



EVALUATION CONTEST

Judge's Guide and Ballot

Names

Judging Items [SEE OVER FOR DESCRIPTION]	<u>Suggested POINT VALUES</u>				Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name
	E X C E L L E N T	V E R Y G O O D	G O O D	F A I R									
<u>ANALYTICAL QUALITY</u> CLEAR FOCUSED	40	28-39	17-27	0-16									
<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u> POSITIVE, SPECIFIC HELPFUL	30	22-29	13-21	0-12									
<u>TECHNIQUE</u> SYMPATHETIC, SENSITIVE MOTIVATIONAL	15	11-14	6-10	0-5									
<u>SUMMATION</u> CONCISE ENCOURAGING	15	11-14	6-10	0-5									
TOTAL SCORE (100 Points Possible)													

(Detach and submit to Counters)

Judge's Official Ballot EVALUATION CONTEST



Name of Contestant :

PLACE RANKING POINTS

- FIRST 3
- SECOND 2
- THIRD 1

(NOTE: Votes must be cast for First, Second, and Third place or the ballot will be voided.)

(Signature of Judge)

(Judge's Name : Please PRINT)

JUDGING CRITERIA

ANALYTICAL QUALITY refers to the effectiveness of the evaluation. Every evaluation should carefully analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the speaker's presentation. Were the evaluator's comments clear and logical? Did the evaluator identify specific strengths and weaknesses of the presentation?

RECOMMENDATIONS are an important part of an evaluation. An evaluator not only points out the strengths and weaknesses of a speech, he/she also offers specific recommendations for improvement. Recommendations should be practical, helpful and positive, and they should enable the speaker to improve his or her next presentation.

TECHNIQUE refers to the manner in which the evaluator presents his/her comments and recommendations. An evaluator should be sensitive to the feelings and needs of the speaker, yet inspire and encourage the speaker in his/her future speaking efforts.

SUMMATION is how the evaluator concludes the evaluation. The conclusion should briefly summarize the evaluator's comments and suggestions, and be positive and encouraging.

JUDGE'S CODE OF ETHICS

1. Judges will consciously avoid bias of any kind in selecting first, second and third place contestants. They will not consider any contestant's club, area, division or district affiliation. Nor will they consider any contestant's age, sex, race, creed, national origin, profession or political beliefs. They will demonstrate the utmost objectivity.
2. Judges will not time the speeches and will not consider the possibility of under-time or overtime when judging a contestant's speech.
3. Judges will support by word and deed the contest rules and judging standards, refraining from public criticism of the contest and revealing scores and ranking only in accordance with official policy.



EVALUATION CONTEST

TIEBREAKING Judge's Guide and Ballot

Names

Judging Items [SEE OVER FOR DESCRIPTION]	Suggested POINT VALUES				Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name
	E X C E L L E N T	V E R Y G O O D	G O O D	F A I R									
<u>ANALYTICAL QUALITY</u> CLEAR FOCUSED	40	28-39	17-27	0-16									
<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u> POSITIVE, SPECIFIC HELPFUL	30	22-29	13-21	0-12									
<u>TECHNIQUE</u> SYMPATHETIC, SENSITIVE MOTIVATIONAL	15	11-14	6-10	0-5									
<u>SUMMATION</u> CONCISE ENCOURAGING	15	11-14	6-10	0-5									
TOTAL SCORE (100 Points Possible)													

(Detach and submit to Counters)

TIEBREAKING Judge's Official Evaluation Contest



Note: All speakers must be ranked

Place / Name of Contestant :

First _____ Fourth _____ Seventh _____

Second _____ Fifth _____ Eighth _____

Third _____ Sixth _____ Ninth _____

(Signature of Judge)

(Judge's Name : Please PRINT)