

AMERICAN PHILATELIC SOCIETY

Committee for National Exhibitions and Judges



MANUAL OF

Literature Judging & Exhibiting

COMMITTEE FOR NATIONAL EXHIBITIONS AND JUDGES

Literature Exhibiting & Judging

This manual applies to USA WSP literature exhibitions only. International, regional, and local exhibitions are not part of the APS WSP system and may have different rules and requirements for exhibitors. Always read the show prospectus thoroughly.

AUGUST 2021

© American Philatelic Society
100 Match Factory Place
Bellefonte, PA

Table of Contents

Foreword	4
Introduction to the Second Edition	5
Chapter 1: What is Philatelic Literature and Why Is It Judged	6
Chapter 2: Types of Literature Competition	8
Chapter 3: Literature Categories Accepted for Judging and Eligibility Requirements	9
Chapter 4: Responsibilities of the Exhibitor & the Synopsis	12
Chapter 5: Overview of the Judging Criteria for Literature	14
Chapter 6: Notes on Judging Philatelic Books, Compendiums, Handbooks and Monographs	17
Chapter 7: Notes on Judging Philatelic Society Periodicals and Journals.....	18
Chapter 8: Notes on Judging Catalogs	20
Chapter 9: Notes on Judging Philatelic Columns and Articles	22
Chapter 10: Notes on Judging Digital Entries	24
Chapter 11: Notes on Judging Electronic Media: Websites, Blogs, and Message Boards	26
Chapter 12: Mechanics of Judging; Using the LEEF	29
Chapter 13: The Role of the Literature Jury Chair	34
Chapter 14: Medal Levels and the Use of Points	41
Chapter 15: Requirements for a WSP Show to Receive Permission to Hold an APS Literature Competition	43
Chapter 16: How to Become an Accredited Literature Judge	45
Chapter 17: How to Become an Accredited Literature Jury Chair	48
Appendix A: APS Open Literature Exhibit Evaluation Form (LEEF)	49
Appendix B: APS “Articles Only” Literature Exhibit Evaluation Form (LEEF)	50
Appendix C: Glossary	51
Appendix D: Administration:	52
CANEJ and its Responsibilities	
The Characteristics and Ethics of Being a Judge	
Maintaining Accreditation	
Literature Judging In Canada	
International Judging	

Foreword

Since the publication of the first edition of this manual and the additional decisions of the Committee on Accreditation of National Exhibitions and Judges (CANEJ) broadening literature categories and providing for a wider variety of non-traditional literature competitions, we have seen an expansion and new interest in literature exhibits. While this manual is primarily to provide guidance to shows and judges, we hope that it will also help producers of philatelic literature in all its forms to better understand the criteria by which it is judged.

This manual does borrow one section from the MPJE7 that does not change much from judging philatelic exhibits to judging literature exhibits, and that is Appendix D: Administration, which discusses CANEJ and the philosophy of judging. It is shortened as some parts do not apply to literature; but I want to thank the MPJE team headed by Dr. Edwin Andrews for the work that went into Appendix D.

Early iterations of the MPJ, prior to the widespread use of computers, covered only print media. However, the term “publication” has a broadened definition today:

“pub·li·ca·tion (pūb’lī-kā’shən) *n.* 1. The act or process of publishing matter in print or electronic form. 2. An issue of printed or electronic matter, such as a book or magazine, offered for distribution or sale. 3. Communication of information to the public: the publication of the latest unemployment figures.” [*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, (New College Edition), 1976, William Morris, Editor, Houghton Mifflin Co, Boston]

Since the publication of the first edition, philatelic use of digital media has increased dramatically. This new edition takes the distinction of electronic and print even further with new judging criteria. The technology of electronic media has evolved to a point where additional categories need to be included, and additional guidance for judges is essential.

Another concern to CANEJ had been the reduction in the number of yearly literature competitions; partially the result of costs, and partially the result of restrictive rules that have discouraged entries. This has been partially alleviated by the addition of “Articles Only” literature exhibits. These exhibits have been able to reduce costs to the sponsoring organization and broaden participation.

We present this manual, not as the last word, but rather as the next logical step in the evolution of philatelic literature exhibiting and judging. It presents the exhibition rules and authors’ guidelines as they are today. As technology and philatelic scholarship (and entertainment) continue to move forward, this manual will become a building block for the future. For that reason, we encourage readers and users of this manual to propose improvements and ideas. Input should be addressed to the Chair of CANEJ, who can always be contacted via the APS website (www.stamps.org).

The most current version of this manual will always be found on the APS website. If you are reading this as a hard copy, please keep in mind that changes may have been made since your copy was printed. The Title Page will provide the effective date of the most current version.

Finally, on behalf of the Committee I want to thank Richard E. Drews, who developed many of the new concepts included herein, and John M. Hotchner, a past CANEJ Chair, who with Rich did most of the drafting of the first edition and to Bill DiPaolo for his work on the second edition. Recognition should also go to the late Charles J. Peterson, the guiding light of American philatelic literature in the 20th Century, and the author of most of the materials that provided the underpinnings of literature judging on which Rich, John and Bill have built.

Elizabeth Hisey
CANEJ Chair, 2021

Introduction to the Second Edition

As with the first edition, the intent is to provide an improved guidance document, built upon the experience of the last five years, for shows wishing to hold literature events, literature judges and those wishing to become literature judges. It is also intended to be a useful tool for authors, editors, publishers, webmasters and other personnel involved in producing philatelic literature.

This effort outlines additional changes in philatelic literature judging. Among the major changes the reader will find in the following pages are:

- Redefines categories eligible for open and “articles only” literature exhibits.
- More complete information about the new “articles only” exhibits that can be held at WSP shows
- A new Literature Exhibit Evaluation Form (LEEF) for open literature exhibits.
- A new Literature Evaluation Form (LEEF) for “articles only” literature exhibits.
- Explanation of the point realignment for judging literature entries.
- Providing more detailed guidance for judging each category of philatelic literature and

aligning it with the categories of evaluation on the Literature Exhibit Evaluation Form (LEEF).

- More detailed guidance for evaluating entries submitted electronically including society journals.

The capabilities of the computer and the advantages of an ever-growing Internet have dramatically increased the accessibility of philatelic literature, allowing all of us to build better collections and exhibits. It is a continuing, growing influence on the literature of our hobby and so our literature exhibitions must continue to reflect these changes.

Thanks to CANEJ and the APS Board welcoming the changes required to manage the changing literature landscape. And to Richard E. Drews, Palatine, IL and to John M. Hotchner, Falls Church, VA who took on the immense task of creating the first edition, making the second an easy piggyback ride. They both reviewed and offered helpful input for this edition as well.

Bill DiPaolo
University Park, FL
2021

What is Philatelic Literature and Why is It Judged?

Philatelic Literature is the record of the existence, knowledge, and accomplishments of the hobby, the questions that occupy philatelists, and the results of research and scholarship in the diverse collecting areas that give the hobby its breadth and depth. It constitutes the permanent record of where we originated, how we have progressed, and opinions on where we believe we are going. It also gives us the knowledge base on the philatelic material we collect and study. As such, it is a vital aspect of the hobby and one that is deserving of encouragement.

The purpose of holding philatelic literature competitions is to encourage, support, evaluate, and improve philatelic publications, regardless of length or method of presentation and distribution.

Encouragement consists of both recognition of excellence and feedback aimed at helping authors and editors to produce an even better product. These are the objectives of the process of literature exhibiting and judging. The role of the judge is to coach the exhibitor toward reaching the goals the exhibitor seeks. The primary method is through written feedback.

Philatelic literature may be in the form of print or electronic media. Philatelic literature as printed hard copy has a long and honorable history. Judging it also has a long and established history that will be reflected in this manual. But electronic media as a category is relatively new on the philatelic scene, and has had a huge effect on publishing and access to information.

The world continues to migrate to the Internet and digital technology. If philately is to be at all relevant, it needs to be on the web, and we need to be equipped to understand and use it whether on websites, blogs or message boards. We also need to be able to judge it and provide feedback on it to assist its producers to improve their products.

Electronic devices are increasingly the media used to read published works, view philatelic presentations, Facebook, YouTube, web sites, digitized books and articles. It is not adequate that such media simply replace hard copy. Literature that

presents itself electronically needs to exploit the opportunities that such media present to be more useful.

The goal of this manual is to encourage the exhibitor to continue to produce and improve. This is especially true of the periodical writers and editors, who have deadlines to meet, often without the recognition given to a book author, who gives birth to a magnum opus and can savor that accomplishment for years.

Feedback is useful in inverse proportion to the level of formal presentation. In other words, a printed and bound volume will not benefit from suggestions for improvement unless and until a revision is undertaken (though critique may be useful to an author planning future work.) For electronic entries, as a website or digital media, there can be immediate benefit from well-considered feedback.

All entries can benefit from the recognition inherent in receiving a medal, which can lend credence to the value of the entry and its sponsoring organization. That can be a factor in the decision of the target audience to buy the product, encourage wider awareness of the work and provide an opportunity to recognize those who produced it and serve as a basis for publicity releases.

Competitive exhibitions, while providing recognition in the form of awards, are not the only method of receiving useful feedback. Mentoring, especially as a work is being developed, has an important place in the support system for authors and editors. Mentoring is available from judges whom the author/editor may know, from the APS Writers Unit, and from writers' forums that are offered at WSP shows.

Exhibiting literature helps promote a specialty society and shows and shares discoveries and scholarship with others. It also gets publicity to help sell the publication. In that regard, the entry will be listed in both the show program, with information on how to obtain it, and the show palmares. The palmares will usually be reprinted in the *Philatelic Literature Review* of the American Philatelic Research Library, and in *The Philatelic Communicator* of the APS [Writers Unit 30](#).

Types of Literature Competition

Philatelic literature may be entered for judging and exhibition at APS nationally accredited World Series of Philately (WSP) philatelic exhibitions. There are four types of literature competition currently permitted; exceptions are possible but require the approval of CANEJ:

1. **Open Literature Competitions** held at larger national WSP shows. A new alternative is that WSP shows may opt to hold a Literature Competition every second year, with the permission of CANEJ and the APS Board
2. **“Articles Only” Literature Competitions** restricted to articles of 8,000 words or less held at national WSP shows. Shows may opt to hold a Literature Competition every second year, with the permission of CANEJ and the APS Board
3. **Regional Sharing of a Literature Competition.** Another acceptable alternative would be for shows that are geographically close to alternate holding a literature competition.
4. **One-time Literature Competitions** limited to the literature of a given specialty area when a society with over 500 members (e.g., The China Stamp Society, The U.S. Stamp Society) is holding its annual convention at a WSP show; so long as that show is not running a competition of types (1.) to (3.). A WSP show may schedule such a competition with the approval of CANEJ if submitted for approval at least 14 months ahead of the projected show dates. Publication date restrictions (See [Chapter 3](#)) for entries in this class may be twice the length of time stated for other types of show.

WSP shows that wish to hold a literature competition must certify in writing to CANEJ that they will adhere faithfully to the requirements for APS literature competitions set forth in [Chapter 12](#). Should a show decide to offer both an open and “articles only” exhibition, two separate juries would be required. CANEJ may grant an exception to this requirement dependent on circumstances.

Literature Categories Accepted for Judging and Eligibility Requirements

OPEN LITERATURE COMPETITION

The following categories are accepted for judging, whether in hard copy, via electronic media, or in combination:

1. *Philatelic books, compendiums, handbooks and monographs.* (A “compendium” is a concise, yet comprehensive compilation of a body of knowledge, usually gathered from several sources.) Release date should be within the 24 months prior to the show at which the competition is taking place.
2. *Philatelic society journals, periodicals (including philatelic study group bulletins).* Release date should be within the 18 months prior to the show at which the competition is taking place, and a full year of the publication (not necessarily a calendar year) should be provided.
3. *Catalogs (both specialized and/or priced philatelic catalogs and auction catalog formats).* Release date should be within the 18 months prior to the show at which the competition is taking place.
4. *Monographs in excess of 8,000 words* published within the 24 months prior to the show at which the competition is taking place.
5. *Websites, digital media, blogs, and message boards* that either stand alone or are an adjunct to one of the above categories. Websites, blogs and message boards are evaluated as they appear prior to the show; normally a month or so before the show. Release date of digital media, should be within a year of the date of application.

ARTICLES ONLY COMPETITION

The following categories are accepted for judging, whether as hard copy, via electronic media or in combination:

1. Philatelic columns by a regular columnist in the philatelic or non-philatelic press

that appear at least quarterly. Entries should consist of all four most recently published columns for quarterlies, all six most recently published columns for bimonthlies, at least eight of the last 12 columns for monthlies, or 20–25 representative columns for weeklies.

2. Individual articles or short series of articles on a single theme. Total words, excluding captions and notes, cannot exceed 8,000 words. Release date should be within the prior 24 months from the date of the show.

ONE TIME LITERATURE COMPETITIONS

For one time literature exhibits, sponsored by a single philatelic society, all classes of literature would be permitted. Publication dates may be extended to 2 times that allowed in other competitions.

FOR ALL LITERATURE COMPETITIONS

Who May Submit Entries

Authors, editors, publishers, sponsoring organizations, and website webmasters may enter their work in literature competitions.

Language

To assure a meaningful and equitable evaluation, literature must be primarily in English because literature in other languages cannot be fairly judged, with the following exceptions:

- Bilingual publications (English and another language presented co-equally) may be accepted.
- Foreign language entries may be accepted in One Time Exhibitions if at least one member of the jury is competent in the language of the specialty.
- Catalogs (as defined in [Chapter 3](#)) in a primary language other than English may be accepted, providing they contain introductory material sufficient to allow an English-speaking user to interpret and understand most of the information contained therein.

Exclusions

Club newsletters and websites are not accepted for competition under these CANEJ rules because the APS Star Route Awards are yearly competitions for both categories in which entries are judged and awarded medals, and feedback is provided. Articles from club newsletters can be entered in “articles only” exhibitions.

Late Entries

An item in the process of being published is sometimes accepted by show committees conditional upon it being available to be sent to the jury at least six weeks ahead of the show. Given the need to read and assess not just these entries and all others, and discuss them and arrive at a medal level, literature promised but not received by this deadline will be disqualified.

Disqualification by the Jury

Acceptance of a literature entry by the show committee will normally mean that the entry will be judged. However, the jury in its collective judgment may decline to judge an entry that it believes does not meet the requirements in this manual or the requirements for entry as defined in the show prospectus.

Non-Competitive Entries

Non-competitive entries may be accepted by the show committee at its discretion for display with the competitive entries, but they will not be eligible for awards.

Responsibilities of the Exhibitor and the Synopsis

Responsibilities of the Exhibitor

- Read and understand the instructions in the show prospectus.
- Apply to enter your philatelic literature exhibit before the deadline, using the application form provided by the show, together with any applicable fees.
- Complete and send a synopsis page (no more than 1–2 pages) for your entry, preferably with your entry form. Revisions are accepted up to 30 days before the show: preferably by email. The synopsis is a requirement for entry.
- When notified of acceptance, send the required number of copies of your entry to arrive by the date specified and in the format requested
- Attend the show if you can, so that you benefit from face-to-face feedback from the judges.

Synopsis Page Form and Content

“Synopsis” has become the term of choice to label the supplemental notes for the judges. It is required for each entry because it provides information essential to the thorough and fair evaluation of your entry and helps the judges provide relevant feedback. The foundation for the judges’ understanding of the exhibit is provided by the exhibitor’s synopsis; which is to be submitted with the competition entry form. It is incumbent on the exhibitors, using the synopsis, to tell the judges what the objectives were for creation of their entry, and to provide such other information responsive to the evaluation criteria in the LEEF as the entrant believes will promote understanding of the entry’s accomplishments, challenges to overcome, and improvements since prior competition entries.

It can be particularly important for society journal entries to outline changes that were recommended from past submissions.

Some guidelines for synopsis page preparation:

- Use the same title as you use in the show entry form, and make sure that both match the title on the entry.

- Date the synopsis, and any revisions so as to prevent confusion as to which is the current version.
- Organize and label the synopsis page entries in line with the judging criteria as stated in the LEEF (See [Appendix A & B](#)). Since these are the judging criteria, you have the opportunity to tell the judges why you think your entry should be highly rated.
- Emphasize how your entry meets the needs of the target audience; and the ways in which it provides new or formerly dispersed information.
- Highlight any special challenges you overcame to produce your entry.

Overview of the Judging Criteria for Literature

Literature exhibits are evaluated according to the following broad criteria and weights, which are more fully explained below:

Judging Criteria		
Treatment	<i>What is said and how</i>	30%
Originality, Significance, Research	<i>New information, conclusions, ap-</i>	50%
Technical	<i>How easy to use.</i>	15%
Production	<i>How well it is made.</i>	5%

These criteria and weights align APS literature judging with the FIP and the worldwide philatelic community. They are applicable regardless of medium, although as evident from the discussions in Chapters 6–11, they may have different elements appropriate to the medium being evaluated.

Literature Exhibit Evaluation Forms are included in this manual as Appendix A and B, and available electronically on the APS website, www.stamps.org.

It is important to understand that every entry is evaluated for points (just as in the case of philatelic exhibits) against the standard: “Is it the Best it Can Be?” in its category. Furthermore, entries are not in competition with each other until special awards are determined. Nor should the entries in one category be evaluated using the standards for another category. There was a time when judging started from the assumption that only a scholarly book could earn a Gold medal. This is no longer the case. In practice, what this means is that attaining a Gold medal is possible in every category, but only when an entry is the best it can be against objective criteria.

Additional notes for consideration as the specific categories of literature are judged are provided in the following chapters, but the basics to look for in each judging criterion are provided below:

Treatment (of contents) or “Authorship and Editorship” 30%

The Content

- Are the goals of the work clearly stated? How well does the work meet those goals?
- Is the scope large and complex, or relatively simple and less demanding?
- Thoroughness of subject treatment
- Organization of the material — ease with which the story can be followed
- Accuracy of the information provided
- Appropriate use of illustrations, charts, graphs, tables

Literary style, clarity, and skill in communication.

- Correct grammar
- Readily understood and usable; both text and illustrative material
- Format and layout; use of titles and subtitles
- Clarity of writing; generally, avoiding overlong paragraphs and sentences
- Explains technical terminology and abbreviations that may not be familiar to the reader
- Use of electronic media as an adjunct to print media

For Electronic Media:

- Utilization of features unique to electronic media
- Up-front explanation of how to use it
- Searchability
- Ease of navigation
- Logic of flow

Originality, Significance, and Research (where applicable) 50%

- Challenge the work represents in terms of its degree of difficulty
- Overall significance of the subject matter — in terms of the work to its subject, its scope, and utility to the reader/user
- Is this an update of a previously published work (and if so, how much has changed/been added), or an original effort?
- Degree to which the work displays original approaches to the subject, and discoveries, research, and analysis (where applicable)
- Scholarly integrity

Technical Matters

15%

- Title and/or introductory page content, pagination, credits, bibliography, table of contents, index, clarity of illustrations, use of QR codes, use of running headers and/or footers
- If there is advertising, is it appropriate, clear, and placed effectively?
- *For electronic media:* Ease of loading, compatibility, clarity of images, contents page, index

Production *

5%

- Binding, typography and similar production aspects relating to the usability of the publication and its long-term preservation
- Use and clarity of color
- Is print size and style appropriate?
- *For digital media:* Accurate and attractive labeling
- *For websites, blogs and message boards:* Accurate title, ease of access and use, currency of updates

**It is recognized that article authors have little control over this category. Points for articles have been adjusted accordingly on the “articles only” evaluation form (Appendix B).*

Notes on Judging Philatelic Books, Compendiums, Handbooks and Monographs

Over the years information and research about the production, varieties, and use of stamps, and the development of postal systems have been given the highest levels of recognition in philatelic literature judging. Though important contributions to our knowledge base, other reasons for producing literature should not be discounted. For example, books and other media about how to participate in the hobby, how to operate stamp clubs, exhibiting and other such references are important contributions to the development of our hobby and equally important to helping and encouraging deeper participation in the hobby.

The key is how well the entry meets a worthy challenge; whether the subject is treated thoroughly and accurately; how well it is presented; how well it serves to energize readers. In determining challenge, consider whether the work is an update of previously published work or an original effort. If the former, how old is the prior work, and how much new material has been added to the knowledge base? Has the new detail required a reorganization of the contents, offered new conclusions, a new identification system? Has rarity information provided been updated and explained?

It has happened in the past, and will again, that an exhibitor filling out an entry form will call a piece of literature a book/handbook, when it is something else. Most often this occurs with what the jury might consider to be a catalog. In general, unless a mix-up in category is clear, or the entry would fare better in a different category, such that the exhibited item must be reclassified, give the exhibitor's opinion the benefit of the doubt.

Beware of overvaluing professional production values and mistaking the weight of the book for merit. Careful attention to assigning points in each criterion will eliminate this problem.

Consider whether and how electronic media are used to supplement entries in this category. This is being done ever more frequently, and like use of color, can enhance the entry, but its absence by itself should not be reason to penalize an entry so much that it loses a medal level. Rather, it is something that could enhance a good book and keep it current.

Notes on Judging Philatelic Society Periodicals and Journals

Discussed here are the periodicals of national specialty societies, not local club newsletters, which are not eligible for entry.

When judging entries in this category, it is important to consider the overall value of the periodical to the membership. In addition to original, substantive articles, how are individual members encouraged to engage as club activists? Is there information of interest to the full range of members (from new adherents to advanced specialists)? Is information about society activities and people included? Does the journal treat the full range of material collected by members in terms of time periods, locations? Is the present state of the hobby reflected in the content as applied to the specialty represented by the periodical.

Other items that may reasonably be included in the evaluation include:

- The inclusion of a statement of purpose, in which the society specifies either the limits of its own coverage, or what it expects its publication to cover. Do the contents match the purpose? If the purpose is not stated in the journal, it should be outlined in the synopsis.
- Is there balance in the coverage, covering various periods, types of material, articles and information for both experienced specialists and beginners?
- Are there articles of various lengths on various subjects, rather than single lengthy articles more suitable for publication as a society monograph?
- Columns by officers and activity chairs that include not just pleas for help, but information about current or completed society activities. How well does the publication serve as a journal of record for the society?
- Is there a diversity of editorial viewpoint through a range of authors, or is it primarily the work of one or two individuals? It is part of the function of the editor to reach out to potential authors one on one; not passively wait for contributions.

- Does the entry cover what is happening in the wider world of philately that bears on the specialty, e.g., new literature released, specialized articles in the general philatelic press, meetings or conventions of related sister societies?
- Is there a table of contents, an annual index, membership information, contact points for officers and activity chairs?
- Is each page labeled with a running header/footer so that the source of material torn out or photocopied can be identified?
- Is information on how to join and where to get additional information presented, as copies are often passed along to non-members and put on freebie tables at stamp shows?
- Are there illustrations, photos of society activities? Are they in color, of good quality and properly labeled?
- If the journal accepts advertising, are the ads well laid out with an index of advertisers? Are ad rates provided?
- Is the journal inviting: neat, well laid-out, with readable text?

Consider whether and how electronic media is used to supplement the journal. Often these entries are produced quarterly, which means that essential information about officer contacts, society activities, etc. may change between issues, and an up-to-date society website, if promoted in the journal, can help to bridge that gap. In addition, elements that a judge might expect to find in the society journal may be presented on the website instead (e.g., yearly index, members' auction, and freeing up space for more substantive content. *As a matter of routine, judges should review the organization's web site to ascertain if some of these elements are present.*

Some societies may have elected to devote journal space almost exclusively to editorial material about the specialty served and forgo detailed information of member activities, particularly if such information is available on a web site. If that is the case, it must be clearly stated in the synopsis so that those factors are not included in the evaluation. The same is true for those societies that choose to post the publication index online rather than in the journal.

See additional information about judging society journals that are submitted digitally in [Chapter 10](#).

Notes on Judging Catalogs

General and specialized catalogs, as well as many auction catalogs, are widely recognized as essential references and tools of philately because they tell us what exists. All can be evaluated using the same criteria as for any other form of literature; notably treatment of contents, originality, significance and depth of coverage, utility to the user (technical matters and production values.). Auction catalogs should normally be entered with prices realized, because that information is an essential part of the long-term value of the catalog.

Other judging considerations include:

- How is the catalog organized (e.g., chronological, by subject, alphabetically), and is it appropriate for the material?
- What do general catalogs choose to leave out and how does that affect utility to the general collector?
- Are specialized catalogs thorough in covering the subject? Do they go beyond what is available in standard general catalogs, both in what is covered, and the depth of coverage?
- To what extent do priced philatelic catalogs/auction catalogs cover the breadth of the collecting area? In other words, is the material presented a first-class overview, or a sparse representation of what exists? For specialized catalogs, is pricing given for a range of condition?
- Does the numbering system used make logical sense?
- To what extent do the write-ups in auction catalogs reflect census information and other research, and/or new contributions to philatelic knowledge?
- Does the layout of information encourage understanding and contribute to utility?
- Does the introduction explain the basis for decisions as to what is listed or not? What is the basis for pricing (or a different method of indicating value or relative scarcity)?
- Is there adequate information about abbreviations used, symbols, etc.?

- Are descriptions complemented with good quality illustrations of items?
- Are most items, especially including varieties, illustrated or only a few extraordinary items?
- Is information provided to encourage reporting of new discoveries, errors, etc.?
- If an update from a previous catalog, are the changes highlighted (if that is possible)? If not, is information about changes clearly communicated in some part of the work?
- If an update, are the changes/revisions/additions substantial?
- Are there clear directions on the most efficient use of the catalog using sample listings as an example?

Notes on Judging Philatelic Columns and Articles

Philatelic Columns

Regular columns on a single subject or a single theme may appear in philatelic or lay publications. For the latter, the single theme may be philately in general. For the former, the subject or theme will normally be smaller piece of the philatelic pie. When writing in the philatelic press, some reader knowledge of the hobby may be presumed, but for the lay press, writers should take into account that many, if not most readers, will not be active collectors and will not know philatelic terms or have a deep background in the hobby. Information presented should be pitched to the expected audience and technical terms explained.

Among the special considerations in judging this category is the evaluation of how well the author presents original thoughts, covers the subject staying on point, supports his or her conclusions, goes into adequate depth, and values input from readers. On the other end of the scale is simply adapting press releases for new issues, announcing philatelic events, reporting the release of standard catalogs, and noting items selling for staggering sums of money. While this approach is appropriate for columns in the lay press, this will not rank very high on the original thoughts scale; nor is it likely to encourage many readers to try stamp collecting.

Additional considerations that merit review when evaluating columns include success in telling a story in a restricted amount of space, providing historical context to stories where appropriate, using illustrative material (in color where possible) that invites the reader into the column, providing accurate information and crediting the source of scholarly findings.

It is important that there is careful separation of factual reporting from editorial opinion and labeling the latter as such. Inviting reader input in the form of questions, comments on opinions stated by the author, and corrections helps to make the column inviting. Actually, using reader input in follow-ups helps the columns come alive. Reporting on new support materials and websites that encourage collecting and make it comprehensible and accessible is important content whether in the philatelic or lay press.

Not every column in a series will have all these elements, but the judge must evaluate how well the column over the period of publication makes the hobby accessible and encourages participation in the hobby by the reader.

If a related group of columns or articles is sufficiently “weighty” to compete as a handbook, monograph or compendium, they may be entered “bound” digitally, but at least one example shall be entered as originally published to aid in judging the presentation. If such is the case, entry should be in the open competition rather than “articles only.”

Individual Articles

Articles are judged according to the same criteria noted above, but with an emphasis on cohesion and completeness of the story being told, the depth of the information provided, and new information being provided to the reader.

When judged in the context of One Time Exhibitions, as described in Chapter 2, and for those articles submitted from any specialty society, a very narrow focus should not be penalized because such entries are of special interest and significance to the members of the society. The most important element in judging such entries is the philatelic merit displayed reflecting the interests of the society members. This may manifest itself in the form of research, analysis, new or revised theories supported by factual material, and ideas for future inquiry.

Individual articles should be entered as published.

Chapter 10

Notes on Judging Digital Entries

The primary value of electronic media is that it provides opportunities for the user to access large quantities of current (and corrected) information and images with minimal cost. To do this well, producers must pay attention to using to its full potential the capabilities that electronic media offer. Judges must evaluate how well they have done this regarding such matters as accessibility to those with current (not necessarily the most up-to-date) technology, full searchability and indexing by key terms, quality of scans, use of pull-down menus, navigational aids, hot links, and capabilities that encourage feedback by users to correct errors, participate in census efforts, etc.

A digital entry can come in a number of forms—memory stick, downloadable files, electronic presentations such as PowerPoint. Whatever the medium, it is important that the work demonstrate the advantages of the medium.

Digital media may be stand-alone productions or produced to be an additional feature augmenting a printed book or other type of hard copy literature. The main difference between this category and the Chapter 11 category is that these products are static. They are what they are until replaced, while Internet-based media can be constantly updated. The least effective use of these items is to be a digital analog of a printed item—a printed page simply scanned as a jpg or pdf file. However, using the capabilities of the media, every word can be searchable. Every key term in an article can be linked to a detailed explanation of the term (to be skipped by the expert and utilized by the novice). At the mention of a variety, a single click should open a detailed scan of the variety with an easy return to the text.

A specialized handbook on an issue of stamps can be supplemented by a memory stick or web site that contains scans of several major collections of the issue from traditional to postal history approaches. A study on tagging can contain a video showing the various taggants and paper characteristics visible under different wavelengths. Census information can be included in spreadsheet format with links

to a supporting website that contains standardized reporting forms for submitting new discoveries, which, after proper vetting, can then be included in an updated census.

Stand-alone digital entries may contain a handbook not published in hard copy, a run of (or highlights) from a society publication, or a set of resources (e.g., album pages) that will help a collector to collect. The key issue here, besides the content itself, is optimizing the features unique to digital media. Some attention also needs to be paid to the packaging of such materials.

Digital Society Journals

Because of costs of distribution and production, many societies have gone to digital distribution. In some cases, distribution is available in both digital and printed form. Entries should be submitted according to the primary means of distribution. If a journal is submitted digitally, it should be judged according to digital criteria outlined above.

Chapter 11

Notes on Judging Websites, Blogs and Message Boards

Websites and other digital media are an outstanding resource because they are, at best, up-to-date with the latest information; and can include both archival and new activity information (e.g., member auctions) that takes up a great deal of space in a hard copy journal. A quarterly hard copy publication can offer very few timely services to the membership. By the time the publication is received, it is several months out of date. However, a website that is identified by its URL code in the periodical (and/or accessible by use of a published QR code) can feed the members all the current news they need regarding meetings, activities, etc., and it can even be delivered by push technology or automated emails as soon as new or revised information is added.

Websites

Websites are constructed of three components:

1. Static — the backbone of the site: the home page, pull down menus, web page structure, navigational aids and search features. This critical aspect of a website changes little if at all until a major revision of the site. It requires only one detailed evaluation of the logical structure and ease of using these criteria:

- Is it user friendly?
- Are the web pages easily readable and with functioning links?
- Is it easy to navigate?
- Do searches provide quick, useful results?

2. Dynamic — This portion of a site changes often without any input from a viewer and needs several views. Here is where new local meeting information, exhibition results, requests for research assistance, and new census listings would be posted. A digital version of the society publication may also be posted here. This

part of the website can also include links to other relevant websites, and to blogs and message boards. Evaluation criteria include:

- What is updated on a regular basis?
- Is the information current?
- Are new links being added when identified as being of interest to the membership?

3. Interactive — This portion of a site changes in direct response to the visitor of the site and requires multiple views for evaluation. This might include the latest information on bids in the club auction, input screens to update ongoing census efforts, online registration to exhibit or volunteer, and to respond to letters to the editor and board discussions.

Often much of the Dynamic and Interactive content will be password protected so that only dues-paying members can access it. Judges evaluating digital media will need to be given temporary access. Evaluation criteria include:

- Is there a website search feature? On what does it key for the stamps the society studies? (e.g., catalog number, face value, stamp description)? Does this accord with how users are most likely to search?
- If there is a sign-in feature, does the site tell the user member what can be accessed after signing in?
- Are the categories that can be clicked on to find specific content adequately detailed so that most things users would want can be found without excessive searching?
- Is the census data form to report new finds easy to use, and the entries properly vetted and is the information current, and flagged for recent additions/changes?
- Are the auctions on the site user friendly and accessible by non-members as a possible inducement to membership, and are the items offered worthwhile and easy to pay for?
- Are shopping carts easy to use and is all merchandise for sale on the site readily searchable?
- Are letters to the editor/author rapidly posted with useful responses?
- Are registrations easy to complete online, and payments easy to make?
- Can articles be submitted online and can corrections be made the same way?
- Does the site include a bulletin board for members and can discussions be followed as threads instead of having to read the entire board?
- Is it easy to print information from the website that users would like to turn into hard copy?

It is recommended that judges visit websites several times, to evaluate the site as a member, and to evaluate the site based on what a non-member could access, to assess how welcoming it is and how it would appeal to someone thinking about joining and to see how often the site is updated.

Blogs and Message Boards

Blogs and message boards are by their nature interactive, and evaluation of them should center on ease of use, utility of content, how they are edited, and how they are indexed so that users can find information for which they are searching.

Chapter 12

Mechanics of Judging and Using the LEEF

FOR OPEN LITERATURE SHOWS

Number of Judges:

Because of the breadth of subjects and collecting specialties, judging stamps and covers exhibits requires five philatelic judges. Literature, because of its relatively narrow formats, the emphasis on conveying information successfully regardless of the subject matter and the ability to do most of the work at home, requires only three accredited philatelic literature judges (sometimes augmented by an Apprentice — See [Chapter 16](#)). Typically, a literature show will have 30-40 entries. If the number of exhibits exceeds 45, an additional judge is required for each block of up to 20. An apprentice will fulfill that requirement for a show with 45–60 exhibits. While this may mean more work in preparing Literature Exhibit Evaluation Forms (LEEFs) than at-the-frames philatelic judges can reasonably be expected to do, philatelic literature judges will normally have more time at a show to do LEEFs, and they will have made detailed notes before arriving at the show.

Distribution of Accepted Entries, and Pre-Show Judging:

The competitive entries with their required synopsis should be distributed by the sponsoring show at least three months before the show opens. Unlike philatelic exhibiting where judging must be done by teams at the frames, literature judging is done individually in the months before the show, and usually, the majority of the awards and responsibilities for preparing LEEFs are decided among the jury (led by the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair), using email and phone calls before the show opens its doors.

The votes of Apprentice Philatelic Literature Judges do not count in selecting the consensus award, but the reasoning supporting their recommendations may have a bearing on the ultimate level awarded. Likewise, apprentices do not have a vote in determining special awards but are encouraged to actively participate in the discussions and even nominate exhibits for special awards.

NOTE: A jury that does not have an apprentice may do its work remotely and apart from attendance at the show if the show committee wishes, and if the Chairman of the Literature Jury agrees. In such cases all required work will be done by telephone, email or electronic meeting, and special attention must be given to completing the LEEFs, since there will be no in-person feedback. In the case of “articles only” exhibits, all work is usually done remotely and completed before the show.

At the Show

The first allegiance of a philatelic literature judge is to the literature jury and its tasks. A judge is expected to be on time for jury functions, stay until released by the Chief Judge and attend the social events to which the jury is invited as guests of the show. Judges must block out these times and inform family and friends that they will not be available. Depending upon how much of the deliberations work has been done before the show, this will be a good share of Friday. What time is not spent in deliberations should be spent on LEEFs, with Saturday prior to the Judges Feedback Forum to complete this task.

Judges should get to the first appointed meeting early (usually Friday Judges’ Breakfast) and personally greet the Show Exhibition Committee member responsible for the jury. Judges should wear their name badge indicating status as a juror for the entire show and dress appropriately for the task. This last point is at the discretion of the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge. Judges should, of course, attend the awards event scheduled by the show committee.

Expectations of the Jury

- Team players skilled at negotiating
- Active participation in the process
- Reasoned, independent decisions
- Objective, balanced results
- Avoid unfairness
- Unqualified support of team consensus
- No shopping on the bourse until the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair has concluded deliberations
- Positive, constructive feedback, with substance, for exhibitors
- High quality Literature Exhibit Evaluation Forms ready to hand in to the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair on time

Deliberations at the Show

The jury meets at the show to resolve any thorny issues, to decide upon the special awards, to assure that the apprentice (if there is one) has taken on board the lessons to be learned from the process, to share perceptions useful in writing up the LEEF, and to make final preparations for the feedback session. Time may also be spent at the show completing the LEEFs and providing detailed feedback and mentoring to exhibitors in attendance apart from the feedback session.

Preparing for the Judges Feedback Forum

The expectation is that jurors will be fully prepared to discuss the merits and deficiencies of an exhibit based on a thorough review of the exhibit against the judging criteria.

Judges should spend some time making in depth notes on exhibits for which they are first responder. *Notes should be comprehensive and meaningful to other judges and easily conveyed and explained to the exhibitor.* Notes should include specific statements, both positive and negative, that would be useful to the exhibitor.

Notes on all exhibits, made during the judging process, should be adequate as a basis for making constructive comments in the LEEF and at the Judges Feedback Forum. A judge should be prepared to justify the jury consensus on all exhibits; not just those for which s/he is first responder. Judges must never indicate that they personally disagree with the award level.

At the Judges Feedback Forum

At the formal Feedback Forum, exhibitors are given the opportunity to request comments from the jury. When called upon, a judge should open with a positive comment on some aspect of the exhibit that intrigued the judge or was particularly well done. Specific suggestions for exhibit improvement should follow in a focused way that addresses the specific criteria areas where alternatives should be considered for potential medal improvement. Comments should be brief; and detailed or embarrassing comments should be handled in the LEEF, or privately one-on-one at or after the show.

The focus on the categories of the LEEF criteria are paramount and personal biases and opinion of the judge should not be presented. The objective of the session is providing meaningful feedback. If the exhibitor seems argumentative, the discussion should be carried on privately after the meeting.

Working with Exhibitors at the Show

It is customary for judges to make themselves available for discussions with exhibitors after the feedback session. This is a more private opportunity to provide more in-depth suggestions to the exhibitor and answer additional questions. Other

exhibitors and/or judges may wish to join in the discussion if the exhibitor does not object. Make sure permission is granted because some may see this as deterring their opportunity and desire for open discussion with a judge of choice. The interaction between judge and exhibitor should always be courteous, helpful, constructive, supportive and non-confrontational.

Further Competition of Grand Award Winners

An entry that wins a Literature Grand at any Literature Competition during a given exhibiting year (starting with The Great American Stamp Show each year) is not eligible for Grand Awards at the other shows in that year. Such entries may be submitted for medals and feedback.

FOR ARTICLES ONLY SHOWS

Broadly, the judging procedures and requirements for “articles only” events are the same as for open competitions. The primary difference is that all work is done remotely. Entries are sent to judges electronically or will be available with the synopsis on the show’s web site.

Additionally, judges are not required to attend the show and there is no in-person feedback session. Without a feedback session complete, detailed LEEFs assume an even more important role and judges are asked to encourage contact by authors by email or telephone if more information or clarification is required.

Judging can be done by email, telephone or electronic meeting. Exact procedures will be determined by the Chief Judge.

COMPLETION OF THE LEEF

The purpose of the LEEF is to provide written comments and scores for the benefit of the exhibitors. Literature judges are expected to complete these forms with compliments on positives, concrete examples of problem areas and suggested means of overcoming them, and other suggested improvements. These comments must reflect major observations of all jury members. The forms must be legible, and your contact information should be included. They should be reviewed for quality by the other jury members and/ or the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair, who has the authority to direct that they be redone if they are judged not helpful to the exhibitor. Personal discussion with exhibitors may impact how much detail is needed in the LEEF, but does not eliminate its need.

The points in brackets shown on the LEEF are the maximum number for each criterion. Enter the consensus points given for each criterion (the jury chair is the final arbiter) and enter the total points at the bottom of the form. See [Chapter 14](#)

for further information on awarding points.

Many judges use the LEEF to organize their notes while reading the entries, and once completed, they also serve as a guide to discussion at the Literature Feedback Session. Keep in mind that the LEEF is a summary of comments from the entire jury, so the judge completing it should pay attention to any comments that other jury members have about the entry being evaluated and incorporate them into the LEEF.

If full points or nearly full points are given in any category, a suggestion for improvement is not required for that category, but feel free to compliment in areas where there is notable performance. Suggestions for improvement should be in the areas where the exhibit is weakest, and in proportion to the points awarded. It is especially important to provide suggestions in the categories that deal with non-production values as those may not be within the control of the exhibitor because they will often have more to do with the financial resources of the publisher or sponsoring society.

The show committee may be willing to photocopy completed LEEFs and provide copies for the judges who would like them. This is a very useful tool for future reference if you are a judge who follows the progress of an exhibit.

It is possible that the show committee may provide LEEFs to the judges in electronic form. This comes normally as a pdf file that can be filled out on your computer. Once completed, it can be given to the show committee as a hard copy or an electronic file. The Chief Judge will usually make these determinations.

Chapter 13

The Role of the Literature Jury Chair

The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge, also called the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair or Chief Judge, is an important leader and focal point for the judging process at literature exhibitions. This section will document the role and functions of the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair.

Selecting the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge for a Jury

Each jury panel should always include at least two accredited Chief Philatelic Literature Judges in case the designated Chief Philatelic Literature Judge for that panel cannot perform the duties required for any reason. The CANEJ chair will choose the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge for each jury panel from among the accredited candidates, and any other accredited chief judges on that jury become alternates. Consideration is given to the nomination of the local exhibition committee, but the nomination is advisory only.

Responsibilities

The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge is responsible for the overall performance and conduct of the jury. This includes:

- *Management:* ensure that deadlines are met, paperwork is complete, and reports are filed.
- *Leadership:* provide leadership and direction to the jury, serve as final arbiter for resolving jury differences.
- *Teamwork:* build teamwork and consensus and participate in awards ceremonies if asked.
- *Communications:* communicate with the jury, the exhibitors and the show committee.
- *Fairness:* assure fairness and consistency in the process and the results.

The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge must do everything possible to ensure ad-

equate preparation (especially for apprentice judges), fair judging, active participation in deliberations, and meaningful feedback to exhibitors, plus positive interaction of the jury with exhibitors and the show committee.

In addition, the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge will be called upon to evaluate an apprentice judge assigned to the jury and may be called upon to mentor an Apprentice Chief Philatelic Literature Judge. Additional paperwork is required in these two cases, and these forms are found on the APS website under “Judges and Judging.”

Chronology of Tasks Prior to the Show

Juries are normally formed at least six months in advance. Once the show committee liaison confirms that CANEJ has approved the jury and selected the Chief Judge, the following chronology is ideal; however, expect some show committees to be less than ideal:

4 to 6 Months in Advance

- The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge should collect or confirm both email and cell phone information for each jury member.
- Communicate with the Apprentice Philatelic Literature Judge (if any), explaining how their apprenticeship will be conducted and any particular expectations the chief has for the apprentice.

3 to 4 Months in Advance

- The show committee should have a complete list of literature entries, and the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge should work with the jury members to assign first response responsibilities.
- The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge should make assignments for first response for each exhibit. This can be done by asking jury members for their preferences, or dictating who gets what, or some combination of these two methods. The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge should assign the Apprentice judge’s portion of first responses, providing a suitable range of exhibit types. Assign each of the other judges to be the back-up first response for those exhibits assigned to the apprentice. Considerations in making first responder assignments might include special areas of expertise, balance of the load in numbers, sizes and types of exhibits, and balance of perceived strong and weak exhibits. Trades among accredited judges are usually allowed with notice and approval of the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge.
- The show committee should be mailing/emailing/posting the initial batch of entries and synopses. Assure that entries are received and that jury members are working diligently.
- Establish an outline schedule of jury activities, including how and when the

judging decisions on medal levels will take place.

2 to 3 Months in Advance

- The show committee should provide the jury with any changes to the final list of exhibits, as well as a list of conventional and special awards. The Chief Judge will need to make any necessary adjustments in first responders.
- The Chief Judge must assure that the jury is engaged in judging and gather initial responses.

1 to 2 Months in Advance

- The show committee will work with the Chief Judge on the schedule of judging and other activities.
- Review the detail requirements for managing the apprentice program on the APS website under “Judges and Judging”

For Open Competitions

- Schedule jury access to the hard copy literature entries the afternoon before the show opens.
- Schedule and location for the Judges’ Breakfast
- Number of tickets each judge requires for the awards function
- The role of the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge and/or the entire jury in the awards function. Some show committees want the judges to help hand out awards, or they want the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge to read the literature palmares, or they may want nothing official beyond introducing the jury.

Late . . . Up to Two Weeks Before the Show

- The show committee sends final corrections, changes to the exhibit entry list, synopses, and any additional special awards. This is best done via email, web site or equivalent electronic means.

For “Articles Only”

- Medal levels and special awards are determined.
- Palmares and completed LEEFs are sent to the show committee by the Chief Judge.

Chronology of Tasks at the Show for Open Literature Exhibits

Chief Literature Judge Arrival at the Show

- Arrive the afternoon before the show and make certain that the jury has access

to the entries that afternoon.

- Secure from the show committee and distribute to the jury any last-minute changes and additional information.
- Make sure that the jury's name badges are ready and are picked up by the jury.
- Confirm the breakfast meeting time and place and assure that all jury members have this information.

Judges' Breakfast

It is generally recommended that the breakfast be at the hotel or on site at the exhibition. Other arrangements should be agreed between the Chief Philatelic Judge, the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge and the show committee to ensure that all essential jury functions can be completed within the show committee's schedule.

Inquire of the show committee who to contact if there are any questions during the deliberations and how to contact that individual.

- Assure that there is a list of which exhibits are eligible for which awards, and that there is a binder that you will have with the criteria listed for each special award.
- Obtain from the show committee the forms they want to use to record the results of deliberations.
- Confirm with the show committee the time that they expect to receive the results of judging.
- Confirm with the show committee about awards function tickets, honoraria, judges' deliberation room, and the expected role the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge and/or the entire jury will play in the awards function.
- Confirm when lunch break will be taken (and where – usually a “working lunch” in the deliberation room).
- Inquire how lunch will be handled (order in advance, or credit at concession, or order at the hotel restaurant?).

It is a waste of time to take the judges to a restaurant off premises.

The Judges' Feedback Forum

- The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge is the leader, manager, and facilitator of the formal Philatelic Literature Judges Feedback Forum; and may also defuse potential problems by presenting clarifying comments on comments from jury members. The forum is a major scheduled event at every open literature exhibition. Time management is important. Feedback sessions are not normally held for “articles only” events but may be held at the discretion of the show in consultation with the Chief Judge.
- The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge introduces the jury, or invites jury mem-

bers to introduce themselves, and thanks the show committee for their efforts to run a high-quality competition. He then describes the purpose of the session and the rules of procedure: lower medal levels first, progressing to higher medal levels and proxies are last if there is time.

- First response from assigned responder, other judges may add brief comment. One follow-up question is usually allowed.
- Chief Philatelic Literature Judge must listen carefully to comments by jury members, monitor responses from exhibitors, and act to stop exchanges that are overlong or tending toward becoming rancorous, and might suggest that the parties meet after the Feedback Session to discuss their differences.

After the Judges' Feedback Forum

- Collect LEEFs from the judges. It is suggested that they be put in exhibit entry number order so that the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge knows that all have been submitted.
- If a preliminary review session was not held with the jury, then briefly review each form to ensure that they are complete, legible, and ready to be given to the exhibitors.
- Return any forms with perceived deficiencies to the originating first responder for correction or completion as necessary, and set a time for their return.
- Initial approved forms to confirm their review and acceptance.
- Deliver LEEFs to the show committee. The show committee will see that the forms are returned to the exhibitors. Ask the show committee to reproduce a set of the completed LEEFs for the jury members who want them.

Jury Reconsideration and Changing of Award Levels

- On rare occasions, it may be discovered after deliberations, possibly even after the awards are posted, that an award level unfairly penalizes an exhibit. This may be made known from a knowledgeable third party or come to light during the Judges Feedback Forum. In these circumstances, the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge may arrange for a jury review for consideration of the new information.
- The jury, in whole or in part, as determined by the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge, can make an initial review. For just cause, the entire jury can then reconvene for the purpose of reconsideration of the award. The objective is to avoid an injustice. Once the palmares are filed with the APS, it is too late to correct an error.

General Procedures for Jury Deliberations

Jury deliberations are conducted in a closed meeting with open and confidential

exchange. Open discussion and active participation are essential by all members of the jury, but all aspects of deliberations are completely confidential within the jury group. Remind the apprentices that they are under the same obligation of confidentiality as are accredited judges.

The role of the apprentice judge in the deliberations must be clear to all. Apprentices are full participants in the discussion, Though their vote does not officially count, the apprentice should be a fully functioning participant in determining final consensus.

Manage the process to assure meeting deadlines, that all jury members including the apprentice (if there is one) are able to contribute, and that the process for reaching award levels and points allocated emphasizes consensus and are consistent with proper procedure.

Report accurately — Rotate the lead among the judges for making medal award recommendations and have at least two members of the jury record all results, usually (but not necessarily) the Chief Judge and one other judge, such as one of the alternate chief judges.

Detailed discussion of an entry is only undertaken if there is a sharp separation in the recommended medal award (two medal levels or more), no clear consensus is apparent, or a challenge is raised by a juror.

Special Situations during Judging

Questions may arise with regard to classification of exhibits, and whether exhibits meet the rules for the competition as stated in this manual and/or the show prospectus. While every effort should be made to judge any entry that the show accepted, there may be instances where that is inappropriate. Discuss these situations with the jury, and take their opinions into account, but the final decision is yours as Chief Philatelic Literature Judge.

Consultants

A jury may occasionally be faced with a difficult, unusual or highly specialized entry, and may have questions as to the accuracy of content. In these instances, the Chief Judge may decide to use an available and impartial consultant known to have expertise in the subject who can provide an informed opinion and answer questions from the jury.

Other Problems

Any number of problems can happen involving exhibits, exhibitors, judges, awards, or other issues. The Chief Philatelic Literature Judge has the primary responsibility to take the lead in problem resolution. The key to most problems is to consider the effect that the perceived problem has on the exhibit's ultimate awards.

Possible remedies extend to withdrawal or disqualification in severe instances.

Interpersonal problems require patience, understanding, sometimes compromise, and ultimately decisiveness and firm resolution.

Each problem must be considered in its unique context and on its own merits. Consistent with the need for rapid resolution, feel free to consult with other chief judges, CANEJ chair, and/or the show committee leadership as deemed appropriate. The involvement of others in solving problems assures consideration of multiple views and minimizes risks attendant with initial, sometimes ill-considered, responses. Seek reasonable outcomes that minimize damage and are seen as fair and equitable for all concerned.

Before Adjourning the Deliberations

- Make a final review of all first responder assignments with the full jury.
- Encourage first responders to capture specific observations from other judges to assure that the suggestions for improvement are reflecting the jury as a whole.
- Reiterate the scheduled time for exchanging LEEFs and the time for the Judges Feedback Forum.
- Reiterate the requirement for completed LEEFs and the time expected for the completed sheets to be turned in to the chief.
- If there is an Apprentice Philatelic Literature Judge, reiterate the schedule for reviewing the apprentice's work

After the Show

- Prepare the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge's show report to CANEJ (form available on the APS web site).
- Send thank you notes to the show and your fellow judges.
- Retain show records for a minimum of six months as support for responding to belated questions.
- Evaluation of the Apprentice:
 - ◊ Complete the apprentice evaluation form, available from the APS website, based on feedback from the other jury members, and your own observations.
 - ◊ Schedule time with the apprentice to meet and discuss the evaluation in the apprentice evaluation form, in a quiet, private setting. Provide the apprentice with a copy of the evaluation (may be sent by mail later).
 - ◊ Submit the apprentice evaluation form to CANEJ together with the required show reports.

Chapter 14

Medal Levels and the Use of Points

Converting Points to Medal Levels

Effective January 1, 2017, CANEJ instituted the requirement that WSP shows offer 8 medal levels, and that Philatelic Literature Judges use points to judge exhibits. The medal point-range appears in the table below:

These medal levels and point ranges are consistent with other countries' national level shows but differ from those used at international competitions.

Show committees need not invest in additional medallions — a Silver medal is also a Large Silver medal; only the wording of award certificates and palmares will need to change. Adding additional ribbons for the new medal levels is not required either, but shows are encouraged to do so if they wish.

Medal	Point Range
Large Gold	90–100
Gold	85–89
Large Vermeil	80–84
Vermeil	75–79
Large Silver	70–74
Silver	65–69
Silver-Bronze	60–64
Bronze	55–59
Certificate	0–54

Point Scoring

In the judging process, judges translate subjective judgment in each category to a numeric values. Start with full points and deduct points as problems are identified. Any deduction of 10% of the points or more in any judging category must be ad-

dressed in the LEEF.

Each criterion should be viewed as a numerical range, much like a satisfaction survey. If the criterion was fulfilled exceptionally well, then near-full or full marks can be awarded for that criterion. Note that poor performance in any given criterion may still range from 0 to up to half the points or more. Giving no points in a given criterion should be a rarity.

Each judge looking at the same entry may come up with a slightly different number of points based on his or her observations. That reality, and the need to give each judge the opportunity to discuss his or her observations is the reason that a discussion of each entry is held prior to the final number of points being agreed. In determining the final point totals, every effort should be made to achieve consensus, but the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair is the final arbiter.

Because this is a subjective system, it is possible that point totals may differ somewhat from show to show, depending upon the observations of the judges. A difference of one point may alter a medal level but is not a major cause for concern. But if a numerical score drops by five or more points from one show to the next, the exhibitor may want to get more detail from the evaluating judge regarding problems perceived. (Contact information should be on the LEEF.)

Chapter 15

Requirements for a Literature Competition and Selection of Judges

Application

While there is no accreditation process for shows to hold a literature competition under the terms of this manual, there are certain rules and practices that must be adhered to for the sake of order and consistency. These are set forth in the CANEJ document titled “Rules for WSP Shows,” available on the APS website. The summary is that all WSP shows, philatelic or literature, require CANEJ approval. If qualification for a philatelic show are met, this would qualify the show for a literature event, but approval must still be sought from CANEJ.

World Series of Philately show committees should appoint a single point of contact and responsibility for the literature competition, preferably someone who has philatelic literature experience. This official should be in constant liaison with the other members of the show committee whose work is key to the success of the competition, including, the exhibits chair, the judges chair, the awards chair, and the events chair.

If this is the first time that such an official has served as a Literature Competition Chair, he or she should be mentored by someone who has done this for a prior running of the show, or by someone who has done this work for another show. Consult the CANEJ chair to determine who might serve as a suitable mentor.

Jury Selection Process

Literature Jury selection for a WSP show is normally done by the Show Exhibition Committee at least six months before the show. Selection is subject to the approval of the CANEJ chair. Literature competitions require a separate jury from the Philatelic Exhibition Jury. The CANEJ chair selects the Chief Judge (jury chairman) for both juries. The Show Exhibition Committee makes choices for both juries generally based on expertise in the areas of specialty societies attending that show and the need for overall balance in experience and expertise.

Accredited judges wishing to serve on a jury should take the initiative to con-

tact the Show Exhibition Committee well in advance to request consideration. The committee needs to know the judge's interest, areas of expertise and willingness to travel to and serve at the show. Over time, many judges become well known but most must proactively seek invitations to judge.

Prior to accepting a jury position for a particular show, judges must ascertain their ability to fill the attendant obligations: time, location, and any show functions jurors are expected to attend. Barring a last-minute crisis, every effort must be made to honor any commitment to the show

Chapter 16

How to Become an Accredited Literature Judge

Introduction and Requirements

There are many similarities between judging material in the frames and judging literature, and most Philatelic Literature Judges first qualified as Philatelic Judges. However, that is not a requirement. What is required is that:

- You have a record of writing/editing experience that satisfies CANEJ that you are a good candidate.
- You have earned the equivalent of at least a Vermeil medal in literature at a WSP or FIP international show by the time the apprenticeship has been completed.
- You are a member of the APS.

Process

1. Register with the Committee on the Accreditation of National Exhibitions and Judges (CANEJ). The registration form is available on the APS website: www.stamps.org, as is the address of the CANEJ chairman.
2. Serve three apprenticeships at accredited national shows. These apprenticeships must have been served within five years before January 1 of the year in which the application for accreditation is made. If already accredited as a philatelic judge, only two literature apprenticeships are required. As this is written, there are four national shows holding yearly literature competitions: Open literature exhibits are held at [Chicagopex](#) and the [Great American Stamp Show](#). “Articles only” events are held at [Sarasota National Stamp Exposition](#) and [SESCAL](#). You may contact shows directly, or the CANEJ Chair can assist you. Start that process at least one year before the show(s) you are targeting.
3. After each apprenticeship, the Jury Chairman will discuss your performance with you and submit a report to the CANEJ. The evaluation form is available on the APS website. These reports serve as the basis of the decision that CANEJ will eventually reach concerning your request for accreditation.
4. Attend at least one Philatelic Literature Judging Seminar prior to beginning

your apprenticeship. The CANEJ Chairman can tell you where these seminars are given (at national shows).

5. Read and be familiar with the *Manual of Literature Judging & Exhibiting* before your first apprenticeship.
6. Sign the Judge's Pledge. See [Appendix D](#). Judges must avoid conflicts of interest or any appearance thereof with respect to judging activities. You should not judge exhibits prepared by family members, nor any exhibit to which you have contributed for which you have been paid. If you have contributed materially to any exhibit even without compensation, you need to inform your jury colleagues.

Apprentices do not receive a judge's honorarium. (Some committees will provide an honorarium but are not required to do so.). For open competitions, you will receive tickets to the show awards banquet and jury breakfast before judging begins on the first day of the show. A working lunch will be provided on the first day.

You will need to spend considerable time preparing to judge, reading and making notes on the before the jury meets. It is important that you have a good grounding in the wide range and depth of philatelic literature, hobby wide, so as to be able to understand the context in which the entries you evaluate exist. This will come naturally through experience, but you can begin to read widely outside your normal interests to accelerate the learning process.

Most importantly, you need to have the ability to think logically, compare and evaluate, to work harmoniously with your fellow judges, and to communicate effectively (orally and through written critique) with exhibitors regarding the strengths of their material and areas for potential improvement.

If you are not a member of the APS [Writers Unit 30](#), you should join, and read its quarterly publication, "The Philatelic Communicator." The journal is a rich source of information with critical reviews of newly released books and monographs, literature exhibition announcements, results of literature shows, articles on philatelic writing/editing/ publishing, and discussions on literature judging.

Go to as many jury feedback sessions as you can, whether for philatelic or literature, but especially the latter.

Role of Apprentice Judge Plays in the Jury Process

Before the show, the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair will assign you a one quarter share of the literature entries upon which you will be first responder in the feedback session and for which you will complete the LEEF. You will also receive the literature entries for review, hopefully no less than three months before the show. You will be expected to:

1. Review entries and make notes, with special attention to those for which you have first response. Use the LEEF as an outline for taking your notes.
2. If an open exhibit, at the show, be on time and appropriately dressed for all

- jury and show social functions and remain until the Jury Chair releases you.
3. Take part in the jury deliberations. The Jury Chair may choose to arrive at medal levels via email or conference call in the weeks prior to the show, or at the show (See Chapter 13). In either case you will be asked for your opinion and vote. Provide your recommended medal level, total points, and a few comments to support your reasons for your awards.
 4. Take part in discussions about the special awards. You do not vote on specials, but your opinions matter as a member of the jury.
 5. Once medal levels and special awards are completed, complete the LEEFs for the entries assigned to you. They must be completed legibly and thoroughly by the time of the feedback session, as they are to be turned in to the Philatelic Literature Jury Chair after that session. The Philatelic Literature Jury Chair will review your LEEFs and may ask that one or more be rewritten if they are not up to standards of legibility, clarity and usefulness.
 6. Philatelic Literature Jury conclusions are not to be discussed outside the deliberations until the show has made the award levels public. At that point you may discuss the reasons for the medal level, but you may not discuss the special awards until they have been announced at the awards event. You are expected to defend the jury consensus. **Under no circumstances should you discuss with others outside the jury what happened in the deliberations.**
 7. Participate in a positive manner in the jury feedback event.
 8. Talk in more depth with exhibitors about their entries as requested; not just about your assigned exhibits, but about any entry where the exhibitor asks for your opinions and suggestions. This may be at the show, if time permits, or by phone or email after the show is over.

Your Evaluation

You will normally be excused from the deliberations before the accredited judges, so that the Philatelic Literature Jury Chairman can have the benefit of their thoughts about your performance. After the feedback session, the Philatelic Literature Jury Chairman will complete the Philatelic Literature Apprentice Evaluation form that is sent to the CANEJ Chair. At that point, or perhaps earlier, the Jury Chair will meet with you to discuss your performance, and any recommendations s/he has for your further apprenticeship work.

Application Process

After completion of the mandatory prerequisites and apprenticeships, apply to CANEJ for accreditation, using the application form available on the APS website under “Judges and Judging.” The application must be completed and mailed to the CANEJ Chair. The application will be circulated to the members of CANEJ for review and a vote. Once that process is completed, you will be notified of the result and, hopefully, welcomed to the select group of accredited literature judges.

Chapter 17

How to Become an Accredited Literature Jury Chair

The APS needs enough Chief Philatelic Literature Judges to cover the requirements for national level shows. Once a year the CANEJ chair will assess current needs and extend invitations as appropriate. Chief Philatelic Literature Judges are expected to have:

- At least five years of experience as a nationally accredited Philatelic Literature Judge and have judged literature for at least six WSP shows
- Demonstrated leadership and communication skills
- Advanced interpersonal skills
- Breadth of expertise
- Willingness to judge any national show (not just shows in a geographic area)
- Good organization skills

Nationally accredited Philatelic Literature Judges who believe they fulfill these requirements may ask to be considered for future openings. The APS website has the current forms to apply to apprentice as a Chief Judge:

- Application to Apprentice as a Chief Judge
- Philatelic Apprentice Chief Judge Evaluation Form
- Mentor's Report on Apprentice Chairman's Performance
- Apprentice Chief Judge Report and Application for Accreditation

A candidate for Chief Philatelic Literature Judge fulfills all of the duties of the Chief Philatelic Literature Judge under the supervision and coaching of a mentor, the alternate Chief Philatelic Literature Judge. CANEJ will act on the results of that experience and the evaluation. A successful candidate will be added to the roster as a Chief Philatelic Literature Judge.

Open Literature Evaluation Form APS World Series of Philately

Large Gold	90-100	Silver	65-69
Gold	85-89	Silver/Bronze	60-64
Large Verm.	80-84	Bronze	55-59
Vermeil	75-79	Certificate	0-54
Large Silver	70-74		

ENTRY: _____ **ENTRY #:** _____

TREATMENT (HOW WELL YOU SAID IT.)	30 points _____
Clear objective/purpose	A B C NA
Clarity	A B C NA
Thoroughness	A B C NA
Usability	A B C NA
Use of Illustrations	A B C NA
Format/Flow	A B C NA
Layout	A B C NA
Quality of writing/Grammar	A B C NA
Use of digital features (<i>electronic only</i>)	A B C NA

ORIGINALITY, SIGNIFICANCE, RESEARCH (WHAT YOU HAD TO SAY.)	50 points _____
Appeals to audience	A B C NA
Importance to Hobby	A B C NA
Lasting value	A B C NA
Scope	A B C NA
Challenge	A B C NA
Discoveries, new information	A B C NA
Different perspective(s)	A B C NA
Extensive study	A B C NA
Accurate	A B C NA
Conclusions justified	A B C NA
Content/author diversity, emails of editor & officers, substantive articles, columns/features (<i>journals only</i>)	A B C NA
Completeness of listings, value as pricing guide, Substantive change over prior works (<i>Catalogs, including auction, only</i>)	A B C NA

TECHNICAL (HOW EASY IT IS TO USE.)	15 points _____
Documentation	A B C NA
Index	A B C NA
Bibliography/notes/credits	A B C NA
Pagination	A B C NA
Clarity of illustrations	A B C NA

PRODUCTION (HOW WELL IT IS MADE.)	5 points _____
Binding, typography, similar production aspects on the usability of the publication	A B C NA

AWARD: _____ **POINTS:** _____

FOR THE JURY: _____

EMAIL: _____

CHIEF JUDGE: _____

- A** = Excellent/Very Good
- B** = Good
- C** = Possible improvement
- NA** = Not applicable

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

TO THE EXHIBITOR: Should any aspect of this form be unclear, or should you like more detailed comments from your jury representative, please contact that individual using the listed email address.

Appendix B

Articles Literature Evaluation Form APS World Series of Philately

ENTRY: _____ ENTRY # _____

Large Gold	90-100	Silver	65-69
Gold	85-89	Silver/Bronze	60-64
Large Verm.	80-84	Bronze	55-59
Vermeil	75-79	Certificate	0-54
Large Silver	70-74		

AWARD: _____ POINTS: _____

FOR THE JURY: _____

EMAIL: _____

CHIEF JUDGE: _____

TREATMENT 30 points _____

Title matches content	A	B	C	NA
Beginning, middle, end	A	B	C	NA
Objective/Purpose established	A	B	C	NA
Organization/Logical progression	A	B	C	NA
Clarity	A	B	C	NA
Quality of writing	A	B	C	NA
Thoroughness	A	B	C	NA

A = Excellent/Very Good

B = Good

C = Possible Improvement

SIGNIFICANCE 20 points _____

Appeals to audience	A	B	C	NA
Importance to hobby	A	B	C	NA
Lasting value to readers	A	B	C	NA
Challenge/Difficulty	A	B	C	NA
Contains new information	A	B	C	NA

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

ORIGINALITY 5 points _____

Unusual Subject Matter	A	B	C	NA
Creativity of presentation	A	B	C	NA

RESEARCH/KNOWLEDGE 30 points _____

Accurate	A	B	C	NA
Extensive study	A	B	C	NA
Well justified conclusions	A	B	C	NA

TECHNICAL 15 points _____

Documentation/Credits	A	B	C	NA
Bibliography	A	B	C	NA
Headers/Footers	A	B	C	NA
Layout	A	B	C	NA
Editing	A	B	C	NA
Use of illustrations	A	B	C	NA
Internal headers	A	B	C	NA

TO THE EXHIBITOR: *Should any aspect of this form be unclear, or should you like more detailed comments from your jury representative, please contact that individual using the listed email address.*

Appendix C

Glossary

AAPE: The American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors - a group of 900+ exhibitors of stamps, covers, post cards and literature who are interested in preparing, improving and judging exhibits, and in putting on the shows where the exhibits are shown. Its many services include feedback on exhibits, titles pages and synopsis pages submitted for review, a mentor service, conventions, awards, and an Association website.

APSWU#30: The APS Writers Unit #30 — the APS Affiliate that exists to promote philatelic literature, support philatelic writers, and provide feedback and mentor services to its members.

Articles Only: A literature exhibition accepting articles under 8,000 words and columns.

Blog: An Internet discussion/opinion site moderated by the site manager.

Compendium: Defined on page 9.

CANEJ: The APS Committee on the Accreditation of National Exhibitions and Judges — a standing committee of the APS responsible for the day-to-day management of the APS accredited shows, judges and the judging process.

Exhibition Committee: See Show Committee.

FIP: The International Federation of Philately — The international body that accredits a corps of judges from whom juries are chosen.

First Responder: A judge assigned to be the first among the judges to answer questions from an exhibitor, on behalf of the panel; and to complete the LEEF.

GASS: The Great American Stamp Show held each summer, sponsored by APS.

Literature Exhibit Evaluation Form (LEEF): The form prepared by the First Responder to provide written feedback on a given exhibit to the exhibitor.

Message Board: An Internet discussion/opinion site more oriented to news and the answering of questions than a blog, but otherwise similar.

Open Exhibition: A literature exhibition held at larger shows accepting books, monographs, society journals and digital entries.

Palmares: The list of exhibits at an exhibition, organized by the level of awards won.

Professional Production Values: High quality attributes of a piece of hard copy or digital literature; for example, hard cover books with perfect binding, slick paper, slip cases, etc.

Proxies: An individual acting on behalf of an exhibitor at a show for the purpose of gathering feedback from judges for an exhibitor who cannot be present.

Push Technology: An Internet communication system in which the transaction request is generated by the central web server or publisher. This is used to update news, weather or other selected information that is updated on a periodic basis on the user's desktop interface.

QR Code: A Quick Response code: a type of matrix bar code that can be read by a digital device (a smartphone) to access additional information or a supporting website.

Show Committee: Volunteers who plan and put on a show or exhibition.

Appendix D

Administration

CANEJ

CANEJ is the acronym for the American Philatelic Society's Committee on the Accreditation of National Exhibitions and Judges. It is a very important committee, overseeing all aspects of philatelic and philatelic literature exhibiting and judging throughout the United States.

This is a standing committee of the APS that is comprised of a chairman (appointed by the APS president with the consent of the APS board), the APS president, and nine other members selected jointly by the APS president and the CANEJ chairman. These 11 make up the voting membership of the committee. The committee guidelines allow this number to fluctuate somewhat based on the needs of the APS and the project work in which CANEJ is engaged.

Additionally, there are three non-voting members: the immediate past CANEJ chairman, the senior FIP representative from the U.S., and the Canadian counterpart to the CANEJ chairman. The committee meets twice a year, but is constantly involved with projects during the year and supporting WSP shows and judging. CANEJ responsibilities are as follows:

- Recruiting, training and accrediting new APS national-level philatelic and philatelic literature judges and correspondingly, new chief judges.
- Supervising the performance of all accredited judges, including monitoring the activities of juries at the frames and during deliberations.
- Developing rules for exhibits and exhibiting at WSP (World Series of Philately) national shows.
- Creating and maintaining the *Manual of Philatelic Judging and Exhibiting*, the *Manual of Philatelic Literature Judging*, *Rules for WSP Shows*, and various other documents relating to judging and show administration.
- Initial adjudication of disputes involving exhibits, exhibiting or judging at WSP shows. The APS Board of Vice Presidents and Board of Directors are the final authority.
- Developing cooperative exhibiting and judging programs with national federations in other countries.
- Organizing judge training programs at APS **Great American Stamp Show** and other WSP shows as needed.
- Approval of judging panels at WSP shows and selection of the chief judge for each panel.
- The CANEJ Chair selects the juries and approves the prospectus for philatelic exhibiting and philatelic literature exhibiting for the APS Great American Stamp Show. NOTE: APS and APRL Board members are not to be selected to the juries at the Great American Stamp Show because Board meeting schedules often conflict with judging schedules.

The Characteristics and Ethics of Being a Judge

The Judge's Pledge: All APS accredited literature judges are obliged to sign and uphold the following pledge of ethical behavior. The Chair of CANEJ will periodically ask all APS accredited judges to reaffirm the Judge's Pledge.

Literature Judge's Pledge

I agree as a literature judge accredited by the American Philatelic Society to approach all philatelic judging with an impartial frame of mind.

I will at all times, compatible with personal responsibility, prior commitments and available transportation, be willing to serve when asked.

I will not competitively exhibit in any show at which I am a judge.

In all cases I will endeavor to render honest and equitable judgment based only on the exhibit's content.

I will be willing to participate in training and evaluating Apprentice judges during my assignments.

Should controversy arise in the judging I will, with Chief Judge's approval, consult disinterested non-exhibiting authorities in the given field for clarification before completing my evaluation.

I further agree to complete the required Literature Exhibit Evaluation Forms, providing meaningful feedback to exhibitors in a legible manner.

I agree to attend judging feedback sessions at shows where I am judging and to be of assistance to exhibitors at all reasonable times.

I acknowledge that if I accept a judging assignment and fail to notify the Organizing Committee promptly of my inability to attend, I may be subject to disciplinary action by the CANEJ.

The Characteristics and Ethics of Being a Judge

All APS accredited Literature Judges must evaluate each exhibit in accordance with guidelines and procedures established by the American Philatelic Society through CANEJ. Good judges share a number of important traits:

1. An attitude of service: the recognition that we all owe a great debt to those that came before us to carry on and enhance the arts of exhibiting and collecting that have provided us so much pleasure, and a willingness to repay that debt through service to the hobby.
2. A thirst for knowledge: an interest in learning more coupled with the humility that there is always more to learn from every situation and every person.
3. A desire to coach: not the process of teaching to impart knowledge; but instead, the process of identifying obstacles that keep an exhibitor from reaching their goals, and being able to formulate ways within the exhibitor's power to overcome those obstacles.
4. The ability to communicate: the logical organization of thoughts and the ability to articulate clearly and concisely in both written and oral forms.
5. A blessing of tact: Intellectual honesty tempered with the sensitivity to others' feelings. We become quite attached to our products, and no one truly appreciates having their baby called ugly, even if that is an honest assessment.
6. Intellectual integrity: The ability to get beyond ones' preconceived notions of perfection to be able to evaluate the success of another's effort without bias.

After these six traits come some other things that are essential: the time to review the entries at home to prepare for the show, and a schedule that allows you time at the show to perform your duties, and the financial means to spend \$1,000 or more of your own money every time you accept

an assignment for an open exhibition. (These expenses are possibly tax deductible; consult your financial advisor.)

As described in detail in Chapter 16, becoming a Philatelic Literature Judge is not an easy task. It is a demanding process. The APS Apprenticeship Program allows candidates to determine whether judging is something they really want to do, and it allows CANEJ to establish whether they are suitable to become judges. Philatelic Literature Judges should have a broad range of knowledge, not only in the general philatelic sense but also of related and supporting history. This is most useful in determining the significance of an historical period or event. It also serves as a foundation for the ability to assess the exhibitor's success in developing the complete story of a chosen subject.

One does not become a philatelic judge for glory or profit. Judges are generally accorded a certain amount of respect, but respect must be earned by hard work and interaction with the exhibitors in providing thoughtful, insightful and useful feedback and recommendations. A judge's reputation will last as long as performance is kept at a high level.

One of the challenges of being a judge is that everything done and said is subject to being second-guessed, and often is, by exhibitors, viewers, and even peers. A judge must develop the ability to evaluate criticism and understand its source and motivation. Judges must have a mind-set that allows them to accept valid criticism while gracefully ignoring unwarranted comments or attacks. While exhibitors may take criticism personally, a judge must not.

Achieving accreditation is not the end of the education of the judge. One of the best reasons for becoming a judge is that it involves a continuing learning process throughout the breadth and depth of our wonderful hobby. An active judge who prepares for and studies the exhibit entries will develop important skills, a broad knowledge of philately, respect for others' knowledge, insights and abilities, and a healthy sense of humility about how little one person can ever know.

Conflicts of Interest

Philatelic judges must avoid conflicts of interest or any appearance thereof with respect to their judging activities.

Judges must not judge exhibits by family members, including domestic partners. Additionally, philatelic judges who have had any direct role or compensation in the preparation of an exhibit should not serve as a member of a jury judging these exhibits. If such a situation unknowingly arises, the juror must advise the chief judge of the conflict of interest and recuse him/herself from any discussion or deliberations of the exhibit(s) in question, including medals and awards.

Requirements for Maintaining Accreditation

Once accredited, literature judges must comply with the following requirements, and any others deemed necessary by CANEJ:

- Serve as a judge at the national or FIP accredited show at least once every two calendar years.
- If currently involved in writing or editing philatelic literature, it is strongly suggested that literature judges exhibit for competition in any class in a national level show at least once every two years. Exhibiting is a dynamic art, always evolving. It is always a useful experience for judges to see the process from the viewpoint of the exhibitors.
- Complete a biannual report to CANEJ summarizing judging and exhibiting activities for the

two previous years.

- Attend judging seminars on a regular or remedial basis as determined by CANEJ.

Failure to serve on a jury once every three years will result in suspension as an active judge. Failure to attend CANEJ required seminars or workshops will result in suspension. Reinstatement as an active judge will be at the discretion of the Chair of CANEJ.

Voluntary Suspension, Retirement or Involuntary Removal from Accredited Status:

Accredited judges may request a temporary leave of absence from the accredited roster for personal reasons for a period of up to one year, at the discretion of the chair of CANEJ.

Accredited judges may resign their accreditation status at any time for any reason by notifying the chair of CANEJ. Judges who retire after many years of honorable service may be accorded the honorary designation of “Judge Emeritus.”

A judge may be suspended or removed from the roll of accredited judges by the chair of CANEJ for misconduct while judging, incompetence as a judge, or loss or suspension of APS membership (whether voluntarily or as a result of disciplinary action).

Judging in Canada

The Royal Philatelic Society of Canada (RPSC) is Canada’s national society for philatelists (www.rpsc.org). The RPSC speaks for all Canadian collectors at provincial, federal, and international levels of philately and is a member of the Fédération Internationale de Philatélie (FIP) and the Federación Interamericana de Filatelia (FIAF).

There is virtually no difference between exhibiting and judging in Canada and the United States. As in the U.S., a number of national-level shows occur across the country each year. These publish prospectuses and entry forms well in advance, often on the host club’s website. Shows are publicized in *The Canadian Philatelist*, as well as in *Canada Stamp News*, *Linns Stamp News*, or *The American Philatelist*. Mail-in exhibits are welcomed, though U.S. exhibitors need to be mindful of Canadian and U.S. customs regulations and forms. Many U.S. exhibitors routinely travel to Canadian shows.

APS guidelines are used for exhibit evaluation sheets, exhibitor feedback sessions and exhibiting/judging seminars. There is no Canadian equivalent to the APS *Manual of Philatelic Judging and Exhibiting*. Canadian judges follow these same guidelines.

The chair of the RPSC judging program is an *ex officio* and non-voting member of CANEJ. This affords regular communication between the two societies in all aspects of exhibiting and judging.

International Philatelic Literature Judging

At both the national and international exhibiting levels, the criteria used in judging are essentially the same. There are, however, differences in the procedures used at the two levels. Jury composition and judging at the international level are in accordance with the General Regulations for Exhibitions (GREX), the General and Special Regulations for Evaluations (GREV, SREVS) and the Guidelines for the Duties and Accreditation of Jurors in FIP World and Specialized Exhibitions developed by the FIP.