



Judge Evaluation Form



Judges: This four teams are CREATE related and partner with Goodwill, so the impact on employment of people with ASD will be important. Teams 1, 5 and 6 will go Albany for the CREATE Competition with the following evaluation categories, and Team 7 was supported by Goodwill directly. Team 6 is also participating the Zahn Center Competition.

Name of Judge: _____

Team & Members	1. Unduanted Abigal B. Carlos S. Raymund R.	5. Worktual Reality Oscar C. David H. Michael T. Dzhonibek P.	6. Bera Yorli C. Luis C.	7. GoodPlan Xiaoyan Z. Songren Z. Hyo Jun M.
Total Score (30)				

A. Characterizing the need (Rate 1-10) Did the team clearly define the problem? Do they understand the problem they are trying to solve—who would use the design? Did they consider “real life” use scenarios?

Team	1. Unduanted	5. Worktual Reality	6. Bera	7. GoodPlan
Score A (1-10)				

B. Coordination with NYSID member agency (Rate 1-5) Did the team communicate well with the NYSID member staff and the people who may benefit from their invention?

Team	1. Unduanted	5. Worktual Reality	6. Bera	7. GoodPlan
Score B (1-5)				

C. Ease of use (Rate 1-5) Is the invention intuitive for users? If instructions are required, are they easy to understand? **Are the name and logo of the invention inviting and fitting?**

Team	1. Unduanted	5. Worktual Reality	6. Bera	7. GoodPlan
Score C (1-5)				

D. Design solution (Rate 1-10) How useful is the invention to the NYSID member agency and to the people they serve? Does the invention do what it is supposed to do? **Does the technology sound and cutting edge?**

Team	1. Unduanted	5. Worktual Reality	6. Bera	7. GoodPlan
Score D (1-10)				



Judge Evaluation Form



Judges: These four teams are not involved the CREATE or Zahn Competition, but they shall also follow the B.E.A.T. schedules. Therefore we will use similar criteria for evaluating their projects. Teams 2 and 3 are involved in research of the visual computing lab, and will write research papers, and Teams 4 and 8 were selected for Zahn Competition but decided not to participate.

Name of Judge: _____

Team & Members	2. ParaShop Nan C. Mengting X. Yuemin T.	3. Share & Care Jin C. Xiaohong Z. Yuting Y.	4. VPP Shi-Bin H. Hongzhi P. Xin Z.	8. GazelIntoView Krystal L. Fayrouz M. Frank O.
Total Score (30)				

A. Characterizing the need (Rate 1-10) Did the team clearly define the problem? Do they understand the problem they are trying to solve—who would use the design? Did they consider “real life” use scenarios?

Team	2. ParaShop	3.Share & Care	4. VPP	8.GazelIntoView
Score A (1-10)				

B. Coordination with communities and users (Rate 1-5) Did the team communicate well with the people who may benefit from their invention and the communities serving those people?

Team	2. ParaShop	3.Share & Care	4. VPP	8.GazelIntoView
Score B (1-5)				

C. Ease of use (Rate 1-5) Is the invention intuitive for their users? If instructions are required, are they easy to understand? **Are the name and logo of the invention inviting and fitting?**

Team	2. ParaShop	3.Share & Care	4. VPP	8.GazelIntoView
Score C (1-5)				

D. Design solution (Rate 1-10) How useful is the invention to the community and users and to the people they serve? Does the invention do what it is supposed to do? **Does the technology sound and cutting edge?**

Team	2. ParaShop	3.Share & Care	4. VPP	8.GazelIntoView
Score D (1-10)				