

Appendix B. Evaluation Rubrics

Vector 23-1 Application Round Grading Rubric

| Criteria | Unsatisfactory (1) | Marginal (2) | Satisfactory (3) | Superior (4) |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Feasibility of solution | No technical basis to support proposed solution | Incomplete/uncl ear, but possible. Some details are missing to substantiate the proposed technical approach | Credible basis for proposed approach. Enough evidence is provided to substantiate proposed approach | Convincing technical basis for proposed approach. |
| Problem Significance | Not aligned with published DoD problems/use cases. No sources of need cited. | Somewhat aligned with published DoD problems/use cases. Some sources of need cited. | Aligned with published DoD problems/use cases. Adequate sources of need cited. | Perfectly aligned with published DoD problems/use cases. Robust sources of need cited. |
| Viability of Business Model | Failed to present challenges and risks. Areas of risk being ignored/hidden. | Inadequate risk analysis. Some areas of risk addressed, others glossed over/omitted. | Credible risk analysis. Areas of risk effectively addressed, weaknesses minimized. | Highly credible risk analysis. Anticipates questions and instills confidence. |
| Team Composition and Expertise | Team has no relevant expertise <u>or</u> evidence of prior execution. | Team has some relevant expertise <u>or</u> evidence of prior execution. | Team has a satisfactory level of expertise, understanding of the problem/solution, <u>and</u> prior execution. | Team has demonstrated exceptional understanding and expertise in this field, <u>and</u> has a proven record of meaningful execution. |



Vector 23-1 Pitch Round Grading Rubric [DRAFT]

| Criteria | Unsatisfactory (1) | Marginal (2) | Satisfactory (3) | Superior (4) |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Feasibility and maturity of solution | No technical basis to support proposed solution. Solution is in concept phase. | Incomplete/unclear, but possible. Some details are missing to substantiate the proposed technical approach. Can provide proof-of-concept of solution. | Credible basis for proposed approach. Enough evidence is provided to substantiate proposed approach. Solution validated in laboratory environment. | Convincing technical basis for proposed approach. Solution prototype demonstrated in relevant environment. |
| Problem Significance | Not aligned with published DoD problems/use cases | Somewhat aligned with published DoD problems/use cases. | Aligned with published DoD problems/use cases | Perfectly aligned with published DoD problems/use cases |
| Viability of Business Model | Failed to present challenges and risks. Areas of risk being ignored/hidden. Solution has no potential for dual-use. | Inadequate risk analysis. Some areas of risk addressed, others glossed over/omitted. Solution has little potential for dual-use. | Credible risk analysis. Areas of risk effectively addressed, weaknesses minimized. Solution has some dual-use application. | Highly credible risk analysis. Anticipates questions and instills confidence. Robust dual-use application/implem entation plan. |
| Quality of Pitch | Presentation difficult or impossible to follow and/or cannot finish in time allowed. Responds ineffectively to/does not answer questions. | Presentation sometimes difficult to follow and/or rushed delivery to finish in time allowed. Some questions answered, others not addressed. | Presentation is clear and delivered within time allowed. Questions answered effectively. | Presentation is clear, concise and persuasive. Delivered within time allowed. Questions anticipated and/or answered with confidence. |
| Accelerator Performance | Participated in less than 40% of live events <u>and/or</u> did not complete final survey. | Participated in 40-60% of live events. Completed final survey. | Participated in 60-80% of live events. Completed final survey. | Participated in 80% or more of live events. Completed final survey. |