Final Results Rubric

Thank you for helping to evaluate team proposals for Robotic Caregivers. Please use this form to evaluate a results presentation. You can find a printable version in the associated Google Doc:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TbM3f-JkTd0Vvcs7H-ESJ81rpF9f-TRlnjcMffjcLuY/

A reviewer provides eight ratings using the following terms and associated points.

    POOR = 6 points
    FAIR = 8 points
    GOOD = 10 points
    VERY GOOD = 12 points
    EXCELLENT = 14 points

The associated points will be added together to obtain a RAW_TOTAL_SCORE that ranges from 48 to 112 points, inclusive. EXCELLENT ratings for all eight categories would result in a RAW TOTAL SCORE of 112. VERY GOOD ratings for all eight categories would result in a RAW TOTAL SCORE of 96. This is designed to allow reviewers to provide some feedback without a grade penalty.

The RAW TOTAL SCORE can be converted to a letter grade using the following numeric ranges (the words in quotes are the standard Georgia Tech interpretations of letter grades from the Registrar's website):

    $90.0 \le$ NUMERIC GRADE   :   A ("Excellent")
    $80.0 \le$ NUMERIC GRADE < 90.0 :   B ("Good")
    $70.0 \le$ NUMERIC GRADE < 80.0 :   C ("Satisfactory")
    $60.0 \le$ NUMERIC GRADE < 70.0 :   D ("Passing")
             NUMERIC GRADE < 60.0 :   F ("Failure")

The grade for this activity will be computed as follows:

Convert the RAW TOTAL SCORE to a BOUNDED TOTAL SCORE by setting the BOUNDED TOTAL SCORE to 100 if the RAW TOTAL SCORE > 100 and otherwise setting the BOUNDED TOTAL SCORE to equal the RAW TOTAL SCORE.

Set NUMERIC GRADE to the average BOUNDED TOTAL SCORE from all of the reviewers.

* Required

1. Your name (Reviewer) *

    Enter your answer

2. The team for which you are providing a review *

    ◯ Team Red

    ◯ Team Green

    ◯ Team Blue

3. Name of the team's project or another simple description of their proposal (Used to ensure accuracy) *

Enter your answer

4. Provide a RATING (POINTS) for each of the eight categories. *

	POOR (6)	FAIR (8)	GOOD (10)	VERY GOOD (12)	EXCELLENT (14)
Value to the population	○	○	○	○	○
Real-world feasibility	○	○	○	○	○
Implementation	○	○	○	○	○
Evaluation	○	○	○	○	○
Interactions with stakeholders	○	○	○	○	○
Support from the literature	○	○	○	○	○
Quality of the video	○	○	○	○	○
Quality of the presentation, including Q&A session	○	○	○	○	○

5. Comments for the team

Enter your answer