

CORSAIR Eco-Challenge Judging Rubric

Scoring Scale

4 points — Advanced: Exceptional quality, depth, clarity, and originality.

3 points — Proficient: Strong work that meets the criterion clearly and effectively.

2 points — Developing: Partial success, but important elements need more depth, clarity, or support.

1 point — Beginning: Limited evidence of the criterion or major weaknesses in execution.

Each track now includes six criteria for a maximum total of 24 points (previously five criteria / 20 points).

Track 1: The Repairability Lab

Track 1 challenges students to analyze how a CORSAIR product is built, evaluate repairability and end-of-life pathways, and propose one meaningful design change. The rubric below measures audit rigor, feasibility, impact reasoning, the quality of the required prototype and one-pager, communication, and originality.

Criterion	4 Points - Advanced	3 Points - Proficient	2 Points - Developing	1 Point - Beginning
Audit Rigor <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	Component analysis is thorough, accurate, and well documented; materials, lifespan, repairability, and end-of-life are clearly addressed for all major parts.	Analysis covers most major components with generally accurate documentation and only minor gaps.	Analysis identifies some major components, but documentation is partial, uneven, or somewhat unclear.	Analysis is incomplete, inaccurate, or missing major parts of the product review.
Proposal Feasibility <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	Proposed change is realistic, specific, and clearly implementable in the product context.	Proposed change is mostly realistic and understandable, though some implementation details are limited.	Proposed change shows some promise but lacks clarity, realism, or practical detail.	Proposed change is vague, unrealistic, or not meaningfully connected to the product.
Impact Reasoning <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	Benefit of the proposed change is clearly explained and strongly argued with clear links to repairability, product life, or environmental outcomes.	Benefit is clear and reasonably supported, though some parts of the argument could be stronger.	Benefit is mentioned but only partly explained or weakly supported.	Benefit is unclear, unsupported, or minimally addressed.
Prototype & One-Pager Quality <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	The prototype/mockup clearly demonstrates the proposed change, and the one-page Repair & Service summary is complete with a well-justified 1–10 repairability rating.	The prototype/mockup and one-pager are both present and mostly complete, with minor gaps in craftsmanship or in the justification of the repairability rating.	The prototype/mockup or the one-pager is missing, incomplete, or the repairability rating lacks clear justification.	The prototype/mockup and one-pager are largely missing, incomplete, or fail to support the proposed change.
Communication <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	Submission is exceptionally clear, organized, and easy to follow, with effective visuals and explanations.	Submission is clear and organized, with understandable visuals and explanations.	Submission communicates the idea unevenly; some parts are unclear or difficult to follow.	Submission is hard to follow, poorly organized, or lacks clear explanation.
Originality <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	Proposal shows strong independent thinking and goes well beyond obvious or surface-level suggestions.	Proposal demonstrates some originality and moves beyond the most obvious fix.	Proposal shows limited originality and relies on familiar or predictable ideas.	Proposal is obvious, surface-level, or shows little independent thinking.

Track 1 — Submission Checklist

Required deliverables

Confirm before scoring. An incomplete submission should be reflected in the relevant criterion score(s) below.

☐ Component map or teardown diagram
☐ Audit notes (materials, lifespan, repairability, end-of-life)
☐ Written or presented design proposal
☐ Prototype or mockup of the proposed change
☐ One-page Repair & Service summary (incl. 1–10 repairability rating)

Track 1 — Score Summary

Criterion	Score
Audit Rigor	___ / 4
Proposal Feasibility	___ / 4
Impact Reasoning	___ / 4
Prototype & One-Pager Quality	___ / 4
Communication	___ / 4
Originality	___ / 4
Total	___ / 24

Judge Notes — Track 1

Entry Title: _____

School / Team: _____

Judge Name: _____

Date: _____

Comments:
