Project Team Member Survey Results
Application Design Contest

Total Started Survey:	19
Total Completed Survey:	17 (89.5%)

Participation:

- 19 out of 21participants responded
- 17 out 19 completed all survey questions

Reasons for the survey:

- To isolate individual input / desires for the contest
- To refine and identify consensus on a small set of essential planning elements
- To resolve ambiguities and/or possible contradictions from our previous meeting

Collaboration – How to promote

1. How do we facilitate and promote collaboration among contest participants? Check all that apply <multiple answers>: Create Chart Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Support it in our messaging and capabilities of the website (wiki, etc)	**89.5%**	**17**
Sponsor all-day-long "hack days" with food/venue	52.6%	10
Award collaboration "bounties" (one-off awards) for effective collaborators	31.6%	6
Award "bonus points" in judging for collaborative submissions	36.8%	7
Show replies Other suggestions:	26.3%	5
	answered question	**19**
Respondent Comments:	***skipped question***	**0**

Conclusions:

- No incentives for collaboration
- Support via messaging and capabilities of website
- Sponsor “hack-day” coding events

1. Designer and coder types may not be particularly motivated by "in person" social events or thrilled by "required" collaboration They have no control over how interested others are in helping them out. What they do want is freedom to ask and give ideas through access to an open source community that will help them get done what they want to do. Think Sourceforge (central suite of development tools, revision control, project wikis, etc). Possibly install GNU Savana at Forge.appsfororegon.org and award bonus points for projects hosted there.
2. I question the importance/utility of promoting collaboration among contest participants. I think the biggest challenge is getting participants, period. I would focus energy and resources around promoting the contest and Portland, rather than facilitating interaction between/among contestants.
3. I don't think collaboration in and of itself should be rewarded; only the results should be judged.
4. Make sure that prizes awarded to multi-person teams can be split among the team members.

Judging Criteria – Rankings

1. Please rate the following criterion in terms of importance in judging: Create Chart Download

	Most Important	Important	Indifferent	Not Important	Rating Average	Response Count
Usefulness and utility to Citizens	**84.2% (16)**	15.8% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.84	19
Appeal of the application in terms of design and usability	31.6% (6)	**63.2% (12)**	5.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.26	19
Originality, uniqueness and inventive nature of application	26.3% (5)	**57.9% (11)**	10.5% (2)	5.3% (1)	2.05	19
Utilization of the various datasets	21.1% (4)	**42.1% (8)**	31.6% (6)	5.3% (1)	1.79	19
Visualization / user experience	5.3% (1)	**68.4% (13)**	26.3% (5)	0.0% (0)	1.79	19
Code quality of the application	5.3% (1)	**52.6% (10)**	36.8% (7)	5.3% (1)	1.58	19
Potential for future promise	10.5% (2)	26.3% (5)	**57.9% (11)**	5.3% (1)	1.42	19
					answered question	**19**
					skipped question	**0**

Too subjective

Conclusions:

- Set of 4 judging criteria total
- Equal weightings
- Need to ID subcomponent attributes to each criterion; what are these?

Questions:

- Too much overlap / need to be more orthogonal?
- Refine / Reword Criteria?
- Different / Better Criteria?
- Other considerations?

Judging Criteria – Comments

Respondent Comments:

1. These categories overlap a lot.

"Size / comprehensiveness of the application?" "Cross-platform application, where appropriate?“

2. Keep the criteria simple and as objective as possible. The last three criteria above seem somewhat more subjective than the first four. They could also be considered subsets of the first four, specifically of "Appeal" and "Innovation". Resolve this by clearly defining the first four criteria so that if there are, for example, a total of 100 points from a maximum of 25 points from each of the above four criteria, it is clear how to get 25 points for "Usefulness to Citizens". This means breaking down "Usefulness to Citizens" into maybe five components, with possible of 5 points each (5 - Excellent, 4 -Very Good, 3 -Good, 2 - Fair, 1 - Poor, 0 - Not at all)

3. 1. Leveraging public data sets with either a) user input and feedback to original data owners or b) other public, private, or proprietary datasets, e.g., U.S. census, real estate transactions, prices, weather or climate, etc. 2. Exploiting multiple services or platforms, especially in an integrated way, i.e., Twitter, Gmaps, Ning, Facebook, iPhone, Blackberry. 3. Potential to foster civic engagement or improve service performance.

4. Do you want to reward "strategic fit" with development priorities of the city/region?

5. To be honest, I see this app development contest as something by developers for developers. At this point, this is so bleeding edge, the use to citizens seem secondary. This is prototype and R&D work.

6. Not sure if this is covered in "usefulness", but making sure that the app performs as designed is important, too.

Prize Awards – Related to Judging Criteria

1. Shall we support different categories of awards that have either a one-to-one relationship or heavier weightings to specific judging criteria?

Create Chart | Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, categories serve as clear lines of demarcation between emphasis	35.3%	6
No, categories don't necessarily need to relate to the judging criteria	35.3%	6
No, we don't need categories at all	11.8%	2
Show replies Other (please specify)	17.6%	3
answered question		17
skipped question		2

Conclusions:

- Add a "Citizens Choice" category; voted only, not judged
- Separating meaningful categories from criteria is impractical if we're to keep it simple
- Categories become very subjective if not directly related to judging criterion; adds complexity
- Judging criteria should be equally weighted; only judging criteria should be published
- Need to abstract "categories" from judging criterion; used only for award recognitions and NOT publicized as a goal of the contest

Respondent Comments:

1. I think it makes sense to have some key criteria that should be weighted, but I am also supportive of having unweighted categories.
2. Yes, but have categories organized around common problems. The purpose of software is to solve a problem. Categories could be public policy issues, business problems, citizen needs, etc. For example, Economic Recovery could be a category that includes software that addresses specific problems related to information about jobs, opportunities, grants, welfare, food banks, church resources, job training, etc
3. Keep it simple. For example, big awards for top 3 apps and maybe 10 small ones for individual great ideas.

Prize Awards – Achieving More Awards Overall

2. How might we best achieve more awards overall? Create Chart Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Create more award categories (i.e., potentially more criterion)	**47.1%**	**8**
Issue more awards per category (i.e., potentially less criterion)	5.9%	1
Avoid categories altogether (judge across all criteria, and group best overall scores)	29.4%	5
Show replies Other (please specify)	17.6%	3
	answered question	17
	skipped question	2

Conclusions:

- Do both; relegate "categories" to serve only as named groupings or themes in contest awards
- Top scoring apps per judging criterion awarded "blue ribbon" prize (4 total); next 3 highest scoring per criterion awarded "red ribbon" prizes (12 total)
- Top scoring app per "Citizen's Choice" receives "blue ribbon"; next 3 highest scoring receive "red ribbon" awards
- Total of 20 awards (per round for apps)

Respondent Comments:

1.More categories and more awards per category. For example, 1 first place selected from 5 second place winners (runners up), who are selected from a pool of 10 third place. Somehow repeat this across each category. Maybe the top winner from the category is automatically a runner up in the first place prize.

2. I really like the Tour De France idea. Helps draw surprises and reward participation in a wide range of ways.

3. don't know that we need more awards.

Prize Awards – Support for Multiple Winners Overall

3. Should we support MULTIPLE "winning" (blue ribbon) submissions for a given category or round of judging?

Create Chart | Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, but only in cases of a justifiable "tie" or insignificant spread in scoring	35.3%	6
Yes, there should be multiple winners across all categories or rounds of judging	**47.1%**	**8**
No, there should be only one top winner per category or round of judging	11.8%	2
Show replies Other (please specify)	5.9%	1
	answered question	17
	skipped question	2

Conclusions:

- Virtual "ties" should both be awarded if incurred
- In general, top scoring apps per judging criterion awarded "blue ribbon" prize (4 total); next 3 highest scoring per criterion awarded "red ribbon" prizes (12 total)
- Top scoring app per "Citizen's Choice" receives "blue ribbon"; next 3 highest scoring receive "red ribbon" awards
- Total of 20 awards (per round for apps)
- Prize awards for multi-person teams should be split

Respondent Comments:

1. I think we're making this too complex. first time should be simple.

Prize Awards – Multiple Winners Across Categories

4. Should we support "winning" (blue ribbon) submissions for MORE than ONE category in a given round of judging?

Create Chart | Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, we should allow someone to potentially dominate the competition	25.0%	4
Yes, but limit multiple wins to ONLY one category AND the "Civic Choice" award (most votes, not panel judged)	**43.8%**	**7**
No, there should be only one winner per category	12.5%	2
None of the above - We shouldn't use categories	18.8%	3
	answered question	**16**
	skipped question	**3**

Conclusions:

- No support for prize awards across multiple / judged criterion
- Allow potential "doubling up" between prize awards for "Citizen Choice" and ONE set of judged criterion should app also win or place in judged event
- Top scoring app per "Citizen's Choice" receives "blue ribbon"; next 3 highest scoring receive "red ribbon" awards
- Total of 20 awards

Awards Categories – Abstractions for Idea Awards

1. Should we support more abstract categorizations of awards for IDEAS to recognize winning ideas?

Create Chart | Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, e.g., "best idea of the week", "most unusual", etc.	23.5%	4
Yes, but use them sparingly and combine them with broad-based awards for great and good ideas.	**35.3%**	**6**
No, award only broad-based groups; great and good ideas	**35.3%**	**6**
Show replies Other (please specify)	5.9%	1
	answered question	17
	skipped question	2

Conclusions:

- Support a few distinct catch phrase type descriptions for top ideas
- Need to ID what these are, but perhaps we wait for the apps prior to characterizing these…
- Otherwise, award “red ribbon” ideas throughout the contest

Respondent Comments:

1. Keep it simple. Criteria already cover these "ideas", particularly if clearly defined. But there could be a category for "People's Choice Award".

Awards Categories – Support for Themes

2. What should be some of the categories or themes we consider in awarding the application submissions? Check all that apply <multiple answers>: Create Chart Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
"Civic Choice" – Highest voted entry by "votes" only (not panel judged)	68.8%	11
"Most Useful" – Usefulness and utility to Citizens	**81.3%**	**13**
"Best Design" – Appeal of the application in terms of design and usability	62.5%	10
"Most Unique" – Originality, uniqueness and inventive nature of application	43.8%	7
"Best use of Data" – Utilization of the various datasets	68.8%	11
"Best Visualization" – Visualization / user experience	50.0%	8
"Best Code" – Code quality of the application	18.8%	3
"Most Promising" – Potential for future promise	31.3%	5
None of the above - We shouldn't use categories	12.5%	2
Show replies Other (please specify)	18.8%	3
	answered question	**16**

Conclusions:

- Support named groupings or themes for awards that directly relate to the set of judged criteria

- Named groupings or themes are used only for distinctions in prize awards and NOT publicized as an objective of the contest in any way

Respondent Comments:

1.These should not be the cate-gories but the CRITERIA that are used to evaluate all categories, except maybe "Civic Choice".

2.Categories around specific user areas, like best transport-ation app, best crime app, best housing app.

3. "Best Code" could be very time consuming to judge

Award Recognition – How to Achieve

1. How do we achieve sufficient recognition for the winning application submissions? Check all that apply <multiple answers>:

Create Chart | Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Highlight via contest website and general "buzz" only	70.6%	12
Awards dinner event with the Mayor, business leaders, et. al.	52.9%	9
Press releases, media coverage, etc	**82.4%**	**14**
Show replies Other (please specify)	47.1%	8
	answered question	17
	skipped question	2

Conclusions:

- Actively support contest information, developments and award announcements via the website and other electronic mediums; guerilla styled marketing tactics
- Support traditional press media needs to be strong and well coordinated
- Possibly support an concluding “hack day” or similar event to network / refer each other to opportunities
- Possibly support sponsored contracts / employment

Respondent Comments:

1. The problem with the awards dinner concept is that is very expensive to pull off
2. It would also be great to sponsor a coder event to recognize the team in front of their peers
3. All three, including other options. For example, in this economy people want money or a job. Consider including paid fellowships as designers or coders with regional partner organizations. Imagine winner gets a desk and pay for three months, without full network access of course, and is assigned web design tasks in Phillip's team. Other sponsors could offer similar win-win opportunities.
4. all of the above, elimiating the word "only" on first item
5. 1. Keep in mind that winners may not be from region. 2. Potential help winners with business assistance (if relevant), such as office space, introduction to business partners, etc.
6. One-day unconference/event that allows developers/would-be developers to meet and hack with one another
7. Monetary awards, potentially contracts or contacts for further work.
8. Some sort of closing party/reception for all app contest participants, to allow winners to be recognized by their peers.

Conclusions Summary

- Keep it simple / publish only what's necessary
- No incentives for collaboration
- Sponsor "hack days" coding events and relevant info via guerilla styled marketing tactics
- Set of 4 different Judging Criterion for apps:
  - Usefulness and utility to Citizens
  - Appeal of the app in terms of design and usability
  - Originality, uniqueness, inventive nature of the app
  - Utilization of the various datasets
- Weightings are equal (25% each)
- Need to determine subcomponent attributes to each of the judging criteria; proposal is for 5 component measures to each criterion, rated 0-5 points each
- Abstracting categories from criterion results in less subjective characterizations, to be used only for award recognition, not promotion or objectives to the contest

For example, some possible named themes include:

- "Most Useful"
- "Best Design"
- "Most Original"
- "Best Use of Data"

- Top ideas should support distinctive catch phrase characterizations in their announcements during the contest
- Good ideas, "red ribbon" will be awarded throughout the contest
- For apps, 20 prizes total per round; 5 "blue ribbon", 15 "red ribbon":
  - Top scoring app for each criterion wins "blue ribbon"; next 3 win "red ribbon"; 16 prizes total
  - Top scoring app for "Public Choice" wins "blue ribbon" award; next 3 win "red ribbon"; 4 prizes total (not panel judged)
  - Allow "doubling up" between "Public Choice" award and ONE judged criterion, but NOT across judged criterion
  - Allow for dual awards for cases of virtual ties in scoring

- Award recognition needs to be actively driven via the website and other mediums (twitter, etc)
- Support for traditional press media needs to be strong
- Possibly support a concluding "hack day" or similar event to network / refer each other to opportunities