**Comments on the sample booklet from an evaluator’s perspective:**

This team was 1st place at state bowl in 1992, not because the booklet was perfect in every way, but because the team did many things well. They have a complete booklet – all 16 challenges, a complete Underlying Problem, all 16 solution ideas, 5 criteria, 8 ranked solutions, and a complete statement for the Action Plan (not thorough, just written). That is very hard to do in 2 hours.

In Step 1, not all of the challenges counted for fluency, but the more ideas a team has, the more likely it is to get a good **fluency** score. The team has a variety of challenges for a good **flexibility** score – a little heavy on the environment, but there are other categories as well. The team members have tried to explain each challenge; that helps their **clarity** score – if the evaluator can tell what the challenge is, why it’s a challenge, and how it relates to the future scene charge, the team gets a higher clarity score.

Their Underlying Problem has all the necessary parts – a big accomplishment for a junior team. On the other hand, the UP is very close to being a restatement; in fact, a different set of evaluators might have identified it as such, which would have slammed the team’s points in Step 2. [A word of advice to coaches: Train teams to NOT use the exact words of the future scene challenge as the key verb phrase of the UP.] The team’s purpose helps narrow the scope of their key verb phrase, but they would have done better to use their purpose as their KVP and the phrase “reduce conflicts” (from the future scene charge) as their purpose.

The team was able to come up with many solution ideas to their broad UP. Sometimes, a broad UP can get the team off-focus in Step 3 – too many ways to solve the UP without sticking to the topic and the future scene parameters. This team did well, though; most of their ideas address the UP and pertain to land use within the future scene parameters.

Their first four criteria are advanced, which gives them some extra points in Step 4, and they obviously checked their grid and their addition, for all the points possible in Step 5.

The Action Plan is definitely NOT the quality we like to see in high-ranked teams. It is too short, although they did try to explain why it would solve the UP. This would not receive very high scores on effectiveness, impact, and development.

Their scores on the overall section of the scoresheet may have helped this team. Their use of appropriate vocabulary, for example, is one way they have shown their research: *use the land wisely, land for housing, experiments on the land, totally drained of minerals, overuse of land, overcrowding of land, Bureau of Land Management, regulations on how land is used.*

This booklet goes to show that being able to complete a booklet in 2 hours and stick to the topic and future scene charge is often the deciding factor in competition. (Remember the time limit is 3 hours for the Qualifying Problem, 2 hours at State Bowl.) A better UP and a more completely described Action Plan would make this booklet stand out. The team won state bowl, but it is probable that no other junior team that year had a really good UP or an Action Plan that tied to the future scene and topic.

Note: This team won the International Conference Junior Division Championship that year in both booklet and presentation of action plan with a booklet that was much better than this one!

We at Georgia FPSP hope that by seeing a sample booklet from a typical junior division team you will say to yourself,

“My teams can do just as good a job as this team!”

Go for it!