EML2322L – MAE Design and Manufacturing Laboratory Concept Generation (DR1) Grade Sheet

Group	Number:	(1)(2)		(3) (4) (5)
Repor	t Grader:			(3)
[-3 pt	s. max] REPORT ASSE	EMBLY (GROUP ASSESS	SMENT SCORE)	
2.3.	No properly labeled, co Report not assembled in	1 0 0 1	ividers included (ref. DRT. (-1 pt.)	petic order by last name. (-1 pt.) Appendix A template). (-1 pt.)
		for completing a requiren	nent.	
		for incomplete, incorrect,		
Any p	oints awarded or deduc	ted must have an associate	ed comment and/or	highlight in Canvas.
	/[5 pts] PROBLEM ST	ATEMENT (GROUP ASS	SESSMENT)	
1.	Are problem statement	and project schedule printe	ed with good quality	? (1 pt.)
2.	Are ALL design specs (-0.1 pts. per missing o	highlighted in yellow (incl or incorrect item)	uding drawings)? (1	pt.)
3.	Are ALL evaluation cr (-0.1 pts. per missing o	, -		
4.	Are ALL deliverable d (-0.1 pts. per missing o	© \ 1 '		
5.	Is any other important is (-0.1 pts. per missing o	information underlined in ror incorrect item)	ed? (1 pt.)	
	/[30 pts.] CONCEPTU	JAL DESIGN GENERAT	ION (<i>INDIVIDUAI</i>	L ASSESSMENT)
1)		plains how each part works ncorrect or unreferenced s	9	ach sketch by figure number?

2) Includes maximum robot velocity estimation. (0.5 pt.) (-0.25 pts. for incorrect calculation)

(-0.2 pts. per part missing a description)

- 3) Justifies each design choice and material selected based on background research or testing? (10 pts)
 - a. Does the written description show evidence that the background information was read and comprehended?
 - i. Selection of motor type and RPM (2 pts.) (-0.5 pts. per missing or incorrect justification)
 - ii. Mobile platform layout justification (1 pt)
 - iii. Steering method justification (1 pt)
 - iv. Ball and/or bucket manipulation method (2 pts) (1 pt. each)
 - v. Material selection justified for all components (material properties, structural shape, etc.) (4 pts)
 - b. Additional point deductions:
 - i. Written description is incomplete (-1 pt.)
 - ii. Unclear and/or overly wordy (-0.2 pts. issue; -4 pts. max)
 - iii. Does not follow the DRT formatting and placement at the beginning of the proper report section? (-1 pt.)
 - iv. Violates principles which should have been learned in the background research assignment? (-0.5 pts per violation; -2 pts. max)
- 4) Conceptual design drawings (14 pts):
 - a. Side, top, & front ortho. views (6 pts (2 pts per view))
 - b. Full isometric view(s) (4 pts)
 - c. Detailed views of manipulator(s), hopper/sorter and/or release mechanism(s)) (4 pts) (-1 pt. per missing view)
 - d. Understanding of mounting for motors, control box, etc. (2 pts)
 - e. Additional point deductions:
 - i. Required views not drawn full page and true scale? (-0.5 pt. per view; -3 pts. max)
 - ii. Required views do not show substantial detail of the entire design and clearly communicate the ideas (-0.5 pts. per missing or unclear detail; -3 pts. max)
 - iii. Required views do not use real components and materials found in lab or cited from other sources? (-0.5 pts. per missing detail; -3 pts. max)
 - iv. Required views are not labeled with member's name and/or sequential figure numbers? (-0.2 pts per incorrect view; -1 pt. max)
 - v. Leaders are not included to clearly label components and material selection? (-0.1 pts. per missing label; -1 pt. max)
- 5) Are explicit dimensions present showing overall size of robot, frame, control box, wheels, motors, manipulated objects, and each mechanism? (2 pts) (-0.1 pts. per item missing required dimensions)
 - a. Concept does not satisfy all constraints noted in the project description. (-.5 points per constraint missed; -2 pts. max)

Member (1):
Member (2):
Wieniber (2).
$M_{\rm cool}$ $\sim (2)$
Member (3):
Member (4):
Member (5):
A DEVELONAL COMMENTED
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS