

Innovation Report: Indicative Rubric

	Good 100-75	Medium 74-50	Poor 49-25	Unsatisfactory 24-0
Business Model Development [40%]				
General Business Model Canvas	All elements attempted, consistent (and colour coded) across different CS, no confusion between elements. Some elements beyond VP, CS, CH, CR and RS attempted	Product market fit between VP and CS is clearly present. CH, CR and RS clearly address requirements of product-market fit.	VP, CS, CH, CR and RS have entries that are consistent across CS	Have not clearly identified core elements for market fit (VP, CS) or logically consistent roles for CH, CR and RS.
Product Market Fit	VP clearly aligned with CS, addressing specific, prioritised pains/gains for each CS. Convincingly tested with CS investigations	Reasonable alignment of VP and CS, though this is not prioritised or extensively tested.	Reasonable alignment of VP and CS, though this is not prioritised or extensively tested.	Conceptualisation of product/service is unclear, features not clearly defined and relationship to CS are not clear
Economic Model	Enumerated target market, served available market and total market. Justification of market type (existing, resegmented, new, cloned) and a comprehensive survey of competitive landscape. Element of the economic model have been tested, including CR Customer Acquisition Costs (CAC) , Lifetime value (LTV), number of customers and RS per CS and a consideration of other costs. Use of CR viral multipliers considered. Reasoned assessment of economic viability made, including costs vs revenue.	Enumerated total market size, with some indication of served available market and target market. Some indication of market type (existing, resegmented, new, cloned). For multi-sided markets, the roles of different CS are identified and differentiated. Channels, the related CAC, LTV, customer numbers and resultant RS per CS have been identified and some quantifications of these models attempted.	Enumerated total market size, but little or no gauging of target market, of market type or whether the market is multi-sided. Some channels identified and some indication of CR factors (such as CAC and LTV), but these are not quantified. Little consideration of other costs.	Little/No attempt to estimate market size or type. Little attempt to identify competitors. Little detail of how customer relationships will work and their impact on the economic viability of the business model
Hypotheses development, testing and pivots [30%] consisting of:				
Hypothesis formation	Clear set of hypothesis established across VP, CS, CH, CR and RS, and others. Clear individual pass/fail criteria.	Overall testable hypothesis for PMF (VP+CS), CH, CR and RS identified.	Overall questions identified but not in a testable form.	Little/No hypothesis formation attempted

Experiment, Results and action/pivots	Experiments clearly defined. Experiment used to drive customer selection. Several Customer interviews conducted. MVP mockup used to good effect for (and only for) customer discovery. Customer interview well documented, including unanticipated insights. Clear pass/fail assessment made. Clear pivots/persevere action identified based on facts gleaned from experiments.	Some CS interviews undertaken or survey undertaken. Experiments clearly related to business model. Result clearly documented, including numbers of and selection of participants. Outcome of experiment in relation to hypothesis testing not clear in all cases. Pivot/persevere decision not fully documented	Broad assessment planned, but does not seem to test a specific hypothesis. No attempt made to identify or interview relevant CS.	No consideration of experiments to perform. Investigations bear no relate to business model.
Ethics Canvas [25%] (reference to specific blocks in brackets)				
	Clear, critical analysis of ethical aspects of the business model addressing all elements of the Ethics Canvas. Any mitigation measures (block 9) are well reasoned and realistic.	Reasonable entries for stakeholder all blocks. Good consistency with business model and between blocks.	Some affected individuals (block 1) and groups (2) are identified but could be more comprehensive. Some of other blocks addressed, but may not be fully consistent with eachother or with the business model. No attempt at formulating mitigations.	The ethics canvas does not relate clearly to the business model canvas. Not all the blocks attempted.
Team Organisation [5%]				
	Strong and well described team responsibilities and execution. Evidence of monitoring execution of responsibilities and adapting accordingly. Report is very well written with excellent use of figures, tables and references	Clear, well conceived assignment of responsibilities with evidence of good collaboration and supportive problem solving. Report is well written with good use of figures, tables and references	Some details of responsibilities assigned, but not clear how this resulted in the conduct of the group assignments. Writing of report is deficient in places and could have made better use of figures and tables.	No reporting of how group organised itself and unclear they effective coordination and management was in place. Report is not well written and poorly organised..

Key:

BMC - Business Model Canvas

VP - Value Proposition

CS - Customer Segment

CH - Channels

CR - Customer Relationships

RS - Revenue Stream

KR - Key Resources

KA - Key Activities

KP - Key Partnerships

CS - Cost Structure
PMF - Product-Market Fit
MVP - Minimum Viable Product
CAC - Customer Acquisition Cost
LTV - Lifetime Value