

SLEEP PATTERNS

Practice Problem II - 2019



EVALUATION DIRECTOR'S NOTE

Congratulations on completing PPII! This was an interesting topic and one that I hope your teams had some fun researching and thinking about. Keep that enthusiasm up as you prepare for the State Qualifier – Gamification is another topic that has both future and present implications. As you're researching, keep an eye on the world around you for examples!

SCENARIO WRITING AND SCENARIO PERFORMANCE REMINDER

As we approach the holiday season and your solvers have some down-time, remember: **there's still time to start writing a scenario, either for on-paper submission or performance!** The deadline for the Scenario Writing competition is January 23, and the deadline for Scenario Performance is February 4. If any of your students are interested in these competitions, John and I can get you more information about the requirements, as well as how to register (deadline: December 31).

Both Scenario Writing and Scenario Performance are awesome opportunities for more literary or expressive students to engage with the topics that they've spent so much time researching. I may be biased (scenarios are my favorite things to evaluate... and every year, I write at least one scenario myself, just because I think it's fun), but I do firmly believe that these competitions are both powerful ways to participate in FPS on a uniquely personal level.

EVALUATOR NOTES – THE GOOD STUFF

- Good use of vocabulary and research – a little can really go a long way in this regard. A team demonstrating that they have read the material and have a decent understanding of the concepts at hand can be the difference between a Perhaps and a Yes.
- Teams earned a lot of Category points on both Challenges and Solutions on this solve. While this topic did lend itself well to a variety of perspectives, I want to commend a lot of the solvers for their ability to really highlight into some of the Categories that don't generally get focused on. Keep that flexibility up!
- While this may have been a lot of teams' first attempts at writing Criteria and Action Plans, overall, they did a pretty good job, overall. For the QP, really work on personalizing Criteria to the Underlying

Problem, and writing Criteria that make sense to judge your solutions by, especially to ensure that the identified best solution/Action Plan wins. For example, if a team has already identified that their chosen Action Plan is going to be a large-scale technical implementation, “cheapest” and “quickest to implement” are not going to be ideal Criteria to include (see my note about grid manipulation below).

EVALUATOR NOTES – SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

- Appropriately elaborated Solutions is an area that many teams struggled with on this solve. For a solution to receive E credit, it needs 3 of the following:
 - **Who** will do it
 - A Solution’s “who” must be logical and appropriate. Spending too much time getting creative with cute acronyms is fine if a team has the time, but practical, real-world entities are great -- governmental organizations, charitable organizations, corporations, etc. I would rather see a team say "NASA" and move on with a space-related solution than spend 5 minutes of precious time coming up with "Super Pretty Astronaut Comrade Endeavors - SPACE!" and risk losing out on writing those last few solutions.
 - Also note that unless the invented organization’s name is VERY clear about its purpose, some specification here is needed, as well. “ASDF, a newly-created organization that provides puppies to astronauts, will...” will be counted, where just “ASDF, a newly-created organization, will...” will not.
 - **What** they will do
 - **Why** they will do it
 - **How** they will do it
 - **When** they will do it
 - Just tacking on "in 20xx and beyond" doesn't count. "This solution will take 18 months to implement and should be deployed by late 20xx" is the preferred “when” formulation.
 - The one caution here is that time is also subject to logic. Depending on the sophistication/background of the evaluator, mileage may vary regarding how lenient they will be with time estimates. For example, if I read a solution that says that "X will build an app that does Y. This will be deployed in 3 weeks." I will laugh quietly to myself and absolutely not give that team credit for including a timeframe.
 - **Where** they will do it
 - Again, just tacking on "in [location of FS]" doesn't count. The identified location must be specific and logical to the solution being proposed.
- A number of teams lost points for either misinterpreting or ignoring the Future Scene on their Challenge identification (or, even worse, on their UP!). As teams are preparing, spending some time working on critically thinking about the story being told, and pulling facts directly from the Future Scene. As well, keeping the Future Scene in mind when writing Solutions is important – solutions that were already present in the FS cannot be counted.

- As always, time management is paramount. While I know it can be stressful to move on from a section that you haven't completed fully, sometimes, it can be a more successful strategy to move past those last few empty Challenge or Solution boxes, then have one or two team-members come back to them while the Action Plan is being written. Keeping that forward momentum is important!
- It is an understood fact that most teams do not use the Criteria to rank their solutions after a full and in-depth discussion over the stack-ranked merits of each. However, if it looks like a team has put minimal-to-no effort into using the Grid for its intended purpose, they will get docked for Grid manipulation. Two of the most common "tells" are:
 - Number patterns (column 1: 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8; column 2: 1-2-3-4-5-6-8-7, column 3: 2-1-3-4-5-6-7-8, etc)
 - Egregious or obvious illogical rankings. If the Action Plan that's been chosen/ranked highest is clearly going to be prohibitively expensive or will take a number of years to implement, and some of the other solutions presented in the Grid are inexpensive and/or immediately implementable, evaluators are going to notice the comparative rankings there.

Spending a few minutes discussing what type of Criteria will bolster your chosen best solution can both help your Grid and your Action Plan overall.

SCORE RANKINGS

The tables below indicate all the scores that that received the corresponding ranks.

Junior scores, by rank

Rank 1	141	147	137	117	145	127	110	130	99	101	106
Rank 2	139	124	136	116	140	124	105	91	94	100	105
Rank 3	116	112	128	115	129	115	94	88	92	93	85
Rank 4	97	97	124	112	119	107	87	86	89	91	81
Rank 5	92	73	122	104	112	87	85	80	79	84	78
Rank 6	55	72	84	89	96	42	82	78	78	70	76
Rank 7	72	67	73								

Intermediate scores, by rank

Rank 1	162	157	159	152	137	146	155	122	123	103	128
Rank 2	157	135	153	150	115	112	137	121	121	99	107
Rank 3	148	125	145	126	114	105	128	115	103	97	103
Rank 4	124	94	133	125	112	98	113	114	95	90	95
Rank 5	116	90	132	124	110	96	108	113	89	83	87
Rank 6	105	50	131	59	105	92	56	104	72	78	73
Rank 7	69	93	68	48							

Senior scores, by rank

Rank 1	151
Rank 2	146
Rank 3	113
Rank 4	106
Rank 5	104
Rank 6	92

JIND scores, by rank

Rank 1	140
Rank 2	133
Rank 3	35

MIND scores, by rank

Rank 1	159	169	149
Rank 2	135	158	132
Rank 3	152	118	127
Rank 4	104	111	118
Rank 5	103	103	94

ONWARD TO GAMIFICATION!

