COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING
International Conference Evaluation Guidelines

Always provide an explanation for a low score on a criterion. Reward the student(s) who have best met a specific criterion with the highest number on the scale for that criterion. Don't be a point grinch! Remember that it is sometimes hard for the CmPSers (or coach or affiliate director) to understand how a project scoring first in the affiliate program could come in last in the international competition.

SUBJECTIVITY AND ANONYMITY IN CMPS EVALUATION

Evaluators should be as objective as possible. Sometimes an evaluator's background and/or life experience may cause him or her to subconsciously identify more positively with one project over another. One project may have hit on a favorite cause of a particular evaluator or, perhaps, the student(s) has chosen to promote something the evaluator finds distasteful. While the projects are assigned a code number, there is no way to keep the students(s) anonymous. The school name, the geographic area, and the student name(s) may all appear in the six-page report, addendum, scrapbook, etc. International CmPS evaluators must be capable of removing any preconceived thoughts about a topic or project before they evaluate in order to judge as impartially as possible.

Some evaluators naturally tend to score more strictly. A maximum of 285 (of 675 points possible, not counting the optional Beyonder bonus) are awarded during preliminary scoring. Averaging the preliminary scores compensates for the difference between a Scrooge or Santa Claus judge.

- **In both preliminary and on-site scoring, evaluation is confidential.**
- **Judges do not discuss any aspect of a project's evaluation with anyone other than their evaluation partner, the CmPS coordinator, or the Executive Director**.

COMPOSITION AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

Each evaluation team is composed of two CmPS certified judges. The two judges are persons with a background in the FPS program, a superior understanding of Community Problem Solving, and no conflicts of interest with teams/individuals competing in the sample they evaluate. The judges participate in both the preliminary and on-site scoring.

The evaluation team receives from five to nine projects, depending upon the total number of projects submitted. The projects are subdivided by category area and sent to different evaluation teams. The two judges receive a copy of each team/individual's six-page report and addendum at least one month before International Conference. Evaluators have approximately three weeks to complete the preliminary scoring on the projects in their sample.

After each judge completes the preliminary scoring, he or she reports the scores to the CmPS coordinator. The total points received by each project are averaged to determine a composite score in the preliminary round. Evaluators bring the NCR scoresheet, the six-page report, and the addendum pages for use during the on-site scoring to verify the team/individual plans and accomplishments at IC. As part of the on-site scoring, each CmPS team/individual participates in a 30-minute interview on Friday. A limited number of callback interviews to clarify important aspects of the project may be scheduled.

The scoresheets, reports, and addenda are returned to the teams/individuals. Evaluators must make general comments on the scoresheet. Evaluators should write expanded suggestions to the student(s) directly on the six-page report and addendum pages. The yellow copies of the preliminary and on-site scoresheets remain with FPSPI so that the IO can answer questions regarding scoring after IC; therefore, evaluator comments on the scoresheet should validate the scores given.

COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING
International Conference Evaluation Guidelines

A. Points earned determine placement.
   - The average of the two preliminary scores is added to the on-site scores to determine the total points
   - A maximum of 675 points are possible, not including the optional Beyonder bonus points.

B. Trophies are awarded in each division by category.
   - The project receiving the highest number of points receives first place.
   - The project receiving the second highest number of points receives second place.
   - The project receiving the third highest number of points may receive third place depending on the number of projects in the category.

C. A grand champion is awarded in each division based on a comparative analysis of the first place winners in each category.
   - All CmPS judges and the CmPS coordinator participate in a "walkabout" on Saturday to learn about and discuss the projects in contention for grand champion. All CmPS evaluators vote for the grand champion in every division. If an evaluator has a conflict of interest (one of the winners is from the evaluator's affiliate program), the evaluator excuses himself or herself from that vote. In cases of a lack of consensus, the CmPS coordinator casts the deciding vote.
   - Grand Champion choices require evaluators to re-determine the order of placement in the category from which the grand champion was chosen.
   - ALL CmPS evaluators in all divisions will utilize the Grand Champion rubric to determine the Grand Champion in each division.

D. The E. Paul Torrance Beyonder Award is determined during the "walkabout."
   - The Beyonder Award may be awarded to a team or individual chosen in the walkabout.
   - The Beyonder Award may be awarded to student(s) whose project does not place (perhaps the student(s) had a difficult time with the interview or the report did not follow the appropriate format) but whose commitment to the project outdistances other students' efforts.
   - The Beyonder Award should recognize students whose efforts may have far-reaching impact beyond this school year or project lifetime. (The Beyonder recipient receives a cash award to be used as seed money to help continue or expand the project goals.)
   - Beyonder bonus point descriptors can be used to determine the Beyonder Award. (See page 13)
   - ALL CmPS evaluators in all divisions will utilize the Beyonder rubric to determine the one Beyonder Award given to one Beyonder over all divisions.

COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING
International Conference Evaluation Guidelines

COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Community Problem Solving (CmPS) -- Teams and individuals apply their FPS skills to solve a real challenge in an identified community. A community challenge is a problem that exists within the school, local community, region, state or nation. Implementation of the action plan is included in this component. Teams/individuals move from hypothetical issues to real world, authentic concerns by solving their action plan within their identified community.

One-year CmPS project-- A CmPS project that is identified, solved and submitted for competition within one FPSPI year. Because the one-year projects are predictably the largest number of projects submitted, One-year projects will be evaluated by dividing them into the three topic categories utilized in determining topics for the Global Issues Problem Solving competition. These categories will be:

1. **Business/ Economics** (projects involving Leadership and Economic issues
2. **Social/Political/Education** (projects involving Human Services, Civic or Cultural issues, or Education)
3. **Science/Technology** (projects involving the Environment, Health or Safety issues as well as other science related concerns.

Multi-year CmPS project-- A CmPS project that takes more than one year to complete in order to solve the action plan. A minimum of fifty- percent of the team members on a Multi-year project must remain constant throughout all years of the project. The multi-year project would be submitted for competition **one time**, upon completion of the project.

Evolving CmPS Project-- This type of CmPS project evolves or builds upon a previously submitted project but a new UP and Action Plan is developed and solved in the second or evolving year. A minimum of fifty- percent of the team members on an Evolving project must remain constant throughout all years of the project. The Evolving CmPS project must submit an additional Preface (see attached) in addition to the six-page written report. The Evolving project must also include a seventh page in the addendum that includes a timeline that **CLEARLY** delineates the accomplishments of the first year and those of the evolving year of the project.

Grand Champion-- The overall winner of all three types of projects within each age division of the CmPS component is the grand champion.

Beyonder Award-- Dr. E. Paul Torrance coined the word "Beyonder" to describe projects that "outdistance the others so far that they are not even on the same scale." Team or Individual CmPSers who have demonstrated an exceptional depth, passion, and commitment in the project that goes above and beyond what would normally be expected of student(s) in the grade level division are considered for the Beyonder Award; a Beyonder does not have to be awarded each year.

PRELIMINARY SCORING

The preliminary scoring analyzes the project's six-page report and addendum and judges the problem solving process, the implementation of the plan, and the documentation of accomplishments. Note: Portions of the report (especially the reflection on outcomes) may be scored on-site in conjunction with the IC presentations. The six-page report may be no longer than six single-sided, single-spaced pages in the equivalent of Times 12 point font (or larger) with a 1/2" margin top, bottom, left and right. The addendum may be up to six single-sided pages. Reports or addenda exceeding the length requirements are penalized in several evaluation areas; only the first six pages are evaluated.

The addendum is composed of significant information from the project the student(s) feels documents the work. The addendum may include newspaper articles, surveys, interview forms, photos from their scrapbook, etc. This information may be reduced in size to fit as much supporting documentation as can be deciphered by the judges. Addendum selections too small to read are not considered in evaluation.

COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING
International Conference Evaluation Guidelines

When judging each section, first determine if all the required information for each criteria is included. (Area of Concern, Challenges Identified, Underlying Problem, etc.). Then rate the quality (Significance, Completeness, Clarity, etc.) in comparison to other projects in the sample. The addendum pages should help the judges determine the "flavor" of the project, whether the project is the work of the student(s) or conducted by the teacher, and the extent to which the project fulfills what is stated in the six-page report.

General Numerical Scoring Guidelines: Each evaluation element is evaluated on three different criteria. Each criterion in the preliminary scoring has a range of scoring from 1-10 in Parts I and II and 1-15 in the Addendum.

The numerical value of the options is weighed according to the importance of that criterion to the overall quality of the project. Award points according to the following:

The general rule of thumb used in the preliminary scoring is:

- **Award the lowest number of points if the team or individual has not included the required information; (1-2/10 or 1-3/15)**
- **Award from among the lower points if the student(s) barely met the criterion; (3-4/10 or 4-6/15)**
- **Award from among the mid range points if the student(s) did an average job of meeting the criterion; (5-6/10 or 7-9/15)**
- **Award from among the higher points if the student(s) did an above average job of meeting the criterion; (7-8/10 or 10-12/15)**
- **Award from among the highest points if the student(s) did an excellent to superior job of meeting the criterion. (9-10/10 or 13-15/15)**

Projects in each category are rated against each other. Read all projects before you begin scoring to get an overall feeling for the quality of the student work. Please remember scores are based on a rating of the work as compared to the other projects in your sample. The project that best meets the criterion in your sample should be considered superior and receive the highest score. Depending upon the quality and number of projects in each category, more than project may receive the same numerical rating for the same criterion. A team/individual may barely fulfill the needs of one criterion, yet receive a superior rating on another criterion.

PART I: PROJECT OVERVIEW (explanation of problem solving process - 150 POINTS MAXIMUM)

Part I, the Overview of Project, reflects an understanding of the problem solving process. The student(s) should clearly describe the intent of the project, how it determined the need area and what it plans to do in order to overcome the identified concern.

A. AREA OF CONCERN

The student(s) should clearly and completely describe the situation it has chosen to address. The student(s) should include information such as why this is an area of concern, how it impacts the community involved, and why this is a significant issue to the community and the student(s).

Significance – evaluators determine how well the student(s) explains the importance of the issue to the identified community and the evaluation team. Is the importance of the project clearly identifiable?

Completeness – refers to the ability of the student(s) to present a comprehensive picture of the area of concern to the evaluator. Who are the stakeholders? How and why did the student(s) become involved? What were the obstacles to overcome?

Clarity – refers to the manner in which the student(s) presented the issues. Was the thought process easy to follow? Was it stated in clear, concise terms? Was the intent clear or did you have to search for clues to tie it all together?

B. CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED (Sub-problems)

The student(s) should clearly describe the challenges the community is facing. The student(s) should look at the concerns causing the situation as well as those resulting from the situation. The selected challenges should demonstrate flexible and insightful thinking. The identification of challenges should reflect the ability of the student(s) to look at the area of concern from as many different perspectives as possible. This may be done in paragraph or linear form. No specific number of challenges is required.

Flexibility – refers to how well the student(s) analyzed the situation. Did the student(s) look at the issues from many different perspectives? Did student(s) consider challenges that may have caused the situation as well as those resulting from it?

Insight – refers to how sensitive the student(s) were to the problems of those directly involved. Did the student(s) demonstrate insightful thinking? Were the student(s) conscious of interrelated concerns? Did the student(s) make connections beyond the scope expected of age group?

Clarity – refers to the manner in which the student(s) presented the challenges identified. Was the flow easy to follow? Were the challenges stated in clear, concise terms?

C. UNDERLYING PROBLEM

The underlying problem (UP) should show a direct connection (relevance) to the area of concern. It should be an outgrowth of the challenges and concerns listed. The focus should demonstrate a narrowing of the area of concern to a manageable size, rather than taking on the whole situation at once. The UP should clearly communicate the goals or desired outcomes of the project.

Relevance to the Area of Concern – refers to the connection between the underlying problem and the area of concern. Was the UP an outgrowth of an important issue presented in the area of concern? Is it a significant issue pertinent to those involved?

Focus – refers to how well the student(s) has narrowed the scope of the situation presented in the area of concern in the UP. Was the magnitude of the situation reduced to a manageable size on which the student(s) could have an impact?

Clarity of Desired Outcomes – refers to how well the student(s) has expressed the goal or desired outcome of the project in the underlying problem. Is the intent ambiguous or is it clear to you?

D. ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION IDEAS

The solution ideas should relate directly to the underlying problem and be clearly explained. They should reflect the research the student(s) have done in investigating many different ways to approach the UP. The solution ideas should make evident the use of flexible and insightful thinking. This may be done in paragraph or linear form. No specific number of solution ideas is required.

Relevance to the UP – refers to how well the student(s) solution ideas relate to the identified UP. Do the ideas address the key verb phrase and accomplish the purpose?

Flexibility – refers to whether the student(s) identified varied options for overcoming the UP. Did the student(s) look at the UP from many different perspectives? Were solution ideas that demonstrated a novel approach included?

Clarity – refers to how well the identified solution ideas were explained. Were the alternative solutions stated in clear, concise terms? Were solution ideas easy to understand?

E. PLAN OF ACTION

The student(s) should thoroughly communicate the plan it **intends** to implement. This should include what the student(s) expects to accomplish, the impact the plan will hopefully have on the area of concern, a rationale for the selection of the solution ideas that were incorporated into the plan, how the student(s) expects to carry out the plan and a proposed timeline indicating when major aspects of the plan will be started and achieved.

Relevance to the UP – refers to how well the plan addresses the UP. Is there a clear connection to the UP? Will what the student(s) hopes to accomplish overcome the problem stated in the UP?

Potential Impact on the Area of Concern – refers to how well the plan will influence and impact the area of concern. Has the student(s) included a justification for the solution ideas incorporated into the plan? Was the plan's potential for success explained?

Completeness (including working timeline) – refers to the completeness of the plan communicated and the inclusion of a time element that delineates when the student(s) hopes to meet the major goals and deadlines. Is the timeline suitable to the proposed plan? Has sound reasoning been used in developing it?

PART II: IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN (description of actions taken – 90 POINTS MAXIMUM)

Part II is part of the preliminary scoring for IC and based on what has been accomplished up to the submission of the report and addendum. Evaluators should note accomplishments to date as well as proposed actions not yet accomplished on Part II of the scoresheet**. The outcome of the proposed actions should be verified when scoring Part IV during On-Site scoring**. The student(s) may continue to work on the project until the date of the International Conference.

A. ACTIONS AND OUTCOMES TO DATE

This section describes the work students have done to date while implementing their action plan. The student(s) should thoroughly describe the actions taken, the progress toward the ultimate goal, why and how the plan will work and any adjustments the student(s) might have to make in the initial plan in order to accomplish goals of the project.

Progress Made – denotes the progress made toward the ultimate goal. Has the progress made been described including what still needs to be done? Has the student(s) met the deadline outlined in the working timeline?

Successful Implementation/Adaptation of Plan – indicates how well the plan has been or can be implemented. Has the student(s) justified why and how the plan worked? Have any adjustments made to the initial plan been recognized and explained?

Evidence of Effort – refers to the amount of time and energy students have invested in their project and in implementing their action plan. Has considerable time been spent on the problem solving process? Has the student(s) worked through each aspect of their plan to relative completion? A comparison of the effort involved among the projects in each sample should be made and points assigned accordingly.

B. ORGANIZATION

The student(s) should present a clear picture of how the project responsibilities were carried out among the project or community members so tasks could be effectively organized and implemented. CmPSers should note the various groups, committees or task forces, etc. charged with carrying out necessary assignments. Team CmPSers should note the division of labor among the team members. Individual CmPSers should explain his or her role as well as those of other community members (coaches, students, community partners) that may have been involved in the project implementation.

Clarity – refers to how clearly the student(s) outlined the responsibility of each person or group involved in the project. Are assignments easy to understand? Do the responsibilities clearly relate to pieces of the plan of action?

Systematic Approach to Tasks – refers to how realistically the student(s) is organized for action. Have the tasks been divided so the plan can be effectively implemented by the team or an Individual CmPSer. Is there a systematic rather than haphazard approach to the tasks?

Involvement of Participants – refers to how well Team CmPSers shared and participated in the project responsibilities. In Individual CmPS, if the student involved others during the implementation phase of the project, evaluate how well this was facilitated. Is it evident the student and other participants have worked cooperatively? Consider whether the student(s) actually made the contacts, gave the presentations, and directed the action, etc. or if the coach did most of the planning and implementation.

C. RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION & UTILIZATION

Student(s) should thoroughly note the resources they identified and used to help implement their plan of action. Resources may include various types of research or references utilized, agencies contacted, field trips taken, people consulted, speakers, etc. The student(s) should utilize multiple resources beyond standard classroom activities and demonstrate outreach into the community.

Thoroughness – refers to the attention given to identifying and using multiple resources to aid in the implementation of the plan. Is there a thorough description of the resources and how they were used?

Flexibility – identifies varied options and resources used. Did the student(s) consult or investigate sources with different perspectives? Did he/she look for a novel approach?

Evidence of Outreach – refers to how well outreach into the effected community and beyond was demonstrated. Did the student(s) seek out and/or utilize the skills of experts? Did the student(s) make connections to or reach out to others in a similar situation? Did the student(s) involve the community in the project?

Regarding RESEARCH: Previously, *Evidence of Research* was scored under Project Overview Part D Alternative Solutions. This scoring criterion has been removed as it is the philosophy of the CmPS competition that evidence of research should be present throughout the documentation of the entire project. Teams and individuals should provide clear and accurate proof of their claims through research and through their documentation of their solutions to their identified community challenge.

PART III: ADDENDUM (documentation of accomplishments 45 POINTS MAXIMUM)

Supporting documentation is the information the student(s) chose to include in the addendum (mini scrapbook). This information reflects what the student(s) consider significant. The addendum pages highlight and document project accomplishments. Newspaper articles, letters, surveys, photos, drawings, etc., from the project scrapbook, reflecting the effort of the project, may be reduced in size and displayed in any format on the six addendum pages as long as the pages can be read. The addendum should include items that document and verify claims made in the six-page report.

Clarity – refers to whether a clear picture of the project is presented in the addendum pages. Are the selections easy to follow and understand? Do they fill in the gaps? Do they make the thrust of the project easier to understand?

Completeness – refers to how comprehensive a picture is presented. Do the selections represent a variety of actions taken? Does the addendum support claims made in the six-page report? Do the pages represent a complete picture?

Creativity – refers to the manner in which the actions are portrayed. Was a creative or novel approach used in presenting the accomplishments? Has a variety of presentation methods been used (linear form, collage, drawings, photographs, text, etc.) Are the project highlights presented in an appealing manner?

ON-SITE SCORING

The final accomplishments of team and individual CmPSers are evaluated in on-site scoring.
Paired evaluators work together to determine how well a project fulfills the requirements of each criterion as compared to other projects in the same category and division.

Each team or individual CmPSer will be given an opportunity to present the focus of the project via a project display and in a 30-minute personal interview. A scrapbook and 3-5 minute visual media (video or computer slide show) presentation highlighting important project events *must* be included as part of the on-site supporting documentation. The scrapbook, visual media presentation, interview, and display are essential elements in judging the scope of the project.

PART IV: PROJECT OUTCOMES (170 POINTS MAXIMUM)

A. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This section reflects the *actual work* accomplished by the student(s) and the progress made toward the ultimate goal of the project. Information regarding all efforts made toward achieving the project goal (presentations made, articles written, changes in laws or ordinances, grants applied for, awareness efforts, honors received, etc.) should be included. The student(s) should describe any unexpected obstacles faced and how the obstacles were overcome. As part of the on-site evaluation, the student(s) should make note of any accomplishment achieved since the six-page report was submitted. Evaluators should refer to the claims made in the six-page report when verifying accomplishments, *especially proposed actions that were to be accomplished* after the six-page report was submitted.

Achievement of Goals – refers to the progress the student(s) have made in accomplishing the project goals. Has the student(s) demonstrated extended effort to implement the plan and clearly outlined his/her accomplishments? Have the various aspects of the plan projected to be completed by IC actually been implemented? Has progress been made toward long-term goals projected for completion following IC?

Effectiveness of Problem Solving – evaluates the ability to use problem solving to overcome impediments to the project's success. Did the student(s) acknowledge obstacles (such as people, ordinances, funding, etc.) that had to be circumvented? Did the CmPSers demonstrate a successful use of problem solving skills to reach their goals? Did obstacles change the flow of the project? Was the student(s) able to make lemonade from lemons?

Impact on Area of Concern and UP – evaluates how well the project outcomes actually impacted the area of concern and overcame the problem stated in the UP. Was a significant part of the underlying problem addressed by the project activities? Has the student(s) clearly stated how the area of concern will be changed? Was consideration given to needs of the community members who will be impacted by the actions of the student(s)?

B. REFLECTION ON OUTCOMES

The student(s) should accurately assess and reflect on the final outcome of the project.

The student(s) should be evaluated on the completeness, accuracy, and thoughtfulness put into the reflection and assessment of the project. The student(s) should consider criteria such as how well the plan of action was implemented and whether the action plan goal were accomplished. Did the plan truly solve the underlying problem? Does the student(s) understand the impact the project has and/or will have on the community? How does the student(s) feel about the project? Would he/she do anything differently?

Completeness – determines how completely the student(s) assessed the project. Did the student(s) describe any plan developed to evaluate the work completed? Did the student(s) seek community input? Were all aspects of the project addressed?

Thoughtfulness – evaluates the attention given to detail. Did the student(s) reflect on what could be done differently? Were the observations the result of a student assessment? Is it evident time was taken to reflect about the final outcome?

Accuracy – refers to the lack of distortion in the reflection. Was it evident that careful assessment was used to evaluate the project accomplishments? Were failures acknowledged as well as successes? Was there an honest assessment of the project and its impact on the community?

C. SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

The scope of the project is judged based on supporting information available to the evaluators. It is the responsibility of the student(s) to make the evaluators aware of information that reflects the impact the project has had, the community support and involvement in the project, and the contacts and media coverage solicited and attained by the student(s).

Community Impact – assesses the positive impact the project has on the identified community. Is there documented evidence of the project making a positive difference? Is there documentation of a growth in community awareness? Is there documentation of the ***student(s) taking action*** in the community resulting in a positive impact on the project goals?

Community Involvement – refers to the ability of the student(s) to involve the identified community in the project goals. Is there evidence of the student(s) seeking community involvement? Did the students make presentations to community groups? Did the student(s) seek input and/or help from the community government, citizens, or community organizations (resource identification and utilization)? Has the community offered positive support for the project?

Resolution of Area of concern/UP – reflects the overall achievements of the students in resolving the challenges and problems, as they defined their area of concern and UP. Did the student(s) accomplish the original objectives? Is there a match between the size of the issues presented in the report and the scope of achievements? Have the issues in the area of concern and the challenges identified been resolved? Were the goals of the UP met by the project outcomes?

PART V: SUPPORTING INFORMATION (Scrapbook, Presentation, Display, Interview - 220 POINTS MAXIMUM)

A. SCRAPBOOK/PORTFOLIO

The information found in the scrapbook should detail and document the project work.

The scrapbook should be clearly labeled, follow a logical flow, and portray a complete picture of the project. The scrapbook should contain a variety of documentation such as: photographs of the students in action; copies of surveys and/or brochures created; newspaper articles; meeting agendas; brainstormed lists of ideas; letters written or received; hard copies of Web sites created or slide presentations developed; copies of grants applied for; working and/or documentary time lines; press releases and media coverage.

Clarity & Organization – judges whether the student(s) presents a clear picture of the project in the scrapbook. Are the selections easy to follow and understand? Is the information well organized (labeled or otherwise identified)? Does the scrapbook fill in the gaps and follow a logical flow? Does the scrapbook make the project easier to understand (complement the project)? Are the project accomplishments clearly outlined?

Completeness – determines how comprehensive a picture is presented. Does the scrapbook contain documentation and verification of research, presentations, brochures created, surveys conducted, honors received, community involvement obtained, grants applied for, media coverage, community outreach, obstacles encountered and overcome, project accomplishments, etc.? Does the information in the scrapbook support all the claims made? Does the information verify the students did the project?

Creativity – refers to the manner in which the student(s) chooses to portray the actions taken in the scrapbook. Does the scrapbook demonstrate a creative or novel approach in presenting the information? Does it utilize a variety of presentation methods (linear form, collage, drawings, photographs, text, etc.)? Is the information presented in an appealing manner? Did the student(s) give thought to the layout of the scrapbook?

B. VISUAL MEDIA PRESENTATION **NOTE THIS IS THE ONLY PART NOT USED AT STATE!!**

The student(s) is required to bring either a 3-5 minute video or 3-5 minute computer slide presentation that describes and highlights the more important aspects and accomplishments of the project. A student(s) using a computer slide presentation should present a hard copy of the presentation to the evaluators. The media presentation should portray a clear picture of the project. **Only the first 5 minutes of a media presentation should be evaluated if the student(s) exceed the time limit.**

Relevance – evaluates the connection between the information presented in the video presentation and the intent of the project. Does it reflect the scope and thrust of the project? Does it highlight the project accomplishments? Does the presentation illustrate an effective overview of the project? Is the desired outcome of the project explained? Is the impact of the project addressed?

Clarity – assesses how well the goals of the project are expressed in the visual media presentation. Does it present a clear picture of the project? Is the video presentation easy to understand?

Completeness – refers to the scope of the video presentation. Is a complete picture of the project presented? Does the visual media presentation flow from beginning to end? Is there evidence of planning and thought in the information included?

C. DISPLAY

The relevance, clarity, selection, and aesthetic arrangement of the information chosen by the student(s) to be highlighted on the project display board is assessed by the judges. CmPSers are *required* to use the tri-fold backboard supplied to them by FPSPI. The student(s) are encouraged to creatively organize and effectively portray the project.

Note: Ideally, the displays are student designed and created; the involvement of coaches/parents/others is not specifically evaluated but is reflected in other criteria (such as team involvement/effort/passion/ ownership.)

Relevance of Materials – refers to how well the display delineates the project goals and outcomes. Are the materials selected for display consistent with the intent of the project? Do the materials highlighted on the backboard show the student(s) in action?

Clarity of Communication – refers to how easy the display is to understand. Is the display easy to follow? Is there continuity of thought?

Visual Appeal – refers to the overall visual appeal of the display. Are the project highlights displayed in an appealing manner? Does the display fit within the required size, length, and/or height guidelines? Has creative thought been demonstrated?

D. INTERVIEW

Students participate in an interview (teams – 30 minutes, individuals – 15 minutes) to explain the project and update the evaluators on recent accomplishments and/or project changes. The evaluators ask questions about the project such as how the student(s) chose the focus of the project, the support received, problems encountered, reaction of the community, accomplishments, long-range plans, etc. Note: Two of the criteria below are based on interview responses; the passion and ownership criterion may be influenced by other impressions evaluators gain during all IC activities.

Clarity of Responses – evaluates the student(s) reactions to the interview questions. Did the student(s) answer the questions asked? Did the student(s) have to search for answers? Is it clear the student(s) understood all aspects of the project? Could the student(s) clarify any changes made to the original plans and point out new information to the evaluators?

Depth of Responses – assesses the quality of the student answers and the productiveness of the interview. Were the responses spontaneous or rehearsed? Did the student(s) provide thoughtful answers to all the questions? Were the student(s) able to explain obstacles encountered and/or overcome? Did they indicate or demonstrate any long-range plans? Were any of the answers insightful?

Evidence of Passion & Project Ownership – refers to the passion and commitment demonstrated in the student(s) answers. Did the student(s) enthusiastically participate in the interview? If a team project, were ALL the team members enthusiastic and engaged? Did the responses of the student(s) demonstrate a keen interest and excitement in the project? Was the student(s) so proud of the project accomplishments that the student(s) almost seemed dedicated or devoted to a cause? Was the project student-driven?

BEYONDER BONUS (Optional — 50 POINTS MAXIMUM)

During his creativity research, Dr. E. Paul Torrance coined the word "Beyonder" to describe persons who "outdistance the others so far that they are not even on the same scale." These individuals or groups should not be judged on the same scale, as the depth and passion of their work cannot be assessed by standard criteria. Therefore, to encourage a new generation of Beyonders, FPSP includes optional Beyonder bonus points so an evaluator can reward those teams/individuals showing the courage and passion to go beyond what was required.

- Bonus points may be given if the Team or Individual CmPSers have demonstrated an exceptional depth, passion, and commitment in the project that goes above and beyond what would normally be expected of a student(s) in the grade level division.
- Beyonder bonus points are awarded after the preliminary and on-site scoring is completed.
- Judges should make note of any exceptional effort found in the preliminary section so they make sure it will be taken into consideration during the final scoring.
- Projects that go beyond what is normally expected, have a special flair, or are innovative in approach or follow-through qualify for Beyonder points.
- Projects stemming from an original idea and are truly student orchestrated and implemented, rather than teacher directed are considered for Beyonder points.

To help identify Beyonders, consider:

1. Did the project go beyond the initial focus and required format of what was necessary?
2. How creative were the ideas produced, the follow through of the student(s), the interview responses?
3. Was this project accomplished during class time or did the student(s) go beyond the time limits of the classroom?
4. Did the student(s) create and implement a positive change or were they only catalysts for it? Did the student(s) write the bill or only request that a bill be written? Did the student(s) ask for money or did the student(s) write a grant to get it? Did the CmPSers raise the money for someone else to do something or did the student(s) use the money to actually do the work?
5. Did the student(s) face unexpected obstacles during the project? How did the student(s) handle them? Did the CmPSers find ways around, over, through or under obstacles that would have defeated ordinary students?
6. Did the student(s) demonstrate a *passion* for the project?
7. Did the project change the student(s) in ways they may not even recognize?
8. Does the project have far-reaching impact beyond the school year or project lifetime? (The Beyonder recipient(s) receive money to continue the project.)
9. Does the project bring tears to your eyes?

COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING
International Conference Evaluation Guidelines

SCORESHEET – COMMENTS and DISTRIBUTION:

Preliminary scoring – each evaluator completes a scoresheet for each project in the sample and writes comments on the reports and addenda. Following IC, the originals of both evaluators' preliminary scoresheets are returned to the students with the evaluators' copies of the report and addenda.

On-site scoring – the average of the two preliminary scores are entered on the on-site scoresheet. The evaluator team completes one on-site scoresheet and may write more comments on the reports and addenda. Following IC, the original on-site scoresheet is returned to the students.

The following will be filed at the IO: every project's (1) original report and addendum, (2) yellow copy of both preliminary scoresheets, and (3) yellow copy of the on-site scoresheet.

After all the points are assigned:

- Add the scores (preliminary average, on-site, and Beyonder, if applicable) to arrive at the total score for each team/individual;
- Determine each team's /individual's rank within the category; and,
- Decide if the team/individual qualifies for a trophy.

Preliminary Score _____
On-site Score _____
Beyonder Bonus _____

Rank | | **Total Score** | |

COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING PREFACE FOR EVOLVING PROJECTS

(Affix to front of 6-page report. This document should not be longer than 2 pages.)

Current Project Title:

Previous Title (if different):

Percent of team members continuing to participate this year: _____

(Please attach a team member list for each year the team has been in existence)

Note where and when this project has been presented:

Briefly explain why there is a NEED to extend your project.

Previous Underlying Problem:

Current Underlying Problem:

Summary of Previous Action Plan:

Summary Current Action Plan:

Additional Information that may be helpful:

Please include a separate page with your addendum containing a timeline of the current and previous years' accomplishments; dates should be included on this timeline.