

Competition Entry Grading Rubric

CleanerGrid 2027

September 2026

Participants are strongly encouraged to go beyond summarising research by presenting practical recommendations and innovative solutions. Entries should showcase original thinking, actionable ideas, and insightful analysis that contribute meaningfully to the energy and sustainability domain. The Competition values creativity, relevance, and impact—favouring submissions that not only address current challenges but also propose clear pathways for improvement and transformation.



The Oval, 160 Shelbourne Road, Ballsbridge, Dublin D04 FW28
Telephone: +353 1 677 1700 | www.eirgrid.ie

1 Competition Entry Format

- Each Competition Entry must include the submission of:
 - a. A written report (the “**Written Report**”);
 - b. A video submission (the “**Video Submission**”); and
 - c. A completed copy of the Competition Submission Form (the “**Competition Submission Form**”)

1.1 Written Report Format Guidelines

Strict adherence to format guidelines demonstrates professionalism and respect for Competition guidelines.

1.1.1 Reference Style

Participants may choose either Harvard or IEEE citation style, but must apply it consistently throughout their submission.

1.1.2 Word Count Policy

Word Count: The Written Report must be between 4,000 words (minimum) and 5,000 words (maximum) in length, with a $\pm 10\%$ tolerance margin permitted (3,600-5,500 accepted range).

Word Count Policy: Written Reports that fall outside the permitted tolerance range as outlined above will not be marked or considered for evaluation. The purpose of a word limit is to maintain fairness and standardise the reviewing workload and to help Participants produce a focused and clear Written Report. Writing to set word limits is a skill required within some professions, as well as an academic skill.

The Written Report word count shall include everything in the main body of the Written Report text (including headings, tables, citations, quotes, lists, etc). Any cover page, table of contents, list of references, appendices and footnotes are NOT included in the word count of the Written Report.

1.1.3 Written Report Format

- **Table of Contents:** A table of contents for the Written Report shall immediately follow any cover page. It should list the title of each chapter of the Written Report and the main sections in each chapter together with the relevant starting page numbers.
- **Abstract:** There shall be a summary abstract of the Written Report (of approximately 300 words) immediately following the table of contents page(s). The focus of the Competition Entry should be clearly identified and the hypotheses/propositions articulated. The methods used should be briefly described. The significance of research should be explained. The main insights and conclusions of the Written Report should be summarised.
- **Main body:** The main body of the Written Report should present the work carried out by the author(s)/Participant(s) in addressing the Competition’s prompt. The author(s)/Participant(s) may use any suitable headings and/or subheadings at their own discretion throughout the main body of the Written Report. Sources will be cited consistently in either Harvard or IEEE format. The main body of the Written Report should present thoughtful and insightful discussions that are clearly informed by the Written Report results, and thoroughly address how the work supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/propositions made. There should be an insightful discussion of how the Competition Entry relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area. The points should be supported with original figures, graphs and charts.
- **Conclusion:** There shall be a conclusionary section in the Written Report that includes a summary of how the author(s)/Participant(s) addressed the Competition’s prompt and a summary of the Written Report’s insights, and suggestions for further research in this area.
- **List of References:** The list of references must be in the format of IEEE or Harvard.

- **Appendices:** Each Written Report is recommended to include a **Team Contribution Statement:** in the appendices, detailing, in brief, who was responsible for what elements of the Competition Entry. Other appendices of the Written Reports should be kept to a minimum and only contain reference materials illustrating and supporting arguments fully made in the main body of the Written Report. Any other materials included in appendices will not be marked

1.2 Video Submission Format Guidelines:

- The Video Submission is a mandatory component of the Competition Entry and must be submitted by the same deadline as the Written Report – 23:59 on 12th February 2027.
- The Video Submission may be presented in any format (including animation, slideshow with voiceover, recorded Zoom presentation, or other creative styles) as long as it effectively communicates the project.
- It must describe the same research project outlined in the Written Report and clearly present the findings, conclusions, and key insights.
- Each Video Submission must:
 - a. have a target duration of no more than 15 minutes. Video duration may be considered as part of the assessment process and may affect the score awarded under the published grading rubric.
 - b. Include speaking by a minimum of half the Participant team members (i.e. in teams of three at least two team members must present, in teams of five at least three team members must present, in teams of six, at least three team members must speak).
 - c. Participants are strongly encouraged to clearly distinguish original and sourced content through citations in the form of on-screen captions and a reference slide using Harvard or IEEE style. The quality, completeness and consistency of video citations and references may be considered as part of the assessment process and reflected in the published grading rubric.
 - d. Be submitted as a **link to an unlisted YouTube video**, included in the email submission. The video must be uploaded by the Participant(s) to YouTube and set to “unlisted” to ensure it is accessible to the judging panel but not publicly searchable.

2 CleanerGrid 2027 - Grading Rubrics

This document contains two grading rubrics - one for the written submission and one for the video. These rubrics provide clear and transparent criteria for evaluating submissions in the CleanerGrid 2027 competition. They are intended to serve as a guide for both students and the assessment panel by outlining expectations for the submitted work.

Submissions must include all of the following, the Competition Submission Form, a Written Report and a Video Submission. If any component is missing, the entry will **not be assessed**.

The final score will be calculated using the following weighting:

- **Competition Submission Form** - not scored but required.
- **Written Report** - 70% of the total score
- **Video Submission** - 30% of the total score

Submissions will be scored on criteria weighted according to their importance. For each criterion, the assessment panel will assign a score from **0 to 5**, based on the description that best reflects the overall quality of the work. The bullet points illustrate typical features of work at that level—meeting any or most of these indicators may suggest placement in that category. Submissions do not need to meet all listed points to receive a score for that level.

If a submission falls between two levels, an intermediate score may be awarded (e.g., **4** if the work is stronger than “Good” but not fully “Excellent,” or **2** if it is better than “Limited” but not fully “Good”).

Scoring Guide:

- **5 = Excellent**
- **3 = Good**
- **1 = Limited**
- **0 = Poor**

Students are encouraged to use this document to review their work before submission and identify areas for improvement. This approach promotes fairness and transparency.

CleanerGrid 2027 - Written Submission Grading Rubric

Intermediate scores (4 and 2) may be awarded for work that falls between levels.

Criteria	Excellent - 5	Good - 3	Limited - 1	Poor - 0
1. Abstract & Relevance of work (10%) Assesses how clearly the submission addresses the CleanerGrid theme of Powering Up the Energy Citizen and how they introduce their project's area of focus.	- Engaging with clear thesis - Fully addresses the CleanerGrid theme and outlines scope of the report - Provides strong context for the report	- Clear thesis - Addresses CleanerGrid theme but lacks depth - Slightly vague outline of the scope of the report - Context is adequate	- Unclear thesis - Limited link to CleanerGrid theme - Scope of the report unclear	- No clear introduction - Theme not addressed - Lacks context
2. Proposed Solution & Feasibility (30%) Evaluates the technical and practical soundness of the proposed approach, including how it could be implemented.	- Innovative and well-developed solution - Detailed, realistic implementation approach - Strong technical feasibility - Clearly Considers existing grid infrastructure, constraints and stakeholders - Considers how the proposal could be delivered in practice	- Relevant solution - Feasible approach - Some detail missing - Addresses basic implementation - Considers some practical constraints and risks	- Conceptual only - Lacks practical depth - Limited consideration of feasibility or grid constraints - Implementation approach is unclear.	- No clear solution proposed - Idea is impractical or unsupported - No meaningful consideration of implementation - Missing feasibility discussion
3. Results & Impact (20%) Looks at the outcomes and findings of the project and their implications for policy, economics, or energy systems.	- Presents clear, insightful results that address objectives - Demonstrates strong policy, economic, or system relevance - Original, clearly labelled visuals (e.g., tables, diagrams) that directly support and enhance the analysis, fully integrated into the narrative - Applies accurate analyses with transparent assumptions	- Presents results with moderate depth - Shows some relevance to policy, economic, or system context - Provides limited data support - Analysis lacks full integration - Relevant and mostly clear visuals with some integration into the text, though they may lack originality or full clarity	- Results unclear or minimally explained - Weak analysis with little interpretation - Minimal supporting data - Visuals are present but generic, unclear, or poorly labelled, with limited relevance to the findings	- No meaningful results presented - No evidence of impact or analysis - No supporting data - No visuals, or visuals are confusing, irrelevant, or copied without interpretation

4. Conclusion & Completeness (15%) Assesses how well the submission wraps up, reflects on broader impacts, and shows a complete, multidisciplinary view.	• Restates main argument and highlights relevance • Connects insights across disciplines • Summarises and interprets key results and implications • Links back to research question • Provides reflective perspective and recommendations	• Adequate conclusion with some relevance • Touches on multiple perspectives but lacks depth • Partial summary and interpretation of results • Minimal reflection or future recommendations	• Weak or narrow conclusion • Little or no summary or interpretation • Minimal integration of perspectives • No clear recommendations	• No conclusion provided • No summary, interpretation, or reflection • No multidisciplinary view
5. Organisation & Communication (10%) Measures clarity, structure, and effectiveness of writing, visuals, and overall presentation.	• Clear, logical structure • Excellent visuals and writing • Smooth flow of ideas	• Generally clear structure • Adequate visuals and writing • Minor flow issues	• Disorganised structure • Weak visuals • Hard to follow	• Poorly structured • Unclear writing • Visuals absent
6. Evidence, Referencing & AI Use (15%) Evaluates the use of credible sources, proper citation, and appropriate integration of AI tools to support but not replace original thinking.	• Original insights made by student(s) • Supports claims with strong academic sources • Consistent Harvard or IEEE citation style • Complete reference list provided • AI tools used transparently and appropriately to enhance—not replace—original analysis	• Some original thinking present • Generally, supports claims • Some academic sources • Applies Harvard or IEEE citation style with only minor citation issues • List of References provided with only minor mistakes • AI use evident but does not dominate	• Minimal personal insight • Limited evidence to support claims • Few sources or non-academic sources used • Citation style inconsistent or incorrect. • List of References provided with some mistakes. • AI-generated content noticeably shapes structure or tone	• No original contribution • Does not backup claims with evidence • No citations or no list of references • Submission appears heavily or fully AI-generated
7. Compliance (pass/fail) • Compliant word count • In-text citations included • List of References included	• All compliance items fully met and documented.			• Missing.

CleanerGrid 2027 - Video Submission Grading Rubric

Intermediate scores (4 and 2) may be awarded for work that falls between levels.

Criteria (Weight & Description)	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Limited (1)	Poor (0)
1. Content & Relevance (30%) Assesses how well the video addresses the CleanerGrid theme, including opportunities, challenges, and insights. Must align with the Written Report and clearly present findings and conclusions.	- Fully aligned with theme - Covers opportunities & challenges - Strong supporting details - Clearly presents findings and conclusions - Where appropriate, sources are clearly acknowledged through on-screen citations and list of references.	- Mostly aligned with theme - Covers main points - Some supporting details - Most sources acknowledged appropriately where relevant.	- Limited alignment - Misses key points - Few details - Sources inconsistently acknowledged where relevant.	- Off-topic or unclear - Lacks substance - No supporting details
2. Structure & Flow (20%) Logical organisation and smooth transitions.	- Clear, logical sequence - Smooth transitions - Easy to follow	- Mostly logical - Minor flow issues - Generally clear	- Disorganised sections - Hard to follow - Weak transitions	- No clear structure - Confusing flow - Jumps between ideas
3. Visual & Audio Quality (15%) Effective use of visuals, sound, and editing.	- High-quality visuals - Clear audio - Professional editing	- Adequate visuals - Mostly clear audio - Basic editing	- Poor visuals - Audio issues - Minimal editing	- Distracting visuals - Unclear audio - No editing
4. Engagement & Creativity (15%) Captures viewer interest and uses creative elements.	- Highly engaging - Creative approach - Strong storytelling	- Some engagement - Moderate creativity - Clear message	- Limited engagement - Minimal creativity - Weak message	- No engagement - No creativity - Unclear message
5. Time Management (10%) Adheres to allotted time effectively.	- All content covered without rushing - Does not exceed 15 minutes	- Most content covered - Minor rushing - Slightly exceeds 15 minutes	- Misses key content - Noticeable rushing - Significantly under or over 15 minutes	- Major gaps - Disorganised timing - Excessively under or over 15 minutes
6. Clarity of Voice & Language (10%) Clear speech and appropriate language	- Very clear speech - Professional tone - Easy to understand	- Mostly clear - Minor tone issues - Understandable	- Hard to hear or follow - Informal tone - Some unclear phrasing	- Unclear speech - Distracting tone - Difficult to understand
7. Compliance (pass/fail) - At least half of team members speak - Uploaded as an unlisted YouTube link - Content aligns with the Written Report	All compliance items fully met.			Missing compliance item.