

Judging Rubric & Peer Evaluation Form

About these tools

The Judging Rubric is used by the jury during final presentations (see guide Ch. 2.2.7 for full process guidance).

The Peer Evaluation Form is completed by each team member about their teammates after the event. Both forms should be shared with participants at the start of the hackathon so expectations are transparent from Day 1.

TEMPLATE A – JUDGING SCORE SHEET

Judge: _____ Team presenting: _____

Challenge theme: _____ Presentation slot: [A / B / C / D]

Instructions: Score each criterion independently. Do not discuss scores with other judges until deliberation. Maximum total: 100 points.

Criterion (weight)	1–2 Weak	3–4 Developing	5–6 Adequate	7–8 Strong	9–10 Excellent	Score (×weight)
Innovation & Creativity (×2, max 20pts)	Follows conventional approaches	Some original elements	Recognisable approach with novel parts	Creative, well-justified	Genuinely original; reframes the problem	
Feasibility & Implementation (×2, max 20pts)	Unrealistic / unsound	Partially feasible	Achievable with realistic effort	Well-grounded plan; credible resources	Highly feasible; clear technical roadmap	
Impact & Value (×2, max 20pts)	No clear user benefit	Benefit stated but vague	Addresses a genuine need	Clear, measurable benefit; scalable	Compelling impact; strong real-world applicability	
Theme Alignment (×1.5, max 15pts)	Superficial connection	Related but lacks depth	Solid connection; shows understanding	Strong thematic integration	Exemplary alignment; deepens the theme authentically	
Presentation Quality (×1.5, max 15pts)	Unclear, hard to follow	Some clarity; key points missed	Understandable; reasonably structured	Clear, engaging, well-demonstrated	Compelling, professional; demo is persuasive	

Criterion (weight)	1–2 Weak	3–4 Developing	5–6 Adequate	7–8 Strong	9–10 Excellent	Score (×weight)
Teamwork & Learning (×1, max 10pts)	No evidence of collaboration	Limited evidence	Some shared work and reflection	Clear journey visible; strong collaboration	Excellent iteration, shared ownership, meaningful reflection	
TOTAL (max 100)						/ 100

QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK FOR THIS TEAM (complete during Q&A or immediately after):

Strongest aspect of their solution:

One concrete improvement suggestion:

Question you asked / would ask the team:

TEMPLATE B – PEER EVALUATION FORM

Complete this form individually after the event. Your responses are confidential and used only for learning assessment purposes.

Your name: _____ Team name: _____

Instructions: Rate each teammate (not yourself) on each dimension using the scale 1–5. Then add a brief qualitative comment.

Scale: 1 = Needs significant improvement · 3 = Met expectations · 5 = Exceptional

Dimension	Teammate 1: []	Teammate 2: []	Teammate 3: []	Teammate 4: []
Contributed meaningfully to the team's work	/5	/5	/5	/5
Communicated clearly and listened to others	/5	/5	/5	/5
Was reliable and followed through on commitments	/5	/5	/5	/5

Dimension	Teammate 1: []	Teammate 2: []	Teammate 3: []	Teammate 4: []
Was supportive and inclusive of all team members	/5	/5	/5	/5
Helped the team stay focused and move forward	/5	/5	/5	/5
AVERAGE	/5	/5	/5	/5

What did your team do particularly well together?

What would have made your teamwork more effective?

Is there anything you would like the organisers to know about your team dynamics? (optional, anonymous)

Self-reflection:

What was your most significant personal contribution to the team?

What skill did you develop most during this hackathon?

What would you do differently if you participated again?
