

JUDGING SCORECARD

This scorecard is a tool for Challenge participants and judges. Challenge participants should review this scorecard to understand the evaluation criteria. Judges will use this tool to evaluate submissions in Phase 1 and Phase 2. All submissions will be evaluated through an equity and inclusion lens. Submissions that address the safety of vulnerable populations such as seniors, newcomers and school children, as well as those those living with disabilities will receive higher scores.

Phase One: Determine Top 5 Teams			
	Scoring (0-10)		
Criteria	0-3	4-7	8-10
<p>User Research (20%) The solution identifies a user need, want, or motivation and includes a sound rationale for this choice.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission includes no or limited evidence that the team conducted user research and developed user insights. + The submission fails to include a synthesis of user research and insights. + The submission fails to identify who the target user group is and fails to or provides limited evidence that it responds to a user need, want or motivation. + The submission provides no or limited evidence that it will be used by target user groups. + The submission does not incorporate user research and testing to guide design, development and refinement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission includes moderate evidence that the team conducted user research and developed user insights. + The submission includes some synthesis of user research and insights. + The submission communicates who the target user group is and is able to moderately demonstrate that it addresses a user need, want or motivation. + The submission provides moderate evidence that it will be used by target user groups. + The submission demonstrates some use of user research and testing to guide design, development and refinement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission includes robust evidence that the team conducted user research and developed user insights. + The submission includes a clear synthesis of user research and insights. + The submission clearly communicates who the target user group is, and addresses the user need, want or motivation. + The submission provides robust evidence that it will be used by target user groups. + The submission demonstrates clear use of user research and testing to guide design, development and refinement.
<p>User Experience and Interface Design (20%) The solution provides a good overall experience for the user. This includes being intuitive, visually appealing and easy to use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is difficult to navigate and requires explanation to use. Components of the submission do not reflect insights from user research. + If the submission is not a working prototype, none or limited functionality and user flow is outlined. + The submission lacks visual appeal and design features. + The submission fails to provide evidence that it is highly appealing, practical and desirable to intended users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is relatively easy to navigate and flows intuitively with some additional guidance. Components of the submission reflect some insights from user research. + If the submission is not a working prototype, some key functionality and user flow is outlined. + The submission has some basic design features and visual elements. + The submission includes some evidence that it is appealing, practical and desirable to intended users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is easy to navigate and flows intuitively without additional guidance. Components of the submission are carefully considered and reflect insights from user research. + If the submission is not a working prototype, all key functionality and user flow is provided. + The submission has excellent design features and visual elements. + The submission demonstrates that it is highly appealing, practical and desirable to intended users.

Phase One: Determine Top 5 Teams (cont.)

	Scoring (0-10)		
Criteria	0-3	4-7	8-10
<p>Impact (30%) The solution has the potential to make it safer immediately for all road users, and enable predictive and high priority interventions in the future.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission includes no or limited evidence about how it would address or improve an issue identified by seniors, newcomers, school children and people with disabilities. + The submission includes no or an unclear rationale for the target user group to use the solution. + The submission identifies none or limited high priority intervention areas for improving road safety in the immediate future. + The submission identifies none or limited high-priority intervention areas for improving road safety in the medium and long term. + The submission does not provide a phased approach to implementing high-priority interventions in the short, medium and long-term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is moderately able to demonstrate how it would address or improve a real issue identified by a seniors, newcomers, school children. and people with disabilities. + The submission provides some rationale for the target user group to use the solution. + The submission identifies high-priority intervention areas for improving road safety in the immediate future. + The submission identifies high-priority intervention areas for improving road safety in the medium and long term. + The submission provides a phased approach to implementing high-priority interventions in the short, medium and long term with some linkages to addressing user needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is able to robustly demonstrate how it would address or improve a real issue identified by seniors, newcomers, school children and people living with disabilities. + The submission provides a clear rationale for the target user group to use the solution. + The submission identifies high priority intervention areas and the impact they would have on improving road safety in the immediate future. + The submission identifies high-priority intervention areas and the impact they would have on improving road safety in the medium and long term. + The submission provides a clear and rationale phased approach to implementing high-priority interventions in the short, medium and long term to meet user needs.
<p>Methodology (20%) The solution uses a novel methodology to arrive at new insights.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission lacks a clear research method. + The submission demonstrates no or little use of user research. + The solution does not consider road safety and Vision Zero research. + The submission demonstrates no or little use of datasets, no new or novel insights produced. + The submission does not include predictive or machine learning models. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission demonstrates some interesting research methods to arrive at insights. + The submission demonstrates some use of user research in developing the methodology + The solution takes some consideration of road safety and Vision Zero research + The submission uses and analyzes some datasets but produces limited new or novel insights. + The submission includes limited predictive or machine learning models. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission uses novel research methods to arrive at new insights. + The submission clearly integrates user research in developing the methodology. + The solution reflects best practices in road safety and Vision Zero research + The submission effectively uses and analyzes multiple data sets to arrive at new insights. + The submission includes predictive and/or machine learning models.

Phase One: Determine Top 5 Teams (cont.)

	Scoring (0-10)		
Criteria	0-3	4-7	8-10
Functionality (10%) The solution represents all or nearly all of the functionality of the final product.	+ The submission is not a working prototype.	+ The submission has some functionality, but may be limited.	+ The submission has nearly all or robust functionality.

Phase Two: Determine the Winners

	Scoring (0-10)		
Criteria	0-3	4-7	8-10
<p>Phase 1 Judging (25%) The final scores from Phase 1 judging</p>	<p>+ Teams will have final Phase 1 scores converted to a percentage of 25</p>		
<p>Innovation (25%) The solution is unique, creative and novel.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is not a new idea or does not adapt existing tools, services, programs, technology in a new way. + The submission does not demonstrate any new methodologies, concepts, processes, services, technologies or business models. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission presents an incremental to modest improvement on an existing tool, service, program, technology. + The submission demonstrates the use of some interesting research methods to arrive at practical and actionable insights. + The submission demonstrates modest improvements to existing services or technologies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is a completely new idea that has the potential to transform road safety in Toronto. + The submission is a novel interpretation of an existing solution that has the potential to improve road safety in Toronto. + The submission demonstrates novel methodologies to arrive at practical and actionable insights. + The submission demonstrates significant improvements to existing services or technologies.

Phase Two: Determine the Winners (cont.)

	Scoring (0-10)		
Criteria	0-3	4-7	8-10
<p>Sustainability (25%) The solution demonstrates that it has the potential to live past the Vision Zero Challenge by meeting user needs in the future, ensuring ongoing data maintenance and functionality and the ability to operationalize the idea.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is minimally able to demonstrate how it has the potential to meet the needs of users in the future. + The submission is minimally able to demonstrate a data strategy for ongoing maintenance and supporting user needs. + The submission does not include an operational plan, or evidence of a core team with relevant experience and skills to build out the idea. + The submission does not include consideration of a revenue model and financial sustainability plan. + The submission is not built as open source software. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission modestly demonstrates how it has the potential to meet the needs of users in the future. + The submission includes some thought to how data will be maintained to provide ongoing supports to users. + The submission includes elements of an operational plan, but may lack evidence of a core team with relevant skills and experience to build out the idea. + The submission includes consideration of a revenue model, but does not have a financial sustainability plan. + The submission is a mix of open source and proprietary software. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The submission is able to robustly demonstrate how it has the potential to meet the needs of users in the future. + The submission includes a robust data strategy for ongoing maintenance and supporting user needs. + The submission includes an operational plan, including evidence of a core team with relevant experience and skills to build out the idea. + The submission includes consideration of a revenue model and robust financial sustainability plan. + The submission is built as free and open source software.
<p>Solution Pitch (25%) The team articulates and demonstrates how the solution will help users stay safe on the road immediately, as well as in the future. The team demonstrates how they addressed concerns and feedback from Phase 1 judges.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The team does not articulate how their solution will improve road safety for intended users in the short, medium and long term. + The team does not address how it incorporated feedback from Phase 1 judges to improve their idea. + The team does not answer judges questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The team articulates how their solution will improve road safety for intended users in the short, medium and long term. + The team articulates how they incorporated some feedback from Phase 1 judges to improve their idea. + The team answers judges questions but leaves some room for ambiguity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The team clearly articulates how their solution will improve road safety for intended users in the short, medium and long term. + The team clearly articulates how they incorporated all feedback from Phase 1 judges to improve their idea. + The team answers judges questions clearly and concisely.