



# POSTER PRESENTATION SCORING CRITERIA

Adapted from: MESA USA NEDC

Team:
School:
Center/State:

Academic Poster Presentation Scoring Criteria (Part A + B = 115 points)

## A. POSTER/DISPLAY CRITERIA (55 points)

**Overview:** Values circled reflect the degree of evidence for design goals: (5) Exceptional/Exceeds Standard When Possible; (4) Meets Very Effectively; (3) Meets Somewhat Effectively; (2) Almost Meets/Inaccurate or Unclear; (1) Attempts/Irrelevant; (0) No attempt. *Please note: to meet any design goal below, all aspects listed in the standard (i.e. row) must be met.*

<b>Pitch. (20)</b> a-Length & Audience, b-Problem & Purpose, c- Methods, Results & Analysis, d- Conclusions & Key Features.						
a. Engages & informs <b>audience</b> . Written very clearly & succinctly using minimal tech. terms.	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. Very clearly <b>summarizes team's project purpose</b> or motivation.	5	4	3	2	1	0
c. Very clearly summarizes <b>team's design approach/methodology</b>	5	4	3	2	1	0
d. Very clearly <b>summarizes conclusions &amp; final design's key features</b> .	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/20</b>					
<b>Design Features &amp; Drawings. (10)</b> a-Key Features; neatness & clarity; labeling; b-Outward Appearance/Isometric Drawing.						
a. <b>Key Features</b> of final design prominently identified in poster. Illustrations are <b>detailed, easily read &amp; interpreted</b> & neatly done. Very effective use of <b>labels/pointers</b> to highlight features of device or data.	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. Two (2) screen shots that very clearly illustrate <b>outward appearance</b> of final design as well as key design considerations.	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/10</b>					
<b>Concepts &amp; Analysis. (15)</b> a-Data Tables; b-Strengths/Shortcomings; c-Recommendations						
a. Results section includes at least (2) two relevant coding samples	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. Analysis section explains <b>design's strengths &amp; at least two (2) challenges that could be addressed in the next version of the app</b> .	5	4	3	2	1	0
c. <b>Recommendations</b> include at least three (3) ideas for future work. Written in first person w/ active verbs.	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/15</b>					
<b>Layout. (10)</b> a-Size, Title & Team, b- Compelling Layout.						
a. <b>Compelling Layout:</b> Very good use of space, neat, uncluttered, very easy to follow. Display captures attention very holds interest very effectively.	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. <b>Title, Team, Size &amp; Sections.</b> Includes clear, compelling title card/header & official MESA USA logo. Team School/Members/State prominently displayed. Poster/display size maximum: one (1) 36"x 48" tri-folds OR one (1) single poster 36" x 48." All major sections included.	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/10</b>					
<b>DISPLAY Total</b>	<b>/55</b>					

Comments:

## B. PRESENTATION CRITERIA (60 points)

Team:	
School:	Center/State:

**Overview:** Values circled reflect the degree of evidence for design goals: (5) Exceptional/Exceeds Standard When Possible; (4) Meets Very Effectively; (3) Meets Somewhat Effectively; (2) Almost Meets/Inaccurate or Unclear; (1) Attempts/Irrelevant; (0) No attempt. *Please note: to meet any design goal below, all aspects listed in the standard (i.e. row) must be met.*

<b>Introduction. (10)</b> a-Team Introduction, responsibilities & design rationale; b-Design problem restatement with background.						
a. Creative introduction of <b>team members, responsibilities &amp; design rationale.</b>	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. <b>Clear restatement of problem</b> with <b>sufficient background</b> provided (key facts, conditions, events prior to project & previous work).	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/10</b>					
<b>Explanations &amp; Quality. (25)</b> a-Scope, b-Factors Addressed, c-Engineering/Tech Concepts.						
a. Thorough description of <b>scope including key design parameters/constraints.</b>	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. Clear explanation of <b>specific factors/ variables team addressed</b> /optimized for and why.	5	4	3	2	1	0
c. A precise, succinct description of 3-4 <b>Engineering / Technology</b> challenges or solutions, incl. advanced concepts if used.	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/15</b>					
<b>Design Process / Approach. (20)</b> a-Approach, Methods & Timeline; b- Design & Testing Impact; c- Notebook as visual aid; d- All observations follow from R&D.						
a. Brief overview of team's design <b>approach, methods</b> and <b>timeline</b> (approach to problem, app format and in-app tools, user-friendliness).	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. Clear explanation of <b>how design &amp; testing informed at least four (4) design choices.</b>	5	4	3	2	1	0
c. <b>Engineering Design Notebook</b> effectively utilized as visual aid at least two (2) times (paper-prototyping, notes from testing, test data).	5	4	3	2	1	0
d. <b>All observations</b> & conclusions well-thought out, accurate, & clearly <b>follow directly from research &amp; design process.</b>	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/20</b>					
<b>Oral &amp; Visual Overall. (15)</b> a-Shared presentation/appearance, b-Projected Voice/Eye Contact, c- Engaging Focus/Flow.						
a. ALL students <b>share equally in presentation.</b> Student <b>demeanor &amp; appearance</b> well suited for event.	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. <b>ALL voices heard</b> & understood. <b>Eye contact</b> is distributed across the audience.	5	4	3	2	1	0
c. <b>Engaging Focus &amp; Flow.</b> Team stayed very focused on the topic & transitioned very smoothly from point to point. <b>Engaging</b> activities & discussion captured & maintained audience/judge attention very well.	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/15</b>					
Presentation Total (Pre-deduction)						/60
<b>Deductions</b> (5 pts if not wearing T-shirt; 5 pts if not within time limits)						/10
<b>PRESENTATION Total</b>						<b>/60</b>
<b>Combined Academic Poster Presentation TOTAL:</b> (Display _____ + Presentation _____)						<b>/115</b>

Judge Name:

Comments:



# TECHNICAL PAPER SCORING CRITERIA

Adapted from: MESA USA NEDC

Team:  
School:  
Center/State:

**Overview:** Values circled reflect the degree of evidence for design goals: (5) Exceptional/Exceeds Standard When Possible; (4) Meets Very Effectively; (3) Meets Somewhat Effectively; (2) Almost Meets/Inaccurate or Unclear; (1) Attempts/Irrelevant; (0) No attempt. *Please note: to meet any design goal below, all aspects listed in the standard (i.e. row) must be met.*

<b>Discussion of Design Process Methods / Approach. (30)</b> a-Design Process , b-Roles, c-Efficacy of each stage, d- Notebook Quality, e-Testing Procedures, f- reason for design choices.							
a. Clear overview of team's <b>design process</b> .	5	4	3	2	1	0	
b. <b>Details roles</b> of all team members at all stages of design.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
c. Details <b>nature &amp; efficacy of each stage</b> of design process reflects (including brainstorming, use of Lucid Chart, paper-prototyping, etc).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
d. At least 3 tidy, scanned/photocopied <b>images from design notebooks</b> reflecting thoroughness & <b>planning</b> .	5	4	3	2	1	0	
e. Very clear description of <b>testing procedures</b> . Includes 2-3 relevant diagrams or pictures.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
f. Clearly explains <b>how design process/testing informed all major design choices</b> .	5	4	3	2	1	0	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/30</b>						
<b>Concepts &amp; Analysis. (25)</b> a- Technical Concepts, c-Data Presented Visually, d-Data exploration, e- all design variables, f- specific variables.							
a. Precise, succinct explanation of at least three (3) Technical challenges/solutions, including advanced concepts if used.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
b. Very relevant <b>screen shots and coding samples</b> for each major design prototype or modification. Includes at least 3.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
c. Paper includes related data analysis or operations used to <b>explore the data</b> (number of screens/process, processing speeds, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
d. All relevant <b>design variables</b> clearly explained, including those not addressed (app format, in-app tools, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
e. Clear explanation of <b>specific variables</b> team addressed/optimized for and why (see c).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/25</b>						
<b>Quality &amp; Thoroughness. (25)</b> a-All Support Sections, b- Extra Mile, c- Cost-Labor Summary, d-Full Cost Documentation, e-Relevant Bibliography							
a. <b>All Supporting Sections included:</b> References (related to background information and function options), Acknowledgments, Appendix (related graphics and photos).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
b. Clear description of team's considerations regarding project choice (real world problem, feasibility) made to be more conscientious in ensuring design's quality went beyond the call of the specifications.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
c. <b>Labor Summary.</b> Very detailed list of student time commitment as well as volunteer support.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
d. <b>Justification</b> for anticipated retail value (if sold through Apple, Google, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
e. <b>Bibliography:</b> 2-3 highly relevant sources that are appropriately formatted (APA, IEEE, or other standard format).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/25</b>						
<b>Conventions. (10)</b> a-Length, b-Sections, c-Title Page, d-Font & Layout, e- Grammar. <i>In this section only, a two (2) reflects fully meeting the standard; a one (1) reflects that it was almost met; and a zero (0) reflects zero evidence addressing the standard.</i>							
a. Length: 5-10 pages (not including cover, title page & appendix)					2	1	0
b. All Key Sections (pitch included)					2	1	0
c. Title page includes authors/team members, school, MESA state & date					2	1	0
d. Font & Layout: double-spaced, 12, Times New Roman. 1" margins.					2	1	0
e. Grammar, spelling, sentence, paragraphing & transition usage are appropriate to standard business English throughout the paper.					2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/10</b>						
<i>Judge Name:</i>	<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>/90</b>	

Comments: