

iGEM 2012 Regional Jamboree Judging Rubric			Language Scale						
Core Categories		Aspects	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Overall	1	Based on Standard Parts?	Entirely	Almost entirely	Mostly	Half	Less than half	Not at all	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Are the data compelling/convincing?	Completely convincing	Remarkably thorough	Solid	Reasonable; minor weak aspects	Major weak aspects	No convincing validity	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Did they finish building a functional system?	All parts work beautifully	All parts work reasonable well	At least one part/device works	Works somewhat; verification is weak	Functions in some way, not as expected	Not at all	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Did the team improve an existing part?	Big improvement of intended function	Minor improvement in intended function	Substantial documentation in "Experience"	Sent missing DNA to Registry	Only verified the DNA sequence	Not at all	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Did the team help another team?	Helped other team(s) at own expense	Gave multiple teams substantial help	Gave single team substantial help	Helped community indirectly (new tool)	Helpful, but not critical	Superficial	No grade/ Not applicable
	6	What is the real world importance/value?	Could save the world	Strong potential impact	Clearly applicable	Possible application	Applications are far off	Possible negative impact	No grade/ Not applicable
	7	Potential impact on synthetic biology	Could change future of field	Strong potential impact	Clearly applicable	Possible application	Applications are far off	None	No grade/ Not applicable
	8	Scientific impact and novelty	Completely unexpected	Very Original	Has some innovative aspects	Novel application of existing tools	Fairly standard	Repetition of published work	No grade/ Not applicable
	9	Creativity	Completely unexpected	Very Original	Has some innovative aspects	Single innovative idea	Fairly standard	Similar to a previous iGEM team	No grade/ Not applicable
	10	Did they do the project themselves?	Entirely done by undergraduates	Almost all done by undergraduates	Out-sourced single minor task	Out-sourced several minor tasks	Out-sourced single major task	Use of external professionals unclear	No grade/ Not applicable
Wiki (Also best wiki award)	1	Are the parts' functions and sources highly-documented in the Wiki and Registry?	Superb; reference manual quality	Good; information is clear and accessible	Thorough, sometimes unclear	Complete list with vague documentation	Functions and sources are often missing	Functions and sources are completely missing	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Do I understand what they did and why?	Completely clear to scientists & non-scientists	Very thorough on a high technical level	Could not understand some aspects	Understood about half	Hard to follow, flow not logical	Motivation and approach are vague	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Is it attractive and easy to navigate?	I want them to build my website!	Fairly attractive and easy to navigate	Good quality	Rather standard	Unappealing design, hard to find important information	No or few changes to the template	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Are the data clearly connected to their accomplishments?	Completely	Mostly	Reasonably well	Some confusion	A few parts only	I am lost	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Did they attribute the project correctly?	Thorough, correct, and easy to find	Technically thorough	Single minor omission	Multiple minor omissions	Major omission(s)	Data plagiarized or wrongly credited	No grade/ Not applicable
Presentation (Also best presentation award)	1	Clarity of presentation: Could you follow the presentation flow?	Completely clear to scientists & non-scientists	Very thorough on a high technical level	Could not adequately explain some aspects	Understood about half	Hard to follow, flow not logical	Unsure why team attempted project	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Graphic design: layout, composition, grammar, etc.	Impressive, error-free, needs no verbal guidance	Key points easy to find, overall message is obvious	Points presented, not visually pleasing	Hard to follow, disjointed	Confusing, unattractive visuals are distracting	Forgot/lost presentation	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Did you find the presentation engaging?	Kept me on the edge of my seat	Held my attention	Mostly held my attention	Somewhat interested	Few interesting aspects	I'm bored	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Did they attribute the project correctly?	Thorough; mentioned within presentation	Thorough single acknowledgment slide	Single minor omission	Multiple minor omissions	Major omission(s)	Data plagiarized or wrongly credited	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Team competence at answering questions	Professional expertise	Comparable to graduate students	Comparable to honors undergraduates	Solid effort; very few mistakes	Often unprepared	Completely unprepared	No grade/ Not applicable
Poster (Also best poster award)	1	Clarity of poster: Do you understand what the team did and why? Is the data clearly presented?	Totally clear to scientists and non-scientists	Very thorough on a high technical level	I did not understand a few aspects	I understood about half	Hard to follow; flow is not logical	Unsure why team attempted project	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Does the poster flow visually?	Enjoyable	Very viewer-friendly	Pretty good	Rather standard	Quite cumbersome	Confusing	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Graphic design: is it neatly arranged, is the grammar correct, are key points clear, etc.?	Professional	Very attractive	Good quality	Clear but not attractive	Plain	Boring and wordy	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Is the data clearly presented?	Crystal clear	Yes, definitely	reasonably well	There are some confusion	Some parts only	I am lost	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Did they attribute the project correctly?	Creatively integrated throughout poster	Thorough single acknowledgment panel	Single minor omission	Multiple minor omissions	Major omission(s)	Data plagiarized or wrongly credited	No grade/ Not applicable
	6	Team competence at answering questions	Professional expertise	Graduate student performance	Honors undergraduate performance	Solid effort; very few mistakes	Often unprepared	Completely unprepared	No grade/ Not applicable
Special Awards			Aspects						
Best Human Practice Advance	1	What is the quality of the contribution to human practices in synthetic biology?	Nobel Prize	Truly noteworthy	Very significant	Modest	Pro forma/ routine	No grade/ Not applicable	Detrimental to society
Best BioBrick Measurement Advance	1	Is the measurement potentially repeatable?	Yes, with standard equipment	Most teams could repeat measurements	Some teams can repeat measurement	Measurement complex to repeat	Requires expensive equipment/ complex setup	Could not be repeated by other iGEM teams	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Is the protocol well-described?	Superb; instruction manual quality	Thorough at a high technical level	A few steps are unclear	Several steps are unclear	Mostly cumbersome	Very incomplete	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Are there web-based support materials?	Sophisticated data processing functions	Useful for recording data	Online documentation complete	Partial online documentation	Documentation online is sparse	Documentation online is misleading	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Is it useful to other projects?	Universally indispensable	Useful for many types of projects	Useful for a specific frequent task	Useful for a specialized task	Useful in very rare cases	Not really useful	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Was a standard reference sample included?	Totally appropriate, clearly described	Adequately described and measured	Description and measurement passable	Mentioned, but lacking evidence	Inappropriate reference sample	No standard reference sample included	No grade/ Not applicable
Best new BioBrick Part (natural)	1	Was it submitted properly?	Received in standard backbone or approved exception	Received in non-standard backbone	Shipping in standard backbone is pending/in-transit/hold by customs	Shipping in non-standard backbone is pending	Shipped after deadline	No attempt to submit DNA	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	How does the documentation compare to BBa_F2620 and BBa_K515100?	Better	Similar excellent quality	DNA sequence, description, some data, references	DNA sequence, description, references	DNA sequence and description	Only DNA sequence	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	How new/innovative is it?	Completely surprising	Very Original	Has innovative aspects	New application of existing tools	Fairly standard	Similar to a previous team	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Did the team show that it works as expected?	Yes, in multiple contexts	Yes, in one context	Characterized in isolation	Weak characterization in isolation	Does not behave as expected	Test not attempted	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Is it compatible with current standards and systems?	Clearly indispensable	Clearly compatible with most	Clearly compatible with many	Clearly compatible with one	Somewhat hard to tell	Not at all	No grade/ Not applicable
Best new BioBrick Device (engineered)	1	Was it submitted properly?	Received in standard backbone or approved exception	Received in non-standard backbone	Shipping in standard backbone is pending/in-transit/hold by customs	Shipping in non-standard backbone is pending	Shipped after deadline	No attempt to submit DNA	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	How does the documentation compare to BBa_F2620 and BBa_K515100?	Better	Similar excellent quality	DNA sequence, description, some data, references	DNA sequence, description, references	DNA sequence and description	Only DNA sequence	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	How new/innovative is it?	Completely unexpected	Very Original	Has innovative aspects	Novel application of existing tools	Fairly standard	Similar to a previous team	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Did the team show that it works as expected?	Publication quality	Good documentation	Adequate documentation	Lacks important documentation	Does not behave as expected	Application not attempted	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Is it useful to the community?	Will be indispensable	Generally useful	Useful for equivalent projects	Other uses of same parts	Specific to the project	Not very useful	No grade/ Not applicable
Best New Standard	1	Did the team file an RFC?	RFC documentation 100% complete	RFC content clear and well described	RFC number, content minimally describes standard	Number, minimal content	RFC number, but no content	No RFC filed	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Is the procedure repeatable?	Completely	Minor limitations	Somewhat limited	Very limited	Major limitations	Not repeatable	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Is the standard easy to apply?	Totally student-friendly	Very easy to apply	Few complications	Many complications	Difficult to apply	Impossible to apply	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	Is it useful to the community?	Will become new standard	Generally useful	Useful for equivalent designs	Other uses of same parts	Specific to the project	Not very useful	No grade/ Not applicable
Best Model	1	Is it correct?	Flawless	Remarkably thorough	Solid	Reasonable	Very approximate	Doubtful validity	No grade/ Not applicable
	2	Does it go beyond differential equations with sample parameters?	Doctoral thesis level	Innovative use of theory	Uses a wide array of tools	Uses an advanced approach	Standard model	Very approximate/simple	No grade/ Not applicable
	3	Is it meaningfully used to inform the experiments?	Mutually informed, harmonious workflow	Determines parameters/design choices	Design check before wetwork	Quantitative check after wetwork	Conceptual check after wetwork	Had separate ends from wetwork	No grade/ Not applicable
	4	How does the model contribute to the overall project?	Produced new discoveries	Integrated into several experiments	Quantitative model	Prediction and experiment agree	Weak support of experiment by model	Only superficial inclusion of a model	No grade/ Not applicable
	5	Is the approach generally useful for other teams?	Will become new standard	Generally useful	Useful for equivalent designs	Other uses of same parts	Specific to the project	Not very useful	No grade/ Not applicable