SYDE462 - Term Engineering Accountability Log

10% of course grade due April 10th, by 8pm ET on LEARN

Objectives of Individual Engineering Accountability Logs:

1. Describe and/or illustrate individual contributions to the team design project:
What did you do? How do we know you did it?
- Proof may be in terms of handwritten entries; annotated illustrations or pictures; select emailed communications; etc. To provide a coherent picture of the project, you may need to provide some context of what others on the team have done. CLARIFY, when efforts were collaborative, and when they were your contributions.

2. Comment on individual academic/technical learning from design project task outcomes:
What did you learn?
- Learning could be interpretation of results; could be better understanding of skill or resource limitations; could be realization that project is not headed in a productive direction – be honest. Honesty is part of professional practice. It is not uncommon to have to explain and own up to why a project has not proceeded as planned. Being accountable and responsible for project decisions are part of professional practice, too.

3. Identify and track personal management of assigned project tasks, within the context of the group's approach to project management:
What were you assigned to do, or take the initiative to do? Did you complete it? If no, why not?
- Be honest. What do you need to do next? Can you reasonably meet new targets, or is project re-scoping needed.
- How does your work fit into the group's overall plan, and how is that plan changing over time? Where is your group trying to go, and how will you get there? How are you individually contributing to achieving that objective?

Frequency of Engineering Accountability Entries:

Students are expected to document work and individual contributions as a work in progress. Dates associated with entries must be clearly stated. Retrospective entries must be clearly identified as such. Better Engineering Accountability Logs will have frequent entries as would be expected in a project log like those one might be keep in an Engineering Notebook. This is your Engineering recored of your work on the project. NOTE: Providing minimum entries with minimal content does not guarantee a passing grade (50%).

Format of Engineering Accountability Logs:

The keeping of a formal Engineering Notebook is recommended for those conducting projects involving innovative product design and/or engineering research. Entries should include components 1, 2, and 3 listed above. We appreciate that not all design projects will lend themselves well to being tracked through the traditional bound Engineering Notebook. For this reason, we are also permitting students to keep their Engineering Accountability Logs in an electronic format. This might be in the form of a "Word-style" or "PowerPoint-style" document that allows for the inclusion of annotated illustrations or pictures, code-sample and calculations (as appropriate), comments, and hyperlinks to on-line appendices (e.g. photo collection, videos, more comprehensive code, simulations, etc.).

Ultimately the the Engineering Accountability Log must be submitted as a single PDF document submitted on LEARN.

Submit your digital logbook using the following filename convention:

lastName_firstName_EAL.pdf

...for example: borland_matt_EAL.pdf

We are looking for a document that is used to capture your ideas, research, contributions, project management, and planning as an Engineering Record of your work. The three categories are intended to guide the types of content you include, but in the EAL itself you do not need to explicitly identify or categorize every single piece of information.

Evaluation

EAL Notebook

The EAL notebook component will be graded holistically with regards to the required three categories of content. A combined overall grade will be assigned from the grading of the 3 categories, it won't simply be a total or an average of the three. That means the complete absence of one category could result in a failing grade, etc.. The instructor also reserves the right to request a meeting with a student to explain the content, or lack thereof, in the logbook.

GRADING RUBRICS:

Descriptions and Illustrations of Contributions

Outstanding 90-100%	Contributions: Comments/Annotation differentiates between contributions made as individual work and that done in collaboration. Evidence provided suggests outstanding contribution to the project. Details: Impressively detailed entries that chronicle the evolution of the designed solution.
Excellent 80%	Contributions: Individual contribution is clear. Collaborations are noted. Evidence provided suggests meaningful participation and contribution to the project. Details: Text, sketches, diagrams, etc. provide an excellent overview of design team progress. Most entries are detailed. Text and sketches are clear and legible; diagrams and tables are appropriately labeled. All entries are signed and dated (can be electronic).
Very Good 70%	Contributions: Individual contributions are usually clear. Evidence provided suggests good participation and contribution to the project. Details: Text, sketches, diagrams, etc. provide a good overview of design team progress. Most entries are signed and dated (can be electronic).
Satisfactory 60%	Contributions: Contributions to project are generally noted but difficult to tell whether student really did the work. Evidence provided suggests basic participation in team project. Details: Entries provide general information or general progress of project.
Minimum 50%	Contributions: Student contribution appears to be very limited. Details: Minimum requirements for number of entries are met but details are sparse.
Fail – Unsatisfactory – 0-40%	Contributions: Unclear as to what student has done to contribute to project. Details: Student has not met the minimum requirements.

Individual Academic/Technical Learning

Outstanding 90-100%	Comments/annotations reflect in-depth knowledge of design project as well as strong insight into the strengths and weaknesses of personal contributions to the project.
Excellent 80%	Comments/annotations reflect strong knowledge of design project as well as good reflection and insight into personal learning or skill development through the teamwork-based project.
Very Good 70%	Comments/annotations suggest good knowledge of the overall progress of the project as well as personal learning or skill development through the design project.
Satisfactory 60%	Comments/annotations suggest basic reflection and basic insight into personal learning or skill development through the design project. Some answers seem contrived.
Minimum 50%	Comments/annotations suggest shallow reflection and limited insight into personal learning or skill development through the team project. Answers are overly similar to those of team-mates, suggesting limited independent thought.
Fail – Unsatisfactory – 0-40%	Comments/annotations are too brief or vague to assess whether or not the student has learned from the project experience to date.

Individual Task Management and Planning

Outstanding 90-100%	Hours: Evident student is working diligently and efficiently in the time frame expected each week. Planning: Evident student has strong grasp of appropriate next steps and efficient resource management.
Excellent 80%	Hours: Evident student is working effectively on project each week. Planning: Evident student has excellent grasp of appropriate next steps and resource management.
Very Good 70%	Hours: Evident student is working on project each week, and is meeting expected time commitments. Planning: Evident student has very good grasp of appropriate next steps resource management.
Satisfactory 60%	Hours: Evident student is working effectively on project most weeks. Planning: Evident student has reasonable grasp of appropriate next steps and resource management.
Minimum 50%	Hours: Evidence suggests student is spending some time each week on project but may not be effective. Planning: Evident student has some grasp of appropriate next steps and efficient resource management.
Fail – Unsatisfactory – 0-40%	Hours: Not enough evidence to suggest that student is meeting minimum course expectations. Planning: Little evidence to support basic task planning and time management skills.

NOTE: The evaluator reserves the right to compare entries across team members, speak directly with the team, and/or consult the named supervisor for clarification of entries before finalizing grades