



Group Name

Category

Jury Name

Element	Criterion	Description	0	1 (Poor)	2 (Weak)	3 (Satisfactory)	4 (Good)	5 (Excellent)	Weighted	Given Score	Score	Comments/ Remarks
Interactive Dashboard	Visual Clarity	Clear charts and graphs	The charts and graphs are unclear, poorly designed, and difficult to interpret. There is no meaningful visual support for understanding the data.	The charts and graphs are minimally clear but contain significant issues such as clutter, missing labels, or poor formatting that make interpretation difficult.	The charts and graphs are somewhat clear, but they lack consistency or proper labelling. Some visual elements are understandable, while others are confusing.	The charts and graphs are generally clear and readable. Most labels and elements are properly presented, with only minor issues affecting interpretation.	The charts and graphs are visually clear, well-designed, and properly labelled. They effectively support understanding of the data with minimal distractions.	The charts and graphs are highly clear, accurate, and professionally presented. They are well-designed, fully labelled, and strongly enhance understanding of the data.	1		0	
	Insight Relevance	Meaningful insights	No meaningful insights are provided, and the presentation does not interpret the results in any useful way.	Insights are very limited and mostly irrelevant, with little connection to the data or problem context.	Some basic insights are provided, but they are superficial and only partially related to the analysis or objectives.	The presentation provides relevant insights that are generally meaningful and connected to the analysis, although some points could be deeper or more developed.	Insights are clearly relevant, well-explained, and demonstrate good understanding of the data and problem context.	The presentation delivers highly meaningful and well-developed insights that are strongly linked to the data, showing deep understanding and strong analytical interpretation.	1		0	
	Interactivity	Basic usability and navigation	The system is not interactive and is very difficult to use. Navigation is confusing or non-functional, making it impossible for users to engage with the content.	The system has very limited interactivity and poor usability. Navigation is unclear, inconsistent, and frustrating for users.	The system has basic interactivity, but usability is inconsistent. Navigation works in some parts but is not smooth or intuitive.	The system is generally usable with acceptable interactivity. Navigation is clear and mostly easy to follow, with minor usability issues.	The system is interactive and user-friendly. Navigation is smooth, intuitive, and supports easy exploration of content.	The system is highly interactive with excellent usability. Navigation is seamless, intuitive, and highly efficient, allowing users to explore content effortlessly.	1		0	
	Creativity	Design attractiveness	The design is unattractive and shows no creativity. It appears dull, inconsistent, and unengaging, with no visual appeal.	The design has very limited creativity and is poorly presented. Visual elements are inconsistent and fail to attract attention or interest.	The design shows some basic creativity, but it is simple and lacks strong visual appeal. Overall presentation is only moderately engaging.	The design is visually appealing with a reasonable level of creativity. It is generally attractive and engaging, with some thoughtful design elements.	The design is creative and visually attractive. It is well-balanced, aesthetically pleasing, and effectively captures audience attention.	The design is highly creative and exceptionally attractive. It is visually striking, innovative, and professionally crafted, leaving a strong positive impression.	1		0	
TOTAL (20%)											0	

Video Presentation	Delivery	Confidence and engagement	No clear attempt at engagement; lacks confidence entirely; delivery ineffective or not completed	Low confidence; poor engagement; monotone or unclear delivery, little to no audience interaction	Limited confidence; minimal engagement; hesitant delivery, frequent reading or lack of connection with audience	Generally confident; some engagement with audience; occasional reliance on notes or uneven delivery	Confident and engaging; good eye contact and interaction; minor lapses but maintains audience attention well	Highly confident and engaging; strong presence, natural delivery, excellent eye contact; actively captures and sustains audience interest	1		0	
	Timing	Structure within 3-5 minutes	Did not meet minimum time expectations or presentation largely incomplete	Poor time control; major sections missing or excessively prolonged	Noticeably over/under time; some parts rushed, skipped, or overextended	Slightly over or under time; key content delivered but pacing is uneven	Within time limit with minor pacing issues (slightly rushed or slightly slow)	Presentation is perfectly timed (3–5 minutes), well-paced, and fully completed without rushing or delays	1		0	
	Explanation	Problem Understanding Understanding of problem context and relevance	No clear understanding of the problem; context and relevance not addressed at all	Poor understanding; context is vague, inaccurate, or largely irrelevant	Limited understanding; context is partially explained but unclear or weakly connected to the problem	Adequate understanding; basic context explained but lacks depth or strong linkage to relevance	Strong understanding of the problem; context and relevance are clear with minor gaps in depth or explanation	Demonstrates deep and accurate understanding of the problem; clearly explains context, significance, and real-world relevance with strong justification	1		0	
		Data Understanding Basic explanation of dataset (use) and variables	No meaningful explanation of dataset or variables provided	Poor explanation; major misunderstandings or incorrect interpretation of dataset/variables	Limited understanding; dataset or variables are only partially explained or somewhat unclear	Basic explanation of dataset; key variables identified but limited depth or partial interpretation	Good understanding of dataset and variables; mostly accurate with minor gaps in detail or interpretation	Clear, accurate, and comprehensive explanation of the dataset; variables are well-defined with correct interpretation, relationships, and relevance to the problem	1		0	
		Methodology	No clear methodology is presented, and there is no use or understanding of AI or predictive modelling elements. The approach is unclear and not reproducible.	The methodology is very weak and poorly described. AI or predictive modelling elements are either missing or incorrectly applied, with no clear explanation of the process.	A basic methodology is provided, with limited reference to AI or predictive modelling. The approach is somewhat clear but lacks detail, justification, or proper structure.	The methodology is generally clear and includes relevant AI or predictive modelling components. The approach is reasonable and mostly well-explained, with minor gaps in detail or justification.	The methodology is well-structured and clearly explains the use of AI or predictive modelling techniques. The approach is appropriate, justified, and mostly reproducible.	he methodology is highly rigorous and clearly integrates advanced AI and predictive modelling techniques. It is well-justified, clearly explained, and fully reproducible, demonstrating strong technical understanding and application.	1		0	
		Analysis & Findings Logical findings and simple analysis	No meaningful analysis or findings presented	Poor analysis; findings are largely incorrect, inconsistent, or not supported by data	Limited or partially correct analysis; findings are weak, unclear, or insufficiently supported	Basic analysis conducted; findings are reasonable but lack depth or strong evidence	Logical analysis with relevant findings; mostly accurate with minor gaps in depth or justification	Analysis is clear, logical, and well-structured; findings are accurate, insightful, and strongly supported by data	2		0	
		Clarity and Presentation Structure and readability	The presentation has no clear structure, making it extremely difficult to follow. Ideas are disorganised and confusing, with very poor readability.	The presentation shows weak structure and limited organisation. Ideas are unclear and not well connected, making it hard for the audience to understand.	The presentation has a basic structure, but it is inconsistent. Some parts are understandable, but there are noticeable gaps in clarity and flow.	The presentation is generally well structured with a clear introduction, body, and conclusion. Ideas are mostly easy to follow, with only minor issues in flow or transitions.	The presentation is well organised and logically structured. Ideas are clearly presented and easy to follow, with smooth readability throughout.	The presentation is highly structured, clear, and very easy to follow. Ideas flow logically and smoothly, with excellent readability and professional presentation quality.	1		0	
	TOTAL (40%)										0	
	Grand Total (60%)										0	

Overall Remarks
