MAVEC 2024 RUBRIC FOR CONTENT STAGE 1

Performance Criteria	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Mark
	s = (0 – 5)	s = (5 – 6.4)	s = (6.5 – 7.4)	s = (7.5 – 10)	(Sxw)
Quality and content of Proposal (w=1.5) 1. Clarity of content 2. Organization of idea	**Clarity of Content:** The content is confusing, lacks focus, or contains numerous ambiguities that make comprehension challenging. **Organization of Ideas:** Ideas are disorganized or presented randomly, lacking a logical flow. There is no discernible structure.	**Clarity of Content:** The content is understandable but may lack detail or specificity in certain areas, leading to occasional confusion. **Organization of Ideas:** Ideas are organized to an extent, but transitions between them might be abrupt or poorly executed.	**Clarity of Content:** The content is mostly clear and informative, with well-explained concepts and terms. **Organization of Ideas:** Ideas are well-organized and structured, with a logical progression that enhances the reader's understanding.	**Clarity of Content:** The content is exceptionally clear, with all terms and concepts defined and explained thoroughly. **Organization of Ideas:** Ideas are excellently organized, with a cohesive structure that guides the reader seamlessly from one point to the next.	
Language (w=1)	The language used is unclear or incorrect, with frequent grammatical or spelling errors that impede understanding.	The language is adequate, with some errors in grammar or spelling that distract but do not completely obscure the meaning.	The language is good, with minor grammatical or spelling errors. It communicates ideas effectively.	The language is outstanding, with very minor errors in grammar or spelling. It is articulate and precise, making the proposal a pleasure to read.	
Technical Approach & Methodology (w=2) 1. Feasibility 2. Justification	**Feasibility:** The technical approach is unrealistic or lacks a sound basis in established engineering principles, suggesting a high probability of failure. **Justification:** Explanations are vague or missing. Justifications for the chosen methodologies are either not present or	**Feasibility:** The technical approach is somewhat realistic but may rely on assumptions that are not validated or could be challenging to meet in practice. **Justification:** Explanations and justifications are present but lack depth. While some reasoning is offered, it may not fully	**Feasibility:** The proposal outlines a technically feasible approach grounded in reliable techniques and principles. Minor uncertainties may be present but are acknowledged and addressed. **Justification:** The proposal offers solid explanations and	**Feasibility:** The technical approach is thoroughly realistic, well-researched, and based on cutting-edge or well-established science. There is a clear path to implementation with identified contingencies for potential technical challenges. **Justification:**	

	not convincing, with a lack of supporting data.	substantiate the methodology or may overlook potential challenges.	justifications for the chosen technical approach. It is supported by preliminary data, pilot studies, or a well-researched rationale, though some minor areas may lack complete clarity.	The proposal provides detailed, logical explanations and strong justifications for the approach. It is supported by comprehensive data, references to authoritative sources, and a clear articulation of why the chosen methods will succeed.	
Innovation and originality (w=1)	The proposal demonstrates no innovation or originality, relying on outdated or common techniques with no novel application or thought process.	There is a slight degree of innovation or a new combination of existing ideas, but it falls short of being transformative or significantly different from existing solutions.	There is clear evidence of innovation and originality, with the proposal introducing new concepts or methods that offer improvements over existing solutions.	The proposal demonstrates significant innovation and originality, offering a unique approach or breakthrough methodology that sets it apart from current practices.	
Implementation Plan (w=1.5) 1. Realistic timeline 2. Optimum resource allocation	**Realistic Timeline:** The timeline is either too vague or overly optimistic, showing a lack of understanding of the project scope and complexity. There may be no consideration of potential risks or dependencies that could affect the schedule. **Optimum Resource Allocation:** The proposal demonstrates a lack of planning in resource allocation, with	**Realistic Timeline:** The timeline shows a basic structure with estimated start and end dates but lacks detailed milestones or buffers for unforeseen delays. It does not fully convey the sequence of activities or necessary checkpoints. **Optimum Resource Allocation:** Resource allocation is addressed but is not fully aligned with the project's needs. Some resources may	**Realistic Timeline:** The timeline is well thought out with clear milestones and estimated durations that appear reasonable. It acknowledges key project phases and includes some consideration for risk management and contingency planning. **Optimum Resource Allocation:** Resources are allocated appropriately across the project, with most allocations justified and tied	**Realistic Timeline:** The timeline is highly detailed and includes all phases of the project, with specific milestones, deliverables, and comprehensive risk assessment. It reflects a deep understanding of the project's complexity and includes contingencies for potential delays. **Optimum Resource Allocation:** The proposal exhibits meticulous planning in	

	critical resources either underallocated or overlooked. There is a significant mismatch between project phases and the resources assigned to them.	be allocated without clear justification, and there could be instances of over or under-allocation.	to specific tasks or outcomes. However, there may be room for more strategic allocation to enhance project efficiency	resource allocation, with each resource clearly justified and aligned with project phases and milestones. It demonstrates an efficient and strategic use of resources to maximize project success.	
Budget and justification (w=1.5) 1. Realistic Budget 2. Clear budget justification and allocation.	**Realistic Budget:** The budget is either incomplete or poorly detailed, with significant omissions that question its overall viability. Costs may be underestimated or overestimated without clear benchmarks or references. **Clear Budget Justification and Allocation:** Justifications for budget items are either missing or lack coherence, with no clear link between budgeted items and project activities. The allocation of funds seems arbitrary and not aligned with the project's objectives.	**Realistic Budget:** The budget provides a basic outline of expected costs but lacks sufficient itemization or may not reflect market rates or actual project needs adequately. Some cost categories may be too vague or generic. **Clear Budget Justification and Allocation:** Budget justifications are present but lack specificity. Allocation is generally related to project goals, but some allocations may not be fully rationalized, leaving doubts about their necessity or efficiency.	**Realistic Budget:** The budget is detailed and provides a fair estimate of project costs, with most items reflecting a reasonable approximation of market conditions and project requirements. Minor discrepancies or uncertainties might be present but do not significantly impact the overall budget. **Clear Budget Justification and Allocation:** The justification for each budget item is clear and shows a direct connection to the project's activities and goals. The allocation of funds appears logical, with a well-thought-out distribution across the project's components.	**Realistic Budget:** The budget is exceptionally well-prepared, with comprehensive, itemized listings that accurately reflect detailed market research and project needs. It demonstrates a deep understanding of the financial requirements necessary to achieve project objectives. **Clear Budget Justification and Allocation:** Every budget item has a thorough justification, demonstrating an explicit link between project activities and expenditures. The allocation of funds is optimized to ensure maximum efficiency and effectiveness, enhancing the project's value for money.	

Impact and Scalability (W=1.5) 1. Potential impact 2. Real-world application	**Potential Impact:** The proposal fails to articulate a clear impact or the impact is very limited in scope and significance. It does not address any significant problem or need. **Real-World Application:** There is little to no consideration of how the project could be applied in real-world settings. The proposal lacks practicality or a path to market or deployment.	**Potential Impact:** The proposal identifies a potential impact but it may be minimal or very niche. The expected benefits and outcomes are somewhat vague or narrowly focused. **Real-World Application:** The proposal demonstrates a basic level of real-world applicability, but there may be significant barriers to implementation or scale that are not adequately addressed.	**Potential Impact:** The proposal outlines a clear and positive impact with evidence or a strong argument to support its claims. It addresses a definite need or problem but may not be transformative. **Real-World Application:** The proposal includes a realistic plan for real-world application, showing awareness of practical considerations and market conditions, though some aspects may lack full development or robustness.	**Potential Impact:** The proposal promises a high level of impact that is significant, wide-reaching, or groundbreaking. It convincingly demonstrates how the project will address critical challenges or bring about substantial improvements. **Real-World Application:** The proposal presents a compelling case for real-world application, including a clear strategy for implementation, scalability, and sustainability. It anticipates potential challenges and provides solutions to ensure successful deployment and market adoption.	
Total Mark (100)					