Bioengineering Design Context Review Rubric

Instructor: Z. Maria Oden

Team Name: _____

		Cycle 1	Cycle 2
1.	Quality of problem statement	/20	
2.	Relevance and completeness of background discussed	/40	
3.	Quality of references cited	/10	
4.	Quality of document structure and organization	/20	
5.	Quality of figures, tables and captions	/10	
6.	Response to comments/ previous grading		*
	TOTAL:	/100	

* can earn up to 75% of previously lost points

Grading elements in Design Context Review

	Excellent (max pts)	Average (mid pts)	Poor (lowest pts)
Quality of problem statement	Problem statement includes all three components described in Step 3 of DC review guide. Problem, contrary condition, and requirements for potential solutions relate logically. Statement is made precisely and concisely.	Problem statement may lack one of the three components OR components may not relate logically. Statement may not be worded effectively.	Problem statement is incomplete and fails to provide motivation for the team's project. The precise nature of the problem that team plans to address and why the problem is worth addressing is unclear, vague, or nonexistent.
Relevance and completeness of background discussed	Team provides sufficient background to set up and explain the problem statement. Relevance of all background discussed to problem statement is immediately apparent. Reader never questions why a particular subject is being discussed or wonders why a subject wasn't discussed.	Background may occasionally drift off-topic. Reader may occasionally question why a topic is being discussed or have questions about material that was not addressed.	Background does not sufficiently describe the project's rationale or motivation. Discussion may ramble off-topic or focus too much on one area at the expense of another. Reader has significant questions about team's knowledge and preparation.
Quality of references cited	Literature cited demonstrates extensive research in all aspects of team's project area. Sources are peer-reviewed and credible. Citations appear appropriately in text.	Literature cited is incomplete. Team may have neglected some aspects of its project area or consulted inappropriate or "soft" sources. OR citation method may be inadequate, with sources not cited when needed.	Literature cited neglects key aspects of project OR comprises mainly "soft" sources OR citations are absent (no references cited in text).
Quality of document structure and organization	Background is problem-focused with problem statement appearing at the end of the document. Transitions between topics occur logically. Team leads with assertions and provides clear forecasting sentences or subheads to guide reader through the document. Grammar/spelling is not distracting.	Background generally stays on topic, but may meander or lack flow. Transitions and other cues to guide reader may be lacking; key points occur at the end rather than the beginning of paragraphs.	Problem statement is not stated at the end of the document OR background is disjointed and team-centered rather than problem-focused. Transitions and other cues to guide reader are absent. Document may be incomplete, sloppily organized, or poorly written.
Quality of figures, tables and captions	Figures are included to explain content or enhance points made in text. Figures are numbered and referenced in text, and figure content is appropriately labeled. Captions explain the figures thoroughly.	Figures are used but may not be explained well or are not appropriate to content. Some figures may be poorly labeled or difficult to interpret. Figure captions may not be complete.	Figure usage is ineffective. Figures do not enhance the points made in the text. Figures may be difficult to understand. Captions are not used effectively or are absent.