



2019 Grand Awards Judging Team Captain Abstract Review Instructions & Process

Abstract Review Instructions:

Please see the [Category Descriptions](#) to review against the abstracts. The Category Descriptions are not necessarily inclusive, just the most common. Finalists select the category for his/her project. Once a move is recommended by a Category Team Captain, the Abstract Gatekeeper (Gwyneth Glissmann) will notify the CSEF Director (Courtney Butler) of the proposed change. The CSEF Director will review and contact the Finalist, his/her Adult Sponsor and the Regional Fair Director to see if they agree or have additional information on their project that was not included in the submitted abstract. The Finalist has the right to keep the project in the chosen category. This is especially important to note in the multidiscipline types of categories such as Energy and Environmental Sciences, which can encompass many subjects.

For 2019, at the discretion of the Category Team Captains, Assistant Team Captains will help in reviewing abstracts for their designated category. With almost 400 projects, captains may require additional "eyes" to review the category abstracts. All recommendations by Assistant Team Captains will be coordinated with the captain of the designated category.

When recommending a project move, DO NOT recommend a project move based on your expertise alone or that there will not be a judge available who has the expertise to evaluate the project. Every effort is made to assign multidisciplinary judging teams with a broad range of judges in order to deal with this very issue. In addition, judges from other teams may be called in for consultation on a project as well. (i.e.: while reviewing abstracts or during the judging process on April 11th).

However, Captains MUST notify the Grand Award Judging Coordinator (grandawardscsef@gmail.com) if any additional expertise is required for judging to properly evaluate the projects in your category. For instance, an Animal Sciences project has developed a computer program to evaluate data. This project might require additional computer science expertise.

As you review the abstracts, focus first on the project content to see if it generally meets the category criteria. If it is a blatant mismatch, such as a plant study in the Animal Sciences category or a chemistry study in the Physics category, then obviously recommend a change. However, there could be a microbiology project in the Environmental Sciences category. There could be an engineering project in the Energy category, but hopefully the student makes it clear in the abstract why they have chosen a particular category. If you have any doubts about a project abstract, please email Nancy Vaughan (grandawardscsef@gmail.com) with a cc to Gwyneth Glissmann (csef.gatekeeper@gmail.com) and Courtney Butler (courtney.butler@colostate.edu). Also, we can ask for additional clarification from the Finalist and/or their Adult Sponsor or Teacher.

Second, focus on the abstracts that are definitely a better fit in another category. For example, a student building a wind turbine generator from his/her own design that is in the Physics category, would probably be a better fit in Engineering. A student simply testing existing design types of wind turbines for efficiency properties, should be left in Physics. Or, conversely, either project could fit into the Energy category. Another suggestion for analyzing the appropriateness of a project in your category is to review the projects in the other category and see if there are similar projects in that category. If so, the project is probably a good candidate for a move. It helps to validate the judging when you have the same judges looking at similar projects. If the project is

one-of-a-kind and is a reasonable fit and you feel it can be judged fairly, just leave it in your category.

Thirdly, you can do your review of the abstracts from the online database. If you want to save one or all of the abstracts on the list for further review or to include in an email to another Category Team Captain for review, just select the desired text or "Select All" to copy and paste into an email or Word document that you can save on your computer or print.

[Category Team Captain Abstract Review Process](#)

The CSEF Finalist, with the help of their Adult Sponsor or Teacher have selected a category in which they feel their project should be judged. As the Team Captain of one of the CSEF Grand Award Categories, we are asking you to review the abstracts to ensure that all of the projects entered fit in your category. *(Captains, please notify your designated Assistant Team Captain if you require their assistance in reviewing the abstracts for your category.)*

The specific steps for this process are as follows:

1. Review all abstracts against the Category Descriptions for your assigned category and division and against the other projects entered in the category by [Wednesday, March 20th](#). If you are unable to complete this task in the time allotted, immediately notify Nancy Vaughan at grandawardscsef@gmail.com.
2. All abstracts are available on the CSEF web site from the "Grand Awards Judge Information" page (<http://www.csef.colostate.edu/Judges.htm>). Scroll down to the yellow box and click on the "Abstract Database" link. Select the Category and Division for your abstracts and click on the "Display" button at the bottom of the page. Please remember that the abstracts do not all come in at the same time, but they are required to be in by [March 15th](#).
3. If a project does not fit your category, review it against the other Category Descriptions.
4. Make a recommendation on which category you think the project should be judged in and contact the Judging Team Captain of that category by sending an email to the Captain of the proposed "Move To" category. In the email, include the Category, Division and Title of the project in question for them to review online and/or copy and paste the text of the abstract into the email. If there is no Captain yet assigned to a particular Category, just notify Nancy Vaughan (grandawardscsef@gmail.com) with a cc to Gwyneth Glissmann and Courtney Butler.
5. Please make sure all correspondence is cc'd to Gwyneth Glissmann (csef.gatekeeper@gmail.com), Courtney Butler (courtney.butler@colostate.edu) and Nancy Vaughan (grandawardscsef@gmail.com).
6. The "Move To" Judging Team Captain must also agree to the change.
7. **ALL** Judging Team Captains **MUST OFFICIALLY** notify Nancy Vaughan (grandawardscsef@gmail.com) via email with a cc to Gwyneth Glissmann and Courtney Butler regarding the outcome of your review:
 - a. "All Project Abstracts are correctly placed in your category" OR
 - b. "All Project Abstracts are correctly placed in your category, except the following:" and list the Project Title, Finalist's Name and the recommended category to which it should be moved to.

8. Once the recommendations are received by the Abstract Gatekeeper, they will be forwarded to the CSEF Director.
9. The CSEF Director will contact the Finalist and his/her Adult Sponsor and Regional Fair Director to discuss the proposed move. A Finalist reserves the right to decline the recommended move, and they sometimes provide additional information about their project that was not included in the abstract. In those cases, the project will stay in the original category.
10. Category placement is considered final on April 1st.

[Sample Abstract:](#)

This is a good fit for Animal Sciences.

Junior Division Animal Sciences Category: Penguins - Tropic vs. Arctic

For my project, I researched penguins that live in tropical habitats and penguins that live in arctic habitats through recourses such as the Internet and personal accounts. I researched information from several reliable sites and put it all into a report. Then I went to the Cheyenne Mountain Zoo and observed one type of tropical penguin and recorded the data received from the observation. Then I went to the Pueblo Zoo and observed another type of tropical penguin and did the same thing. This was also repeated at the Denver Zoo. I found live footage of Arctic penguins in New York's Central Park Zoo and recorded the information gathered from my observations. Then I took all of the received information and put it into a graph that displayed the penguins' behavioral patterns. The information received was then used to make conclusions about the penguins' behavioral patterns and whether or not their habitats had anything to do with the way they acted.