



## Welcome to the Advancing African Digital Humanities Ideation Hub (AADHIH) Reclaiming African Voices Hackathon Rubric

A hackathon rubric is a structured evaluation framework designed to ensure fair, consistent, and transparent judging. By clearly defining criteria and performance levels, it helps judges assess projects using a shared understanding of what quality and success look like. This is especially important in multidisciplinary hackathons, where judges may come from different backgrounds and participants may take diverse approaches. A rubric also communicates the competition's priorities—such as impact, innovation, ethics, or usability—so participants can align their work with the intended goals rather than focusing solely on technical flashiness.

Beyond scoring, a hackathon rubric plays an important educational and developmental role. It supports constructive, criterion-based feedback that participants can use to reflect on and improve their work. At the same time, it strengthens the legitimacy of outcomes by clearly justifying advancement and prize decisions. In this way, a rubric functions not just as a judging tool, but as a guiding framework that shapes participation, reinforces values, and turns the hackathon into a meaningful learning experience.

## Reclaiming African Voices – Judging Rubric

Total: 100 points

---

### 1. Humanities Depth & Relevance (30%)

Performance Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent (26–30 pts)</b>	Demonstrates rich, nuanced engagement with African histories, languages, cultures, or lived experiences. Shows strong critical thinking, with clear historical, cultural, and/or ethical reflection. Purpose is well articulated and clearly prioritises meaning, interpretation, or preservation over technical novelty.
<b>Good (20–25 pts)</b>	Shows solid engagement with relevant African contexts and some critical reflection. Purpose is clear, though interpretation or preservation aspects may not be fully developed. Technology is generally well connected to humanities concerns.
<b>Adequate (14–19 pts)</b>	Engagement with African contexts is present but limited or surface-level. Critical reflection is minimal or implicit. Project leans more toward technical execution than humanities insight.
<b>Limited (0–13 pts)</b>	Little to no meaningful engagement with African humanities content. Lacks critical reflection. Purpose is unclear or driven primarily by technical novelty.

---

### 2. Community Impact (25%)

Performance Level	Descriptor
<b>Excellent (21–25 pts)</b>	Project is strongly grounded in real community needs or lived realities. Clearly amplifies underrepresented or marginalised voices. Demonstrates strong awareness of community context, with evident or well-reasoned community benefit.

<b>Good (16–20 pts)</b>	Project is relevant to communities and has clear potential impact. Addresses marginalised voices, though community engagement or benefit may be indirect or conceptual.
<b>Adequate (11–15 pts)</b>	Community relevance is stated but not convincingly demonstrated. Impact is generalized or abstract, with limited attention to specific voices or beneficiaries.
<b>Limited (0–10 pts)</b>	Little consideration of community relevance or impact. Does not meaningfully engage with or benefit marginalised voices.

---

### 3. Accessibility & Inclusivity (20%)

<b>Performance Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>Excellent (17–20 pts)</b>	Demonstrates strong inclusive design: considers language diversity, accessibility, connectivity constraints, and varying user abilities. Interface or presentation is clear, intuitive, and context-sensitive.
<b>Good (13–16 pts)</b>	Shows clear consideration of accessibility and inclusion, with minor gaps. Interface or presentation is mostly clear and usable across contexts.
<b>Adequate (9–12 pts)</b>	Some acknowledgment of inclusivity or accessibility, but application is limited or inconsistent. Usability may be uneven.
<b>Limited (0–8 pts)</b>	Accessibility and inclusivity are largely unaddressed. Interface or presentation may exclude users or ignore contextual constraints.

---

### 4. Creativity & Innovation (15%)

<b>Performance Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
--------------------------	-------------------

<b>Excellent (13–15 pts)</b>	Highly original concept or approach. Uses digital tools in imaginative and effective ways. Technology and humanities perspectives are well integrated and mutually reinforcing.
<b>Good (10–12 pts)</b>	Shows creativity and some innovation. Digital methods are thoughtfully applied, though not entirely original or deeply integrated.
<b>Adequate (6–9 pts)</b>	Concept shows limited originality. Uses familiar tools or approaches with minimal adaptation or creative extension.
<b>Limited (0–5 pts)</b>	Lacks originality or innovation. Relies on conventional or undeveloped use of tools.

---

### 5. Sustainability & Future Potential (10%)

<b>Performance Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>Excellent (9–10 pts)</b>	Strong potential for longevity, reuse, or scaling. Demonstrates ethical data practices and respect for community ownership. Maintenance and future growth are clearly feasible.
<b>Good (7–8 pts)</b>	Some consideration of sustainability and ethics. Project could continue beyond the challenge with moderate effort.
<b>Adequate (4–6 pts)</b>	Sustainability is briefly acknowledged but underdeveloped. Long-term viability or maintenance is unclear.
<b>Limited (0–3 pts)</b>	No meaningful consideration of sustainability, ethics, or future use.