

Judging Process For CAPA Competitions

This document outlines the details of our competition judging process, including the criteria for evaluation, the scoring system, and the measures in place to ensure fairness and consistency. It aims to provide transparency in how judges are selected, how scores are calculated, and how discrepancies in scoring are handled. By fostering an understanding of these processes, we aim to enhance the credibility of our competitions and build trust among participants and judges.

Judging Specifications


Competition details and judging criteria are clearly outlined for each of our national and zone competitions. Before the commencement of the judging process, judges are briefed on these specifications. All judges must evaluate images using our standardized scoring system, which ranges from 4 to 10 points in half-point increments.

Judges are selected based on their expertise in the photographic genres which encompass the competition they will be judging.

Variance Calculation

After initial scoring, we calculate score variance by subtracting the lowest score from the highest. The variance calculation provides an objective measure for identifying potentially controversial scores.

For images with a variance of 3.0 or more, judges are asked to reconsider their original scores. However, judges are not obligated to change their scores, and entrants cannot appeal the results respects their individual perspectives.



Acknowledging Subjectivity

This threshold is a simple and effective way to detect major discrepancies in judges' assessments. A difference of 3.0 or more serves as our benchmark for initiating a review. This threshold effectively highlights substantial disagreements in scoring. To preserve the judging process's integrity and avoid drawn-out conflicts, an entrant is not permitted to appeal a judge's score or decision.

This scoring variance and review process acknowledges the subjectivity of photography judging, which depends on a judge's experience in specific genres.

Our judging process strives for consistency typically reflected in a normal distribution of scores. While some variation is expected due to the subjective nature of image evaluation, the shape of each judge's scoring distribution can reveal tendencies towards strict or lenient scoring.

We acknowledge and accept a certain degree of variance in individual judges' scoring patterns, as this reflects the inherent subjectivity in evaluating images. However, substantial deviations from the expected distribution may indicate a lack of consistency in a judge's approach.

Judges' Summary Spreadsheet

After the conclusion of the competition, we develop a Judges' Summary spreadsheet which is distributed only to the particular judges and to the Director of the Judging Program. The spreadsheet provides information based on an evaluation of the judges' scoring in each theme of the competition, and the overall scoring of the competition.

When a judge's scoring pattern shows significant variance from the norm, it triggers a review by Director of the Judging Program and his team of senior Association judges. This review process involves:


- Evaluating the specific images and scores assigned by the judge in question
- Consulting with the judge to understand their scoring rationale
- If necessary, provide appropriate remedial training.

The Director of the Judging Program ensures high-level over-sight. This can help identify systemic issues which require training program enhancements and/or modification in the selection of judges for competition processes.

Feedback and Learning

In addition to the judges receiving a copy of the judges' summary spreadsheet, they are also provided access to all of the competition's scored images. The frequency distribution charts for each theme offer concrete, visual feedback on scoring patterns. It allowing the judges to review all images and compare their scores with other judges, which promotes self-reflection and learning. It can also help identify personal biases or areas where a judge's evaluation might differ significantly for their peers.

Judges' Self-Reflection and Learning Cycle



Frequency Distribution Charts

Frequency distribution chart #1 below illustrates a typical judging normal distribution curve. It is common to have a gap between the frequency distribution curves, which indicates the presence of both strict and generous judging approaches.




Chart 1 – Frequency distribution chart for judging an average photo competition.




Chart 2 – Frequency distribution chart reflects an inconsistency in scoring compared to the other two judges.

Chart #2 reflects an inconsistency in scoring compared to the other two judges. This deviation may prompt the Director of the Judging Program to initiate a review of these images.

By breaking down the scoring analysis by theme, we are assisting the judges to

understand their expertise and scoring patterns as they vary across different photographic genres. This is crucial for identifying areas of strength and areas in need of improvement.

Conclusion

This level of openness in the judging process builds trust among competition participants and judges alike, enhancing the credibility of our competitions.

Our competition assessment framework helps maintain the integrity of our judging system while respecting the nuanced nature of photography assessment.

For questions related to competition rules and judging guidelines, contact me judgingdirector@capacanada.ca

Bill Hall – FCAPA
CAPA Director of Judging