

## Flourish-A-Thon Judging Rubric

Judge: \_\_\_\_\_ Team: \_\_\_\_\_

### 1. Problem Framing: WHAT gap, WHOSE flourishing?

<b>3</b>	Specific flourishing gap and specific target population. Engaged at least one potential end-user while shaping the work.
<b>2</b>	Clear flourishing gap and clear target population. Did not engage potential end-users.
<b>1</b>	Flourishing gap is loose, or benefits are vague. Targeted towards “everyone who could benefit.”
<b>0</b>	Generic problem statement; no clear who or what.

### 2. Why AI: WHY this tool vs. alternatives

<b>3</b>	Clearly articulates how AI specifically enhances the product and helps support user flourishing.
<b>2</b>	Makes a clear case why the AI is a reasonable fit; the case holds up under pressure.
<b>1</b>	Makes a case that AI use is plausible, though it still feels plug-and-play.
<b>0</b>	AI for AI’s sake. A simpler tool would do the job.

### 3. Measurement: HOW you’ll know, WHEN you’ll check

<b>3</b>	Explains multiple concrete flourishing signals and a clear validation plan (when + how measurements will be considered).
<b>2</b>	Has a measurement approach, but vague on timeline, failure, or plans to validate product.
<b>1</b>	Gestures at measurement, but not specific.
<b>0</b>	No measurement plan.

### 4. Product Quality/Demo: WHERE it lands, HOW a user lives with it

<b>3</b>	Impressively functional and user-friendly demo that shows real insight regarding the end-user’s interests.
<b>2</b>	Functional demo, reasonably user-friendly but not exceptional.
<b>1</b>	Non-functional OR not user-friendly—does not attend to human design factors.
<b>0</b>	Non-functional AND not user-friendly—does not attend to human design factors.

## Flourish-A-Thon Judging Rubric

### 5. Scale, Cost & Sustainability: WHAT it takes to persist

<b>3</b>	Names comparable competitors and how they differ. Has a plausible cost model per user or deployment. Names who pays in year 1 vs. 3, and what sustains the work.
<b>2</b>	Two of three: competitive landscape, cost model, sustainability plan.
<b>1</b>	Acknowledges cost and sustainability exist; plan is vague.
<b>0</b>	No business thinking; no awareness of comparable efforts.

### 6. Handling Q & A: WHO shows cogency and humility

<b>3</b>	Responses are clear, well-supported, and aligned with the presentation. Interdisciplinary influence enhances real-world value. Transparent about limits.
<b>2</b>	Responses are good. influence is visible but general. Acknowledges limits.
<b>1</b>	Responses are vague. Collaboration described as division of labor, not mutual influence. Evasive in Q&A.
<b>0</b>	Responses are unconvincing. No evidence of cross-disciplinary friction producing insight. Defensive in Q&A.

### Sample Questions to Probe (Q&A)

- Walk me through how a real user would interact with this on day 1, week 4, and month 6.
- How did the public health/business/AI person on your team change your approach?
- What surprised you most when you talked to potential end-users?
- If this works exactly as planned, what does flourishing look like for one specific person in 6 months?
- What makes this proposal sustainable in the long-term?
- Have you considered what might lead you to decommission or pause the product?
- What would you consider a failure of the product, or an inappropriate use of the product?
- What adjacent markets or features might you target over time?
- Are there other user groups you considered? If so, why were they excluded?
- How are you protecting user data/privacy?

**Total:** \_\_\_\_\_ / 18 Tie-break: highest score on Dimension 6.

Notes / standout moments:

