



POETRY OUT LOUD

JUDGE'S GUIDE 2018-2019

www.poetryoutloud.org

[f /PoetryOutLoud](#) | [@PoetryOutLoud](#) | [/PoetryOutLoudVideos](#) | [/PoetryOutLoud_POL](#)

CONTENTS

1. [Program Overview](#)
2. [Judge Preparation](#)
3. [Day of Competition](#)
4. [Evaluation Criteria](#)
5. [Tips for Judges](#)
6. [Contest Evaluation Sheet](#)
7. [Poetry Out Loud Scoring Rubric](#)
8. [Role of Accuracy Judge](#)
9. [Accuracy Score Sheet](#)
10. [Conflict of Interest](#)

Credits and Acknowledgments

1. Program Overview

[Poetry Out Loud](#) is a national recitation competition for high school students created by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Poetry Foundation in partnership with U.S. state and jurisdictional arts agencies. State arts agencies bring Poetry Out Loud to each state, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, with some 300,000 students participating last year. Since the program began in 2005, Poetry Out Loud has reached more than 3.6 million students and 60,000 teachers in 14,000 schools nationwide.

The competition begins in the classroom as students select poems to memorize and recite from the online [Poetry Out Loud anthology](#) of more than 900 classic and contemporary poems. Poetry Out Loud follows a pyramid structure. After a classroom contest, winners will advance to a school-wide competition, then to a regional and/or state competition, and ultimately to the national finals in Washington, DC. In total, Poetry Out Loud will award more than \$100,000 to state- and national-level winners and their schools.

About Judging

Judging recitations is one of the most important roles in Poetry Out Loud. Teachers, parents, state arts agency staff, and volunteers—not to mention the students themselves—have dedicated many hours to coaching, practicing, promoting, and planning. The integrity of the contest rests on the work of judges at each and every level of competition.

Judges will find themselves weighing very different recitations, and will need to measure accurately the strengths and weaknesses of each according to the Poetry Out Loud evaluation criteria. The process happens very quickly; judges will have no more than a minute between recitations to mark their scores. Familiarity with the evaluation criteria and advance preparation is essential.

2. Judge Preparation

The contest organizer will provide you with a variety of materials in advance of the competition to help you prepare for your role as judge. Review all materials and become comfortable with the judging process before you arrive at the event. If there is a conference call or judges' orientation, please put this on your calendar and take part.

To best prepare for judging a Poetry Out Loud recitation contest, here are a few things you should do:

- ❑ **Be sensitive to conflicts of interest.** Consider whether you may have an actual or perceived conflict of interest with any of the participating students or schools. If so, notify the event coordinator immediately. (See pg. 13 for more details.)
- ❑ **Familiarize yourself with the evaluation criteria and scoring rubric.** Review this Judge's Guide thoroughly and ask questions of the contest organizer if anything seems unclear to you.
- ❑ **Watch the Learning Recitation videos on the Poetry Out Loud website.** The [featured recitations](#) are ones that scored highly at the National Finals, and provide a good model of what an excellent recitation looks like. Read the text that accompanies the videos, as it will provide you with some insight about the strengths of each performance. (For more video examples, visit our [Poetry Out Loud YouTube channel](#).)
- ❑ **Practice scoring.** The scoring process is quick during an actual competition. You will have less than a minute after each recitation to make your decisions and mark scores. Use copies of the contest evaluation sheet and online video examples to practice scoring the recitations in real time. Don't allow yourself more than 45 seconds or so to mark your ballot.
- ❑ **Read and study the poems the students will recite.** You will receive a list and/or a notebook of the students' selected poems in the weeks before the competition. Read them over and consider each poem's content, language, and length. If you have read the poems ahead of time, you will have a much better standpoint from which to judge the recitations. Some judges find it helpful to read the students' selected poems aloud beforehand.
- ❑ **Participate in any scheduled orientation.** Many states will hold a conference call orientation for judges about one or two weeks before the competition. Please mark your calendars and plan to join the session—it's a good time to ask questions of the organizer and your fellow judges.

3. Day of Competition

- When you arrive at the contest, find the event coordinator and check in. Judges will be seated together in a designated area separated from the contestants and audience members.
- To avoid the potential appearance of a conflict of interest, do not socialize with students, teachers, or parents prior to or during the competition.
- Once you are seated, you will receive a stack of contest evaluation sheets already personalized with the competitors' names and poems, in the order of recitation.
- When the contest begins, students will take turns reciting poems, each reciting one poem in each round of competition. The number of rounds in the competition will vary based on the level of competition.
- Complete your contest evaluation sheet directly after the student recites. Circle one number for each element of the evaluation criteria. Score independently, exclusively based on merit. No other considerations should influence your decision.
- You do not need to tally scores yourself. You will not be able to convene or discuss scores with other judges during the competition. Nor can you revisit scores. Once you pass them in, the scores stand. Scoring is cumulative; the scores from each round will be totaled to determine the winner.
- There will be a prompter directly in front of center stage, in case a student forgets a line. Use of the prompter will primarily affect the student's accuracy score, but their struggle to remember their poem might also influence their "overall performance" score.

4. Evaluation Criteria

Judging a Poetry Out Loud contest differs in several important ways from judging a poetry slam or original poetry contest. Students' recitations must be assessed according to the Poetry Out Loud evaluation criteria, outlined below. Poetry Out Loud contestants recite poems written by others, so it is important that they convey a tone and mood appropriate to the selected work.

The following explains the evaluation criteria used for scoring recitations. Strong recitations will reflect excellence in each area. The scoring rubric on page 9 will help you understand exactly how this information applies to your score.

PHYSICAL PRESENCE

Consider the student's body language and stage presence.

The student should be poised—but not artificially so—projecting ease and confidence by his or her physical presence. This is an important category, but also one of the easiest to rate. A weaker performance may be one in which the student displays nervous gestures or appears stiff and uncomfortable with the audience.

VOICE AND ARTICULATION

Consider the student's volume, pace, intonation, rhythm, and proper pronunciation.

The student should be clear and loud enough to capture the audience's attention, but watch out for students who mistake projection for yelling or communicate passion by shouting. Any changes in tone should be appropriate to the subject matter. Students should proceed at a fitting and natural pace, not speaking too quickly from nervousness. Students should correctly pronounce every word in the poem. With rhymed poems, or with poems with a regular meter, students should be careful to not fall into a singsong rhythm. Decide whether the pauses come in suitable places for the poem. A recitation that is mumbling, inaudible, or monotone will obscure a poem's meaning for the audience.

DRAMATIC APPROPRIATENESS

Consider whether the student's interpretative and performance choices enhance the audience's understanding and enjoyment of the poem without overshadowing the poem's language.

This category evaluates the interpretive and performance choices made by the student. A strong recitation will rely on a powerful internalization of the poem rather than distracting gestures or unnecessary emoting. The [videos of student recitations available at poetryoutloud.org](https://www.poetryoutloud.org) and on our [Poetry Out Loud YouTube channel](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC...) will help illustrate this point. Low scores in this category should result from recitations that have an affected pitch, character voices, singing, inappropriate tone, distracting or excessive gestures, or unnecessary emoting.

EVIDENCE OF UNDERSTANDING

Consider the student’s use of intonation, emphasis, tone, and style of delivery.

“Evidence of understanding” measures a student’s comprehension and mastery of a poem. How well does the student interpret the poem for the audience? Does the student make difficult lines clearer? Does the student communicate the correct tone of the poem—angst, dry humor, ambivalence? The poet’s words should take precedence, and the student who understands the poem best will be able to voice it in a way that helps the audience to understand the poem better. Students should demonstrate that they know the meaning of every line and every word of the poem through the way these elements are handled.

In a strong recitation, the meaning of the poem will be powerfully and clearly conveyed to the audience. The student will offer an interpretation that deepens and enlivens the poem. Meaning, messages, allusions, irony, shifts of tone, and other nuances will be captured by the performance. A great performer may even make the audience see a poem in a new way. A low score should be awarded if the interpretation obscures the meaning of the poem.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

Consider whether the student’s physical presence, voice and articulation, dramatic appropriateness, and evidence of understanding all seem on target and unified to breathe life into the poem.

“Overall performance” is worth more than other categories, with the value up to nine points. This category evaluates the total success of the performance, the degree to which the recitation has become more than the sum of its parts. Has the student captivated their audience with the language of the poem? Did the student bring the audience to a better understanding of the poem?

Use this score to measure how impressed you were by the recitation, and whether the recitation has honored the poem. You may also consider the diversity of a student’s recitations with this score. If a student seems to be stuck using the same style of delivery with each of their poems, that may be evidence that they’ve not taken the time to consider each poem individually. In addition to range, judges should consider the complexity of the poem, which is a combination of its content, language, and length—bearing in mind that a longer poem is not necessarily a more complex one. A low score should be awarded for recitations that are poorly presented, ineffective in conveying the meaning of the poem, or conveyed in a manner inappropriate to the poem.

5. TIPS FOR JUDGES

- For each of the evaluation criteria, a solid performance scores a 4 (or 5 for overall performance); please keep this in mind as you are scoring the first-round of recitations. You would not want to score higher or lower than the student deserves, as these early scores will set your standard for the rest of the competition.
- A score of 9 for overall performance is generally very rare. Save this for truly exceptional recitations.
- Be sure you score each category separately and carefully—you should not find yourself circling all 3's, for instance.
- Before you pass in your scores, double check you have circled a number in each category. It is easy to skip a line while judging so many recitations quickly!
- If you happen to dislike the work of a particular poet, please keep a fresh and objective perspective while scoring a recitation of one of his/her poems.
- While proper pronunciation is key to the “voice and articulation” category, remember that some students may be learning English as a second language or may hail from a particular region of the state or country, and these students should not be penalized for reciting with an accent.
- Be consistent with yourself throughout the entire competition—don't decide to change your scoring style halfway through the event.
- Give each student your full attention, whether they are first or fifteenth.
- Enjoy the company of your fellow judges before and after the competition; however, during the event, please don't converse.
- If you see a student competitor after the event, offer encouraging feedback and avoid comparing one student to another.

6. Contest Evaluation Sheet

Name of Student:

Title of Poem:

	Weak	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Physical Presence	1	2	3	4	5	6
Voice and Articulation	1	2	3	4	5	6
Dramatic Appropriateness	1	2	3	4	5	6
Evidence of Understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6
Overall Performance	1	2	3	5	7	9

TOTAL:

(MAXIMUM of 33 points)

ACCURACY JUDGE'S SCORE:

(MAXIMUM of 8 points)

FINAL SCORE:

(MAXIMUM OF 41 POINTS)

7. Poetry Out Loud Scoring Rubric*

The scoring rubric is meant to provide a consistent measure against which to evaluate recitations. It is not intended to be comprehensive but serves as a companion to the evaluation criteria. We suggest you review it before the competition to get a sense of what you should look for in individual performances. The rubric, Judge's Guide, and [model recitations](#) are tools to use in preparation for judging.

	Weak	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Physical Presence	Stiff or agitated; lacks connection with audience; appears uncomfortable	Timid; unsure; body language reflects nervousness	Body language is at times unsure, at times confident	Comfortable; confident body language	Poised; body language reveals strong stage presence	Authoritative; body language shows compelling stage presence
Voice and Articulation	Inaudible; slow; distracting rhythm; singsong; hurried; mispronunciations	Audible, but quiet; too loud; monotone; paced unevenly; affected tone	Clear, adequate intonation, even pacing	Clear, appropriate intonation and pacing	Very clear, crisp, effective use of volume, intonation, rhythm, and pacing	Very clear, crisp, mastery of rhythm and pace, skillful use of volume and intonation
Dramatic Appropriateness	Poem is overshadowed by significant distracting gestures, facial expressions, inflections or accents; acting out of poem; singing; over-emoting; inappropriate tone	Poem is secondary to style of delivery; includes instances of distracting gestures, facial expressions, and vocal inflections; inappropriate tone	Poem is neither overwhelmed nor enhanced by style of delivery	Poem is enhanced by style of delivery; any gestures, facial expressions, and movement are appropriate to poem	Style of delivery reflects precedence of poem; poem's voice is well conveyed	Style of delivery reflects internalization of poem; all gestures and movements feel essential to poem's success
Evidence of Understanding	Obscures meaning of poem	Doesn't sufficiently communicate meaning of poem	Satisfactorily communicates meaning of poem	Conveys meaning of poem well	Interprets poem very well for audience; nuanced	Masterfully interprets poem for audience, deftly revealing poem's meaning
Overall Performance (Consider poem complexity in this category)	Ineffective or inappropriate recitation; does disservice to poem	Inadequate recitation; lackluster; does disservice to poem	Sufficient recitation; lacks meaningful impact on audience	Enjoyable recitation; successfully delivers poem	Inspired performance shows grasp of recitation skills and enhances audience's experience of the poem	Captivating performance—whole equals “more than the sum of the parts”; shows mastery of recitation skills

*Note that all elements need not be present. Semicolons often represent “or,” especially in the negative categories.

8. Role of Accuracy Judge

Each panel of judges has only one accuracy judge—other judges need not concern themselves with this category. Accuracy is the first element of a recitation—the most basic task for the student is to keep the poet’s language intact for the audience. Given that accuracy is the foundation of a good recitation, serving as an accuracy judge is a critical component of the evaluation process.

The accuracy judge will have a binder with all poems in the order they will be recited. (Students will use the version of poems in the [Poetry Out Loud anthology](#).) The accuracy judge will have an assigned seat with the other judges in a location where he or she can both read the text and hear the recitations.

During the competition, students will begin each recitation with the title of the poem and the name of the poet (both must be accurate).

- Epigraphs included with the poem in the Poetry Out Loud anthology should be recited, and their omission will affect the accuracy score.
- Footnotes included with the poem in the Poetry Out Loud anthology should not be recited, and their inclusion will affect the accuracy score.
- Reciting stanza numbers and dedications is optional.
- A student’s own editorial comments before or after the poem are not allowed. However, the addition of a “*thank you*” at the end of the recitation, while discouraged, should not affect the accuracy score.
- Students must include the name of the translator, if applicable.
- The poem must be delivered from memory.

The accuracy judge will work independently, following the text of the poem as the student recites. It is essential that the poem be recited for the audience as written, word for word. After each recitation, the accuracy judge’s score sheet will be collected. The score tabulator will add the accuracy judge’s score to all contest evaluation sheets for each recitation.

Instructions for scoring accuracy: mark the text each time there is an error in accuracy. You should mark all minor inaccuracies the same (since each is worth a 1 point deduction) and flag the bigger mistakes differently. After the recitation, use the guidance on the accuracy score sheet to assign a point deduction to each mistake. To get the final accuracy score, count up the point deductions, and subtract them from the maximum accuracy score of 8 points. The minimum accuracy score is one point.

Example: If the competitor repeated a word (-1 point), confused an article (-1 point), and skipped one line (-3 points), that would be 5 points subtracted from the maximum score of 8. The final accuracy score would be 3 points.

9. Accuracy Score Sheet

Name of Student:

Title of Poem:

Maximum Score 8 points

Inaccuracy Deduction (subtract) - ____ points

Prompt Deduction (subtract) - ____ points

FINAL ACCURACY SCORE ____ points*

*Lowest possible score is 1 point

Minor inaccuracies, resulting in a 1 point deduction per occurrence, include:

- Confusing a pronoun (“he” instead of “she”)
- Confusing an article (“a” instead of “the”)
- Pluralizing a word or vice versa (“horses” instead of “horse”)
- Replacing a word with a similar word (“jump” instead of “leap”)
- Confusing the order of words (“hops and skips” instead of “skips and hops”)
- Skipping a word
- Repeating a word
- Adding a word
- Omitting the poem title
- Omitting the author
- Omitting the translator

Major inaccuracies, resulting in larger deductions per occurrence, include:

- One line out of order -2 points
- Repeating a line -2 points
- Omitting an epigraph -2 points
- Including a footnote -2 points
- Skipped one line/skipped three or more words in the same line -3 points
- Reversed two stanzas -5 points
- Skipped one stanza -6 points

Use of prompter: Each time a student uses the prompter, 3 points will be deducted from the final accuracy score.

10. Conflict of Interest

If you feel you may have a conflict of interest, please speak up—the earlier the better. Disclosure of any potential conflicts of interest (or the appearance of conflicts of interest) will help organizers to preserve the integrity of the contest and make it fair for all students.

Potential conflicts of interest include:

- Relative or friend of one of the contestants or of a contestant's parent or teacher
- Teacher or coach of one of the contestants (at regional, state, or national level)
- Alumni of represented school (at regional, state, or national level)
- Poet whose work appears in anthology

If you have any questions about this, please ask your contest organizer.

Credits and Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge all state arts agencies, assessment experts, students, and teachers for their assistance in helping us shape and test this guide.

Thanks most of all to the judges for their time, expertise, and dedication.

We appreciate your feedback to improve this guide and the judging process. Please send comments to poetryoutloud@arts.gov.



Established by Congress in 1965, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is the independent federal agency whose funding and support gives Americans the opportunity to participate in the arts, exercise their imaginations, and develop their creative capacities. Through partnerships with state arts agencies, local leaders, other federal agencies, and the philanthropic sector, the NEA supports arts learning, affirms and celebrates America's rich and diverse cultural heritage, and extends its work to promote equal access to the arts in every community across America. Visit arts.gov to learn more about the NEA.



The Poetry Foundation, publisher of *Poetry* magazine, is an independent literary organization committed to a vigorous presence for poetry in our culture. It has embarked on an ambitious plan to bring the best poetry before the largest possible audience. The Poetry Foundation seeks to be a leader in shaping a receptive climate for poetry by developing new audiences, creating new avenues for delivery, and encouraging new kinds of poetry through innovative partnerships, prizes, and programs.

Poetry Out Loud: National Recitation Contest is a partnership of the National Endowment for the Arts, the Poetry Foundation, and the State and Jurisdictional Arts Agencies of the United States.