

# SYST 495 SENIOR DESIGN PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

Version 8 Apr 16, 2012

TOPIC: \_\_\_\_\_ JUDGE NAME/AFFILIATION: \_\_\_\_\_

	1 = unsat	2 = minimally competent	3 = competent	4 = very good	5 excellent
<u>PROBLEM DEFINITION</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Context</b> of Problem explained, complete, consistent?</li> <li>• <b>Stakeholders</b> identified and “tensions” explained?</li> <li>• Constraints (economic, safety, illities, social, political, ethical) and “gap” identified?</li> <li>• Data and Analysis used to derive problem?</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
<u>PROBLEM/NEEDS STATEMENT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative performance target defined?</li> <li>• Win-win for “tension” identified</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
<u>MISSION/FUNCTION/DESIGN REQS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Reqs</b> derived from problem statement?</li> <li>• Reqs include quantitative performance measures?</li> <li>• Distinction between the operational reqs and technology reqs clear?</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
<u>SYSTEM DESIGN ALTERNATIVES</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designs satisfy reqs and derived from Context/Stakeholders?</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
<u>DESIGN ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY/TECHNICAL APPROACH</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the proposed <b>analytical approach</b> appropriate and valid for defined problem?</li> <li>• Is the proposed method of analysis correct, complete?</li> <li>• Is the <b>Design of Experiment (DOE)</b> applied correctly, achievable?</li> <li>• Value hierarchy?</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
<u>RESULTS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results reasonable, consistent?</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
<u>RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCLUSIONS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respond to problem statement?</li> <li>• Provide adequate basis for policy/business decision?</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
<u>PROJECT PLAN &amp; BUDGET</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning complete and comprehensive?</li> <li>• Budget reasonable?</li> <li>• Critical path identified?</li> <li>• Project risk/mitigation identified?</li> <li>• Progress evaluation metrics applied?</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
<u>COMMUNICATION</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oral and visual communication clear? Presentation engaging/interesting? Scientific graphics (e.g. charts, tables) used effectively? Prior works referenced? Questions answered effectively?</li> </ul>	1    2    3    4    5				
Presenter A:	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter B:	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter C:	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter D:	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter E:	1	2	3	4	5

**OVERALL GRADE (1 Unsat. 2, 3, 4, 5 Excellent)** \_\_\_\_\_

**OVERALL COMMENTS:**

<b>AQ</b> Crockett, Amy DeGregorio, John Delsouz, Amir Hossein Muhealden, Alan Streicher, Daniel	<b>EM</b> El Beleidy, Saad Jamshidi, Peyman Kovacs, Jared Lewis, Gabriel	<b>GHG/Carbon Neutral Airport</b> Hannah, Joel Hettmann, Danielle Rashid, Naseer Saleh, Christopher Yilmaz, Cihan	<b>HCA</b> Anderson, Christopher Fadul, Joseph Menon, Anupam Terceros, Harold	<b>SpExp/Lunar Habitat</b> Hetteema, Daniel Neal, Scott Quach, Anh Taylor, Robert	<b>T&amp;E DM TSO</b> Almashhadi, Saud Cann, Andrew Jones, Nathan Popal, Hina
---	--	--	---	---	---