

MTRAC AgBio Innovation Hub Reviewer and Team Information Packet for 2018 Tier I Full Proposals

This PDF document contains information useful for both applicants and the expert reviewers evaluating applications. Please review this document carefully as it details the information we collect and how it will be evaluated.

When evaluating applications, please use the criteria you'll see in this packet holistically.

Table of Contents

Page(s)	Title	Description
2	Evaluation Criteria	These pages detail the evidence-based evaluation matrix we are using for this competition. Each evaluator will score applicants using this tool. Feedback will be anonymized, aggregated and provided to all participating applicants.
3	An example heat map	This page gives you an idea of what a feedback summary for a proposal will look like once a given round of review is complete.

The MTRAC Innovation Hub for AgBio located at Michigan State University has partnered with Valid Evaluation, Inc. and is using that company's tools to drive our programming. Below are links to two tutorial videos explaining key aspects of their online platform. Please watch them as you will find them very beneficial.

Audience	Video	Running Time
Reviewers	The Evaluation Process	3:03
Applicants	Understanding Feedback	2:40

		DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	MOVING TOWARD EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	
PRODUCT / SERVICES	PRODUCT / SERVICE DESCRIPTION	Fails to describe product or service and beneficial features. Fails to establish a differentiated unique sales proposition.	Partly describes product or service and beneficial features. Partially establishes a differentiated unique sales proposition.	Adequately describes product or service and beneficial features. Establishes a differentiated unique sales proposition.	Clearly and concisely describes product or service and beneficial features. Establishes a highly differentiated unique sales proposition.	
	TECHNOLOGY VALIDATION	No evidence of technical validation, even for product plans / designs.	Evidence of initial validation. Designs and / or models vetted by external experts, customers or partners, but have not been field tested.	Evidence of stage-appropriate validation. Articulates clear plan to complete remaining validation.	Convincing evidence to validate that technology is commercially viable.	
	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LANDSCAPE	No patent filings to date and technology in market that desires patents.	Patent application(s) filed in some country(ies) but missing protection in relevant market territory(ies).	Patent application(s) pending in relevant county(ies); or, for market in which patents not needed, copyright or proprietary material protection available.	At least one patent issued or allowed in relevant market territory.	
weight 40%						
	MARKET SEGMENT	DEFINITION	Undefined market segment.	Somewhat defined market segment.	Defined market segment.	Engaged with possible customers (customer discovery) in defined market segment.
	SIZE IN DOLLARS	Market segment as a whole books <\$5M per year.	Market segment as a whole books between \$5M and \$50M per year.	Market segment as a whole books between \$50M and \$250M per year.	Market segment as a whole books >\$250M per year.	
weight 20%	MARKET RESEARCH	Fails to provide relevant data on market size, trends, or opportunities. Analysis fails to support opportunity.	Provides minimally relevant data on market size, trends, and opportunities. Analysis partially supports opportunity.	Provides mostly relevant data on market size, trends, and opportunities. Analysis sufficiently supports opportunity.	Provides highly relevant data on market size, trends, and opportunities. Analysis persuasively supports opportunity.	
	POTENTIAL IMPACT	MARKET GROWTH	Zero or negative market growth.	Market growing in step with economy.	Market growing significantly faster than the economy.	Explosive market growth. (>30% CAGR.) Increasing number of opportunities for innovators.
weight 20%	TIMING OF MARKET NEED	No current need evident. Unclear when need will emerge.	No current need evident. Projections of significant need in > 5 years.	Evidence of need in today's market. Need likely will increase in < 5 years.	Present and longstanding need for this invention. Need likely to last for 10+ years.	
	GO TO MARKET	GETTING TO MARKET	Fails to argue this technology will be purchased / licensed for incorporation into a salable product within ten years.	Unconvincingly argues this technology will be purchased / licensed for incorporation into a salable product within ten years.	Somewhat plausibly argues this technology will be purchased / licensed for incorporation into a salable product within ten years.	Plausibly argues this technology will be purchased / licensed for incorporation into a salable product within ten years.
weight 20%	DOWNSTREAM VALUE	No evidence of downstream value analysis. Cannot say how partners and end-users will profit.	Addresses some downstream value issues. Adequate description / concept of downstream profit or end-user ROI.	Effectively addresses downstream value issues. Some evidence of sufficient downstream partners profit or end-user ROI.	Strong evidence of sufficient downstream profit or end-user ROI.	

Qualitative Feedback

All proposals that pass the compliance review will be evaluated by multiple reviewers. Valid Eval's system uniquely summarizes the evaluation clicks made by every reviewer evaluating that proposal. (Clicks are not required in every row.)

For reviewers. Please know that each feedback click you make matters. Your clicks are important parts of the overall feedback the system delivers to teams. It's better not to click in a row if you are unsure of your feedback.

For applicants. Reading the heat map is pretty simple. Darker colors represent more agreement among reviewers on a given feedback click. So, dark colors represent more trustworthy feedback which you can use for improvement if expectations are not met, for example the proposal evaluated below was clearly doing a poor job with "Customer Engagement." On the other hand, the reviewers couldn't seem to agree at all on "Incumbents' Power." This is a different sort of signal. It could mean that your application wasn't clear on this aspect or that the reviewers simply have widely varying points of view.

