

Borderless Competition August—October 2020 Judging Criteria and Standards

Criteria & mark	20-17	16-13	12-9	8-5	4-0
<i>Sub-criteria mark:</i>	10-9	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-0
Creativity and Appropriateness (20): Creativity (10) Appropriateness (10)	Proposal innovates and contributes to existing features of Lomeweb. Precise identification of features of the inspiring event. Proposal demonstrates convincing relationship to the specific features of the identified event.	Proposal extends and complements existing features of Lomeweb. Conscious identification of features of the inspiring event. Proposal demonstrates thoughtful understanding of the specific features of the identified event.	Proposal is largely an improvement of existing features of Lomeweb. Some identification of features of the inspiring event. Proposal makes an attempt to consider the specific features of the identified event.	Proposal is a replication of existing features of Lomeweb. Limited identification of features of the inspiring event. Proposal is general and demonstrates limited consideration of the specific features of the identified event.	Proposal is banal and does not contribute to existing features of Lomeweb. No identification of features of the inspiring event. Proposal fails to consider any specific feature of the identified event.
Criteria & mark	30-26	25-20	19-14	13-8	7-0
<i>Sub-criteria mark:</i>	10-9	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-0
Economic Analysis (30): Identification of relevant economic concepts (10) Application of economic theory (10) Soundness of predictions made (10)	Precise identification of economic concepts related to the proposed element. Appropriate economic theory competently applied. Analysis demonstrates sound knowledge of underlying theory. Convincing predictions drawn from analysis. Clear articulation of assumptions involved. Sensitive to potential weakness of the argument.	Correct identification of economic concepts related to the proposed element. Satisfactory attempts to apply relevant economic theory. Analysis demonstrates adequate knowledge of underlying theory. Reasonable predictions drawn from analysis. Limited discussion of assumptions involved. Potential weakness of the argument not mentioned.	Partial identification of economic concepts related to the proposed element. Some attempts to apply economic theory. Analysis indicates some knowledge of underlying theory. Plausible predictions drawn from analysis but no mentioning of assumptions involved. Potential weakness of the argument not considered.	Inaccurate identification of economic concepts related to the proposed element. Limited attempt to apply economic theory. Analysis reflects limited understanding of underlying theory. Doubtful predictions drawn from analysis. Assumptions involved questionable. Weakness of the argument perceptible.	No identification of economic concepts related to the proposed element. No or erroneous attempt to apply economic theory. Analysis reflects flawed understanding of underlying theory. Analysis flawed, spurious or irrelevant. Assumptions inappropriate or untenable. Weakness of the argument apparent.

Criteria & mark	10-9	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-0
Justification (10): Use of literature and supporting evidence (10)	Appropriate literature, facts, statistics or data collected and clearly described. Sources clearly and accurately referenced.	Appropriate literature, facts, statistics or data collected and clearly described. Sources not clearly and accurately referenced.	Appropriate literature, facts, statistics or data collected but not well described. Sources not clearly and accurately referenced.	Some attempt at collecting literature, facts, statistics or data. Collection not well described. Sources not clearly and accurately referenced.	Very limited attempt at collecting literature, facts, statistics or data. Collection not well described.
Organization (10):	Presentation logically structured. Main points clearly emphasized. Arguments and evidence effectively placed and presented.	Presentation conventionally structured. Main points apparent. Arguments and evidence suitably placed and presented.	Presentation structured. Main points can be deduced but not always apparent. Placement and presentation of arguments and evidence does not interfere understanding.	Presentation loosely structured. Main points not always clear. Placement and presentation of arguments and evidence sometimes interfere understanding.	Illogical or severely loose structure. Main points unclear. Arguments and evidence are hampered by digressions that interfere understanding.
Effective use of presentation aids (10): Tables, graphs, diagrams, visuals, audios, etc. used	Succinct and clear presentation of <i>relevant information</i> using tables, graphs, diagrams, visuals, audios, etc., demonstrating a high level of understanding of the materials presented.	Succinct and clear presentation of <i>relevant information</i> using tables, graphs, diagrams, visuals, audios, etc., demonstrating understanding of the materials presented.	Presentation of information not succinct or clear but demonstrates an understanding of the materials presented.	Presentation of some information but a limited understanding of the materials presented.	Presentation of information severely limited. Limited demonstration of understanding of the materials presented.
Language proficiency and presentation style (10):	Clarity of expression excellent. Professional presentation style.	Language mainly fluent. Presentation style up to standard.	Meaning apparent but language not always fluent. Presentation style proper.	Meaning not always clear. Presentation style sometimes unsatisfactory.	Meaning is unclear. Presentation style unprofessional.
Teamwork (10):	Clear evidence of collaboration across team members.	Evidence of collaboration across team members.	Evidence of partial collaboration across team members.	Doubtful evidence of collaboration across team members.	Limited or no evidence of collaboration across team members.