

# Scoring Rubric for CharterHacks

Team/Project Name:

Category	No Credit (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Effective (2 points)	Excellent (3 points)
<b>Fit</b> Does the product address the prompt?	The project has very little or no application. The project does not address the prompt or is too loosely correlated.	The project has an unclear application to the prompt. The project addresses the prompt vaguely though some connection may be seen after a few minutes of thought	The content of the project indirectly addresses the prompt. The project has a somewhat clear application and correlation is apparent. It is easy to see the correlation.	The content of the project directly addresses the prompt. The project has applications in a clear, unique way. Alternatively, the project develops a new idea that fits the hackathon goals well by coordinating with the organizers.
<b>Innovation</b> Does the product introduce a new approach or perspective, technical, analytical, or visual?	Unoriginal and already repeated multiple times. Borderline plagiarism.	The code is a variation of established design but still is widely based on a recurrent past theme. The new code provides a slightly improved version of the old one.	The new project tackles a problem that has been overlooked/ignored in the past or attacks a problem with a new angle / on a bigger scale / on a higher level	The project is very innovative and attacks an overlooked/ignored problem with a new approach and angle. It stands out amongst other projects.
<b>Functionality</b> Does the product function as intended? Is it robust and easy to interact with?	The project does not work (i.e. buttons don't do anything). Disrupts UX	The project kind of works. Less than half of the functions do what it is intended to do	The project is mostly-functional. Does most of the intended functions, but some noticeable flaws still exist	The project is fully functional - meets intentions. Very few (if any) minor bugs.
<b>Design</b> Is the product aesthetically pleasing? Does the design of the product elevate its message?	No design. The project is very mundane and looks like a like something produced in the 20th century	Eases the UI and UX. The message is somewhat muddled from unattractive and confusing design.	The project is well designed and easy to use. Clear message. additional directions are needed to easily navigate the project.	The message is fresh, creative, and compelling. The design is beautiful. Could win a Nobel Prize in Digital Arts. The project is largely self-explanatory.
<b>Extensibility</b> Can the product be easily expanded in the future?	The project is not interactive in any way and is not utilizing code.  (Wix, Google Sites, Scratch)	The project is interactive and code is easily accessible, but it does not use open frameworks or is difficult to further develop.	The project uses conventions that make it extensible. It distinguishes between data, code, front end design, and uses open frameworks.	The overall project is very clear how it was developed (framework, coding conventions, naming conventions), and has some in-code documentation attached to it, which makes it easy to be expanded by other coders.
<b>Presentation</b> How alluring and effective was the video? Does the video detail the code?	The video bored judges to sleep. Monotone, no code shown, and no "fun" parts. No music in the background. Does not answer the questions.	Video shows code but does not describe it. Not very attractive; comparable to a PowerPoint presentation produced in 5 minutes. Somewhat answers the questions.	The video describes code and is a good presentation. The judges would like if there was more information on the code though. Answers all questions, but there is some confusion in certain parts.	Video has flavor. The code is effectively detailed and quite understandable. Time was definitely spent on the project and video. Answers all the questions thoroughly and all parts are understandable.

Total Score:

(Out of 18)

Judge Name: