

## 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.