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.

	☐ There was unity,	☐ There was a logical and	☐ There was a generally	☐ The lack of sequential	☐ There was no logical
DEVELOPMENT	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.	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.	logical sequence to the presentation. The presenter showed some examples and counter-examples. Presenter cannot describe avenues for further research.	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.	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.