

**TOASTMASTERS INTERNATIONAL  
Evaluation Contest Judge's Guide & Ballot**

<b>JUDGING CRITERIA</b>	<b><u>SUGGESTED POINT VALUES</u></b> 5-Excellent      2-Fair 4-Very Good      1-Poor 3-Good	Speaker ↓						
		TOTAL ↓	#6	#5	#4	#3	#2	#1
<b>ANALYTICAL QUALITY</b> 40%	Analysis Of Content: Speech Development, Effectiveness and Speech Value (Focused On Technique Vs. Review Of Content)	5						
	Analysis of Delivery: Physical, Voice, Manner	5						
	Analysis of Language: Appropriateness, Correctness	5						
	Highlighted Areas of Strength/Weakness Comments Clear; Logical	5						
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b> 30 %	Depth of Recommendations - Specific-Why/How Speech Worked	5						
	Depth of Recommendations - Why/How to Improve Speech	5						
	Sound & Meaningful Advice: Helpful; Positive; Practical	5						
<b>TECHNIQUE &amp; SUMMATION</b> 30 %	Sensitive; Sympathetic; Tactful; Enthusiastic; Sandwich Technique; Positive Overall Effect;	5						
	Concise Summary of Weaknesses/Strengths	5						
	Motivational, Encouraging End Note	5						
<b>TOTAL SCORE (50)</b>		50						
<b>Multiply by 2 for score out of 100</b>		100						

Compiled and edited by Ros Hansen, 2010

(Detach and submit to Counters)

**Judge's Official Ballot Evaluation Contest**

Place / Name of Contestant

Ranking Points

First \_\_\_\_\_

3 points

Second \_\_\_\_\_

2 points

Third \_\_\_\_\_

1 point

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Judge (Print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Judge)

## 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.

## BARRIERS TO OBJECTIVITY

Judging is a subjective process that we as judges must try to make objective. Each one of us has likes and dislikes which can unconsciously affect our decisions. Additionally, being aware of some of the barriers we are up against can help us to understand and use the judging process more effectively and fairly.

Barriers to objectivity in judging include:

### 1. **First or Last Speaker Is Best**

We tend to remember first and last speakers best so they have an advantage over other speakers. The first speaker because he or she becomes a reference point and the last because they are more easily remembered. As a judge we need to be equally attentive to the middle speakers.

### 2. **Let's Help the Underdog**

Do we need to give a break to the new Toastmaster? Resist the temptation to mark highly because a speaker deserves a win. Use the judging form scrupulously.

### 3. **Halo Effect**

A speaker with a reputation should be judged using the same criteria as we employ to judge other speakers. Resist giving high marks because the speaker dresses well or has a dynamic delivery but rather give high marks because the speaker is good.

### 4. **Reverse Halo Effect**

This is the association of one unfavourable trait with another unrelated trait. For example a speech that exhibits poor grammar does not necessarily mean the speech will be badly organized. Resist the temptation to downgrade a score in one area because you are not happy with the performance in another area.

### 5. **Second Time Around**

Even if you have heard the speech previously, it must be judged as if it were a new speech. Always judge as if this were the first time you have heard the speech and the speaker.

### 6. **Give Someone Else a Chance**

Even if a speaker has won a contest in previous years, that speaker is entitled to the same judging as other speakers. Past performance should never influence current performance.

### 7. **Not the Norm**

Outside the Speech Contest Rules, there is no norm for speakers. As a judge, consider what is usually the norm for a good speech. Ask yourself if you expect everyone to fit into that norm. If so you may be out of step.

### 8. **Prejudices and Personal Preferences**

Tastes, beliefs, preferences, and prejudices are the most prevalent barriers to unbiased judging. Try to remember to judge not what the speaker is but what the speaker is saying.

### 9. **The Unknown Judging Form**

As a judge you need to be familiar with the judging form. If this is not so, you may spend time analyzing and understanding the form instead of listening to the speakers. Study the form prior to the contest.