Lack of shared understanding of selection criteria

As the contest deadline approaches, **Bob** and his team are ready for the shortlisting process. **Bob** plans a workshop, which is expected to last half a day. In this workshop, the team should reduce the number of ideas to a reasonable amount for the next round. **John**, **Mike**, **Lisa** and **Sara** are distributed in various places around the globe and therefore, will join the meeting via Skype. The rest of the team is located at the headquarters of **AwesomeTech**. For the shortlisting phase, the evaluators are supposed to take into consideration the official criteria, which were announced during the description of the challenge. The criteria are **novelty**, **coolness**, **feasibility** und **customer-value**. In a previous meeting with the evaluators, Bob "*communicated upfront the criteria to the evaluators, so that they have a shared understanding*". The shortlisting phase starts punctually. **Bob** welcomes the participants and briefly describes the structure of the process. For the next hours, the evaluators will form teams of two and start discussing the ideas that have been assigned to them. Bob already knew which of the team members are familiar with which ideas and subsequently distributes them evenly among the teams. After some in-depth discussions, the teams insert their ratings across the four pre-specified criteria. **Bob** observes the discussions and aggregates the ratings in the available online tool. While going through the ratings, he realizes that many ideas are consistently rated with a 3 in a 5-point scale. As he describes in his memo "*In a 5-point scale, everyone crosses a 3. Can it be that the evaluators didn't actually understand the definition of the criteria?"* He also notices that some teams are surprisingly faster with the evaluation than others are, even though the amount of ideas is evenly distributed. Bob writes in his memo: "*there are always cases, where the teams of two are evaluating somehow too fast*". As a result, when the evaluation completes, **Bob** decides to start "*an open discussion with the evaluators about the evaluation of the ideas to develop a shared understanding*". Therefore, **Bob** asks the evaluators about the suitability and understandability of the evaluation criteria. **Mike** is the first to say: "*I think the evaluation criteria are very "softly" described*" and **Sara** continues: "*Customer value is very difficult. Actually, you cannot say which idea deserves five stars or three stars, it is difficult to assess.*" Bob listens to the evaluators carefully and takes some notes: "*A precise description of each criterion*" and "*In-depth discussion of the criteria prior to the shortlisting process*". The workshop lasts much longer than originally planned until the team concludes to the finalists for the next round.