

AAPA Communications Awards Sub-Committee Report; Mid-Year Meeting -- June 2008

Chair: Marilyn Sandifur, Port of Oakland, Oakland, USA (msandifur@portoakland.com)

Members: Cheryl Graham, Detroit/Wayne Co. Port Authority (Solomon@portdetroit.com);

Heather Morris, Port of Long Beach (morris@polb.com); John Valls, Port of Corpus Christi

(jvalls@pocca.com); Lisa Mandt, Port of Everett (lisam@portofeverett.com); Nelson Holmberg, Port of Vancouver, USA (nholmberg@portvanusa.com); Rod Koon, Port of Tacoma (rkoon@portoftacoma.com)

Thank you to all of you who submitted entries for the awards competition this year and congratulations to the winners. There are a number of changes that are being considered to the awards process for next year's competition. The following are items that have been reviewed through an e-mail survey sent to the awards sub-committee members. We are making the following recommendations:

- 1) If we continue to leave out the question about the cost effectiveness of the entry, the judges recommended deleting the question about whether an advertisement or other communication was printed in-house or by an ad agency. We think that this is a logical suggestion and we recommend this change.
- 2) Conversely, the judges recommended bringing back the question of how much money the port spent on developing, distributing and measuring their communications entry, but recommending making it optional to answer. If the port chooses to answer the question, the information MUST include the port's internal costs, such as staff time, graphics, printing, etc., or the numbers won't be relevant. In some cases, ports may have gotten a great deal on a trade-out with a media provider, such as a radio or television station. What we need to know in cases like this is - what were the savings the port made vs. having to buy the same media? The recommendation from the sub-committee is "no", this should not be added as an optional question on the application. We did not agree with the judges.
- 3) We received a couple of radio advertisements classified as "Single Ads" as part of this year's submissions. Consequently, there was nothing the judges could look at that was in printed form. Next year, the judges recommended that radio ads be submitted under the "Audio Only" classification and not within one of the two "Advertisement" classifications. We agreed with this suggestion - radio ads being submitted under Audio Only.
- 4) The judges felt that it would be a good idea if AAPA included a session at its next PR Seminar, or at an upcoming committee meeting, on what it takes to get a good score on the communications entries. Some judges even offered to participate in such a session (if it were held in Washington, D.C.) and talk about why they gave such high scores to certain entries. We recommend having this session.
- 5) Many of the videos we received did not have the running time listed, so we need to include a space on the entry form for this information. Furthermore, many of the videos were VERY LONG, and we had to limit the viewing time per video to 10 minutes. So we recommend including in the rules that the submitter MUST indicate what time segment(s) of the video he/she wants the judges view, for a total of 10 minutes, if the video is more than 10 minutes in length. We recommend requiring that the submission indicate what part of the video should be viewed by the judges if it is longer than ten minutes.
- 6) The entry form needs to more clearly specify what image size (5" x 7" for instance) is needed for the high-resolution graphic that must accompany the entry, and then we need to delete the option of submitting an audio cassette tape for Audio Only submissions, since CDs are a better option for audio. We recommend both of these changes.