

Accessibility Impact and Inclusion

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Problem relevance	Clearly addresses an accessibility, inclusion, or usability challenge for people with diverse abilities	Addresses accessibility, but the problem could be more clearly defined	Mentions accessibility but connection is weak	Little or no accessibility focus
User-centered design	Shows strong understanding of users' needs through research, interviews, personas, or testing	Shows some understanding of intended users	Assumptions about users are made without much support	No clear user group identified
Inclusive design choices	Project is designed for a wide range of users, including people with disabilities	Includes some inclusive features	Accessibility is added as a minor feature	Accessibility appears to be an afterthought
Real-world usefulness	Solution could meaningfully help users in a practical setting	Solution has potential usefulness	Usefulness is limited or unclear	Solution does not address a realistic need

Technical Implementation

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Functionality	Project works reliably and demonstrates all major intended features	Project mostly works with minor issues	Project partially works	Project does not run or has major errors
Code quality	Code is organized, readable, well-commented, and uses appropriate structure	Code is mostly readable and organized	Code is hard to follow in places	Code is disorganized or incomplete
Use of technology	Uses tools, libraries, hardware, APIs, or platforms effectively and appropriately	Uses technology appropriately	Uses limited or basic technology	Technology choice is unclear or poorly implemented
Testing and debugging	Clear evidence of testing, debugging, and improvement	Some testing is described	Minimal testing	No testing described

Creativity and Innovation

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Originality	Project shows a creative, thoughtful, or novel approach	Some original elements	Mostly follows existing examples	Little originality
Design thinking	Strong connection between problem, solution, and design decisions	Design decisions are mostly clear	Some design choices are unclear	Design choices are not explained
Student voice	Project reflects student ideas, ownership, and personal motivation	Some student ownership is clear	Limited explanation of student role	Project appears copied or heavily adult-directed