Divergence of opinions among evaluators

After establishing a shared understanding about the selection criteria, the jury members of AwesomeTech start discussing the ideas to define the finalists. As the moderator, Bob intends to keep a balance during the discussion so that all voices are heard. While going through the ideas, Lisa is very skeptical about a high-rated idea and nodded disagreement. **Bob** notices Lisa's reaction, but he is aware that Lisa is too shy to express her opinion. Bob asks her to express her disagreement, as he always feels that "a moderator has to stay alerted; if someone wants to say something it should be said, especially in cases that the person has a quieter voice." Lisa feels awkward, as her manager Jeff is also joining the discussion. He is one of those that gave good ratings to the idea. She expresses her concerns, but her arguments puzzle the team. Some members find her concerns reasonable, while others are still not convinced. The discussion heats up and conflicts emerge. Bob takes over and says: "I would like to remind you that this is not about forcing your opinion but identifying the best idea. I would propose to control your emotions and reach an agreement." Even though he disagrees with Lisa, Jeff understands her concerns and asks John and Mike's opinion, as they are experts in this area. They both agree with Lisa. Although the rest of the team is not happy, they decide to discard the idea. Moving forward, **Bob** notices that **Brad** is the only one rating a specific idea with a five, while the ratings from the rest of the team range between 2 and 3. Brad takes over and says "I know this guy. We used to work for several months together. He has innovative ideas and this particular has high potential in different levels." The others are not convinced and the idea is discarded. After a long discussion round, the team defines the finalists for the next round. While observing the conflicts, **Bob** realizes that adjustments are required to overcome the conflicts. Therefore, he writes down: "Maybe by establishing an anonymous voting everybody would rate the ideas without feeling biased or influenced by the others." He also likes the idea of a "veto right": "If I am the only one in the team to disagree then the idea is out." but while reconsidering he notices: "would that work if some jury members have different expertise or have not dealt with this specific topic to date?" Bob concludes that he should maybe talk to his team and brainstorm for the right solution.

