Senior Honors Division - Final Round Rubric **Project:**

I. Statement of Problem (x1) **I. Statement of Problem**

5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Satisfactory	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Poor	Comments
Clear, specific, and well-focused question; explains importance and relevance.	Clear question with explanation of importance.	Question present but somewhat broad or unclear.	Vague or weakly focused question; limited importance explained.	Missing, unclear, or unrelated question.	

II. Background Research (x1) **II. Background Research**

5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Satisfactory	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Poor	Comments
Thorough understanding of background research; accurate explanations; strong scientific vocabulary.	Good understanding; mostly accurate explanations.	Basic understanding; some concepts unclear.	Limited understanding of background information.	Minimal or inaccurate background knowledge.	

III. Research Design and Methods (x1) **III. Research Design and Methods**

5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Satisfactory	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Poor	Comments
Clear explanation of procedures, variables, materials, and reasoning; strong understanding of design.	Explains procedures and variables with minor gaps.	Procedures described but lacking clarity or detail.	Procedures incomplete or unclear; weak understanding of design.	Methods missing or poorly explained.	

IV. Data and Results (x1) **IV. Data and Results**

5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Satisfactory	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Poor	Comments
Data clearly presented; accurate interpretation; identifies limitations or errors.	Data clear with mostly accurate interpretation.	Data included; interpretation basic or partially unclear.	Limited data; weak or inaccurate interpretation.	Data missing or not explained.	

The Academy of Science of St. Louis

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

V. Conclusions and Future Research (x2) **V. Conclusions and Future**

5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Satisfactory	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Poor	Comments
Conclusion clearly tied to results and question; thoughtful future research ideas.	Conclusion relates to results; some future ideas.	Conclusion stated but weak connection to results.	Conclusion unclear or loosely connected.	Conclusion missing or unsupported.	

VI. Scientific Communication Skills [x2] **VI. Scientific Communication**

5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Satisfactory	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Poor	Comments
Confident presentation; clearly explains science, results, limitations, and conclusions; answers thoughtfully; demonstrates strong independence and ownership.	Clear presentation; strong understanding; minor gaps; shows substantial independence.	Adequate presentation; basic understanding; moderate or unclear independence.	Unclear presentation; difficulty explaining science or limitations; limited independence.	Unable to clearly explain the project or role; minimal understanding or independence.	

VII. Professionalism and Preparation (x2) **VII. Professionalism/ Preperation**

5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Satisfactory	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Poor	Comments
Materials clear, organized, and visually effective; logical flow; professional delivery; appropriate vocabulary; within time.	Organized and understandable with minor issues.	Materials present but cluttered or inconsistently organized.	Materials difficult to follow; lacks organization or professionalism.	Materials missing or very unclear; minimal preparation.	

Caucus Notes:
Following all the presentations, the Final Round judges will caucus to determine the three ISEF Finalists.

The Academy of Science of St. Louis

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