

FUTURE CITY COMPETITION – JUNIOR (PILOT PROGRAM) PROPOSED 4-5TH GRADE RULES

As a result of the high interest in this year's theme and requests by a number of groups, the North Texas Regional is piloting a Future City Junior program for 4-5th graders. The Junior program is an abbreviated version of the full Future City Competition effort. It will include the research essay and the physical model deliverables. Proposed rules for the Junior pilot program follow. Please note: this program is only available in North Texas at this time.

REGISTRATION:

Schools and youth organizations with 4-5th grade students may register by contacting Jean Eason, NTX Regional Coordinator at regional@dfwfuturecity.org. Please include the following information in the email:

- Teacher name, phone number and email address.
- School or organization, address, phone
- Number of students participating and number of proposed teams.

There will be no registration fee for the Junior Competition.

TEAMS:

The students will work in teams. Teams consist of three 4-5 grade students and one educator. You may bring in technical experts-engineers, but it is not necessary to have a mentor on the team.

- Students must be from the same organization, but not necessarily the same class or grade.
- Organizations may enter multiple teams. There will be a TBA limit to the number of teams and models shown at UTA.
- Prior to the model showing, organizations may work as a class or group and select the three students (one team) that will represent them at the competition.

RESEARCH ESSAY: URBAN AGRICULTURE – FEEDING FUTURE CITIES

This component will be as in the Program Handbook, pages 19-29 except that instead of picking both a vegetable and a protein to research, the team will choose either a vegetable or protein. The essay will be judged using the rubric in the handbook (pp. 28-29). It will be due 1 December 2014. Late submissions will be accepted (with penalty points deducted) through 21 December 2014. Submit the essay in electronic form, in a common file format (.doc or .pdf), by uploading to the website (details to follow).

PHYSICAL MODEL:

This component will be as specified in the Program Handbook, pages 33-38, *except*

- Model size will be no bigger than 25" (w) x 36" (l) x 20" (h).
- Model will be focused on demonstrating the urban agriculture theme/essay topic: Feeding Future Cities.

- The total value of the materials used may not exceed \$50 and must be reported on the Competition Expense form (p. 39).

Model Judging:

- The model will be judged using the modified rubric attached.
- Judging will take place at UTA on the same date as the NTX Regional Competition (date TBA – a Saturday in late January 2015).
- Team of students will stand with their model during judging to answer any questions and *briefly* explain their research solution (urban agriculture). No formal presentation is required or expected.
- Judges will spend approximately 5 minutes with each model display.
- Adults (parents, teachers, mentors) are not allowed to participate. They may stand quietly (out of the way, along the walls) and observe.

PRIZES:

- Future City Competition Junior will provide prizes for Best Essay, Best Model, and Best Overall Junior Team.
- Prizes will consist of a cash award, gift cards for the students and a plaque/certificate.
- Prizes will be presented during the Future City NTX Regional Awards Ceremony later the same day.

OTHER RULES:

- Participants will comply with the basic rules of the Future City Competition program as laid out in the handbook and as modified herein.
- Deadlines will not be extended. Teams making submittals after the deadlines will receive penalty points.
- Any conflicts will be resolved locally. There is no appeal.
- The judges' decisions are final.
- Prizes are not transferable or exchangeable.

Scale Model Rubric (FC Jr.)

	0 No Points Re- quire- ments missing	1 POOR Poor-Fair quali- ty. Fulfills at least 20% of requirements.	2 FAIR Fair-Average quality. Fulfills at least 50% of requirements	3 GOOD Average quality. Fulfills at least 90% of require- ments.	4 VERY GOOD Above average quality. Fulfills 100% of re- quirements.	5 EXCELLENT Excellent quality. Fulfills 100% of requirements. Additional dis- tinctive features.
I. CITY DESIGN (15 POINTS)	0	1	2	3	4	5
1. Model demonstrates theme: Urban Agriculture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating essay topic/theme into model Solutions for urban agriculture 		Little illustration of problem or solution.	Some illustration of problem and attempt at solution.	Fairly good illustration of urban agriculture solution.	Good overall illustration of the urban agriculture solution. Could be more comprehensive.	Excellent illustration and overall solution for urban agriculture problem.
2. City Representation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes clearly recognizable city elements and identifiable structures 		Elements and structures unclear. Little variety.	Elements and structures somewhat clear. Little variety.	Elements and structures clear. Some variety.	Elements and structures clear and some variety. But, could be more comprehensive.	Elements and structures form clear representation of city. Very good variety.
3. City Infrastructure and Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes infrastructure and services essential to support urban agriculture theme 		Shows very little infrastructure and services.	Few infrastructure or service components.	Some infrastructure and services.	Several infrastructure and services. Not all essential theme.	Several infrastructure and services essential to theme.
II. BUILD IT: QUALITY AND SCALE (15 points)						
4. Quality Workmanship and Age Appropriateness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age appropriate for 4-5th grade Quality construction Reasonably durable 		Mediocre quality.	Fair to good quality.	Good quality. Age appropriate.	Very good quality. Age appropriate.	Excellent quality. Age appropriate.
5. Appearance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of color, graphics, shapes, etc. Realistic elements (flora, fauna, landscapes) Good use of available space 		Poor aesthetics.	Fair aesthetics.	Good aesthetics enhance the model.	Very good aesthetics enhance the model.	Excellent aesthetics enhance the model.
6. Model Scale: _____ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate scale chosen to create a good city model Consistent scale throughout model Applied horizontally and vertically 		Inconsistent scale for majority of model.	Fair scale choice. Some scale inconsistencies.	Good scale choice, city elements easy to identify. Scale consistently applied over majority of model.	Very good scale choice; city elements easy to identify. Consistent application.	Exceptional scale choice, city elements very easy to identify. Consistent application of chosen scale across entire model.
III. BUILD IT: MATERIALS AND MOVING PARTS (15 points)						
7. Innovative Construction Materials, Techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variety of materials, imaginative or unusual materials Creative modification and application of materials 		Very few creative materials or modifications.	Little creativity, variety. Little attempt to modify.	Some variety of innovative materials. Some creatively modified.	Good variety of innovative materials. Many creative modifications and applications.	Exceptionally varied and innovative materials. Most creatively modified and applied.
8. Moving Part Innovation and Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one moving part Quality workmanship, durability Repeatability of movement Innovative execution 		One moving part. Fair quality. One time movement.	One moving part. Good quality. Little innovation.	At least one moving part. Good quality. Repeatable movement. Somewhat innovative.	At least one moving part. Very good quality. Repeatable movement. Innovative.	More than one moving part. Excellent quality. Repeatable movement. Highly innovative.

9. Moving Part Relationship to the Design or Function of the City <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one moving part Closely related to function of the city 		Moving part cosmetic; not relevant to city function.	Moving part not relevant to city function.	At least one moving part closely related to city function.	At least one moving part intrinsic to city function.	More than one moving part essential to city function.
IV. JUDGE ASSESSMENT OF DESIGN (15 POINTS)						
10. Innovative, Futuristic Solution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Innovative solution to urban agriculture theme Futuristic, yet plausible and technologically sound 		Poor solution, not innovative or futuristic.	Fair solution. Somewhat innovative and futuristic, but not real plausible.	Good solution. Somewhat innovative, futuristic and plausible.	Very good solution that is innovative and futuristic.	Excellent, innovative, futuristic and plausible solution.
11. Questions and answers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers questions with confidence Accurate and complete answers 		Answers a few questions accurately. No supporting facts.	Students answer at least 50% of the questions accurately, few supporting facts	Students answer 90% of questions with accuracy and some supporting facts.	Answers 100% of the questions accurately with some supporting detail.	Students fully, accurately, and confidently answer all questions with many supporting details.
12. Teamwork <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members supported each other Team members shared time equally Team members displayed an equal amount of knowledge Full complement of team members (three students) 		A small amount of collaboration among team members but more support of one another is needed; one or two tend to dominate.	Some collaboration, some support and sharing among some team members. Amount of knowledge appears unequal. One or two tend to dominate.	Good collaboration; support and sharing among most members. Full complement of three team members. Some team members have more knowledge and dominate	Very good collaboration, support and sharing among the team. Equivalent knowledge level for most of team. Full complement of three team members.	Excellent collaboration, support and sharing among all team members. Equivalent knowledge level for all. Full complement of three team members. No one dominates.