Rubrics for Internal Design Review

	(4) Advanced - A	(3) Proficient - B	(2) Basic - C	(1) Below Basic - D or E
Timeliness (10%)	• Design Candidate Sheets are completed on time for each design • Design Assessment Criteria sheet is completed on time • Group is present and ready to begin on time	• Design Candidate Sheets are complete but not on time • Design Assessment Criteria sheet is completed but not on time • Group is present and read to begin on time	• Most Design Candidate Sheets are complete • Design Assessment Criteria sheet is mostly complete • Group is present	• Design Candidate Sheets are not completed • Design Assessment Criteria sheet is not completed • Group is not present
Discussion (30%)	• Group follows good meeting and teamwork procedures • Discussion remains professional in tone and direction • Discussion proceeds efficiently • Group is able to focus on the relevant aspects of the robot designs	• Group follows decent meeting and teamwork procedures • Discussion remains professional in tone and direction • For the most part discussion proceeds efficiently • For the most part group focuses on relevant aspect of robot designs	• Group follows few meeting and teamwork procedures • Discussion does not have a professional tone or manner • Discussion does not proceed efficiently • Group rarely focuses on relevant aspects of robot design	• Group does not work as a team • Little discussion occurs • Discussion does not stay on topic • Group does not focus on relevant aspects of robot design

Rubrics for Internal Design Review

(Cont.)	(4) Advanced - A	(3) Proficient - B	(2) Basic - C	(1) Below Basic - D or E
Problem Understanding (40%)	• Design Assessment Criteria are appropriate • Discussion indicates that all team members are familiar with the problem • Discussion indicates that all team members understand the needs of the solution • Candidate designs are oriented toward solving the problem • Candidate designs show evidence of thought out design including mechanics, programming, and testing	• Design Assessment Criteria are mostly appropriate • Discussion indicates that most team members are familiar with the problem • Discussion indicates that most team members understand the needs of the solution • Candidate designs are mostly oriented towards solving the problem • Candidate designs mostly show evidence of thought out designs	• Design Assessment Criteria are not very appropriate • Discussion indicates that a few team members are familiar with the problem • Discussion indicates that a few team members understand the needs of the solution • Candidate designs do not really try to solve the problem • Candidate designs do not show a thought out design	• Design Assessment Criteria do not exist • Little discussion takes place • Candidate designs do not exist
Consensus (20%)	• Group members avoid unnecessary "attachment" to their designs that gets in the way of productive discussion • All group member are able to reach consensus	• Group members avoid unnecessary "attachment" to their designs that gets in the way of productive discussion • Most group members are able to reach a consensus • Group is present and ready to begin on time	• Group member must keep pieces of their original design which may temporarily halt productive discussion • Few group members reach consensus	• Group members feel that their design is the only design • Group members never reach consensus