## Judges' 2020 Engineering Notebook Score Sheet

Purpose: To document the process used to design, build, and test the robot. ( 30 pts.)

## Research Paper (4 pts.)

| Possible <br> Points | Points <br> Awarded |
| :---: | :---: |

Correlation between the game and how the science/technology is being used at a companylindustrylresearch lab in the team's state or region

| $7-10$ | In-depth discussion of how this year's game theme relates to industry in this region. |
| :---: | :--- |
| $3-6$ | General discussion of how this year's game theme relates to industry in this region. |

General discussion of how this year's game theme relates to industry in this region.

| $1-2$ | General discussion of this year's game theme, but no ties to the region | 0 | No discussion of game theme |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Comments:

Any related information of the game theme such as history, famous inventor(s), major milestones, etc.
4-5 $\quad$ In-depth discussion of history and people related to this year's game theme.
1 Some mention of history or people.
Comments:
$0 \quad$ No discussion of related info

Analysis of the game theme/problem \& related technology's impact on the human experience, our needs, adaptations, and progress with solutions.
4-5 $\quad$ In-depth historical account of the effects to human experience, needs, adaptation and progress toward solutions.
2-3 Some discussion about the effects of the theme/problem/technology on human experiences, needs, adaptations or progress. 1 Mentioned the effects to human experience, needs, adaptation or progress.
Comments:

Creativity in linking the game to appropriately related science content

| $7-10$ | Very creative in linking this year's game theme to other science/technology. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3-6 | Attempted to link this year's game theme to other science/technology. | 0 | No discussion of other science/technology. |  |
| 1-2 | Mentioned other science/technology. |  |  |  |
| Comments: | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  |  |  |

Proper formal writing - Proper use of grammar \& composition throughout ; source citations used to gather information; within 2-5 page limit
7-10 Very few grammar mistakes/misspellings, included citations, 2-5 pages.
3-6 Noticeable grammar mistakes/misspellings or did not include citations, 2-5 pages.
1-2 $\quad$ Many grammar mistakes/misspellings, no citations, or not within 2-5 pages. $\quad 0 \quad$ Incomprehensible or missing.
Comments:

## Design Process (17 pts.)

Implementation of the Engineering Design Process (Evidence that the engineering design process was effectively used)

| $21-25$ | Process is explicitly identified; steps are obvious and explanation is thorough. |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16-20$ | Process is identified; steps are discernible and there is some explanation. |  |  |
| $11-15$ | Process is not identified; there is some discussion of a design process. | $6-10$ | Discussion of process is minimal. |
| $1-5$ | You can tell there was a design process of some sort. | 0 | No discernible design process. |

Comments:
Brainstorming Approaches - How well organized and productive was the brainstorming approach? How well was it documented?

| $21-25$ | Approach is explicitly identified, organization \&productivity are obvious, explanation is thorough, discussion of how decisions made. |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16-20$ | Approach is identified, organization and productivity are discernible, there is some explanation. |  |  |
| $11-15$ | Approach is not identified, there is some discussion of brainstorming. | $6-10$ | Discussion of approach is minimal. |
| $1-5$ | You can tell there were ideas generated. | 0 | No discernible brainstorming. |

Comments:

| Analytical evaluation of design alternatives - Use of analytical and mathematical skills in deciding upon and implementing design alternatives |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $21-25$ | Evaluation is explicitly identified, analytic/mathematical approach is obvious, alternative designs are explained. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16-20$ | Evaluation is identified, analytic/mathematical approach is discernible, alternative designs are identified. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $11-15$ | Evaluation is not identifiable, alternative designs are identified. | $6-10$ | Discussion of alternative designs is minimal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1-5$ | You can tell there were alternatives. | 0 | No discernible evaluation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |  |
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