

### **MemeLabs**

([memelabs.com](http://memelabs.com)) Features

- Great for video contests, but there is no support for written proposals. Students could upload them, but they would be public, and judging would have to be done manually by email.

Cost: \$12,750 to \$31,200

### **Strutta** ([strutta.com](http://strutta.com))

Features

- No limits on what administrators can ask on the entry form—totally customizable.

Drawbacks

- No way to create contest categories.
- Judging tool doesn't allow for more than one judge to review a submission, so judging would also have to occur outside of the platform (e.g., by sending out a CSV file that judges fill out after downloading proposal from Strutta platform, and then send back to administrators to compile).
- No way to assign judges to specific proposals for judging. A link would be set out to judges to access all entries, and admins would need to specify to judges which entries they should be reviewing.
- Cannot use judging tool if the contest requires feedback from multiple judges.
- At this time, Strutta cannot support upload of PDF or Word doc. They may be able to do this for an extra development cost.
- The platform isn't set up to deal with contests with multiple round. Admins would have to have two separate "contests"—one for each round.

Cost: \$1999 + 99/mo for each round + \$299 + 99/mo video contest

### **ContestCore** (<http://www.contestcore.com/>)

Features

- Applicants can upload PDFs or videos.
- ContestCore can build around our website, logo, using preferred fonts, and color schemes.
- Platform supports multiple category submission.
- Can create two submission windows, but can't limit the second round to just finalists. Administrators would have to hand weed out people who applied who should not have.

Drawbacks

- Can have judging template, but cost extra to design. ContestCore isn't built for internal judging—it is built for submissions to go viral (e.g., video submissions). Extra design cost = \$500.
- Can have matrix of all entries and all scores. Judges would have to hand average their

scores (or admins would have to).

- Can have multiple judges judge each entry, but assigning them is a little clunky. Admins would inform each judge of which particular entry IDs they are judging, and tell judges to enter their scores as Judge 1, 2, or 3. Judges would be able to see each other's scores.

Cost: \$6000. (Typically, the cost is broken down by duration of contest: \$1500 per 4 weeks)

### Gust (<http://gust.com/>)

#### Features

- Administrators can either send entrants a URL to the contest (so they don't need to create a Gust account) via email or that you post to your website. Once they apply, they'll have a Gust account automatically created.
- The "Deal List" contains all active submissions. You can also take in deals by adding them if you want to this list. Or students can submit right to the deal list.
- Can ask any number and type of custom questions on the "entrepreneur application."
- Admins can receive an email for each submission, and entrants receive an automated confirmation email once they've submitted their entry.
- For judging, administrators can add them as "guests" to an account or create "deal rooms" for each of the judges. Judges will be able to rate and review each proposal, and admins can hide these ratings from the entrants or other judges.
- Gust offers demos and training—and they can lead judges training sessions.

#### Drawbacks

- Don't have a way to create categories, but can label entries from different categories by hand after they are submitted using the "deal labels." One of the entry form questions would ask students to identify the category that they are submitting it, and then admins would have to open that up in order to label the submission properly.
- Dealing with multiple stages is tricky. Entrants can come in at any time to update their application. So, administrators can't "close off" the contest after the pre-proposal stage, but administrators can instruct students not to update their information after the deadline, and if they do, we'll know and can disqualify them. For the second round, administrators can instruct students to go back and add new materials, and again, tell them to do this before the deadline and disqualify those that update after the deadline.
- Working on integrating Salesforce, but don't have a way to do this yet. Administrators can download data as a spreadsheet and manually import it into Salesforce.

Cost: FREE to universities

### WizeHive

#### Features

- Contest is built custom for each client. There are no templates, and WizeHive can do anything in terms of color, font, branding, etc. Admins can collect any type of information they want and set any kind of limits they want.

- There isn't a direct way to "limit" who can apply. But administrators could make it a required item to pick from a list of schools and if they haven't picked one then they can't move on.
- Typically, contests use an Iframe: page looks like it is part of the website, but they are still hosting it. So if our website goes down for any reason, it still exists on the WizeHive frame.
- On the student end, students would share a login to a common application, and all their names could be requested in the entry form. Entrants can save application as draft and return to it at multiple points in time.
- Full proposal can be limited to just the finalists. Or administrators can take the I- frame off the website and send out a private link during final round. If someone tried to create an application after the deadline, they would just see a message that say it is closed.
- Can archive data from pervious years competitions on WizeHive. No integration with Salesforce yet, but can download data into CSV and merge this data into Salesforce.
- Automatic email can be created for everyone who finished an application, if they are moved into the finalist folder, etc. anytime you want. Admins can also pre-write emails that are automatically sent at various points (e.g., announcing video contest, announcing deadlines, sending updates, etc.)
- Judges will be invited to judge via an automated email and will be sent to a "private review portal." Administrators can limit the information that judges see, if necessary. And administrators can embed the judging platform into the Big Ideas website too.
- To provide feedback for applicants, administrators can easily merge comments into an email and send out to all pre-proposal/full proposal applicants, instead of sending individual emails.
- Lots of tools to ensure public voting on videos is not fraudulent.
- Can include links to PDFs in entry form.

Cost: Licensing fee is \$6,000 per year (covers hosting, testing, software licensing, updates, and basic support) + an additional fee for the number of professional service hours administrators need.

### Skild (<http://www.skild.com/>)

#### Features

- Contest is hosted via microsite. The contest page will technically be hosted by Skild, but will integrate seamlessly into contest website, so that users will likely not notice that there was any change when moving from website to contest platform. Administrators can do this by pasting in the html code from our website.
- Platform can support both public voting (for video contest) and internal judging (for proposal contest)
- Can support different categories, and administrators can create different scorecards for each category and well as different entry form questions for each category using their "brackets" feature. Admins can allow students to enter only one bracket or more than one

bracket, depending on contest needs.

- There is an option to have judges “open enroll,” so that members of the public can volunteer to judge to help with recruitment. Or, administrators can manually enter and register judges that administrators have selected. They will receive an email with a temporary password.
- Can easily select a “short list” of finalists and manually rank or use judges feedback to rank. Admin page shows a ranked list of entrants for each bracket, so it is easy to see which entries have the highest scores from judges. But you can also force rank if admins want to.
- Can easily do public voting for a video contest. Voters would have to verify email address and “register” where they enter name, email, password, and would receive a link to validate email.
- Can embed Google analytics to admin page
- User can’t edit after they submit, but administrators can un-submit or make edits for the team, if necessary
- Can share part of feedback with entrants through platform, and information on who was selected, who moved on to final rounds, etc. if wanted.
- Can do blind and double blind judging (neither the judge nor the entrant knows who is being judged or who is judging). But you can also choose to release judge information if you want.
- Can see if a student proposal is in progress, not submitted, or submitted and send emails to those groups.
- Admins can append documents like letters of recommendation or old proposals for scaling up without entrants seeing it, but so that judges can view it.

### Drawbacks

- Only have one comment area for qualitative feedback. Administrators would have to instruct the judges what to put there, and hope that they address all things administrators want them to address. Can probably add in more comment boxes for additional development cost of about \$300.
- Data is easy to export, but no integration with Salesforce yet.

Cost: \$7,500. To add public voting would be \$1500.