2018 MATE ROV COMPETITION ENGINEER	ING PRESENTATION SCORE SHEET -	SCOUT							
Judge Name (First Last):									
Competition Class:	Scout								
Team #:		COMPANY/SCHOOL NAME: N/A							
Category	Criteria	Scoring Requirements	Enter your scores here	Raw Score	Points Possible	Raw %	Weight	Category Score	Comments
					by categor	·у			
Safety				0	12	0%	10%	0.00	
	Content								
		Did our presentation highlight our ROV's safety features and our company's safety practices?		0					
	Safety procedures								
		Did we describe safety protocols (e.g. safety checklist) and how we handle any safety issues (e.g. cut or other injury)?		0					
	Safety measures								
		Did we describe point out labels and safeguards on potentially hazardous parts?		0					
Team Presentation				0	52	0%	25%	0.00	
	Preparation								
		Did all of our team members participate in the presentation?		0					
		Were we well prepared for the presentation?		0					
	Delivery								
		Was our presentation was clear and informative? Did we have energy or were we boring?		0					
		Did we convince the judges to buy our ROV?		0					
	Insight/Creativity								
		Did we describe the technical (e.g. skills) and organizational (e.g. working as a team) challenges that we faced as we designed and built our ROV and prepared for the competition?		0					
		Did we describe how we thought through and solved our problems?		0					
	Understanding								
		Did we convince the judges that we understand how each of our ROV's systems (e.g. control box, motors, etc.) work? Did we explain how we came up with the design?		0					
	Resources/Budget								
		Did we include how much our ROV cost and how we paid for it?		0					
		Did we thank the people and organizations who gave us funds, materials, equipment, and cheered us on?		0					

Category	Criteria	Scoring Requirements	Enter your scores here	Raw Score	Points Possible	Raw %	Weight	Category Score	Comments
	Teamwork								
		Did we describe the skills that we learned in order to design and build our ROV and prepare for the competition?		0					
		Did we convince the judges that we (and not our teacher or mentor) did the work and what role (job) each of us had?		0					
		Did we convince the judges that we work well as a team?		0					
		Did we convince the judges that we were excited to learn and helped each other along the way?		0					
Theme/Tasks				0	16	0%	10%	0.00	
	Content								
		Did we talk about the competition theme and mission tasks?		0					
		Did we describe the science (e.g. seafloor spreading) and technology (e.g. tidal turbines) that's involved with these tasks in the real world?		0					
	Understanding								
		Did we convince the judges that we understand the theme and what the tasks are about?		0					
		Did we convince the judges that we designed and built our ROV specifically to solve the tasks?		0					
Overall Design/Workmanship				0	16	0%	10%	0.00	
	Content								
		Did we describe how we came up our own ROV design? If we used a kit, did we describe how we thought through the design of the frame, placement of the motors, etc.?		0					
		Did we convince the judges that our ROV is sturdy and that it won't easily come apart or unwired and, if a repair is needed, that we can fix it on the pool deck?		0					
		Did we give some thought and describe why other people might want to buy and use our ROV?		0					
		Did we talk about how we tested the ROV and practiced before the competition?		0					
Build vs. Buy, New vs. Used				0	16	0%	20%	0.00	
	Justification								
		Did we explain why we chose to buy certain ROV parts and/or build others?		0					
		Did we explain why we chose to re-use certain old parts and/or build others?		0					
	Understanding								
		Did we convince the judges that we understand how the parts that we bought and those that we built work?		0					
		Did we convince the judges that we understand how the parts that we re-used and the parts that we built work?		0					

Category	Criteria	Scoring Requirements	Enter your scores here	Raw Score	Points Possible	Raw %	Weight	Category Score	Comments
System Design				0	108	0%	25%	0.00	
	Engineering Design Rationale								
		Did we explain our overall ROV design in a way that made sense to the judges?		0					
		Did we show that we had a plan or schedule and followed it?		0					
		Did we convince the judges that we thought through our design and building choices?		0					
	Originality								
		Did we come up with any new ideas or make any changes along the way that improved how our ROV operated and saved us money?		0					
		Did we come up with any creative designs or tools and explain them to the judges?		0					
	Describes problem solving process								
		Did we explain how we brainstormed ideas?		0					
		Did we describe how we compared our ideas and came up with the "best" one?		0					
		Did we describe the criteria that we used to pick our "best" idea?		0					
	Systems approach								
		Did we convince the judges that we thought through how to assemble the individual ROV systems into one whole working vehicle?		0					
	Material and component decisions								
		Did we talk about how we chose the materials to use for our frame? Our control box? Our tools? Etc.		0					
		Did we convince the judges that we made good decisions on selecting our materials and ROV parts?		0					
	Vehicle structure								
		Did we describe any trade-offs that we made (e.g. homemade PVC gripper instead of a store-bought one) to keep our ROV at a certain cost or size?		0					
	Vehicle systems								
		Did we explain how we chose our materials and tools to keep costs down but yet still allow us to perform the mission tasks?		0					
		Did we explain how our design and/or tools changed over time as we discovered what did and didn't work?		0					

		re Score	Possible		eignt	Score	Comments
Control/Electrical system						_	
Did we convince the judges that our of way that makes sense for how we op	ontrol box was put together in a erate our ROV?	0					
Did we describe our ROV's control sy switches/joysticks, wiring, and tether?	stem, including the design of the	0					
Did we convince the judges that we k and describe any special features the	now how the control box works t we may have included?	0					
Do all of our team members understa control box, switches/joysticks, wiring	nd the basics of our ROV , and tether?	0					
Did we convince the judges that we u tether and how we came up with its le	nderstand the purpose of our ngth?	0					
Did we come up with a way to manag the judges?	e our tether and describe it to	0					
Propulsion							
Did we describe the number and place	ement of our thrusters (motors)?	0					
Buoyancy and Ballast							
Did we convince the judges that we u ballast?	nderstand buoyancy and	0					
Did we describe how ROV's buoyanc we selected that specific type of buoy	y (e.g. foam noodles) and why ancy?	0					
Payload and Tools							
Did we explain why we did or did not	use cameras?	0				_	
Did we explain how our tools were de tasks?	signed to perform the mission	0					
Did we explain why we did or did not are or aren't needed for the tasks?	use sensors and why sensors	0					
Did we convince the judges that we u cameras, and/or sensors work?	nderstand how our tools,	0					
		0	220	10	0%	0.00	Base Score
		Raw	Max	Tot	al %		
		Score	Points (cat)	(chec	:k:100)		

Category	Criteria	Scoring Requirements	Enter your scores here	Raw Score	Points Possible	6 Weight	Category Score	Comments
						Weight		
Discretionary Points			0-4 pts each	0	8	1	0	Discretionary points
	Do w	ve have a unique ROV design, tool, or other feature?		0				
	use of	every single part?		0				
Deductions			0-4 pts each	0	8	1	0	Deduction points
	Do the of	he judges think that our teachers, mentors, and parents built most e vehicle and wrote our presentation for us?		0				
	Did v witho	we use a lot of pre-built parts or parts from previous teams out explaining why?		0				
							0	Final Score
Other Comments								

Scoring Rubric (applies to all score Items)	Outcome	Criteria	Score	Discretionary Points Rubric
	Missing	Not included, can't evaluate	0	Criteria:
	Needs work	Effort made, meets some key requirements. Understanding or treatment of key requirements needs more depth. Judges had to question deeply to find answers.	1	 Novelty Depth of Understanding Depth of Analysis Effectiveness (functions as intended) Quality of Implementation
	Partially meets requirement	Response demonstrates understanding and addresses most key requirements. Simple prodding from judges encouraged team to answer.	2	
	Meets requirement	Response demonstrates thorough understanding and addresses all key requirements. Team addressed topic with little to no prompting.	3	
	Exceeds requirement	Response extends beyond key requirements, demonstrating exceptional depth and breadth of understanding.	4	

Deductions Rubric	Degree	Deduction
Criteria:	None	0
- Extent to which team relied on outside help, existing work and/or ourchased components and	Minor	1
services	Fair	2
	Medium	3
	Extreme	4

Degree	Points
None	0
Minor	1
Fair	2
Good	3
Extraordinary	4