

<p>ETEC 522</p> <p>D. Vogt and D. Porter MET Program 2008</p>	<p>ETEC 522 - Assignment 3 - Venture Pitch</p>		
<p><b>Objective / Criteria</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicators</b></p>		
	<p><b>Excellent</b></p>	<p><b>Acceptable</b></p>	<p><b>Re-focus</b></p>
<p>Pitch (Value = 10)</p>	<p>Highly engaging pitch that focuses on resonant value and would capture attention of potential investors or decision makers</p> <p>10 (This means 10-8 range)</p>	<p>Pitch outlines key points of the proposal or project but needs additional focus on the value proposition for investors or decision makers</p> <p>7 (This means 7-3)</p>	<p>No pitch evident in the proposal</p> <p>2 (This means 2-0)</p>
<p>Executive summary (Value = 5)</p>	<p>High-impact coverage of the relevant proposal points is provided in a manner that would attract investment or positive response</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Relevant proposal points are outlined for investors or decision-makers</p> <p>4</p>	<p>No executive summary provided</p> <p>2</p>
<p>Critical EVA (Value = 5)</p>	<p>The analysis uses criteria that are relevant, comprehensive, and clear for the substance of this proposal</p> <p>5</p>	<p>The analysis uses criteria that are clear and mostly relevant. However, some facets of analysis have been overlooked or are missing</p> <p>4</p>	<p>The analysis uses criteria that are general, vague, or irrelevant. Or, the analysis is not present in the proposal.</p> <p>2</p>
<p>Self evaluation (Value = 5)</p>	<p>The proponent clearly and accurately outlines the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal</p> <p>Thumbs up</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Some strengths and weaknesses are outlined, but some are also missing or have been overlooked</p> <p>Competent, but perhaps not a winner</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Weak or no self-evaluation provided</p> <p>Thumbs down - good try</p> <p>2</p>