

DIRECTIONS FOR JUDGES:

1. *Make a copy of this document by selecting "File" at the top left-hand corner and clicking "Make a copy." You should be redirected to another identical document.*
2. *Change the words in [] in the new document and its title to the applicable information. Delete the "copy of" at the beginning of the document title.*
3. *When finished, send this document to envisionbywistem@gmail.com by clicking the "Share" button at the top right hand corner.*
4. *Spot the "Get Link" section and click "Change to anyone with the link" if that option is not already selected.*
5. *Copy the link and email it to envisionbywistem@gmail.com in an email titled the same as the document title. Please only include one link per email.*

ENVISION 2020

Entry: [Chloe Chan]

Judge: [Edwards] (dedwards@eagles.ewu.edu)

1. Significance - The contestant's proposal either aims to solve a small inconvenience that affects a large population or a problem with a large impact that affects a small population. There is a literature review which supports the significance of the problem.
2. Feasibility - The contestant's interpretation of all pre-existing technology, methods, and concepts she describes in the proposal are correct. If the contestant can take all the steps, the study will succeed.
3. Innovation - How novel and creative is the proposal idea? Is it different from pre-existing concepts?
4. Approach - The funding, time, and resources the proposal asks for are justified by the breadth of the potential impact. In other words, the proposal uses the most avant-garde, efficient, and effective methods available to accomplish the goal. (Because this is a high school level competition, students are *not required* to include a budget in their proposal.)

*Grade on a scale from 1-9 where 9 is the highest score possible. Please **score in each category to the tenth** e.g. 7.1 or 3.8.*

Add up these values to get your overall score.

Significance	Feasibility	Innovation	Approach
4.5	2.5	4.5	2.5

OVERALL

14

Judge's comments: This proposal seems like a good start, but the lack of in text citations and the vague language remove the details needed. This proposal would be strengthened by including specific ranges and numbers when reviewing the literature (instead of terms such as "faster than" with no numerical value.)

Because the species of algae used in the reference literature were not named, it's not possible to tell how innovative or feasible the proposed project is. Likewise, so does the lack of technical definition for "inefficient" light supply, higher growth rates, more biomass, etc. The approach score is hurt by lack of detail on types of assays, original measurements of algal culture (needed to evaluate sample sizes), spectrum of the lights used, etc.