

Understanding the Judging Process

Enactus believes that the more knowledge teams have of their assessment process, the better-prepared and successful they can be. In an effort to provide insight on this, the following illustrates an outline of the judging process at all competitions:

1. Judges are taken through an in-depth orientation process, during which they are introduced to the overall program and trained on how to best evaluate the competing teams in-line with the judging criterion. The judge orientation video used as part of this process can be viewed at www.enactus.org/worldcup. Faculty Advisors are welcome to attend the judge orientation session as observers.
2. Each judge agrees to the Judges' Oath, committing to providing fair and quality assessments of the teams' overall programs (see appendix for a copy of the Judges' Oath).
3. During each presentation, judges will assess the quality and sustainability of the team's initiatives and its impact in relation to the judging criterion, using the Individual Team Evaluation Form (ITEF) to take notes and select assessment ratings. The ITEF is used as the key assessment tool during presentations and also serves as the primary form of feedback to teams on their performance.
4. Judges use the Cumulative Evaluation Form (CEF) to actually assess teams which then serve as the guide and key deciding factor in making their final decisions on rankings.
5. One or more veteran judges serve as the League Coordinator and facilitate the competition process in the room, ensuring that the team presentations begin on time and that all judges are on-track and present for all the presentations (in order for their votes to count during the scoring process).
6. At the conclusion of the last presentation, judges then cast their votes based on their rankings on the CEF for competing teams. Individual votes per team and per placement are then counted and mathematically tabulated to arrive at the winning teams. This tabulation process is annually audited and monitored by KPMG.

Level of Impact

Judges use the Level of Impact descriptions (listed below) as a tool in making better assessment of the teams' programs through the ITEF. Please note that the Level of Impact selection is not mandated by Enactus nor is it part of the criterion. It is simply a resource and guide. Though we expect judges to evaluate teams based on the options selected from the assessment of the ITEF, do note that their final ranking is ultimately their decision to make.

- Insufficient (equivalent to low impact): Project(s) activities satisfactorily completed, but had little effect on changing or improving lives.
- Good (equivalent to medium impact): Project(s) gave criterion/issue public attention, gained support and participation of key stakeholders; endorsements/testimonials set forth.
- Very Good (equivalent to high impact): Project(s) advocated the passage of significant, sustainable change in target audience, attention/support around project clearly advanced, key stakeholders strongly influenced.
- Excellent (equivalent to exceptional impact): Project(s) clearly provided evidence of systematic/habitual, long-term change that has significantly improved lives of target audience members, has proven sustainable for multiple years, and has further solidified commitments from key stakeholders.

Note: Each level is contingent upon meeting requirements described in prior level.

Important Notes

- The voting and scoring process is a closed session – open only to judges and led by the trained League Coordinator(s) and/or Enactus staff members.
- Judges are not permitted to consult with one another or influence the votes of others. Neither are they permitted to hold discussions or consult with Enactus staff.
- Although teams will be assessed and evaluated on their programs and not presentations, Enactus does permit judges to offer feedback on Annual Reports and audio-visual presentations. However, the feedback does not influence the competition results.
- All voting results are reviewed and verified by Enactus staff who use an official scoring process and Score Verification Grid provided by Enactus.

Judges' Oath

On my honor, I agree to serve today
as an official judge of an Enactus competition
in a completely fair and impartial manner.
I personally commit to this responsibility
with no previous conflicts of interest or
predetermined expectations for the
outcome of the competition.

I will make my evaluations based entirely
on the teams' presentations and written
reports using only the judging criterion
provided to me. And I will make my judging
decisions independently, with integrity
and without regard as to the institutions,
communities or countries represented
by these teams.

Individual Team Evaluation Form



Institution Name: _____

Date: _____

Please offer insights below on how effectively and efficiently the team met specific elements of the Enactus Judging Criterion. They will receive and use this feedback to help improve their programs. **For each judging sub-element below, place an "X" or check mark in the box that best matches your sentiments regarding the team's performance on that sub-element of the criterion. Be sure to also assign an Overall Assessment in the box to the right of each judging element.**

We also strongly encourage you to provide written feedback in the Comments sections. Note that this is the ONLY formal feedback the teams receive from judges, so please take the time to complete the entire form as thoroughly as possible.

Enactus Judging Criterion:

Considering the relevant economic, social and environmental factors, which team most effectively empowered people in need by applying business and economic concepts and an entrepreneurial approach to improve their quality of life and standard of living?

JUDGING ELEMENTS

In carrying out its project(s), did the team:

1. Consider the relevant economic, social and environmental factors?	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Considered and accounted for relevant economic factors				
Considered and accounted for relevant social factors				
Considered and accounted for relevant environmental factors				

Comments:

OVERALL ASSESSMENT: Place an "X" or check mark in only ONE of the following categories and then transfer the assessment onto the Cumulative Evaluation Form.

- Insufficient Good
 Very Good Excellent

2. Effectively empower its target audience(s)?	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Applied an engaging and collaborative approach with audience(s)?				
Transferred valuable knowledge and/or skills				
Successfully built capacity for individual(s) to take responsible actions for long-term success				
Incorporated solutions that focus on long-term empowerment				

Comments:

OVERALL ASSESSMENT: Place an "X" or check mark in only ONE of the following categories and then transfer the assessment onto the Cumulative Evaluation Form.

- Insufficient Good
 Very Good Excellent

3. Target people in need?	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Performed needs-assessment				
Project(s) responded to a need				

Comments:

OVERALL ASSESSMENT: Place an "X" or check mark in only ONE of the following categories and then transfer the assessment onto the Cumulative Evaluation Form.

- Insufficient Good
 Very Good Excellent

Individual Team Evaluation Form



4. Apply business and economic concepts and an entrepreneurial approach?	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Applied sound business and economic concepts				
Applied entrepreneurial approaches				

Comments:

OVERALL ASSESSMENT: Place an "X" or check mark in only ONE of the following categories and then transfer the assessment onto the Cumulative Evaluation Form.

Insufficient Good
 Very Good Excellent

5. Improve the quality of life and standard of living for its project beneficiaries?	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Utilized appropriate and effective evaluation methods				
Achieved quantitative results				
Achieved qualitative results				
Positively impacted lives/Outcome of lives changed				
Built foundation for continuation and/or expansion of success				

Comments:

OVERALL ASSESSMENT: Place an "X" or check mark in only ONE of the following categories and then transfer the assessment onto the Cumulative Evaluation Form.

Insufficient Good
 Very Good Excellent

SAMPLE

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT/OVERALL COMMENTS:

In this area, please provide valuable general insights and suggestions related to the team's projects and activities.

*In this section, please offer any constructive feedback regarding the team's annual report and audio-visual presentation.

*These comments have **no direct impact** on the scoring process of the team. They are strictly being provided as recommendations the team can consider for future improvement.

Cumulative Evaluation Form



Judge Name: _____ Organization: _____ Date: _____

Please use the **Overall Assessments** from your Individual Team Evaluation (ITE) Forms as the primary reference in recording your rankings below.

Overall Assessment Legend:
(Do not make any marks in this box – this is for your reference only)

I - INSUFFICIENT G - GOOD VG - VERY GOOD E - EXCELLENT

For each team, please transfer your Overall Assessments from the Individual Team Evaluation Form. We ask that you use the codes **I**, **G**, **VG** and **E** to note level of performance.

TEAM NAMES:		Please list team names (in order of presentation)		
1. Consider the relevant economic, social and environmental factors?				
2. Effectively empower its target audience(s)?				
3. Target people in need?				
4. Apply business and economic concepts and an entrepreneurial approach?				
5. Improve the quality of life and standard of living for its project beneficiaries?				
RANKING: Please rank the teams, 1 being your first choice; NO TIES ALLOWED				

JUDGING ELEMENTS