

CREATE Evaluation Rubric

Evaluative Criteria	Below Expectations (0 points)	Meets Expectations (1 point)	Exceeds Expectations (2 points)	Score
Product/Service Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to clearly describe the product/service and how it works, as well as why it is useful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly describes the product/service and how it works, as well as why it is useful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops a compressive statement describing the product/service and how it works, as well as why it is useful 	
Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks in diversity of skillset, clear roles of each team member are poorly defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value add of each team member is clear. Roles are responsibilities are defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Composition and quality of team are exceptional. Team represents a distinct advantage to the probability of success for the venture 	
Target Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to explain which individuals will most want (or need) to pay for the product/service, and why they will do so 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies which individuals will most want (or need) to pay for the product/service, and why they will do so 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comprehensive description of which individuals will most want (or need) to pay for the product/service, and why they will do so 	
Market Sizing TAM/SAM/SOM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to approximate the three components of market sizing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonably calculated the three components of market sizing with sourced research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurately defines and calculates TAM/SAM/SOM. Research is cited and defensible 	
Competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to identify relevant competitors and/or substitutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes relevant competitors and/or substitutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers a comprehensive review of competitors and/or substitutes 	
Competitive Advantage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not identify how a competitive advantage can be developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers basic ways that a competitive advantage can be developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives a comprehensive description of ways in which a competitive advantage can be developed 	
Financials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacking pro forma and historical financials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financials are included and professionally presented to external users. Capital ask is defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial assumptions are defensible. Clear definition of historical/future sources and uses of funds 	
Quality of Venture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Venture is poorly thought out. Does not represent a practical opportunity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial thought has been put into the realistic viability of the venture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The venture is a real-world opportunity with realistic expectations of future challenges and path to success 	
Professionalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of video/presentation displays lack of effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional bearing is maintained, degree of effort is self-evident 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely professional presentation and preparation. Team conducted themselves with the highest professional standards in mind. 	
Total Score				