

## Introduction to Product Development - Evaluation rubrics.

P3 - Problem clarification	Poor		Good		Excellent		
	Please describe what your problem is, and why you feel it is important	The problem seems to be very narrow (how to pick the pinky nail) or extremely broad (how to solve climate change)	(0-5)	The problem presents a good balance between breadth and depth of effort, and is feasible within the time frame of this course.	(6-15)	The problem is well balanced, feasible and seems to be an important problem to solve.	(16-30)
	Present a brief market overview, and competing solutions to the problem	No competing solutions are presented, although there are products/services/systems in the market that solve or partially solve the problem	(0-10)	Only a few competing solutions are presented, but major groups of solutions are missing because of poor assumptions on what the problem is	(11-20)	A thorough research on existing solutions for the problem has been done and the strengths and weaknesses of each solution are critically explored	(21-40)
	No solutions at this point in time	The tem is already fixated in a predetermined solution and work has begun to solve the problem without a clear understanding of the problem.	(-15)	The team has presented a few ideas on how to move forward, but no significant effort was put in the development of those ideas.	(0-10)	No specific ideas are presented on how to solve the problem. Instead, the problem is moderately understood at this point	(11-30)

P4 - Identification of user needs	Poor		Good		Excellent		
	Please present what you uncovered from your interaction with your target audience.	No interviews (or very few) were done, and nothing very new has come out of this phase	(0-10)	Some interviews were done, some critical assessment of the interviews was also done, not much was uncovered	(11-20)	A significant number of interviews were done, enough to uncover some interesting facts about the target user, with a critical assessment of the results	(21-30)
	Present how much current solutions address the problems found and what is the gap you are trying to bridge with your solution.	No benchmarking (or just a few products) was done, although there are competing products in the market already	(0-10)	Major competing products were found and compared, but no gap was identified	(11-20)	Major competing products were found and compared, and gaps were identified and critically assessed	(21-30)
	Show explicitly your solution specifications, but do not present a definitive solution at this point in time. You can present possible solutions/technologies you are considering.	No specifications were presented. Instead a potential solution was presented without a clear justification	(0-10)	Some specifications are presented, but their derivation is not clear. Potential solutions/technologies are identified but not justified	(11-25)	Specifications are clearly justified through the interaction with the target audience, and relate with the benchmarking studies conducted. Potential solutions/technologies are preliminarily identified	(26-40)

Name of juror: \_\_\_\_\_

Introduction to Product Development - Evaluation rubrics.

P5 – Efforts concerning concept generation		Poor		Good		Excellent	
	Functional/activity diagrams of the product	No (or very little) abstract functions/activities have been identified	(0-5)	Some abstract functions were identified, but not coherently put together as a whole product/service/system	(6-15)	Abstract functions and activities are coherently identified and the whole set of functions is embedded in the product/service/system	(16-25)
	Product concepts	The team relies on just one (or a few) ideas to further develop the concept and functions identified.	(0-10)	The team has identified a number of concepts, and used some criteria to select the most promising ones	(11-20)	The team used one or more structured methods of ideation to develop concepts, and then selected the most promising ones with quantifiable and meaningful criteria, based on customer needs	(21-35)
	Concept testing	No evidence of any testing, or very limited testing	(0-10)	Some planning and testing was done, but it did not result in any meaningful learning or iteration of the concepts	(11-25)	Extensive testing was performed, based on a testing plan, with explicit criteria of assessment, and the team learned from it and improved the concepts to meet the criteria	(26-40)

P7 - Proof of concept		Poor		Good		Excellent	
	Proof of concept	The team presents no prototype or just one without a strategy. No evidence of prototyping rationale such as prototyping canvas .	(0-10)	Prototypes exist, but are simple and obvious and do not inform the process of product development. Prototyping canvas is presented, but is lightweight.	(11-25)	Extensive prototyping is presented with evolution of project. The prototyping strategy allowed the evolution of the project.	(26-40)
	Patent analysis	No patent analysis or very badly done.	(0-10)	Simple patent analysis. No information passed to the project.	(11-20)	Good patent analysis. Evidence of informed the decision making spill to the project.	(21-35)
	Crude financial model	No evidence of costs, sales or price. Absurd numbers all around.	(0-5)	Number exist, but little care on validation. Some numbers are absurd.	(6-15)	Major items of a financial model are presented. Evidence of reasoning for the numbers presented.	(16-25)

Name of juror: \_\_\_\_\_

Introduction to Product Development - Evaluation rubrics.

		Poor		Good		Excellent	
<b>POSTER</b>	Communication: How well the ideas were communicated.	Improper use of data/ representation. Difficult to understand. Incomplete. Drawing series does not show any meaningful research or demonstrate design opportunity. Scenario parameters do not expand on the development of the project.	(0-8)	Clear. Proper use of data/representation. Drawing series integrate good research and the parameters of the scenario are used to develop the project.	(9-15)	Eloquent visual & graphic communication. The drawing series integrate research and a good range of information on the project overall. All information presented is clearly critical to the development of the project.	(16-25)
	One Critical Image: How well the constructed image/drawing showcase the project.	The image is not well thought out, and it misrepresents the intent of the design. The overall composition and construction of the image poorly convey the project concept.	(0-8)	The image enables the design intent and concept of the project to be communicated to the viewer. It compliments other information presented in the poster.	(9-15)	The image constructed is critical in conveying the design intent to the viewer. Its framing, angle, chosen composition, background and visual clarity adds to the concept of the project. It is integral to the other information presented in the poster.	(16-25)
	Prototype testing evidence	No evidence of prototype testing, no relation to the testing plan, or no learning was experienced by the team.	(0-5)	There are elements of prototype testing, but without a structure/process of data collection and learning outcome.	(6-13)	Evidence is shown of prototype testing, with results from various iterations and lessons learned. The concept testing was planned and executed.	(14-20)
<b>OVERALL STAND</b>	Overall presentation of the stand: How well ideas are communicated by the stand.	Components are overall unrelated. No thought was given to make the stand a coherent story.	(0-4)	Some components in the stand do not contribute to the understanding of the design outcome or design process.	(5-10)	All the components in the stand contribute in a coherent way and flow towards understanding of the design outcome or design process.	(11-15)
	Craft and Completeness of the prototypes: How well model/prototype is completed, crafted and aesthetically expressed	In progress. Many features missing or not followed through (incorrect sizes, scales, overall seems that it's not finished). No, or very little number of, functions implemented. Poor choice of materials used. Rough, messy work.	(0-4)	Model/prototype mostly completed, missing minor parts. Partially functional prototype. Good choice of materials used. Skillful but either slightly sloppy craftsmanship or hard to appreciate aesthetics.	(5-10)	Comprehensive. Model/prototype completed in multiple and/or relevant scales. Fully functional prototype. Excellent choice of materials used. Mastery. Exceptional neatness and intricate craftsmanship. Beautifully presented.	(11-15)

Name of juror: \_\_\_\_\_