**Figure 14: Final Presentation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Newton's 1st Law | In addition to describing how design choices have impacted the egg's inertia, the presentation included evidence from experimentation of how features affect inertia. | The group clearly and accurately described how inertia influenced design choices. | An attempt was made to describe how inertia influenced design choices. | The role of inertia in collisions was described, but no connection was made to design choices. |
| Newton's 2nd Law | In addition to describing how Newton's 2nd law influenced design choices, the presentation included evidence from experimentation of how features affect acceleration. | The group clearly and accurately used Newton's 2nd law to justify design decisions and explain how features reduce force on the egg. | An attempt was made to justify design choices using Newton's 2nd law and explain how features reduce force on the egg. | An attempt was made to justify design choices using Newton's 2nd Law, but there was no discussion of how design features reduce the force on the egg. |
| Evidence  | The group collected, considered, and presented data to support the effectiveness of its design. | The group included data for at least three different accelerations with all necessary measurements. | The group included data for only two different accelerations or collected three data points, but did not perform all necessary measurements to determine acceleration. | The group included only one acceleration or includes two or fewer data points, but did not perform all necessary measurements to determine acceleration. |
| Design Process | Everything for a "3" + included documentation of various designs, including photos, schematics, and other records. | The group shared performance of prototype and what design changes were made with a clear justification for changes. | The group shared performance of prototype and what design changes were made. | The group shared performance of the prototype without discussing how this influenced final design choices. |
| Engineering Communication | The presentation addressed likely concerns of the audience and provided clear information about the strengths of the group's design supported by clear evidence. | The presentation provided clear information about the strengths of the group's design supported by clear evidence. | The presentation included information about the strengths of the group's design, but did not provide supporting evidence. | The information about the strengths of the group's design was unclear and was not supported by evidence. |