iGEM 2012 World Championship Judging Rubric

Categories		Aspects	Language Scale 6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Project This category is used to determine track awards Substance of project itself and the work they did	1	How impressive is this project?	Wow! The project is impressive in many ways	Some elements of the project are amazing	A single area of the project is impressive	Solid project	Somewhat impressive	Project superficial	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	How creative or novel is the teams project?	Completely unexpected	Very Original	Has some innovative aspects	Single innovative idea	Fairly standard	Similar to a previous iGEM team	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Did the project work?	Demonstration of full system working beautifully	Full system works convincingly	All parts and devices work Function independently	Some parts and devices function independently	Functions in some way but not as expected	Nothing worked	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	How much did the team accomplish?	Amazed at how much the team accomplished!	Impressive accomplishments	Solid accomplishments	They achieved something	Minor accomplishments	They didn't accomplish anything	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	How strong is the potential impact?	Could change future of field	Strong potential impact	Clearly applicable	Possible application	Applications are far off	None	No grade/ Not applicable
	6	Is the team's project based on Standard Parts?	Entirely	Almost entirely	Mostly	Half	Less than half	Not at all	No grade/ Not applicable
	7	Are the parts' functions and behaviors well-documented in the Registry?	Superbly documented; reference manual quality	Illustrations, performance curves, descriptions and sources	Some performance information and descriptions	Descriptions, but no performance information	Basic description	None or a single sentence	No grade/ Not applicable
	8	How well are engineering principles used?	Professionally engineered project	Solidly engineered project	Portions of the project were well engineered	Some engineering principles applied	Attempted application of engineering principles	Engineering principles not applied	No grade/ Not applicable
	9	How well integrated were Human Practices?	HP activity well integrated	HP integrated into some aspects of project design and experiments	HP maybe discussed during project design	Single element of HP project integrated	No evidence of HP during design of project	HP activity independent of project design and experiments	No grade/ Not applicable
	10	Did they do the project themselves?	Entirely done by undergraduates	Almost all done by undergraduates	Out-sourced single minor task	Out-sourced several minor tasks	Out-sourced single major task	Not the teams work	No grade/ Not applicable
Wiki How thoroughly and well is the project documented on their wiki?	1	Do I understand what they did and why?	Completely clear to scientists & non-scientists	Very thorough on a high technical level	Could not understand some aspects	Understood about half	Hard to follow, flow not logical	Motivation and approach are vague	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Is it attractive and easy to navigate?	I want them to build my website!	Fairly attractive and easy to navigate	Good quality	Rather standard	Unappealing design, hard to find important information	No or few changes to the template	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Are the data clearly connected to their accomplishments?	Completely	Mostly	Reasonably well	Some confusion	A few parts only	I am lost	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Did they attribute the project correctly?	Thorough, correct, and easy to find	Technically thorough	Single minor omission	Multiple minor omissions	Major omission's)	Data plagiarized or wrongly credited	No grade/ Not applicable
Presentation How well was their project represented in a formal presentation?	1	Clarity of presentation: Could you follow the presentation flow?	Completely clear to scientists & non-scientists	Very thorough on a high technical level	Could not adequately explain some aspects	Understood about half	Hard to follow, flow not logical	Unsure why team attempted project	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	How good is graphic design including layout, composition, grammar, etc?	Impressive, error-free, needs no verbal guidance	Key points easy to find, overall message is obvious	Points presented, not visually pleasing	Hard to follow, disjointed	Confusing, unattractive visuals are distracting	Forgot/lost presentation	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Did you find the presentation engaging?	Kept me on the edge of my seat	Held my attention	Mostly held my attention	Somewhat interested	Few interesting aspects	I'm bored	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Did they attribute the project correctly?	Thorough; mentioned within presentation	Thorough single acknowledgment slide	Single minor omission	Multiple minor omissions	Major omission's)	Data plagiarized or wrongly credited	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	How competent were the team at answering questions?	Comparable to graduate students	Comparable to honors undergraduates	Solid effort; very few mistakes	Often unprepared	Completely unprepared	Answers are incorrect	No grade/ Not applicable
Poster	1	Clarity of poster: Do you understand what the team did and why? Is the data clearly presented?	Totally clear to scientists and non-scientists	Very thorough on a high technical level	I did not understand a few aspects	I understood about half	Hard to follow; flow is not logical	Unsure why team attempted project	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Does the poster flow visually?	Enjoyable	Very viewer-friendly	Pretty good	Rather standard	Quite cumbersome	Confusing	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Graphic design: is it neatly arranged, is the grammar correct, are key points clear, etc.?	Professional	Very attractive	Good quality	Clear but not attractive	Plain	Boring and wordy	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Is the data clearly presented?	Crystal clear	Yes, definitely	reasonably well	There are some confusion	Some parts only	I am lost	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Did they attribute the project correctly?	Creatively integrated throughout poster	Thorough single acknowledgment panel	Single minor omission	Multiple minor omissions	Major omission's)	Data plagiarized or wrongly credited	No grade/ Not applicable
	6	How competent were the team at answering questions?	Graduate student performance	Honors undergraduate performance	Solid effort; very few mistakes	Often unprepared	Completely unprepared	Answers are incorrect	No grade/ Not applicable

Special Awards		Aspects							
Best Human Practice Advance	1	How creative and/or original is HP approach?	Completely unexpected	Very Original	Has some innovative aspects	Single innovative idea	Fairly standard	Similar to a previous iGEM team	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	How much did the team accomplish?	Amazing!	Team did a great job	Solid piece of work	The team attempted something	Insubstantial	Negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	How thorough was the teams HP activity?	Amazing!	Team did a great job	Solid piece of work	The team attempted something	Insubstantial	Negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
Rate the following (if applicable)	4	Public perception (if applicable)	Amazing!	Team did a great job	Solid piece of work	The team attempted something	Insubstantial	Negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Observational - Survey/outreach (if applicable)	Amazing!	Team did a great job	Solid piece of work	The team attempted something	Insubstantial	Negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
	6	Consideration of ethics (if applicable)	Amazing!	Team did a great job	Solid piece of work	The team attempted something	Insubstantial	Negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
	7	Expression through Arts (if applicable)	Amazing!	Team did a great job	Solid piece of work	The team attempted something	Insubstantial	Negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
	8	Safety and security (if applicable)	Amazing!	Team did a great job	Solid piece of work	The team attempted something	Insubstantial	Negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
	9	Consideration of patents (if applicable)	Amazing!	Team did a great job	Solid piece of work	The team attempted something	Insubstantial	Negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
Best Model	1	Does it go beyond differential equations with sample parameters?	Doctoral thesis level	Innovative use of theory	Uses a wide array of tools	Uses an advanced approach	Standard model	Very approximate/simple	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Did the model contribute to the overall project?	Produced new discoveries	Integrated into several experiments	Quantitative model	Prediction and experiment agree	Weak support of experiment by model	Only superficial inclusion of a model	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Did the project improve the model?	Mutually informed, harmonious workflow	Determines parameters/design choices	Design check before wetlab work	Quantitative check after wetlab work	Conceptual check after wetlab work	Had separate ends from wetlab work	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Is the approach generally useful for other teams?	Could become new standard	Generally useful	Useful for equivalent designs	Other uses of same parts	Specific to the project	Not very useful	No grade/ Not applicable