

# SOLVEXCHANGE PITCH CONTEST RUBRIC

## EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

Participants are to be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate the performance indicators outlined on the Judge's Evaluation Form. While participants may demonstrate additional strengths, judges should score only the criteria listed, as these represent the core skills and values emphasized by SolveXchange.

**Judges are encouraged to consider how effectively students:**

- Identify and analyze real community problems
    - Propose feasible, impactful solutions
  - Demonstrate leadership, accountability, and initiative
  - Communicate ideas professionally and persuasively
- 

## EVALUATION FORM INTERPRETATION

To ensure consistency and fairness, judges should use the following evaluation levels when assigning scores.

### **Exceeds Expectations**

Participant demonstrated the performance indicator at an exceptional level. The work is highly polished, professional, innovative, and well beyond what is typically expected of a student at this level.

### **Meets Expectations**

Participant demonstrated the performance indicator competently and effectively. The work meets expected standards and shows solid understanding and execution.

### **Below Expectations**

Participant demonstrated the performance indicator with limited effectiveness. Key elements are missing, unclear, or underdeveloped.

### **Little / No Value**

Participant demonstrated little to no evidence of the performance indicator. The work lacks clarity, preparation, or relevance.

---

## LEVELS OF EVALUATION

**Exceeds Expectations:** Participant demonstrated the criteria at an exceptional level. Work is highly polished, professional, innovative, and significantly exceeds expected standards for a student at this level.

**Meets Expectations:** Participant demonstrated the criteria competently and effectively. Work meets expected standards and shows clear understanding and solid execution.

**Below Expectations:** Participant demonstrated the criteria with limited effectiveness. Key elements are missing, unclear, or underdeveloped, indicating a need for improvement.

**Little / No Value:** Participant demonstrated little to no evidence of the criteria. Work lacks clarity, preparation, relevance, or understanding.

# JUDGE’S EVALUATION FORM

Participant / Team Name: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge: \_\_\_\_\_

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

Did the participant(s):	Little / No Value	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Judge Score
1. Clearly identify and analyze a real community problem?	0–4	5–9	10–14	15–20	_____
2. Propose a high-quality, logical, and innovative solution?	0–4	5–9	10–14	15–20	_____
3. Demonstrate meaningful community impact and feasibility?	0–4	5–9	10–14	15–20	_____
4. Present a clear and realistic implementation plan and use of resources?	0–3	4–6	7–11	12–15	_____
5. Communicate ideas clearly, confidently, and professionally?	0–3	4–6	7–11	12–15	_____
6. Respond thoughtfully and effectively to judge questions?	0–2	3–4	5–7	8–10	_____

## PITCH STRUCTURE CHECKLIST

- ☐ Clear introduction and community context
- ☐ Problem clearly identified
- ☐ Solution clearly explained

- ☐ Implementation or next steps addressed
- ☐ Strong conclusion and call to action

\_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL SCORE

Total Score (out of 100): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

JUDGE COMMENTS

Strengths:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Areas for Improvement / Feedback:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Judge Comments & Feedback:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_