Grading Rubric

CleanerGrid 2026

November 2025

CleanerGrid 2026 - Grading Rubrics

This document contains two grading rubrics – one for the written submission and one for the video. These rubrics provide clear and transparent criteria for evaluating submissions in the CleanerGrid 2026 competition. They are intended to serve as a guide for both students and the assessment panel by outlining expectations for the submitted work.

Submissions must include **both** a Written Report and a Video Submission. If either component is missing, the entry will **not be assessed**.

The final score will be calculated using the following weighting:

- **Written Report** – 70% of the total score

- **Video Submission** – 30% of the total score

Submissions will be scored on criteria weighted according to their importance. For each criterion, the assessment panel will assign a score from **0 to 5**, based on the description that best reflects the overall quality of the work. The bullet points illustrate typical features of work at that level— meeting any or most of these indicators may suggest placement in that category. Submissions do not need to meet all listed points to receive a score for that level.

If a submission falls between two levels, an intermediate score may be awarded (e.g., **4** if the work is stronger than "Good" but not fully "Excellent," or **2** if it is better than "Limited" but not fully "Good").

Scoring Guide:

- **5 = Excellent**

- **3 = Good**

- **1 = Limited**

- **0 = Poor**

Students are encouraged to use this document to review their work before submission and identify areas for improvement. This approach promotes fairness and transparency.

CleanerGrid 2026 - Written Submission Grading Rubric

Intermediate scores (4 and 2) may be awarded for work that falls between levels.

Criteria	Excellent - 5	Good - 3	Limited - 1	Poor - 0
1. Abstract & Relevance of work (10%) Assesses how clearly the submission addresses the CleanerGrid theme of offshore wind opportunities and challenges, and how they introduce their project's area of focus.	• Engaging with clear thesis • Fully addresses the CleanerGrid theme and outlines scope of the report • Provides strong context for the report	• Clear thesis • Addresses CleanerGrid theme but lacks depth • Slightly vague outline of the scope of the report • Context is adequate	• Unclear thesis • Limited link to CleanerGrid theme • Scope of the report unclear	• No clear introduction • Theme not addressed • Lacks context
2. Methods & Feasibility (30%) Evaluates the technical and practical soundness of the proposed approach, including how it could be implemented.	• Detailed, realistic methods • Strong technical feasibility • Considers existing grid infrastructure and constraints	• Feasible approach • Some detail missing • Addresses basic implementation	• Conceptual only • Lacks practical depth • Limited consideration of grid constraints	• No clear method • Idea impractical • Missing implementation details
3. Results & Impact (20%) Looks at the outcomes and findings of the project and their implications for policy, economics, or energy systems.	• Presents clear, insightful results that address objectives • Demonstrates strong policy, economic, or system relevance • Original, clearly labelled visuals (e.g., tables, diagrams) that directly support and enhance the analysis, fully integrated into the narrative • Applies accurate analyses with transparent assumptions	• Presents results with moderate depth • Shows some relevance to policy, economic, or system context • Provides limited data support • Analysis lacks full integration • Relevant and mostly clear visuals with some integration into the text, though they may lack originality or full clarity	• Results unclear or minimally explained • Weak analysis with little interpretation • Minimal supporting data • Visuals are present but generic, unclear, or poorly labelled, with limited relevance to the findings	• No meaningful results presented • No evidence of impact or analysis • No supporting data • No visuals, or visuals are confusing, irrelevant, or copied without interpretation

4. Conclusion & Completeness (15%) Assesses how well the submission wraps up, reflects on broader impacts, and shows a complete, multidisciplinary view.	• Restates main argument and highlights relevance • Connects insights across disciplines • Summarises and interprets key results and implications • Links back to research question • Provides reflective perspective and recommendations	• Adequate conclusion with some relevance • Touches on multiple perspectives but lacks depth • Partial summary and interpretation of results • Minimal reflection or future recommendations	• Weak or narrow conclusion • Little or no summary or interpretation • Minimal integration of perspectives • No clear recommendations	• No conclusion provided • No summary, interpretation, or reflection • No multidisciplinary view
5. Organisation & Communication (10%) Measures clarity, structure, and effectiveness of writing, visuals, and overall presentation.	• Clear, logical structure • Excellent visuals and writing • Smooth flow of ideas	• Generally clear structure • Adequate visuals and writing • Minor flow issues	• Disorganised structure • Weak visuals • Hard to follow	• Poorly structured • Unclear writing • Visuals absent
6. Evidence, Referencing & AI Use (15%) Evaluates the use of credible sources, proper citation, and appropriate integration of AI tools to support—not replace—original thinking.	• Original insights made by student(s) • Supports claims with strong academic sources • Consistent Harvard or IEEE citation style • Complete reference list provided • AI tools used transparently and appropriately to enhance—not replace—original analysis	• Some original thinking present • Generally, supports claims • Some academic sources • Applies Harvard or IEEE citation style with only minor citation issues • List of References provided with only minor mistakes • AI use evident but does not dominate	• Minimal personal insight • Limited evidence to support claims • Few sources or non-academic sources used • Citation style inconsistent or incorrect. • List of References provided with some mistakes. • AI-generated content noticeably shapes structure or tone	• No original contribution • Does not backup claims with evidence • No citations or no list of references • Submission appears heavily or fully AI-generated
7. Compliance (pass/fail) Compliant word count and inclusion of all the following: AI Use Declaration and Team Contribution (where applicable).	**• All compliance items fully met and documented.**			**• Missing.**

CleanerGrid 2026 - Video Submission Grading Rubric

Intermediate scores (4 and 2) may be awarded for work that falls between levels.

Criteria (Weight & Description)	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Limited (1)	Poor (0)
1. Content & Relevance (30%) Assesses how well the video addresses the CleanerGrid theme, including opportunities, challenges, and insights. Must align with the Written Report and clearly present findings and conclusions.	• Fully aligned with theme • Covers opportunities & challenges • Strong supporting details • Clearly presents findings and conclusions	• Mostly aligned with theme • Covers main points • Some supporting details	• Limited alignment • Misses key points • Few details	• Off-topic or unclear • Lacks substance • No supporting details
2. Structure & Flow (20%) Logical organisation and smooth transitions.	• Clear, logical sequence • Smooth transitions • Easy to follow	• Mostly logical • Minor flow issues • Generally clear	• Disorganised sections • Hard to follow • Weak transitions	• No clear structure • Confusing flow • Jumps between ideas
3. Visual & Audio Quality (15%) Effective use of visuals, sound, and editing.	• High-quality visuals • Clear audio • Professional editing	• Adequate visuals • Mostly clear audio • Basic editing	• Poor visuals • Audio issues • Minimal editing	• Distracting visuals • Unclear audio • No editing
4. Engagement & Creativity (15%) Captures viewer interest and uses creative elements.	• Highly engaging • Creative approach • Strong storytelling	• Some engagement • Moderate creativity • Clear message	• Limited engagement • Minimal creativity • Weak message	• No engagement • No creativity • Unclear message
5. Time Management (10%) Adheres to allotted time effectively.	• All content covered without rushing • Does not exceed 15 minutes	• Most content covered • Minor rushing • Slightly exceeds 15 minutes	• Misses key content • Noticeable rushing • Significantly under or over 15 minutes	• Major gaps • Disorganised timing • Excessively under or over 15 minutes
6. Clarity of Voice & Language (10%) Clear speech and appropriate language	• Very clear speech • Professional tone • Easy to understand	• Mostly clear • Minor tone issues • Understandable	• Hard to hear or follow • Informal tone • Some unclear phrasing	• Unclear speech • Distracting tone • Difficult to understand
7. Compliance (pass/fail) • At least half of team members speak • Citations are shown as on-screen captions in Harvard or IEEE style • A reference slide is included at the end • Uploaded as an unlisted YouTube link • Content aligns with the Written Report	• All compliance items fully met.			• Missing compliance item.