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Las Vegas COMMUNICATIONS JURY FEEDBACK
10/13/2017

Hello Las Vegas,

Please find below some brief comments and feedback provided by the Communications jury for Solar Decathlon 2017. Note that this feedback is meant to be illustrative of their thoughts, but is not, and cannot be, comprehensive. The jury’s ultimate decision and scoring result from a compendium of information and considerations, both of your pre-event jury deliverables and the on-site project and tour.

In addition, this jury provided some general comments they felt were applicable to most or all teams and could help improve your projects in the future.

As juries are inherently subjective, the Solar Decathlon organizers are not able to provide further clarification or feedback beyond what is included here. Similarly, as indicated in Rule 2-9: Protests, the opinions of a jury cannot be protested. Only factual errors and mistakes may be protested.

Thank you for all of your work and continued engagement in this project.

Joe and the Solar Decathlon Organizers
Las Vegas COMMUNICATIONS JURY FEEDBACK
10/13/2017

• The team’s market research was thorough and included face-to-face interactions with the target market and their caregivers.
• The target market was misrepresented as both active aging and elderly individuals, causing some confusion initially amongst the jury and unclear messaging strategy.
• The inclusion of multiple distinct audiences diluted the effectiveness of the communications materials and home’s impact on the market.
• The team developed detailed personas for their target market but didn’t present them particularly successfully in the tour or written narratives. The jury would have appreciated seeing these personas explained more thoroughly.
• The consistent, professional graphics were not paralleled by the editorial content, which was lacking in similar professionalism.
• There was a disconnect in concept when talking about active aging while the house features were designed for the disabled. This messaging disconnect led to some dissonance amongst audiences.
• The video’s audio quality was not as strong as the other visual communication materials.