

# TOASTMASTERS

## GENERAL EVALUATOR

Category	Description	Rating	Comments/ Recommendations
<b>Start</b>	On Time? Were the call to order, invocation, pledge to the flag, and opening remarks handled smoothly and orderly?		
<b>Table Topics</b>	Did members not on the program participate? Were the topics appropriate? Did table topics monopolize time?		
<b>Introductions</b>	Consider all introductions. Toastmaster, Guests, Topic Master, Evaluators. deserve more than just name and title (duty) Speakers deserve main event worthy introductions		
<b>Evaluation Team Reports</b>	Consider thoroughness, length and tact. How helpful did they seem to be? Were there suggestions for improvement? Were the reports encouraging? Were the following covered in the reports by:		
	<b>Evaluators</b>	Did the speakers accomplish their purpose? Did the speakers use and follow their manuals?	
	<b>Timer</b>	Were the time limits observed? Was the meeting smooth flowing? Did it drag anywhere?	
	<b>Grammarian</b>	Were filler words covered? Were verbal miscues covered? Were exceptional phrases mentioned?	
<b>Program</b>	Did the program meet the TM standard of excellence for variety, imagination, and participation? Did the program provide the members with a rewarding, educational experience in communication and leadership development?		
<b>Fun</b>	Did the members seem to enjoy the meeting? Did YOU enjoy it? What was the tone of the meeting?		
<b>Guests</b>	How many present? Did each member introduce himself or herself? Was each guest made to feel like the most important person in the room? How many became members?		
<b>Business</b> (optional) Omit if no Business Meeting	Done smoothly or did it drag? Too much time spent on triviality or did business get "railroaded through"? Was proper parliamentary procedure followed?		

Ratings: 5– Excellent, 4 – Good (Above Average), 3 – Satisfactory (Average), 2 - Should Improve, 1 – Must Improve (Requires immediate attention)

General Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_