

1.9.5 Rubric: “NO LIMITS” Project Assessment

	Needs Improvement	Fair	Good	Excellent
Question, Language Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation rambles - Lack of coherent arguments - No clearly-defined question - Team member ideas not integrated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research question is vague - Research question is implied - Organization elements are present, but weak logical flow - Team member ideas not well-integrated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research question is fairly clear and concise, but could use a little tweaking - Main point is clear - Goals are articulated - Group effort is seamless - Presentation outline is clearly evident 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organized- clear beginning, middle and end - Persuasive arguments and examples - Research question is concise and clear - Question is stated directly and explained - Presentation shows logical thought progression - All elements are relevant and well-integrated - Appendices included, if relevant
Completeness, Teamwork	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One team member doing all the work - No evidence for conclusions - No position on issues - Unable to answer judges’ questions - Excessive adult intervention (help from mentor/coach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less than ½ team doing work - Project not fully understood - Arguments obscured by jargon - Insufficient data - Incomplete analysis - Inferences unsupported - ½ team able to answer judges’ questions - Adult intervention is apparent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ¾ team doing the work - All aspects of assignment carried out - Good use of technical terms - Evidence is clearly presented - ¾ able to answer judges’ questions - This project is clearly the work of the children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All team members participating - Original data carefully documented - Team provides judges with more than the assignment requires - All students are able to answer the judges’ questions - This project is clearly the work of the children
Background, Data & Graphics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No outside sources (books, websites, magazines, etc) used - Personal opinion treated as universal - No visual aids - Presentation has no link to your research question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very limited outside sources— only one source or type of source cited - Credit to sources not given - Inappropriate use of sources - Link to research question is vague - Outside sources misinterpreted <p>Continued next page</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good sources - Credit is given to others when due - Supporting printed materials provided to judge(s) - Visual aids support research question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Books, periodicals and websites cited (variety) - Credit given clearly when due - Supporting printed material given to judge(s) - Visual aids clearly support research question - Visually aids are carefully chosen

	- Needs Improvement	- Fair	- Good	- Excellent
Analysis & Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No relevance to FLL mission - Lacking personal reflection - Alternate views ignored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevance is unclear - Alternate views dismissed - Conclusions are vague, unsupported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal relevance and FLL relevance is clearly stated - Implications have been considered - Students take firm, articulate stand - Awareness of differing views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conclusions are clearly supported by data - Analysis clearly relates to research question - Clear, well-supported position on issues - Alternative views considered - Relation to personal experience is explained - Original, important insights are shared - Concrete examples relating presentation to the mission
Style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many errors - Too long/short - Not rehearsed - Plagued with technical difficulties - Reliance on presentation software - Excessive computer sound/visual effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation seems rushed or unrefined - Few errors - Too long/short - Semi-rehearsed - Plagued with technical difficulties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well-edited - Proper length of 5 minutes (plus 1 min set-up) - Well-rehearsed - Very minor tech difficulties - Creative format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creative, imaginative - A joy for the audience—humor, personal touches - Edited to 5 minutes (plus 1 min setup) - Model of clarity & good speaking - Well-rehearsed - No technical difficulties - Clever choice of presentation style

1.9.6 Rubric : Teamwork and FLLValues

	Needs Improvement	Fair	Good	Excellent
Roles & Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No clearly-defined roles - Not clear who completed which tasks - Very uneven distribution of work - Time management is poor or purely directed by the coach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loose role assignments - Uneven work distribution - Time management skills are weak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly-defined roles - Team members understand each other's roles, but focus on their own - Work is distributed fairly - Team members will help each other, if asked - Team mentions learning time management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defined roles - Team members understand each other's roles - Team members can fill each other's roles (happily!), if needed - Workload is distributed fairly - Team members assist each other without being asked - Team members give concrete examples of learning time management
Gracious Professionalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Team members show little/no respect for each other - Team members show no awareness of school/community issues - Team members compete with each other to be heard during judging - Team doesn't mention gracious professionalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Team members show limited respect for each other - Team members show limited awareness of school / community issues - Team talks about gracious professionalism, but gives no concrete examples of what they have done to help others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Team members show respect for teammates - Team members imply increased awareness of school and/or community - Team members are vague about how this awareness translates into other aspects of their lives - Team implies that they have helped each other/other teams 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Team members give concrete examples of respect for teammates - Team members show increased awareness of their school/community - Team members clearly discuss how this increased awareness translates into other areas of their lives - Team members give concrete examples of how they have helped each other/others
Problem-Solving & Team Dynamics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A problem was identified, but no steps were taken to identify a solution - One team member used power to reach their desired outcome - One person's ideas are used - Team members working against each other - Coercion and/or confrontation dominate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A problem was identified, but the chosen solution was inadequate to some team members - Some team members didn't accept the solution - Simple majority had input at meetings - Decisions made by simple majority - Coexistence is a dominant theme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A problem was identified and there is compromise evident in the solution - Team tested various solutions to solve the problem - Cooperation is a dominant theme - Team focuses on individual tasks - Decisions made by most of the team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A problem was identified and the team worked together to find a solution - Various solutions were tested and then incorporated - Team is willing to accept input - Collaboration and co-ownership are dominant themes - Team members show equality and value each other's roles - Group sees the big picture and overall goals - Members recognize inter-dependence - Decisions made by the entire team

	Needs Improvement	Fair	Good	Excellent
Confidence & Enthusiasm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only one team member spoke to the judge(s) - No/limited eye contact with judge(s) - Some team members seem disinterested 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - About ½ the team spoke to the judge(s) - About ½ the team seems interested - Limited eye contact with judge(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Everyone was ready to answer at least one question from the judge(s) - Most of the team appears excited and interested - Good eye contact with judge(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All team members show confidence in themselves as well as the team - Members work together to include each other - Concrete examples of enthusiasm are shown - Team members show equal investment in FLL - All team members speak to the judge(s) - Good eye contact with judge(s)
FLL Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No clear enthusiasm for science, engineering or technology - Team doesn't mention new skills acquired - No mention of future aspirations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some members show an interest in science, engineering or technology - Limited attention paid to new skills acquired - Team members imply future aspirations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Team shows a keen interest in subject matter, but limited use of concrete examples - Team implies new skills acquired - Team members suggest future aspirations - Team talks about how FLL has made a difference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group articulates a clear understanding of FLL - Team gives concrete examples of their interest in the subject areas - Team members give concrete examples of how they plan to continue in FLL, FRC or subject areas - Team talks about career aspirations - Team clearly talks about how FLL has made a difference for them

