

Normalized Scores 56.6

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	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Failed to recognize any unique conditions in the City; recommendations could have applied to anywhere...</i>	<i>Paid basic attention to general conditions but not based on any specific City need.</i>	<i>Recognized local conditions and demonstrated an understanding of the economic climate.</i>	<i>Paid attention to specific City needs and focused on targeted economic issues.</i>	<i>Grounded by a detailed understanding of the needs of the City and its people.</i>
				4.5 / 5
Score:	4.5			
Comment:	They present a thorough picture of the soft (attitudinal) strengths and weaknesses as well as the hard assets that the City can use to develop this exciting project. It provides an underpinning that can support all other economic development activity in all 6 pillars.			
				4.1 / 5
Score:	4.1			
Comment:	While it is implied that economic benefits would come from implementing this proposal it is hard to quantify them. Benefits, particularly in the education areas, would be longer term and not immediate.			
				3.6 / 5
Score:	3.6			
Comment:	The proposal took into account the need for internet connectivity in developing both business opportunities and a sense of place in downtown Greensboro. It used current assets well, but did not address the needs of the city throughout it's geography.			
				4 / 5
Score:	4.0			
Comment:	Takes into consideration a local need and national trend. Cities like Chattanooga, Kansas City have successful programs.			
				4.9 / 5
Score:	4.9			
Comment:	Need more focus on the direct benefits - understood that access to the internet will be a positive - what are the direct economic impacts? or indirect?			

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	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Misguided by an optimistic understanding of obstacles and underestimated the effort required to deliver results.</i>	<i>Addressed basic obstacles to general recommendations but not with specific or realistic tasks.</i>	<i>Demonstrated a realistic and efficient level of effort and attention to detail.</i>	<i>Addressed specific obstacles with recommendations tied to detailed, measurable and cost effective tasks.</i>	<i>Guided by practical and concrete recommendations; considered timing, funding, return on investment and measureable outcomes.</i>
				3.7 / 5
Score:	3.7			
Comment:	Their SWOT analysis provides a realistic description of the challenges the project will face. While their plan for gathering, using and communicating ongoing input from the community is excellent, it also makes a specific timeline difficult to determine. Also, the cool factor that would say to the world " we are/intend to be on the cutting edge" is an immeasurable positive outcome.			
				3.7 / 5
Score:	3.7			
Comment:	The proposal offers a variety of implementation alternatives that could be used based on the financial resources available			
				3.6 / 5
Score:	3.6			
Comment:	The proposal has addressed a specific objective of improving internet connectivity in the downtown area and has sufficiently detailed the costs and timeframe for implementation.			
				3.8 / 5
Score:	3.8			
Comment:	Good multi phase strategy. Pilot that is scalable.			
				3.4 / 5
Score:	3.4			
Comment:	What is the timeline for Pilot projects? for roll out? Seems it could take a very long time to distribute through the entire city, which might be difficult to 'sell' - what is the capacity to scale this? Again, there are few actionable tactics identified to create economic good - what will be done and by whom to improve the local economy? What will/could workforce development agencies do to leverage this? ARE they willing? more bases to touch -			

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	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Promoted style over substance or lacked new and original methods with not enough practical thinking.</i>	<i>Raised novel and interesting concepts but failed to tie approach to clear outcomes.</i>	<i>Delivered new and different methods with focus on concrete goals and improving outcomes.</i>	<i>Raised creative and new ideas that offer a clear roadmap to improved conditions.</i>	<i>Introduced ground breaking and advanced thinking that exceeds the promise of any previous approach.</i>
				4.2 / 5
Score:	4.2			
Comment:	By taking advantage of existing assets the city has, new technologies in the marketplace and information on trends and future needs, their idea is realistic and innovative at the same time.			
				3.7 / 5
Score:	3.7			
Comment:	The proposal sets out a clear strategy for testing alternatives and getting public involvement to determine the feasibility of providing Wi-Fi			
				3.4 / 5
Score:	3.4			
Comment:	Although the proposal posits the extensive outcomes that will result from increasing internet connectivity, it fails to recognize the lack of results in other portions of the city. The proposal is one-dimensional and assumes that benefits to the city will result as an outcome of the development of high-speed internet capability in a limited geographic area. Implementation of this system city-wide will likely be costly and lengthy.			
				3.1 / 5
Score:	3.1			
Comment:	Not terribly innovative but we are at a time that we could learn from other cities. Well thought out and plays on City of Greensboro strength.			
				2.9 / 5
Score:	2.9			
Comment:	The provision of free WiFi sounds like a great benefit. Need more detail on the specific outcomes.			