

Loc: _____ Title: _____

JUDGES: Use this rubric to assign a **Level (1, 2, 3, or 4)** to **Parts A, B, and C** for the project.

*** ½ marks are acceptable. Students will only see the feedback portion, NOT the scores.***

INNOVATION: Develop and evaluate new devices, models, theorems, physical theories, techniques, or methods in technology, engineering, computing, natural science, or social science.

PART A: SCIENTIFIC THOUGHT

LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4
Build a model or device to duplicate existing technology OR demonstrate a well-known physical theory or social/behavioural intervention.	Improve or demonstrate new applications for existing technological systems, social or behavioural interventions, existing physical theories or equipment, then justify them.	Design & build innovative technology ; provide adaptations to existing technology or to social or behavioural interventions; extend or create new physical theory . Human benefit, advancement of knowledge, and/or economic applications are evident.	Integrate multiple inventions, technologies, social or behavioural interventions OR design & construct an innovative application that will have human and/or commercial benefit .

PART B: ORIGINALITY & CREATIVITY

LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4
The project design is simple with little evidence of student imagination. It can be found in books or magazines.	The project design is simple with some evidence of student imagination . It uses common resources or equipment. The topic is a current or common one.	This imaginative project makes creative use of available resources. It is well thought-out and some aspects are above average .	This highly original project demonstrates a novel approach. It shows resourcefulness and creativity in its design, use of equipment, construction and/or analysis.

PART C: COMMUNICATION

(visual display + oral presentation + project report with background research + logbook)

LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4
Most or all of the four elements are simple, insubstantial or incomplete . There is little evidence of attention to effective communication. In a pairs project, one member may have dominated the presentation.	Some of the four elements are simple, insubstantial or incomplete , but there is some evidence of student attention to effective communication. In a pairs project, one member may have made a stronger contribution to the presentation.	Most of the four elements are complete and demonstrate attention to detail and substance . The communication components are well thought out and executed. In a pairs project, both members made an equitable contribution to the presentation.	All elements are complete and exceed reasonable expectations of a student at this age/grade. The visual display is logical and self-explanatory. The exhibit is attractive and well laid out. Both project report and logbook are informative and written clearly; the bibliography extends beyond web-based articles. The oral presentation is clear, logical, and enthusiastic. In a pairs project, both members contributed equitably and effectively to the presentation.

**PART A
SCIENTIFIC
THOUGHT**

(1 – 4)

**PART B
ORIGINALITY
& CREATIVITY**

(1 – 4)

**PART C
COMMUNICATION**

(1 – 4)

**TOTAL
SCORE**

(max. 12)

On a scale of 1 to 5, should this project advance to the regional science fair (GVRSF)?

NO 1 2 3 4 5 ABSOLUTELY

Turn over to alert Chief Judge to any concerns (these will not be seen by students)

INNOVATION

Loc: _____

Student(s): _____

School: _____

JUDGES FEEDBACK FOR STUDENTS

Students will receive this portion after the fair. Please leave comments!

What was done well:

Areas to Improve:

Quick alerts: If this project were to be revised, focus on...

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> personal knowledge of subject | <input type="checkbox"/> display of data |
| <input type="checkbox"/> background research on the topic | <input type="checkbox"/> analysis of data |
| <input type="checkbox"/> experimental design | <input type="checkbox"/> oral presentation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> use of control group | <input type="checkbox"/> display board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> identification of variables | <input type="checkbox"/> construction & design |
| <input type="checkbox"/> choice of materials/chemicals | <input type="checkbox"/> attention to detail |
| <input type="checkbox"/> care & precision of observations | <input type="checkbox"/> processes used |
| <input type="checkbox"/> care & precision of data recording | <input type="checkbox"/> sources of error |
| <input type="checkbox"/> application & synthesis of information | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> level of difficulty vs. your age & training | |

Other Comments (fold along dotted line & use other side as needed):

Further notes for students

Concerns for Chief Judge

Are there any concerns that the Chief Judge should be aware of?

(Check all that apply)

- Student did not show up for judging.
- Scoring based only on project display.
- Presentation shortened due to delay.
- Presentation affected by technical issues or noise.
- Evidence of unsafe practices.
- Student unable to present proof of ethics approval when asked.
- Project appears to be in progress (i.e. proposal only, no data collected).
- Significant part of project (e.g. research, construction, testing, analysis) outsourced rather than done by student.
- Other
