

<b>CONTESTANT NAME</b>									
<b>CONTEST CRITERIA</b>									
<p><b>ANALYSIS</b>                      Did the evaluator analyse the delivery of the target speech effectively, with some reference to the criteria outlined in The Speakers Guide? Did they highlight particularly effective parts of the presentation and why they worked? Did they describe parts of the presentation that could be improved and why those parts weren't as effective as they could have been? Did the evaluator provide a rationale for why the points they raised (strong areas and development areas) were important? Was reference made to the choice and suitability of subject?</p>	<b>40</b>								
<p><b>ADVICE</b>                      Did the evaluator provide clear, positive and useful suggestions for improvement? How closely related were the suggested improvement processes to identified weak points in the presentation? Did the evaluator provide a rationale for choosing these particular improvement processes? Was time given to suggestions of how the speaker could maintain and develop their strengths? Was the advice delivered in a manner that made it acceptable to the speaker and accessible to the audience in order to maximise the learning?</p>	<b>40</b>								
<p><b>PRESENTATION</b>                      Was the evaluation a well-constructed speech not prepared in advance? Did the presentation demonstrate the skills and techniques outlined in The Speakers Guide to a high quality?</p>	<b>20</b>								
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>								
<b>RANK ORDER</b>	1,2,3 etc								
<b>NAME OF JUDGE:</b>									