The Use of Point Scores to Evaluate Exhibits

APS COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION OF NATIONAL EXHIBITIONS AND JUDGES
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHILATELIC EXHIBITORS
Sign in Sheet

• Complete sign in sheet for record of attendance.

• Handouts provided
  • New EEF for Youth from 7th edition Manual, also available on APS website.
  • Seminar Summary Sheet with details of the judges’ check list for evaluation criteria (7th edition Manual, p. 28).
1. Purpose of Seminar


• Review and discuss:
  • Changes to Manual
  • Use and advantages of points
  • Translation of points to meaningful feedback
  • Procedures for judging using points
2. 7th Edition of the Manual

• Two year effort involving 57 judges and exhibitors
• Public comment period provided additional input
• Final edition approved by APS Board August 2016
• Effective January 1, 2017

- Name now includes “Exhibiting”
- All exhibits assessed using EEF big 4 criteria
- Appendices provide suggested treatment outlines and typical content for exhibit types – these are not rules
- Divisions eliminated, 4 classes remain
  - General Class (all multi-frame exhibits regardless of type)
  - One Frame Class
  - Youth Class
  - Literature Class
3. Changes to Manual (continued)

• Picture Postcards now part of One Frame, General or Youth Classes
• Experimental Exhibits (older special studies) described
• Topical Exhibits described
• Point scoring introduced
• New medal levels introduced (5 to 8), now including:
  • Large Silver
  • Large Vermeil
  • Large Gold

• Rules for Shows and Philatelic Literature Judging chapters removed to their own dedicated Manuals.
4. Changes to EEF and Youth Evaluation Forms

• Percentages become points
• Point ranges reflect new medal levels
• Special point situations for thematic, topical and display exhibits
• Youth EEF point ranges reflect new medal levels
5. Advantages of Points

• More detailed focus on deficient areas
• More specific recommendations for improvement by EEF criteria
• Better overall feedback for exhibitors
• Aids jury in deliberations for special awards
### 6. Review of Point Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Medal Levels</th>
<th>Old Point Range</th>
<th>New Medal Levels</th>
<th>New Point Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>85-100</td>
<td>Large Gold</td>
<td>90-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>85-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermeil</td>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>Large Vermeil</td>
<td>80-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermeil</td>
<td>75-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>Large Silver</td>
<td>70-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>65-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bronze</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>Silver Bronze</td>
<td>60-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>55-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0-54</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0-54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Review of Point Breakdown (continued)

- Review Seminar Summary Sheet
- Note the order of evaluation is different from the standard EEF
- Best order to use for scoring
  - Presentation, Treatment, Knowledge, Rarity/Condition, Importance
- Why do Importance last?
  - The exhibit subject can best be evaluated after considering the entirety.
  - Thematic, display and topical exhibits are weighted on the exhibit itself.
6. Review of Point Breakdown (continued)

- Point score in one criterion does not equate to the same point score in other criteria (e.g., silver treatment but gold knowledge)
6. Review of Point Breakdown (continued)

• Start high or low?
  • Chief and jury will decide process at each show.
  • If choice is to start with highest points, reduce only as required by deficiencies that can be clearly articulated as feedback (EEF and oral).
  • If choice is to start in middle or low then increase only as can be defended by clear reasoning.
  • Any point added or removed should be easily supported by fact.
7. Judges’ Checklist for Pointing

• All judges should be knowledgeable of detailed criteria and the judges’ check list (Manual p. 28)

• **Presentation** = 5 points
  - No distractions to interfere with treatment
  - Visually interesting/attractive
  - What % of **Presentation** does each point represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-100% to -80%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Judges’ Checklist for Pointing (continued)

- **Treatment** = 20 points
  - Unambiguous title
  - Purpose/intent/scope limitations
  - Plan/statement/organizing structure
  - Logical/balanced development by plan
  - For One Frame Class consider “fit”
  - What % of **Treatment** does each point represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-100% to -50%</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Judges’ Checklist for Pointing (continued)

- **Knowledge** = 25 points
  - Items necessary/ sufficient for treatment
  - Accurate, complete and concise descriptions
  - Accurate analyses and logical conclusions
  - Key items are originals (no scans/copies)
  - Thematic/Topical = philatelic/thematic/topical (element choice) + subject knowledge
  - Display = subject knowledge (balance, element choice) + philatelic, deltiology/ephemera knowledge
  - What % of **Knowledge** does each point represent?

| Points | 0-12 | -100% to -47% | 13 | -48% | 14 | -44% | 15 | -40% | 16 | -36% | 17 | -32% | 18 | -28% | 19 | -24% | 20 | -20% | 21 | -16% | 22 | -12% | 23 | -8% | 24 | -4% | 25 | 0% |
7. Judges’ Checklist for Pointing (continued)

• **Research and Personal Study** = 10 points
  • Evidence of significant personal study, or
  • Evidence of original research
  • Thematic exhibits combine knowledge + research/personal study as combined maximum 35 points divided equally
    • 17 ½ points = philatelic knowledge
    • 17 ½ points = subject knowledge
  • What % of **Res/Pers. Study** does each point represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-5 (-100% to -50%)</th>
<th>6 -40%</th>
<th>7 -30%</th>
<th>8 -20%</th>
<th>9 -10%</th>
<th>10 -0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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7. Judges’ Checklist for Pointing (continued)

- **Rarity** = 20 points
  - Rarity = numbers extant vs. scarcity = $ value
  - Rare items are identified and quantified
  - What % of Rarity does each point represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rarity (pts)</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-100 to -50%</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Judges’ Checklist for Pointing (continued)

- **Condition** = 10 points
  - Fine condition in context of time period/source/use
  - Damaged or altered items noted
  - What % of **Condition** does each point represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-100 to -50%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Judges’ Checklist for Pointing (continued)

- **Importance** = 10 points
  - Importance to philately, region/country
  - For thematic, topical and display exhibits = all points on exhibit importance
    - Challenge and difficulty in creating exhibit
    - Exhibit’s importance to similar exhibits
  - What % of **Importance** does each point represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-100 to -50%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Judges’ Checklist for Pointing (continued)

• Notes at frames and translation to EEF
  • Use EEF or other sheet +/- judges’ checklist
  • Point deficiencies should translate directly to suggestions for improvement on EEF and orally
  • All deficient areas need to have meaningful comments
  • Low point areas require more comments than high point areas
  • Be specific
  • Not every criterion needs comments on the EEF
8. When to Reconsider?

- Before leaving the frames
  - Briefly look at all borderline exhibits
  - Ensure comparable exhibits are similarly pointed
  - Adjust points as necessary
9. Procedures for Judging Using Points

- Chief Judge will determine procedure for the given show
  - Depends on size of show
  - Number of teams
  - Jury calibration on points
  - Order of exhibits
  - Use of first responder to lead frame discussion
  - Conflict resolution
  - Timing
  - Review of EEFs
  - Special award assignments
Questions?
Group Findings and Facilitated Discussion
Wrap up and Knowledge Gained

• If you arrived late and did not sign in, please do so before leaving.