

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION/JUDGING

The panel on standards and judging criteria met from 2 to 5 on Friday, afternoon. Five very interesting yet broadly diverse papers were presented. In many ways, it appeared as if the topic was too broad in scope and might have been narrowed down for easier discussion. One of the papers gave some general guidelines for coaches and judges and served a strong overview for the other presentations. Some of the presentations included some highly specific standards for judging. Areas of concentration included both the public address area and oral interpretation. In the area of public address, two specific types of standardization were proposed. One included a list of criteria along with a hierarchical rank and the other proposed dealt with a creation of uniform judging standards and that judging criteria statements be required of coaches/critics participation in major national individual events tournaments. (similar to that used in NDT debate). An additional presentation provided statistical data explaining current trends in judging, and offered the potential for further research. After the presentation, a lively discussion and extensive debate surrounded the idea of uniform judging, standards and the proposal of the judging philosophy form. Most concerns regarded the implementation of such a tool. Discussion surrounded the feasibility of this used in some of the events. After much discussion, it was considered that perhaps this proposal might be implemented in events like extemporaneous and impromptu. More discussion followed with concerns about the proposals made for oral interpretation. The paper argued that present "rules" don't allow for practice of contemporary theory. In the same discussion, we began to examine the concept of hierarchical criteria for events. Though the discussion proved insightful, informative, and thought-provoking due to the large scope of the panel, it was difficult to come up with some final guidelines, however it was agreed that:

- 1) Need to remember the pedagogical nature: of the coach and judge.
- 2) We need to try to make our ballots as educational and pedagogical as possible.

ble.

- 3) More thorough criteria needs to be established and this needs to be explained on ballots.
- 4) Our professional organizations need to reexamine current rules/criteria for each event and discuss possible amendments, additions etc.
- 5) We need to encourage more workshops (ie short courses, convention panels, etc.) to inform, enlighten, and expose coaches/judges to current trends in events.

- Submitted by Judy Santacaterina