Design Presentation Rubric — COE 485: Senior Design Project

Term: _____ Project: _____ Evaluator: _____

Students: _____ ☐ Advisor ☐ Examiner ☐ Coordinator

Criteria	Score 100%	Novice 0 – 20%	Apprentice 20 – 50%	Competent 50 – 80%	Proficient 80 – 100%
Problem Definition Weight: 20%		1. Poorly-defined problem. 2. Insufficient user requirements and technical specifications: meeting the stated requirements and specifications does not solve the stated problem.	1. Adequately-defined problem. 2. User requirements and technical specifications cover only some aspects of the system.	1. Well-defined problem. 2. Accurate user requirements and technical specifications that cover most aspects of the system.	1. Well-defined problem. 2. Accurate, comprehensive, and sufficiently specific user requirements and technical specifications.
System Design Weight: 50%		1. Non-representative, or missing, list of abstract system components. 2. Unclear assignment of system functions to specific system components. 3. No design options are considered. 4. No description of component design. 5. Inter-component interfaces are not specified.	1. Only some system components are identified. Some major components are missing. 2. Some main system functions are not mapped to any system components. 3. Superficial discussion of design options. Unconvincing justification of design choices. 4. Incomplete description of component design. 5. Too generic specification of inter-component interfaces.	1. Most major system components are identified, with mixed levels of abstraction. 2. Most system functions are assigned to specific system components. 3. Adequate justification of some design decisions. 4. Reasonable description of the design of some individual components. 5. Inter-component interfaces are somewhat specified.	1. All major system components are identified with appropriate abstraction. 2. Clear assignment of system functions to system components, covering all system functions. 3. Strong justification of some design decisions and the involved tradeoffs. 4. Clear description of the design of some individual components. 5. Inter-component interfaces are clearly specified: physical, protocols, APIs, etc.
Progress and Documentation Weight: 15%		1. Completing the project appears to be infeasible. 2. No useful documentation of work.	1. Noticeably behind schedule. Completing the project is questionable. 2. Work is barely documented.	1. Progressing slowly. Need to pick up the pace to complete the project in time. 2. Work is partially documented, leaving many questions unanswered.	1. Made sufficient progress so far to complete the project in time. 2. Work is well-documented, painting a clear picture of project progress.
Delivery and Handlign of Questions Weight: 15%		1. Too fast, too many um's, not projecting voice, lack of enthusiasm. 2. Does not answer questions adequately.	1. Somewhat fast, some um's, little projecting of voice, little enthusiasm. 2. Rarely answers questions adequately.	1. Good pace, usually projects voice, some enthusiasm. 2. Answers questions adequately.	1. Excellent pace, projects voice, enthusiastic. 2. Answers questions effectively and smoothly.