

# Map the System: Evaluation Criteria – Printable version for scoring

**Document purpose:** This document can be printed by institutions in judging project submissions. We suggest printing one per project/team. There is also an Excel version where scoring can be done digitally to avoid printing.

**Guidance:** Together, the combination of the visual, written, and verbal submissions form one body of knowledge that will be evaluated holistically. That is to say, judges will base their final decisions on both the visual and written submission AND verbal presentation and Q&A where a presentation is made (*whether you are also including presentations in the evaluation at your local finals will depend on your local institution, the presentation is a requirement at the Semi- and Global Finals*).

This evaluation is done in three steps:

- **Step 1: Evaluation of written submission materials – presentation of deliverables**
- **Step 2: Evaluation of written submission – key questions and approach**
- **Step 3: Evaluation of verbal presentation and Q&A**

Submissions are scored numerically. Each bulletpoint represents a criterion and is worth 5 points. Each criterion is scored on a scale from 1-5 based on the following guidelines:

Assessment	Scoring Guidelines for Each Criterion
1 - Very weak	The submission does not meet the criterion, i.e. missing important details.
2 - Weak	The submission is sub-par for this criterion, i.e. insufficient information provided, inadequate detail or obvious inaccuracies.
3 - Average	The submission is average or just meets the criteria i.e. minimum required level of detail provided.
4 - Strong	The submission is strongly rated for this criterion, i.e. above average in terms of the level of detail provided.
5 - Exceptional	The submission is 'best in class' for this criterion and demonstrates exceptional depth and breadth of research/reflection.

<b>Institution Name</b>	
<b>Topic</b>	
<b>Team Name</b>	
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	

## Step 1: Written Submission - Presentation of Deliverables

No.	Criteria	Total points available	Project score
1	<b>Visual Systems Map (15 points total)</b>		
	Clearly identifies key parts and relationship dynamics of the system, including a justifiable system boundary and its environment.	5	
	Goes beyond a network map, actor map, or stakeholder map to show how the different parts of the system interact with each other to produce the challenge (e.g., feedback loops). An attempt should be made to illustrate either dynamics of influence, power, root causes and/or what someone with lived experience of the system might encounter.	5	
	Adequately reflects the level of necessary detail in an insightful, compelling and user-friendly way.	5	
2	<b>Written Research Summary (15 points total)</b>		
	Provides a helpful and compelling narrative that complements the visual systems map including an exploration of root causes, key insights, and lessons learned.	5	
	Written report is intelligible, logical, and informative.	5	
	Opinions are strongly backed up by research and information is clearly referenced.	5	
3	<b>Bibliography (10 points total)</b>		
	Demonstrates the use of a diverse range of research sources (i.e. not only desktop research but also includes a blend of academic sources from diverse disciplines, media stories or opinion pieces, community-generated reports, and practitioner/user perspectives).	5	
	Bibliography is adequately cited/referenced.	5	
<b>Total Score for section:</b>		<b>40</b>	

## Step 2: Written Submission Evaluation - Key Questions and Approach

No.	Criteria	Total points available	Project score
<b>Understanding the Challenge (15 points total)</b>			
1	Demonstrates an understanding of the depth of the challenge identified and presents a macro view of the sector (including an outline of the scale and impacts of the challenge) with justification for the boundary selected.	5	
	Addresses the key underlying drivers (root causes) of the challenge and presents a hypothesis as to why the challenge persists and a view on the trajectory and history of the systems change.	5	
	Demonstrates an understanding of the relationships, connections and power dynamics of the direct and indirect key stakeholders affected by the challenges.	5	
<b>Application of a Systems Thinking Approach (20 points total)</b>			
2	Demonstrates understanding and use of relevant systems thinking tools and concepts to research, mapping and describing the system.	5	
	Demonstrates a broad perspective and ability to see the whole system.	5	
	Understands key relationships and networks of interconnections within and across the system.	5	
	Considers mental models, embedded structures, power dynamics, and how personal and/or popular assumptions are challenged.	5	
<b>Understanding the existing Solutions Landscape (15 points total)</b>			
3	Thoroughly describes the range of other attempted interventions or solutions within the system and explores a diversity of perspectives.	5	
	Draws from a wide range of different approaches, both at a local and global level, including those working on the same problem and others which are tangentially related.	5	
	Demonstrates an understanding of the nature and diversity of the existing solutions, including a perspective on what has been more or less successful and why, including why existing options fail to solve the identified problem.	5	

4	<b>Identification of Levers of Change and Intervention Opportunity (20 points total)</b>		
	Identifies a range of potential impact opportunities and leverage points in the system which might be used to positively shift the system results.	5	
	Looks beyond untapped market opportunities or new start-ups ideas by identifying potential leverage points such as missing linkages or relationships, structural changes, policy change, opportunities, or behaviour change initiatives, that include wider actors such as government, non-profits, or researchers.	5	
	Uses this analysis to provide a recommendation of where the system should be acted on through suggesting an intervention opportunity (or two or three complementary interventions). Note that the proposed 'solution' could be any lever in the system where there is a market/intervention opportunity; it does not need to be a specific product or service.	5	
	Identifies potential implementation issues in driving change through this intervention, and analyses the expected outcomes of a set of potential future scenarios.	5	
5	<b>Key Insights, Reflection and Lessons Learned (10 points total)</b>		
	Demonstrates a deeper awareness and an honest reflection of key lessons and insights derived from the research and mapping process.	5	
	Demonstrates understanding that complex problems cannot be understood from a single perspective and context and different viewpoints and contexts are necessary to properly understand the problem. Lessons shared are very valuable, insightful and user-friendly and are possible points of action for anyone working in this area.	5	
<b>Total Score for section:</b>		<b>80</b>	

<b>Step 3: Verbal Presentation Evaluation</b>			
<b>No.</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Total points available</b>	<b>Project score</b>
<b>Content (20 points total)</b>			
<b>1</b>	Provides a concise, clear and understandable overview of the challenge and solutions landscape, identifying key relationships, systemic patterns, interconnections, and power dynamics.	<b>5</b>	
	Highlights the necessary components in order to explain why the system is the way that it is (gaps & root causes), and what might be the essential elements necessary for transformation (levers of change).	<b>5</b>	
	Demonstrates understanding of the broader ecosystem in which the challenge exists.	<b>5</b>	
	Lessons shared are very valuable, insightful and user-friendly and include possible calls to action for anyone working in this area.	<b>5</b>	
<b>Delivery (15 points total)</b>			
<b>2</b>	Presentation was cogent, cohesive, engaging, and well-thought out. Presenter(s) conveyed enthusiasm and passion for their research.	<b>5</b>	
	Presentation visuals included a systems map of some sort that goes beyond a simple list of actors.	<b>5</b>	
	Findings are articulated in a way that people can meaningfully understand and learn from.	<b>5</b>	
<b>Q&amp;A (15 points total)</b>			
<b>3</b>	Questions were answered adequately and concisely.	<b>5</b>	
	Responses were humble and honest in cases where the answers were unknown.	<b>5</b>	
	Teams were well equipped to answer questions related to research ethics and approach.	<b>5</b>	
<b>Total Score for section:</b>		<b>50</b>	

## Final Project Score Calculation:

TOTAL SCORING TABLE	Project score	Percentage % <i>(Project Score/Total x 100)</i>
<b>Step 1 – Presentation of Written Deliverables:</b>	<b>/40</b>	
<b>Step 2 – Key Questions and Approach:</b>	<b>/80</b>	
<b>Step 3 – Verbal Presentation and Q&amp;A:</b>	<b>/50</b>	
<b>Overall Score:</b>	<b>/170</b>	