



## Stock Market Simulation – Round 2: Portfolio Presentation

### JUDGE INSTRUCTIONS

#### COMPETITION CONTEXT

This is Round 2 of the Stock Market Challenge, the final evaluation phase where the top 10 teams from the online simulation will present their investment strategies and portfolio analysis. You will be evaluating teams who advanced based on their portfolio performance during a two-week stock market simulation where they managed \$100,000 in virtual capital.

#### CRITICAL JUDGING PRINCIPLE

Round 1 simulation results DO NOT factor into Round 2 scoring. Judge each team based solely on their presentation quality, strategic analysis, and articulation of their investment approach according to the evaluation rubric. Teams are not scored on how much money they made, but on how well they can explain and defend their strategy.

#### PRESENTATION PROCEDURE

- Participants have prepared for one weeks prior to the event and do not receive additional preparation time on-site. Presentations are scheduled at 20-minute intervals.
- Please place the participant team's name and ID number in the upper right-hand corner of the Evaluation Form.
- During the first 7 minutes, the team presents their investment strategy, portfolio analysis, and rationale. Allow them to complete this portion without interruption unless clarification is required. The timekeeper will provide a 1-minute warning and indicate when time is up.
- During the next 3 minutes, ask questions to assess understanding and critical thinking. Each team member should respond to at least one question. Ask the standard questions provided, then any team-specific follow-up questions.
- After questioning, conclude by thanking the participants and complete the Evaluation Form, recording scores for all categories. Maximum score is 100 points.

## JUDGING THE PRESENTATION

### Judge Responsibilities

- Listen to the full presentation without interruption (unless clarification is needed).
- Take detailed notes using the rubric categories as your framework.
- Ask the standard questions provided plus any team-specific questions.
- Score the participants using the Portfolio Presentation and Communication criteria.
- Conclude the session by thanking participants.

### EVALUATION CRITERIA OVERVIEW

#### *Portfolio Strategy & Presentation Criteria*

Evaluate the team's portfolio management and strategic thinking using these five criteria:

1. **Investment Thesis & Objectives** – Clear goals, coherent philosophy, articulated strategy
2. **Portfolio Construction Logic** – Rationale for stock selection, position sizing, and allocation decisions
3. **Strategic Adaptability** – Ability to adjust strategy based on market conditions or new information
4. **Data Interpretation & Financial Understanding** – Ability to analyze and draw insights from financial data, metrics, and market information
5. **Diversification or Concentration** – Clear rationale for portfolio approach, whether concentrated or diversified, aligned with stated investment philosophy

#### *Communication & Presentation Criteria*

Evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the presentation using these three criteria:

1. **Clarity & Articulation** – Ideas expressed clearly and understandably
2. **Professional Presence** – Confidence, poise, and engagement; all members participate
3. **Response to Questions** – Demonstrates the ability to effectively answer judges' questions with thoughtful, substantive responses

### STANDARD QUESTIONS

After the initial presentation, ask the following questions of each team. Distribute questions among team members to ensure everyone responds:

1. Walk me through your research process for selecting one specific investment?
2. If this simulation lasted 6 months instead of 2 weeks, what would you do differently?
3. If you could go back to the beginning of the simulation, what would you do differently and why?
4. What was the biggest surprise or takeaway from practical experience?
5. How did current social or economic conditions contribute to your portfolio's performance?
6. If your team had a fundamental disagreement about whether to buy or sell a particular stock, how did you resolve it?

## JUDGE'S EVALUATION FORM

**Event:** Stock Market Simulation – Portfolio Presentation

Portfolio Presentation	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Little/No Value
<b>Investment Thesis &amp; Objectives</b> <i>Clear goals, coherent philosophy, articulated strategy</i>	Crystal clear thesis with specific, measurable objectives. Strategy is sophisticated and well-articulated.	Clear thesis with defined objectives. Strategy is logical and generally well-explained.	Basic thesis present but vague. Objectives lack clarity or specificity.	No clear thesis or objectives. Strategy is unclear or absent.
Score (0-14): _____	<b>14-13-12</b>	<b>12-11-10-9-8</b>	<b>7-6-5-4-3</b>	<b>2-1-0</b>
<b>Portfolio Construction Logic</b> <i>Rationale for stock selection, position sizing, and allocation decisions</i>	Every position has clear, well-reasoned justification. Sizing decisions are strategic and explained.	Most positions are justified with sound reasoning. Sizing generally makes sense.	Some positions explained but rationale is weak. Sizing lacks clear logic.	Cannot explain portfolio construction. Decisions appear random.
Score (0-14): _____	<b>14-13-12</b>	<b>12-11-10-9-8</b>	<b>7-6-5-4-3</b>	<b>2-1-0</b>
<b>Strategic Adaptability</b> <i>Ability to adjust strategy based on market conditions or new information</i>	Demonstrates thoughtful adaptation with clear reasoning. Shows flexibility while maintaining discipline.	Made appropriate adjustments. Can explain changes to strategy reasonably well.	Limited adaptation or changes lack clear justification. Some inconsistency.	Rigid strategy despite changing conditions, or erratic changes without rationale.
Score (0-14): _____	<b>14-13-12</b>	<b>12-11-10-9-8</b>	<b>7-6-5-4-3</b>	<b>2-1-0</b>
<b>Data Interpretation &amp; Financial Understanding</b> <i>Ability to analyze and draw insights from financial data, metrics, and market information</i>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of financial metrics and market data. Interprets information insightfully and accurately.	Understands key metrics and can interpret data appropriately. Shows solid analytical capability.	Basic understanding of metrics. Interpretation is simplistic or incomplete.	Cannot interpret financial data. Little understanding of metrics or market information.
Score (0-14): _____	<b>10-9</b>	<b>8-7-6</b>	<b>5-4-3</b>	<b>2-1-0</b>
<b>Diversification or Concentration</b> <i>Clear rationale for portfolio approach, whether concentrated or diversified, aligned with stated investment philosophy</i>	Exceptionally clear justification for approach. Portfolio structure is intentional, strategic, and perfectly aligned with stated goals and risk tolerance.	Good justification for approach. Portfolio structure is reasonable and generally consistent with strategy.	Basic justification but lacks depth. Approach somewhat aligns with strategy but has inconsistencies.	No clear justification for approach. Portfolio structure conflicts with stated strategy or appears random.
Score (0-14): _____	<b>14-13-12</b>	<b>12-11-10-9-8</b>	<b>7-6-5-4-3</b>	<b>2-1-0</b>

Portfolio Strategy & Presentation Subtotal: \_\_\_\_\_ / 70

Communication Criteria	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Little/No Value
<b>Clarity &amp; Articulation</b> <i>Ideas expressed clearly and understandably</i>	Exceptionally clear. Complex ideas explained simply and effectively.	Clear communication. Ideas are well-expressed and easy to follow.	Generally clear with some confusion or unclear phrasing.	Unclear communication. Difficult to understand main points.
<b>Score (0-10):</b> _____	<b>10-9</b>	<b>8-7-6</b>	<b>5-4-3</b>	<b>2-1-0</b>
<b>Professional Presence</b> <i>Confidence, poise, and engagement.</i>	Highly professional, confident, engaging. All members contribute meaningfully.	Professional and appropriate. All members participate, though unevenly.	Generally professional with lapses. Not all members fully engaged.	Unprofessional or one/some members don't participate meaningfully.
<b>Score (0-10):</b> _____	<b>10-9</b>	<b>8-7-6</b>	<b>5-4-3</b>	<b>2-1-0</b>
<b>Q&amp;A Responses</b> <i>Quality of responses; all members participate meaningfully (For teams)</i>	Thoughtful responses to all questions. All members contribute meaningfully.	Professional and appropriate. Good responses. All members participate, though contribution may be uneven.	Generally professional with lapses. Basic responses. Not all members fully engaged.	Unprofessional or weak responses. One/some members don't participate meaningfully.
<b>Score (0-10):</b> _____	<b>10-9</b>	<b>8-7-6</b>	<b>5-4-3</b>	<b>2-1-0</b>

**Communication & Presentation Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_ / 30

**Total Points:** \_\_\_\_\_ / 100