

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>ETEC 522</p> <p>David Vogt David Porter MET Program 2011</p> | <h2 style="text-align: center;">ETEC 522 - Assignment 3 - Venture Proposition</h2> <p>The persuasive submission (Assignment 3) will allow you to pitch the business proposition for a new venture, or else a rebuilding, new direction or operating plan for an existing venture.</p> <p>We will be looking for the same critical thought, design and presentation standards sought in Assignment #1, now focused on compellingly conveying the essential value proposition and viability of a learning technologies enterprise.</p> | | |
| <p>Objective / Criteria</p> | <p>Performance Indicators</p> | | |
| | <p>Excellent</p> | <p>Acceptable</p> | <p>Re-focus</p> |
| <p>Elevator Pitch (Value = 5)</p> | <p>Highly engaging elevator pitch would capture attention of potential investors or decision makers. The student's passion and ability to carry out the venture are easily evident.</p> <p>5</p> | <p>Competent introductory description of the venture. The student's personality and conviction helps to carry the message.</p> <p>4 (This means 4-3)</p> | <p>Unconvincing or no elevator pitch evident in the proposal</p> <p>2 (This means 2-0)</p> |
| <p>Venture Pitch (Value = 10)</p> | <p>High-impact, comprehensive and compelling proposition that would engage investment interest and cogently demonstrates the student's ability to lead the venture.</p> <p>10</p> | <p>The key points of the venture are present, but it needs additional focus on the value proposition and/or student's leadership ability to engage potential investors.</p> <p>7</p> | <p>Incomplete or unconvincing venture presentation.</p> <p>2</p> |
| <p>Critical EVA (Value = 5)</p> | <p>The pitches use arguments that are relevant, comprehensive, and incisive to the substance and the proposition.</p> <p>5</p> | <p>The pitches use criteria that are clear and mostly relevant. However, some key facets are weak or missing.</p> <p>4</p> | <p>The pitches use criteria that are general, vague, or irrelevant.</p> <p>2</p> |
| <p>Self evaluation (Value = 5)</p> | <p>The proponent clearly and accurately outlines the strengths and weaknesses of the proposition</p> <p>5</p> | <p>Some strengths and weaknesses are outlined, but some are also missing or have been overlooked</p> <p>4</p> | <p>Weak or no self-evaluation provided</p> <p>2</p> |