|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **%** | **0-40** | **40-50** | **50-60** | **60-70** | **70-100** |
| **Strategy**  (Bus. model, strategy, regulation, conclusion & executive summary) | 25 | Does not present adequately ‘joined up’ strategic thinking. Fails to reach appropriate conclusion. | Inadequate standard of strat. analysis. Provides simplistic or unreasoned conclusion and summary. | Adequate standard of strat. analysis. Suitable conclusion & summary based on suitable feasibility analysis. | Good strat. analysis conveying inter-related nature of feasibility study. Informed conclusion and summary. | Very good to prof. standard of strategic analysis. Broad, reasoned and informed conclusions & summary. |
| **Market Analysis**  (Potential customers, marketing strategy, possible competition) | 15 | Does not consider potential customers or competition. Fails to present marketing strategy. | Description of potential customers and competition only. Marketing strategy unaligned with findings. | Adequate consideration of potential customers and competition. Marketing strategy reflects findings. | Discerning analysis of potential customers and competition with clearly aligned marketing strategy. | Strong to professional market analysis. Strategically aligned and knowledgeable marketing strategy. |
| **Company Definition**  (Product context, mission statement, company structure & HR) | 15 | Poor company definition Inappropriate mission statement and/or account of legal structure & HR. | Inadequate company definition. Unsuitable mission statement and/or account of leg. struc. & HR. | Satisfactory company definition. Adequate mission statement and account of legal structure and HR. | Suitable company definition. Appropriate mission statement and justified legal structure and HR. | Prof. and insightful company definition. Articulate mission statement and strategic account of leg. struc. and HR. |
| **Product Definition**  (Product proposal, value proposition, development planning & tech. targets) | 15 | Does not provide adequate description or analysis of chosen product or product benefits. | Provides descriptive account of product, benefits and development only. Fails to analyse or evaluate these from strategic perspective. | Satisfactory product proposal and development planning. Demonstrates awareness of strategic value of product benefits. | Comprehensive product proposal and development planning. Identifies strategic value of product benefits. | Clearly defined product proposal and development planning. Capitalises on strategic value of product benefits. |
| **Funding & Finance**  (Funding sources, financial planning, implications for venture) | 15 | Does not demonstrate awareness of funding sources or financial planning. No consideration of implications for venture. | Funding source identified. Basic standard of financial planning. Descriptive only, no consideration of implications for venture. | Funding source identified. Adequate awareness and consideration of real world financial planning issues for business. | Justifies funding source. Broad consideration of financial planning for business, and implications for venture feasibility. | Realistic financial planning. Includes forecasts. Justifies funding source. Perceptive of implications for venture feasibility. |
| **Intellectual Property**  (Relevance of IP to venture, types of IP used) | 15 | Does not demonstrate awareness of relevance of IP.  Fails to identify any types of IP used in venture. | Descriptive account of relevance of IP. Identifies some IP types involved in implementation of venture. | Analytical account of relevance of IP. Identifies adequate range of IP types used. | Strong analysis of relevance of IP to venture. Identifies broad range of IP used and its value to venture. | Thorough account of IP types used. Communicates strategic value of IP to venture and company. |

In addition to their specific criteria, the above components will be assessed according to their presentation and critical approach using the following criteria:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Presentation**  (Spelling, grammar, punctuation, structure, references) |  | Poor standard of spelling, grammar, and/or punctuation. Inappropriate and confusing structure, incorrect referencing. | Confusing writing style. Many mistakes in grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Poorly researched, evidenced & presented. | Acceptable writing style. Mistakes in grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Acceptably researched, evidenced & presented. | Clear writing style. Generally correct grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Researched, evidenced & presented to good standard. | Articulate writing style. Grammar and spelling wholly accurate. Researched & evidenced to high standard. Professionally presented. |
| **Overall Analysis & Evaluation**  (Application, analysis and evaluation of knowledge) |  | Does not provide adequate description. Fails to analyse or evaluate. | Conveys descriptive information only. Little or no attempt made to contextualise, analyse or evaluate points made. | Descriptive information is satisfactorily contextualised, analysed and evaluated. Some consideration of real world feasibility issues. | Descriptive information is competently contextualised, analysed and evaluated. Perceptive consideration of real world feasibility issues. | Very good to professional standard of commercial awareness combined with strong knowledge of relevant industry. |