



Clearly stated mission goals/purpose(s) (Total score is not weighted – equal to the sum of both items below)

SCORE	<i>To what extent did the community reflect appropriate knowledge of Mars?</i>				
	All or almost all the Mars knowledge conveyed in the community guide was inaccurate/unclear .	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the community guide was inaccurate/unclear .	There was an even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate knowledge of Mars conveyed in the community guide.	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the community guide was accurate/clear .	All or almost all of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the community guide was accurate/clear .
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
	<i>To what extent did the presenter(s) reflect appropriate understanding of our knowledge of Mars in their mission plan?</i>				
	All or almost all the Mars knowledge conveyed in the presentation was inaccurate/unclear .	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the presentation was inaccurate/unclear .	There was an even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate knowledge of Mars conveyed in the presentation.	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the presentation was accurate/clear .	All or almost all of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the presentation was accurate/clear .
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points

Carefully designed community and cultural elements (Total Score is weighted – equal to the sum of the two items below divided by 2)

SCORE	<i>To what extent did the community reflect appropriate knowledge of space science/technology/culture?</i>				
	All or almost all the science /tech/culture knowledge conveyed in the community guide was inaccurate/unclear .	Most of the science /tech /culture knowledge conveyed in the community guide was inaccurate /unclear .	There was an even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate knowledge of science/tech/ culture conveyed in the community guide.	Most of the science/tech/ culture knowledge conveyed in the community guide was accurate/clear .	All or almost all of the science/ tech/ culture knowledge conveyed in the community guide was accurate/clear .
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
	<i>To what extent did the presenter(s) reflect appropriate understanding of our knowledge of space science/technology/culture?</i>				
	All or almost all the science / tech/culture knowledge conveyed in the presentation was inaccurate/unclear .	Most of the science /tech/ culture knowledge conveyed in the presentation was inaccurate/unclear .	There was an even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate knowledge of science/tech/culture conveyed in the presentation.	Most of the science /tech/culture knowledge conveyed in the presentation was accurate/clear .	All or almost all of the science/ tech/culture knowledge conveyed in the presentation was accurate/clear .
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points



Features adapted to function in harsh conditions (Total score is not weighted – equal to the score on the one item below)					
SCORE	<i>To what extent did the community's design adapt to the physical characteristics of Mars?</i>				
	None of the components of the community's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.	A few of the components of the community's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.	Some of the components of the community's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.	Most of the components of the community's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.	All of the components of the community's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points

Clever/creative task features to accomplish mission (Total score is not weighted – equal to the score on the one item below)					
SCORE	<i>To what extent did the community's design fit the mission goals and objectives?</i>				
	None of the community's design features fit the mission's goals & objectives.	A few of the community's design features fit the mission's goals & objectives.	Some of the community's design features fit the mission's goals and objectives.	Most of the community's design features fit the mission's goals & objectives.	All of the community's design features fit the mission's goals & objectives.
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points



Clearly written documentation - Habitation Guide booklet (Total Score is weighted – equal to the sum of the four items below divided by 2)

SCORE	<i>To what extent did the booklet reflect appropriate knowledge of Mars?</i>				
	All or almost all of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the booklet was inaccurate/unclear .	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the booklet was inaccurate/unclear .	There was an even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate knowledge of Mars conveyed in the booklet.	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the booklet was accurate/clear .	All or almost all of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the booklet was accurate/clear .
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
	<i>To what extent did the booklet reflect appropriate knowledge of space science/technology?</i>				
	All or almost all of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the booklet was inaccurate/unclear .	Most of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the booklet was inaccurate/unclear .	There was an even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate knowledge of space science/technology conveyed in the booklet.	Most of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the booklet was accurate/clear .	All or almost all of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the booklet was accurate/clear .
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
	<i>To what extent was the booklet coherent, organized and well written?</i>				
	Extremely unorganized, incoherent and very poorly written.	Somewhat unorganized, incoherent and poorly written.	An even mix of organized/unorganized, coherent/incoherent, and well and poorly written.	Somewhat organized, coherent and well written.	Extremely well organized, coherent and well written.
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
	<i>For TEAMS: To what extent is the contribution of each team member documented?</i>				
	The contribution of the team members was completely undocumented .		The contribution of the team members was partially documented.		The contribution of the team members was thoroughly documented.
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points



Quality workmanship reflected in the Habitation model (Total score is not weighted – equal to the sum of both items below)					
SCORE	<i>To what extent was the model visually appealing?</i>				
	Very visually unappealing.	Somewhat visually unappealing.	Neither appealing or unappealing	Somewhat visually appealing.	Very visually appealing.
	1 points	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
	<i>Were the illustrations/drawing made with care and good workmanship?</i>				
	Very poor workmanship and no attention to detail.	Somewhat poor workmanship and very little attention to detail.	An even mix of good/poor workmanship, and high and low attention to detail.	Somewhat good workmanship and attention to detail.	Very good workmanship and attention to detail.
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points

Organized and well-rehearsed presentation (Total Score is weighted – equal to the sum of the three items below multiplied by .67)					
SCORE	<i>To what extent was the oral presentation organized and coherent?</i>				
	Extremely unorganized and incoherent.	Somewhat unorganized and incoherent.	An even mix of organized/unorganized and coherent/incoherent.	Somewhat organized and coherent.	Extremely organized and coherent.
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
	<i>To what extent was the oral presentation well rehearsed and prepared?</i>				
	The presentation was extremely choppy.	The presentation was somewhat choppy.	The presentation was an even mix of smooth and choppy.	The presentation was somewhat smooth.	The presentation was extremely smooth.
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
	<i>For TEAMS: To what extent did each team member contribute to the oral presentation?</i>				
	Only one team member contributed (or no team member contributed).	Only a few of the team members contributed .	About half of the team members contributed .	Most team members contributed .	All team members contributed .
	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points



Habitation – Mars Celebration Judges Rubric

The table below describes the original scoring as well as the weighting of scores.

- 1) The **Unweighted Possible Score** is the straight sum of the items in each category.
- 2) Since not all categories count the same in the overall total score for a submission, the **Weighting** column indicates what each unweighted score is multiplied by to create a weighted score that reflects the importance of the category in the overall score for the submission. The following three categories are weighted slightly lower than all other categories:
 - a) Carefully designed source of power and control features
 - b) Clearly written documentation - Habitation Guide booklet
 - c) Organized and well-rehearsed presentation
- 3) The **Final Possible Score** is the weighted score possible for each category.
- 4) **The maximum score for any submission is 55.**

SECTION	Unweighted Possible Score	Weighting	Final Possible Score
Clearly stated mission goals/purpose(s)	10	1.00	10
Carefully designed community and cultural elements	10	0.50	5
Features adapted to function in harsh conditions	5	1.00	5
Clever/creative task features to accomplish mission	5	1.00	5
Clearly written documentation - Habitation Guide booklet	20	0.50	10
Quality workmanship reflected in the Habitation model	10	1.00	10
Organized and well-rehearsed presentation	15	0.67	10
TOTAL SCORE POSSIBLE			55