

Control Number:

<i>Criteria</i>	Strong	Medium	Poor	<i>Points</i>
Summary Sheet: Interpretation of the Problem	Clear background, mentions the big problem to be solved and specifies focus areas of the paper; easy to locate and is consistent throughout the paper <i>(5 points)</i>	Restates the problem, some goals are mentioned and consistently followed <i>(3 points)</i>	Problem not stated or hard to find <i>(1 point)</i>	/5
Summary Sheet: Overview of Methods	Indicates methodologies used, as well as their purposes in a chronological fashion; easy to understand <i>(10 points)</i>	Methods stated, but are unclear and difficult to understand <i>(6 points)</i>	Methods barely or not mentioned with no explanations given <i>(1 points)</i>	/10
Summary Sheet: Statement of Conclusions	Main results included with analysis and assessment of the model(s) mentioned <i>(10 points)</i>	Results included, but not clear and/or too technical <i>(6 points)</i>	Few or no results, analysis, and assessment <i>(1 points)</i>	/10
Solution: Assumptions/ Justifications	Assumptions are well justified and limitations are stated when appropriate; all major assumptions are included and consistently followed <i>(5 points)</i>	Some major assumptions are missing, unreasonable, or not flowed <i>(3 points)</i>	Most major assumptions are left out, unreasonable, or not followed <i>(1 point)</i>	/5
Solution: Variables and Parameters	Identifies important factors in the model and their influences on the outcome; numbers are clearly cited if appropriate <i>(5 points)</i>	Factors are mentioned but sometimes introduced without sufficient reasoning <i>(3 points)</i>	Factors are poorly chosen or numbers are not well cited <i>(1 points)</i>	/5

Solution: Usage of Method(s)	Method(s) are used correctly, efficiently, and effectively for solving the problem; consistently followed without significant errors <i>(25 points)</i>	Method(s) are used correctly but are inefficient for solving the problem <i>(15 points)</i>	Method(s) are incorrectly utilized or involve major errors <i>(1 points)</i>	/25
Solution: Explanation	Detailed, accurate, and concise explanations with words and math; conclusions are easily accessible and answers the problem statement <i>(20 points)</i>	Presentation is somewhat detailed, accurate, and concise; the original problem statement is answered <i>(12 points)</i>	Vague and long winded, or the original problem statement is not answered <i>(1 points)</i>	/20
Solution: Analysis and Assessment	Analyzes the viability of the model. For example, how it responds to change in parameters? Possible weaknesses? <i>(10 points)</i>	Some analysis is included, but not well justified <i>(6 points)</i>	Insufficient or incorrect analysis is presented <i>(1 point)</i>	/10
Format	0-1 criteria missing from the following: - Length does not exceed 35 pages - References are clearly represented and sources are correctly cited - Formulas and graphs are plainly labeled - Paper is enjoyable to read - Appropriate grammar and font used - File type (PDF) <i>(10 points)</i>	2-3 formatting criteria missing <i>(6 points)</i>	More than 3 formatting criteria missing <i>(1 point)</i>	/10

Note:

1. If a team is believed to be intentionally manipulating their results, 25 points will be deducted.
2. Points for each grading criteria may be allocated between the indicated values should a judge see fit. (i.e. Even though “Strong” = 10 points and “Medium” = 6 points, it’s possible to give 7-9 points per the judge’s discretion)
3. If summary is over 1 page in length, 5 points will be deducted.
4. If a section of the paper exceeds the expectations listed, additional points (up to 20%) may be rewarded for that grading criteria.