## Evaluation quide jury

Evaluation criteria	High (3 points)	Medium (2 points)	Little(1 point)
<b>Diversity dimensions</b> How was the topic of diversity implemented? Were as many different dimensions of diversity as pos- sible presented in the article? Or was a dimension of diversity shown in its facets?	Particular "depth" in conside- ring diversity; intersectional references are made; multiple diversity dimensions or parti- cular facet of single dimen- sion.	Understanding of correlati- ons / recognition of the me- anings of the partial infor- mation, recombination, ma- king predictions / focusing and evaluation available	Knowledge of facts, methods and theories available
Relevance How relevant is the contribution for the OVGU? How outstanding is the contribution considering the existing framework conditions such as age/gender/impairment etc. of the team mem- bers, size of the respective organization?	Specific recognition of rele- vance to an issue at OVGU that has been substantiated, substantiated, or identified.	Reference is fundamentally relevant, but not selfmade?	Remains at the general level
<b>Creativity and degree of innovation</b> What unusual approaches to communicating the topic in the organization or industry were found? To what extent can the contribution be classified as innovative?	High degree of creativity and innovation of the idea (new, creative and unusual)	Medium degree of creativity and innovation of the idea (new, creative and unusual)	Low degree of creativity and innovation of the idea (new, creative and unusual)
Sustainability How high is the sustainable impact of the contri- bution? Does it have a lighthouse character and serve as a role model? Does the contribution have an impact on other areas within the organization and/or on other organizations?	High connectivity and inte- grability	Basically connectable	Individual action that could possibly be further develo- ped in the long term (e.g. establishment of a recurring event).
Visibility Is the project/idea self-supporting & designable for the participants? Is there transparency regar- ding the decisions made towards the participants?	High transparency & "real" participation (making sug- gestions and having deci- sion-making power)	Transparency and opportuni- ties for participation without decision-making power	Information is communica- ted and consultation of the target group (collection of opinions)