

CORSAIR Eco-Challenge Judging Rubric

These judging rubrics are designed for the two contest tracks in the official contest described on the website and in the official rules:

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 2: Pitch the Improvement

Track 2 challenges students to identify one repairability or sustainability issue in a CORSAIR product, design a realistic solution, and present that solution in a 90-120 second video pitch supported by one visual. The rubric below measures clarity of problem, feasibility, impact reasoning, the quality of the supporting visual, delivery, and originality.

Criterion	4 Points - Advanced	3 Points - Proficient	2 Points - Developing	1 Point - Beginning
Clarity of Problem <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	The flaw is specific, real, and immediately easy to understand.	The flaw is clear and understandable, with only minor gaps in explanation.	The flaw is somewhat clear but needs more precision or supporting detail.	The flaw is vague, confusing, or not clearly defined.
Feasibility <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	Proposed fix is realistic, specific, and clearly could be made in practice.	Proposed fix is believable and mostly practical, though some details are underdeveloped.	Proposed fix has some merit but is only partly realistic or clearly explained.	Proposed fix is unrealistic, unclear, or not workable as presented.
Impact Reasoning <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	The benefit of the fix is clearly and convincingly argued, with strong explanation of why it matters.	The benefit is clear and reasonably persuasive, with adequate support.	The benefit is mentioned but explained only partially or generically.	The benefit is unclear, weakly argued, or unsupported.
Visual Support <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	The visual is clear, well designed, and directly strengthens the pitch's key points.	The visual is clear and relevant, with minor room for improvement in design or connection to the pitch.	The visual is present but only loosely connected to the pitch, or is unclear or rough.	The visual is missing, irrelevant, or too unclear to support the pitch.
Delivery <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	Pitch is confident, well-paced, engaging, and effective within the 90-120 second time limit.	Pitch is clear and appropriately paced, with solid audience engagement and time management.	Pitch communicates the basic idea but may be uneven in pacing, confidence, or engagement.	Pitch is hard to follow, poorly paced, or ineffective within the time limit.
Originality <i>Score ____ / 4</i>	Idea is notably creative and goes beyond an obvious or surface-level fix.	Idea shows some fresh thinking and rises above a basic response.	Idea has limited originality and stays close to obvious solutions.	Idea is predictable, generic, or surface-level.

Track 2 — Submission Checklist

Required deliverables

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

☐ 90–120 second pitch submitted as a video
☐ One supporting visual (slide, sketch, or diagram of the fix)

Track 2 — Score Summary

Criterion	Score
Clarity of Problem	___ / 4
Feasibility	___ / 4
Impact Reasoning	___ / 4
Visual Support	___ / 4
Delivery	___ / 4
Originality	___ / 4
Total	___ / 24

Judge Notes — Track 2

Entry Title: _____

School / Team: _____

Judge Name: _____

Date: _____

Comments:
