

# Map the System 2019 – Evaluation Criteria Scorecard for Submission Materials (Step 1)

## Guidance Note for Evaluators:

### Requirements for Evaluation

In order to review a submission, it must first meet ALL of the following requirements. All submissions must be:

- Focused on a social or environmental challenge
- Submitted by an individual or team of up to 5 members with at least one member being a current student or recent graduate (< past 12 months) of a Map the System partner institution
- Inclusive of all three required submission components: Visual map, Written Summary of Research (max 3,000 words), and Bibliography.

If the submission does not meet these minimum requirements, it will not be considered for evaluation.

### Evaluation Components

There are two steps to the Map the System evaluation process:

- **Step 1:** Review of materials submitted via the Map the System online form (Visual Map, Written Summary, Bibliography), to be reviewed using this scorecard. All institutions must complete this first step.
- **Step 2:** Review of presentation and Q&A, reviewed using the **Evaluation Criteria Scorecard for Presentation and Q&A**. This step is only needed if the application is shortlisted to progress to a presentation event (e.g. local selection event at your institution, the Canadian Final, or the Global Final).

Ranking should be determined by a combination of these two evaluations, weighted equally:

- Half of the final ranking to be based on the submission materials
- Half of the final ranking to be based on the presentation and Q&A

If your institution is not holding a local presentation event, then the evaluation of the submission materials (Step 1) can serve as the final evaluation from which to select your institution's winning team.

**This form is for reviewing the submission materials only. A separate form should be used for in-person presentations and Q&A, though many of the evaluation criteria are the same.**

The submission materials (Visual map, Written Summary of Research, Bibliography) should be evaluated as a whole rather than separately for each component. For example, a visual system map may be difficult to understand on its own, but in combination with the written summary, an evaluator may find that the learning was cogently and clearly presented. Below you will find six evaluation criteria and a detailed explanation of how to rate each submission (as Weak, Average, Strong or Exceptional). At the end of the form there is space for comments and further questions to ask the team if they are selected to progress to the next round. We recommend each evaluator individually completes one form per submission. Afterwards, evaluators should compare and discuss their notes and agree on an overall rating for each submission.

### Scorecard for Submission Material:

<b><i>Institution Name:</i></b>	<b><i>Team Name:</i></b>
<b><i>Reviewer Name:</i></b>	<b><i>Topic Area:</i></b>

<b>Criteria</b> Each of the following criteria should be reviewed individually. It is not intended that every submission is able to satisfy <u>all</u> of the questions in order to get a strong rating as some of them may not be relevant to the research topic selected.	<b><i>Weak:</i></b> The submission is sub-par for this criterion, i.e. insufficient information provided, inadequate detail or obvious inaccuracies.	<b><i>Average:</i></b> The submission is average or just meets the criteria i.e. minimum required level of detail provided.	<b><i>Strong:</i></b> The submission is strongly rated for this criterion, i.e. above average in terms of the level of detail provided.	<b><i>Exceptional:</i></b> The submission is 'best in class' for this criterion & demonstrates exceptional depth and breadth of research/reflection.
<p><b>Criterion 1: Understanding the challenge</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the submission demonstrate an understanding of the system, including how this challenge is related to other challenges, and the complexity of the issues, with <u>justification</u> for the <u>challenge</u> and <u>geography</u> selected?</li> <li>2. Does the submission demonstrate a deep understanding of the <u>resources, roles, rules, and relationships</u> inherent in the system which contribute to the <u>results</u> of their chosen challenge?</li> <li>3. Does the submission present a <u>macro view</u> of the challenge (including understanding of the scale of the problem, its causes, when it started, and what is holding it in place)?</li> <li>4. Does the submission clearly demonstrate an understanding of the <u>key stakeholders</u> affected by the problem (directly and indirectly) and any <u>power dynamics</u> between those impacted, those furthering the challenge, and those with the most power to create change?</li> </ol>	The challenge is discussed only at the surface level. The root causes are overlooked or unexplored and/or presented in a way that is insufficient to demonstrate the depth of understanding expected from the timeline of this project. Opinions or assumptions are presented as facts with little or no evidence. Power dynamics are not explored.	The challenge is explored in detail, root causes are identified, but some complexity is overlooked. For example, little or no explanation is given for why the challenge persists, the relationship between their chosen challenge and other areas of concern is unclear, or an exploration of power dynamics is missing. An "average" submission might include many facts and a demonstration of research, but sometimes the participants' own opinions are extrapolated to make unjust implications about the challenge as a whole.	The challenge is well defined, data is cited, complexity is addressed, and reasons for the persistence of the problem are explored. An understanding of the relationships between elements in the system is evident, rather than just a list of actors. Power dynamics are explored. Some additional detail is missing which would have made the report excellent.	The submission shares a thorough mapping of the challenge, an understanding of the root causes, and a thorough portrayal of what is holding the status quo in place. There is a nuanced look at the impacts of the challenge, including expert opinions and/or well-referenced insights on its future trajectory. Relationships in the system are explored, as well as a deeper exploration of the nature of those relationships. Outstanding research questions are identified in areas where the applicant/s would have liked to go deeper.
<b>Please circle your ranking for Criterion 1:</b>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>

	<b><i>Weak</i></b>	<b><i>Average</i></b>	<b><i>Strong</i></b>	<b><i>Exceptional</i></b>
<p><b>Criterion 2: Understanding existing solution efforts</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the submission demonstrate an understanding of the <u>resources, roles, rules, and relationships</u> in the system and how existing solution efforts are (or are not) shifting the <u>results</u> of that system?</li> <li>2. Does the submission clearly articulate the overall landscape of current solution efforts including acknowledgement of a <u>diverse range</u> of existing efforts, such as policy, market-based initiatives, movements &amp; networks, behavior change efforts, etc?</li> <li>3. Does the submission demonstrate a deep understanding of the <u>nature</u> and <u>diversity</u> of the existing solution efforts including an opinion on what is or isn't working well?</li> <li>4. Does the submission explore some of the <u>models for change</u> being tried and what distinguishes the approaches?</li> <li>5. Does the submission look beyond a listing of specific organizations or system actors in order to explore their <u>relationships</u> and any initiatives that <u>join up</u> some of the efforts?</li> </ol>	<p>While some existing organizations/solution efforts may be explored, very few details are shared regarding their models, their impact, or their relationships.</p>	<p>Many solution efforts are listed and some are explored in depth. Some models are identified, yet the depth of analysis is not very robust. Little or no effort is focused on the space "between" the efforts (i.e. government support, knowledge sharing, etc) and little is shared about how these efforts are impacting the system. There is little exploration of tangential efforts (in different geographies or sectors) from which lessons could be learned.</p>	<p>A thorough look at different models for change is included, plus a comparison of their efforts. Different types of efforts (business, government, non-profit, etc) are explored and tangential efforts, which could be learned from in other geographies or issue areas, are discussed. There is a clear understanding of the relationships between key solution efforts and the current system dynamics.</p>	<p>The submission is exceptional in its analysis of the landscape of current solution efforts. It not only includes a wide look at the efforts both locally and globally from which lessons can be drawn, but also thoroughly examines relationships between different efforts and the impact on the system. The analysis includes an exploration of tangential efforts (in different geographies or sectors) from which lessons could be learned.</p>
<p><b>Please circle your ranking for Criterion 2:</b></p>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>

	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>
<p><b>Criterion 3: Identification of Gaps &amp; Levers of Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the submission clearly identify any potential <u>gaps</u> or what is <u>missing</u> from the landscape of existing solution efforts (for example, untapped market opportunities, regulation, or unmet services/linkages)?</li> <li>2. Does the submission clearly outline <u>key levers of change</u> that could contribute to existing efforts? Is the <u>depth</u> of those levers explored, indicating an understanding that not all leverage points are equal?</li> <li>3. Are the gaps <u>backed up by facts</u> and research which show that these are not just assumptions about what is missing? Are there lessons learned about how to impact change in those gaps, and are these backed up by research?</li> <li>4. Does the submission look <u>beyond one “solution”</u> or singular new start-up idea to identify a range of possible opportunities for government, non-profits, educational institutions, media, researchers and/or other groups whose efforts might contribute to mitigating the negative impacts of the challenge?</li> <li>5. Does the submission include <u>actionable insights</u> that anyone looking to take action on this issue could learn from or build upon?</li> </ol>	<p>The applicant(s) present “their” solution to the problem (i.e. focus on one idea for a business or activity designed to solve the problem) rather than identifying a range of missing pieces, and/or the applicant/s provide only a surface level list of opportunities which are not explored in detail.</p> <p><i>Note: If the submission focuses in great detail on THEIR idea for a solution, with very little detail on other possible paths to impact, they should be rated as “weak” for this section.</i></p>	<p>Many ideas for improvement and impact are explored, yet most of them are not explored in detail. Some leverage points are listed but an understanding of the depth of the points is not shown. Some research and data is included, though not sufficient to show a deep understanding of the identified gaps.</p>	<p>The submission includes a thorough look at the impact gaps with data, research, or expert opinions to back those up. A range of opportunities for increased positive impact is explored, such as efforts from government, business, non-profits, researchers, etc. Leverage points are explored with an understanding of which opportunities might be “deeper” and which might be easier to implement. Some additional detail is missing which would have made the report excellent.</p>	<p>The submission not only includes all of the efforts listed in the previous column but also goes into more detail on what would be needed for those efforts to succeed, linking up the lessons they learned in the challenge analysis, and demonstrating the insights they gathered from their interviews and research.</p>
<p><b>Please circle your ranking for Criterion 3:</b></p>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>

	<b><i>Weak</i></b>	<b><i>Average</i></b>	<b><i>Strong</i></b>	<b><i>Exceptional</i></b>
<p><b>Criterion 4: Lessons Learned</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the submission demonstrate a deep <u>awareness</u> and <u>self-reflection</u> of key lessons and insights derived from the research?</li> <li>2. Does the submission include any <u>assumptions</u> which were confirmed or challenged through this research?</li> <li>3. Do the applicants link the <u>key lessons they learned when exploring the underlying drivers</u> of the problem to the proposed levers of change?</li> <li>4. Do the applicants <u>acknowledge gaps</u> in their research and highlight what information might be missing to further improve the submission (were they to have more time or resources)? Do they offer a <u>humble and honest</u> assessment of their own understanding and learning?</li> </ol>	<p>Very few lessons are drawn from the applicants' research. Research seems like a repetition of facts, rather than their own analysis and comparison across various perspectives. The submission does not include self-reflection or acknowledgement of assumptions.</p>	<p>Some lessons are shared, but there is little effort to link the problem analysis with these lessons. Assumptions are proposed for how best to move forward, but the data behind those assumptions – or even a recognition that they are assumptions – is not shared.</p>	<p>The lessons shared are very valuable, deep and include self-reflection on any assumptions tested or opinions changed. More detail would be helpful to consider the insights exceptional.</p>	<p>The lessons shared are so insightful that the reader feels they have acquired a valuable education on the topic as well as an understanding of the participants' learning journey. The link between the challenge analysis and the lessons learned is strong. The lessons shared would be useful and insightful for anyone working in this area. The applicant/s acknowledge what learning they are missing and what they might pursue with more time.</p>
<p><b>Please circle your ranking for Criterion 4:</b></p>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>

	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>
<p><b>Criterion 5: Research Approach</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the submission demonstrate a diverse <u>range of research sources</u> (i.e. not only desktop research but surveys and/or practitioner interviews too)?</li> <li>2. Does the submission demonstrate <u>pro-active</u> research methods (i.e. finding ways to get proxy information or data on related issues when the key data they were seeking was not readily available)?</li> <li>3. Does the Written Summary of Research submitted provide sufficient <u>detail</u> to understand the <u>research approach</u> and <u>methodology</u> of the research undertaken, including a summary of <u>key insights</u>?</li> <li>4. Have all relevant sources been <u>adequately cited/referenced</u> in the bibliography?</li> <li>5. Have the applicant/s considered <u>research ethics</u> and proceeded appropriately in their approach?</li> </ol>	<p>Few sources are noted. No interviews were conducted. Information is poorly referenced. Facts and opinion are conflated.</p>	<p>Most research was desktop research, but information is cited and the range of data was adequate to present an average submission.</p>	<p>Many sources were used and some interviews/surveys were conducted but most research was desktop. The data is well presented and referenced.</p> <p><i>Note, if the data is well presented but little to no interviews were conducted, they should still receive a "Strong" rather than an "Exceptional" rating for this section.</i></p>	<p>Many sources, including at least one interview (for example, of someone working in a related field) are referenced in the data collection. Opinions are strongly backed up by research and information is clearly referenced.</p>
<p><b>Please circle your ranking for Criterion 5:</b></p>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>

	<b><i>Weak</i></b>	<b><i>Average</i></b>	<b><i>Strong</i></b>	<b><i>Exceptional</i></b>
<p><b>Criterion 6: Quality of Visual Map</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do the visual materials submitted adequately reflect the necessary level of <u>detail</u> in a <u>creative</u> and <u>insightful</u> way?</li> <li>2. Would someone outside of this competition be able to look at these materials and gain significant <u>insights</u> when reviewing the visual map in conjunction with the written summary?</li> <li>3. Do the visuals include a <u>system map</u> of some sort which goes beyond a simple list of actors and shows <u>relationships</u>?</li> </ol>	<p>Visuals are confusing or minimal, and do not add value when reviewed alongside the written summary. A system map is either not present or too basic.</p>	<p>The visuals are adequate but do not provide high-quality learning opportunities. The visuals add value to the written submission, but only minimally. A system map may be present, but is simplistic.</p>	<p>Visuals are creative, cogent and insightful. The submission includes a system map that demonstrates relationships, rather than simply a list of actors. When considering the submission as a learning opportunity, the visuals add significant value to the written summary.</p>	<p>Exceptionally useful and beautiful presentation of relevant learning material. The visuals demonstrate a thorough system mapping process, clearly illustrating the results, resources, roles, rules, and relationships in the system. The visuals, in conjunction with the written summary, provide a robust learning opportunity for the viewer.</p>
<p><b>Please circle your ranking for Criterion 6:</b></p>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>

**Overall Application View**

- Overall review of the submission (Weak, Average, Strong, Exceptional)
- This application should progress further to the next stage of the competition

**Weak / Average / Strong / Exceptional****Yes / No****Comments****If selected to proceed, further questions to ask the applicant/s during the next stage:**