

Viasat: Space for Good | Phase 1 Scoring Rubric

Use this rubric to evaluate your Viasat: Space for Good Phase 1 submission. Review it closely to ensure your answers meet our requirements.

Category	Maximum Points	Description	Scoring Ranges
Concept, clarity, and depth	15	How clearly is the solution summarized? Does the student articulate the "why" and "how" without jargon overload? Can a person with a limited technical background understand the concept?	(0-6) Vague or confusing; lacks technical "how-to"
			(7-10) Basic summary; clear but lacks depth and details
			(11-12) Comprehensive; technical logic is sound in described in a way all can understand
Mission relevance	15	Does the solution directly address one or more of the 11 core areas (e.g., D2D, Disaster Response)? Is the link to supporting and improving "Life on Earth" clear?	(0-6) Weak link or no link to one or more of the 11 core areas
			(7-10) Mentions one or more core areas but logic is tangential or incomplete
			(11-12) Strong alignment with one or more of the 11 core areas and moderately clear explanation of how concept improves life on Earth
Innovation and creativity	15	Is this a novel application of satellite tech? Does it offer a fresh perspective or improve significantly on existing methods? Does the student clearly explain the inspiration for their idea?	(0-6) Standard "off-the-shelf" idea that's been around forever, no real explanation around student's inspiration
			(7-10) Incremental improvement to existing tech, but likely not enough to be commercially viable; vague explanation around inspiration for idea
			(11-12) Novel application and/or fresh perspective with clear explanation around inspiration for idea
			(13-15). Breakthrough concept that wows; paradigm-shifting with clear and compelling explanation around source of inspiration

Viasat capability alignment	15	Does the student demonstrate an understanding of Viasat's specific technical capabilities and Viasat's products and services (Multi-orbit, open architecture, etc.)?	<p>(0-6) No mention of aligning with Viasat's capabilities; demonstrates no understanding of Viasat's core capabilities</p> <p>(7-10) Mentions Viasat but lacks understanding of capabilities; not aligned with Viasat's capabilities</p> <p>(11-12). Demonstrates relatively clear understanding of Viasat's capabilities and aligns with one of more of these in a clear way</p> <p>(13-15) Highly strategic fit with Viasat's capabilities and those of our partners, and with our potential future business, explained in a compelling and clear way</p>
Commercial viability	15	Is there evidence of comprehensive market research and market knowledge? Is the assessment of stakeholders and opportunities to scale realistic?	<p>(0-6) Little to no evidence of commercial viability and market research</p> <p>(7-10) Some explanation of commercial viability, but it's generic and surface level; little to no market research conducted</p> <p>(11-12) Relatively clear demonstration of commercial viability, stakeholders, and scaling with moderate level of examples and specifics</p> <p>(13-15) Detailed, thorough, and compelling information presented around commercial viability, specific stakeholders, and approach to scaling. Comprehensive market research presented and applied to explanation.</p>
Feasibility and risk awareness	10	Has the student identified realistic roadblocks? Are their mitigation strategies technically and logically sound? Does the student demonstrate clear understanding of biggest risks?	<p>(0-2) Little to no attention in demonstrating understanding of risks and roadblocks</p> <p>(3-5) Some explanation of risks and mitigation strategies, but shallow and incomplete</p> <p>(6-8) Moderately clear description and understanding of risk and feasibility with some specific mitigation examples mentioned</p> <p>(9-10) Exceptionally clear and compelling demonstration of understanding of risk and risk mitigation with thorough, thoughtful, and realistic mitigation strategies outlined</p>
Metrics and impact	10	Are the 4–6 success metrics quantifiable and logical? Do they actually measure the impact on	<p>(0-2) Impact is trivial or unmeasurable, no metrics presented</p> <p>(3-5) Identifies impact but lacks clear metrics</p>

	earth and society and are matched with a realistic timeline?	<p>(6-8) Demonstrable impact with 4-6 clear, concrete metrics and reasonable timeline</p> <p>(9-10) Crystal clear impact with matching metrics that illustrate concrete impact on society and are matched with relevant and specific timeline</p>
Quality and professionalism	<p>5 Is the writing polished, well-researched, and free of grammatical errors?</p>	<p>(0-2) Writing has notable spelling, grammatical, and punctuation errors, it is evident that student did not proofread</p> <p>(3) Writing quality is moderate with room for improvement, a moderate level of errors detected</p> <p>(4) Strong, clear, polished writing with few errors</p> <p>(5) Writing is exceptionally clear, compelling, professional, and "publication-ready", zero spelling or grammar errors detected</p>

TOTAL: 100 points