## 2024 Hackathon Judging Rubric

(adapted from the University of Illinois Hackathon Rubric)

## **General**

|  | **General Rubric** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Creativity** | **Product Design (UI/UX)** | **Problem/Target Market Identification** | **Impact** | **Category-Specific** |
| **4 (Highest Score)** | Project tackles a new/relevant problem with an innovative solution. Significant effort has been made towards setting the solution apart from existing solutions and solving for either a new problem, or solving an already-tackled problem in a novel way. | Project is incredibly intuitive and user interaction is smooth. On every part of the user flow, it is clear what functionality is available and what the purpose is. A user manual is not necessary to understand how to use the product.  Visual appearance is excellent and well thought-out, following good design principles including color contrast, reasonable font size, etc. Product considers accessibility in design and is catered towards the target audience. (e.g. an app for toddlers having an audio option in the case that they aren't yet reading fluently.) | Clear identification of a specific problem and target audience. Evident that research was done and there is a reasonable understanding of both the problem and audience while approaching the product.  Product is clearly built to address problem rather than fitting a product into a problem. The pain points of the users are addressed and solved by the product.  Team conducted or referenced some form of user research. | Solution clearly addresses an existing problem or need. Makes meaningful and relevant impact to the end user (also identified) and has a positive outcome. User pain points are addressed and solved for.  Aspects such as cost-effectiveness, practicality, and time constraint are taken into account when presenting the solution.  Team conducted or referenced some form of user research. | See category rubric. |
| **3** | Project is original and not generic.  May reference existing solutions. Designers/engineers often reference existing solutions before building their own, so this isn't necessarily an indication of getting a 3 vs 4. However, if the solution incorrectly preserves aspects of existing technology that does not pertain to their problem statement, that would warrant a 3 as opposed to a 4. | Project is reasonable intuitive, fairly easy to use. Some areas may need an explanation but that info is provided either in the demo or in the description.  Visual appearance is good but not exceptional. Product considers accessibility in design and is catered towards the target audience. | Clear identification of a specific problem and target audience. There is a reasonable understanding of both the problem and audience while approaching the product.  Product is built to address problem rather than fitting a product into a problem. However, product does not fully address target audience’s problem, misunderstands the target audience, or only partially addresses the pain points. | Meaningful impact to end user. The problems and solutions are clearly defined. Solution is practical in context of the need or problem. |
| **2** | Project is similar to an existing technology but adds a slight improvement/different feature. Project does not necessarily tackle problems in a unique way or select a new issue that hasn't been explored before. | Project is usable, but confusing.  Visual appearance and design principles seem like an afterthought. Accessibility and target audience were not considerations. | General problem identification, but could be clearer in selecting a problem and target audience. Satisfactory understanding of both.  Seems like the product is stuffed into a problem or that the problem is created around the product, as opposed to the product serving an existing need or problem. | Solution only partially addresses user pain points, but still attempts to deliver meaningful impact to the target audience for the problem or need. Lacking in practicality. |
| **1 (Lowest Score)** | Project is almost exactly the same, or worse, as previously existing technologies, nothing new is being introduced. | Project is difficult to use.  Visual appearance detracts from functionality. Good design principles are largely ignored. | Little to no effort in identifying and understanding a target audience and problem. | Provides little to no benefit to the end user, or is not clear. |

## **Category Specific**

|  | **Categories (select the correct column based on which category the team has submitted to, and place the score in the category-specific column of the general rubric)** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Data Science** | **Community** | **Beginner** |
| **4 (Highest Score)** | Dataset is interpreted and used in a meaningful way. Central component of the project. Dataset has substantial and relevant data.  Data science techniques are carefully selected and impactful to the theme of the project. Any visualization presented is effective and powerful in conveying information. Any analysis done is clearly explained and key information is extracted to be presented to the viewer.  Analysis and visualization techniques are industry-standard. Libraries are used for efficiency and accuracy instead of manual calculation where applicable. | Solution is relevant to an existing need or problem and demonstrates the potential to have a significant positive impact.  Presentation takes into consideration how the solution may differ in implementation based on geographical, cultural, and regional differences, and identifies the scope of impact clearly. | Completely developed product which does not sacrifice any usability. Works flawlessly, although may still be simple. Clear sense of direction towards product expansion and meaningful applications.  Students demonstrate learning, ambition, and growth. |
| **3** | Dataset is interpreted and used, but could be used more extensively.  Techniques are carefully selected and powerful in conveying information, whether that be visualization or analysis. Slightly lacking in the usage of industry-standard practices and may not be using the right libraries at the appropriate times. | Solution is relevant to an existing need or problem and demonstrates the potential to have a positive impact. Problem statement is clear and identifies a pressing need, but the solution only partially addresses that need.  Presentation attempts to take into consideration how the solution may differ in implementation based on geographical, cultural, and regional differences, and identifies the scope of impact. | Fully functioning and fledged out working product, although simple. Good design, usability and can successfully be implemented to solve identified problems. |
| **2** | Dataset may not be the best fit for the project, but still somewhat relevant. Analysis and visualization techniques are carefully selected, but may not necessarily be clear or effective in their presentation. Project might not be making use of existing libraries and industry standard practices. | Solution is relevant to an existing need, but only minimally addresses that need. Goal is clearly stated but impact does not align fully with that. | App functions and can be used smoothly without difficulty. Integrates basic app development techniques. Feature set has the potential to solve identified problems. |
| **1 (Lowest Score)** | Dataset is not interpreted or used. Dataset is too sparse to be used for a project of this scale. Attempts at visualization and analysis are ineffective and unclear. | Minimal attempt is made at identifying an important cause, and discussing nuance surrounding how the solution would be implemented. | App struggles to incorporate basic functionality, glitchy, and does not seem to be particularly applicable. |