Judging Orientation for 2023
Agenda

1) Organization
2) Scoring
3) Conduct
Organization:

DRSEF affiliated with the International Science & Engineering Fair (ISEF)
Over 4 million projects worldwide

Our region = Dallas + 7 adjacent counties

Approximately 1,000 students at DRSEF
All winners at their individual school fairs

Today’s winners can advance to:
• Texas Science & Engineering Fair
• Regeneron ISEF
• Thermo Fisher Scientific Junior Innovators Challenge
Two Kinds of Judges

**Red Ribbon**

*Science & Engineering Category Judges*

Determine ISEF category winners

**Blue Ribbon**

*Special Award Judges*

Determine donor organization’s prize winners
Divisions and Categories

Projects divided into:
- Junior Division (6-8 grade)
- Senior Division (9-12 grade)

Divisions divided into categories:
- Animal Science (ANIM)
- Plant Science (PLNT)
- Earth & Environmental Sciences
  etc.

Some small categories are combined
Each Team is numbered (1-80) you’ll interviews students in a particular Division / Category

Each Team has a Captain

Goal - 3 judges per Team

2+ Judging Groups for Large categories therefore ... 2\textsuperscript{nd} round of judging
Round 1 - Interviews

If your category has only 1 Judging Team

**Captain** submits **ORANGE** form

Winners and Honorable Mentions

Your Team is done!

If your category has several Judging Teams

**Captains** submit a **BLUE** worksheet to check-in
- note top 3 projects in group
- suggest Honorable Mentions

Students are dismissed at **Noon**.

All Captains submit Round 1 results by **12:30 pm**
Captains collect **Blue** worksheets from Check-in

Round 2 starts when ready, team members may join.

Compare & Discuss top projects across groups, no interviews; look at projects together.

One **Captain** submits **ORANGE** form

Winners and Honorable Mentions

Complete by **1:30 pm**

Your Category Teams are done!
# Rounds Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9am</th>
<th>10am</th>
<th>11am</th>
<th>12pm</th>
<th>1pm</th>
<th>2pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1 – Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch Buffet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring:

Complete Score sheet for each project interviewed, please take notes!

Use scores as basis for discussion

Review differences in scoring methods & weighing of items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Lacks focus</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Field</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>Vague</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Method</td>
<td>Not testable with</td>
<td>Partly Testable with</td>
<td>Testable with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Poorly designed</td>
<td>Some planning</td>
<td>Well-designed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables and Controls</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>Incomplete or Inappropriate</td>
<td>Defined and Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproducibility</td>
<td>None Possible</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Arbitrary</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Methods</td>
<td>Erroneous</td>
<td>Some Inappropriate</td>
<td>Appropriate &amp; correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Cookbook No New Ideas</td>
<td>Teacher Assigned Some Value Added</td>
<td>Student Initiated Innovative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>Illogical or Unreadable</td>
<td>Lacks supporting docs or some lack of clarity</td>
<td>Logical, readable, &amp; supporting docs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Poor Responses Basic Misunderstanding No Conclusion No Recognition of Impact No Future Ideas</td>
<td>Some Vague Responses Basic Misunderstanding Misunderstanding Results Unawareness of Impact</td>
<td>Clear Responses Basic Understanding Understands Results Recognizes Impact Future Ideas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>(TEAM) One Student Dominant</td>
<td>(TEAM) Uneven Contributions</td>
<td>(TEAM) All Members Involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Judge Group: Jdg_grp  PROJECT #: Project

### TITLE: ENGINEERING PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Problem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical Need</td>
<td>Not Described</td>
<td>Partly Described</td>
<td>Fully Described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Solution</td>
<td>Not Defined</td>
<td>Partly Defined</td>
<td>Fully Defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>Not Explained</td>
<td>Partly Explained</td>
<td>Fully Explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Not Explored</td>
<td>Partly Explored</td>
<td>Fully Explored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>Vaguely Identified</td>
<td>Clearly Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototype/Model</td>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td>Partly Developed</td>
<td>Fully Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Execution of Prototype         |                              |                             |                             |     |        |       |
| Intended Design                 | Not Demonstrated             | Partly Demonstrated         | Fully Demonstrated          |     |        |       |
| Testing Conditions/Trials      | Very Narrow                  | Limited                     | Multiple                    |     |        |       |
| Skill and Completeness         | Little Demonstrated          | Somewhat Demonstrated       | Well Demonstrated           |     |        |       |

| Creativity                     | Cookbook No New Ideas        | Teacher Assigned Some Value Added | Student Initiated Innovative |     |        |       |

| Presentation                    | Poor Responses Basic Misunderstanding No Conclusion No Recognition of Impact | Some Vague Responses Basic Misunderstanding Results Unawareness of Impact | Clear Responses Basic Understanding Understands Results Recognizes Impact Future Ideas |     |        |       |
| Interview                       | One Student Dominant          | Uneven Contributions         | All Members Involved         |     |        |       |
Each Judge interviews every project in group

Only one Judge at a project at a time

Ask many and detailed questions

Budget 8-10 min for each project

Complete evaluations away from the student
Team Movement

Divide your Team’s projects into sub-blocks

After interview - fill out form, move to next person in block, rotate to the next block

Check mid morning to make sure all projects will be covered.
Scoring Check List - Abstract

If Stated as 2+ Person Team:
Check under the Project Number for team members
Include all members in the interview
Reduce presentation score if any student absent

If #2 is checked YES on Abstract ...
  **Form 1C** must be displayed (work done at institution)
  Only judge student’s own work

If #3 is checked YES on Abstract...
  **Form 7** must be displayed (continuation of research)
  Only judge this year’s work
Judging Do’s:

Consider age, maturity, knowledge. These are Students, not professionals!

Students take competition seriously

Be encouraging

Be respectful

Interviews are highlight of Fair

Have fun and learn new things
Judging Don’ts:

Don’t judge someone you know

Don’t ask about parents or school

Don’t ignore weak projects

Don’t criticize ... offer suggestions

Don’t discuss your judging process with students, parents, or teachers
Captains’ Responsibilities

Leadership in discussion
Listen to all Team Members
Build consensus
Be Accurate in score keeping
Be Scientific and Fact based
MAINTAIN THE TIMETABLE
Captains’ Responsibilities

Round 1 Blue Form and scoring sheets returned by 12:30 pm

Round 2: Meet with your category Captains (Substitute group member if necessary)

Return Round 2 Orange Form by 1:30 pm