

## Helpful hints about the Rubric

- The reason for the rubric is based off of teacher and student requests for a clearer understanding of how we at HUNCH rate student presentations for PDR and CDR
- Please understand that there is no single way of rating projects that are often very dissimilar to each other. So the rubric should be used as a GUIDE for your presentations.
  
- The Research Review was added this year based on feedback that students do not have a lot of experience presenting scientific information. It is also meant as a way for teachers to gauge the amount of research students have done for their projects.
  - PLEASE NOTE - the number one problem we at HUNCH have found during PDRs is that students have not spent a serious amount of time deeply researching their project AND/OR micro-gravity and its potential problems. The research review is meant as a way of emphasizing the need of research in the design and prototyping process.
  - It is HIGHLY encouraged that the Research Reviews should be peer reviewed along with being teacher reviewed. This should give students a much deeper understanding of potential problems and allow them to hear other student's thinking about the space environment.
  - Teachers may use the Research Review as a grading opportunity but should avoid using the rubric as a hard grading "device." Please create your own process and standards for grading. The rubric should only be used as a general guide.
  - Even though the "score" for each review totals "100" this is only a rough estimate of a weighting system we use for projects.
- "Score" in educational terms could be viewed a "weighting value" of importance of that topic.
  - For example: a "20 for 'discussion' under Research Stage means that whatever grade you give a team for 'discussion' is worth 20% out of a total weight of 100%
  - Another example: getting a perfect grade(whatever that is for your system) for building a prototype(a weight/score of 5) during the Research Stage is not going to worth as much during that stage as an average grade for your showing off your actual research(a weight/score of 50)
- If a topic has no score for a specific review it means it most likely has a minimal impact in an overall review of a project.
- We suggest a 4 point "grading scale be used for each topic pointed out in the Design Review chart (Presentation, Research, Design,etc.) Where most students should be aiming at getting a "3" or "Meeting Expectations." Those expectations should be determined by the teacher in an effort to connect class standards to HUNCH.

<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Exceeding</b>	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Approaching</b>	<b>Needing Additional Support</b>	<b>No Evidence</b>

- If there is confusion about the chart, the weighting system or how to integrate them into your class, please contact your mentor.

- Note: This score sheet is only provided as a guide. NASA HUNCH does not want to impinge on any classroom's syllabus or teacher's style. This sheet is provided so that teachers and students alike can understand what evaluators look for when rating a project. There is no "Final Score Sheet" of all the projects and their scores. Evaluators use versions of this sheet to have a basis to compare and contrast each project. They then open discussions with other evaluators to come to a final result which does not have a number.