| CONTENT | - (MINIMAL) – Rating 1-4 | = (GOOD) – Rating of 5 - 7 | + (EXCELLENT) Rating of 8 – 10 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Quantitative Analysis and Modeling** *(Weight 35%)* <br><br> 1. Problem understanding and scope <br> 2. Modeling approach and techniques <br> 3. Depth of analysis <br> 4. Accurate findings | • Limited understanding of the problem. Scope is too narrow or misaligned. Key assumptions are inconsistent with information provided <br> • Uses basic or inappropriate modeling techniques. Lacks justification for methodology. Technical approach lacks consideration <br> • Provides some supporting evidence but lacks depth of analysis <br> • Did not answer all modeling requests <br> • Missing details connecting model to accurate findings | • Provides sound problem understanding with a reasonable level of assumptions and detail, but may miss some key considerations <br> • Provides reasonable technical approach but may not be fully vetted <br> • Uses reasonable modeling techniques with some justification. Could improve selection of methods or explanation of choices <br> • Provides appropriate analysis, but missing key factors to show depth <br> • Findings make sense but may lack connection and accuracy to model | • Problem understanding and analysis goes above and beyond what is stated in the case <br> • Clearly defines the problem, considers all relevant factors, and sets a well-scoped, strategic approach to analysis <br> • Technical approach indicates a clear understanding of analytics, socio-demographics and industry factors <br> • Analysis uncovers creative ideas and considerations <br> • Quality analytical methods and understanding used; model looks production-ready for implementation. |
| **Solutions and Recommendations** *(Weight 25%)* <br><br> 1. Logical tie-in between model output and suggestions <br> 2. Sound justification of recommendations <br> 3. Innovations and ideas for future exploration <br> 4. Objective and unbiased solutions | • Recommendations are not clearly tied to analysis and findings <br> • Recommendations are weakly justified or rely on assumptions without data-driven support <br> • Strategic thought is lacking causing solutions to be narrowly focused on only the tactical <br> • Implementation of recommendation may not be feasible <br> • Recommendations show signs of bias or fail to account for multiple perspectives. Conclusions may be influenced by assumptions rather than data | • Recommendations are incorporated using evidence and connected to the analysis <br> • Justification is mostly solid, but some areas could be better explained or backed by stronger evidence <br> • Solution is innovative but may be too basic or lacking creativity <br> • Implementation of recommendation is logical but may miss the mark in a few areas <br> • Solutions are generally objective, but may lean toward a particular viewpoint without fully addressing counterpoints | • Recommendations are well-supported based on a complex set of evidence, analysis and findings; in addition, industry and external factors were considered. <br> • Solutions show innovation and a strategic fit into the industry, demonstrating a deep level of understanding. <br> • Implementation is clearly defined and can be logically implemented <br> • Solutions are well-balanced, data-driven, and consider multiple perspectives, ensuring objective and unbiased recommendations. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Report, Dashboard or Tools**<br>*(Weight 10%)*<br><br>1. Visuals that are easy to understand<br>2. Tools (visuals, reports, dashboards, software solutions) allow for repeatable processing<br>3. Functional use for various levels of organization | • Visuals are unclear and/or difficult to use<br>• Tools demonstrated little attention to detail to underlying factors surrounding prioritization decisions<br>• Tools would be difficult or time consuming to replicate for regular update and use<br>• Tools focused on only 1 level of the organization or were missing | • Tools demonstrated in a way that makes sense. It is easy to understand when and how they would be used<br>• Solution was good but may have been too complicated or not user friendly<br>• Team provided recommended prioritizations, but limited illustration of underlying factors<br>• Some levels of the organization can successfully use tools presented | • Tools demonstrated in a way that creates a positive user experience<br>• Solutions were clear and were presented with user friendliness in mind<br>• Proposed tools were clearly created with a focus on repeatable processing<br>• A wide range of levels in the organization can successfully use tools presented |
| **Delivery**<br>*(Weight 30%)*<br><br>1. Visually appealing presentation content<br>2. Effective and captivating storytelling<br>3. Topic knowledge showcased throughout<br>4. Provides cohesive narrative<br>5. Effective question & answer (Q/A) session | • Presentation is cluttered, difficult to read, or lacks relevant visuals. Charts and graphs are unclear or not well-integrated<br>• Data is presented without a clear narrative, making it difficult to follow<br>• Limited understanding of the topic. Explanations are unclear or inaccurate. Lacks confidence in discussing technical details<br>• Presentation lacks logical flow, making it hard to connect data, insights, and conclusions<br>• Only one person on the team was able to respond during Q/A session or responses did not support presentation content | • Presentation is mostly organized. Visuals support the analysis but may not be fully optimized for clarity and understanding<br>• Some storytelling elements are present, but the connection between data, insights, and recommendations could be stronger<br>• Demonstrates good topic knowledge with mostly accurate explanations. Some areas could be deeper or more confidently delivered.<br>• Information mostly flows logically, but some areas could have smoother transitions between findings and recommendations.<br>• Team was able to respond during Q/A session, but lacked confidence in responses | • Presentation is polished, professional, and visually compelling. Graphics, charts, and visuals effectively enhance understanding and engagement<br>• A clear, compelling narrative using storytelling techniques ties the analysis together with the insights and recommendations, making the presentation engaging for all audiences<br>• Shows strong expertise, explaining technical concepts clearly and accurately while making them understandable for non-technical stakeholders<br>• Data, insights, and recommendations flow seamlessly, creating a well-structured, easy-to-follow presentation<br>• Team was able to respond during Q/A with confidence, showcasing knowledge across team members |