

Evaluation criteria for the 2025 XJTLU Student Research-Led Learning Symposium

Dimension & Explanation for the Major Awards (Grand Prize, First Prize and Second Prize)	Score
Problem Identification (20 points) (15-20) The problem is highly authentic, clearly significant, and demonstrates a sophisticated insight into its underlying root causes and complexities. (8-14) The problem is relevant and well-defined, showing a clear understanding of its main components and why it matters to a specific audience. (1-7) The problem is vague, overly broad, or lacks a strong connection to evidence. The insight into the issue is surface-level.	
Method & Procedure (20 points) (15-20) The method is robust, logical, and well-suited to the problem. Data collection and analysis form an integrated, iterative, and adaptive process. (8-14) The method is clear and appropriate. Data collection techniques are well applied to support analysis and steer the project's direction. (1-7) The method is unclear, incomplete, or mismatched with the problem. The connection between the collected data and the analysis is weak or not well established.	
Innovation & Feasibility (20 points) (15-20) The solution is highly original and creative. It is also highly feasible, with a realistic and thoughtful plan that addresses potential constraints like time, cost, and resources. (8-14) The solution shows clear, creative elements and is practical. Most real-world constraints are acknowledged and have been considered in the plan. (1-7) The solution is conventional and lacks innovation, or is innovative but clearly impractical. Major constraints have been overlooked or not adequately addressed.	
Teamwork (20 points) (15-20) The team functioned as a highly cohesive and self-managing unit. Workload was distributed equitably and based on members' strengths, with exceptional communication and conflict resolution. (8-14) The team collaborated effectively and reliably. Workload was shared fairly, and communication was clear and productive, with minor issues resolved appropriately. (1-7) Team collaboration was inconsistent or fragmented. Workload distribution was uneven, and communication was infrequent or unclear, hindering the group's progress.	
Reflection (10 points) (8-10) The reflection is honest, critically analytical, and offers deep insight. It thoughtfully connects the project experience to personal growth and future applications. (5-7) The reflection is thoughtful and identifies the key strengths and weaknesses of the project process and its outcome. (1-4) The reflection is superficial, vague, or purely descriptive. It lacks critical analysis and fails to discuss meaningful personal learning.	
Presentation (10 points) (8-10) The presentation is engaging, polished, and clearly communicates all key points. Visual aids are professional and enhance the narrative, and delivery is confident and well-paced. (5-7) The presentation is clear and well-organized. Visual aids are helpful and appropriate, and delivery is competent. (1-4) The presentation is disorganized or unclear in parts. Visual aids are distracting or not well-integrated, and delivery is hesitant or rushed.	
Total score (up to 100)	

Explanation for the Special Award: Best AI Application Award	Score
This award recognizes outstanding and innovative application of artificial intelligence that significantly enhances the research process and outcome. The winning project will demonstrate a strategic selection of AI tools, seamlessly and critically integrated to augment the work, alongside a clear commitment to ethical use and transparency. The AI application must provide a significant and measurable impact on the project's depth, efficiency, or creativity, serving as a transformative element rather than a superficial addition. Total score (up to 10)	