

Meeting Minutes from Apps Contest Planning, Thursday, October 29th

Team –

Thanks to those who attended the meeting this past Thursday. Future meetings will be scheduled during the noon hour to better accommodate everyone's schedule. Following are the decisions made and key discussion points from our meeting.

Attendees: Eva Schweber, Cort Buchholz, Arlo Belshee, Mark Chubb, Bart Massey, Joel Donaldson, Rick Nixon

Meeting Objective: Meeting to review team survey results and issues surrounding judging criteria.

In summary, the top four judging criterion proposed in the survey were ratified by the team, albeit they need to be reworded for clarity. All judging criteria will be equally weighted. Scoring will be performed across all criteria then added up for an overall score. Each judging criterion will be broken down into 4 or 5 constituent "attributes" or subcomponents for the purpose of prescribing the judging methods and considerations to each criterion.

The judging criteria is as follows:

1. Usefulness and utility to Citizens
2. Appeal of the application in terms of design and usability
3. Originality, uniqueness and inventive nature of the application
4. Utilization of the various datasets

Key Discussion Points:

- Positioning of the contest will be away from a "contest" and more towards an opportunity for a "collaboration event".
- Planning details need to get finalized within the next couple of weeks so downstream processes can take place, such as legal review, securing of sponsors, etc.
- Role and function of the project advisory group (us) will soon transition from the current planning aspects, to:
 - Contributing and reviewing of content to the data portal and contest websites, to:
 - Reviewing and testing of the website implementations, to:
 - Executing the contest itself, i.e., running the hackfest, guerilla marketing the buzz, etc.
- Prize award "categories" will support the judging criteria itself in addition to "Citizen Choice" (public voting) and "Participant Choice" (contestant peer voting), and possible sponsored awards and discretionary "special awards" as deemed by the judges to recognize exceptional work outside that of our planned award categories.
- Prize awards will be awarded per round and will support the "county fair" model, including "blue ribbon", "red ribbon" and "best of show" awards.

- A “best of show” ceremony at the end of each round was suggested, having each “blue ribbon” participants demo their apps prior to the announcement of the “best of show” award winner. This would be a good opportunity to invite sponsors and biz people for a meet/greet and peer recognition.
- Limit public voting to ideas and the Citizens Choice award only was suggested.
- Limit participant voting to only the Participant Choice award (peer review).
- We discussed the need to serve as many motivations as possible with participants for “being there”; need to reach out to the Microsoft/.Net Code Camp attendee type of developers as well.
- “CivicApps Portland” is the contest naming proposed, whereas the word “Portland” suggests the region and is NOT contained in the domain URL; this needs to be sent out to data owners / regional partners for buy-in.
- Next steps include determining cash award levels, defining subcomponent breakdowns to judging criteria, and any remaining considerations to forward a proposal to the City Attorney’s office and City Hall for review and input.
- The point was made that low cash value awards are worth less than no cash value awards. If there’s no cash value involved, it’s purely recognition and prestige. Once cash is involved, the recognition and prestige value drops “precipitously”, so the cash award levels need to be high enough to overcome the loss of prestige value. No one in attendance really knows what this threshold is.
- Adequate sponsorships will play a very important role in support of the various awards and award levels.

--Rick

Rick Nixon
Program Manager
BTS Technology Initiatives

Rick.Nixon@ci.portland.or.us

503.865.8447 | cell: 503-550-2037