

Evaluation Contest Judging Criteria & Guide

1. Analytical Quality (40%) -- Clear? Focussed?

In this category you must assess how well the contestant analyses the speech.

Does the contestant understand the construction and delivery of the speech?

Does the contestant spend time merely recapitulating what has just been said?

[It is perhaps alright to give a quote to illustrate the vividness of the word picture created.]

Does the contestant understand the purpose of the speech and what the speaker was trying to achieve or does he/she waste time arguing with the speaker's conclusions?

Does the contestant detail the construction of the speech or does he/she simply remark that the speech had an opening, body and conclusion?

Lastly a contestant may merely be following the evaluation guide in the Communication and Leadership Manual slavishly. [The classical example is when the contestant remarks that the speaker used the A-I-D-A model of speech construction without either explaining the reference or what it means in terms of the speech given.]

For high marks in this section a contestant must simply, concisely and clearly relate the structure of the speech to the audience and demonstrate understanding of the CONSTRUCTION of the speech.

2. Recommendations (30%) -- Positive? Specific? Helpful?

The quality of the recommendations is the essence of good evaluation. Look for the contestant who makes worthwhile suggestions to help the speaker to improve AND who also explains how these suggested improvements might be achieved.

Has the contestant made any recommendations at all? [If not, you MUST give him/her "0" marks. I suggest recommendations without the explanation should not get more than 12 marks out of the 30]

Do you think that the recommendations made are likely to help the speaker?

Has the contestant made too many recommendations? [Remember that suggested recommendations should all be achievable in the speaker's next speech: more than 3 recommendations is too many.]

Are they the most appropriate recommendations? [Has the contestant overlooked more important, achievable recommendations and chosen nit-picking, less important ones.]

Has the contestant made inappropriate recommendations - matters beyond the speaker's immediate control - e.g. a foreign accent; a speech defect such as a stutter or a sibilant.

For high marks in this section a contestant must identify not more than three of the most important recommendations AND explain how they might be achieved

3. Technique (15%) -- Sympathetic? Sensitive? Motivational?

The Technique is the structure and mode of evaluation used by the contestant. To a large degree this will determine whether the speaker heeds the contestant or not. An evaluation that is not listened to has no value whatsoever. Observe the speaker (if you can), The first minute will suffice to determine the success of the evaluation.

Is the speaker taking a real interest in the evaluation.

Does the contestant use the recommended Praise... Improve... Praise (PIP) also known as the

Commend... Recommend... Commend model (CRC)? Does the contestant have these distinct phases in the evaluation. OR does the contestant use a 'Mix and Match' model: overpraising each facet of the speech and then cutting each of these back with a BUT statement, thus mixing the praise with seemingly false and unnecessary recommendations - compensating for the contestants extravagant praise.

Is the contestant showing too much sympathy towards the speaker? Is the contestant giving a "Whitewash" both of which are useless to the speaker.

Is the contestant being overly stringent, harsh and critical?

For high marks-in this section a contestant must have a good technique, which makes the speaker want to listen to the evaluation.

4. Summation (15%) Concise? Encouraging?

Does the contestant give a conclusion to the 'mini-speech', the evaluation, with a concise point summary of the evaluation - the recommendations first followed by those points done well to finish on a high, encouraging note.