## **Classical AI Judging Rubric**

	Needs Improvement (1-2 points)	Satisfactory (3-4 points)	Good (5-6 points)	Great (7-8 points)	Excellent (9-10 points)
Business Understanding & Solution Design  How effectively does the team translate the business problem into a well-defined technical challenge? How well do they develop an algorithmic solution, including appropriate model selection, tuning, and application, to address that challenge?	The team demonstrates poor understanding of the business problem, misidentifying key challenges or focusing on irrelevant aspects. The solution design lacks alignment with the business objectives and fails to offer a meaningful or viable approach.	The team shows some awareness of the business problem, but there are significant gaps in understanding. The proposed solution is partially aligned with business needs, but it lacks depth or relevance in addressing the core challenges.	The team demonstrates a basic understanding of the business problem, identifying key issues. The solution design is reasonably aligned with business objectives, offering a somewhat relevant approach, though it may miss opportunities for optimization or refinement.	The team shows a good understanding of the business problem, clearly identifying key challenges and business needs. The solution design is well-aligned, addressing the problem with a relevant, coherent approach that demonstrates a solid grasp of both business and technical aspects.	The team excels at translating the business problem into a precise, well-structured technical challenge. The solution showcases excellent model selection, thorough tuning, and an optimal application of the algorithm, fully addressing the business challenge with a high degree of relevance and technical sophistication.
Handling Data  How well does the solution handle complex datasets with null values, outliers, non-numeric field types, and other anomalies?	The solution struggles to manage the dataset effectively, failing to address null values, outliers, non-numeric field types, or other anomalies. Data handling is minimal or poorly executed, leading to a significant impact on the quality of the results.	The solution demonstrates a basic approach to handling datasets, addressing some issues like null values or outliers, but there are significant gaps in handling more complex data anomalies. The team's approach is incomplete and affects the reliability of the solution.	The solution handles common data issues like null values and outliers, with a moderate level of effectiveness. However, it may lack robustness in addressing more complex anomalies such as non-numeric fields or edge cases. Data handling is adequate but could be improved.	The solution handles a wide range of data challenges, including null values, outliers, and non-numeric field types, with a thoughtful and structured approach. The team demonstrates good data cleaning and preprocessing techniques, resulting in reliable and well-prepared data for analysis.	The solution excels in handling complex datasets, managing null values, outliers, non-numeric fields, and other anomalies with advanced techniques. The team demonstrates a deep understanding of data preprocessing and cleansing, ensuring that the data is highly reliable, clean, and well-prepared for the solution's algorithms.
Effectiveness of Models How well does the model perform against performance metrics?	The model performs poorly against key performance metrics. It fails to meet basic	The model shows some ability to perform against performance metrics	The model performs reasonably well against key performance metrics,	The model performs well against most performance metrics, consistently achieving	The model excels across all relevant performance metrics, consistently delivering

	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory (3-4	Good (5-6 points)	Great (7-8 points)	Excellent (9-10
	(1-2 points)	points)			points)
	thresholds, with low accuracy, precision, recall, or other relevant measures. The solution is largely ineffective and does not produce useful results.	but falls short in key areas. It may meet minimal expectations, but overall effectiveness is limited, with inconsistent performance across accuracy, precision, recall, or other metrics.	meeting basic expectations for accuracy, precision, recall, or similar measures. While there is room for improvement, the solution is generally effective in addressing the problem.	solid results in accuracy, precision, recall, or other relevant measures. The solution is effective, with only minor areas that could be optimized further.	high accuracy, precision, recall, or other key measures. The solution is highly effective and optimized for the task, demonstrating excellent technical proficiency and performance.
Presentation  How clearly does the presentation detail the approach?	The presentation is unclear and lacks structure. Key details about the approach, such as methodology, process, or decision-making, are missing or poorly explained, making it difficult to understand the team's solution.	The presentation provides some explanation of the approach, but important details are unclear or missing. The overall flow is disjointed, and the methodology or decision-making process is only partially explained.	The presentation adequately explains the approach, including the methodology and key decisions. However, some areas may lack clarity or depth, and the flow could be improved for better understanding.	The presentation is clear and well-organized, providing a thorough explanation of the approach, including methodology, process, and key decision points. The team communicates their solution effectively, though there may be minor areas for improvement in clarity or structure.	The presentation is exceptionally clear, well-structured, and detailed. The approach is explained with precision, including methodology, process, and decisions, making it easy to understand. The team communicates their solution in an engaging and highly professional manner.
Overall Score					