AiSC 2003-2004 Judging Criteria (Finalists)

Evaluation Criterion	How to Score (0 to 10 points)
Problem Statement (Weight 15%) ❑ Was a scientific or mathematical problem clearly defined? ❑ Was the problem clearly thought out and well researched? ❑ Was appropriate background information presented to understand the context of the problem? ❑ Is the proposed solution clever and well thought out? ❑ Is it a complex problem or could it be solved on a calculator or with off-the-shelf applications? ❑ Was the problem appropriately simplified?	0 – problem not defined 5 – problem clearly defined, but lacks background or simplification or is not complex 10 – complex problem clearly defined with appropriate background and simplification
Mathematical Model (Weight 15%) ❑ Is the model accurate? ❑ Is the model correctly applied to the problem and its solution? ❑ Does the team understand the model, its equations and variables?	0 – no model 5 – basic understanding of model, but unable to answer questions 10 – thorough understanding of model
Computational Model (Weight 15%) ❑ Is the computational approach appropriate for the project? ❑ Are the assumptions/limitations documented? ❑ Does the model require multiple iterations or samples to identify an optimum solution or range of solutions?	0 – no model 5 – basic understanding of model, but unable to answer questions 10 – thorough understanding of model
Code (Weight 10%) ❑ Is the code original or borrowed? (Note: no penalty for using borrowed code.) ❑ If the code was borrowed: Is the originator acknowledged? Does the team understand the borrowed code? Were any modifications made? Why? ❑ Extra points for: original code or combination of original code with borrowed code; real-time demo; graphical display of results; parallel computing; multiple languages; elegance.	0 – none 5 – clean, documented code 10 – clean, documented code with extras
Results & Conclusions (Weight 15%) ❑ Are the results reasonable and verifiable? ❑ Were logical conclusions drawn from the results? ❑ Do the conclusions relate to the stated problem?	0 – no results or conclusions 5 – results, but conclusions are incomplete or illogical 10 – reasonable results with logical conclusions that relate to the stated problem
Presentation (Weight 10%) ❑ Are the project' goals, objectives, and expected and actual results clearly articulated? ❑ Is the layout logical and well organized? ❑ Was there good contrast between text and background? Were slides too busy? ❑ Is the presentation free of spelling and grammatical errors? ❑ Is the presentation professional?	0 – presentation does not support the project, is incomplete, or is not visually pleasing 5 – a good presentation with some minor problems 10 – a professional presentation
Teamwork (Weight 10%) ❑ Do all members of the team understand the problem and conclusions? ❑ Was the work divided among the team members to take advantage of each member's skills? (Note: not all members need to contribute equally.) ❑ Did the team consider differences of opinion and come to an amiable solution?	0 – dysfunctional team 5 – at least 50% of team participated or only one participant 10 – 100% of team participated, team dynamics were excellent
Integrity (Weight 10%) ❑ Was work original (i.e., not plagiarized)? ❑ Were references cited and proper attribution given?	0 – evidence of plagiarism 5 – no plagiarism, but attribution not complete 10 – no plagiarism, complete and accurate attribution, complete and proper citing of references

AiSC 2003-2004 Awards

Awarded by Finalist Judges

- 1st Place Team
- 2nd Place Team
- Honorable Mentions

Awarded by Judges (Expo and Finalist)

- Judges Special Recognitions
- Teamwork (IBM)
- Best Written Report (Society for Technical Communications)
- Best Professional Presentation (Albuquerque Tribune)
- Electronic Search and Browse (New Mexico CHECS)
- Creativity and Innovation (Sandia National Laboratories)
- Environmental Modeling (LANL)
- Multimedia (?)
- Best HTML Version of Final Report (FatCow)
- Best Use of StarLogo (SFI/MIT)

Other

- Technical Poster (LANL)
- Graphical Poster (LANL)
- High Performance Computing (Cray)
- Teachers' Choice
- Students' Choice

AiSC 2003-2004 Project Evaluation (Finalists)

Team #: _____ **Judge:** _____

Comments	Score (0 to 10)
Problem Statement (Weight 15%)	
Mathematical Model (Weight 15%)	
Computational Model (Weight 15%)	
Code (Weight 10%)	
Results & Conclusions (Weight 15%)	
Presentation (Weight 10%)	
Teamwork (Weight 10%)	
Integrity (Weight 10%)	