

**AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION**  
**JUDGES' EVALUATION FORM**

There are two rounds of judging for the design contest: the evaluation of the formal written reports and the evaluation of the oral presentations. The purpose of the first round of judging is to select the best two undergraduate and the best two graduate entries, based on the written reports. These will be invited to make an oral presentation at the ANS Winter Meeting and a second panel of judges will select the winner and a runner-up in each category, based on the oral presentations. We strive for as much uniformity as possible among the rankings of the different judges. In grading an item, the judges must rely on their experience in evaluating professional papers. If a paper is average with respect to an item, a grade of 5 would be appropriate using a 10-point scale. If an item is poor, a lesser grade would apply; similarly, an item that is better than average would score in the range of 6 to 10.

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Authors: \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

University: \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate \_\_\_\_\_ Undergraduate \_\_\_\_\_

**Factors used to judge the written reports:**

- A. CLARITY**  
Is the basis of the analysis clear and acceptable? Is the writing satisfactory? \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- B. COMPLETENESS**  
Are the computations supporting the conclusion adequately described?  
Are the computations complete (have significant issues been overlooked)?  
Was a 900-word summary submitted electronically to ANS? \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- C. CREDIBILITY**  
In your judgement, is the problem solution practical and credible with regard to both  
economics and environmental considerations? \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- D. ORIGINALITY**  
Is the solution original? Are issues approached creatively (new and/or different methods used)? \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- E. OVERALL REPORT QUALITY** \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- F. Comments** \_\_\_\_\_
- Total (50)**

**Factors used to judge the oral presentations:**

- A. ORGANIZATION**  
Are the objectives and conclusions succinct? Are the scope, methodology, and results clear? \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- B. VISUAL AIDS**  
Quality of presentation materials. \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- C. INDUSTRY COLLABORATION**  
Evidence of collaboration with industry in problem definition and/or solution \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- D. RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS** \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- E. OVERALL PRESENTATION QUALITY** \_\_\_\_\_(10)
- F. Comments** \_\_\_\_\_
- Total (50)**