



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.*

Pitch. (20) a-Length & Audience, b-Problem & Purpose, c- Methods, Results & Analysis, d- Conclusions & Key Features.						
a. Engages & informs audience . Written very clearly & succinctly using minimal tech. terms.	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. Very clearly summarizes team's project purpose or motivation.	5	4	3	2	1	0
c. Very clearly summarizes team's design approach/methodology	5	4	3	2	1	0
d. Very clearly summarizes conclusions & final design's key features .	5	4	3	2	1	0
Subtotal	/20					
Design Features & Drawings. (10) a-Key Features; neatness & clarity; labeling; b-Outward Appearance/Isometric Drawing.						
a. Key Features of final design prominently identified in poster. Illustrations are detailed, easily read & interpreted & neatly done. Very effective use of labels/pointers to highlight features of device or data.	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. Two (2) screen shots that very clearly illustrate outward appearance of final design as well as key design considerations.	5	4	3	2	1	0
Subtotal	/10					
Concepts & Analysis. (15) 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 design's strengths & at least two (2) challenges that could be addressed in the next version of the app.	5	4	3	2	1	0
c. Recommendations include at least three (3) ideas for future work. Written in first person w/ active verbs.	5	4	3	2	1	0
Subtotal	/15					
Layout. (10) a-Size, Title & Team, b- Compelling Layout.						
a. Compelling Layout: 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. Title, Team, Size & Sections. 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
Subtotal	/10					
DISPLAY Total	/55					

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.*

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

Combined Academic Poster Presentation TOTAL: (<i>Display _____ + Presentation _____</i>)	/115
---	-------------

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.*

Discussion of Design Process Methods / Approach. (30) 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 design process .	5	4	3	2	1	0	
b. Details roles of all team members at all stages of design.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
c. Details nature & efficacy of each stage 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 images from design notebooks reflecting thoroughness & planning .	5	4	3	2	1	0	
e. Very clear description of testing procedures . Includes 2-3 relevant diagrams or pictures.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
f. Clearly explains how design process/testing informed all major design choices .	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Subtotal	/30						
Concepts & Analysis. (25) 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 screen shots and coding samples 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 explore the data (number of screens/process, processing speeds, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
d. All relevant design variables clearly explained, including those not addressed (app format, in-app tools, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
e. Clear explanation of specific variables team addressed/optimized for and why (see c).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Subtotal	/25						
Quality & Thoroughness. (25) a-All Support Sections, b- Extra Mile, c- Cost-Labor Summary, d-Full Cost Documentation, e-Relevant Bibliography							
a. All Supporting Sections included: 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. Labor Summary. Very detailed list of student time commitment as well as volunteer support.	5	4	3	2	1	0	
d. Justification for anticipated retail value (if sold through Apple, Google, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
e. Bibliography: 2-3 highly relevant sources that are appropriately formatted (APA, IEEE, or other standard format).	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Subtotal	/25						
Conventions. (10) 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
Subtotal	/10						
<i>Judge Name:</i>	TOTAL					/90	

Comments: