

JUDGING CRITERIA						
S. NO	CRITERIA	POOR (1)	SATISFACTORY (2)	AVERAGE (3)	GOOD (4)	EXCELLENT (5)
1	INNOVATION	The technology stack chosen was insufficient and poorly aligned with the project requirements. The selected languages and tools did not address the project needs, resulting in limited features and potential compatibility issues.	The technology stack was suitable but lacked optimization. The chosen languages and tools partially fulfilled the project's needs but exhibited shortcomings, causing minor hindrances in development and potentially affecting scalability and efficiency.	The technology stack was reasonably chosen, aligning with the project's primary requirements. The selected languages and tools adequately met the project's needs, demonstrating a moderate level of effectiveness and compatibility, but improvements could enhance performance and efficiency.	The technology stack was well-chosen, demonstrating effectiveness in fulfilling the project's requirements. The selected languages and tools contributed to efficient development, scalability, and performance, but minor improvements can be made.	The technology stack was chosen impeccably, showcasing a thorough understanding of the project's needs. The selected languages and tools resulted in outstanding performance, seamless integration, high scalability, and efficiency.
2	DESIGN	The design was completed early but lacked adequacy and functionality. The interface was subpar, and navigation was difficult for users.	The design was completed within the allotted time, but the UI/UX elements were of poor quality. The interface was not intuitive, causing confusion for users.	The design demonstrated effective time management and consideration for the user experience. The UI/UX elements were well-prepared and visually appealing, enhancing usability.	The design maintained good usability and engaged users effectively. The interface facilitated meaningful interactions, enhancing the overall user experience.	The design was exceptionally well-crafted, providing a perfect user interface. It effectively presented visually pleasing graphics. The interface was user-friendly and exhibited outstanding design.
3	PRESENTATION	The presentation was completed early, the slides were inadequate, and the presenter merely read from them.	The presentation was completed within the allotted time, but the slides were of poor quality.	The presentation demonstrated effective time management, and the slides were well-prepared and visually appealing.	The presenters maintained time efficiently and covered all the topics with great appeal	The slides were perfectly designed, and the content effectively presented key information with supporting evidence and graphics along with time management
4	COLLABORATION	There was a limited understanding of the problem statement, and the innovation in addressing the problem was minimal. The proposed features or solutions lacked creativity, novelty, or meaningful enhancements to existing solutions.	The team had a foundational understanding of the problem statement, but the innovation was basic and offered incremental improvements. The proposed features were innovative but did not significantly stand out or bring solutions to the problem.	The team had a reasonable grasp of the problem statement, and the innovation in addressing it was adequate. The proposed features showed moderate innovation, offering valuable enhancements and introducing some new elements that contributed to solving the problem.	The team demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the problem statement, and the innovation was significant. The proposed features displayed creativity, addressing the problem in an efficient manner. The innovative solutions brought substantial value and differentiation.	The team exhibited an exceptional understanding of the problem statement, showcasing pioneering innovation. The proposed features showed uniqueness in concepts which showcased remarkable creativity.
5	IMPLEMENTATION	The team implemented a minimal number of features, and the majority of team members did not actively contribute. The strategy lacked planning and execution, resulting in an inadequate demonstration of the project's potential.	The team implemented basic features, but the scope was limited. Only a portion of the team actively participated, and the strategy had shortcomings in planning and coordination, hindering the project's progress.	The team implemented a moderate number of features, demonstrating reasonable progress. A fair number of team members participated, but there were instances of inadequate planning or coordination, affecting the project's overall efficiency.	The team implemented a substantial number of features, showcasing significant progress. The majority of team members actively participated and contributed effectively. The strategy was well-structured, facilitating successful feature development.	The team implemented a comprehensive set of features, displaying exceptional progress. Every team member actively participated and played a vital role in the project's success. The strategy was well planned and executed, ensuring the efficient development of all planned features.