**ES 2501 Balloon Group Project Calculations Review**

You will be trading your calculations with another team to review their calculations. This type of quality control (QC) process is common in engineering practice as work must be reviewed before being delivered to your clients.

You will send all of your submitted work to your reviewer group and they should send their work back to you. If you are in HOW group A2 sub group A2a, then you will trade your work with subgroup A2b. (i.e. your reviewers are the other subgroup in your HOW groups). Be sure to get their contact information so that you can send the work between teams.

**Schedule:**

* The project is due on 9/15/2016 at midnight.
* Send your work to the reviewing team by 9/16/2016 by noon.
* Review the work that you received from the other team.
* Return the reviewed work by Tuesday 9/20/2016 by midnight.
* Review your work based on the corrections you received.
* Resubmit your project along with a copy of the corrections that your team did of the other teams work by Thursday 9/22/2016 at midnight.
* If a resubmission is not received by midnight on 9/22/2016, the original submission will be used for your final project grade.

**Reviewing:**

As there are two different configurations that were calculated by each team, so as a part of your review, at least one person from each team should review each configuration. You may want to do a detailed review of one of the configurations and then trade with someone in your team to do a quick review of the configuration that they reviewed in detail. You will be reviewing both the statics calculations and the payback time calculations.

You will be providing written feedback to the team whose work you are checking. This can be in the form of a report, as a scan of hand written notes on a copy of their calculations, or some other method that you choose. This must be legible feedback so that they will be able to make the appropriate corrections. You should have at least 1 paragraph to summarize your groups’ feedback. This should highlight both strengths and weaknesses of their work as well as summarize your overall impression.

You should focus your corrections on constructive feedback that will help the other group improve their final product. You should be giving input to both their calculations and their report. However, this does NOT mean that you are to edit their writing. You will be checking the report of sound logic and analysis/evaluation of calculations. (i.e. does the report convey sound conclusions about the cable scenarios described?)

You will also submit a copy of your corrections of the other teams work with the submission of your revised work. You must identify who made corrections to each configuration. Your QC work will be graded for bonus points on your teams’ submission.

**QC Bonus Points Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **5 pts** | **3 pts** | **1 pts** | **0 pts** |
| **Errors Identification** | All errors are found and corrective actions are given | More than half of the errors are found. All identified errors are given corrective actions | Fewer than half of the errors are found. Most identified errors are given corrective actions | Fewer than half of the errors are found. Many of the identified errors are not given corrective actions |
| **Clear Feedback** | Corrective actions have clear feedback. The root cause of the error is identified, and the change required to correct this action is shown. | Corrective actions have clear feedback. The root cause is not always identified, but changes are shown. | Corrective actions are not clear, some changes are unclear or incorrect | Incorrect changes/corrections are given. Feedback is unclear/not decipherable. |
| **Legible Feedback** | Corrections/feedback can be read/easily deciphered. |  |  | Corrections/feedback cannot be read/easily deciphered. |