Mastering NHD Judging

Pre-Contest Preparation for National Contest Judges
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Why We’re Here

• To provide students with a rigorous opportunity to develop their research, presentation, communication and technological skills while boosting their confidence and increasing their interest in history and in learning

• National History Day....
How it Works

• Students create projects in one of five categories:
  • Paper (Individual only)
  • Website
  • Performance
  • Documentary
  • Exhibit

• Except for Paper, students enter as individuals or in groups of 2-5.

• Students compete in the Junior (grades 6-8) or Senior (grades 9-12) division.

• Judges evaluate student projects and provide feedback.
What Judges Do

Judges...

1. examine student projects.
2. interview students to clarify understanding.
3. evaluate the work based on:
   - a rubric with specified criteria
   - parameters spelled out in a rule book
   - an annual theme
4. leave a lasting impression on students.
5. have fun meeting interesting students and colleagues.
Top 6 Teacher Expectations of Judges*

1. Be fair.
2. Be consistent.
3. Be open-minded.
4. Pay attention (put away phones, remove hats).
5. Credit all student effort with considerate comments.
6. Treat every entry with the same level of respect and interest, whether you care for it or not.

*2013 survey results
Top 6 Student Expectations of Judges*

1. Give me your full attention.
2. Care about how much work I put into this.
3. Help me feel at ease.
4. Ask me what I know and why I care about this project.
5. Tell me how I can improve.
6. Encourage me to keep learning.

*2013 survey results
NHD’s Expectations of You

• Entry evaluation is the single-most important aspect of the contest that we must get right.

• You control whether we get this right.

• You must:
  • be friendly and put the kids at ease.
  • remain objective.
  • be consistent with EVERY entry.
  • assume every entry to be the work of the student(s) and ask them if you are unsure about it.
  • honor the anonymity of all entries.
  • remember that every project has redeeming qualities.
  • provide the positive feedback that you wanted to receive as a student.
The Ideal Judge is...

- Kind
- Fair
- Neutral
- Thorough
- Clear
- Encouraging
- Positive
- Consistent
- A team player
Judging Criteria

Evaluation of entries is based on three criteria:

- Historical Quality – 60%
- Relation to the Theme – 20%
- Clarity of Presentation – 20%
Evaluation

Historical Quality – 60%

- Entry is historically accurate.
- It shows analysis and interpretation.
- It places topic in historical context.
- It shows wide research.
- It uses available primary sources.
- Research is balanced.
Evaluation

Relation to Theme – 20%

• Clearly relates topic to the theme
• Demonstrates significance of topic in history and draws conclusions
Evaluation

Clarity of Presentation – 20%

- The work is clear, appropriate, organized, and well presented.
- Text is clear, grammatical and spelling is correct. Graphics and images have visual impact and engage the viewer.
Process Paper and Annotated Bibliography

• Process Paper
  • 500-word description of research process
    • How did they choose the topic?
    • What was their research process?
    • How does the topic fit the theme?

• Annotated Bibliography
  • Primary & secondary sources must be separated.
  • Annotations should explain how the source was useful.
  • Internet sources can be primary and secondary and should be properly cited.

• For Papers – The process paper is not required; the annotated bibliography must be included along with either footnotes or endnotes.

• For Websites – These materials must be integrated into the site.
Contest Rules

• What?
  • The NHD contest has rules for all entries and specific rules for each category.
  • Please read the instructions that we’ve sent to you, including the rules section.
  • Even if you’ve judged previously, always consult your instructions for rules.

• Why?
  • Parameters enable you to compare apples to apples.
    • The parameters of size, time, and words = Equalizers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minor Infraction</th>
<th>Major Infraction</th>
<th>Disqualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>A violation that does not provide a competitive advantage</td>
<td>Exceeding any of the equalizers (time, size, words), thus creating a competitive advantage by being able to provide more information</td>
<td>The ONLY grounds for this are: 1. reusing an entry from a previous year; 2. plagiarism; 3. tampering with another entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>School name on process paper, exceeding word count by 10 words, etc.</td>
<td>Exceeding words by 10+, size by 1 inch+, time by more than 5-10 seconds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedure</strong></td>
<td>Note these in your comments. These violations should not prevent an entry from advancing. Consider them only to break a tie between two entries that are otherwise equal.</td>
<td>Note these in your comments. These entries should NOT advance. If they truly are the best, please consult with NHD staff.</td>
<td>Please do not act on your own. Bring this concern immediately to NHD staff, who will decide if the entry should be removed from competition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

• **THE Most Important Thing You Will Do**

  • Keep them positive & constructive.
  • Realize that most entries will be eliminated.
  • Do not lecture.
  • Be careful of phrasing so that you are not misunderstood.
  • Take good notes as you go.
  • Make sure your comments support the boxes you checked.

• Remember when you were a student. What feedback would you want?
Evaluation Forms: Purpose

- The key to creating a meaningful learning experience is to provide positive, but critical evaluations of each entry.

- Why?
  - Students have worked very hard for many months on a project that they value.
  - They want and need to understand what you think about the quality of their entry.

- Why?
  - They will use your feedback as a guide for future projects.
  - They have EARNED it.
**Unacceptable Evaluation Form Example**

**Problems:**

- These comments tell the student nothing about what he did well or how he might improve. They are just flattery.

- Please don’t provide actual rankings or tell students they deserve an award. Even if an entry places first in the first-round, it may come in lower in the finals. These comments will be very confusing and potentially harmful!

- The judge clearly thinks this entry is superior. But why? What is so well done? And, is it flawless? There’s always room for growth.

- This empty space could be filled with comments.
Unacceptable Evaluation Form Example

Problems:

- Each of these comments is negative but could be rephrased in the positive.
- If you suspect a rules violation, please verify. Don’t guess!
- You may have seen this topic a dozen times, but it’s new to this student and he/she deserves your objective feedback.
- Some students live far from a library and many quality websites contain reliable material.
- The checkboxes indicate this entry ranks somewhere in the middle of those in the judge’s group, but the comments say NOTHING about what the student did well. What was so “excellent?” The student may conclude that the judge rated the whole project poorly because it wasn’t “pretty” and the topic was not favored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGING CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPRISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Quality (60%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Entry is historically accurate</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shows analysis and interpretation</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Places topic in historical context</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shows wide research</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses available primary sources</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research is balanced</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Theme (20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clearly relates to theme</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates significance of topic in history and draws conclusions</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Presentation (20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exhibit, written material is original, clear, appropriate and organized</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exhibit is organized, has visual impact, correctly uses maps, photos, etc.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains size requirement (40” x 30” x 72”)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Media device maintains time limit (3 minutes)</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains word limit (500 words)</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Includes annotated bibliography</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More comments are needed here.
## Evaluation Forms: Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thought</th>
<th>Constructive Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project needs a lot of work.</td>
<td>You’re off to a good start. Consider strengthening your project by…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance is just not your thing but your research is strong.</td>
<td>Your courage at creating a performance is admirable, but another category might enable you to demonstrate your research better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The documentary sound quality was awful.</td>
<td>The poor audio quality of your documentary distracted from the overall project. Consider testing your audio on different systems and in different settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your annotations don’t tell me whether you’ve even read these sources!</td>
<td>Be careful to use your annotations to explain how you used your sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your project does not relate to the theme.</td>
<td>Consider making a stronger case in your process paper for your project’s relationship to the theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t agree with your interpretation.</td>
<td>Reading ___ would have strengthened your entry by providing additional information on which to base your interpretation.  OR Historians disagree on interpretation of this topic. Your case would be strengthened by finding additional evidence for ___.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Better Example #1

Reasons:

- The comments are positive and criticisms are phrased constructively.
- Specific criticisms are backed up with examples.
- The comments support the checkmarks.

Better still?:

- More could have been said about why the interviews and sources were so impressive.
- This judge could have written more, particularly about the topic’s relationship to the theme.
- Another positive comment or two would be appreciated.
Better Example #2

Reasons:

- The comments are positive and criticisms are phrased constructively.
- Specific criticisms are backed up with examples. This reads like an action plan for improvement.
- The comments support the checkmarks.
- The comments end on a positive note and thanking the student for participating is kind and thoughtful.
The Comment Sandwich

Start and finish your comments with something purely positive. Place your constructive feedback in the middle. Students will find this to be a tasty combination.
Primary and Secondary Sources

• Primary sources = materials directly related to a topic by time or participation

• Secondary sources = materials about a topic, usually based on interpretation of primary sources
Student Confusion

- Students sometimes erroneously think:
  - Primary means “the most important.”
  - Newspapers and diaries are always primary sources.
  - An expert historian is a primary source because he/she knows “everything” about the topic.
  - A quote from an otherwise primary source in a secondary source can be listed as primary.
How to Respond to a Misunderstanding

• In your written comments, suggest to students that they should ask questions about the origin of their sources:
  • Was the source an eyewitness to an event?
  • Did the source participate in the event?
  • Was the source created by the event or in the process of the event?
Thank You!

Thank you for preparing to evaluate student work.

NHD appreciates you!

See you in June.