

Team ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Team Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Flag #: \_\_\_\_\_ Brief project description: \_\_\_\_\_

**(\*) Judging Score**

<b>5: Strongly Agree</b>	excellent, outstanding, advanced, exemplary, or amazing
<b>4: Agree</b>	good, accomplished, or proficient
<b>3: Neutral</b>	average, intermediate level, or acceptable
<b>2: Somewhat Disagree</b>	attempted but needs work
<b>1: Disagree</b>	little attempted or needs lots of help

1 ~ 5

Judging Category	Sub Categories	Weight	Score*
1. Artistic creativity	Students created a unique and artistically appealing robot float.	15%	
2. Technical creativity	Students applied unique technically creative and innovative elements to the robotics project.	15%	
3. Interactions	There were elements of wireless interaction between the robot and the team players using sensors or other communication technologies.	10%	
4. Robot Design and performance	Robot mechanical design was creative, user-friendly, and sturdy. Robot reliably and successfully negotiated the official parade route. No human touch was required. Robot met all qualifying requirements.	20%	
5. Team work	Teamwork and team spirit were evident.	10%	
6. Robot Display	Useful data (speed, distance, etc) is displayed in clear manner.	10%	
	Student demonstration and explanation of display and data.	10%	
7. Team independence	I believe the project was mostly designed, developed, and programmed by the students, not by adult coaches, parents, or mentors.	10%	

100%