STL SCIENCE FAIR
Supporting the Advancement of Youth Scientists
A Program of the Academy of Science of St. Louis

Junior Honors Division
INTERVIEW - SCIENCE PROJECTS

Criteria	Category Weight	5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Satisfactory	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Poor
Research Question (10 pts)	x2	• Clear research question or goal. • Explains why the research is important. • Can be tested using the scientific method.	• Mostly clear and focused question or goal. • Possible but incomplete explanation of why research is important. • Can be tested using the scientific method.	• Generally clear question or goal. • Explanation of research importance is limited or unlikely. • Testable using the scientific method but with a large margin for error.	• Vague or unclear question or goal. • Explanation of research importance is incomplete or inaccurate. • Testability is questionable.	• Question is unclear or unfocused. • No clear explanation of research importance. • Not testable.
Design & Methodology (20 pts)	x4	• Uses a clear plan to carry out the investigation and collect data. • Identifies and defines all necessary variables and controls.	• Good investigation plan that can be carried out with minimal errors. • Necessary variables and controls identified but not defined.	• Adequate investigation plan with errors that do not impact understanding. • Most variables and controls are defined, but may be missing some.	• Adequate investigation plan with errors that impact overall understanding. • Some incorrect variables and controls identified, or may be missing.	• Inadequate or flawed investigation plan. • Variables and controls missing.

The Academy of Science of St. Louis

STL Science Fair 2026 © Modified from Regeneron ISEF Grand Awards Judging Rubrics

Execution: Data Collection, Analysis & Interpretation (20 pts)	x4	• Collects and organizes data in a careful and consistent way. • Reproducible results. • Explains the data using appropriate charts, graphs, calculations, or statistics. • Collects enough data to support the conclusions.	• Collects and organizes data in a careful and consistent way. • Reproducible results. • Explains data using correct but inappropriate charts, graphs, calculations, or statistics. • Collects enough data, but many data points appear to be outliers.	• Adequate data collection methods, with few examples of the investigation plan not being used. • Aspects of the project are reproducible. • Charts, graphs, calculations, or statistical methods are implemented without clear purpose. • Insufficient data collected to support conclusions.	• Inconsistent data collection methods, somewhat following the investigation plan. • Limited reproducibility. • Charts, graphs, calculations, or statistical methods are used incorrectly to support conclusions. • Insufficient data collected to support conclusions.	• Inconsistent data collection, frequently not following the investigation plan. • Limited reproducibility. • Charts, graphs, calculations, or statistical methods are not used. • Insufficient data collected to support conclusions.
Creativity & Potential Impact (15 pts)	x3	• Shows original thinking or creative problem- solving. • Explains in detail how the project could help people, science, the environment, technology, or the community.	• Shows some original thinking or creative problem-solving, possibly with some errors. • Explains how the project could help people, science, the environment, technology, or the community, but with limited details.	• Some original thinking was attempted but not fully evident in final project design and execution. • Limited discussion of how the project could help people, science, the environment, technology, or the community.	• Minimal original thinking was provided, but not evident in final project design and execution. • Very minimal discussion of how the project could help people, science, the environment, technology, or the community.	• No original ideas or project design, and execution is a reproduction of existing experimental methods. • No recognition of how the project could help people, science, the environment, technology, or the community.

The Academy of Science of St. Louis

Presentation: Display (10 pts)	x2	• Project information is presented in a clear and logical way. • Graphs, charts, pictures, and labels are clear and helpful. • Supporting documents, visuals or models are relevant to the project and contribute to understanding.	• Project information is mostly logical and clear. • Most graphs, charts, pictures, and labels make sense. • Supporting documents, visuals, or models are relevant to the project but do not contribute to understanding.	• Project information is adequately organized. • Some graphs, charts, and /or pictures are missing labels. • Supporting documents, visuals, or models are somewhat relevant to the project and do not contribute to overall understanding.	• Project information is poorly organized or unclear. • Graphs, charts, and/or pictures have unclear labels or are not connected to research. • Supporting documents, visuals, or models lack any relevance to the model and contract from overall understanding.	• Project information is disorganized, or has parts missing. • Labels display incorrect information. • Supporting documents, visuals, or models are not relevant to the project or the science.
Presentation: Interview (25 pts)	x5	• Fully answers questions clearly showing a complete understanding of the science behind the project. • Explains the results, conclusions, and any limitations of the investigation. • Shows ownership of the work and can explain how the project was completed. *Acknowledgement given to any QS or*	• Answers questions clearly showing a decent understanding of the science behind the project. • Explains the results, conclusions, but does not address the limitations of the investigation. • Shows ownership of the work and can explain how the project was completed. • Mostly explains why the project is	• Answers questions showing a moderate understanding of the science behind the project. • Explains the results but does not address the conclusions or limitations of the investigation. • Can explain how much of the project was completed. *Acknowledgement NOT given to any QS or RRI that assisted on the project.*	• Answers questions showing a basic understanding of the science behind the project. • Explains the data collected but not the results, conclusions or limitations of the investigation. • Can explain some of how the project was completed but with significant methodology gaps. • Incomplete explanation of why	• Answers questions showing a basic understanding of the general science behind the project. • Explains the data collected but not the results, conclusions or limitations of the investigation. • Explanation of how the project was completed contains gaps significant enough to interfere with understanding.

The Academy of Science of St. Louis

		RRI that assisted on the project. • Explains why the project is important and who might benefit from it. • Shares thoughtful ideas for future research or improvements.	important and who might benefit from it. • Shares ideas for how the project could be improved if repeated.	• Explains why the project is important but not who might benefit from it. • Shares sources of experimental error instead of future directions for the project.	the project is important or who might benefit from it. • Shares sources of experimental error instead of future directions for the project.	• Incorrect or missing explanation of why the project is important or who might benefit from it. • No discussion of future directions for research.

The Academy of Science of St. Louis