JUDGING INSTRUCTIONAL GUIDANCE

Local Event Judging Deadline: October 12
Universal Judging Deadline: October 20
Global Judging Deadline: November 10
Executive Judging Deadline: November 30

Please be sure to evaluate all projects you have been assigned. These will appear on your judging tab. You can use the toggle to see projects that you have not yet judged to help manage your queue.

STEP 1: Ensure the project has met minimum requirements.

If a project fails to meet any of these, score it a 1 (Poor) and do not evaluate it any further.

- Primarily in English.
- Responds to the challenge selected.
- Demo does not exceed 7 slides (including title or ending slides) **OR** is no longer than 30 seconds.
- Project links are all accessible/password unrestricted.
- NASA Open Data & Resources used.
- AI usage declared. Generated content may not use, contain, or modify any NASA branding or design elements (such as the NASA logos, flags, or mission identifiers).
    - **Images and videos:** Must be amended to include a visible watermark indicating they are AI-generated.
    - **Audio:** Must acknowledge AI generation in descriptive text and metadata.
    - **Code and data:** Must acknowledge AI generation in descriptive text and metadata.

STEP 2: Rate each project holistically from 1 (poor) to 5 (exemplary). The following criteria are meant to provide you with some guidance, but please make a holistic assessment, according to the project.

- **GLOBAL JUDGING:** Be selective; award a score of '5' only to the truly exemplary projects.
- **EXECUTIVE JUDGING:** Please see award descriptions on the last page to help decide how to judge each project.

JUDGING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

Consider the criteria when judging; If it helps, you can use the notes feature to note scores for each criterion:

Impact: What is the project's potential for significant impact in both quality and quantity? Does it address a major problem or a minor one? To what extent does it inspire or help others?

- **Score of 5 (Outstanding Impact):** Demonstrates exceptional impact, addressing a significant problem with innovative methods. Its reach is extensive, inspiring and benefiting a large audience or changing the world. The quality and effectiveness of the project far exceed expectations, setting a high standard for others.
- **Score of 3 (Moderate Impact):** Reasonable level of impact, tackling a problem with a fair degree of effectiveness. While it presents useful ideas and benefits a moderate audience, its execution and reach could be enhanced to maximize its potential.
- **Score of 1 (No Impact):** Does not effectively address a meaningful problem or create notable change. The scope is extremely limited, with little to no inspiration or benefit to others. Improvements in concept, execution, and outreach would be necessary to make a substantial impact.

Creativity: How well does the project demonstrate originality and innovation in its approach? Does it introduce a novel concept that has not been attempted before, or present an improvement upon existing ideas in a meaningful way? To what extent does the level of creativity distinguish it from conventional methods, showcasing a fresh perspective or inventive execution?

- **Score of 5 (Highly Creative and Innovative):** Showcases remarkable creativity, introducing a groundbreaking approach that has never been attempted before. It challenges conventional methods, presenting an original and inventive method that stands out in its field. The uniqueness of the idea makes it a true innovation.
- **Score of 3 (Moderately Creative):** Demonstrates a reasonable level of creativity, incorporating some original elements while building on existing concepts. Though it introduces improvements, the approach feels somewhat familiar and could benefit from a more distinctive or unconventional perspective.
- **Score of 1 (No Creativity):** Lacks creative or innovative elements, relying heavily on established ideas without significant enhancement. It does not introduce a fresh perspective or novel approach, making it difficult to distinguish from prior work.

Validity: Does this project present a method that is grounded in scientific principles? Does it demonstrate technical feasibility? How effectively would it achieve its intended purpose in real-world applications? How usable or user-friendly is the project? To what extent does this influence its practicality and accessibility?

- **Score of 5 (Highly Valid and Feasible):** Scientifically sound and technically feasible, demonstrating strong alignment with established principles. It is fully developed and ready for real-world implementation, effectively achieving its intended purpose. The project is highly usable and user-friendly, making it accessible and practical for widespread application.
- **Score of 3 (Partially Valid, but Needs Refinement):** Built on a reasonable scientific foundation but requires further development to ensure full effectiveness. While parts of the project are technically feasible, certain aspects may still need refinement or testing to function reliably in real-world scenarios. Usability and user-friendliness are present but could be improved for broader accessibility.
- **Score of 1 (Not Scientifically Valid or Feasible):** Lacks a strong scientific basis and does not demonstrate technical feasibility. It has significant gaps in functionality, preventing it from effectively achieving its intended purpose. The project is incomplete and requires extensive improvement, with usability and user-friendliness presenting major barriers to practical application.

NASA Space Apps is funded by NASA's Earth Science Division through a contract with Booz Allen Hamilton, Mindgrub, and SecondMuse.

For more information, visit **spaceappschallenge.org**

JUDGING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

Consider the criteria when judging; If it helps, you can use the notes feature to note scores for each criterion:

Relevance: Does this project fully and directly address the challenge for which it was submitted, demonstrating a strong alignment with the intended objectives? How meaningfully does it integrate NASA data, utilizing it as a core component of the proposed method rather than a superficial addition? The depth of engagement with the data enhances the project's credibility and effectiveness.

- **Score of 5 (Highly Relevant and Strong NASA Data Integration):** Thoroughly engages with the challenge, delivering a method that is deeply connected to the intended goals. NASA data is integral to the project's success, providing meaningful insights that drive the innovation forward. The use of the data is well-executed, enhancing both the credibility and impact.
- **Score of 3 (Moderately Relevant, but Limited NASA Data Engagement):** Aligns with the challenge in a general sense, addressing key aspects but lacking full immersion in the topic. NASA data is incorporated, but its role is more supplementary than foundational, meaning the method could function without it. Further integration of the data could strengthen the project's relevance and effectiveness.
- **Score of 1 (Not Relevant to the Challenge or Superficial Use of NASA Data):** Does not meaningfully respond to the challenge, showing little connection to the intended objectives. NASA data is either absent or used in a superficial manner, failing to contribute significantly to the project's development. The project would need substantial revisions to ensure alignment with the challenge and proper utilization of NASA data.

Presentation: How effectively did the team communicate their project? How clearly did they convey the challenge, their proposed method, and its significance? How engaging and well-structured was the storytelling? How did the clarity, organization, and delivery of their presentation play a role in making their ideas compelling and accessible, ensuring the audience understood the project's purpose and impact. Judges should evaluate the demo and full project to compute this score.

- **Score of 5 (Exceptional Communication and Storytelling):** The team delivered a well-structured and compelling presentation, clearly articulating the challenge, methods, and importance of the project. Their storytelling was engaging, making the audience fully grasp the significance and potential impact of the work. The delivery was polished, confident, and highly effective in communicating their ideas.
- **Score of 3 (Moderately Effective but Needs Refinement):** The team communicated their project with reasonable clarity, outlining the challenge, methods, and its relevance. However, some areas lacked depth or could have been presented in a more compelling manner. While the presentation was functional, improvements in organization, storytelling, or delivery could enhance its effectiveness.
- **Score of 1 (Unclear or Ineffective Communication):** The team struggled to clearly present their project, resulting in confusion about the challenge, methods, or significance. The storytelling was weak or disjointed, making it difficult for the audience to fully understand their approach. Improvements in clarity, structure, and delivery would be necessary for a more impactful presentation.

JUDGING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

Award Descriptions (For Executive Judging Only)

- **Best Use of Science:** The project that makes the best and most valid use of science and/or the scientific method.
- **Best Use of Data:** The project that best makes space data accessible or leverages it for a unique application.
- **Best Use of Technology:** The project that exemplifies the most innovative use of technology.
- **Galactic Impact:** The project with the most potential to improve life on Earth or in the universe.
- **Best Mission Concept:** The project with the most plausible concept and design.
- **Most Inspirational:** The project that captures our hearts.
- **Best Storytelling:** The project that most creatively communicates the potential of open data through the art of storytelling.
- **Global Connection:** The project that best connects people around the world through technology.
- **Art & Technology:** The project that most effectively combines technical and creative skills.
- **Local Impact:** The project that demonstrates the greatest potential for local impact.