



Scoring Overview

Thank you for participating in the WNY Invention Convention. We have attempted to create a fair judging process and hope the judging experience is a positive one for both the judge and the inventor. The creative spirit is easily extinguished, and for that reason we are taking a “building” approach to rating the inventions. Inventions will garner points from the judges as they rate each of three criteria:

- How well the invention meets a need or solves a problem
- How creative and valuable the invention is
- The quality of the presentation

A small team of judges will be assigned a limited number of inventions to judge. The students will be present during judging. Within these “Judging Panels”, each student will be asked to present their invention and can expect some questions from the judges about their invention process as well as their final invention. The ratings that judges assign to each of the inventions will be combined with those of other judges within the panel to give a fair assessment to each student’s invention.

Explanation of Judging Criteria

Each criterion is scored according to the scales below. We are relying the judge’s expertise in combination with your presentation to process the criteria into a representative score for each invention.

Criterion 1: Meets a need or solves a problem

In meeting this criterion the invention should:

- truly solve the problem
- be technically feasible (this is something that can be produced with current technical capability)

Scoring:

0: Completely fails to solve the problem (solution does not map to the actual problem identified)

1: Has an idea but no demonstration of technical feasibility (more fantasy than reality)

2

3: Demonstrates technical feasibility of concept through similar existing technologies (“works like a...”; “is similar to a...”)

4

5: Completely solves problem; understands the form of solution and scientific/engineering concept (evidenced through research)



Criterion 2: Creativity/Value

Creative solutions are recognized by divergence of thinking and value to intended user. Four criteria for evaluating creativity from research literature include: (i) fluency – number of ideas identified during brainstorming; (ii) flexibility – breadth of ideas; (iii) originality – novelty of ideas; (iv) elaboration – detail in each idea.

In considering inventions judges are evaluating Originality (Low originality/expected; Medium originality; High originality/unexpected) and Value to intended user:

Scoring:

- 1: (Low Originality + Low value)
- 2: (Low Originality + Medium value) OR (Medium Originality + Low value)
- 3: (Low Originality + High value) OR (High Originality + Low value)
- 4: (Medium Originality + Medium value)
- 6: (Medium Originality + High value) OR (High Originality + Medium value)
- 9: (High Originality + High value)

Criterion 3: Presentation quality

The quality of the presentation is rated with respect to technical communication both in format of the presentation and verbal communication. Judges are rating the inventor's ability to communicate the problem and its significance, the development and functional behavior of the solution, and the level of success in solving the problem as demonstrated through prototyping. Judges are also asked to consider adherence to the formatting rules (see [Original Invention Development Guidelines](#) and [Goodwill Industries Re-Invent Guidelines](#)). The aesthetic quality of the presentation is only considered when choosing to score between a 6 and a 7.

Scoring:

- 1: One format element met
- 2: One format element met + Good verbal communication
- 3: Two format elements met
- 4: Two format elements met + Good verbal communication
- 5: All format elements met
- 6: All format elements met + Good verbal communication
- 7: All format elements met + Good verbal communication + High quality presentation (legible/easy to follow)