



# City Presentation Rubric

0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>No Points</b> Requirements missing.	<b>Poor</b> Poor-fair quality. Fulfills at least 20% of requirements.	<b>Fair</b> Fair-average quality. Fulfills at least 50% of requirements.	<b>Good</b> Average quality. Fulfills at least 85% of requirements.	<b>Very Good</b> Above average quality. Fulfills 95% of requirements.	<b>Excellent</b> Excellent quality. Fulfills 100% of requirements with additional distinctive features.

<b>I. Content &amp; Delivery (35 Points)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Overall presentation content</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major elements: intro, body, and conclusion</li> <li>Logical flow and transitions</li> <li>Supporting details</li> </ul>	Disorganized and no major elements addressed.	Poorly organized and missing major elements. Few supporting details.	Fair organization. Contains most major elements. Some details and transitions but ideas could be more developed.	Contains all major elements and good transitions. Details could be clearer.	Well organized and contains all major elements. Very good supporting details.	Extremely well organized. Effective variety of supporting details. Overall presentation is thoroughly developed.
<b>2. Overall presentation delivery</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear and audible</li> <li>Confident and creative</li> <li>Onscreen balance of people and visual aids</li> </ul>	Unclear and inaudible. Delivered with no confidence or creativity.	Not very creative. Needs more practice. Poor balance of student presenters and visual aids.	Somewhat creative. Some presenters lack confidence. Poor balance of student presenters and visual aids.	Creative but confidence could be improved. Good balance of student presenters and visual aids.	Very creative and confident delivery by most of team. Good balance of student presenters and visual aids.	Extremely creative and confident delivery by entire team. Good balance of student presenters and visual aids.
<b>3. City overview &amp; daily life</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location, terrain, and benefits</li> <li>Description of residents and daily life</li> <li>Recreation</li> <li>Why do people want to live in your city?</li> </ul>	No description.	Underdeveloped overview does not provide basic information.	Fair overview. Lacks sufficient details.	Good overview supported by sufficient details.	Very good overview supported by many details.	Excellent overview supported by a variety of thorough details.
<b>4. Infrastructure &amp; services</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Futuristic city features and infrastructure</li> <li>Innovative city services (could include education, healthcare, fire, etc.)</li> </ul>	No description.	Underdeveloped description. Lacks detail about infrastructure and services.	Fair description. Some details about infrastructure and services. Not very futuristic or innovative.	Good description. Many details about infrastructure and services. Somewhat futuristic.	Very good description. Many details about infrastructure and services. Futuristic.	Highly detailed and thorough description of infrastructure and services. Very futuristic.
<b>5 Use of Moon resources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How resources are collected</li> <li>How resources are used in the city</li> <li>Problems/challenges they address</li> </ul>	No description.	Briefly mentions challenges. Does not describe how any Moon resources are used in the city.	Fair explanation of challenges and how one Moon resource is used in the city. No real supporting details.	Good description of challenges and how at least one Moon resource is used in the city. Supporting details could be improved.	Very good description of challenges and how two Moon resources are used in the city. Many supporting details.	Excellent description of challenges and how two Moon resources are used in the city. Variety of thorough supporting details.



DOWNLOAD THIS RUBRIC at [futurecity.org/resources](http://futurecity.org/resources) (filter for Rules and Rubrics).

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

# City Presentation Rubric

0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>No Points</b> Requirements missing.	<b>Poor</b> Poor-fair quality. Fulfills at least 20% of requirements.	<b>Fair</b> Fair-average quality. Fulfills at least 50% of requirements.	<b>Good</b> Average quality. Fulfills at least 85% of requirements.	<b>Very Good</b> Above average quality. Fulfills 95% of requirements.	<b>Excellent</b> Excellent quality. Fulfills 100% of requirements with additional distinctive features.

I. Content & Delivery (35 Points) (Continued)	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>6. Use of demonstration aids</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of model</li> <li>Additional visual aids (if used) are well-prepared, legible, and relevant.</li> <li>Enhance rather than distract from presentation</li> </ul>	Model not referenced. No other visual aids.	Model is not used effectively. Other demonstration aids poor or nonexistent.	Model is partially effective at enhancing the presentation. Other visual aids are fair to good.	Good use of the model as an illustration of city design and function. Other visual aids are effective and generally add to presentation.	Model used effectively to illustrate city design, function and innovations. Other visual aids are very good and enhance the presentation.	Extremely creative, integrated use of model contributed to the understanding of city design and function and innovations. Other visual aids are excellent.
<b>7. Teamwork</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team members supported each other</li> <li>Team members shared time equally</li> </ul>	No evidence of teamwork.	A small amount of collaboration among team members but more support of one another is needed; one or two tend to dominate.	Some collaboration, support and sharing among some team members. Amount of knowledge appears unequal. One or two tend to dominate.	Good collaboration, support and sharing among most members. Some have more knowledge and dominate.	Very good collaboration, support and sharing among the team. Equivalent knowledge level for most of team.	Excellent collaboration, support, and sharing among team members. All members display thorough knowledge.
II. Engineering and Technology (15 Points)	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>8. Engineering design process</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discusses the application of the engineering design process to their project</li> </ul>	No discussion.	Little or no discussion of engineering design process.	Underdeveloped discussion of engineering design process.	Good discussion of engineering design process and how they applied it.	Very good discussion and understanding of engineering process and application to Future City project.	Excellent discussion and understanding of engineering design process and application to Future City project.
<b>9. Engineering and roles</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates a knowledge of engineering roles in city design and operation</li> </ul>	No mention of engineering roles.	Mentions engineering, but little discussion of roles.	Demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of engineering and roles.	Demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of engineering and roles.	Demonstrates very good knowledge and understanding of engineering and roles.	Demonstrates excellent and thorough knowledge and understanding of engineering and roles.
<b>10. Risks, tradeoffs, &amp; compromises</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discusses potential risks and benefits</li> <li>Analyzes tradeoffs</li> </ul>	No mention of risks or tradeoffs.	Little mention of risks or benefits. No tradeoffs.	Some discussion of risks, benefits or tradeoffs.	Good analysis of risks and benefits. Mentions tradeoffs.	Very good analysis of risks, benefits, and the tradeoffs made.	Excellent and thorough analysis of risks, benefits, and tradeoffs.