

Judge Evaluation Scoring Form for Project Technical Report

PROJECT #.: ..Project Title.....



UNCC
PROTOCOL APPROVAL APPLICATION
Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Research with Human Subjects

Easy to Use Template Instructions:

Simply tab to the gray blocks and type in your information. The box will expand as you type.
 To select a box, simply point the mouse to the box and click!

PROJECT TITLE	REU Site: Computing Research for Undergraduates: Visualization, Virtual Environments, Gaming, and Mobile Robotics & Networking			
INVESTIGATOR INFORMATION	Name:	Teresa Dahlberg	Dept.:	Computer Science
	Title:	Associate Professor	Status: Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Student <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty/Staff <small>(If student, provide information for responsible faculty below)</small>
	Degree(s): <small>(If student, state degree being sought)</small>	PhD	Phone:	704-687-8553
	Complete Mailing Address:	University of North Carolina at Charlotte 9201 University City Boulevard Charlotte, NC 28223	Email:	Teresa.Dahlberg@uncc.edu
RESPONSIBLE FACULTY	Name		Dept.:	
	Title:		Phone:	
	Degree(s)		Email:	

List all co-investigators below, including those from other institutions.

Simply tab to the gray blocks and type in your information. The box will expand as you type.

Name	Degree(s)	Responsibility on Research Project	Department <small>(provide address if off-campus)</small>	Contact Information
Tiffany Barnes	PhD	Co-Investigator	Computer Science	Ph: tbarnes2@uncc.edu Email: 704-687-8553
Audrey Rorrer	MA	Research Assistant	Counseling	Ph: 704-277-3059 Email: arorrer@uncc.edu
				Ph: Email:

Investigator's Agreement:

I certify that myself as well as all co-investigators have completed the required UNC Charlotte Human Subjects On-Line Training Tutorial located at <http://www.research.uncc.edu/Comp/human.cfm> and that each of the co-investigators has accepted their role in this study. I agree to a continuing exchange of information with the Institutional Review Board (IRB). I agree to obtain approval before making any changes or additions to the project. I will provide progress reports at least annually, or as requested. I agree to report promptly to the IRB all unanticipated problems or serious adverse events involving risk to human subjects. A copy of the informed consent will be given to each subject if applicable and a signed original will be retained in my files.

Signature of Investigator

Date

Responsible Faculty Member's Agreement: (If the Investigator is a student)

I certify that, as the student's responsible faculty, I have:

- read and endorsed the materials submitted; and

PARTICIPANTS:

DATE:

ORGANIZATION: (Does the report presentation meet the requirements of a professional research report?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

METHOD OF ANALYSIS: (Have the students made creative use of their training and presented a sound technical approach to the problem?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

CRITICAL PATH: (Did the students demonstrate a well-structured plan of experimental investigation, and was it followed?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

SYNTHESIS OF TEST DATA: (Did the students present a systematic procedure to synthesize the test data collected to develop the results presented? Has the adequacy of these results been demonstrated?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

GOAL ACHIEVEMENT: (Did the students achieve the stated objectives of the project?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

COMMENTS:

Judge Evaluation Scoring Form for REU Participant Presentation

PROJECT .#: ...Project Title....

STUDENT NAME:

DATE:

ATTITUDE: (Does the student look and act like a research engineer making a report to his peers and superiors?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

ORGANIZATION OF PRESENTATION AND EMPHASIS: (Was the information relevant? Did it bridge with the other presenters? Was it presented in a methodical and coherent manner?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

CLARITY OF PRESENTATION: (How well has the student made the point? Do you understand what is being done?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

USE AND QUALITY OF VISUAL AIDS: (Were they appropriate? Were they readable and visually effective?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE: (Did the student speak clearly and coherently? Did the student appear confident about the answer?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

COMMENTS: (if any)

Judge Evaluation Scoring Form for Poster Presentation

PROJECT.#.: ...Title..

PARTICIPANTS:

DATE:

CONTENT: (Did the poster capture the technical essence of the whole project?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

ORGANIZATION OF PRESENTATION AND EMPHASIS: (Was the story-line well organized and easy to follow? Were important points highlighted?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

CLARITY OF PRESENTATION: (How well are the main points made? How well is the textual information presented? How well the textual, pictorial and graphical information augment each other? Can someone understand the information without clarification?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

USE AND QUALITY OF VISUAL AIDS: (Were they appropriate and clear? Were they of good quality? Were they clearly and effectively presented?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE: (Were the team members able to explain? Were they confident and poised?)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
-----------	-----------	------	------	----------------

EVALUATION REMARKS: