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.

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. Faculty Advisors are welcome to attend the judge orientation as observers.

Each judge agrees to the Judges’ Oath, committing to providing fair and quality assessments of the teams’ overall programs.

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.

Judges use the Cumulative Evaluation Form (CEF) to actually assess teams. This form serves as the guide and key deciding factor in making their final decisions on rankings.

One or more veteran judges serves as the League Coordinator. Their role is to facilitate the competition process in the league, ensuring that the team presentations begin on time and that all judges are present for all the presentations. Judges must be present for all presentations in order for their votes to be counted during the scoring process.
At the conclusion of the last presentation, judges cast their votes based on their rankings on the CEF. 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. No ties are allowed. Enactus utilizes a uniform tiebreaking process globally should a tie occur.

1. First, judges vote between the tied teams only. No conversation or debate should take place among the judges. If the tie is broken, no additional actions are needed. Scoring is complete.
2. Second, League Coordinator(s) and/or Enactus staff members review the total number of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, etc. votes until one of the tied teams has a higher number of votes in the higher ranking slot. If the tie is broken, no additional actions are needed. Scoring is complete.
3. Third, League Coordinator(s) and/or Enactus staff members explain to the judges that they will be permitted to discuss and deliberate for up to 10 minutes on which of the tied teams should be higher ranked. After 10 minutes (or sooner if the discussion has concluded) the Enactus staff member and League Coordinator will lead a re-vote between the tied teams. Scoring is complete when no ties remain.

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. Please see the tie-breaking process for exceptions to this policy.
- 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 using an official scoring process and score verification grid provided by Enactus.

Assessment Definitions
- INSUFFICIENT (equivalent to no impact): No evidence of activity, no connection to sustainable change.
- FAIR (equivalent to low impact): Some evidence of activity, but little connection to sustainable change.
- GOOD (equivalent to medium impact): Evidence of activity, with some connection to sustainable change.
- VERY GOOD (equivalent to high impact): Evidence of activity, that drives business and innovation to sustainable, positive impact.
- EXCELLENT (equivalent to exceptional impact): Clear evidence of activity, leading to systematic/habitual change that has significantly driven business and innovation to sustainable, positive impact.

**PREPARATION TIPS**

**Understand the Judging Criterion**
Before you start working on your presentation make sure that you fully understand what you will be evaluated on during the competition! Review the relevant resources provided by your country office. Remember that we only have ONE holistic judging criterion and your goal is to show how your team has best met that overall criterion.

**Know the Expectations of the Judges**
Study the Judge Reference Materials (including the Judge Orientation Video). Numerous tools and resources are available to help you understand competition from the perspective of a judge.

**Use the Language & Structure of the Individual Team Evaluation Form (ITEF)**
Consider integrating some of the language used on the ITEF into your presentation script. Also consider using a presentation structure which is linked to the judging elements on the ITEF. This may create a better and more fluid presentation, making it easier for the judges to follow your story in a logical and organized manner.

**Focus on Outcomes!**
Enactus competitions are about results achieved in the field. Make sure you show how your projects demonstrate sustainable positive impact to benefit people, planet and prosperity within the last year.

**But...Explain Your Method**
However, you do need to spend time explaining how you arrived at those outcomes. The judging criterion encompasses several essential elements that should be featured in any successful project. Judges want to hear what strategy (and/or tactics) you employed and which evaluation tools you used to successfully conduct your projects and track impact.