



THE UK COMPLAINT HANDLING AWARDS '18

For more information, contact Gerard on gerard.gargan@awardsinternational.eu or call 020 7193 3373.

Scoring of entries

Our aim is to provide a robust and transparent judging process that provides clarity and confidence to all involved.

Entries are scored using predetermined criteria, with written entries being used to provide shortlisted finalists who then also make 15 minute presentations to a panel of judges. Scores are generated from a combination of the written entry and the live presentations.

Winners from each category are identified based on the highest score. An overall winner, one across all sector specific and discipline specific categories will be identified from the highest scores overall.

All entrants receive feedback reports to help continuously improve their business performance. Finalists will receive evaluation feedback reports showing their performance vs other finalists, including winners.

Scoring Grid

Scoring stages	By whom	Basis of assessment	Outcome	Impact on scoring
1. Shortlist				
	Shortlist judging panel 3 – 5 Judges	Written entry Criteria 1 – 7 <i>Summary will be especially important</i>	Shortlist of finalists	Score not carried forward
2. Assessment of the finalists				
	Category judging panels 3 – 5 Judges each	Written entry Criteria 1 -7	Score	50% of weighting of final score for all categories
	Category judging panels 3 – 5 Judges each	Live presentation Criteria 2 - 7	Score	50% of weighting of final score for all categories

There are a standard set of 7 criteria across all of the categories.

Each criterion has 100 marks available. All 7 criteria will be used for both the shortlisting of finalists (by the judging panel) and for scoring written entries by the finalist judging panel. Finalist presentations will be scored against criteria 2-7 only.



For more information, contact Gerard on gerard.gargan@awardsinternational.eu or call 020 7193 3373.

Scoring criteria

Scoring criteria Overall maximum word count allowed is 2000 words including the summary	Score available (out of 100)
The case for recognition	
1. Summary An overview of the initiative that provides a robust, thorough and compelling argument for why this entry 100 deserves recognition (elements of the other 6 criteria should be included). 200 words maximum NB. Will be used for shortlisting finalists and the scoring of the written entries but is not relevant to finalist presentations.	100
The following criteria are relevant to all stages of judging: shortlisting, written entries and finalist presentation Each criterion requires a compelling, fully evidenced description.	
The drivers for change	
2. Business rationale and context The drivers and targeted business benefits/aims that provided the rationale and context for the initiative.	100
The change achieved	
3. The outstanding initiative delivered The resultant outstanding initiative/project/campaign that has been delivered.	100
4. Business impact and results achieved The resultant impact on business performance and results- linking with original targeted benefits/aims	100
How was the change achieved	
5. Clear insight The clear insight achieved into unmet needs of the business and how this was achieved, including the involvement of the team throughout the initiative/project/project/campaign	100
6. Innovative and creative solution The solution to the unmet needs of the business, how this was developed by the team and what made it innovative and creative	100
7. Effective implementation The implementation of the solution and what made it effective, including how the team contributed throughout the process including the management of time and budgets	100



THE UK COMPLAINT
HANDLING
AWARDS'18

For more information, contact Gerard on gerard.gargan@awardsinternational.eu or call 020 7193 3373.

Scoring Guidelines

Rating	Description of how well the entry meets the criteria	Score Available
Outstanding	Compelling, robust, fully evidenced description	80 - 100
Strong	Very good story with some strong evidence	60 - 79
Adequate	Good, well evidenced description	40 - 59
Limited	Some weak areas, would have benefited from more evidence	20 - 39
Weak	Unconvincing, weakly evidenced description	0 - 19