



The Miclot Family Business Plan Competition - 2023

The Miclot Family Business Plan Competition is actually an “opportunity assessment plan” competition. The term “business plan” is used for the sake of brevity. An opportunity assessment plan includes a description of a product, service, or venture and its market need. Competitive products, services, or ventures are assessed, analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of each competitor. The plan includes the unique selling propositions of the product, service, or venture, along with future growth and characteristics of the target market(s).

Any Culver Academies student is eligible to compete in the Miclot Family Business Plan Competition.

How do students compete?

Students may compete individually or may form a team. A team may have no more than three members. If students form a team, that team must select a team captain. All competitors must utilize experts/stakeholders that influence the divergence stage (understanding the pain point), the ideation stage (forming solutions), and the convergence stage (confirming the solution will positively impact the pain point) – these experts should not be family members. The use of these experts is a key part of the process, and submissions that lack initial proof of their participation will not be moved on to the finalist round. It is understood that these participants will have a deeper impact if a team moves on to the finalist round, so this initial submission may not be comprehensive with relationship to divergence, ideation, and convergence.

Competitors will develop a product, service, or venture that is entirely new to the market. It may be either “for-profit” or “not-for-profit.” The product, service, or venture cannot already exist.

Please see the “Competitions” section of Rubin School.org for information about past winners.

Here are the steps to follow:

1. Submit a summary of the product, service, or venture in no more than 500 words, using 12 pt. font and double spacing. Support for items to consider including in the summary can be found with the Canvas business model. A cover sheet must identify the name of the product, service, or venture, the individual competitor's name/captain's name (if a team entry), and name of business/idea. Also on the cover sheet, include a summary of the experts who have participated thus far and in what capacity – no more than 200 words. Entries will be dismissed with limited to zero participation from outside stakeholders.
2. The deadline for submission of the written summary is Saturday, 4/8 by 3PM EST. Submissions must be emailed to Mr. J.D. Uebler (john.uebler@culver.org) or can be delivered to The Ron Rubin School for the Entrepreneur Faculty Office (005 in Eppley Hall of Humanities).
3. The most attractive summaries from the entries will be selected as finalists. The rubric below will be used for the Round 1 entries. Finalists will be notified on Friday, 4/14. See the attached rubric on which Finalists will be judged.
4. Finalists will have the opportunity to make their presentations in the Heritage Room of Legion Memorial Building before a panel of judges – made up of experienced entrepreneurs and businesspeople. This will take place on Sunday, May 14, 2023 at 2PM EST.
5. Finalists will have 10 minutes to make their presentation. The judges will have up to three minutes to question each individual/team. Only individuals/team members may participate in both the presentation and question/answer period. Signs, handouts, props, laptops, presentation aids (*i.e.* Slide Deck), etc. may be used. No finalist shall use note cards or written speeches during final pitch. Each team may select its own uniform: business dress or dress school uniform.
6. The order for competitors will be determined by blind draw. That order is final.
7. If a competitor arrives late, they will not be allowed to compete. If a competitor leaves early, they will not be eligible for any prize money. If a team loses a member prior to competition, the team may continue with remaining members. A team member may not be replaced with a member not in the initial submission materials.
8. The winning competitor (individual or team), as determined by the judges, wins \$5,000; second place wins \$1,000; and third place wins \$500. Please see the attached rubric the judges will use to evaluate competitors.

Round 1 Submission Rubric –

This rubric shall be used to evaluate those projects that will be moved to the finalist round.

Metric	Exemplary 8 points	Accomplished 5 points	Developing 3 points	Beginning 1 point
<i>Creativity</i> —The idea appears to be new, fresh, viable, and innovative.				
<i>Divergence</i> — The presented idea solves a stated pain point, problem, issue, or challenge. The contestant articulates how the presented idea will solve the identified pain point, problem, issue, or challenge.				
<i>Convergence</i> – The presented idea has accompanying proof that it will solve the stated problem or headache.				
<i>Experts / Stakeholders</i> —The contestant/team identifies relevant experts and the influence on the project to date. The contestant/team may acknowledge how these experts/stakeholders could be utilized in the future if moved to final round.				
<i>Presentation</i> - contestant/team submit a polished summary with required components.				

Total: _____

Comments:

**The Ron Rubin School for the Entrepreneur
Summary Evaluation Form**

Evaluator's Name: _____ **Team Name:** _____

Individual / Captain Name: _____

Product, Service, or Venture – 40%

Overall Rating	5 – Well Above Standards	4 – Above Standards	3 – Meets Standards	2 – Below Standards	1 – well below standards
Selection (X)					

Standards:

1. Summary clearly describes Product/Service/Venture.
2. Summary substantiates the marketability of the product/service/venture.
3. Summary identifies the major risks anticipated and identified.
4. Summary defines capital requirements for the product/service/venture.

Viability – 40%

Overall Rating	5 – Well Above Standards	4 – Above Standards	3 – Meets Standards	2 – Below Standards	1 – well below standards
Selection (X)					

Standards:

1. The product/service/venture provides something novel/unique/special that gives it competitive advantage.
2. The product/service/venture has potential to attract investors.
3. The group took advantage of the business/entrepreneurial mentor.

Presentation – 20%

Overall Rating	5 – Well Above Standards	4 – Above Standards	3 – Meets Standards	2 – Below Standards	1 – well below standards
Selection (X)					

Standards:

1. Submission is professional and content is professional.
2. A competitor should be proud of how this submission would be presented to a judge.

Comments/questions:

Finalist: Yes ___/No ___

**The Ron Rubin School for the Entrepreneur
Miclot Family Business Plan Competition – Finalist Rubric**

Judge's name: _____ Team Name: _____

Individual/Captain Name: _____

Please evaluate each presentation based on the following criteria:

Product, Service, or Venture – 35%

Overall Rating	5 – Well Above Standards	4 – Above Standards	3 – Meets Standards	2 – Below Standards	1 – well below standards
Selection (X)					

Standards:

1. Product/Service/Venture is clearly described.
2. Marketability of the product/service/venture substantiated.
3. Major risks anticipated and identified.
4. Capital requirements clearly stated.

Comments/questions:

Viability – 35%

Overall Rating	5 – Well Above Standards	4 – Above Standards	3 – Meets Standards	2 – Below Standards	1 – well below standards
Selection (X)					

Standards:

1. The product/service/venture provides something novel/unique/special that gives it competitive advantage
2. The product/service/venture has potential to attract investors.
3. The competitors took advantage of the business/entrepreneurial mentor.

Comments/questions:

Presentation Style – 20%

Overall Rating	5 – Well Above Standards	4 – Above Standards	3 – Meets Standards	2 – Below Standards	1 – well below standards
Selection (X)					

Standards:

1. Presentation stayed within the time limits.
2. Competitor(s) conveyed professionalism.
3. Competitor(s) were adequately responsive to questions from judges.
4. The individual's or team's style inspired interest in the product/service/venture.

Comments/questions:

Presentation Aids – 10%

Overall Rating	5 – Well Above Standards	4 – Above Standards	3 – Meets Standards	2 – Below Standards	1 – well below standards
Selection (X)					

Standards:

1. Presentation stayed within the time limits.
2. Competitor(s) conveyed professionalism.
3. Competitor(s) were adequately responsive to questions from judges.
4. The individual's or team's style inspired interest in the product/service/venture.

Comments/questions:

For official scoring only – **TOTAL SCORE:** _____

Product/Service/Venture (35%): _____ = _____ Presentation (20%): _____ = _____

Viability (35%): _____ = _____ Presentation Aids (10%): _____ = _____