

# New Project Proposal Rubric

Thank you for helping to evaluate team proposals for Robotic Caregivers. Please use this form to evaluate a proposal presentation for a new project. You can find a printable version in the associated Google Doc:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VqORQEVi6y5as6NP\\_bGTLc0Q7F-FomwCYj2SL9pyfvU/](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VqORQEVi6y5as6NP_bGTLc0Q7F-FomwCYj2SL9pyfvU/) .

A reviewer provides eight ratings using the following terms and associated points.

POOR = 6 points

FAIR = 8 points

GOOD = 10 points

VERY GOOD = 12 points

EXCELLENT = 14 points

The associated points will be added together to obtain a RAW\_TOTAL\_SCORE that ranges from 48 to 112 points, inclusive. EXCELLENT ratings for all eight categories would result in a RAW TOTAL SCORE of 112. VERY GOOD ratings for all eight categories would result in a RAW TOTAL SCORE of 96. This is designed to allow reviewers to provide some feedback without a grade penalty.

The RAW TOTAL SCORE can be converted to a letter grade using the following numeric ranges (the words in quotes are the standard Georgia Tech interpretations of letter grades from the Registrar's website):

90.0 <= NUMERIC GRADE : A ("Excellent")

80.0 <= NUMERIC GRADE < 90.0 : B ("Good")

70.0 <= NUMERIC GRADE < 80.0 : C ("Satisfactory")

60.0 <= NUMERIC GRADE < 70.0 : D ("Passing")

NUMERIC GRADE < 60.0 : F ("Failure")

The grade for this activity will be computed as follows:

Convert the RAW TOTAL SCORE to a BOUNDED TOTAL SCORE by setting the BOUNDED TOTAL SCORE to 100 if the RAW TOTAL SCORE > 100 and otherwise setting the BOUNDED TOTAL SCORE to equal the RAW TOTAL SCORE.

Set NUMERIC GRADE to the average BOUNDED TOTAL SCORE from all of the reviewers.

\* Required

1. Your name (Reviewer) \*

2. The team for which you are providing a review \*

Team Red

Team Green

Team Blue

3. Name of the team's project or another simple description of their proposal (Used to ensure accuracy) \*

4. Provide a RATING (POINTS) for each of the eight categories. \*

	POOR (6)	FAIR (8)	GOOD (10)	VERY GOOD (12)	EXCELLENT (14)
Value to the population	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Real-world feasibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proposed implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proposed evaluation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interactions with stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support from the literature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work plan with timeline	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quality of the presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Comments for the team

---

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Microsoft. The data you submit will be sent to the form owner.

