

becky.koch@ndsu.edu  
To: <pamelmar@nmsu.edu>  
Cc: <holly.young@unh.edu>, <becky.koch@ndsu.edu>  
Reply-To: <becky.koch@ndsu.edu>  
Your ACE C&A Critique

April 1, 2013 9:46 PM

Dear Pamela,

Your ACE Critique and Award program entry "Southwest Plant Collector" (2013-0594) has been critiqued and the honorable mention winner in Class 39 - Best innovative use of communication technology. Congratulations!

We hope you'll be able to attend the ACE/NETC conference June 11-14 in Indianapolis to accept your award in person and to bring samples of your work or a display to share with others. Conference registration will be out soon, but learn more now at <http://www.dce.k-state.edu/conf/ace-netc/>.

Reviewer comments are below. Please contact me at becky.koch@ndsu.edu if you have questions. Thank you for submitting your work to ACE C&A.

Regards,  
Holly Young, ACE Interim Executive Director, and Becky Koch, ACE President-elect

=====  
REVIEWER COMMENTS:  
=====

1. Judge:  
Jake Dolan

2. Design:  
Does this program demonstrate an appropriate level of planning and vision in its design and format, as stated in the entry's objectives?  
Strongest aspects:  
Weakest aspects:  
Score: (15 possible)  
Strengths: Simple, easy to use, and accomplishes mission.  
Weakness: It would be beneficial to broaden the scope beyond the borders of New Mexico to encompass more of the southwest.  
9

3. Content:  
Does this program present its content to the target audience(s) in an easy-to-grasp and engaging method?  
Strongest aspects:  
Weakest aspects:  
Score: (15 possible)  
Strengths: Excellent job. Simple information, but effective. 13

4. Technical Quality:  
Provide an overall rating for this program/product's technical quality, which can include images, sound, text, graphics, video, printed material.  
Strongest aspects:  
Weakest aspects:  
Score: (15 possible)  
The app looks great. Strengths: Effective use of technology in the app. 13

5. Use of medium:  
Provide an overall rating for this entry's appropriate use of medium.  
Strongest aspects:  
Weakest aspects:  
Score: (15 possible)  
You nailed it. Strengths: Simple and effective. 15

6. Marketing/Promotion:

Did the entrant use appropriate techniques to market or promote availability of this program or product?

Strongest aspects:

Weakest aspects:

Score: (10 possible)

Strengths: Extremely targeted promotion to the most likely users.

Weakness: Could broaden marketing scope for audiences not already connected with extension or state resources. 10

7. Evaluation:

Did the entrant use appropriate methods to evaluate this program, or does the entrant have appropriate methods outlined for a future evaluation?

Strongest aspects:

Weakest aspects:

Score: (15 possible)

Strengths: Integrated feedback and updates from their pilot.

Weakness: It would be nice to see numbers associated with usage beyond the pilot. 6

8. Effectiveness:

Was this program/product effective in achieving the entrant's stated goals, objectives, and needs?

Strongest aspects:

Weakest aspects:

Score: (15 possible)

This would appear to be a must have tool for a gardener in New Mexico. 13

9. Total Score: (100 possible, no ties)

79

10. Award: (gold, silver, bronze {no ties} or honorable mention)

Honorable mention