# 2013 Marketing Presentation Scoring Rubric

This is a suggested rubric for scoring marketing presentations. It is OK to use your own judgment in scoring and to adjust these suggestions up or down for factors that are not covered.

## Company Demographics, Budget & Operations

**Company Structure and operations**

20 - the corporate org chart is well defined, roles are clearly explained, company operations are clearly defined (such as decision making processes, accountability, etc.)

15 - there is a corporate org chart, roles are identified, company operations are identified

10 - some corporate roles are identified, company operations are mentioned

5 - a few roles are named

0 - no roles or operations defined

**Organization of company departments for product development**

10 - departments are clearly identified and their relationship to robot building is clear

7 - some departments are named and they have to do with robot building

3 - some departments are named

0 - no departments identified

**Company demographics**

10 - there is a clear discussion of diversity on the team, within the constraints of the individual school (e.g. not all schools have a minority population)

7 - diversity is discussed

3 - you can tell there is some diversity, even if it is not mentioned

0 - no discernible diversity

**Evidence of a budget**

10 - a clear and complete budget is presented and categories are explained

7 - a budget is presented

3 - funds are mentioned

0 - no evidence of a budget

## Design & Manufacturing Process

**Brainstorming approaches, including game strategy evaluation**

10 - brainstorming is clearly presented as an activity, thorough evaluation of the game is clearly evident

7 - brainstorming was done, they did discuss game strategy

3 - brainstorming or game strategy discussion occurred, but not both

0 - no brainstorming, no game strategy discussion

**Analytical evaluation of design alternatives**

10 - evaluation of multiple design ideas is clearly presented, each was evaluated with some mathematical rigor

7 - multiple design ideas were considered, some evaluation was done

3 - multiple design ideas are mentioned, no evidence of evaluation

0 - no mention of multiple design ideas

**Effective implementation of engineering process**

10 - an engineering design process with multiple steps is clearly identified, there is evidence that the process was followed

7 - an engineering design process is discussed

3 - there is discussion of design, but no clear process is identified

0 - no mention of a design process

## Marketing Strategies

**Publicity efforts to inform school and community ...**

30 - there is clear evidence of multiple publicity efforts, publicity targets **both** school and community

25 - there is some evidence of multiple publicity efforts, publicity targets **both** school and community

20 - there is a publicity effort that targets **both** the school and community

15 - there is some evidence of multiple publicity efforts, they target **either** school or community but not both

10 - there is a publicity effort that targets **either** the school or community

5 - publicity is mentioned

0 - no evidence of publicity

## Use of Available Technology

**CAD ... / Computer programming ...**

20 - there is thorough discussion of technology used in robot design, types of technology are clearly identified

15 - there is some discussion of technology used in robot design, the technology(s) are identified

10 - technology for robot design is discussed, but not specifically

5- you can tell some technology was used during robot design, but it isn't discussed

0 - no evidence of technology use in robot design

**Web page development/computer simulations/PowerPoint**

20 - a web page for the project was created and thoroughly presented, other technologies to support the project are discussed

15 - a web page was developed for the project, other technologies were used

10 - a web page or other technologies for the project are mentioned

5 - you suspect they used some technology for the project, but it isn't discussed

0 - no discernible technology use

## Quality of Presentation

**Communication skills and professionalism ...**

30 - presentation is outstanding, everyone is clearly understandable, the presentation is well organized, everyone is clearly prepared

25 - presentation is very good, most presenters are clearly understandable/well organized/well prepared

20 - presentation is good, a few presenters are weak in one area - understandable/organized/prepared

15 - presentation is good, most presenters are weak in one or two areas - understandable/organized/prepared

10 - presentation is fair, most presenters are weak in multiple areas

5 - presentation is poor, most presenters are weak in all areas

0 - presentation is very poor, no one is understandable/organized/prepared

**Met specifications for presentations**

10 - total time < 25 minutes, had 4 to 8 presenters, students did all the setup/break-down

7 - did not meet one of the specifications

3 - did not meet two of the specifications

0 - did not meet any specifications

**Achieved goal of marketing the company's 'product'**

20 - presentation was very persuasive, you want to give them all your money

15 - presentation was pretty persuasive, you might think about giving them money

10 - presentation was somewhat persuasive, you might give them someone else's money

5 - presentation was not persuasive, no money is forthcoming

0 - there was no attempt to 'sell'

**Creativity of format**

20 - they did some special things that made the presentation very memorable

15 - they did something unexpected that made the presentation memorable

10 - solid presentation but nothing special

5 - presentation was mundane

0 - they just went through the motions

**Q&A quality in responses to judges**

20 - answers were crisp, clear and showed depth of thought

15 - answers were crisp and clear

10 - answers were reasonable but lacking

5 - answers were poor

0 - could not answer questions