

INNOVATE4IMPACT GLOBAL CHALLENGE

Detailed Judge Assessment Rubric & Scoring Guide

Theme: *Young Minds. Bold Ideas. Technology for Impact.*

Purpose:

The Innovate4Impact Challenge assesses students on their ability to identify real-world problems linked to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), develop innovative technology-enabled solutions, take meaningful community action, influence behaviour and demonstrate measurable impact.

The judging framework evaluates not only the idea but also the **complete innovation journey**:

Problem → Evidence → Innovation → Technology → Community Action → Campaign → Prototype → Impact → Business/Sustainability → Pitch

A. JUDGING CRITERIA

No.	Criterion	Maximum
1	SDG & Impact	10
2	Innovation & Creativity	15
3	Technology	10
4	Entrepreneurship & Business Model	10
5	Feasibility & Prototype	10

6	Community Service & Engagement	5
7	Campaign & Behaviour Change	5
8	Media & Storytelling	5
9	Scalability	5
10	Teamwork & Leadership	5
11	Pitch, Communication & Q&A	20
	TOTAL	100

1. SDG & IMPACT — 10 POINTS

Judges assess how well the team understands the problem, connects it to the SDGs and demonstrates potential for measurable impact.

9–10 Outstanding

The team:

- Tackles a significant climate, environmental or social challenge.
- Clearly identifies the relevant SDG(s).
- Demonstrates excellent understanding of the problem.
- Uses credible research and evidence.

- Clearly identifies beneficiaries.
- Demonstrates why the problem matters.
- Provides realistic and measurable impact indicators.
- Shows how the proposed solution could contribute to meaningful SDG progress.

7–8 Strong

The team:

- Addresses an important and relevant challenge.
- Clearly connects the project to one or more SDGs.
- Provides good research and evidence.
- Identifies beneficiaries.
- Demonstrates realistic potential for positive impact.
- Provides some measurable outcomes.

4–6 Developing

The team:

- Addresses a relevant problem.
- Makes a basic connection to the SDGs.
- Provides limited research or evidence.
- Has a mainly theoretical impact.
- Provides few measurable outcomes.

0–3 Weak

The team:

- Has a weak or unclear connection to the SDGs.
- Demonstrates limited understanding of the problem.
- Provides little or no supporting evidence.
- Does not clearly identify beneficiaries.
- Provides no convincing impact pathway.

2. INNOVATION & CREATIVITY — 15 POINTS

Judges assess whether students have moved beyond simply identifying a problem and developed a genuinely creative solution.

13–15 Highly Innovative

- Highly original and creative solution.
- Significant evidence of innovative thinking.
- Goes beyond conventional approaches.
- Clearly differentiates itself from existing solutions.
- Demonstrates strong problem-solving.
- The solution is compelling, relevant and well-designed.

10–12 Strong

- Strong innovation.
- Contains several original elements.
- Improves on existing approaches.
- Demonstrates good creative thinking.

6–9 Developing

- Some creative elements.
- The solution has value but is relatively conventional.
- Limited differentiation from existing solutions.

0–5 Weak

- Limited evidence of innovation.
- The solution largely repeats existing approaches.
- Weak connection between the innovation and the identified problem.

3. TECHNOLOGY — 10 POINTS

Technology is judged on purpose and impact—not simply because technology has been used.

Technology may include:

- Artificial Intelligence
- Coding
- Mobile/web applications
- Digital platforms
- Data analytics
- Sensors/IoT

- Robotics
- Websites
- Digital education
- Social media technology
- Automation
- Other appropriate emerging technologies

9–10 Excellent

- Technology is integral to the solution.
- Technology is used creatively and appropriately.
- Demonstrates strong technical understanding.
- Technology significantly improves effectiveness, reach, efficiency or impact.

7–8 Strong

- Good use of appropriate technology.
- Technology provides clear benefits.
- Students demonstrate good understanding of how it works.

4–6 Developing

- Technology is present but its contribution is limited.
- Technology is not central to the solution.
- Technical development is basic.

0–3 Weak

- Little or inappropriate use of technology.
- Technology appears to have been added simply to meet the requirement.
- Limited understanding of the technology.

4. ENTREPRENEURSHIP & BUSINESS MODEL — 10 POINTS

Judges assess whether the team understands how the solution could operate and remain sustainable in the real world.

Assess:

- Target users/customers
- Value proposition
- Revenue/funding
- Costs
- Partnerships
- Customer/beneficiary needs
- Competitive advantage
- Sustainability

9–10 Excellent

- Clearly identifies target users/customers.
- Strong value proposition.
- Realistic revenue, funding or sustainability model.
- Understands costs and resources.
- Identifies relevant partners.
- Demonstrates competitive advantage.
- Provides a convincing pathway to sustainability.

7–8 Strong

- Good understanding of users.
- Clear value proposition.
- Reasonable funding/revenue approach.
- Identifies costs and potential partners.
- Minor gaps remain.

4–6 Developing

- Basic business model.
- Some understanding of users and value proposition.
- Funding/revenue and cost assumptions require further development.

0–3 Weak

- No convincing business or sustainability model.
- Target users are unclear.
- Little understanding of costs, funding or implementation.

5. FEASIBILITY & PROTOTYPE — 10 POINTS

Judges assess whether the team has demonstrated that the idea can actually work.

9–10 Excellent

- Functional or highly developed prototype.
- Strong evidence of testing.
- Demonstrates feedback and iteration.
- Users/beneficiaries have interacted with the solution.
- Clear implementation plan.
- Realistic pathway to deployment.

7–8 Strong

- Good prototype or proof of concept.
- Some testing has taken place.
- Solution appears practical.
- The implementation plan is reasonably clear.

4–6 Developing

- Early-stage prototype or concept.
- Limited testing.
- Significant feasibility questions remain.
- Implementation plan needs development.

0–3 Weak

- Little or no prototype evidence.
- The solution has not been meaningfully tested.
- Significant implementation barriers remain unresolved.

6. COMMUNITY SERVICE & ENGAGEMENT — 5 POINTS

This is a practical requirement. Written claims alone should not receive high scores.

Evidence may include:

- Community volunteering
- Workshops

- Clean-up projects
- Awareness activities
- Interviews
- Surveys
- Community campaigns
- Supporting beneficiaries
- Working with community organisations
- School/community events

5 - Excellent

- Significant community action.
- Strong evidence of beneficiary involvement.
- Students directly engage with the community.
- Demonstrates meaningful service and community impact.

4 - Good

- Meaningful community engagement.
- Good evidence of consultation or service.
- Beneficiaries have participated.

2–3 - Developing

- Some community activity.
- Engagement is limited in depth, participation or evidence.

0–1 - Weak

- Little or no meaningful community engagement.
- Activity is primarily theoretical.

7. CAMPAIGN & BEHAVIOUR CHANGE — 5 POINTS

Judges assess whether students can turn their project into an **action-oriented campaign**.

Assess:

- Campaign message
- Target audience

- Call to action
- Behaviour-change strategy
- Campaign activities
- Reach
- Participation
- Evidence of behaviour change

5 - Excellent

- Highly effective campaign.
- Clear target audience.
- Strong and memorable message.
- Clear call to action.
- Appropriate behaviour-change strategy.
- Evidence of reach and/or behavioural response.

3–4 - Good

- Clear campaign.
- Appropriate audience.
- Good message and call to action.
- Some engagement evidence.

1–2 - Developing

- Basic campaign.
- Message or audience is underdeveloped.
- Limited evidence of engagement.

0 - Weak

- No meaningful campaign or behaviour-change activity.

8. MEDIA & STORYTELLING — 5 POINTS

Students should use media to communicate the **problem, action, solution and impact**.

Assess:

- Video

- Photography
- Social media
- Graphics
- Interviews
- Storytelling
- Creativity
- Audience engagement

5 - Excellent

- Highly engaging and memorable storytelling.
- Strong use of appropriate media.
- Clearly communicates the problem and solution.
- Demonstrates community action and impact.
- Strong audience engagement.

3–4 - Good

- Good-quality media content.
- Clear storytelling.
- Communicates the project effectively.

1–2 - Developing

- Basic media use.
- Story is understandable but lacks impact or creativity.

0 - Weak

- Little or no media evidence.
- The project story is difficult to communicate.

9. SCALABILITY — 5 POINTS

Judges assess whether the solution can grow beyond the team's original community.

5 - Excellent

- Strong potential to expand.
- Clear replication strategy.

- Can be adapted to different communities or countries.
- The team understands resources and partnerships required for expansion.

4 - Good

- Clear potential for expansion.
- Some consideration of replication has been demonstrated.

2–3 - Developing

- Some scalability potential.
- Expansion strategy is limited.
- Significant barriers remain.

0–1 - Weak

- Very limited potential for replication or expansion.
-

10. TEAMWORK & LEADERSHIP — 5 POINTS

Judges should observe the **whole team**, not just the strongest presenter.

5- Excellent

- Excellent collaboration.
- Clear division of roles.
- Strong leadership.
- Members demonstrate shared ownership.
- All/most members contribute meaningfully.
- The team communicates respectfully and effectively.

4 - Good

- Good teamwork.
- Most members participate.
- Leadership is evident.
- Some minor unevenness.

2–3 - Developing

- Adequate teamwork.
- Participation is uneven.
- Leadership or role-sharing could improve.

0–1 - Weak

- Poor collaboration.
 - One or two students dominate.
 - Limited evidence of shared responsibility.
-

11. PITCH, COMMUNICATION & Q&A — 20 POINTS

This criterion now properly reflects its **20% weighting**.

Judges should assess both the **presentation and question-and-answer session**.

17–20 - Outstanding

The team:

- Delivers an exceptionally clear and compelling pitch.
- Captures the judges' attention quickly.
- Clearly explains the problem and supporting evidence.
- Presents a convincing solution.
- Explains technology effectively.
- Demonstrates community action.
- Clearly communicates impact.
- Explains business/sustainability potential.
- Uses visuals effectively.
- Demonstrates excellent preparation.
- Communicates confidently and professionally.
- Responds to questions accurately and thoughtfully.
- Demonstrates genuine understanding rather than simply memorising answers.
- Ends with a powerful call to action.

13–16 - Strong

- Clear and well-structured presentation.

- Problem and solution are effectively communicated.
- Good presentation skills.
- Good understanding of the project.
- Answers most questions confidently.
- Good use of visuals.
- Minor gaps in evidence or delivery.

7–12 - Developing

- The basic idea is communicated.
- Some important information is missing.
- Structure or storytelling is inconsistent.
- Presentation confidence varies.
- Answers demonstrate partial understanding.
- Visual communication could be stronger.

0–6 - Weak

- Pitch is unclear or poorly structured.
 - Problem and solution are difficult to understand.
 - Limited preparation.
 - Weak presentation skills.
 - Team struggles with questions.
 - Impact and value are poorly communicated.
-