Reimagine Waste Challenge Grading Rubric

Judge Name: C Rutherford

Student's names: Rancho Cotate HS

Scoring & Scoring Structure

Poor	1- Missing key details with respect to the scored element or failed to include. Lack of detail or poor explanation.
Fair	2- Minimal/partial information provided and/or information was unclear.
Good	3- Pertinent information provided and/or additional clarity needed.
Excellent	4- All information was provided in a clear and understandable manner.

- **Is the proposed solution practical & viable?**
- **How well does the project show originality, creativity, and/or innovation?**
    - Does the solution include originality or introduce a new idea?
    - Is the idea creative in thinking?
    - Is the idea or implementation new to Brightmark's territory or is an old idea applied in a new way?
    - Is the idea innovative? For example, does it use a new communication medium, new software, or resource?
    - Does it leverage other outside or existing resources?
    - Does the solution reduce barriers to participation?
- **How well does the solution address the potential impact of the big problem?**
    - How well thought out is the endeavor?
- **Did the student clearly articulate how the solution would be applied? The students should provide sufficient information related to the key activities/purpose of the solution.**
- **The applicant has a clear goal and/or concept**
    - They should be able to clearly articulate "why" and "how" without the judges inferring how their solution will be implemented
- **Assess the Communities' Needs**
    - What kind of existing resources does this community have?

    - What barriers prevent residents in this community from participating in programs?
    - Who do people in this community trust? Where do they get their information? Where do they go when they have questions?
- **Improve Outcomes**
    - Does the solution have any unintended negative consequences?
    - How should the evaluation results be framed and communicated in order to reach important stakeholders?
- **Rate the overall (content) quality of the pitch**
    - How well did the participant(s) present the material?
    - Did the participant(s) present relevant information related directly to the judges' criteria?
    - Did the presenter(s) provide quality answers to the judges' questions?
    - Did the presenter(s) demonstrate a clear and concise understanding of how their solution addresses the challenge problem?
    - Does the participant understand the impact of such practices (does the student(s) have a strong understanding of how their practices play into the larger picture)?
- **Rate the overall (delivery) quality of the pitch.**
    - Did the participant(s) connect to the audience in an engaging way, pausing for feedback and questions throughout?
        - Did they adapt to feedback, questions, reactions, etc.?
    - Did the participant(s) deliver the presentation in a way that flowed cohesively from one point to the next?

Practicality Criteria	Scoring
1. Is the proposed solution practical and viable? *(4 pts)*	Yes No

1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent

Creativity Criteria	Scoring
2. How well does the project show originality, creativity, and/or innovation? *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
3. How well does the solution address the potential impact on a big problem? *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4

Sustainability & Equity Criteria	Scoring
4. Assess the communities' needs & set goals. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
5. Establish community-led decision-making. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
6. Develop a plan for tracking the success of the solution. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
7. Ensure leveraging of the proposed solution *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
8. Improve Outcomes. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
Overall Quality	**Scoring**
9. Rate the overall content quality of the pitch. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
10. Rate the overall delivery quality of the pitch. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4

Total Points: _31__/36

32

Additional Feedback/Comments/Questions: New creative idea submitted, trash to treasure. Targeting older students, more an educational tool than a call to action. They addressed the 'why' more than the 'how.' Difficult to track effectiveness. Perhaps they should follow up with some kind of student survey. Very good graphics. Interactive learning with the QR codes does drive people to our website. I'm assuming their target community is the school itself as a microcosm. Bilingual language broadens the scope.

Reimagine Waste Challenge Grading Rubric

Judge Name: C Rutherford

Student's names: Amarosa Academy

Scoring & Scoring Structure

Poor	5- Missing key details with respect to the scored element or failed to include. Lack of detail or poor explanation.
Fair	6- Minimal/partial information provided and/or information was unclear.
Good	7- Pertinent information provided and/or additional clarity needed.
Excellent	8- All information was provided in a clear and understandable manner.

- **Is the proposed solution practical & viable?**
- **How well does the project show originality, creativity, and/or innovation?**
    - Does the solution include originality or introduce a new idea?
    - Is the idea creative in thinking?
    - Is the idea or implementation new to Brightmark's territory or is an old idea applied in a new way?
    - Is the idea innovative? For example, does it use a new communication medium, new software, or resource?
    - Does it leverage other outside or existing resources?
    - Does the solution reduce barriers to participation?
- **How well does the solution address the potential impact of the big problem?**
    - How well thought out is the endeavor?
- **Did the student clearly articulate how the solution would be applied? The students should provide sufficient information related to the key activities/purpose of the solution.**
- **The applicant has a clear goal and/or concept**
    - They should be able to clearly articulate "why" and "how" without the judges inferring how their solution will be implemented
- **Assess the Communities' Needs**
    - What kind of existing resources does this community have?

    - What barriers prevent residents in this community from participating in programs?
    - Who do people in this community trust? Where do they get their information? Where do they go when they have questions?
- **Improve Outcomes**
    - Does the solution have any unintended negative consequences?
    - How should the evaluation results be framed and communicated in order to reach important stakeholders?
- **Rate the overall (content) quality of the pitch**
    - How well did the participant(s) present the material?
    - Did the participant(s) present relevant information related directly to the judges' criteria?
    - Did the presenter(s) provide quality answers to the judges' questions?
    - Did the presenter(s) demonstrate a clear and concise understanding of how their solution addresses the challenge problem?
    - Does the participant understand the impact of such practices (does the student(s) have a strong understanding of how their practices play into the larger picture)?
- **Rate the overall (delivery) quality of the pitch.**
    - Did the participant(s) connect to the audience in an engaging way, pausing for feedback and questions throughout?
        - Did they adapt to feedback, questions, reactions, etc.?
    - Did the participant(s) deliver the presentation in a way that flowed cohesively from one point to the next?

Practicality Criteria	Scoring
11. Is the proposed solution practical and viable? *(4 pts)*	Yes No

1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent

Creativity Criteria	Scoring
12. How well does the project show originality, creativity, and/or innovation? *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
13. How well does the solution address the potential impact on a big problem? *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4

Sustainability & Equity Criteria	Scoring
14. Assess the communities' needs & set goals. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
15. Establish community-led decision-making. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
16. Develop a plan for tracking the success of the solution. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
17. Ensure leveraging of the proposed solution *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
18. Improve Outcomes. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
Overall Quality	**Scoring**
19. Rate the overall content quality of the pitch. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4
20. Rate the overall delivery quality of the pitch. *(4 pts)*	1 2 3 4

Total Points: 29/36

Additional Feedback/Comments/Questions: The generational approach shows great thought and potential longevity for impact. Emphasis on community outside of the school setting. No formal method for tracking effectiveness. There may be community barriers to implementation but that is not the fault of the presenter or audience. Perhaps they can ask for infrastructure for collection to their community. There was great emotional appeal in their message with their emphasis on family. Their presentation title shows a grasp of the assignment.