Hackathon Scoring Rubric

Category #1: Ambition of Problem

Scale and complexity of the problem being explored.

Category scoring (1-5):

- 1 - There are already existing solutions for this problem that are identical or very similar.
- 2 - The new code provides a better/faster/clearer way to attack the problem than existing solutions.
- 3 - The new code adds functionality beyond that provided by the old code.
- 4 - The new project tackles a problem that has been overlooked or ignored in the past, or attacks a problem with a new angle / on a bigger scale / on a higher level.
- 5 - The new project attacks an entirely new problem, and provides a good solution.

Category #2: Innovation of Solution

Scale and novelty of the technology being used, and/or the architectural approach taken.

Category scoring (1-5):

- 1 - The chosen technology and design is already deeply established at BetterCloud.
- 2 - The code adds a new twist on established design (e.g. exploring a new Java library).
- 3 - The project adds a major departure from established design (e.g. exploring a new Java framework, or new Kafka-replacement middleware, etc).
- 4 - The project makes a profound break from established design (e.g. implemented in an entirely different programming language, uses an entirely different deployment or infrastructure model, a major new architectural direction we've never done here, etc).
- 5 - The technology or design breaks new ground, not only here at BetterCloud, but in the industry at large.

Quality of Implementation

Ability for the team to reach a conclusion about the viability of the project.

Category scoring (1, 3, 5):

- 1 - The team was not able to offer a conclusion.
- 3 - The team offered a definitive conclusion with no reason, or evidence backing it.
- 5 - The team offered a definitive conclusion with a well thought out reason, or evidence backing it.

People Impact

Total impact of the idea and impact on cost of goods sold (COGS).

Category scoring (1-5):

- 1 - The functionality provides little to no benefit to the "end user" and it has a major negative impact on COGS.
- 2 - The functionality provides little to no benefit to the "end user" but it has no negative impact on COGS.
- 3 - The functionality provides significant benefit to the "end user" but it has a major negative impact on COGS.
- 4 - The functionality provides significant benefit to the "end user" and it has little to no impact on COGS.
- 5 - The functionality provides significant benefit to the "end user" and it has a major positive impact on COGS.

Quality of Presentation

Ability for the judges to clearly understand (a) what the desired functionality is, and (2) see that the functionality is behaving as expected.

Category scoring (1-5):

- 1 - The visualizations obscured the functionality, and the desired functionality was unclear.
- 2 - The visualizations obscured the functionality, and the desired functionality was poorly explained.
- 3 - The visualizations were difficult to understand and the functionality was poorly described/explained.
- 4 - The visualizations were clear but the functionality was poorly described/explained.
- 5 - The visualizations clearly showed the functionality working as described.