

# Judging criteria

Every entry is scored out of 40 across three criteria. Judges score against the bands below, which describe what each score looks like in practice. A sources slide is required; it does not count toward the 4 to 6 slide limit.

|                      |           |
|----------------------|-----------|
| The problem          | 10        |
| Solution & AI impact | 20        |
| Presentation         | 10        |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>40</b> |

## The problem 10 POINTS

The first required section: the issue your team chose. We are looking for a problem specific enough to act on, shown rather than asserted.

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9–10<br>EXCELLENT | The problem is narrow, concrete, and clearly bounded — a particular group of people in a particular situation, not a whole sector. The team explains who is affected and how badly, using evidence that is cited and checkable. A reader who knew nothing about the area finishes the section understanding exactly what is wrong and why it has not already been fixed. |
| 7–8<br>STRONG     | A well-defined problem supported by evidence. Who is affected is clear. Some sense of why it persists.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 5–6<br>ADEQUATE   | The problem is identifiable but broad — "education in India" rather than a specific failure within it. Some evidence given, or evidence given without much interpretation.                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 3–4<br>WEAK       | The problem is stated but not examined. Little or no evidence. Reads as a topic rather than a problem.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 1–2<br>POOR       | Vague or generic. No sense of who is affected.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 0<br>MISSING      | The required content is not there.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

## Solution & AI impact 20 POINTS

The largest section, and where entries are separated. It covers four things: the proposed solution, existing approaches, requirements and limitations, and the implementation plan. Originality is rewarded — we read a great many entries, and a familiar idea has to be executed exceptionally well to reach the top band.

---

17–20

EXCELLENT

**Proposed solution.** Specific about what the AI actually does — what goes in, what comes out, who uses it, and why this approach beats a simpler non-AI one.

**Existing approaches.** Names what is already being done in this area and shows precisely what it does not do. Originality is evidenced here rather than asserted.

**Requirements and limitations.** Names the data the system would need and where it would fail. Engages honestly with at least one serious limitation rather than listing benefits.

**Implementation plan.** Who does what, in what order, at what cost or how funded, and how success is measured, in both the short and long term. The first step is something that could actually be started.

---

13–16

STRONG

A clear, well-matched solution described in working detail. Existing approaches are mentioned. Limitations acknowledged. The implementation plan has concrete steps and some sense of cost or ownership. The idea is a competent version of an approach we have seen before.

---

9–12

ADEQUATE

Plausible but general — “an AI system that helps farmers” without saying how. Existing approaches are not considered. Limitations mentioned in passing. The implementation plan stays at the level of aims rather than actions. Little to distinguish it from other entries.

---

5–8

WEAK

Vague, or applies AI where it does not fit the problem well. No engagement with what already exists or with what could go wrong. The implementation plan is a list of intentions with no sense of cost, effort, or who is responsible.

---

1–4

POOR

AI is invoked rather than applied. No working detail, and no route to making it happen.

---

0

MISSING

The required content is not there.

## Presentation 10 POINTS

Whether the deck communicates well. We are judging clarity and craft, not budget — a plain deck made carefully beats a busy one.

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9–10<br>EXCELLENT | The argument is easy to follow from the first slide to the last. Each slide makes one point. Text is readable, uncluttered, and free of errors. Any charts or images earn their place, and every figure on them can be traced to the sources slide. The deck uses its 4 to 6 slides deliberately. |
| 7–8<br>STRONG     | Clear and well organised, with minor issues — a crowded slide, a chart that needs explaining, a few small errors.                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 5–6<br>ADEQUATE   | The content is there but the reader has to work for it. Dense text, inconsistent formatting, or a structure that jumps around.                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 3–4<br>WEAK       | Hard to follow. Slides overloaded with text, or key points buried. Noticeable errors throughout.                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 1–2<br>POOR       | Difficult to read. Little evidence of care.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 0<br>MISSING      | Unreadable, or does not meet the format requirements.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |

### Sources

Every entry must include a sources slide. It is not optional, and it does not count toward the 4 to 6 slide limit.

- List every statistic, quotation, image and claim that did not come from your own observation.
- Name the organisation or publication and the year. A bare link is not enough.
- Where a figure comes from a study of a particular group, say so — do not present it as a national number.
- An entry with no sources slide cannot score above 5 for Presentation, and any uncited figure is treated as unsupported when scoring The problem.

### Ties

1. Higher Solution & AI impact score wins.
2. If still tied, higher Problem score wins.
3. If still tied, the judges read both entries again and decide together.

### What we do not score

- Which problem area you chose. No area is worth more than another.
- Design software, budget, or production value beyond what Presentation covers.
- School, city, or class. A class 9 team is judged against the same standard as a class 12 team.
- Whether we agree with your conclusion. A well-argued case for an unpopular position scores as well as a well-argued case for an obvious one.

---

If you ask after results are announced, we will tell you what your entry scored on each criterion and where it lost points. Write to [birdspiracy.competition@gmail.com](mailto:birdspiracy.competition@gmail.com).