Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
REGION VII - CENTRAL VISAYAS
DIVISION OF CITY SCHOOLS - TAGBILARAN CITY

Office of the Schools Division Superintendent

August 17, 2026

DIVISION MEMORANDUM
No. 669 , s. 2026

STEMAZING CONTEST FOR JHS/SHS
(Division Festival of Talents 2026)

To: All Public Secondary School Heads
All Private Secondary School Heads
All Science Coordinators
All Others Concerned

1. This Office, through the Curriculum and Implementation Division (CID) hereby announces the conduct of **Science STEMAZING Contest on September 3, 2026 at Security Bank Building, Tagbilaran City Central Elementary School, Tagbilaran City.**

2. For **STEMazing Secondary (Grades 7–12),** each team shall be composed of two (2) learners selected from Key Stages 3 and 4. Only one (1) learner per grade level is allowed per team. For example, a team may consist of one (1) Grade 8 learner and one (1) Grade 10 learner, or one (1) Grade 11 learner and one (1) Grade 12 learner. Each team shall be **accompanied by one (1) teacher-coach**.

3. For secondary schools that do not offer both Junior High School and Senior High School, the following options may be considered:

A. Select **two (2) learners from the same school**, provided that they are from **different grade levels**.

B. Allow **two (2) learners from different schools** to form a team and collaborate. The participating learners shall indicate the **name of the school requesting the collaboration**.

4. The time allotment for the High School category is **one hundred fifty (150) minutes**.

5. The following are the designated stations and personnel assigned to oversee the conduct of the contest.

- Station 1: **Maria Hazel Beldoro, Jane Lagare, Preciosa Culajao**
- Station 2: **Elsieditha Miao, Raymond Gone, Anamie Galves**
- Station 3: **Ma. Daisy Lou Merca, Romeo John Balon, Ma. Teresa Auxtero**
- Station 4: **Catherine Patac, Jepson Cuadra, Preciosa Culajao**
- Station 5: **Mae Bastes, Rachelle Mende, Resa Nina Jacob**

H. Zamora St., Dampas, Tagbilaran City, Bohol
(038)427-1702; (038)427-2506
tagbilarancity.division@deped.gov.ph
http://www.depedtagbilaran.org

- Station 6: **Brian Baluca, Florafel Datoy, Mercy Mae Serate**
- Station 7: **Editha Gone, Eutropia Arcayena, Legardo Palaca Jr.**

  - Registration and Secretariat: **Jane Lagare, Ma, Daisy Lou Merca**
  - Program and Ceremonies: **Rache Mende**
  - Tabulation and Ranking: **Jonathan Membreve, Cherry Michelle Collyer**
  - Venue and Physical Arrangement: **Brian Baluca, Raymond Gone**

6. Please refer to the attached enclosures for your information and reference.

7. Immediate dissemination of this Memorandum is directed.

WILFREDA D. BONGALOS PhD CESO V
Schools Division Superintendent

WDB/JAAL/CID/JTB/cmfc

H. Zamora St., Dampas, Tagbilaran City, Bohol
(038)427-1702; (038)427-2506
tagbilarancity.division@deped.gov.ph
http://www.depedtagbilaran.org

C. CRITERIA FOR JUDGING

Category	Maximum Points per Category
Easy	30
Average	30
Difficult	40
TOTAL	**100**

- The total cumulative number of points shall always be 100 points.
- The points per station shall be determined by the organizer based on the nature of the task, provided that the total points and the points for any station do not exceed the maximum points allocated for its respective category.
- Teams shall receive points based on the scoring rubrics.
- The total time to complete the challenges shall be computed but will not affect the score of each team for each station's task.
- In the event of a tie, the judges shall determine the winner based on the total completion time. The team that finishes in the shortest time shall be declared the winner.
- In the event of a tie in both score and time, the judges shall administer a do-or-die question to determine the winner.
- For station/s with written output and oral presentation, and slide deck refer to the criteria below:

Written Output:

Criteria	Score
Content Thematic Relevance and Organization	8
Feasibility of the proposed solution/output (Based on scientific, mathematical, technological, and other valid assumptions)	6
Relevance of data used	6
Total	**20**

Oral Presentation:

Criteria	Score
Discussion/Arguments/Delivery (Based on scientific, mathematical, technological, and other valid assumptions, the feasibility of the proposed solution)	8
Content / Organization	5
Ability to answer the questions	7
Total	**20**

Slide Deck Presentation *(for High School only)*:

Criteria	Score

Problem Analysis and Engineering Design Process	4
Engineering Design Solution	6
Scientific and Mathematical Justification	6
Feasibility and Practicality	4
Total	**20**

- Written output, oral presentation and slide deck activities shall be placed under the difficult categories.
- Refer to the scoring rubric for reference.

B.2 High School

- Teams navigate shall through multiple stations.
- There shall be seven (7) stations for STEMazing High School.
- Stations 1–5 shall focus on the demonstration of skills and learning competencies in Science and Mathematics, while Stations 6 and 7 shall assess participants' ability to integrate and apply these learning competencies through engineering design process, innovation, communication, and collaborative problem solving in response to a real-world STEM challenge.
- Majority of the challenges shall focus on Science competencies.
- The number of stations per category shall be flexible, allowing the organizer to determine the distribution based on factors such as the nature of challenges, availability of materials and equipment, and the contest venue.
- Sample distribution of stations and points is shown below:

Category	Station	Maximum Points
Easy	1	10
	2	10
	3	10
Average	4	15
	5	15
Difficult	6	20
	7	20
TOTAL		**100**

- Challenges shall include:
  - ✓ Application of scientific and mathematical concepts and analysis of real-world data,
  - ✓ Developing scientific and mathematical solutions and solving problems through Engineering Design Process (EDP), and
  - ✓ Presenting solutions and findings.

- Each team shall start at station 1. The next team will proceed after the time interval set by the Technical Working Group (TWG), based on the nature of the task.
- If the venue and resources can accommodate all teams simultaneously, they may start at the same time. However, if space or materials are limited, teams will complete the tasks in batches. Teams waiting for their turn will remain in the designated waiting areas until called.
- Each station will be equipped with sufficient materials and equipment to accommodate at least five teams simultaneously.

- Each station shall have a time limit for completing the task, which shall be determined by the organizer. A digital timer will be provided at every station, which the teams must activate by themselves when they begin their task and deactivate once they finish or choose to discontinue.
- For Station 6 (Slide Deck Making), only one problem scenario shall be given to all participants. Moreover, the station shall cover a maximum of sixty (60) minutes.
- For Station 7 (Oral Presentation), each team presentation shall be limited to three (3) minutes followed by a maximum of seven (7)-minute Question and Answer (Q&A) session.
- All judges may ask questions, provided the Q&A remains within the allocated seven (7)-minute timeframe.
- Each team must complete their presentation within three (3) minutes. For every additional minute beyond the allotted time, one (1) point will be deducted from the team's score for that station.
- A timer shall be assigned for the task.
- Participants are not permitted to return to any previous station they chose to discontinue, even if they still have remaining time. Returning to discontinued stations will result in disqualification from the contest.
- The total maximum time allotted to complete the whole STEMazing challenge is 150 minutes.
- Checkpoint marshal/s at each station shall collect the team's answer or output.
- Any form of communication between the participants and other parties (e.g., coach, parents, classmates, teachers, etc.) shall warrant automatic disqualification from the competition.
- At the end of the competition, the group with the highest cumulative score will be declared the overall champion. In case of a tie in both cumulative score and time, a tie-breaker question will be given.
- A Terms of Reference for the Program Management Team (PMT), Activity Host, Station Marshall, Supervising Marshall, and the Judges shall be provided.
- The decision of the judges shall be final and irrevocable.

C. Safety and Compliance

☐ **General Safety Protocols**

- Teams must stay within designated safe zones
- Mandatory use of specified safety equipment
- Access to water stations and rest areas
- Compliance with station-specific safety guidelines

☐ **Supervision and Support**

- Station Masters present at each checkpoint
- Recognizable medical team on standby throughout the competition
- The safety officer will oversee all activities
- There must be a technical support team for digital components

☐ **Emergency Response Procedures**

- Medical emergency response protocol
- Weather emergency contingency plans
- Technical failure backup systems
- Lost team search and recovery procedure

- **Incident Management**
  - Immediate reporting to Safety Officer
  - Documentation through incident report forms
  - Implementation of appropriate response measures
  - Post-incident analysis and documentation

- **Scoring and Awards**

- **Scoring System Implementation**
  - Digital real-time scoring through station verification
  - Individual judge scoring followed by panel consensus
  - Final verification by Head Judge and Technical Committee

- **Award Categories**
  - Main Awards:
    - Overall Champion (Medals + Certificates)
    - First Runner-up (Medals + Certificates)
    - Second Runner-up (Medals + Certificates)
    - Third Runner-up (Certificates)
    - Fourth Runner-up (Certificates)
  - Recognition:
  - Certificates of recognition for all competing students
    - Certificates of recognition for all coaches

E. Post Competition Rule
The main hall and waiting rooms shall be cleaned and organized by the participants before leaving their respective areas.

Terms of Reference

A. The Program Management Team (PMT) shall:
- ✓ Ensure the systematic and smooth conduct of the event.
- ✓ Coordinate with the Event Focal regarding preparations and requirements.
- ✓ Provide technical support as needed during the activity.
- ✓ Supervise the overall readiness and smooth execution of the contest.

B. The Host shall:
- ✓ Assist the PMT in ensuring the successful conduct of STEMAzing.
- ✓ Lead the group in the preparation, execution, and post-activity tasks regarding:
  a. Venue setup and cleanliness
  b. Manpower deployment
  c. Materials management
  d. Safety and risk management
- ✓ Ensure the billeting quarters and working areas for the Technical Working Group (TWG) are ready and properly arranged.
- ✓ Provide support to the Event Manager in coordinating personnel and logistics during the event.

C. The Event Facilitator shall:
- ✓ Record the beginning and end time of each team in the assigned station.

- ✓ Ensure that answer sheets are properly placed inside the envelope assigned to each team.
- ✓ Endorse all completed envelopes in the station to the Judges.
- ✓ Check the completeness of materials in the assigned station before and during the activity.
- ✓ Assist in the placement of markers, tables, and other related materials needed for the station.
- ✓ Provide technical assistance limited to the provision of necessary materials only.
- ✓ Refrain from coaching, giving hints, or assisting teams in answering tasks.
- ✓ Maintain order and proper documentation within the assigned station.

E. The Judges shall:

- ✓ Be a specialist in the field of STEM.
- ✓ Review competition guidelines and scoring rubrics.
- ✓ Evaluate the outputs based on originality, scientific accuracy, practical application, clarity, and teamwork.
- ✓ Provide impartial scores and constructive feedback.
- ✓ Maintain confidentiality of deliberations and declare any conflict of interest.

(Enclosure No. 2 to DepEd Memorandum No. s. 2027)

Engineering Design Challenge for High School

The Engineering Design Challenge provides participants with an authentic, contextualized STEM problem that requires the application of scientific knowledge, mathematical reasoning, engineering principles, and critical thinking to develop an innovative and feasible solution. The challenge is intended to simulate real-world engineering practice by engaging learners in the Engineering Design Process (EDP), where they analyze a problem, identify design criteria and constraints, generate and justify a solution, and effectively communicate their proposed design.

The focus of the challenge is not solely on arriving at a correct answer, but on demonstrating a systematic and evidence-based design process. Participants are expected to integrate concepts from Science and Mathematics, consider practical constraints and societal needs, and propose solutions that are technically sound, creative, sustainable, and responsive to the given context.

To provide flexibility while ensuring consistency in judging, teams may organize and present their ideas using a format of their choice. However, the presentation must clearly demonstrate the essential components of the Engineering Design Process and address all required contents prescribed in these mechanics. The presentation shall serve as the official basis for the oral presentation and the question-and-answer session.

Required Contents of the Presentation Deck

The presentation deck shall clearly communicate the team's engineering design solution to the given challenge. While the sequence and organization of the presentation are left to the discretion of the team, the presentation **must include** the following components:

1. **Problem Statement**
   Clearly define the engineering problem or challenge to be addressed.
2. **Needs, Criteria, and Constraints**
   Identify the intended users or stakeholders, design requirements, success criteria, and relevant constraints (e.g., cost, materials, time, safety, sustainability, environmental impact).
3. **Background Research and Analysis**
   Present relevant scientific and mathematical concepts, data, evidence, or contextual information that informed the team's understanding of the problem.
4. **Proposed Engineering Solution**
   Describe the proposed solution and explain how it addresses the identified problem and satisfies the stated criteria.
5. **Design Representation**
   Include a labeled sketch, schematic, flowchart, diagram, or conceptual illustration sufficient to explain the proposed design.
6. **Scientific and Mathematical Justification**
   Explain the scientific principles, engineering concepts, mathematical reasoning, calculations, or evidence supporting the proposed design.
7. **Implementation Plan**
   Describe how the proposed solution could be developed or implemented, including the major steps, required resources, and practical considerations.

8. **Evaluation of the Proposed Design**
   Explain how the effectiveness of the proposed solution may be evaluated, including anticipated outcomes, potential limitations, possible risks, and opportunities for improvement.
9. **References**
   Properly acknowledge all sources of information, data, images, and other materials used in developing the presentation.
10. **AI Use Declaration**
    The presentation shall include a declaration indicating whether Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools were used in preparing the presentation. If AI tools were used, the team shall specify the tool(s) used, the purpose of use, and affirm that the team's analysis, engineering decisions, and final presentation are their own work and that all AI-generated content has been critically reviewed and verified for accuracy.

Presentation Requirements

- The presentation shall consist of **not more than ten (10) content slides**, excluding the title slide.
- The organization, sequence, visual design, and layout of the presentation shall be determined by the team.
- All required contents listed above must be addressed in the presentation.
- You may use any slide deck application and any other application to enhance your presentation.
- The submitted presentation shall serve as the official basis for the oral presentation and the subsequent question-and-answer session.

(Enclosure No. 2 to DepEd Memorandum No. s. 2027)

Rubric for Scoring for Written Outputs

Criteria	Max Point	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content Thematic Relevance and Organization	8	**8 - 7 pts** Comprehensive, logical, and strongly aligned with theme Well-structured, follows all format guidelines	**6 - 5 pts** Mostly clear and relevant, minor gaps Mostly organized, minor format issues	**4 - 3 pts** Limited depth, some inconsistencies Some disorganization, noticeable format errors	**2 pts – 1 pt** Incomplete or off-topic Poor structure, ignores format
Feasibility of Proposed Solution	6	**6 pts** Highly practical, based on valid scientific, mathematical, technological principles	**5 - 4 pts** Generally feasible, minor assumptions unclear	**3 - 2 pts** Limited feasibility, weak assumptions	**1 pt** Impractical or unsupported
Relevance of Data Used	6	**6 pts** Uses accurate, credible, and well-integrated data	**5 - 4 pts** Mostly relevant and credible data	**3 - 2 pts** Some irrelevant or weak sources	**1 pt** Data inaccurate or missing
Total	**20**				

(Enclosure No. 2 to DepEd Memorandum No. s. 2027)

Rubric for Scoring for Slide Deck Presentation

Criterion	Excellent	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
1. Problem Analysis and Engineering Design Process (4 pts)	**4 pts** – Clearly defines the problem, identifies stakeholders, criteria, and constraints, and demonstrates a systematic application of the Engineering Design Process.	**3 pts** – Defines the problem and identifies most criteria and constraints with minor omissions.	**2 pts** – Problem analysis is partially developed; important criteria or constraints are missing.	**1 pt** – Problem is poorly defined or lacks a clear engineering design process.
2. Engineering Design Solution (6 pts)	**6 pts** – Solution is innovative, technically sound, and fully addresses the identified problem while meeting the stated criteria and constraints.	**5 pts** – Solution adequately addresses the problem and is generally feasible, with minor weaknesses.	**3–4 pts** – Solution partially addresses the problem but lacks completeness, innovation, or technical soundness.	**1–2 pts** – Solution is impractical, incomplete, or does not adequately address the problem.
3. Scientific and Mathematical Justification (6 pts)	**6 pts** – Solution is thoroughly supported by accurate scientific principles, mathematical reasoning, engineering concepts, and relevant evidence or data.	**5 pts** – Scientific and mathematical concepts generally support the solution, with only minor inaccuracies or gaps.	**3–4 pts** – Limited or partially accurate scientific and mathematical justification.	**1–2 pts** – Justification is inaccurate, insufficient, or largely unsupported by scientific or mathematical principles.
4. Feasibility and Practicality of the Proposed Solution (4 pts)	**4 pts** – Solution is realistic, implementable, sustainable, and appropriately considers cost, safety, available resources, environmental impact, and other practical constraints.	**3 pts** – Solution is generally feasible but has minor practical limitations.	**2 pts** – Feasibility is only partially demonstrated; several practical considerations are overlooked.	**1 pt** – Solution is impractical or fails to consider major implementation constraints.

(Enclosure No. 2 to DepEd Memorandum No. s. 2027)

SAMPLE SCORESHEET

STATION	CORRECT/ACCOMPLISHED	SCORE	TIME (in minutes:seconds)
Team 1			
1	**CORRECT**	**5**	**5:00**
2	**CORRECT**	**8**	**6:30**
3	**ACCOMPLISHED**	**10**	**5:30**
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
TOTAL		**94**	**170:40**

Prepared by:

_____

Signature over Printed Name
Judge 1

(Enclosure No. 2 to DepEd Memorandum No. s. 2027)

Rubric for Scoring for Oral Presentation / Argument

Criteria	Max Point	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Delivery/ Discussion of Arguments	8	**8 - 7 pts** Arguments are clear, logical, and strongly supported by scientific, mathematical, and technological principles; delivery is confident and engaging.	**6 - 5 pts** Arguments are mostly clear and supported by valid assumptions; delivery is generally good.	**4 - 3 pts** Arguments lack depth or clarity; limited support from valid assumptions; delivery needs improvement.	**2 pts – 1 pt** Arguments are weak, unclear, or unsupported; delivery is ineffective.
Content Presentation and Organization	5	**5 pts** Demonstrates full knowledge by presenting details with explanations and elaboration	**4 pts** At ease with presenting details without much elaboration	**3 pts** Uncomfortable with presenting information and is able to present details but without elaboration	**2 pts – 1 pt** Does not have a grasp of details during the presentation, cannot elaborate the information presented
Ability to Answer Questions	7	**7 pts** Accurate, confident, and well-supported answers	**6 - 5 pts** Mostly accurate, minor hesitation	**4 - 3 pts** Limited accuracy, vague answers	**2 pts – 1 pt** Incorrect or no answers
Total	**20**				

Note: Oral presentation will be based on the written output.