

GRADES BY JUDGES

Group	Grades (out of 100 pts)			Average Grade
	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	
A	96	100	98	98
B	90	90	92	90.667
C	92	90	96	92.667
D	99	95	100	98
E	84	80	90	84.667
F	87	85	92	88
G	89	90	94	91
H	93	90	96	93
I	97	95	100	97.333

Comments:

Group	Comments
A	Overall design elegant; very good construction; nice release mech. and efficient method for adjusting distance w/ bolt
B	Very unique design; well thought out, but physical device needs tweeking - high power input, low output; good construction; evidence design calcs incooperated; moderate distance adjustment-NO calibrations
C	Simple; fair construction; not elegant; unique choice of power storage; good design for distance adjustment; release mech moderate
D	Elegant design; very good construction; well thought out, evidence of design calculations incooperated; moderate release mech; moderate dist adjustment capability
E	Not elegant design; No evidence of calculations incooperated design; fair construction; poor release mechanism, cut fishing line; poor use of stored energy, high power input, low power output; dist adjustment f(rubberbands), based soley on trial and error
F	Dist adjustabilty overdesigned, only ended up using one method which was unreliable and not elegant; fair construction; no evidence of calculations used in design;
G	Excellent release mech; fair construction; good design; good adjustability, but based on trial and error
H	Unique design; moderate construction; good energy storage and delivery; good release mech, but needs tweeking; moderate dist adjustment
I	Elegant design; very good construction-double shear connections and bearings; moderate release mech; overall repeatable; moderate dist adjustment capability