Rubric for judging MATHEMATICS projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE = 5</th>
<th>PERFECT SCORE</th>
<th>SCORE = 4</th>
<th>FIRST PLACE</th>
<th>SCORE = 3</th>
<th>SECOND PLACE</th>
<th>SCORE = 2</th>
<th>THIRD PLACE</th>
<th>SCORE = 1</th>
<th>THIRD PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FULLFILLMENT OF PURPOSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The presentation had a sharp, distinct focus.</td>
<td>☐ The presentation had a clear focus.</td>
<td>☐ The presentation had adequate focus.</td>
<td>☐ The presentation had vague focus.</td>
<td>☐ The presentation had an absence of focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The presenter used appropriate mathematical vocabulary and used it correctly.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter used appropriate mathematical vocabulary and used it correctly.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter used appropriate mathematical vocabulary with a minor error or two.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter did not use appropriate mathematical vocabulary and/or had errors in the use of mathematical terms.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter did not use appropriate mathematical vocabulary and/or had errors in the use of mathematical terms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The scope of the presentation was excellent, considering both the topic and time allowed</td>
<td>☐ The scope of the presentation was appropriate, considering both the topic and time allowed.</td>
<td>☐ The scope of the presentation was somewhat limited, considering both the topic and time allowed.</td>
<td>☐ The scope of the presentation was very limited, considering both the topic and time allowed.</td>
<td>☐ The scope of the presentation was inappropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The presenter showed excellent depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter showed proficient depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter showed satisfactory depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter showed limited depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter lacked depth of understanding of relevant mathematical concepts and principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The presentation had substantial, specific and illustrative content.</td>
<td>☐ The presentation had specific and illustrative content.</td>
<td>☐ The presentation had sufficient content.</td>
<td>☐ The presentation had limited content.</td>
<td>☐ The presentation had an absence of relevant content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The presenter includes complete, specific example(s) of practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.)</td>
<td>☐ The presenter gives example(s) of practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.)</td>
<td>☐ The presenter makes reference to practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.)</td>
<td>☐ The presenter is unaware of practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.)</td>
<td>☐ The presenter is unaware of practical application or correlation with other disciplines. (This does not apply to pure math presentations.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The project contained no mathematical errors.</td>
<td>☐ The project contained no mathematical errors.</td>
<td>☐ The project contained limited minor mathematical errors.</td>
<td>☐ The project contained multiple minor mathematical errors or a major mathematical error.</td>
<td>☐ The project contained substantial mathematical errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The presenter used appropriate mathematical notation and used it correctly.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter used appropriate mathematical notation and used it correctly.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter used appropriate mathematical notation with a minor error or two.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter did not use appropriate mathematical notation and/or made notational errors.</td>
<td>☐ The presenter did not use appropriate mathematical notation and/or made notational errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>PRESENTATION</td>
<td>JUDGE’S OPINION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - 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. | - 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. | - 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. |
| - 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. | - 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 most of the questions to the satisfaction of the judges. | - 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. |
| - There was a generally logical sequence to the presentation. 
- The presenter showed some examples and counter-examples. 
- Presenter cannot describe avenues for further research. | - 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. | - 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 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. | - Presentation 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. | - 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. |
| - 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. | - The 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. | - 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.**
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