

FIRSTSM LEGO[®] League International

FLL JUDGES' GUIDE
2003

MISSION MARS

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO[®] League Tournament Manual – Judges' Guide

FIRST LEGO League 2003 Judges’ Guide

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>1 WELCOME</u>	3
<u>2 2003 FIRST LEGO LEAGUE INTERNATIONAL AWARDS</u>	3
2.1 Director’s Award	3
2.1.1 Award Weight Values	4
2.1.2 Team Value, Inspiration, Motivation, FLL Values	4
2.2 Technical Awards	4
2.2.1 Robot Design Award.....	4
2.2.2 Robot Performance Award.....	5
2.3 Team Performance Awards	5
2.3.1 Research Presentation Award.....	5
2.3.2 Teamwork Award.....	7
2.4 Special Recognition Awards	7
2.4.1 Outstanding Volunteer Award	7
2.4.2 Adult Coach/Mentor Award.....	7
2.4.3 Young Adult Mentor Award	7
2.5 Optional Judges’ Awards.....	8
2.5.1 Rookie Award	8
2.5.2 Against All Odds Award	8
2.5.3 Team Spirit Award.....	8
2.5.4 Other Judges’ Award.....	8
<u>3 JUDGING AREAS</u>	8
3.1 The Technical Judging Area.....	9
3.2 The Presentation Judging Area.....	9
3.3 Competition Judging Area.....	9
3.4 Pit Judging Area	9
<u>4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</u>	9
4.1 Judge Advisor	9
4.2 Judges and Recruitment.....	10
4.3 Judge Assistants.....	10
<u>5 JUDGING PROCESS</u>	10
5.1 Teams of Judges	10
5.2 Team Familiarization.....	10
<u>6 AWARD DETERMINATION</u>	10
6.1 Ask Questions.....	11
6.2 Allow Time.....	11
6.3 Take Notes.....	11
6.4 Observe Teams During Unguarded Moments	11
6.4.1 Team Dialogue	11
6.4.2 Team Character and Functionality.....	11
6.4.3 Team Interaction.....	12
6.5 Provide Visuals to Spectators	12

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO^o League Tournament Manual – Judges’ Guide

<u>6.5 Determine Winners</u>	12
<u>APPENDIX</u>	15
<u>7 FLL CHALLENGE AND MISSIONS</u>	15
<u>7.1 Challenge Introduction</u>	15
<u>7.2 Robot Game</u>	15
<u>7.3 Research Assignment</u>	15
<u>7.4 At the Tournament</u>	15
<u>8 TOURNAMENT TERMS AND RULES</u>	15
<u>9 JUDGING SHEETS</u>	15
<u>9.1 Team Introduction Page</u>	17
<u>9.2 Team Comment Form</u>	19

1 WELCOME

While it may be cold outside, it will be hot, exciting, and energized at the tournament. Imagine three hundred kids, eight hundred parents and family members, other spectators, and rock music pumping through the sound system. These are the beginnings of an FLL Tournament! Now what do you do?

Welcome to FIRST LEGO League. Your day here and probably your understanding of children will never be quite the same. Judging will change you, excite you, and teach you about the power and energy of kids in love with science and technology! What role will you play?

As a critical element in the excitement that will make up this day, kids will be running up to you to show you what they have done. They are excited to talk with you, and they are speaking really fast and loud! You turn around and another team, equally enthusiastic, grabs your attention as you look at their robotic creation.

Today, we will prepare you to help kids for their tomorrows.

2 2003 FIRST LEGO LEAGUE INTERNATIONAL AWARDS

The 2003 FLL International Awards represent the true FIRSTSM LEGO[®] League values and focus of FLL internationally. Children, regardless of what country they are from, or what type of tournament event they compete in, will be judged using this group of awards, ultimately leading to a recognized standard of excellence for all FLL teams.

The 2003 FLL Awards consist of four main categories: Technical, Team Performance, Special Recognition, and Judges' Awards. Judges use the criteria of Technical and Team Performance when determining the winner of the Director's Award, the most prestigious honor a team can win at an FLL Tournament.

Each of the four categories contains several individual awards. FLL requires all tournament organizers to present the Technical and Team Performance Awards. The organizers present other award categories at their discretion. In addition, all state tournament participants receive an FLL medallion to signify their accomplishments on and off the Competition Field.

Award distribution is spread as equitably as possible among the teams, with the goal of no team winning more than two (2) major awards. (State Partners do have the right to allow a team to win additional awards, and will state their policy clearly in the team tournament information.)

2.1 Director's Award

The Director's Award is the most prestigious award that any team can win. Teams considered for the Director's Award are those that perform well in all of the major award categories. Once Judges select potential teams, they review the results of the each team's FLL Value Assessment interview. Using this final parameter for determination, Judges will decide which team(s) will receive this most coveted award.

In most cases, if Judges choose a team as a Director's Award Team, the team will not receive any additional awards in the other categories. As the Director's Award recipient, the team is recognized as outstanding in each of the following:

1. Robot Design
2. Robot Performance Score
3. Research Presentation
4. Teamwork
5. Team's understanding and practice of the FIRST mission and FLL values

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO^o League Tournament Manual – Judges’ Guide

2.1.1 Award Weight Values

Judges use the Technical and Team Research Assignment award scores, in conjunction with the Robot Performance Score and the assessment of FLL Values, to determine the winner of the Director’s Award. The weight value for each of the awards is as follows:

Technical Awards Category:	Robot Design	25%
	Robot Performance	25%
Team Presentation Awards Category:	Research Presentation	25%
	Teamwork	25%
	FLL Values Assessment	
TOTAL		100%

2.1.2 Team Value, Inspiration, Motivation, FLL Values

The FLL experience is more than building robots or attending competitions. The FLL experience begins with the robot, but the most important element defines how the children unite to form a team and how the program impacts each child as an individual and as a team member.

The Director’s Award celebrates the ultimate success of the FIRST mission and FLL Values. It measures how the children inspire and motivate others regarding the accessibility, excitement, and the wonders of science, technology, and engineering while demonstrating respect, encouragement, and continued gracious professionalism. The winning team receives the honor of serving as a valued role model for FIRST and the FIRST LEGO® League Program.

FLL Values	Criteria	Areas of Consideration
(Used only to help determine Director’s Award Winning Team)	Impact of FIRST Mission on Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learned new skills and set priorities • Exhibited student involvement • Showed ability to share ideas • Community as a team
	Gracious Professionalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showed self respect and for others • Had comradeship, honesty, integrity • Discovered new things about themselves and others

2.2 Technical Awards

2.2.1 Robot Design Award

A winning design is predicated on three distinct elements, innovative design, robust design, and programming elements; which in conjunction with one another, make a robot and its team of designers, programmers, and builders stand out. *Tournaments may choose to break the Robot Design Award into three separate awards:*

- a. **Innovative Design Award**– FLL presents this award to the team that best demonstrates its ability to use a creative design, component or unique strategy of play for the most original approach when solving the *Challenge* missions.
- b. **Robust Design Award** – FLL presents this award to the team that best demonstrates its understanding and application of sound mechanical principles, producing the most solid, consistent, and dependable robot.
- c. **Programming Award** – FLL presents this award to the team who understands and applies sound programming principles, creating an effective and efficient program to run the robot.

Criteria	Areas of Consideration	Sample Questions
Structural Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Durability • Stability • Efficient use of parts • Range of capabilities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why did you go with this design? 2. How many different tasks can this robot perform? 3. What have you done to make sure the robot stays together?
LOCOMOTION / NAVIGATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drive ratio • Precision 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How/why did you decide to use wheels versus treads? 2. Explain why your robot goes fast/med/slow. 3. What did you try in order to get the robot to drive straight?
Sensor Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree • Variety • Mounting 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What sensors did you incorporate? Why or why not? 2. Explain why you mounted them the way you did.
Programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of loops and conditionals • Use of variables, subroutines • Strategy • Efficiency 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is your favorite programming technique, and why? 2. Show me a program where you’re using less blocks now that when you started.
Creativity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique design or strategy • Flair / Appearance / Entertainment 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did you end up using any ideas that you first thought were crazy? 2. What makes your robot stand out as special?

2.2.2 Robot Performance Award

FLL presents this award to the team(s) whose robot achieves the best score in the competition field (or in the elimination round) at the Tournament. The top 2 or 3 scoring teams receive this award. There are several options you can use to determine the winner of the award:

If NO elimination Rounds	If Elimination Rounds are held
The team with the highest score receives the trophy.	The team(s) whose robot achieved the highest score in the elimination round receives the trophy.
	The team that eliminates all opponents, using high score between two teams as the factor for advancement to the next round, receives the award.

2.3 Team Performance Awards

2.3.1 Research Presentation Award

FLL presents The Research Presentation Award to the team whose quality research, innovative solutions, and creative presentation best reflect an in-depth understanding of the various scientific disciplines and issues involved with the *Challenge* Research Assignment. *Tournaments may choose to break the Research Presentation Award into three separate awards:*

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO^o League Tournament Manual – Judges’ Guide

- **Research Quality** – The use and understanding of diverse resources used to formulate an in-depth and thorough explanation of the teams’ point of view and solution to the Research Assignment.
- **Innovative Solution** - Thought provoking and innovative resolution, including how and why it was chosen.
- **Creative Presentation** – An imaginative, creative presentation demonstrating the team’s research and solution.

On the day of the tournament, each team will have approximately five (5) minutes to present its research findings to the judge panel. There are endless possibilities and creative ways to present the Research Assignment such as skits, formal presentations, and demonstrations to name a few. Judges will also look for the team’s ability to have more than one, or all, team members participating in the Research Presentation. Look for how the team does the following:

- Clearly and accurately outlines and understands all aspects of the problem
- Addresses the potential impacts if the problem is not resolved
- Captures the judges’ attention with the team presentation
- Presents the team solution, using robotics technology, and shows how it assists in resolving the problem
- Shows creativity and innovation in its solutions

Criteria	Areas of Consideration	Sample Questions
Research Question	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of Question • Effect of question on humanity, science, technology • Question tied to FLL Challenge 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why did the team choose this research question? 2. Why is this question so important?
Background Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variety of research materials used and cited • Ability to demonstrate an understanding of the topic chosen • Information presented relevant to research question chosen 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do the facts the team presents relate to the research question? 2. What information was most helpful in determining the choice for your research question?
Mission Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of mission plan • Background information provided and applied to mission plan • Mission plan relates to research question 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How did the team develop the mission plan? 2. What information was most helpful in determining the mission plan?
Data and Graphics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses relevant and informative visual aids • Visual aids support research question and mission plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why did you choose this data to support your mission plan and research question? 2. How did conflicting data impact your mission plan and research question?
Analysis and Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and data used in analysis • Analysis supports conclusions • Solid understanding of Research Question 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How did you analyze data? 2. Did all the data support your conclusion? 3. How did this help you reach your conclusion?
Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation is organized – beginning, middle, and end • Engaging and persuasive • Creative and imaginative 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why did the team choose its presentation style? 2. What do you think was the most important aspect of your presentation?

2.3.2 Teamwork Award

Teamwork is necessary to succeed in FIRST LEGO^o League, and is the key ingredient in any team. FLL presents this award to the team that best demonstrates extraordinary enthusiasm and spirit, exceptional partnership, and the utmost respect to its own teammates and in its support and encouragement of fellow teams. The team receiving this trophy demonstrated the following attributes:

- Confidence, energy and enthusiasm
- Problem solving skills
- Understanding and respect of others
- Team interaction and group dynamics

Criteria	Areas of Consideration
Team Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All team members participated • They shared roles • Used problem-solving skills
Team Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked together to solve problems • Focused on objectives • Showed willingness to try new ideas
Consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showed respect for teammates and others • Worked well together, especially under pressure • Learned from each other
Communication and Confidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibited confidence, energy, and excitement, • Were comfortable speaking • Listened and paid attention

2.4 Special Recognition Awards

2.4.1 Outstanding Volunteer Award

The success of the FLL Program is a reflection of the commitment and enthusiasm our volunteers display. This award honors the dedication of the volunteer(s) whose assistance and devotion helped to change the lives of children for the future.

2.4.2 Adult Coach/Mentor Award

Many teams reach significant milestones of success thanks to their close relationship with an adult mentor. This award goes to the coach or mentor whose wisdom, guidance, patience, and devotion were most clearly evident in his/her team’s discussion with the Judges. See next page.

2.4.3 Young Adult Mentor Award

FLL presents this award to the young adult (high school through college) mentor, whose support, impact, inspiration, devotion, and guidance were most clearly evident in the team’s discussion with the Judges. See next page.

Awards	Criteria	Areas of Consideration
Adult/Coach Young Adult / Mentor	Relationship with coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coach/mentor and team communicate well • Team taught principals and applies them to other areas • Demonstrates respect for coach/mentor
	Understanding of FLL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands what FLL is about • Team shows effective communication independent of coach/mentor
	Independence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team can work by itself • Team does the work • All have learned and can demonstrate this
	Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team Structure – governing rules • Leadership within team • All members exposed to all aspects of program
	Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands what has been learned from coach • Understands how this affected team

2.5 Optional Judges’ Awards

2.5.1 Rookie Award

Each season, another fearless brigade of rookies enters the fascinating FLL process. This award goes to the team who rises above and beyond we expect from rookies and shows promise to be ranked among the most elite veteran teams when they return next season.

2.5.2 Against All Odds Award

We can overcome incredible odds if we just never give up, no matter what. This award goes to the team that rises above the worst situation and improvises, adapts, overcomes, and still makes a respectable showing.

2.5.3 Team Spirit Award

Some teams really know how to go overboard, and their communities know them well. They are loud, they are bright, they jump around, and their high-fives really sting. They may rock the boat sometimes, but they always rock the house! This award goes to the team that most enthusiastically demonstrates a commitment to getting others to see how accessible, fun, and rewarding science and technology can be, especially when you are part of a great team.

2.5.4 Other Judges’ Award

Many high quality teams do not exactly fit the mold for an existing award, but nonetheless deserve recognition. Some teams have a story that profoundly sets them apart in a unique way. Sometimes an award is just too close to call. This award gives the Judges the freedom to recognize the most remarkable teams for which a standard award does not exist.

3 JUDGING AREAS

There are four areas that judging can take place: technical judging space, team performance area, the competition floor, and the Pit. These individual spaces allow both Judges and teams locations

conducive to discussion as well as provide a complete picture of each team and how it functions during a tournament.

3.1 The Technical Judging Area

You will find one or more (4' x 8') playing field, depending on tournament size. Teams enter with their robots, and in a quiet setting with 2 or 3 Judges; each demonstrates the strategies for its robot. Look at the team's design and program and how the team used this information to help solve the challenge. The focus is on the robot, what the team did and why. Innovation, mechanical practices, challenge, and strategy are important. Emphasize a child - judge discussion. You will want to see what the kids know, what they did, and why they chose what they chose. *Coach and mentor input is highly discouraged and can result in loss of points.* The kids need to shine and so do their efforts!

3.2 The Presentation Judging Area

In an informal setting, the focus now turns to the team members, the science of the *Challenge*, the influence of the mentor, and how well the team worked together. A team of 2 or more Judges sits with the kids, exploring the presentation the team gives about the science behind the *Challenge*. What did they learn, how did it influence their strategy in the technical choices they made, what was the impact of the team's coach/mentor? Is there an "against all odds" story here, and does the team show gracious professionalism between team members? *Coach and mentor input is highly discouraged and can result in a lower team score.* Again, the spotlight is on the kids and their efforts!

3.3 Competition Judging Area

Technical and Performance Judging arenas are quiet and allow for conversation in a more controlled environment. On the competition floor, you get to see the kids in action. Do the kids follow the competition rules? Is the coach encouraging, controlling? Is team spirit running high? How do the kids deal with the stress, success and/or adversity of competition? How do they deal with the other teams? You can see this from the competition area.

3.4 Pit Judging Area

Back in the Pit, are teams dealing well with their attempt on the competition field? How is the coach motivating the team members? Are ideas flying and the kids involved, or are they quiet, contemplating their next move? The Pit provides you with volumes about how the kids are really doing and if there is a story that you missed somewhere else.

4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 Judge Advisor

Critical to the success of any tournament is the judging process. Tournament partners recruit a Judge Advisor.

This person is responsible for:

- The Judging Process: Recruiting, training, and overseeing all Tournament Judges.
- The liaison between Teams and Judges: teams and coaches are asked to accept rulings by the referees and Judges as final, but there are times that questions and observations will arise.
- Preparing a form, in conjunction with the Planning Committee, that teams can use to inform the Judge Advisor of concerns, questions, and issues that need Judges' attention. You can find a sample "Team comment Form" in this Manual, toward the end of the Appendix.

4.2 Judges and Recruitment

Judges are usually distinguished individuals who serve as role models for team members. They usually have some experience in the careers that model the awards and team member roles. To find Judges, we suggest that the Judge Advisor contact local businesses in the area, local and/or state celebrates, individuals who work in the same field as the research assignment and *Challenge*, teachers, civic leaders, as well as university professionals. A twenty-five-team Tournament generally requires twelve to fifteen judges.

4.3 Judge Assistants

To support the efforts of the Judges and Judge Advisor, we recommend that the Advisor recruit at least 2 assistants. These persons are responsible for keeping the judging schedule on track, monitoring the time the teams spend with the judges, and ensuring that teams do not run over the time allowed per judging session. Two or three minute delays may not seem much for a team or two, but multiply that amount by twenty-five or thirty, and this can put the entire day behind schedule by more than an hour.

The assistants perform other critical roles, including providing the Judges with the proper team information, recording the scores teams receive during the session, and providing an extra pair of eyes and ears for the Judges. Sometimes a story will come out while a team is awaiting the judging process, and the Judge Assistants may be the only ones able to share the story with the Judges.

5 JUDGING PROCESS

Please read below for hints to make the judging process easier and more efficient and effective.

5.1 Teams of Judges

To facilitate the judging process, we recommend that tournaments group 2 to 4 judges together as a team to judge the two main award areas: Technical and Team Presentation Awards. With a larger tournament, it is wise to have several teams of judges for each award. A team of Judges that visits more than ten to fifteen teams in one day begins to lose clarity and the differential between teams. While this requires having more Judges, the results offer a better judging process, an easier time on teams, judges, volunteers, and spectators. It also helps keep the tournament day on schedule.

5.2 Team Familiarization

To assist in the judging process, we suggest that tournaments use a Team Introduction Page to help Judges better familiarize themselves with the teams. "The Team Introduction Page" might contain information such as team name and number, organization the team is associated with, coach name, team member names, a team picture, and a couple of questions regarding participation during the judging session. This will let judges know if all team members, or selected persons will participate in the discussion. This information will help judges frame questions and determine if team members have specific roles or if all team members are involved in every aspect. (*See sample in the Appendix at the end of this guide.*)

6 AWARD DETERMINATION

Understanding how the team functions will help you determine awards. To get a feel for this, Judges should compile a list of questions that the kids can answer. Tournaments can use the Judging Sheets and interview questions in the Appendix of this guide. The sheets have a place to enter the team name and number, a description of the award and its objectives, criteria for judging each aspect of the award and point value, and a place for the Judge to sign off with the team's total score.

6.1 Ask Questions

Each award has associated questions to help teams and Judges begin the interview process. Use these questions as a guide to understand how the team functions. Judges do not have to ask all questions of every team, but the questions may also help team members provide information that they may not have thought of, or may have a difficult time expressing without the prompting questions.

Remember, there is a lot going on and the kids may not have had enough sleep; they are excited and are trying to focus on their missions. These factors create pressure for some children, especially the younger ones!

6.2 Allow Time

Please be prepared to spend anywhere from ten (10) to fifteen (15) minutes per team per award. This will allow you and the team enough time to get to know each other a bit, have time to talk with most, if not all of the team members, and adequately assess the award you are judging.

It is very important to observe their behaviors in the Pit and competition areas. Talking with teams will reveal one aspect of the group, while the Pit and Competition areas will tell another side of the story. If you observe actions that you would like to learn more about, do not be afraid to ask team members to tell you what they were doing and thinking at that time. Sometimes your observations and the actual event may differ, so do not assume you know what is happening – ask.

6.3 Take Notes

Please make notes of your team observations, as they will help you determine award winners. Additionally, we can often use the comments about a team during the award ceremony. Return the judging sheets to the teams at the end of the tournament to help them improve their efforts in subsequent seasons.

6.4 Observe Teams During Unguarded Moments

Assessing the elements below, in combination with the formal question and answers you will present and receive, will allow for a well-rounded assessment of a team.

6.4.1 Team Dialogue

In addition to the material that a team presents to the judging panel, there is also a dialogue to assess the team's real understanding of the discipline. This question and answer period will help determine the following:

- Breadth and depth of teams' understanding of discipline
- How teams interact with each other
- How teams interact with the judges
- Teams independence from coach/mentor

6.4.2 Team Character and Functionality

Observe team member interactions from the moment the team enters the Judging Area until the session is complete. Make sure to understand the team make up, as some team members may have been more involved in a specific area than others. Are all team members present? If not, understand why.

Note how the team enters the room, and watch the initial setup prior to formal discussion with the Judges. Also observe how the team performs during break down once the interview is complete. Look at how the team accomplishes this and who is involved. Clues to team function are very evident in these unguarded moments, and can tell judges volumes about the team.

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO^o League Tournament Manual – Judges' Guide

During the more formal interview process, observe not only the answers the team offers, but also how they respond to each other. Are they respectful of each other's comments, answers, and ideas, or are some team members more dominate than others? Do they seem to build upon each other's ideas? Is the team eager to respond, or are questions greeted with silence and concerned looks?

6.4.3 Team Interaction

Try to make the session as comfortable for the team as possible. The children will be nervous, tired, and wound up. While this can add to the excitement level on the competition floor, it can affect an interview both positively and negatively.

To encourage interaction with the entire team, direct questions to each team member. Give them time to think about their answers, especially in an area that the team may not have considered prior to the interview. Using deductive reasoning can be difficult for children at this, as they are generally very concrete thinkers. When asking a question of this nature, guide the wording of the question, and be prepared to offer an example if a team is struggling.

Observe how the team interacts with each Judge. How does the team present itself to you? Is the team attentive to the speaker during the interview? Do the team members look at the Judges, or do they appear shy and/or nervous? Do the team's actions appear natural or prepared?

6.5 Provide Visuals to Spectators

To help teams and spectators understand what aspects of the Research Presentation Award(s) the Judges' value, we suggest that tournaments consider videotaping this segment of the interview. The videotapes are multi purpose, ranging from assisting Judges in final award determinations to the showing audiences and teams the winning presentations. If videotaping is not possible, we suggest that you have the top 3 to 5 Research Presentation candidates make a presentation to the audience prior to final award decisions. Please note that you can also do this for Technical Award judging.

6.5 Determine Winners

The Advisor will lead the Judge Group, and the support volunteers will assist in determining the award winners. We recommend that each Judge or Judging Group have at least 2 to 3 teams that it can recommend for a specified award. Award distribution is spread as equitably as possible among the teams, with the goal of no team winning more than two (2) major awards. (State Partners do have the right to allow a team to win additional awards, and will state their policy clearly in the tournament information they provide to teams.)

When using multiple judging teams for one award area, we recommend that each judging team pick the top 1 or 2 teams that they judged during the day. At the Judges' meeting, each team will present its top choice(s), and through consensus, determine the top teams in the award category. If necessary and/or time allows, Judges should revisit the top teams, by either informally watching them on the field and in the Pit, or formally back in the judging rooms. This last visit will help determine the final award winners. As for the Director's Award, all Judges will look at the top five teams that overall are the strongest in Robot Design, Research Presentation, Teamwork, and Score. Judges will then factor in the FLL Values to help determine the award winner.

APPENDIX

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO[®] League Tournament Manual – Judges' Guide

APPENDIX

7 FLL CHALLENGE AND MISSIONS

2003 FLL Challenge – Mission Mars

Humans have always been mystified by the idea of other worlds out in space. Those worlds are full of lessons we can learn about our past and our future. For these reasons we are exploring Mars, performing science experiments there, and considering the possibilities of colonization.

7.1 Challenge Introduction

The Robot Missions center around a simulated environment that represents the problem(s) found within the Challenge. The design and development of an FLL robot requires students to learn, understand, and apply scientific, engineering, strategic, and analytical concepts for a solution. Teams create and follow a project timeline for the design, construction, programming, testing and development of their inventions. Specific rules and point values are associated with each mission objective.

7.2 Robot Game

The Robot Playing Field consists of LEGO elements that have been strategically placed on an 8' x 4' playing field. The robot must perform the Missions utilizing the elements on the playing field within the 2 ½ minute round. Teams have approximately 8 weeks to develop their robots and prepare for their State Tournament.

7.3 Research Assignment

Teams will choose one of the missions from the FLL MISSION MARS *Challenge*. What is an important question related to this mission? What is the design for a robotics expedition to answer this question?

7.4 At the Tournament

At the tournament, teams will give a presentation of their research findings and conclusions to a team of Judges. FIRST LEGO League teams will experience very similar challenges encountered by the scientists and engineers at NASA. It takes all kinds of people and skills to fully understand and appreciate what the challenges are to get to Mars.

The Research Assignment helps teams more fully understand why each mission is represented and its significance to the real work being conducted by scientists around the world.

8 TOURNAMENT TERMS AND RULES

Please refer to the Referees' Guide for the specific terms rules of the 2003 *Challenge*.

9 JUDGING SHEETS

Please use the following pages to help keep track of team information. The Judging Criteria sheets will be available for download from the website.

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO[®] League Tournament Manual – Judges' Guide

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO[®] League Tournament Manual – Judges' Guide

9.2 Team Comment Form

All decisions by referees and judges are final.

This form provides space for teams to inform the Head Referee or Judge Advisor of any questions or comments that a team may have during the tournament. The coach or mentor must fill out this form and provide the information in writing. Forms will be read, but **there is no guarantee** that a response will be provided to the coach.

Please maintain Gracious Professionalism at all times.

Team # _____

Team Name: _____

Name of Coach:

Comment Section:

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO[®] League Tournament Manual – Judges' Guide

The 2003 FIRSTSM LEGO^o League Tournament Manual – Judges' Guide

The 2003 FLL International Judging Guide is a collaborative effort involving Tournament Partners and State Planning Committee Members from the United States and other countries. FLL Headquarters in Manchester, New Hampshire would like to recognize and thank the following individuals and organizations for their initial contribution:

- Rachel Mascarella – Motorola, Illinois
- Fred Rose – Honeywell, Minnesota
- Trude Sundset – Scandinavia FLL International
- Soren Lund – Director, LEGO MINDSTORMS Communities
- INSciTETM – Innovations in Science and Technology Education