

Evaluator

You will evaluate a prepared speech, using the guidelines set forth in the speaker's manual. Your duty is crucial. You are, in effect, mentoring the speaker. You want to provide honest reaction to the speaker's presentation in a positive manner. You must recognize the fact that you are not a professional authority, but capable of giving your own reaction to the material presented. The speakers rely on you to give them feedback. Your goals are . . .

Meet with the speaker before his or her speech to see if they have any special items they want you to look for.

Make the speaker feel good about giving the speech. The club will only grow if members get positive emotional rewards from participating. With new members go out of your way to say specific positive things about the speech.

List a minimum of four (preferably eight) specific things about the speech that were good. Even if the only good thing you can say is to congratulate them on having the courage to get up and speak. It is very important that you be as specific as possible. Rather than say, "I liked your speech." You could say something like, "I felt your chart showing yearly sales was very effective in demonstrating the effectiveness of the new ad campaign."

Limit yourself only one or two things that would have improved the speech. Be as specific as possible and be brief. You are giving the speaker advice on how to improve. With new members limit yourself to just one thing.

End your evaluation by affirming the person. You can say something like, "I'm really pleased you joined our club. Your enthusiasm warms us all."

Do not comment upon or rebut the contents of the speech. You will be analyzing the speaker's organization and delivery, not his opinions. Your evaluation should take 2-3 minutes.

Remember: *Studies have shown that organizations where people get feedback in a ratio of four praises for every criticism are considered to have a positive atmosphere.*

Something to think about: In an experiment, adults were given ten puzzles to solve. All subjects received the same ten puzzles. The subjects worked on the puzzles, turned them in, and were given the results at the end. The researchers, when they gave the subjects the results of their puzzle solving, gave them fictitious results. Half of the exam takers were told that they had done well, with seven out of ten correct. The other half were told they had done poorly, with seven out of ten wrong. Then all were given another ten puzzles (the same for each person). The half who had been told that they had done well in the first round really did better in the second, and the other half really did do worse.

