

SBC 2021 EVALUATION GRID
Literature Review (Study) Projects

Project Title :		
Participant:		
Judge :		
Page 1 of 2		Judge Comments
Page 1 of 2		Page 1 of 2
ORIGINALITY AND SCIENTIFIC MERIT		ORIGINALITY AND SCIENTIFIC MERIT
Relevance to Biotechnology (Life Sciences)		DRAFT
8 9 10	Relevant	
6 7	Somewhat relevant	
4 5	Possibly relevant in the future	
0 1 2 3	Not relevant	
Originality and Innovation		
8 9 10	Very original / creative / ingenious, their own unique idea	
6 7	Imaginative, creative use of resources, good design	
4 5	Little imagination, project largely led by the mentor	
0 1 2 3	Little imagination, project entirely led by the mentor	
Independence and Motivation		
4 5	Work carried out largely independently	
2 3	Work carried out somewhat independently	
0 1	Project largely led by the mentor	
Level of Science		
4 5	Equivalent to University: Bachelors/Masters/PhD	
2 3	Equivalent to High School (Gr 10/11/12 OR Sec 4/5/CEGEP)	
0 1	Equivalent to High School (Gr 8/9 OR Sec 2/3)	
PROJECT EXECUTION		PROJECT EXECUTION
Problem / Hypothesis		
0 1 2 3 4 5	Existing knowledge and background research were integrated into the formation of the problem/objective.	
0 1 2 3 4 5	The objective was clearly stated and provided direction and appropriate scope for the project.	
Methodology		
0 1 2 3 4 5	The information acquired showed depth and variety.	
0 1 2 3 4 5	The data gathered were reliable, comprehensive, well-organized and appropriate (multiple independent sources were used and verified).	
0 1 2 3 4 5	The student explained/recorded progress of the project, including research notes, resources, and discussions.	
Analysis / Conclusions		
0 1 2 3 4 5	Key scientific concepts, including alternate viewpoints, of the research topic were identified and explored.	
0 1 2 3 4 5	Critical analysis/interpretation of research material was presented (e.g., comparison of sources, surveys, and statistics).	
0 1 2 3 4 5	Logical conclusions based on the research were reached.	

SBC 2021 EVALUATION GRID
Literature Review (Study) Projects

Page 2 of 2		Page 2 of 2	
Participant:		Judge Comments	
COMMUNICATION (POSTER AND ORAL PRESENTATION)		COMMUNICATION :	
Presentation of the Project Summary			
4 5	Good summary of the project and conclusions		
2 3	Rather vague summary of the project and conclusions		
0 1	Little information about the project and findings		
Clarity and Layout			
4 5	Explicit, well-illustrated scientific approach		
2 3	Easy to interpret, little or no evidence of the scientific approach		
0 1	Difficult to interpret, little or no evidence of the scientific approach		
Oral Presentation: Demonstration of Scientific Knowledge			
9 10	Level of scientific knowledge: advanced university		
6 7 8	Level of scientific knowledge: beginner university		
3 4 5	Level of scientific knowledge: end of high school		
0 1	Level of scientific knowledge: beginning of high school		
Ability to Explain and Defend Conclusions			
9 10	Good explanation of the project, good defense of the conclusion(s)		
6 7 8	Good explanation of the project, poor defense of the conclusion(s)		
3 4 5	Poor explanation of the project, good defense of the conclusion(s)		
0 1 2	Poor explanation of the project, poor defense of the conclusion(s)		
/100	TOTAL SCORE		

