

Proposal Report Assessment Guidelines

NOTE: This rubric has a dual purpose: (1) to give a guideline for EE493-EE494 students about the criteria and overall expectations from the Proposal Reports and (2) to establish a common guideline for us, the design studio coordinators, in evaluating the reports. Note that the rubric, being only a guideline at this point for all of us, should not be perceived as a strict set of requirements for the content of a successful report. However, we hope that the detailed comments below include a large number of clues to serve the preparation of such a report. An attempt was made to reflect the expectations of all design studio coordinators in the rubric. However, each corresponding coordinator will still be evaluating freely based on his/her best judgment.

	Excellent (9-10)	Good (7-8)	Marginally Satisfactory (5-6)	Needs Improvement (Unsatisfactory) (1-4)
Components of the Title Page and table of contents.	All required elements are present in a way that add to the professionalism of the report (e.g., graphics for logo and company name, pictures) have been added together with extra information such as project initialization date, duration and expected completion date. Table of content has the suitable resolution and is correctly structured.	One required element is missing. Table of content is correct but not fully detailed.	Two required elements are missing. The table of content contains misleading indexing.	Several required elements are missing. Table of content has errors.
Executive summary	The executive summary is professional and creates a curiosity in the reader to go further in the report.	The executive summary is just a correct compounding of the report content.	One of the important information about the project is missing (e.g., problem statement, solution procedure, deliverables).	The executive summary lacks a lot of relevant information about the project.
Statement of the Problem and Requirement Analysis	Customer needs are thoroughly and clearly defined, requirements are clearly identified. Report illustrates clear identification and thorough decomposition of objectives (i.e., relevant objectives are grouped and an objective tree is formed including the weights of objectives). Objectives are stated in such a way that the project scope and functional specifications are clearly identified. All possible constraints of the project are discussed. Specifications are clearly identified and stated in quantifiable manner.	Customer needs are clearly defined, requirements are identified. Report illustrates identification and decomposition of design objectives but the relative importance of objectives are not evaluated by team members. Objectives are stated in terms of project scope and functional specifications. Discussions about some of the constraints are missing. Specifications are identified, but are stated in a somewhat unclear manner.	Customer needs are rewritten in a different way from the given project descriptions in verbal rather than technical terms. Some of the requirements are identified. Report illustrates a limited understanding about objectives. Functional description of the project is partially provided. Discussions about most of the constraints are missing. Specifications are partially identified. No quantification is provided.	Customer needs mostly match the given description of the project but no technical information has been thought of to identify the scope of the project. Requirements are not identified. Report illustrates inaccurate understanding of the team about objectives of the project. Objectives are not related to the functional specifications of the project. Discussions of the constraints are missing.
Standards	Draft description/discussion of the requirements for any standards for the project is clearly identified. Initial ideas for standards that would be required to successfully implement the project, are thoroughly discussed.	Draft description/discussion of the requirements for any standards for the project is identified. Initial ideas for standards that would be required to successfully implement the project, are discussed.	Draft description/discussion of the requirements for any standards for the project is partially identified. Initial ideas for standards that would be required to successfully implement the project, are partially discussed.	Draft description/discussion of the requirements for any standards for the project is not identified. Initial ideas for standards that would be required to successfully implement the project, are not discussed.

Team Organization	Group qualifications have been matched to subsystem design requirements of the project. Key personnel have been identified providing their experience in the field of the project. An organizational chart identifying the individual areas of responsibilities is provided.	Group decomposition has been done according to project subsystem design requirements but no match of qualifications has been analyzed. Key personnel have been identified. No organizational systematic represented by a chart.	Group decomposition is coarsely described without a direct match to any subsystem design requirement of the project. Key personnel are not mentioned.	Report illustrates inaccurate understanding of team decomposition for carrying a design.
Solution Approach	The solution approach is clearly defined, supported by references on existing relevant works or products. Principal tasks, their duration and logical sequence and their particular purpose are given in details. The schedule of the solution tasks, including subsystem test plans, are given professionally as a Gantt chart. The Gantt chart includes overlapping tasks and relations between the tasks. The solution approach has been decomposed into subtasks where milestones and measures of success are clearly indicated.	The solution approach is clearly defined. Principal tasks, their duration and sequence; and their particular purpose are given without any systematic or logics. The schedule of the solution tasks are given as a chart. The solution approach has been decomposed into subtasks without any testing envisaged, nor success measures.	The solution approach is defined with a coarse description of tasks. The schedule of the solution tasks exists but does not reflect a clear understanding of the task decomposition.	The solution approach is insufficiently described with no or erroneous decomposition of tasks. The schedule of the solution tasks does not exist or does not reflect a realistic approach.
Deliverables	Description of products and services to be given to the customer at the end of the work is given in high details, reported professionally.	Description of products and services to be given to the customer at the end of the work is given in a detail suitable for the design work.	Description of products and services to be given to the customer at the end of the work is partially or very coarsely given.	Deliverables are missing or written as an obvious list such as including only prototype and guaranty.
Introduction, conclusion and societal impact	The introduction put forward a clear problem definition reflecting a detailed and analytical understanding of the problem. A synthesizing conclusion is included based on the solution procedure. The societal impacts of the project are completely analyzed.	The introduction provides a correct problem definition with a suitable background to the problem in hand. An analysis of the solution provided concludes the report. The societal impacts of the project are partially discussed.	The introduction includes some information about the definition of the problem. A conclusive statement as a general summary is included. The societal impacts of the project are not mentioned.	The introduction provides erroneous or ill posed statement of the problem without any further depth. No conclusion is provided.
Spelling, Punctuation, Grammar	Rare errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar are observed in the report.	Seldom errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar are observed in the report.	Frequent errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar are observed in the report.	Abundance of errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar are observed in the report.
Appearance / Organization of the report	Report is organized and written in a logical and professional manner. The use of headings and subheadings, pages with team logo reflect the visual presentation of the design work.	Report is neatly written. The uses of headings and subheadings visually organize the design work in a nice manner.	Report is neatly written, but formatting does not visually organize the design work.	The organization and appearance of the report are poor. Graphs or tables are not labeled and/or difficult to read.