

VIP Consortium 2021 Innovation Competition

Guidelines

Updated 10-21-2020

The VIP Consortium Innovation Competition provides a forum for VIP teams from around the world to showcase their work and be recognized for their accomplishments. VIP teams from any of the [40 institutions](#) that are part of the VIP Consortium are eligible to enter the competition.

Each competing VIP team is asked to prepare a brief presentation about their project (no more than **six minutes** long) addressing the following categories and “Heilmeier” questions:

GOALS

- What are you trying to do? Articulate your objectives using absolutely no jargon.

INNOVATION

- How is it done today, and what are the limits of current practice?
- What is new in your approach and why do you think it will be successful?

IMPACT

- Who cares and why?
- If you are successful, what difference will it make?

VIABILITY

- What are the risks?
- How much will it cost?
- How long will it take?
- What are the mid-term and final criteria for success?

In addition to the above areas, teams will be evaluated on **presentation effectiveness**. Students are encouraged to be creative in their approach and to incorporate visuals to illustrate content rather than rely on text-heavy slides. Brief animations or video clips are permissible in presentations if suited to the content.

There will be two levels of competition, local and international, summarized on the following page. The format for the initial round will be determined by the local organizers. Teams may benefit from interaction with an audience in the first round (in person or in an online format), but this is not required. Regardless of format, facilitators should stop each presentation promptly at the six-minute mark and notify teams in advance that they will be doing so. During live competitions, judges may be permitted to ask questions after each presentation, but Q&A should last no more than 15 minutes.

The final (international) level of competition will be entirely virtual: Competing teams will be asked to record their presentations with audio narration or subtitles in English, and to provide access to their presentations via web links. The judging rubric for the final level of competition is included below.

Last year’s regional finalists* were:

- Asia – [Sens'er'](#), Inha University (South Korea)
- Europe – [RoVER](#), University of Strathclyde (Scotland)
- Southern Hemisphere – [MATSim](#), University of Pretoria (South Africa)
- US - Northeast – [Social Sphere](#), Howard University (Washington, DC)
- US - Southeast – [Robotic Human Augmentation](#), Georgia Tech (Georgia) (*Overall Winner*)

VIP Consortium 2021 Innovation Competition

**Note: Participation in regional competitions is not required to advance to the finals this year.*

Levels of Competition

Local Institution VIP Competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competition format and date determined by local VIP site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Live presentations encouraged (in person or online) but not required - Team presentations strictly limited to six minutes - Q&A period <i>optional</i>, limited to no more than 15 minutes per presentation • Local competitions completed by March 15, 2021 • One winner from each VIP site advances to the finals
Deadlines for advancing to finals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each participating VIP site sends name and brief description (one to two sentences) of winning team to Kitty Vogt (kfv@vip-consortium.org) by March 15, 2021 • Participating VIP sites send video link of their winning team presentation to kfv@vip-consortium.org by April 2, 2021
International VIP Consortium Competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each site may submit one team presentation • Presentations must be submitted as videos, accessible by Web link • Videos must be no more than six minutes in length and have English narration (or subtitles) • Videos should reference VIP or Vertically Integrated Projects in presentation title or team name • Videos may be shared publicly and should not include any confidential information • Video presentations will be judged entirely online; no Q&A sessions • Winner announced at 2021 VIP Consortium Annual Meeting in Atlanta (May 27-28, 2021)

VIP Consortium 2021 Innovation Competition

Judging Categories

I. Goals

- *What are you trying to do? Articulate objectives using absolutely no jargon.*

The presentation should clearly and concisely describe the goals of the project and provide the audience with a foundation from which to understand the remaining presentation content.

II. Innovation

- *How is it done today, and what are the limits of current practice?*
- *What is new in your approach and why do you think it will be successful?*

Teams should demonstrate that they have a broad understanding of existing challenges/approaches and have made efforts to integrate new perspectives into a novel solution.

III. Impact

- *Who cares and why?*
- *If you are successful, what difference will it make?*

Teams should demonstrate that they understand the context of the project in the real world and the needs of stakeholders who would benefit from the new approach.

IV. Viability

- *What are the risks?*
- *How much will it cost?*
- *How long will it take?*
- *What are the mid-term and final criteria for success?*

Teams should demonstrate that they have considered factors necessary to transform the idea into an implementable solution and have identified reasonable markers for progress.

V. Presentation Effectiveness

The team's presentation should be organized, clear, and enthusiastic. It should provide useful visuals and keep the audience engaged.

VIP Consortium 2021 Innovation Competition

Judging Rubric for Final Level of Competition

	Inadequate	Fair	Good	Exceeds Expectations
Category	0	1	2	3
Goals	Does not describe the need that the project addresses or the project's specific goals	Superficial explanation; key points are unclear	Provides explanation of goals but some details are unclear	Provides clear explanation of the problem being addressed and the goals of the project
Innovation	No time spent on explaining existing solutions, novel approaches	Vague discussion of existing solutions and new approach	Discussion of problem/current solutions from a limited perspective; suggests how this approach could be an improvement	Clearly addresses problem and existing solutions from multiple perspectives; makes a compelling case that this approach is a significant improvement
Impact	No discussion of stakeholders (e.g., potential users/ customers/ beneficiaries), no explanation of broader impact	Mentions potential stakeholders with no obvious connection to project outcomes	Some discussion of how stakeholders could potentially benefit from project outcomes	Motivational, value-added discussion of how multiple stakeholders would benefit from the project's success
Viability	Did not address risks, cost, timeframe, or measures of success	Superficial or limited consideration of risks, cost, timeframe, measures of success	Good understanding of risks, cost, timeframe; some attempt to incorporate measures of success	Outstanding understanding of risks, cost, timeframe; valid, well-structured measures of success
Presentation Effectiveness	Did not effectively use visuals; unenthusiastic and unclear presentation; lacked organization	Used some visuals, but lacked organization; some points unclear	Good use of visuals; clear presentation; fairly well organized	Excellent visuals; engaging and clear presentation; outstanding organization