UMass SDP17 PDR – Evaluation Sheet

Team Number/Name

Team Members:

Evaluators:

Presentation (15%)	❑ (4.0) A professional presentation that demonstrates knowledge and practice. ❑ (3.5) The presentation should have been practiced more. ❑ (3.0) The presentation was confusing at a few points. ❑ (2.5) The presentation was confusing at more than a few points. ❑ (2.0)The presentation was poorly organized or presented.
Significance and societal impacts (10%)	❑ (4.0) Clearly discussed significance and societal impacts (impact on special populations and moral implications) of their project. ❑ (3.5) Examples given of project significance and societal impacts but not believable – better examples were omitted. ❑ (3.0) Examples given of project significance and societal impacts, but did not demonstrate understanding of concepts. ❑ (2.5) Either project significance or societal impacts were completely omitted. ❑ (2.0) Both were omitted.
Requirements (25%)	❑ (4.0) The requirements are clear, complete, and appropriate. ❑ (3.5) A few necessary requirements are missing or unclear. ❑ (3.0) More than a few requirements are missing. ❑ (2.5) Requirements are given, but they are either inappropriate or very incomplete. ❑ (2.0) Minimal emphasis was placed on requirements.
Alternatives (10%)	❑ (4.0) Technical and non-technical alternatives were described and compared well. ❑ (3.5) A single key alternative or comparison criteria was omitted. ❑ (3.0) Comparisons were not made well or multiple key alternatives were omitted. ❑ (2.5) Multiple key alternatives were not made well or multiple key alternatives were omitted. ❑ (2.0) Minimal emphasis was placed on alternatives.
Block Diagram (25%)	❑ (4.0) A clear block diagram, well defined interfaces, and feasible plan to implement. ❑ (3.3) One or two blocks is poorly defined or feasibility is unknown. ❑ (2.7) More than two blocks are missing interface or feasibility. ❑ (2.0) The block diagram needs major work.
MDR deliverables (15%)	❑ (4.0) MDR deliverables address feasibility of all major subsystems. ❑ (3.3) MDR deliverables fail to address feasibility of a major subsystem. ❑ (2.7) MDR deliverables fail to address feasibility of several major subsystems. ❑ (2.0) MDR deliverables were not presented.

UMass SDP17 PDR – Evaluation (Written Comments)

Team Number/Name

Team Members:

Evaluators:

Presentation

Broader Impacts

Requirements

Alternatives

Block Diagram

MDR Deliverables

Other Comments: