Rubric for judging MATHEMATICS projects

	SCORE = 5 PERFECT SCORE FIRST PLACE	SCORE = 4 FIRST PLACE	SCORE = 3 SECOND PLACE	SCORE = 2 THIRD PLACE	SCORE = 1 THIRD PLACE
FULLFILLMENT OF PURPOSE	❑ The presentation had a sharp, distinct focus. ❑ The presenter used appropriate mathematical vocabulary and used it correctly. ❑ The scope of the presentation was excellent, considering both the topic and time allowed ❑ The presenter showed excellent depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.	❑ The presentation had a clear focus. ❑ The presenter used appropriate mathematical vocabulary and used it correctly. ❑ The scope of the presentation was appropriate, considering both the topic and time allowed. ❑ The presenter showed proficient depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.	❑ The presentation had adequate focus. ❑ The presenter used appropriate mathematical vocabulary with a minor error or two. ❑ The scope of the presentation was somewhat limited, considering both the topic and time allowed. ❑ The presenter showed satisfactory depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.	❑ The presentation had vague focus. ❑ The presenter did not use appropriate mathematical vocabulary and/or had errors in the use of mathematical terms. ❑ The scope of the presentation was very limited, considering both the topic and time allowed. ❑ The presenter showed limited depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.	❑ The presentation had an absence of focus. ❑ The presenter did not use appropriate mathematical vocabulary and/or had errors in the use of mathematical terms. ❑ The scope of the presentation was inappropriate. ❑ The presenter lacked depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.
CONTENT	❑ The presentation had substantial, specific and illustrative content. ❑ The presenter includes complete, specific example(s) of practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.) ❑ The project contained no mathematical errors. ❑ The presenter used appropriate mathematical notation and used it correctly.	❑ The presentation had specific and illustrative content. ❑ The presenter gives example(s) of practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.) ❑ The project contained no mathematical errors. ❑ The presenter used appropriate mathematical notation and used it correctly.	❑ The presentation had sufficient content. ❑ The presenter makes reference to practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.) ❑ The project contained limited minor mathematical errors. ❑ The presenter used appropriate mathematical notation with a minor error or two.	❑ The presentation had limited content. ❑ The presenter is unaware of practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.) ❑ The project contained multiple minor mathematical errors or a major mathematical error. ❑ The presenter did not use appropriate mathematical notation and/or made notational errors.	❑ The presentation had an absence of relevant content. ❑ The presenter is unaware of practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.) ❑ The project contained substantial mathematical errors. ❑ The presenter did not use appropriate mathematical notation and/or made notational errors.

DEVELOPMENT	❑ There was unity, coherence and inherent logic in the sequence of ideas. ❑ The presenter showed sufficient examples and counter-examples ❑ Presenter knows what areas for further research or application exist on the current topic.	❑ There was a logical and appropriate sequence to the presentation. ❑ The presenter showed sufficient examples and counter-examples. ❑ Presenter can describe possible avenues for further research on the current topic.	❑ There was a generally logical sequence to the presentation. ❑ The presenter showed some examples and counter-examples. ❑ Presenter cannot describe avenues for further research.	❑ The lack of sequential flow seriously interfered with the objective of the presentation. ❑ The presenter showed a very limited number of examples or counter-examples. ❑ Presenter cannot describe avenues for further research.	❑ There was no logical sequence to the flow of ideas. ❑ The presenter did not show examples or counter-examples ❑ Presenter cannot describe avenues for further research.
PRESENTATION	❑ Presentation was clear. ❑ Transparencies were very well thought out and to the point. ❑ Presenter was very knowledgeable and self-confident. ❑ Presenter RARELY looked at notes. ❑ Presenter's answers to the judge's questions indicated an exceptional understanding of the research topic.	❑ Presentation was clear. ❑ Transparencies were understandable and enhanced the presentation. ❑ Presenter spoke clearly. ❑ Presenter referred to notes but didn't read notes. ❑ Presenter could answer questions to the satisfaction of the judges.	❑ Presentation was clear. ❑ Transparencies were understandable. ❑ Presenter spoke clearly. ❑ Presenter referred to notes but didn't read notes. ❑ Presenter could answer most of the questions to the satisfaction of the judges.	❑ Presenter was unsure of the research and his or her work. ❑ Transparencies were difficult to read. ❑ Presenter read most of the presentation from the note cards. ❑ Presenter could answer a few questions.	❑ Presenter was totally disorganized. ❑ Transparencies were either absent or used without apparent reason. ❑ Presenter was unable to answer any questions. ❑ Presentation exceeds 10 minutes or is too short to be effective.
JUDGE'S OPINION	❑ The project was of excellent quality in all areas: research, planning, understanding and presentation. ❑ The entire project is appropriate for a student beyond the presenter's current grade level, ability to produce quality work, procedures, depth of understanding and creativity.	❑ The project was of proficient quality in all areas: research, planning, understanding and presentation. ❑ The entire project is appropriate for a student at the presenter's current grade level, ability to produce quality work, procedures, depth of understanding and creativity.	❑ The project was of good quality in all areas: research, planning, understanding and presentation. ❑ The entire project is appropriate for a student slightly below the presenter's current grade level, ability to produce quality work, procedures, depth of understanding and creativity.	❑ The project was of below average quality in all areas: research, planning, understanding and presentation. ❑ The project is appropriate for a student well below the presenter's current grade level, ability to produce quality work, procedures, depth of understanding and creativity.	❑ The project was of poor quality in all areas: research, planning, understanding and presentation. ❑ The entire project is inappropriate.

CHECK WITH THE JUDGING COMMITTEE IN THE JUDGES' TALLY ROOM BEFORE DISQUALIFYING THE PRESENTATION.

Rubric for judging MATHEMATICS projects.