

University of Southern California  
Marshall School of Business

BUAD 307  
Lars Perner, Ph.D., Instructor

Marketing Fundamentals  
Spring, 2009

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>EVALUATION OF PROJECT PROPOSAL</b>			
<b>The below ratings do NOT represent “points,” but rather <i>evaluations</i> of specific components. Grading is based on the <i>overall impression</i> of the proposal.</b>			
<b>Criterion</b>		Rating (NOT “points” and not additive)	
Clarity of discussion		/10	
Identification of existing potentially competitive offerings (close or remote) or other attempts to meet the identified customer need		/10	
Identification of customer value created as distinct from what is already available in the market place.		/10	
Discussion of technological feasibility, if applicable		/10	
Discussion of ethical issues, if applicable and significant		/10	
Description of new product, target market, distribution channel, or cross-country product transplantation		/10	
Overall impression		/10	
<b>Section Review</b>			
Revenue sources	OK	Acceptable with minor changes	Major changes needed
Technological feasibility	OK	Acceptable with minor changes	Major changes needed
Ethical issues—if applicable	OK	Acceptable with minor changes	Major changes needed
Chicken-and-egg problems—if applicable	OK	Acceptable with minor changes	Major changes needed
Product Description	OK	Acceptable with minor changes	Major changes needed
Value added	OK	Acceptable with minor changes	Major changes needed
Value description	OK	Acceptable with minor changes	Major changes needed
<b>Project proposal base score</b>			<b>/50</b>
<b>Adjustments</b>			
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Adjustment range</b>		<b>Actual adjustment</b>
Failure to show up for appointment or failure to arrive on time*	-10		
Failure to bring a hard copy of the proposal*	-10		
Reckless disregard for instructions	-10-25		
Incomplete proposal	-10-50		
<b>Adjusted project proposal score</b>			<b>/50</b>

**NOTE: Scores on proposals are likely to run somewhat higher (in percentage terms) than scores on subsequent assignments where a stronger distinction between the quality of different papers is likely to be found. Therefore, the score received on the proposal should *not* form the basis for expectations of scores on the preliminary and final papers.**

**Concerns listed below apply only if an “X” is marked by the specific item.**

	The discussion is not closely tailored to the actual the actual venture.
	Reasoning is not spelled out.
	“Stipulated excellence.”
	Failure to sufficiently address technological feasibility.
	Failure to identify a specific firm (or a new one) to undertake this venture. Proposing a general idea that could be adopted by any industry firm is NOT acceptable. Specifically created consortia may be acceptable if their structure is clearly identified.
	Insufficient or unpersuasive discussion of how this venture would make money or, if non-profit, at least raise revenue enough to cover costs.
	Use of hyperbole or other exaggerations.
	Writing is ambiguous, including possible use of the term “etc.”
	Use of low quality or otherwise not credible sources, if applicable
	Superficial or incorrect use of marketing terms
	Excessive use of “buzz” words
	Poor writing quality and/or poor proof reading
	Overall failure to follow instructions.

\* Individuals who fail to show up, fail to arrive on time, or fail to bring a printed copy of the proposal must appear during scheduled office hours within a week of the scheduled appointment. Such evaluations will be done on a first come, first served basis.

Under the grading standards of the Marshall School of Business, an average score of approximately 85% would be expected. Not everyone will reach, let alone score above, the class average.

If you would like to discuss the grading of your proposal, please come in during regularly scheduled office hours.