

# Greater Kansas City Science and Engineering Fair

## Computer Science Scoring Guide

|-----Gold-----| |-----Bronze-----|  
|-----Silver-----|

	Full Accomplishment	Substantial Accomplishment	Partial Accomplishment	Little or no Accomplishment
<b>Project Documentation &amp; Development</b>				
Is a <b>Notebook</b> present that shows the developmental process of the project?	<b>Yes</b> , it is detailed, complete and clear.	<b>Yes, but</b> there are portions missing or not clear.	<b>No, but</b> there was an attempt to keep notes.	<b>No</b> , there is no notebook.
<b>Is there a review of literature exploring solutions</b> for this issue/problem?	<b>Yes</b> , at least 3 sources were identified with possible solutions for this issue/problem.	<b>Yes</b> , at least 2 sources were identified with possible solutions for this issue/problem.	<b>Only 1</b> source was identified with possible solutions for this issue/problem.	<b>No</b> , there is no evidence that any effort was made to see if the problem has ever been addressed.
<b>Is there documentation shown to address all important features of the project</b> (science concepts, mathematical formulas, existing product or programs, etc.)?	<b>Yes</b> , many different features of the project were listed describing this design goal.	<b>Yes, but</b> the features are inadequately described or is missing major components.	<b>No, but</b> some attempt was made to describe the basis for the project about the problem.	<b>No</b> , there is no evidence that any effort was made to describe the underlying concepts.
Is there a <b>clear description of a design goal that will meet an unmet or desired need</b> ?	<b>Yes</b> , it has clearly described design goals that would meet potential users' needs.	<b>Yes, but</b> there are some areas of the design goals that are poorly described.	<b>No, but</b> there is a vague or incomplete description of the design goals addressed.	<b>No</b> , there is no description or practical need for the problem to be solved.
<b>Did the student develop meaningful design criteria</b> ?	<b>Yes</b> , the criteria directly addresses the need they were attempting to meet.	<b>Yes, but</b> there were a few minor inconsistencies or areas that were not addressed.	<b>No, but</b> there were criteria that were proposed, they would not address the problem.	<b>No</b> , design criteria were not assessed prior to addressing the problem.
<b>Product</b>				
Is there evidence that the <b>design goal was redesigned and retested multiple times for the desired performance</b> .	<b>Yes</b> , a description of multiple tests and/or iterations and their results are included (comments & graphs).	<b>Yes, but</b> the results are not conclusive.	<b>No, but</b> there is evidence that some testing was done.	<b>No</b> , there is no evidence of any tests being done-
<b>Is there evidence of standard (good) programming practices</b> such as documentation, code readability, error checking, error recovery, user interface ,any borrowed code is clearly identified and cited, etc.	<b>Yes</b> , there is evidence of standard programming practices. Any borrowed code (from an open-source or on-line forum) is clearly identified and cited.	<b>Yes</b> , there is some evidence of standard programming practices. Any borrowed code is identified and cited.	<b>No</b> , there is little evidence of standards programming practices. Any borrowed code is partially identified and not cited properly.	<b>No</b> , there is no evidence that standard programming practices were used. Any borrowed code is <b>NOT</b> identified or cited.
<b>Does the product or program represent a new capability or significant improvement</b> over existing products?	<b>Yes</b> , the product or program represents a new capability or significant improvement over existing products.	<b>Yes</b> , the product or program represents a capability that is important but exists in another form.	<b>No</b> , the product or program only barely represents a significant improvement.	<b>No</b> , the product or program does not represent a significant improvement over existing products.
<b>Is the product design user-friendly</b> ?	<b>Yes</b> , the product is user friendly.	<b>Yes</b> , the product can be used by most people.	<b>No</b> , the product is only usable by a few people	<b>No</b> , the product is not user friendly for anyone.
<b>Display</b>				
Does the display provide a complete representation of the research documentation?	<b>Yes</b> , it is clear and easy to read. The summary provides a clear representation of the product development and effectiveness.	<b>Yes</b> , but there are elements that are unclear or does not logically explain their process of development and/or how effective the program is..	<b>No</b> , some additional information is presented but the documentation is unclear or incomplete.	<b>No</b> , the summary does <b>NOT</b> include documentation of the process or effectiveness.
Is the display <b>neat</b> and well <b>organized</b> ?	<b>Yes</b> , it was easy to follow the progression of the entire project.	<b>Yes, but</b> there were some places that were confusing or messy.	<b>No, but</b> there was some information that could be gleaned from the display.	<b>No</b> , there was no continuity to how it was organized.