## Exhibit Judging Evaluation Scale LSRT SCIENTIFIC EXHIBIT SCORING SHEET

Exhibit Number:\_ Judge Number:\_

exciting and fresh. Excellent synthesis of all resources used with unique conclusion drawn from synthesis.  Good: Project is tirendy, but is presented in a new or innovative method. Good synthesis of resources used with typical conclusion drawn from research.  Average: Project is nice, but is not unique. Have similar components as other presentations. Limited in research and/or restating presented sources. Lack of real synthesis of sources.  Poor: Project does not demonstrate originality or creativity of the subject, appears forced or hard to follow line of reasoning or purpose of research. Has too many parts that do not add to purpose. Lack of research, sources, or effort to be original.  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent color scheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outselvarsad on on appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cultered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but overall appears sone/sive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work wall, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handout/serkar are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still appeared to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain	Originality	Possible Points	Score
Good: Project is trendy, but is presented in a new or innovative method. Good synthesis of resources used with hypical conclusion drawn from research.  Average: Project is ince, but is not unique. Have similar components as other presentations. Limited in research and/or restating presented sources. Lack of real synthesis of sources.  Poor: Project does not demonstrate originality or creativity of the subject, appears forced or hard to follow line of reasoning or purpose of research. Has too many parts that do not add to purpose. Lack of research, sources, or effort to be original.  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation  Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent color scheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readsbile, and additional outsfearts of not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear outsreed. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handoutsfextra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project appears to the comp	Superior: Project is unique. Shows evidence of original work; does not look like others. Work is creative,	28-35	
with typical conclusion drawn from research.  Average: Project is nice, but is not unique. Have similar components as other presentations. Limited in escending presented sources. Lack of real synthesis of sources.  Poor: Project does not demonstrate originality or creativity of the subject, appears forced or hard to follow line of reasoning or purpose of research. Has too many parts that do not add to purpose. Lack of research, sources, or effort to be original.  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation  Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent cloor scheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outsértars do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handout/serkar are for numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still appearent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project appears to the view of the subject, and parts do not work f	exciting and fresh. Excellent synthesis of all resources used with unique conclusion drawn from synthesis.		
Average: Project is nice, but is not unique. Have similar components as other presentations. Limited in research and/or restating presented sources. Lack of real synthesis of sources.  Poor: Project does not demonstrate originally or creativity of the subject, appears forced or hard to follow line of reasoning or purpose of research. Has too many parts that do not add to purpose. Lack of research, sources, or effort to be original.  Presentation  Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent color scheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outs/extras of not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears coloriselve. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appears somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when velving but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extrasthandous to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, d	Good: Project is trendy, but is presented in a new or innovative method. Good synthesis of resources used	17-27	
research and/or restating presented sources. Lack of real synthesis of sources.  Poor: Project does not demonstrate originality or creativity of the subject, appears forced or hard to follow line of reasoning or purpose of research. Has too many parts that do not add to purpose. Lack of research, sources, or effort to be original.  Presentation  Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent cloro scheme, lat or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outs/extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good affort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat duttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, detailed. Content supported with proper cluding of readers and practical view and practical view and practi	with typical conclusion drawn from research.		
Poor: Project does not demonstrate originality or creativity of the subject, appears forced or hard to follow line of reasoning or purpose of research. Has too many parts that do not add to purpose. Lack of research, sources, or effort to be original.  Presentation  Presentation  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent color scheme, Let or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outs/extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear interesting, but and additional outs/extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear interesting, but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat clustered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not include or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  S	Average: Project is nice, but is not unique. Have similar components as other presentations. Limited in	6-16	
line of reasoning or purpose of research. Has foo many parts that do not add to purpose. Lack of research, sources, or effort to be original.  Presentation  Presentation  Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent colors cheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outs/extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are leagible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still appearent to audience. Fast or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  E	research and/or restating presented sources. Lack of real synthesis of sources.		
Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent color scheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outskertads on or alloyear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handoutslextra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appeared difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extrasilhandouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project till of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures  Educational or Technical Value and text a	Poor: Project does not demonstrate originality or creativity of the subject, appears forced or hard to follow	0-5	
Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent color scheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outs'extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear duttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears conserve. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems to work well; but may be distracting, text or graphics attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project till of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content s	line of reasoning or purpose of research. Has too many parts that do not add to purpose. Lack of research,		
Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent color scheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outs/extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handoutsfextra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appeared ifficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extrasfhandouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational of text and provided as a large provides a learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Ave	sources, or effort to be original.		
encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of the project/purpose and additional outs/extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interresting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handoutsiextra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extrashandouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not include or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.   Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper clation of references.  Questional content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  Poor: Content presented is n	Presentation		Score
the project/purpose and adds value. Excellent color scheme, text or graphics are clear and easily readable, and additional outs/extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not idear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main p	Superior: Project shows excellent effort, appears complete, gains reader's attention and gives clues to	28-35	
and additional outs/extras do not appear excessive or make the presentation space appear cluttered. Material is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Ave	encourage reader to go to the next point. All of the parts work as intended and are necessary to the needs of		
is orderly and presented in a logical sequence.  Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but overall appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompsts unanswered questions. Learning experience presented is not valu			
Good: Project appears to have good effort and time spent on creation. Project may appear interesting, but does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Superior: Updates, expands, and with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points  covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practic			
does not immediately grab audience attention or does not engage reader to the next point. May lack detail but overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appears difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points  Cood: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points  2-9 experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning  2-9 experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to r			
overall appears cohesive. Some parts may not work correctly or not in the correct place. Color scheme seems to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic		17-27	
to work well, but may be distracting, text or graphics are legible, and handouts/extra are too numerous or somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fit interest and practical value among t			
somewhat distracting from the main point of the exhibit. May appear somewhat cluttered or include too much information.  Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fiair interest and practical value am			
Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points  covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Reverage: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning  experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  O-1  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience inter			
Average: Project appears like some parts were put together as an afterthought or in a hurry. Seems interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  O-1  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interest			
interesting when viewing but does not grab reader's attention. Some details not clear, but main idea is still apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  O-1  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fiair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fiair interest and pract		6.46	
apparent to audience. Text or graphics appear difficult to read or understand, colors are distracting instead of enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fielium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing mo		0-10	
enhancing, project needs additional extras/handouts to explain or items used are unnecessary and distract from the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning 2-9 experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  O-1  General Interest and Practical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of inte			
From the project as a whole.  Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  O-1  General Interest and Practical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additio			
Poor: Main points unclear. Project appears to be completed in a hurry or out of necessity/requirement, details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented is not valued as a to	·		
details not included or understandable. Project full of errors, thoughts or statements linger with no or little comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.  Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fier interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.		0-5	
comprehension of the subject, and parts do not work or are missing. Colors, text, or graphics not professional or representative of competition level work or effort.    Educational or Technical Value			
Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  Superior: Content presented demonstrates at opic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Educational or Technical Value  Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.			
audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.		Possible Points	Score
detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	Superior: Updates, expands, and/or enhances existing knowledge, and draws conclusions. Captures	16-20	
Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.  O-1  10-15	audience's attention immediately. Provides an in depth learning experience. Topic thoroughly covered and		
covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.  Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.  O-1  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	detailed. Content supported with proper citation of references.		
Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	Good: Enhances existing knowledge. Gains audience attention upon reviewing content. Main points	10-15	
experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Possible Points  Score  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	covered. Provides a learning experience. Content supported with proper citation of references.		
Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.  General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	Average: Provides existing knowledge. Topic covered but prompts unanswered questions. Learning	2-9	
General Interest and Practical Value  Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	experience presents content established as common knowledge. Attempts to reference material.		
Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	Poor: Content presented is not valued as educational or technical.	0-1	
technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	General Interest and Practical Value	Possible Points	Score
references for personal interest.  Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.	Superior: Content presented demonstrates a topic of cutting edge, high interest, and practical value among	8-10	
Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.  O-1	technologists, educators, and students. Audience interested in learning more about topic, resources, and		
educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.  0-1	references for personal interest.		
educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.  Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists, educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.  0-1	Good: Content presented demonstrates a topic of medium interest and practical value among technologists,	5-7	
educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.  Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.  0-1	educators, and students. Audience interested in hearing more about the topic in future.		
Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.  0-1	Average: Content presented demonstrates a topic of fair interest and practical value among technologists,	2-4	
Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists, educators, and students.  0-1	educators, and students. Audience is not prompted to seek additional information.		
	Poor: Content presented is not valued as a topic of interest or practical value among technologists,	0-1	
Total Score:	educators, and students.		
		Total Score:	