are impolite, make inappropriate comments or otherwise make the reviewer uncomfortable speaking with the group 	• Anyone from the team makes a derisory, sexist or otherwise unprofessional comment that could lead to disciplinary action when employed

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design – Written Report Rubric – Semester I

	3 - Expert	2 – Practitioner	1 - Apprentice	0 - Novice
Content	Content of the report	Content conveys most of	Content conveys much of	Content conveys little of
content	conveys all of the detail	the project detail.	the project detail.	the project detail.
	of the project and device.	• An engineer might be	An engineer would have	 An engineer would not b
Score:	 An engineer can build the project based on the 	able to build the project based on the report.	difficulty building the project based on the	able to build the project based on the report
	report.	based on the report.	report	based on the report
Visual Format	The document is visually	 The document is 	Errors in the Table of	The document is not
and	appealing and easily navigated.	organized.	Contents are present.	visually appealing and there are few "cues" to
Organization	 Appropriate typography 	 Use of white space and typography help the 	 Within sections, the order in which ideas are 	help the reader navigate
C	and usage of white space	reader navigate the	presented is occasionally	the document.
	are used as appropriate to	document, although the	confusing.	• There is no apparent
Score:	separate blocks of text and add emphasis.	layout could be more effective.		ordering of paragraphs.
Language	Sentences are complete	• For the most part,	 In a few places, errors in 	Errors in sentence
(Word Choice,	and grammatical. They	sentences are complete	sentence structure and	structure and grammar
Grammar)	flow together easily.	and grammatical, and	grammar distract the	frequently distract the
Oraillinai)	 Words are chosen for their precise meaning. 	they flow together easily. Any errors are minor and	reader and interfere with meaning.	reader.There is unnecessary
	 Engineering terms and 	do not distract the reader.	 Word choice could be 	repetition of the same
	jargon are used correctly.	 For the most part, terms 	improved.	words and phrases.
	 No misspelled words are 	and jargon are used correctly with some	Occasionally, technical	 There is an overuse of jargon and technical
Score:	present.	attempt to define them.	jargon is used without definition.	terms without definition.
Score		• There are one or two	There are a few	There are many
		misspelled words.	misspelled words.	misspelled words.
Technical	 High level of relevant detail is provided to 	 Sufficient detail is provided to allow another 	 An accomplished engineer would have 	 Significant amounts of detail are missing. An
Details	allow other engineers to	engineer to continue	difficulty carrying	engineer would have
	understand the design, re-	development with some	forward the design	little use of the report to
	create the choices made	minor backtracking	without significant work	continue the project.
	and to continue the development of the	necessary.	to understand what has been done.	
	solution if necessary		oven done.	
Design and	• There is a thorough	 Drawings and design 	 Not enough design 	 The design as
Documentation	description of the theory of operation, design	details are present but a description of the theory	documentation to carry forth the design without	documented may not work.
	details (CAD Drawings,	is insufficient.	significant investigation	 Implementation plan is
	Schematics,	 Can be implemented 	 Difficult to implement 	lacking.
	Pseudocode/flow charts)			
	 Easy and ready to implement 			
Equations,	 All equations are clear, 	 Most equations are 	 Most equations are 	There may be
Numerical	accurate, and labeled.	accurate and clear. Most	accurate. Too many	inaccuracies within the
Usage, and	All variables are defined and units specified.	variables are defined and units specified. With	variables are not defined. Discussion regarding the	equation. Little or no attempt is made to make
Illustrations	Discussion regarding the	some minor exceptions,	development and usage	it easy for the reader to
	equation development is	adequate discussion	of the equation is unclear.	understand the use of an
	stated.All figures, graphs,	regarding the equation development is stated.	 In some cases, illustrations are not 	equation or its derivationFigures, graphs, charts,
	charts, and drawings are	 For the most part, 	conveying information	and drawings are of poor
	accurate, consistent with	illustrations are accurate,	clearly.	quality, have numerous
	the text, and of good quality. They enhance	consistent with the text, and of good quality.	 While items are labeled, references to these items 	inaccuracies and mislabeling, or may be
	understanding of the text.	 All items are generally 	are missing.	missing.
	All items are labeled in	labeled in accordance	C C	 There is no corresponding
Score:	accordance with	with engineering standards and are referred		explanatory text for included items.
	engineering standards and are referred to in the	to in the text.		included hems.
	text.			
Use of	 Prior work is asknowledged by 	 With an occasional oversight prior work is 	 On several instances, references are not stated 	 Little attempt is made to aakpowledge the work of
references	acknowledged by referring to sources for	oversight, prior work is acknowledged by	references are not stated when appropriate.	acknowledge the work of others.
	theories, assumptions,	referring to sources.	 Bibliographical entries 	 Most references that are
	quotations, and findings.	With some minor	are not complete.	included are inaccurate of
	 References are exact with author, journal, volume 	exceptions, references are exact with author,		unclear.
	number, page number,	journal, volume number,		
Score:	and year.	page number, and year.		
Use of	Information is placed	 Appendices are used 	While appendices are	Appendices were not
appendices	appropriately in either the main text or an appendix.	when appropriate.Selection and/or extent of	present, material in appendix is not referred	utilized when appropriate.
	 Appendices are 	 selection and/or extent of material in appendix may 	to properly in text.	 There is unnecessary
Score:	documented and	not be optimal.	 Content in appendix is 	inclusion of detailed
	referenced in the text.		not complete.	information in the main

UNC Charlotte COE Senior Design II – Technical Design Rubric

Project:		Date:	Score	:/ 30
	3 - Expert	2 – Practitioner	1 - Apprentice	0 - Novice
Identification of the problem or task	The problem statement is clear, concise and complete and is fully substantiated with supporting factual evidence.	A problem statement has been articulated and some evidence has been provided.	The problem statement is ambiguous and has weak support.	Problem has not been stated clearly and lacks any supporting evidence.
Score:				
Research and information gathering Score:	Existing solutions to the problem, including their strengths and weaknesses, have been thoroughly investigated, analyzed and discussed.	Existing solutions have been stated. Additional discussion may be warranted in places.	A review of existing solutions and research related to this problem is not adequately presented.	Connection between references and what is written is not clear. Little or no research has been performed.
Definition of the project	 There are clear expectations of the specific outputs or deliverables for the project. A complete set of measurable performance objectives has been created. 	 Mostxpectations have been stated. Some objectives may not be measurable. 	 Some expectations have been stated. Most objectives are not measurable. 	 Expectations are not clear or are missing. Objectives are not measurable or are missing.
Execution of the plan Score:	 All major points of the project were completed. 100 to 90 percent of the requirements were met. 	 Most major project points of the project were accomplished. 89 to 80 percent of the requirements were met. 	 Few of the major project points were accomplished. 79 to 70 percent of the requirements were met. 	 None of the major project points were accomplished. Less than 70 percent of the requirements were met.
Verification of the design *2 Score:	The prototype/model has been tested/simulated against the performance requirements listed in the definition of the project and has successfully met criteria.	The prototype/model has not been fully developed or tested/simulated.	Little verification of design was accomplished.	No verification of design was accomplished.
Project Scheduling Score:	A complete plan stating the cost, completion date, and required resources has been presented. Gantt charts and a budget spreadsheet have been thoroughly maintained and updated.	Some aspects of the plan have not been fully developed and some of the plan was not followed.	Few aspects of the plan have been developed and much of the plan was not followed.	Lack of planning is evident. A plan was not used.
Technical level of project *3 Score:	A significant portion of this project involves technical information or expertise which is an extension of the undergraduate curriculum.	Several technical aspects were new to the students and required research for successful completion.	This project contains some research but mostly involves technical information taught at the junior and senior levels.	This project did not challenge the students to perform much research, as it relied mainly on information taught within the curriculum.