

Normalized Scores 59.7

JUDGING CRITERION # 1: LOCAL (0-5)

Does the Proposal/Plan take into account local economic conditions, focusing on existing and potential competitive advantages, in its recommended solutions? Is the Proposal/Plan expected to result in direct economic benefits to the city and its surrounding area? Does the Proposal/Plan identify local assets, economic strengths and weaknesses, and describe how the city can leverage assets and strengths to result in economic benefits?

0 - 1

*Failed to recognize any unique conditions in the City; recommendations could have applied to anywhere...*

1 - 2

*Paid basic attention to general conditions but not based on any specific City need.*

2 - 3

*Recognized local conditions and demonstrated an understanding of the economic climate.*

3 - 4

*Paid attention to specific City needs and focused on targeted economic issues.*

4 - 5

*Grounded by a detailed understanding of the needs of the City and its people.*

2.7 / 5

Score: 2.7

Comment: The proposal does address the City's desire for additional economic growth. The basic strategy is to capitalize on existing assets (JSNN and Gateway Research Park, 2 research universities) and build on the targeted growth industries for the region, specifically, advanced manufacturing, aerospace. Job creation will higher skilled workers should attract new companies to the area. More jobs leads to additions to the tax base.

4.3 / 5

Score: 4.3

Comment: The Gateway Research University Park has been a strong supporter of the local community. This proposal clearly outlines their continued efforts to be focused on the economic development of the community. They have also aligned their direction with those of the city in attracting businesses within certain verticals.

5 / 5

Score: 5.0

Comment: The proposal is an expansion of a current program based on a proven model that will bring economic benefits to the city and region.

4.6 / 5

Score: 4.6

Comment: Plays on strength of City. Focuses on a challenge with a solution. Directly impacts local economy with measurable results.

3.9 / 5

Score: 3.9

Comment: is the proposal for any sort of testing facility a city may support? or specifically for the GMTC?

JUDGING CRITERION # 2: FEASIBLE (0-5)

Can the Proposal/Plan yield practical and concrete results in a realistic timeframe that justify the level of required investment, addressing likely obstacles, such as resources available to the city? Does the Proposal/Plan identify economic development strategies that are achievable using existing city resources, or propose ways in which the city can utilize nonexisting/currently unidentified resources to implement these economic development strategies? Does the Proposal/Plan outline a timeline by which the city can develop actionable strategies to implement the ideal contained in the Proposal/Plan?

0 - 1

*Misguided by an optimistic understanding of obstacles and underestimated the effort required to deliver results.*

1 - 2

*Addressed basic obstacles to general recommendations but not with specific or realistic tasks.*

2 - 3

*Demonstrated a realistic and efficient level of effort and attention to detail.*

3 - 4

*Addressed specific obstacles with recommendations tied to detailed, measurable and cost effective tasks.*

4 - 5

*Guided by practical and concrete recommendations; considered timing, funding, return on investment and measureable outcomes.*

3.4 / 5

Score: 3.4

Comment: Feasibility is probably where this proposal is most significant. The facilities and infrastructure are already in place. This proposal is designed to expand an existing concept and enterprise, more so than to create something brand new. Essentially, this proposal is about developing more capacity which results in more commercial activity.

4 / 5

Score: 4.0

Comment: This proposal seems to be based on actual fact based on current experience in this proposed space as well as via comparison with another location that has implemented a similar solution. I was not 100% clear on the amount of investment required to make this happen, but I did see some implied concepts of how they would expand into this type of solution. Assuming the grant is enough to kick start this plan, then I feel it was well represented.

4.3 / 5

Score: 4.3

Comment: The proposal is very practical primarily using existing assets that are underutilized. This can be accomplished in a short time period and provide economic benefits immediately.

3.8 / 5

Score: 3.8

Comment: Understands challenges of local talent. But, could bring new skills and trades into Greensboro while leveraging JSNN and Gateway. Great plan and implementation.

3.4 / 5

Score: 3.4

Comment: it is unclear what will lead to the growth in employment and testing at the center? is it availability of labs and equipment? or connection to interested industries? There is significant R&D activity at many firms in Wichita - R&D may be more modest in the Greensboro area.

JUDGING CRITERION # 3: INNOVATIVE (0-5)

Is the Proposal/Plan offering a fresh and forward-looking approach that will lead to a clear set of strategically-aligned goals that other economic development initiatives have failed to deliver? Are the ideas and strategies submitted in the Proposal/Plan duplicative of existing plans or strategies being utilized by the city? Does the Proposal/Plan outlay strategies that propose to utilize city resources in more effective and efficient ways to realize the city's economic development goals?

0 - 1

*Promoted style over substance or lacked new and original methods with not enough practical thinking.*

1 - 2

*Raised novel and interesting concepts but failed to tie approach to clear outcomes.*

2 - 3

*Delivered new and different methods with focus on concrete goals and improving outcomes.*

3 - 4

*Raised creative and new ideas that offer a clear roadmap to improved conditions.*

4 - 5

*Introduced ground breaking and advanced thinking that exceeds the promise of any previous approach.*

2.4 / 5

Score: 2.4

Comment: This proposal was not particularly innovative or creative because it did not truly present something new. The objectives illustrated in the proposal are the same goals and objectives that were intended as a result of the creation of Gateway Research Park and JSNN. The proposal makes complete sense and warrants funding to execute the desired plan for expansion. However, it is not a separate, new idea.

4.1 / 5

Score: 4.1

Comment: I do feel that this proposal, although not a new concept, could represent a new offering for our local region. The solution proposed already fits into existing business needs of the various industries. Due to the nature of these needs, its not common for a region to have this type of solution in place. I view this as one more way to attract businesses to our region over other potential location. This solution is one that could be on the Regions Resume as a bullet item to help attract new potential business.

4.5 / 5

Score: 4.5

Comment: The proposal is copying a proven model that is being used elsewhere. While it's not a new idea it's new to this area and can easily provide quantifiable economic benefits

4.7 / 5

Score: 4.7

Comment: Very innovative. Plays off Greensboro's most innovative strengths. Outlines strategies and plays off our resources.

4.6 / 5

Score: 4.6

Comment: The plan points to success of the Testing Center. How will this impact the City of Greensboro? just in retail development in the physical area? what will be the partnerships, collaborations, 'spin off' of the center into the community?