

Business Canvas Project — Graded Sample Pack

© 2026 SYNAPSE ACADEMIC PRESS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

This is an original work of Synapse Academic Press. No content from any other publisher, textbook, or proprietary source has been reproduced. AP®, Advanced Placement®, and Course and Exam Description® are trademarks of the College Board, which has not authorized, sponsored, endorsed, or reviewed this companion. FBLA®, DECA®, and BPA® are trademarks of their respective organizations. The business described here is fictional; any resemblance to a real company is coincidental.

Use this pack **after** you have read Appendix F (the Business Canvas Project Guide) and the Business Canvas Templates file. It shows the same business modeled at three quality levels so you can see — block by block — what separates a canvas that scores 2/5 from one that scores 5/5.

Everything here maps to the **12-criterion, 50-point Self-Evaluation Rubric** in Appendix F, the **Desirability / Feasibility / Viability (DFV)** lenses, and the **six-part Exam-Day Validation** (Pitch, Customer + problem, Hypothesis test, Decision outcome, Viability challenge, DFV connection). The overall 5-point band under each sample is a quick reading of that same 50-point rubric.

How to use it:

1. Read the **Weak** canvas first and try to spot the gaps yourself before reading the teacher comments.
2. Read the **Excellent** canvas and notice how every claim is followed by a number or a test.
3. Work through the **3/5 → 5/5 revision table** — this is the actual move you make on your own canvas.
4. Copy the **Evidence Log** and the **Pitch Checklist** into your own project folder.

The Business Used in All Three Samples

CleatCycle — a resale service for outgrown youth soccer cleats, founded by Maya Okafor, age 16, out of her family's garage. Kids' feet grow one to two sizes a season, so parents keep buying \$45–\$70 cleats their child wears for four months. Maya buys back gently-used cleats from families at the end of a season, cleans and replaces them, and resells them at a fraction of retail through local club sign-up nights.

The **same business idea** is written up below three times. Only the *rigor* changes.

SAMPLE 1 — WEAK CANVAS ($\approx 2/5$)

Overall band on the Appendix F rubric: $\approx 23/50$ — “**NEEDS SIGNIFICANT REVISION / LOW DEVELOPING.**” The framework is present, but almost every block is an untested assumption stated as a fact. There is no evidence, no pricing number, no fixed/variable split, and no viability challenge.

CLEATCYCLE — Business Model Canvas (Weak Draft)

Customer Segments

- Parents
- Kids who play sports
- Anyone who wants to save money on cleats

Value Propositions

- Cheap cleats
- We help the environment by reusing shoes
- Good deals for families

Channels

- Social media
- Word of mouth
- Maybe a website later

Customer Relationships

- We will have great customer service
- People will keep coming back because they like us

Revenue Streams

- We sell cleats and make a profit
- Customers pay when they buy

Key Resources

- Used cleats
- The garage
- Me

Key Activities

- Cleaning the cleats
- Selling them

Key Partners

- Soccer teams
- Suppliers

Cost Structure

- Cleaning supplies
- It won't cost much because I already have the garage
- We will make more than we spend

Exam-Day Validation (attempted)

- **Pitch:** I sell used soccer cleats for cheap.
- **Customer + problem:** Parents don't want to spend a lot on cleats.
- **Hypothesis test:** I think a lot of people will want this.
- **Decision outcome:** I decided to go for it.
- **Viability challenge:** Competition from stores.
- **DFV connection:** I think it's a good idea.

What a teacher would write on this canvas

1. **[Criterion 1 — Customer Segments, 0/5]** “Parents” and “anyone who wants to save money” is the **“everyone” mistake** flagged in Appendix F. No demographic, no ZIP code, no behavior. *Who* buys, and how often? Name a segment you could actually reach on a Tuesday.
 2. **[Criterion 5 — Revenue Streams, 1/5]** “Make a profit” is not a revenue stream. There is **no price**. What does one pair sell for? What did you pay for it? A grader cannot verify a model with no numbers.
 3. **[Criterion 9 — Cost Structure, 1/5]** No fixed-vs-variable split, and “it won't cost much” is a hope, not a cost. Even a garage business has variable cost per pair (buy-back price + laces + cleaning) and some fixed cost. Show both.
 4. **[Criteria across the board — no evidence]** Every block reads as a confident assertion. Appendix F is explicit: run **at least 3 hypothesis tests** and cite them. Right now nothing here has been checked against a real parent.
 5. **[Exam-Day Validation — ~2/15]** The viability answer (“competition from stores”) is the vague answer Appendix F says earns **zero points**. It is also a *desirability/feasibility* worry, not a viability one. No numbers, no test, no DFV lens named.
-

SAMPLE 2 — GOOD CANVAS ($\approx 3\text{--}4/5$)

Overall band on the Appendix F rubric: $\approx 40/50$ — “**STRONG.**” Most blocks are specific and some carry real evidence. But several claims are still hand-waved: the cost structure is thin, one channel cost is a guess, and the viability challenge is named but not quantified. This is a solid draft with clear places to push to a 5.

CLEATCYCLE — Business Model Canvas (Good Draft)

Customer Segments

- Parents of recreational soccer players ages 6–12 in the Northgate and Westfield club areas, whose kids outgrow cleats every season.
- Budget-conscious families who currently buy new cleats at big-box sporting-goods stores.

Value Propositions

- Gently-used, cleaned, and re-laced cleats at roughly half the price of new.
- Convenience: buy at your own club’s sign-up night, so no extra trip.
- A greener option — reusing cleats instead of throwing them out.

Channels

- A table at two clubs’ season sign-up nights (where parents already gather).
- An Instagram account for photos of current inventory and sizes in stock.
- Word of mouth from coaches.

Customer Relationships

- Friendly in-person service at the table; parents can try sizes on their kid.
- A text list so past buyers hear when their child’s next size comes in.

Revenue Streams

- Primary: cleat sales at about \$25–\$30 per pair.
- Possible secondary: a small buy-back credit that brings families back.

Key Resources

- Inventory of used cleats sourced from families.
- Cleaning and re-lacing supplies; the family garage as a workspace.
- Maya’s time and her contact with two club coordinators.

Key Activities

- Sourcing and buying back used cleats at end of season.
- Cleaning, sanitizing, re-lacing, and sorting by size.
- Selling at sign-up nights and posting inventory online.

Key Partners

- Northgate Youth Soccer and Westfield FC (access to sign-up nights).
- Coaches who refer families.

Cost Structure

- Variable: buy-back price paid to families (~\$8/pair) plus cleaning supplies.
- Fixed: Instagram is free; table space is free at the clubs.
- Model is cost-driven — keep expenses low so prices stay low.

Exam-Day Validation (attempted)

- **Pitch:** CleatCycle resells cleaned, gently-used youth soccer cleats at about half retail.
- **Customer + problem:** Parents of 6–12-year-old players who hate paying \$60 for cleats their kid outgrows in a season.
- **Hypothesis test:** I asked parents at one sign-up night whether they'd buy used cleats at half price. Most said yes.
- **Decision outcome:** That convinced me to set the price around \$25–\$30.
- **Viability challenge:** My supply is seasonal — I can only buy back cleats at the end of a season, so I might run out of sizes mid-year.
- **DFV connection:** Desirability looks strong because parents said yes. Viability is my weaker area because of the seasonal supply.

What a teacher would write on this canvas

1. **[Criterion 1 — Customer Segments, 4/5]** Big improvement — real segment, real areas, a behavior (“outgrow every season”). To reach 5, add the *evidence*: how many families did you talk to, and how many said they currently overspend?
2. **[Criterion 5 — Revenue Streams, 3/5]** You have a price range (\$25–\$30), which beats the weak draft. But it's a **goal price, not a tested price**. Appendix F wants “accepted by X of Y prospects.” Which is it — \$25 or \$30 — and how do you know?
3. **[Criterion 9 — Cost Structure, 2/5]** You split fixed from variable, good. But “Instagram is free / table is free” understates it — what about the buy-back cost at scale, packaging, and your own hours? And there's **no contribution-margin math**, so a grader can't see whether this breaks even.
4. **[Criterion 3 — Channels, 3/5]** Channels are realistic, but none has a **cost-per-customer**. Which channel actually brings buyers — the sign-up table, Instagram, or coach referrals? Test one and report the number.
5. **[Exam-Day Validation — ~10/15]** The viability challenge (seasonal supply) is genuinely a viability issue and correctly labeled — nice. But the hypothesis test is vague (“most said yes”). Give the count. And name which lens has the **strongest** evidence *and* the weakest, with a next test.

SAMPLE 3 — EXCELLENT CANVAS (≈ 5/5)

Overall band on the Appendix F rubric: ≈ 48/50 — “OUTSTANDING.” Every block is specific, most carry a number or a test result, three hypotheses were tested and logged, the cost structure includes contribution-margin math, and the viability challenge is named, quantified, and given a 90-day response. This canvas is exam-ready.

CLEATCYCLE — Business Model Canvas (Excellent Draft)

Customer Segments

- Parents of recreational players ages 6–12 in the Northgate (ZIP 74132) and Westfield (74133) club areas, whose child changes cleat size at least once per 12-month season. *Evidence: 18 parent interviews at two sign-up nights; 15 of 18 said their child outgrew cleats within one season and 12 of 18 called the cost “annoying.”*
- Secondary: coaches buying 2–3 spare pairs for the “forgot my cleats” kid on game day. *Evidence: 3 of 4 coaches interviewed said they’d pay \$15 for a spare pair.*

Value Propositions

- “We help parents of growing players get quality cleats for about half of retail, cleaned and game-ready, at the club night you already attend.” *Tested: in interviews, 14 of 18 parents preferred a \$28 cleaned used pair over a \$60 new pair for a fast-growing child.*
- Convenience beats online resale: no shipping, try-on at the table, right size guaranteed. *This is the entry parents named unprompted 9 times.*

Channels

- Primary: a table at Northgate and Westfield season sign-up nights. *Channel cost-test: 11 sales from 1 night, table cost \$0, so customer-acquisition cost ≈ \$0 — my best channel.*
- Instagram size-inventory posts (@cleatcycle). *CAC-test: a boosted post cost \$12 and produced 2 sales = ~\$6 CAC.*
- Coach referral (a \$5 buy-back credit per referred family). *Kept small on purpose; 4 referrals so far.*

Customer Relationships

- In-person try-on and fitting at the table (acquisition).
- A “next size” text list: when a child’s next size arrives, the parent gets a text. *Retention test: 6 of the first 20 buyers (30%) returned for a second pair within one season after the text list started.*

Revenue Streams

- Primary: cleat sales at **\$28/pair**. *Price test: 13 of 18 parents accepted \$28; only 8 of 18 accepted \$34; chose \$28.*
- Secondary: coach “spare pair” sales at \$15. *3 of 4 coaches accepted.*
- Buy-back credit is a cost lever, not revenue (see Cost Structure).

Key Resources

- *Physical*: inventory of ~40 cleaned pairs; cleaning/sanitizing station and re-lacing supplies in the garage.
- *Human*: Maya (founder) plus one part-time helper for peak sign-up weeks.
- *Intellectual*: the size-sorted inventory spreadsheet and the club-night access relationship.
- *Financial*: \$300 startup float from summer earnings.

Key Activities

- Season-end buy-back drives at both clubs.
- Cleaning, sanitizing, re-lacing, sizing, and photographing inventory.
- Running the sign-up-night table and the “next size” text list.

Key Partners

- Northgate Youth Soccer and Westfield FC — access to sign-up nights. *Written OK from both coordinators for the fall season.*
- Two families who reliably donate/sell end-of-season cleats in bulk. *Concentration risk noted below.*

Cost Structure

- **Fixed**: garage workspace \$0, Instagram \$0, cleaning-station setup \$40 one-time. Effectively ~\$0/month fixed.
- **Variable per pair**: buy-back \$8 + laces \$2 + cleaning supplies \$1.50 = **\$11.50/pair**.
- **Contribution margin**: \$28 – \$11.50 = **\$16.50/pair**. At the \$12 Instagram CAC on that channel, margin still clears. Model is **cost-driven**.
- *Break-even on the one-time \$40 setup = 3 pairs. Already sold 11 at the first night.*

Exam-Day Validation

- **Pitch**: CleatCycle buys back, cleans, and resells outgrown youth soccer cleats at about half retail, at the club sign-up nights parents already attend.
- **Customer + problem**: Parents of 6–12-year-old recreational players (ZIPs 74132/74133) who re-buy \$60 cleats every season for a fast-growing child. 15 of 18 confirmed the outgrow-every-season pattern.
- **Hypothesis test**: “13 of 18 parents will accept \$28 for a cleaned used pair; fewer will accept \$34.” Actual: 13 accepted \$28, only 8 accepted \$34.
- **Decision outcome**: I set the price at \$28 (not \$34) and moved the Revenue block from a guessed range to a tested number.
- **Viability challenge: Single-supplier / supply concentration**. Two families currently provide ~60% of my buy-back inventory; if either stops, I run out of mid-range sizes. This is a *viability* problem (the unit is profitable, but the model can’t scale or survive the loss), not desirability (parents clearly want it) or feasibility (I can clearly clean and sell them). **Next 90 days**: run buy-back tables at both clubs’ end-of-season nights to get inventory from 15+ families and drop any single source below 25%.
- **DFV connection: Desirability** has the strongest evidence (18 interviews, tested price, 30% repeat rate). **Viability** is weakest — profitable per pair, but supply concentration and seasonality are unproven

at scale. Next test targets viability: measure whether one buy-back drive can supply a full off-season of sizes.

What a teacher would write on this canvas

1. **[Criterion 1 — Customer Segments, 5/5]** Specific segment + ZIP + behavior + interview counts. This is exactly the standard in Appendix F. Nothing to fix.
2. **[Criterion 5 — Revenue Streams, 5/5]** Tested price with the acceptance split (“13 of 18 at \$28, 8 of 18 at \$34”) and a stated pricing decision. Textbook.
3. **[Criterion 9 — Cost Structure, 5/5]** Fixed vs. variable split, per-pair variable cost, **contribution margin (\$16.50)**, and a break-even count. A grader can verify the model survives. Excellent.
4. **[Criterion — viability, full credit]** Names a *quantified* challenge (60% supply concentration), correctly rules out desirability/feasibility, and gives a concrete 90-day step. This is the answer Appendix F says earns full marks.
5. **[Exam-Day Validation — ~14–15/15]** All six sub-parts present, each with a number. Strongest and weakest lenses are named with the evidence behind each, and the next test targets the weak lens. Ready to pitch.

How to Revise from 3/5 to 5/5

This is the single most useful move in the project: take the **Good** draft’s block, find the vague line, and rewrite it as an **evidence-backed** line. Notice the pattern — *every* upgrade adds a number, a count, or a test result.

Block	3/5 line (vague)	5/5 rewrite (evidence-backed)	What changed
Customer Segments	“Parents of recreational players 6–12 who outgrow cleats every season.”	“Parents of 6–12-year-old players in ZIPs 74132/74133; 15 of 18 interviewed confirmed their child outgrew cleats within one season and 12 of 18 called the cost annoying.”	Added the interview count and the ZIP — turns a claim into evidence (Criterion 1).
Revenue Streams	“Cleat sales at about \$25–\$30 per pair.”	“ \$28/pair — price test: 13 of 18 parents accepted \$28, only 8 of 18 accepted \$34 , so I chose \$28.”	Replaced a goal <i>range</i> with a single tested price and the acceptance split (Criterion 5).
Cost Structure	“Variable: buy-back (~\$8/pair) plus supplies. Fixed: mostly free. Cost-driven.”	“Variable \$11.50/pair (\$8 buy-back + \$2 laces + \$1.50 cleaning); fixed ~\$0/month + \$40 one-time; contribution margin \$28 – \$11.50 = \$16.50/pair; break-even = 3 pairs. ”	Added per-pair variable total, contribution margin, and break-even (Criterion 9).

Block	3/5 line (vague)	5/5 rewrite (evidence-backed)	What changed
Channels	"Sign-up-night table, Instagram, word of mouth."	"Sign-up table = ~\$0 CAC (11 sales, 1 night); boosted Instagram post = ~\$6 CAC (\$12 → 2 sales). Table is the best channel."	Added a tested cost-per-customer for each channel (Criterion 3).

The rule behind all four rewrites: if a line could be said by someone who had never spoken to a customer, it is a 3/5 line. Add the test that only *you* could have run, and it becomes a 5/5 line.

Evidence Log Template

Keep this running the whole project. It is a lighter companion to the full **Hypothesis Test Log** in the Templates file — use it for quick daily entries, then promote your three strongest rows into the formal log you cite during FRQ 1. One row per thing you assumed and then checked.

Assumption (what I believed)	How I tested it (interview / survey / experiment)	Result (what actually happened)	Decision (kept / changed / killed)
Parents will pay \$28 for a cleaned used pair.	Price question with 18 parents at two sign-up nights.	13 of 18 accepted \$28; only 8 of 18 accepted \$34.	Changed — set price at \$28, dropped the \$34 idea.
Instagram will be my main sales channel.	Boosted one \$12 post; tracked resulting sales.	2 sales (~\$6 CAC) vs. 11 from one free sign-up table.	Changed — table is primary; Instagram is inventory display only.
Two families can supply all my inventory.	Tracked where the first 40 pairs came from.	Those two families = ~60% of supply.	Kept for now, flagged — viability risk; run wider buy-back drive.

TIP: the number in the "Result" column is what earns points on exam day. "Most parents liked it" is worth almost nothing; "13 of 18 accepted \$28" is worth full credit.

One-Page Pitch Checklist — Exam-Day Validation

Print this and rehearse it against a 25-minute timer, exactly as Appendix F describes. FRQ 1 is worth **15 points** and has **six required sub-parts**. If you can tick all six with a number attached, you are ready.

Before you speak — have these in front of you:

☐

Your completed one-page canvas.

☐

Your Hypothesis Test Log with **at least 3** tested rows (kept / changed / killed).

☐

Your contribution-margin and break-even numbers.

The six must-hit points (in order):

☐

1. Pitch — the product/service in **1–2 sentences**. (“CleatCycle resells cleaned, outgrown youth cleats at ~half retail, at club sign-up nights.”)

☐

2. Customer + problem — name a **specific** customer (demographic + behavior) and the exact problem you solve. No “everyone.”

☐

3. Hypothesis test — state one **falsifiable** hypothesis and the **evidence** (“13 of 18 accepted \$28”). A count, not “most people.”

☐

4. Decision outcome — say how that evidence **confirmed or changed** a specific block on your canvas.

☐

5. Viability challenge — name **one** real viability concern **with a number** (CAC, margin, concentration %), explain **why it’s viability** and not desirability or feasibility, and give **one 90-day next step**.

☐

6. DFV connection — name which lens has the **strongest** evidence and which is **weakest**, and what your **next test** targets.

Self-scoring reminders (from the Appendix F rubric):

☐

Every claim I made is backed by a number or a test — not a hope.

☐

My viability answer is quantified (a vague “competition” answer scores **zero**).

☐

I referenced concepts from **at least four chapters** somewhere in the project (Criterion 12).

☐

I named a viability challenge with **humility plus a plan** — graders prefer that over false confidence.

EXAM TIP: you cannot reconstruct your evidence under time pressure in 25 minutes. The Evidence Log and Hypothesis Test Log *are* your pitch — bring the numbers, and the six sub-parts write themselves.