The Opportunity Project Prize Challenge 2019
Rubric for Judging Submissions

Full Competition Details available at: https://www.challenge.gov/challenge/opportunity-project-prize/
More on The Opportunity Project at: https://opportunity.census.gov

This rubric will be used by judges in evaluating submissions, but they will also be encouraged to apply their own technical and domain expertise and considerations in the scoring process.

Criterion	Scores (1 - 5)		
	Sample Score of 5	**Sample Score of 3**	**Sample Score of 1**
Quality & Technical Evaluation (20%)	Product has effective functioning features and is very user friendly. Product creates a positive user experience and follows UX/UI design best practices. Product description clearly states the problem it intends to solve and an overview of the user journey.	Product has some moderately functioning features, but has a complicated or cumbersome user experience. Product is possible to use, but would benefit from technical and design improvements. Product description lacks clarity on the user journey, intended functionality or problem it aims to solve.	Product has minimal functionality and it not at all user friendly. Product is difficult to use and is in obvious need of technical and design improvements. Product does not have a clear user journey, purpose or end user.
Cross-sector collaboration & Diversity (15%)	Product team conducted thorough user research and the product clearly addresses user defined needs The product has been tested with	Product team conducted some user research but it is limited or not well documented. Team may not meaningfully have incorporated user defined needs in	Product team conducted little or no user research. The product has not been tested with community users.

	community users and improvements have been made. Diverse representatives from the end user community were engaged throughout the build process.	their design. The product has been tested with community users but user feedback was not fully incorporated. Product team somewhat communicated the role of end user engagement in their process, but may have diversity or inclusion concerns.	Product team did not communicate how user engagement informed their build process. The product has obvious diversity or inclusion issues or may not accommodate a major segment of its target end users.
Use of federal open data (25%)	Product clearly uses Federal Open Data and explicitly states what data sets are used and how. Federal open data has a critical use in the product and provides value for the end user and overall functionality. Product highlights additional data sets used in their product to complement federal data. Data is utilized in a novel or creative way.	Product uses Federal Open Data but does not clearly explain how the data sets are used. Data sets are used but not incorporated in a novel or creative way. Federal open data used in the product has an ancillary function with limited return for the end users. Limited or no other data sets are utilized to complement federal open data.	Product does not use any Federal Open Data, or does not address which data sets are used and how. Product may use some federal open data but it does not provide any obvious value to the end user or contribute to the functionality of the product.
Implementation + Sustainability (20%)	Implementation plan is thorough and realistic, with well documented growth plans to scale and grow with increasing users. The product is either currently live	Implementation plan is included but has gaps or seems infeasible. Product maintenance and growth plans are are not thoroughly described, or are included, with some concerns about feasibility.	Product team has not yet identified where or how the tool can be deployed, or does not understand how to reach end users. Product team has not developed

	or has a rapid time to market Product team has deployed the tool to users, or has specific and feasible plans to do so. Product team thoroughly described how they maintain the product moving forward.	Product is not live and has a very long time to market, or if live the team has not described plans to promote adoption. Product team has ideas on how to sustain the tool, but has not implemented them, or describes plans that may not be feasible.	a future path for product sustainability or maintenance. Product team has not addressed how the product can scale with growing users. Product is not live and has a time to market that could severely inhibit product impact with no plans to accelerate.
Impact (20%)	The product addresses a problem of national or local importance, and clearly addresses a felt need in the user community The team thoroughly describes how this product creates a meaningful outcome for end users. Product team describes well thought out metrics to track the product's impact and usage.	The product addresses a clear problem statement, but may not address user needs, or addresses needs that are not nationally or locally meaningful. The team insufficiently describes plans for impact, or describes user impact on an outcome that is not meaningful or significant for the problem space. Product team describes metrics that may not be feasible or meaningful.	The product is not aligned with a problem statement and/or does not demonstrate relevance for the user community. Product team has not considered or described impact metrics.

Bonus: X- Factor (Optional 0-5% points)
Prize Judges will have the option to recommend up to 5% bonus points on the total score for exceptional tools, originality, innovation, potential and talent. Awarding these points is not mandatory. X-factor points may also be considered in the event of a tie. Teams submitting applications are encouraged to include additional information that they believe would inform judging of their application.

Total Possible Score = 100/100
Total Possible Score with X-Factor bonus points = 105/100