

1. Understand the shared opportunity

Develop pages 1-3 together: industry, faculty, and students as involved. Faculty record the review on page 4.

Company / organization

Site / city / state

Industry / faculty contact and role

Email and phone

Project title

Date / proposed university or program

What happens today, and why is it a problem?

Describe the current process, frequency, consequences, and previous attempts.

Who uses, maintains, or is affected by the system?

What should improve, and what would success mean?

Examples: safer handling, shorter changeover, less scrap, more reliable inspection.

Where can students lead design decisions? What is already fixed?

Identify room to compare alternatives; explain any required equipment, method, or vendor.

What information is available?

List drawings, photos, measurements, operating data, or prior studies. Do not attach confidential files yet.

2. Define the design opportunity

Develop requirements together. Unknowns are welcome: write "to discuss together."

Project title (repeat for page identification)

Likely engineering disciplines / skills

Measurable requirements

For each: describe the requirement, baseline, target, and method of verification.

Requirement 1: baseline | target | verification method

Requirement 2: baseline | target | verification method

Requirement 3: baseline | target | verification method

What alternative approaches could students investigate?

You may leave the alternatives open for student development.

What engineering calculations, models, or experiments may be needed?

Examples: loads, heat transfer, circuits, controls, materials, tolerances, or process analysis.

What limits or trade-offs must the design address?

Include budget, space, energy, manufacturing, maintenance, usability, environment, and schedule as relevant.

What standards, codes, company requirements, and hazards are known?

Explain how they affect the design. Faculty will help identify appropriate requirements.

3. Plan the collaboration

Agree on a useful educational scope, shared resources, and ways of working together.

Project title (repeat)

Desired term / completion date

Minimum useful deliverable and optional stretch goals

Available funding / purchasing limits

Materials, software, fabrication, test facilities

Site/data access, training, hazards, supervision, and test permissions

Identify restrictions and lead times. Describe how verification could be performed safely.

Industry, faculty, and student communication / joint reviews

Record meeting frequency, contacts, shared responsibilities, and key deadlines.

Confidentiality, publication, and intellectual-property restrictions

Describe issues requiring university review. Do not assume an agreement is in place.

Would a verified design/prototype needing further development still be useful?

Dependencies, expectations, attachments, or additional information

If space is insufficient, attach numbered continuation pages keyed to the field labels.

Planning acknowledgment

Save and reopen a copy to confirm entries. Share it with the participating program coordinator through an agreed channel for a planning conversation. This PDF does not submit itself, score ABET compliance, guarantee acceptance, or create an agreement. Confirm arrangements before sharing sensitive information.

4. Collaborative feasibility review

Faculty record findings with industry and student input as involved. This is not ABET approval or certification.

Project title (repeat)	Reviewer / program / date
Review area	Assessment
Design opportunity Students can develop and compare meaningful alternatives.	Not reviewed
Technical depth Applies suitable prior engineering coursework.	Not reviewed
Measurable requirements Success can be specified and evaluated.	Not reviewed
Standards and multiple constraints Relevant requirements shape analysis and trade-offs.	Not reviewed
Verification Credible analysis, testing, or validation is available.	Not reviewed
Scope and resources Team, schedule, budget, and facilities are realistic.	Not reviewed
Safety and access Supervision, permissions, and risk controls are feasible.	Not reviewed
Academic assessment Faculty can inspect and evaluate sufficient student work.	Not reviewed
Program fit Matches discipline, course, and applicable program criteria.	Not reviewed
Overall review outcome	
Select outcome	
Shared findings, open questions, and agreed scope changes	
Agreed next steps, responsibilities, and follow-up date	

Basis: ABET Engineering Accreditation Commission, 2026-2027, Engineering Design definition and Criteria 3 and 5. Faculty must confirm the criteria for the applicable review cycle and discipline. No numeric score substitutes for academic judgment.