

MASTER EVALUATOR

AIM:

- To evaluate assignments which have NOT already been evaluated.
- To provide a comment on the overall conduct of the meeting which will serve as a useful guide for future meetings
- To point out any 'significant' areas you feel an evaluator may have overlooked which maybe useful to the speaker or meeting. Be careful doing this-do not pick up on minor issues!
- It's a great assignment -hard work, but challenging. You have to listen carefully. You'll be scribbling all evening yet you will have to be selective about what you say because of time constraints

PREPARATION:

Read the assignment guide. Check the main aims responsibilities of the assignments so you know what to expect from each assignment.

ON THE NIGHT:

Note: comment only on those assignments in your session

1. The overall tone of the meeting. Was it lively? Orderly? Entertaining? or Dull? Dragging? Too serious or frivolous. What didn't you like?
2. The Sgt at Arms - Did the meeting start on time with a firm introduction and handing over of the gavel. Was all the gear eg. banner, lectern in place, the water and glasses. Were the visitors made welcome before the meeting?
3. Welcome - Was it sincere, informative, welcoming, different? Were the visitors given enough information? Were any props used (eg. manual, Toastmaster Magazine)
4. The Toast - Was it appropriate, topical, too long, dull, inspiring? Did the Toastmaster remember their glass? Was the Toast itself short enough for the audience to repeat?
5. Table Topics Master - Did the Toastmaster explain the purpose for visitors? Was there a theme? Was it an imaginative session? Were the questions too long or difficult? Was the overall session lively? Did they ensure members without major assignments received a question? Were the visitors asked if they would like a question? Did they give clear instructions for the time and evaluators?

6. Table Topics Evaluators - Did the evaluators waste time by repeating the question? Did they offer a point of praise and a point for improvement? Were the evaluations likely to help the speakers and audience?
7. Table Tonic / Surprise - Did it add sparkle to the meeting? Was it something different?
8. Toastmaster - Did he put the audience at ease and outline the purpose of the prepared speeches? Was the room set up correctly for each speaker (and himself)? Did he introduce the speakers clearly and make them feel comfortable? Did he name the evaluators and instruct the timer? Did the introductions show he had prepared his comments in advance (had he done his homework!)? Was the Toastmaster too showy, did he try to upstage the speakers?

Don't evaluate the speakers but you do comment on the:

9. Speech Evaluators - Did they give worthwhile and valuable evaluations - eg. praise/improvement/praise. Were they familiar with the objectives of the speech? Were the evaluations too tough or too kind? Did they miss any noteworthy points? Do not mention any specific areas in the speech unless you feel it was overlooked by the evaluator and was important to the speaker
10. Reports - Do not evaluate the Business Session and Reports this is covered by the Parliamentarian
11. Grammarian, Ums & Ahs and Timer: Did they give us the information we wanted? Were the reports concise? Did the grammarian give a balanced report of praise and improvement. Did the time keep the meeting to time?

Finally don't forget to evaluate:

12. The Chairman - Did he open the meeting well? Did he fill the position with courtesy, tact and firmness? Did he lose control? Did he keep the meeting flowing? Had he prepared in advance?

Note: Please don't evaluate any Toastmasters dignitaries that are attending in an official capacity during their reports eg. Area Governors.

TIMING:

10 minutes (5 minutes just prior to the break and 5 minutes at the end of the meeting)