Prototype Phase

Creativity of the proposed project (25%)				
Poor (0 - 4)	**Fair (5 - 9)**	**Average (10 - 14)**	**Good (15 - 19)**	**Great! (20 - 25)**
The idea is very common or copied. Nothing new or interesting. No creativity shown.	Some effort to be creative, but still very basic or similar to existing apps.	The idea is a bit creative, maybe with some new touches. But not deep or well developed yet.	The idea is quite creative. Has new features or a smart twist on a common problem.	Very creative and original idea. Shows imagination and unique thinking.
Feasibility of the proposed project (25%)				
Poor (0 - 4)	**Fair (5 - 9)**	**Average (10 - 14)**	**Good (15 - 19)**	**Great! (20 - 25)**
Not realistic. The idea sounds good but probably can't work. Missing planning or wrong tools	Might work but many important things are missing and unclear. Challenging to implement.	Mostly works, but may encounter some problems or needs more polishing. The tech stack chosen is okay.	Looks realistic and possible. The plan is clear and doable using the chosen tech stack.	Very practical and ready to build. Everything is planned out well and the chosen tech stack is used correctly.
Impact of the proposed project (25%)				
Poor (0 - 4)	**Fair (5 - 9)**	**Average (10 - 14)**	**Good (15 - 19)**	**Great! (20 - 25)**
The problem isn't solved or even clearly shown.	Unclear or insignificant impact or relevance to the problem.	The idea can help users, but the effect is small or limited	Useful and helpful. Can largely solve the problem for the target group.	Very helpful and impactful. Can solve the problem for users' in a significant way.
Pitching (25%)				

Poor (0 - 4)	Fair (5 - 9)	Average (10 - 14)	Good (15 - 19)	Great! (20 - 25)
Hard to understand. Team members did not explain the idea clearly. Confusing or boring.	Basic explanation but missing flow or confidence. Not well organised.	The pitch is understandable but needs more energy or clearer structure.	Clear and confident. The idea is well explained and easy to follow.	Excellent pitch! Very clear, confident and exciting. Makes the idea sound valuable and worth building.

Finals Phase

Architecture (15%)				
Poor (0 - 3)	**Fair (4 - 6)**	**Average (7 - 9)**	**Good (10 - 12)**	**Great! (12 - 15)**
- Monolithic code, no separation of concerns. - Hardcoded values, no configuration. - No scalability consideration.	- Basic file structure but inconsistent. - Minimal reusability (tight coupling). - Props drilling, no state management.	- Logical folders (`components/`, `utils/`). - Basic state management (Context/Redux). - Some documentation.	-Feature-based architecture. - Reusable components (HOCs, hooks). - API service layers.	-Domain-driven/ atomic design. - Lazy loading, micro-frontends - Full documentation + ADRs.
Execution (15%)				
Poor (0 - 3)	**Fair (4 - 6)**	**Average (7 - 9)**	**Good (10 - 12)**	**Great! (12 - 15)**
- Critical features missing/broken. - Frequent crashes, no error handling. - Non-responsive UI.	- Core features work but with major bugs. - Crashes occur but the app is largely usable. - Poor UX (no loading states).	- Minor bugs in non-critical features. - Basic error handling (toast messages). - Decent responsiveness.	- Edge cases handled. - Robust error recovery. - Polished UX (animations, validation).	- Flawless under stress tests. - Offline mode/caching. - Exceptional performance (debouncing)
Presentation (30%)				

Poor (0 - 6)	Fair (7 - 12)	Average (13 - 18)	Good (19 - 24)	Great! (25 - 30)
- Confusing and disorganised. - Message is unclear. - Weak communication of problem/solution. - Audience unable to follow.	- Basic clarity but lacks structure. - Missing key details. - Flow feels disconnected. - Needs more focus on the audience.	- Reasonably structured. - Covers all major points. - Lacks confidence in delivery. - Moderately clear but not compelling.	- Clear, logical structure. - Message and solution are mostly understood. - Smooth delivery. - Engages the audience.	- Well defined and coherent structure. - Delivery is polished and confident. - Message and solution are communicated well and understood. - The audience clearly understands and is impressed.

Features & Effectiveness of the Project (15%)

Poor (0 - 3)	Fair (4 - 6)	Average (7 - 9)	Good (10 - 12)	Great! (12 - 15)
Core features does not work	Only basic features are implemented and are incomplete	Main features are able to solve the problem statement. However,implementation lacks depth	Well executed, only one reliable feature with additional enhancements on top of the basic features.	More than one innovative and fully polished feature

Deployment (15%)

Poor (0 - 3)	Fair (4 - 6)	Average (7 - 9)	Good (10 - 12)	Great! (12 - 15)
This project is not deployed.	The project has no clear plan on future sustainability, project lifespan remains unclear. User feedback is poor.	The project is a requires a certain amount of continuous funding and maintenance. User feedback is mixed.	The project can operate for long periods without human intervention and last a reasonable time without maintenance. User feedback is somewhat positive.	The project can operate for long periods without human intervention. The project can last a reasonable amount of time without maintenance. User feedback is generally positive.

Practicality (10%)				
Poor (0 - 2)	**Fair (3 - 4)**	**Average (5 - 6)**	**Good (7 - 8)**	**Great! (9 - 10)**
Project is impractical, less effective than existing solutions.	Project could be deployed on a smaller scale and will face funding difficulties due to unclear use cases.	Project could be deployed in a large scale, however targeted market is niche and will face funding difficulties.	Project is practical with clearly defined target users.	Project can be scaled up to deploy in real world scenarios.