

Here you can find the rubrics to use for providing feedback to other teams (right below), as well as the rubrics that will be used in grading your assignments – Pre-assignment, Final Pitch and Team Action Report (scroll down to see).

Rubric for Peer Feedback (Team to team):

Component	Sophisticated	Competent	Not Yet Complete
Teamwork	The assignment suggests that the team members have collaborated excellently to achieve objectives. Members are visible working and presenting together throughout. The deliverable is presented in a highly coherent and consistent manner among team members.	The assignment suggests that the team has collaborated well towards achieving the stated objectives, with only a few exceptions. Team members are mostly visible working and presenting together, and the deliverable is presented in a coherent and consistent manner amongst them.	The assignment does not provide enough evidence of team member collaboration. Only few of them are visible working towards the objectives or presenting, independently and not in tandem. Deliverables are not presented coherently and consistently across team members.
Subject knowledge / Critical thinking	The objective of the assignment has been delivered. Output suggests a substantial amount of thought has been put into its preparation.	Most of the objectives of the assignment have been delivered, but the output suggests that further thought could have led to greater depth of analysis.	Very few of the objectives of the assignment have been met and there is little evidence of thought and effort put into its preparation.
Improvisation / Creativity	The deliverable as well as the process documented exhibit an unusual degree of creativity.	The deliverable as well as the process documented exhibit some degree of creativity. The team went beyond the	The deliverable as well as the process documented demonstrates little creativity and originality. There is

Component	Sophisticated	Competent	Not Yet Complete
	<p>Outcomes transcend usual ideas and solutions and suggest the team pushed the boundaries of their creativity. The outcome and process documented suggests that independent thinking and practical improvisation was employed to reach novel ideas and solutions.</p>	<p>obvious in developing their ideas, but could have been more creative. There has been some attempt towards demonstrating practical improvisation and independent thinking, and this has lead to somewhat novel ideas and solutions.</p>	<p>little or no evidence of improvisation and independent thinking to arrive at novel ideas and solutions.</p>
Presentation	<p>The presentation of both process and outcome of the assignment is excellent: flawless, focused, and engaging. Speakers are visible, and their voice is clearly audible and understandable. Video is 8-10 mins. long. Non-essential material has been left out.</p>	<p>The quality of the presentation of the process and outcome is very good, but there is room for improvement, especially with regards to coherence and audience engagement. The presentation is by-and-large audible and understandable, and speakers mostly visible. Video is slightly over the 10 min. limit. There is some material, which, if left out, would have improved the presentation.</p>	<p>The presentation did not engage the audience, was often incoherent, and lacked a smooth flow. Speakers seemed hesitant and had to frequently refer to notes. Parts of the presentation were inaudible, or speakers not visible. Video is well outside the 10 min. limit. There is a lot of material in the presentation that does not address the objectives, and in some cases undermines them.</p>

Rubric for Pre-assignment (graded by instructors):

Component	Sophisticated (<i>grade = 5</i>)	Competent (<i>grade = 3, 4</i>)	Not Yet Complete (<i>grade = 1, 2</i>)
Interview technique (45%)	Asks a sufficient number of key questions, and uses them to ask follow-up questions. Exhibits a high level of preparation. Goes beyond the superficial, and delves beneath the surface of what the entrepreneur has to say, to uncover deep insights.	Asks some key questions, and a few follow-up questions. Sufficient level of preparation. Somewhat superficial in approach, and occasionally delves beneath the surface of what the entrepreneur has to say, to uncover deep insights.	Asks only high-level questions, and almost no follow-up questions – sticks to a script. Superficial in approach, and does not delve beneath the surface of what the entrepreneur has to say. Does not uncover any deep insights.
Lessons learned (45%)	The deliverable indicates that the individual has reflected deeply on the interview findings, both in terms of the experiences of the entrepreneur, as well as how it applies to himself/herself. The individual has expertly identified strengths and limitations related to his/her own entrepreneurial behavior, as well as how it applies to venture outcomes.	The deliverable indicates that the individual has reflected somewhat on the interview findings, both in terms of the experiences of the entrepreneur, as well as how it applies to himself/herself. The individual has identified strengths and limitations related to his/her own entrepreneurial behavior, as well as how it applies to venture outcomes.	The deliverable lacks reflection concerning the interview findings, both in terms of the experiences of the entrepreneur, as well as how it applies to himself/herself. The individual has not sufficiently identified strengths and limitations related to his/her own entrepreneurial behavior, as well as how it applies to venture outcomes.
Composition (10%)	The report is focused, well structured, engaging and easy to read. Makes good use of relevant quotes from the interview. It has no spelling or grammar mistakes. It adheres to the 3-page limit.	The report is somewhat focused, structured, engaging and easy to read. Makes some use of relevant quotes from the interview. It is largely free of spelling or grammar mistakes. It is slightly over the 3-page limit.	The report lacks focus, structure, and is not engaging or easy to read. Does not use any quotes from the interview, and when used are not relevant. It has a large number of spelling and grammar mistakes. It is significantly outside the 3-page word limit.

Rubric for evaluation of Final Pitch

Component	Sophisticated (<i>grade = 5</i>)	Competent (<i>grade = 3, 4</i>)	Not Yet Complete (<i>grade = 1, 2</i>)
Problem/Solution (20%)	The pitch is extremely convincing in terms of the existence and importance of the problem identified. The solution suggested is compellingly argued as unique, highly appropriate and matching the problem very closely.	The pitch is very convincing in terms of the existence and importance of the problem identified. The solution suggested is relatively well argued as unique, appropriate and matching the problem.	The pitch is not particularly convincing in terms of the existence and importance of the problem identified. The solution suggested is not particularly convincing in terms of its uniqueness, suitability and fit with the problem.
Team (10%)	The pitch convincingly argues for an excellent fit between the team's skillset and the needs of the venture idea execution.	The pitch is relatively convincing in its argumentation of the team's skillset fit to the needs of the venture idea execution.	The pitch is not particularly convincing in its argumentation of the team's skillset fit to the needs of the venture idea execution.
Achievements (10%)	The pitch convincingly argues for positive customer feedback on the last iteration of the venture idea. The pitch includes clear evidence of effort by the team in taking steps in advancing the development of their idea, for instance through creating a demo or conducting a trial.	The pitch suggests some evidence of positive customer feedback on the last iteration of the venture idea. The pitch includes some evidence of effort by the team in taking steps in advancing the development of their idea, for instance through creating a demo or conducting a trial.	The pitch provides little or no evidence of customer feedback supportive of the last iteration of the venture idea, and of effort by the team in taking steps in advancing the development of their idea, for instance through creating a demo or conducting a trial.
Market (20%)	The pitch argues compellingly for the existence and importance of the potential market. Estimates are convincing and based on strong evidence.	The pitch argues somewhat compellingly for the existence and importance of the potential market. Estimates are relatively convincing.	The pitch does not offer a convincing argumentation in favor of the existence and importance of the potential market. Estimates are arbitrary.

Business/Revenue model (20%)	The pitch conveys excellently the business and revenue model proposed, and is extremely convincing in terms of their financial viability. The business and revenue model have an excellent fit with the problem, customer and solution.	The pitch conveys comprehensively the business and revenue model proposed, and is relatively convincing in terms of their financial viability. The business and revenue model have a good fit with the problem, customer and solution.	The pitch is not very comprehensive in its description of the business and revenue model proposed, and insufficiently justifies their financial viability and fit with the problem, customer and solution.
Enthusiastic presentation (10%)	The presenter/s convey great enthusiasm and genuine interest during their pitch of the venture idea. They are visible, audible and very engaging. The pitch is very well rehearsed and professional. Body language complements positively the content of the pitch.	The presenter/s convey some enthusiasm and interest during their pitch of the venture idea. They are mostly visible and audible. The pitch is well rehearsed and relatively professional.	The presenter/s do not manage to convey substantial enthusiasm and interest during their pitch of the venture idea. They are not (sufficiently) visible and audible. The pitch is neither well rehearsed nor professional.
Adherence to time limit (10%)	The pitch adheres to the 4' time limit.	The pitch is slightly over the 4' time limit.	The pitch is longer than 4 and half minutes long.

Rubric for Team Action Report (graded by instructors):

Component	Sophisticated (<i>grade = 5</i>)	Competent (<i>grade = 3, 4</i>)	Not Yet Complete (<i>grade = 1, 2</i>)
Evolution of idea (30%)	The team has exhibited with clarity in the report how the idea progressed and developed throughout the course. They have been specific about how interactions with mentors and more importantly potential customers have brought about thoughtful re-assessments of their idea. They have also explained convincingly and in detail what improvements of the idea they have undertaken and why they are expected to improve value for the customer.	The team has presented with some detail the evolution of their idea over time. They have used some examples of mentor/customer feedback and the re-assessments that these triggered, but these are limited. They have explained to some extent what improvements of the idea they have undertaken and why they are expected to improve value for the customer.	The description of the idea evolution process is limited, too broad or missing. The team has focused on the finished product without providing any insights into the iterative process that went into the idea creation, nor the factors or individuals that influenced this. There is little or no evidence of improvements undertaken based on feedback.
Lessons learned (30%)	The report suggests that the team has reflected deeply on their experiences gained through the team challenges and final presentation. They show great insight and reflexivity into their strengths and limitations as a team, and have identified areas where they could improve both the process and outcomes of venture ideation in the future.	The report suggests the team have reflected somewhat on the experiences gained through the team challenges and final presentation. They show some insight and reflexivity into their strengths and limitations as a team, as well as in the identification of areas of improvement in both the process, as well as outcomes of venture ideation in the future.	The report has too few or no reflections – or underdeveloped reflections – into any experiences the team has gained, or learnings from the team challenges and final presentation. There report lacks insight and reflexivity into their strengths and limitations of the team, nor does it identify areas of improvement.

Supporting evidence (30%)	The report is convincing of the teams' claims. The narrative is internally consistent, and consistent with earlier team challenge submissions. The team has provided additional materials (e.g. demos or trials of venture idea, photos/quote transcripts of reactions of potential customers, other audiovisual material) that strongly substantiate their claims.	The report is somewhat convincing of the teams' claims. The narrative has some degree of internal consistency, and consistency with earlier team challenges. The team has provided additional materials (e.g. demos or trials of venture idea, photos/quote transcripts of reactions of potential customers, other audiovisual material) that somewhat substantiate their claims.	The report is not very convincing of the teams' claims. The narrative lacks internal consistency, as well as consistency with the earlier team challenges. The team has provided inauthentic, too few or no additional materials (e.g. demos or trials of venture idea, photos/quote transcripts of reactions of potential customers, other audiovisual material) to substantiate their claims.
Composition (10%)	The report is focused, well structured, engaging and easy to read. It has no spelling or grammar mistakes. It adheres to the 2.000 word limit.	The report is somewhat focused, structured, engaging and easy to read. It is largely free of spelling or grammar mistakes. It is slightly over the 2.000 word limit.	The report lacks focus, structure, and is not engaging or easy to read. It has a large number of spelling and grammar mistakes. It is significantly outside the 2.000 word limit.