	SCORE = 5 PERFECT SCORE FIRST PLACE	SCORE = 4 FIRST PLACE	SCORE = 3 SECOND PLACE	SCORE = 2 THIRD PLACE	SCORE = 1 THIRD PLACE
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	❑ The presenter clearly stated the objective of the project. ❑ The project had relevance or practical application in today's world. ❑ The presenter used appropriate computer vocabulary and used it correctly ❑ The presenter showed advanced depth of understanding of relevant programming concepts and principles	❑ The presenter clearly stated the objective of the project. ❑ The project had a function or useful purpose. ❑ The presenter used appropriate computer vocabulary and used it correctly. ❑ The presenter showed proficient depth of understanding of relevant programming concepts and principles.	❑ The presenter alluded to the objective of the project. ❑ The project had a function or useful purpose. ❑ The presenter used appropriate computer vocabulary with a minor error or two. ❑ The presenter showed satisfactory depth of understanding of relevant programming concepts and principles.	❑ The presenter alluded to the objective of the project. ❑ The project was somewhat useful or functional. ❑ The presenter did not use appropriate computer vocabulary and/or had errors in the use of computer terms. ❑ The presenter showed limited depth of understanding of relevant programming concepts and principles.	❑ The presenter never stated the objective of the project. ❑ The project had no useful function. ❑ The presenter did not use appropriate computer vocabulary and/or had errors in the use of computer terms. ❑ The presenter lacked understanding of relevant programming concepts and principles.
METHODS	❑ There was unity, coherence and inherent logic in the sequence of the presentation. ❑ The presenter effectively explained the project design using a high level diagram (flow-chart, pseudo-code, etc) ❑ Accepted programming design methods (i.e. structured or object-oriented) were used in the project. ❑ The presenter included a complete explanation of difficult, unique and/or significant section(s) of the program.	❑ There was a logical and appropriate sequence to the presentation. ❑ The presenter effectively explained the project design using a high level diagram (flow-chart, pseudo-code, etc). ❑ The logical design of the project was beyond what one would expect at this level. ❑ The presenter included a general explanation of difficult, unique and/or significant section(s) of the program.	❑ There was a generally logical sequence to the presentation. ❑ The presenter adequately explained the project design using a high level diagram (flow-chart, pseudo-code, etc) ❑ The logical design was appropriate for this level. ❑ The presenter included a partial explanation of difficult, unique and/or significant section(s) of the program.	❑ The lack of sequential flow seriously interfered with the objective of the presentation. ❑ The presenter gave an inadequate description of the project design. ❑ The program design was logically weak for this level. ❑ The presenter did not explain significant section(s) of the program.	❑ There was no logical sequence in the presentation of ideas. ❑ The presenter gave little or no description of the project design. ❑ The program design was totally without organization. ❑ The presenter did not explain significant section(s) of the program.

FULLFILLMENT OF PURPOSE	❑ The presenter showed the results of his/her work. ❑ The project objective was obtained. ❑ The completed project was of excellent quality. ❑ The presenter included features and code beyond what is expected at this level. ❑ The presenter knows what areas exist for further expansion or improvement of the project.	❑ The presenter showed the results of his/her work. ❑ The project objective was obtained. ❑ The completed project was of proficient quality. ❑ The presenter included features and/or code beyond what is expected at this level. ❑ The presenter can describe possible avenues for further expansion or improvement of the project.	❑ The presenter showed the results of his/her work. ❑ The project objective was obtained. ❑ The completed project was of good quality. ❑ The presenter included limited special features. ❑ The presenter cannot describe avenues for further expansion or improvement of the project.	❑ The presenter did not show the results of his/her work. ❑ The project objective was partially obtained. ❑ The completed project was of average quality. ❑ The presenter cannot describe avenues for further expansion or improvement of the project.	❑ The presenter did not show the results of his/her work. ❑ The project objective was not obtained. ❑ The completed project was of poor quality or the project was not completed. ❑ The presenter cannot describe avenues for further expansion or improvement of the project.
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. ❑ The project is appropriate for a student beyond the presenter's current grade level.	❑ The project was of proficient quality in all areas. ❑ The entire project is appropriate for a student at the presenter's current grade level.	❑ The project was of good quality in all areas. ❑ The entire project is appropriate for a student slightly below the presenter's current grade level.	❑ The project was of below average quality. ❑ The entire project is appropriate for a student well below the presenter's current grade level.	❑ The project was of poor quality. ❑ The project was inappropriate for this competition.
	CHECK WITH THE JUDGING COMMITTEE IN THE JUDGES TALLY ROOM BEFORE DISQUALIFYING THE PRESENTATION. This rubric is appropriate when the presenter wrote a computer program for his/her project. There are other types of computer projects (example – a comparison of data compression techniques) where this rubric is not appropriate				