

UMass GDP19-20 PDR – Evaluation Sheet

Team Name

Team Members:

Evaluators:

Presentation (15%)	<input type="checkbox"/> (4.0) A professional presentation that demonstrates knowledge and practice. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.5) The presentation should have been practiced more. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.0) The presentation was confusing at a few points. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.5) The presentation was confusing at more than a few points. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.0) The presentation was poorly organized or presented.
Problem Statement (10%)	<input type="checkbox"/> (4.0) Comprehensively assesses problem needs (question customer; needs vs. wants; input/output analysis; project boundaries). <input type="checkbox"/> (3.5) A few necessary assessments missing. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.0) More than a few missing. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.5) Needs are assessed, but they are either inappropriate or very incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> (2.0) Minimal emphasis was placed on assessing needs
System Specs (25%)	<input type="checkbox"/> (4.0) The requirements are clear, complete, and appropriate. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.5) A few necessary requirements are missing or unclear. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.0) More than a few requirements are missing. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.5) Requirements are given, but they are either inappropriate or very incomplete. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.0) Minimal emphasis was placed on requirements.
Design Alternatives (10%)	<input type="checkbox"/> (4.0) Technical and non-technical alternatives were described and compared well. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.5) A single key alternative or comparison criteria was omitted. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.0) Comparisons were not made well or multiple key alternatives were omitted. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.5) Multiple key alternatives were not made well or multiple key alternatives were omitted. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.0) Minimal emphasis was placed on alternatives.
Block Diagram (25%)	<input type="checkbox"/> (4.0) A clear block diagram, well defined interfaces, and feasible plan to implement. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.3) One or two blocks is poorly defined or feasibility is unknown. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.7) More than two blocks are missing interface or feasibility. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.0) The block diagram needs major work.
MDR deliverables (15%)	<input type="checkbox"/> (4.0) Deliverables address the most essential, technically challenging portion of project. Individual responsibilities addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> (3.3) Either the most essential portion of the project or individual responsibilities were not fully addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.7) Both the most essential portion of the project and individual responsibilities were not fully addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> (2.0) Both the most essential portion of the project and individual responsibilities were not addressed.

UMass GDP19-20 PDR – Evaluation (Written Comments) Team Members: Evaluators:	Team Name
Presentation	
Problem Statement	
System Specs	
Design Alternatives	
Block Diagram	
MDR Deliverables	
Other Comments:	