



Confidential Literature Jury Chair Report APS World Series of Philately Shows

Name of Chair: _____

Show: _____ Date: _____

Preparation for Judging

Did the local committee provide the literature jury with adequate information beforehand about the exhibits in time to properly prepare (i.e. titles, review copies, synopses [if available], current CANEJ approved literature critique sheets)?

Did the jury receive all the required information about show and judging logistics, i.e. where to go, and when, times of all events, schedules, names of judges, etc?

Judging

Were there any specific problems with any of the jury members during the judging, deliberations, or critique, e.g. not well prepared, uncooperative with fellow jurors, missing for periods of time, not cooperative with exhibitors, not available for individual conferences with exhibitors, gross errors of judgment about entries, etc? If yes, specify name and briefly describe the problem.

If yes, did you discuss the problem(s) noted with the judge in question, and was there any reaction?

Were there any exceptionally good performances turned in by accredited jury members? Briefly describe.

Post-Judging

Were the jury room facilities adequate?

Was the room used for the feed back session adequate?

Was the jury introduced at the banquet?

Was there any other judging related difficulty?

Overall

Was there anything exceptionally good, poor, or unusual about the show that you would like to mention?

(Signed)

(Dated)

Return to: David McNamee, APS Committee on Accreditation of National Exhibitions and Judges, P. O. Box 37, Alamo, CA 94507