



Clearly stated mission goals/purpose(s) (Total score is not weighted – equal to the sum of both items below)					
<b>SCORE</b>	<i>To what extent did the mission plan reflect appropriate knowledge of Mars?</i>				
	All or almost all of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the mission plan was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the mission plan was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	There was an <b>even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate</b> knowledge of Mars conveyed in the mission plan.	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the mission plan was <b>accurate/clear</b> .	All or almost all of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the mission plan was <b>accurate/clear</b> .
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>
	<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 of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the presentation was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the presentation was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	There was an <b>even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate</b> knowledge of Mars conveyed in the presentation.	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the presentation was <b>accurate/clear</b> .	All or almost all of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the presentation was <b>accurate/clear</b> .
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>

Carefully designed source of power and control features (Total Score is weighted – equal to the sum of the two items below divided by 2)					
<b>SCORE</b>	<i>To what extent did the model reflect appropriate knowledge of space science/technology?</i>				
	All or almost all of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the model was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	Most of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the model was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	There was an <b>even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate</b> knowledge of space science/technology conveyed in the model.	Most of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the model was <b>accurate/clear</b> .	All or almost all of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the model was <b>accurate/clear</b> .
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>
	<i>To what extent did the presenter(s) reflect appropriate knowledge of space science/technology?</i>				
	All or almost all of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the presentation was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	Most of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the presentation was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	There was an <b>even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate</b> knowledge of space science/technology conveyed in the presentation.	Most of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the presentation was <b>accurate/clear</b> .	All or almost all of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the presentation was <b>accurate/clear</b> .
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>



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 Mars Rover model's design adapt to the physical characteristics of Mars?</i>				
	<b>None</b> of the components of the model's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.	<b>A few</b> of the components of the model's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.	<b>Some</b> of the components of the model's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.	<b>Most</b> of the components of the model's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.	<b>All</b> of the components of the model's design reflected appropriate environmental adaptations.
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>

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 Mars Rover model's design fit the mission goals and objectives?</i>				
	<b>None</b> of the model's design features fit the mission's goals and objectives.	<b>A few</b> of the model's design features fit the mission's goals and objectives.	<b>Some</b> of the model's design features fit the mission's goals and objectives.	<b>Most</b> of the model's design features fit the mission's goals and objectives.	<b>All</b> of the model's design features fit the mission's goals and objectives.
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>



Clearly written documentation - Rover Guide booklet (Total Score is weighted – equal to the sum of the four items below divided by 2)					
<b>SCORE</b>	<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 <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the booklet was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	There was an <b>even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate</b> knowledge of Mars conveyed in the booklet.	Most of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the booklet was <b>accurate/clear</b> .	All or almost all of the Mars knowledge conveyed in the booklet was <b>accurate/clear</b> .
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>
	<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 <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	Most of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the booklet was <b>inaccurate/unclear</b> .	There was an <b>even mix of clear/accurate and unclear/inaccurate</b> knowledge of space science/technology conveyed in the booklet.	Most of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the booklet was <b>accurate/clear</b> .	All or almost all of the space science/technology knowledge conveyed in the booklet was <b>accurate/clear</b> .
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>
	<i>To what extent was the booklet coherent, organized and well written?</i>				
	<b>Extremely unorganized, incoherent and very poorly written.</b>	<b>Somewhat unorganized, incoherent and poorly written.</b>	<b>An even mix of organized/unorganized, coherent/incoherent, and well and poorly written.</b>	<b>Somewhat organized, coherent and well written.</b>	<b>Extremely well organized, coherent and well written.</b>
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>
	<i>For TEAMS: To what extent is the contribution of each team member documented?</i>				
The contribution of the team members was <b>completely undocumented</b> .		The contribution of the team members was <b>partially</b> documented.		The contribution of the team members was <b>thoroughly</b> documented.	
<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>	



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

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



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 - Rover 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 source of power and control features	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 - Rover Guide booklet	20	0.50	10
Quality workmanship reflected in the Rover model	10	1.00	10
Organized and well-rehearsed presentation	15	0.67	10
<b>TOTAL SCORE POSSIBLE</b>			<b>55</b>