



## Project Evaluation Criteria Form

**Enter only one score in only one of the boxes below for each part**

### Part 1: Knowledge/Research of Topic/Project:

Level 1 (Acceptable)	Level 2 (Fair)	Level 3 (Good)	Level 4 (Excellent)
The project demonstrated only a basic knowledge and understanding of accessibility, identified only 1 example of accessibility or barrier	The project demonstrated only a fair knowledge and understanding of accessibility, identified only 1 example of accessibility or barrier with minimum elaboration on how it applies to full access.	The project demonstrated a good knowledge and understanding of accessibility, the right to it, types of accessibility and types of barriers to full access but limited ability in applying this knowledge in some situations.	The project discussed the topics of accessibility, the right to it, types of accessibility and types of barriers to full access at length.
<b>Mark Range: 11-14</b>	<b>Mark Range: 15-19</b>	<b>Mark Range: 20-24</b>	<b>Mark Range: 25-30</b>

### Part 2 Innovation:

Level 1(Acceptable)	Level 2 (Fair)	Level 3 (Good)	Level 4 (Excellent)
The project was a duplicate of a known/existing model/service without any new modifications was presented.	The project was an extension of a known model/service with some modifications, improvements, recommendations	The project illustrated a new approach to a known/existing model/service with modifications for a new application.  Or  A new device/model and/or service was created but requires more extensive testing and possible modifications for improvement.	A new device/model/service was created and has been systematically tested and modified throughout its development.
<b>Mark Range: 11-14</b>	<b>Mark Range: 15-19</b>	<b>Mark Range: 20-24</b>	<b>Mark Range: 25-30</b>

<b>Part 3 Project Organization:</b>			
<b>Level 1(Acceptable)</b>	<b>Level 2(Fair)</b>	<b>Level 3(Good)</b>	<b>Level 4(Excellent)</b>
The project had limited information and was poorly organized.	The project was organized in a somewhat logical manner.	The project was presented in a neat and attractive format with some tables, graphs, charts, pictures, or other supporting material.	The project was presented in a clear and logical manner. There was a logical use of tables, charts, pictures, or other supporting material enhanced the overall look and understanding of the project.
<b>Mark Range: 1-4</b>	<b>Mark Range: 5-9</b>	<b>Mark Range: 10-14</b>	<b>Mark Range: 15-20</b>

<b>Part 4: Originality and Creativity:</b>			
<b>Level 1(Acceptable)</b>	<b>Level 2 (Fair)</b>	<b>Level 3 (Good)</b>	<b>Level 4 (Excellent)</b>
The project was simple with minimum student input and/or effort.	The project was simple with some evidence of creativity and imagination. Common resources and/or a simple design was used.	The project demonstrated imagination in its creative use of available resources. Some thought was put into it and some original research was done.	The project demonstrated originality and creativity in its approach as well as the use of information/content and resources, construction and/or design.
<b>Mark Range: 1-4</b>	<b>Mark Range: 5-9</b>	<b>Mark Range: 10-14</b>	<b>Mark Range: 15-20</b>

<b>Judge's Scoring Tally</b>			
<b>Part 1: Knowledge of Accessibility</b>	<b>/30</b>	<b>Part 3: Project Organization</b>	<b>/20</b>
<b>Part 2: Innovation</b>	<b>/30</b>	<b>Part 4: Originality and Creativity</b>	<b>/20</b>
<b>Total Score Awarded to this Project</b>	<b>/100</b>		
<b>Judge's Name:</b>		<b>Judge's Signature:</b>	

**Judge's Comments and Recommendations**

**Project Strengths:**

**Project Challenges:**

**Judge's  
recommendations for  
improvement:**



[mpowerchallenge.ca](http://mpowerchallenge.ca)  
[mpower@manitobapossible.ca](mailto:mpower@manitobapossible.ca)  
204-975-3100