

## ME4054 Final Report Evaluation Criteria

|                    | <b>Unacceptable</b>  | <b>Marginal</b>  | <b>Acceptable</b>  | <b>Good</b>  | <b>Exceptional</b>  |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Executive Summary  | Does not provide a good overview of the project or results   | Provides reader with some understanding of project, but the important results are not clear to a reader new to the project       | A reasonable summary of the project  | A good overview of the project and results   | Problem stated clearly. Design solution described succinctly. Quantitative evaluation presented. Project can be understood by an engineer unfamiliar with project.  |
| Problem Definition | Reader cannot understand the problem to be solved. Little consideration of prior art. Design requirements inadequate.              | Confusing problem statement. cursory technical review that misses most of the prior art. Design requirements flawed.             | Problem is introduced, but difficult for new reader to understand. Technical review is adequate, if not complete. Key design requirements included.  | Reasonable introduction to problem. Adequate technical review that covers the most significant prior art. Important design requirements identified.                  | Problem introduced so that new reader can understand. Comprehensive, well-cited technical review of prior art that puts problem in context. Design requirements complete and clear.   |
| Design Description | The design and its details cannot be understood.   | Reader will have difficulty understanding the final design. Little information on the details.                                   | Reader can understand the overall design, but some aspects may not be clear. Uneven coverage of design details.  | Final design clearly presented. Figures sufficient to convey a basic understanding of the design. Some details lacking.  | Clear and comprehensive. Excellent overview and detailed descriptions of components. Excellent use of figures.  |
| Design Evaluation  | Little or no evaluation. Design not supported with modeling or analysis. Analysis has serious errors. Superficial recommendations. | Uneven evaluation plan. Results qualitative. Analytical or simulation results likely to have errors. Incomplete recommendations. | Some, but not all requirements tested. Simulations and analysis may not have been verified. Some analytical results may be open to question. Largely qualitative rather than quantitative evaluation approach. | Evaluation plan directed towards requirements. Most requirements tested. Simulation results mostly verified. Prototype used for testing. Some recommendations given. | Evaluation plan clear and logical. All main design requirements were evaluated. Supporting simulation or experiment analysis appropriate. Mathematical or simulation analysis results verified with hand calculations. Prototype used for testing. Cost, environmental impact considered. Comprehensive set of recommendations. |

|                 |   |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Volume II       | Few supporting details and what is there is difficult to understand.  | Incomplete record of supporting details. Little attention paid to writing quality  | Good record of supporting details. Writing quality acceptable.   | Comprehensive record of supporting details. Attention paid to organization and writing style.  | Complete record of all supporting information. Logical organization. Excellent writing quality.  |
| Grammar & Style | Unprofessional writing style. Poor sentence and paragraph structure. Excessive grammatical errors and typos. Would be embarrassing to have report read by a professional. | Writing needs revision. Inadequate organization with omissions or redundancies. Sentence and paragraph structure is weak. Many errors and typos. | Writing is acceptable but not clear. Organization weak. Some sentences difficult to understand.  | Clear writing overall. Good organization. Logical sentences and paragraphs. Almost no grammatical errors or typos.   | Writing is complete and a pleasure to read. Excellent organization. No grammatical errors or typos. Carefully copy edited. Would be proud to deliver to a professional.  |
| Formatting      | Headings, fonts, layout difficult to understand and hinder reading the report   | Headings, fonts, layouts not logical, but report can still be read. Placement and size of figures is illogical                                   | Headings, fonts, layout are appropriate and help reader to move through the report   | Good use of headings, fonts and layout. Figures appropriately sized and placed.  | A beautifully laid out document with attention to graphic design. Size and location of figures is perfect. Appears professionally formatted and typeset.   |
| Figures         | Difficult to understand or too few. Lacking captions. Not properly referenced from text   | Some figures poor quality or not referenced in the text.   | Most figures can be understood. About the right number of figures. Plots show data, although captions may be incomplete and data may not be clear. | Figures are mostly helpful and easy to understand. All figures have captions. Data plots have correct axes and the data stands out. Photographs and drawings are acceptable quality. | Figures provide essential information and that is clearly conveyed to the reader. Figures well integrated with the text. Attention paid to captions. On data plots, axes and data are clear. Photographs and drawings are near-professional quality. |
| References      | Cursory attempt at supporting statements through citations. No knowledge of proper formatting of reference lists.   | Some citations support the document. Little knowledge of proper formatting style.  | Uneven set of citations. Some attention paid to formatting.  | Good list of citations. Some key citations missing. Formatting uneven.   | Complete list of citations. Citations are appropriate. Formatting is perfect.  |
| Overall         | Poor documentation of final project. Scope of report inadequate relative to difficulty of the project. Writing is poor.   | Report does not adequately document all aspects of the project. Uneven.  | Report documents most important aspects of the project, but lacks detail   | Report documents the project. A follow-up team could use the report to understand the work by the team.  | Report is comprehensive yet concise. A follow-up team could use the report to efficiently reconstruct the work done by the team. Writing quality is exceptional.   |