Abstract Review Instructions

Please see 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 the Captains, Gwyneth Glissmann, the Abstract Gatekeeper will notify Courtney Butler, the CSEF Director of the proposed change. Courtney will review and contact the Finalist and his/her Adult Sponsor/Teacher to see if they agree or have additional information on their project that was not included in the 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 Transportation and Environmental, which can encompass many subjects.

For 2015, at the discretion of the Captains, Assistant Captains will help in reviewing Abstracts for their designated category to support the Captains. With the addition of 100 extra science fair projects, Captains may require additional “eyes” to review the category abstracts. All recommendations by Assistant 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 multidiscipline 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 (e.g., while reviewing abstracts or during the judging process on April 9th). However, Captains MUST notify Nancy Glissmann (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 would 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 Category, a Chemistry study in the Physics Category, then obviously recommend a change. However, there could be a Microbiology project in Environmental. There could be an Engineering project in the Energy and Transportation Category, but hopefully the Finalist makes it clear in the Abstract why they have chosen a particular Category. If you have any in doubts about a project abstract, please email Gwyneth Glissmann at csef.gatekeeper@gmail.com with a cc: to Nancy Glissmann at GrandAwardsCSEF@gmail.com and Courtney Butler at courtney.butler@colostate.edu. Also, Courtney can ask for additional clarification from the Finalist and/or Adult Sponsor/Teacher.

Second, focus on the Abstracts that are definitely a better fit in another Category. For example: a Finalist building a wind turbine generator from his/her own design that is in Physics would probably be a better fit in Engineering. A Finalist simply testing existing design types of wind turbines for efficiency properties, should be left in Physics. Or, conversely, either project could be in the Energy and Transportation 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 look at similar projects. If the project is one-of-a-kind and is a reasonable fit and you feel can be judged fairly, just leave it in your Category.

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

The CSEF Finalists, with the help of their Sponsors/Teachers have selected a Category in which they feel their project should be judged. As the Judging Team Captain of one of the CSEF Grand Awards Categories, we are asking you to review the Abstracts to ensure that all of the projects entered fit into your category. (Captains: 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 Description for your assigned Category and Division against the other projects entered in the Category by March 21st. If you are unable to complete this task in the time allotted, immediately notify Nancy Glissmann at GrandAwardsCSEF@gmail.com (so that I can designate the Assistant Team Captain or someone who will be able to assist you in reviewing the Abstracts), with a cc: to Gwyneth Glissmann csef.gatekeeper@gmail.com, and Courtney Butler at courtney.butler@colostate.edu.

2. All Abstracts are available online at the CSEF website on the “Grand Awards Judge Information” page at (http://www.csef.colostate.edu/Judges.htm) (no password required to access the Abstracts). Scroll down to the yellow box click on the “Abstract Database,” select the Category and Division for your Abstracts, and click on “Display” at the bottom of the page. Please remember that the Abstracts do not all come in at the same time, but all of the Abstracts are required to be in by March 11th.

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 in 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 or attach the text of the Abstract into your email. The “Move To” Captain must also agree to the change. If there is no Captain yet assigned to a particular Category, just notify Gwyneth Glissmann. Please make sure all correspondence is cc’d to Gwyneth Glissmann at csef.gatekeeper@gmail.com, Courtney Butler at courtney.butler@colostate.edu, and Nancy Glissmann at GrandAwardsCSEF@gmail.com.

5. All Judging Team Captains must officially notify Gwyneth Glissmann by email at csef.gatekeeper@gmail.com 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.

6. Once the recommendations are received by Gwyneth, she will forward them to the Courtney Butler, the CSEF Director.

7. The CSEF Director will contact the Finalist and his/her Adult Sponsor to discuss the proposed move. A Finalist reserves the right to decline the recommended move, as 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.
Sample Abstract: This is a Good Fit for Animal Science

Junior Animal Category: Penguins - Tropic vs. Arctic

For my project I researched penguins that live in tropical habitats and penguins that live in Arctic habitats through resources such as Internet and personal accounts. I researched information from several reliable sights and put it all into a report. Then I want 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.