

# American Philatelic Society Philatelic Apprentice Judge Evaluation Form

Apprentice Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Exhibition \_\_\_\_\_ This is apprentice's \_\_\_\_\_ apprenticeship

**NUMERICAL KEY:**

1 = *Unacceptable*. This is an area of urgent concern. The apprentice should make efforts to correct this clear deficiency. If it persists after more than two apprenticeships, the apprentice should reexamine whether she/ he wishes to become a philatelic judge. The evaluator must make comments and recommendations on this criterion in the narrative section.

2 = *Less than Acceptable*. This is an area of deficiency that requires some attention on the part of the apprentice. An apprentice cannot be accredited with any criteria scoring at this level on the final apprenticeship. The evaluator has an obligation to address any criterion rated at this level with comments and recommendations.

3 = *Acceptable*. This is a minimum level on each criterion. Improvement over this level is to be encouraged through comments and recommendations.

4 = *Proficient*. This is the level at which an experienced judge should perform. And it is the expectation that during the fourth apprenticeship an apprentice should perform at this level as well.

5 = *Commendable*. The apprentice is performing at the highest levels. Special effort should be made to praise an apprentice performing at this level. It is not expected that an apprentice will perform at this level on all criteria. Indeed there are times that accredited judges may not perform at this level on all criteria.

<b>1. Preparation.</b> To what degree did the apprentice show evidence of preparation prior to show through the study of handbooks, articles, etc?	1	2	3	4	5
<b>2. Knowledge</b>					
a. Of own field(s) of philately	1	2	3	4	5
b. Philatelic knowledge of many countries	1	2	3	4	5
c. Of diverse philatelic areas (e.g. thematic, postal history, stationery)	1	2	3	4	5
d. Technical philatelic knowledge (e.g. printing, perforation, papers)	1	2	3	4	5
e. Knowledge of philatelic exhibiting	1	2	3	4	5
<b>3. Exhibit Ratings</b>					
a. Efficiency. Does apprentice schedule her/ his time to give each exhibit proper consideration but still complete her/ his duties on time?	1	2	3	4	5
b. Accuracy. Are the award levels the apprentice recommends close to the levels of the remainder of the jury?	1	2	3	4	5
<b>4. Jury Deliberations</b>					
a. Communication. Does the apprentice contribute willingly and effectively express herself/ himself when explaining her/ his reasons for ratings?	1	2	3	4	5
b. Contributions. Does the apprentice contribute willingly and positively to the deliberations (as opposed to parroting others)?	1	2	3	4	5
c. Analytical ability. Is the reasoning to justify ratings of exhibits logical and consistent?	1	2	3	4	5
d. Compatibility. Does the apprentice get along well with other members of the jury?	1	2	3	4	5
<b>5. Critique</b>					
a. Suggestions. Does the apprentice assist exhibitors with useful suggestions?	1	2	3	4	5
b. Reasons for award level. Does the apprentice tell exhibitors the real reasons an exhibit receives a lower award?	1	2	3	4	5
<b>6. Personal Bias.</b> Is the apprentice free from bias towards any philatelic area or collecting interest?	1	2	3	4	5
<b>7. Overall Appraisal of Apprentice as Future Judge</b>	1	2	3	4	5

Evaluator (Please print) \_\_\_\_\_

Apprentice signature \_\_\_\_\_  
(optional)

**Chief judge MUST make additional comments on back of this form.**  
Mail completed form to Stephen Reinhard Chair CANEJ,  
P. O. Box 110, Mineola, NY 11501