Judging Sheet

AWARD:	VR PRACTITIONER	
Name of Nominee:		
Name of Judge:		
Essential entry criteria: Must answer yes to all	Nominee is a current Member	Yes / No
	Nomination is GDPR compliant[1]	Yes / No
	Used appropriate form	Yes / No
	Has **not** won this award before[2]	Yes / No
Scoring Key (Do **not** use half points)	0-1: Inadequate or inappropriate evidence in the nomination 2-3: Minimal evidence in the nomination 4-5: Moderate evidence in the nomination 6-7: Good evidence in the nomination 8-9: Strong evidence in the nomination 10: Excellent evidence in the nomination	

A.	The nominee's professional background, experience and current area of VR provision are clearly outlined, relevant and appropriate to this award	Score: #
B.	The nomination demonstrates a contemporary, innovative and evidence-based approach to VR provision, and, wherever possible, with supporting evidence	Score: #
C.	Appropriate outcomes are demonstrated. These are relevant to the VR context, positive in the particular circumstances, and as far as possible they are measurable.	Score: #
D.	Overall, this nominee demonstrates an outstanding approach and level of VR provision. Their nomination contributes to the field as a best-practice example for other VR practitioners	Score: #
	TOTAL:	**# out of 40**

NB: Testimonials and any other supporting evidence are not scored separately. They should be considered only in relation to how they support/evidence the degree of achievement in the 3 scored sections above. E.g. strong, clear and relevant testimonials will strengthen one or more of the scored components.
NB: Wordcounts are indicative with a 20% tolerance either way
Refer to Guidelines and the nomination form for the information provided to the nominators.

---

[1] All applications must conform with GDPR. See Guidance document for details re consent
[2] Previous winners in the practitioner category are not eligible to be nominated again in this category.