

**best practice
paper:
serving as
a juror for
a design
award
competition**

The aim of Design Award Competitions is to evaluate and recognise existing work created by designers. Design Award Competitions can play an important role in the field, serving to illustrate and define current design benchmarks that may influence future design projects, methodologies and outcomes.

Design Award Competitions differ from contract work or award schemes that ask for original (new) work, which at times, may constitute speculative practice.

This document, *Best Practice Paper: Serving as a Juror for a Design Award Competition*, was developed as a set of guidelines for professional designers to serve as Jurors in Design Award Competitions in ways that are ethical and respect the integrity of designers, the design process and the value of design.

A best practice is a way of doing things that—through experience—has proven to achieve a desired result, or has become a standard way of doing things. In the context of the work of the International Council of Design, *Best Practice Papers for Design* are intended to provide designers and related stakeholders with guidelines and information about an array of concepts, processes and methodologies to address relevant issues for the promotion of ethical design practice.

This document is part of a series that also includes the ico-D *Best Practice Paper: Organising a Design Award Competition*.

LEXICON

AWARD COMPETITION—where recognition is given to existing work via an open application process. Other terms often used interchangeably with **Awards Competition: Award Scheme, Contest, Prize, etc.**

AWARD COMPETITION BY INVITATION—where recognition is given to existing work by a closed competition between applicants that were invited to submit work.

AWARD COMPETITION FOR ORIGINAL WORK—where recognition is given to new work—generally around a specific theme or problem statement. Can be open or closed to a select group of applicants. See page 11 for more.

AWARDS CEREMONY—An event or occasion planned to announce and celebrate the winners of the Award.

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS—the public announcement inviting entrants to submit their work (including theme, objectives and concept, the competition logistics, including timelines, the names of Jury members and all the terms and conditions of entry).

COMPETITION RULES—the Competition Rules document should include not only the Rules of Entry of the competition but all other regulations governing the Award including: Terms and Conditions, Fees, and any mandatory attendance.

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS—the time limit set for entrants to submit their work (should specify the timezone if there is a specific hour).

DESIGNATED AWARD—where recognition is given to existing work without a submission process.

ENTRANT—the Designer, design studio, client or other entity who is submitting work to the Competition.

ENTRY—the piece of design that it submitted for consideration, also called 'submission'.

FACILITATOR—the individual who is responsible for liaising between the Organiser, the Entrants and the Jury. This person may be an employee of the Organiser or not.

INNOVATION—this term is often erroneously used as a substitute for 'new' or 'different,' but innovation is much more impactful than mere novelty. Real innovation creates disruptive change, and this can only be measured over time based on sustained impact.

INTERNATIONAL DESIGN AWARD—an award competition is considered 'International' when the Jury is composed of representatives of least two of these six regions (North America, Latin America, Europe, Africa, Asia, Oceania). Call for submissions must be published and available in at least three regions.

JUDGING CRITERIA—the elements on which the entries will be judged by the Jury as well as the relative importance thereof.

JURY—a group of expert individuals tasked with choosing the winning entries from among the submissions.

JURY CHAIR—a member of the Jury appointed by the Organiser (or by the Jury if the Organiser has failed to do so) to be the collective voice of the Jurors, cast the deciding vote and prepare the Jury Report

JURY SECRETARY—an individual appointed to keep a record of the activities of the Jury for posterity.

JURY PROCESS—the rules of the process by which the Jury will reach decisions (may include rules on voting, what constitutes a majority, how much time is allotted to each piece, etc.)

JURY REPORT—a written report produced by the Jury Chair that records all the important elements of the judging process for posterity.

METADATA—information about a file which is embedded into the file and can be read by a variety of software programmes. Copyright ownership information such as the name of the author or creator, copyright status, and copyright notice, can be embedded into electronic files as metadata. Many software programmes such as Adobe Creative Suite permit the user to embed their metadata as the file is created. Once the copyright management metadata is embedded, the file be tracked as it is distributed online.

NATIONAL AWARD—an award competition is considered 'national' when it is limited to one country or a region within one country.

ORGANISER—the person or organisation who is responsible for running the award competition, including setting the rules and regulations, financial management of the competition, logistics of the competition, etc.

PRE-SELECTION COMMITTEE—a Committee of experts put in place to reduce the number of submissions to a number that can be reasonably examined by the Jury

PRIZES AND AWARDS—prizes are awards given in currency whereas awards can be any form of recognition given to the winner or winners of the competition.

REGIONAL DESIGN AWARD—for the purposes of this document, the term 'Regional' refers to trans-national initiatives, including multiple countries from one geographic region. For an award competition to be considered 'regional', the jury must include jurors from at least three countries of that region, and call for submissions must be published and available in at least three countries.

RIGHT OF ATTRIBUTION—the right of attribution is considered a moral right of copyright holders. Moral rights for copyright holders include right of attribution, right to integrity (preventing prejudicial distortions of the work), right to have a work published pseudonymously or anonymously, etc. Some countries (the US, for instance) have very weak support for moral rights of copyright holders, but in other countries (ie, France) there is strong support for moral rights.

SPECULATIVE PRACTICE—Speculative practices (also called 'spec work') are defined as: design work (including documented consultation), created by professional designers and organisations, provided for free or for a nominal fee, often in competition with peers and often as a means to solicit new business. In harmony with ico-D's code of professional conduct for designers, ico-D recommends that all professional designers avoid engaging in such practices.

STUDENT AWARD COMPETITION—where recognition is given to existing student work or class work.

CLARIFICATION

*Sometimes the term 'Design Competition' can refer to a Design Award but sometimes it refers to a competition to assign a design contract. While it is possible to conduct a competition to assign design contracts in a manner that is fair to both designer and client, we suggest caution as often Design Competitions fall into the domain of **Speculative Practice**.*

See our note on page 11.

table of contents

03 **lexicon**

INTRODUCTION

06 what is the value of design award competitions?
06 understanding contest objectives
06 types of award competitions
07 stages of awards competitions
07 responsibilities of jury members

SERVING AS A JUROR FOR A DESIGN AWARD COMPETITION

08 **accepting an invitation to serve on a jury**

08 evaluating an invitation
09 evaluating your capacity to sit on the jury
09 evaluating if you have a conflict

09 **roles and responsibilities**

09 jury member responsibilities
09 special responsibilities within the jury
09 responsibilities of the organiser
10 role of facilitator

10 **judging and deliberation**

10 before deliberation
10 jury deliberation
10 distribution of awards/prizes

10 **announcement of results**

10 integrity of the jury

ISSUES JURORS SHOULD BE AWARE OF

11 **competitions for original work and 'spec' work**

11 intellectual property
11 conflict of interest and bias
12 vetting and pre-selection
12 return of materials and exhibit

introduction

These guidelines are intended to assist individuals invited to serve as members of a Jury in a Design Award Competition, as well as award competition organisers. The quality of the Jury may have significant impact on the quantity and quality of submissions received. These best practices for Jurors have been developed to promote consistent high standards, and aim to encourage broad representation and a common application of practical considerations.

This document is intended to serve as a companion to existing ico-D Best Practice documents. For additional information, please consult *Best Practice Paper: Organising Design Award Competitions*.

Design award competitions differ from competitions for contract work. This document provides guidelines for best practices in the organisation of Design Award Competitions.

Award competitions are mostly aimed at evaluating and recognising existing work. They can illustrate and define current benchmarks that may influence future design projects.

WHAT IS THE VALUE OF DESIGN AWARD COMPETITIONS?

The main purpose of Awards, such as 'Poster Design Award', 'Package Design Award', 'Interior Design Award', 'Product Design Award', 'Sustainable Design Award' etc., is to recognise the merit of existing work, to raise standards of design and to promote a better and wider use of design.

UNDERSTANDING CONTEST OBJECTIVES

Each Design Award Competition has unique objectives. Thus the structure, format and mechanics of each Design Award competition should reflect those unique objectives. The organiser may wish to promote the design output of individual designers to promote regional excellence, or showcase the impact of design on a specific industry, to reveal excellence in the profession or to convince business of the impact of design on sales or any number of other objectives. Having a clear understanding of what they wish to achieve is paramount to the success of the competition.

TYPES OF AWARD COMPETITIONS

The possible reasons for putting in place a design award competition are innumerable, as are the possible objectives. These are some examples of the most common types of award competitions out there.

Recognition of design achievement

Traditionally, practicing designers have seen design awards as a means to recognise the work of individual designers. These awards focus on the recognition of design achievement to enhance the individual designer's commercial stature and recognition of provision of good service to clients. This traditional format celebrates the design product or 'designs', and, is usually based on a fairly superficial review of the visual attributes of the design submitted—graphic, product or spatial. The Jury, in most cases, reviews images—a process that is relatively easy, and quick.

Recognition of design excellence

While recognition of good professional achievement can be effectively assigned to many submissions, excellence—by definition—can only be assigned to a very few. This type of award advances from focusing on "designs" to considering the process itself, the "designing". The focus moves away from the visual aspects of individual products to the professional capacity of the designer.

Reviewing "designing", the abstract, invisible design process, is far more complicated and time consuming, requiring a complicated effort to describe and evaluate objectives and processes through a comparison of hard-to-collect-and-compare data and results.

Demonstration of impact of design

This format focuses on convincing an audience of the potential of design to achieve desired outcomes. Whether economic development or social change, environmental protection or other. Such efforts can be discipline specific—visual design, interactive design, product design, fashion design, etc., or sector specific—health, transportation, habitation, urban accessibility, etc. Such efforts are aimed at influencing very specific audiences—not designers, but governments, business sector leaders, media influencers, etc. The intention to impact very specific target audiences greatly influences the format and mechanics of the award scheme.

Awards that encourage work for a cause

ico-D strongly believes that the social, cultural and environmental responsibilities of professional designers are just as important as their economic and marketing capabilities. Design awards can be a way to value work that is for a higher cause.

STAGES OF AWARD COMPETITIONS

Stage	Responsible entity
Competition: Concept, Structure and Planning	Organiser
Call for Submissions	Organiser
Submission of Entries	Entrants
<i>Pre-Selection Process (where applicable)</i>	<i>Pre-Selection Jury</i>
Final Judging	Jury
Notification to Entrants	Organiser
Awards Ceremony	Organiser
<i>Awards Exhibit (optional)</i>	<i>Organiser</i>
<i>Return of Materials (where applicable)</i>	<i>Organiser</i>
Communication of results to public	Organiser

RESPONSIBILITIES OF JURY MEMBERS

When sitting on a Jury, a professional designer has responsibilities not only to the Organiser and Entrants but also to the greater design community. Each distinct Award Competition has responsibilities that are specific to their structure. These should be clearly outlined by the Organiser in advance and it is the duty of each Jury member to perform them to the best of their abilities. But the responsibility does not end there.

Jury members do not serve as individuals; they have a responsibility to serve the interests of the greater design community. The Jury member is not an instrument of the Organiser; they have been entrusted with elevating the standards of the design community and should act to advocate for these standards, for professional practice and for good design. If a Jury member is identified as representing an association, educational institution or promotional body, then they also have a representational responsibility towards this body and the community of designers they serve. Jury members should not represent the interests of their firm or their own professional interests while serving in the capacity as juror.

-serving as a juror for a design award competition

ACCEPTING AN INVITATION TO SERVE ON A JURY

Receiving an invitation to be a Juror in a design award competition is an honour and a responsibility. Your work as a member of the Jury, and the decisions that you make in the process, will have impact on the event Organiser, the designers whose work you evaluate, your colleagues who join you as Jury members, and through the results, the larger community of designers. Invitations should be considered with care.

EVALUATING AN INVITATION

Before accepting an invitation to serve as a Juror, we recommend that you take the time to carefully evaluate the competition to ensure that it is organised in a manner that respects you as a professional, respects the Entrants and ensures that the competition is planned adequately. Some things to look at:

Objectives and desired outcomes

The objectives and the desired outcomes, as well as the targeted group of Entrants and targeted audience to be influenced should be carefully defined as this will influence the award criteria and messaging.

Judging Criteria

Entrants should be made aware of the guidelines Jurors will base themselves on to determine and select the works that are recognised. Criteria could include originality, innovation, excellence, quality of execution, etc.

Competition Rules

The rules of the award competition should be clearly defined in advance and made available to all Entrants before they submit work. Within the general Awards Competition Rules, information should be provided on all aspects of the competition including the judging criteria, the timeline and process of application, the fees and the conditions of eligibility.

Terms and Conditions of Entry

The terms and conditions should include intellectual property rights such as permissions and rights of reproduction, information on whether the work will be exhibited, be returned—or not, and how it will be used and distributed. Legal conditions should be clear and legible by a layman and not clearly skewed in favour of the organiser.

Honorarium/Reimbursement of Expenses

We recommend that the Organiser pay the Jurors' travel, and provide accommodation and per diems. An honorarium should be given to Jurors to acknowledge their professional work.

Extra-judging Duties

Jurors are sometimes requested to make public presentations, participate in panels or workshops or take on other duties at events related to the competition. If this is the case, details of these additional obligations and the associated honorarium should be provided in advance.

Rules and Regulations and Decision-making Methodology

All Jury members should be provided with the Competition Rules. International jury members should be provided with an English translation of the full set of regulations. The Organisers should have set a decision-making process, which includes, for example, definition of majority, method for conflict resolution, time allotted to evaluate each work, etc.

Jury Diversity

To ensure diversity of viewpoints and to minimise the possibility of biases, we recommend that the jury composition be diverse and representative of the geographical region being covered. Thus elements to consider in jury selection should include:

- gender representation
- age distribution
- ethnic/religious/cultural representation
- geographical representation (especially in regional and international contexts)

Potential Jurors might want to enquire as to the Organiser's policy on jury diversity and their intentions with regard to recruiting a diverse jury before accepting a position on the Jury.

Standards

The Council does not recommend that professional designers

accept to act as Jury members or take part in design award competitions that do not comply with international standards for best practices. More information on Design Award Competitions can be found in the companion document: **Best Practice Paper: Organising Design Award Competitions**.

EVALUATING YOUR CAPACITY TO SIT ON THE JURY

Design is a diverse sector of professional practice and there are a number of approaches to structuring a Jury. Assess whether you feel your professional experience is an appropriate match to the competition topic or theme. The expertise of the Jury should be relative to the discipline being judged (i.e. graphic designers should be judging logo competitions and industrial designers should be judging product design competitions).

You should try to evaluate your personal skillset against those you can ascertain will be necessary from the documents provided. It is fair to assume that a Jury will be diverse and that you alone are not expected to embody all of the necessary skills to cover all of the categories. However, if the Competition requires key areas of specific expertise (i.e., a specialisation in graphic design or wayfinding) that you do not possess, then the match is probably not a good one.

EVALUATING IF YOU HAVE A CONFLICT

The Organiser should clearly define what constitutes conflict of interest within the rules of their Design Award Competition and how it should be addressed in deliberation. If you have a significant interest (financial or personal interest in the matter) in an entry or category, this should be communicated to the Organiser. In this case, it is suggested that you recuse yourself from that particular deliberation.

Your agreement to serve as a Juror establishes a bond of trust between you and the Organiser, and you and the Entrants. The consequences of that trust being broken are outlined in this document.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Whether you are an experienced Juror or accepting your first invitation, the judging process for the competition should be clearly understood and carefully observed.

JURY MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Attendance

All Jurors should attend all official meetings of the panel, whether they take place face-to-face or in an online environment. If absences are accepted, a clear definition of quorum for meetings should be established.

Conflict of Interest

As a matter of ethics, Jury members should recuse themselves

from the deliberations and voting on submissions of their own work or that of their immediate family, firm, designers with whom they collaborate on a regular basis, or their students.

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE JURY

Chairing a Jury

For smooth functioning, the Organiser should name a Jury Chair. The Jury Chair can be appointed by the Organiser or selected by the Jury. The Jury Chair ensures that the selection process is conducted in a manner that reflects the competition rules, keeps the jury deliberations moving ahead, in the case of deadlock may be given the deciding vote, and will be responsible for a report of the deliberations.

Chairing a jury is usually determined by seniority, expertise or stature. It is a position of honour but carries with it responsibilities, so should only be accepted if you are prepared to fulfil these additional responsibilities. If the Organiser has extended an invitation to a specific individual to serve as the Chairperson of the Jury, it is recommended that this be clearly stated in the invitation to all Jurors.

If you are selecting a Chair from among your peers, it is suggested that you choose an individual with substantial past jury experience, not just an experienced designer; these are different skillsets. We suggest that the Jury Chair familiarise themselves with this document and with the **Best Practice Paper: Organising Design Award Competitions**.

The Jury Chair will prepare a written report for the Organiser including:

- official record of the voting results
- judging process and experience
- issues and recommendations
- overall evaluation of submissions

All Jury members have the right to contribute observations to the report. Where Jury members have dissenting opinions about the results of the judging process, they may ask for this opinion to be recorded in the report.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ORGANISER

Before an Award Competition is launched and before potential Jury members are approached, it is the responsibility of the Organiser to clearly define the contest objectives, rules and to define the decision-making process:

Jury Chair

The Organiser should appoint a Chair to the Jury.

Judging Criteria

The Judging Criteria should be clear from the onset and should have been part of the initial Call for Submissions. The Facilitator should ensure that the criteria on which the entries are to be judged are clear and understood by all members of the Jury.

Rules and Regulations

All Jury members should be provided with a full set of documents describing the rules of the competition. International Jury members should be provided with an English translation of the full set of regulations.

Decision-making/methodology

The Organisers should stipulate a decision-making process within the Call for Submissions. If they have not done so, the Jury should determine this before starting to deliberate. Issues that should be resolved include:

- is voting by a straight majority? Two-thirds?
- is a consensus expected? (and if so, what is the method of conflict resolution?)
- what is the maximum time allotted to evaluate each work?

Secretary to the Jury

The Organiser should appoint a Secretary to the Jury. A record of jury deliberations should be generated, concluding with a list of the total number of works considered in each category and a list of designs selected for recognition. This list should be signed by all Jury members. The Secretary to the Jury is not a Jury member.

ROLE OF FACILITATOR

A Facilitator should be appointed by the Organiser to coordinate between the Organiser, the Jury and the Entrants. This individual can be an Organiser representative or employee or a third party.

The typical duties of the Facilitator are:

- overseeing receipt of submissions
- receiving and addressing questions pertaining to the Competition Rules
- coordinating with the Organiser to receive adequate answers to Entrants' questions to relay back
- processing the Call for Submissions after the submissions deadline of the Competition
- ensuring that submissions meet the Rules outlined in the Call for Submissions.
- managing the flow of submissions to the Jury members
- keeping a register of all submissions
- ensuring the anonymity of the submissions before the Jury
- ensuring all submissions are returned (unless other arrangements have been agreed upon)

Questions and relevant answers that could be generally useful to other competition participants, should be publically shared i.e.: via a website pertaining to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).

To avoid conflicts of interest, it is recommended that the Facilitator not act as a Secretary to the Jury, nor take part in the Jury's deliberation in any way.

JUDGING AND DELIBERATION

Ideally, judging should be done in a face-to-face environment, permitting open discussion.

BEFORE DELIBERATION

When the Jury first meets, a pre-determined deliberation process must be communicated and put in place. If the Organiser has

not nominated a Jury Chair, the jury will elect a Jury Chair from amongst themselves.

Unless a Pre-Selection Committee has already established whether submissions meet the Competition Rules, the Jury will examine all submissions, determine whether each meets the Rules and will exclude work that does not meet the rules.

JURY DELIBERATION

A simple and transparent judging methodology is recommended. Where there is a large number of submissions it may take multiple rounds of voting to establish the final winners. In these cases, it is practical to establish short list of finalists and then agree on the winners of the prizes.

As part of the Jury's process, it is normal for there to be discussion and debate on the merits of the submissions. The Jury Chair should ensure that neither the Organiser nor any outside individual exerts influence on the Jury in their work.

Jurors should respect the opinions of their colleagues on the Jury and not pressure other Jury members to change their vote.

Confidentiality

Jury deliberations are secret.

Language

Where the Organiser has invited a Juror (or Jurors) who require(s) assistance with the language of the Jury's work, the Organiser is responsible to provide a translator so that each Juror may participate equally.

Number of Entries

A Jury can only reasonably judge a limited number of entries.

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS/PRIZES

The whole value of what was promised in the Call for Submissions should be distributed to the winners. In the event that in a given category it was decided not to award a prize, the prizes may be re-distributed among the winners.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESULTS

INTEGRITY OF THE JURY

Jury decisions are final. No other entities or individuals can be allowed to alter the decisions made by the Jury. It is the responsibility of every Jury Member to ensure this.

issues jurors should be aware of

As a Juror, your role is not only to judge the work submitted to the Design Award Competition, but also to contribute your expertise to the overall Competition. Your reputation will be compromised if you are associated with a competition that does not follow Best Practices. There are some larger issues regarding the treatment of design work and ethical standards that you should be aware of. Being informed will ensure that you protect your professional reputation and can play a role in helping Design Award Competition Organisers protect theirs.

COMPETITIONS FOR ORIGINAL WORK AND ‘SPEC’ WORK

This document, and the accompanying *Best Practice Paper: Organising Design Award Competitions*, deal very specifically with Awards recognising existing work. This is because Award Competitions for *original work* can fall dangerously into an area that is very similar to “Spec” work or Speculative Practice. The Council is resolutely against any endeavour that asks designers to work for free. In very rare instances, Design Award Competitions for original work are deemed ethical by the Council. In clear differentiation from Speculative Practice, if the purpose of the Award is to raise awareness to an issue, it is possible to structure an Award in such a way as to respect the integrity of the designer, on the condition that:

- entrants are asked to participate on the basis of a theme with the purpose of highlighting a cause or issue (rather than a commercial objective)
- the competition does not generate a viable product or something that can be used as the basis for one, by anyone other than the original designer
- every effort should be made to reduce expenses incurred by the entrants: there should be no entrance fee, or the entrance fee should be minimal
- entrants should not be required to submit physical samples of works until the final stages of judging

- submission guidelines should be clearly communicated to mitigate disqualified submissions

A competition for original work will generally yield an exhibition or catalogue bringing awareness to a matter of public interest. In competitions for original work, where a designer has spent time on a submission uniquely for the competition, all prizes should be given in every category.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The International Council of Design vigorously defends the right of the designer to maintain ownership of their work. It is unethical for a Competition Organiser to demand, invoke or claim ownership of copyrights or intellectual property rights of the submissions collected.

Right of Reproduction/Display

It is normal for Competitions to display winning work and sometimes even the submissions. This is acceptable as long as the intention to do so is clearly stated from the outset. It is unethical to demand transmission of ownership rights. Permissions should be explicitly obtained for display, exhibition or any other use of intellectual property, stipulating the length of time.

All works published must be credited to the designer. Any Metadata embedded in electronic submissions should be preserved as is technologically possible.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND BIAS

All humans have some kind of personal bias, which is why it is important to have a Jury composed of at least more than three Jurors to determine the awardees. The reputation of the Design Award Competition will depend not only on the fairness of the judging process, but also on the *appearance of fairness*. If an Award is given to a family member of a Jury member, or all the awards go to one gender (especially if the Jury is composed only of one gender), or if the same studios receive awards year after year and the Jury has been composed of the same people from one iteration to another, the Award will develop a reputation for bias, regardless of whether there was impropriety or not.

There are steps which can be taken to counter the bias or perception of conflict of interest:

Jury Diversity

To ensure diversity of viewpoints and to minimise the possibility of entrenched biases, we recommend that the jury composition

be diverse and representative of the geographical region being covered. Thus elements to consider in jury selection should include:

- gender representation
- age distribution
- ethnic/religious/cultural representation
- geographical representation (especially in regional and international contexts)

Variability

Where a competition is an annual (or recurring) event, we recommend that the jury composition be altered from one competition to another. As a general rule, we recommend that less than half of the Jurors serve on consecutive Juries. The reason for this is that there is always some element of personal bias. It is important to ensure relevance and vitality while maintaining continuity.

Conflict of Interest

If a Jury member has a significant interest (financial or personal interest in the matter) in an entry or category, it is suggested that they recuse themselves from that particular deliberation.

Anonymity

The anonymity of Entrants in front of the Jury should be preserved. The Facilitator is responsible for maintaining a register of the Entrants and submissions and managing a system to track these, ensuring that the Jury does not see any identifying characteristics (signature or otherwise distinguishing marks).

VETTING AND PRE-SELECTION

Pre-selection Committee

When the number of entries is so large as to make it necessary to convene a Jury panel meeting for more than two or three days, it is recommended to put in place a Pre-selection Committee. The Organiser should appoint five or more Committee members for this purpose. The majority of the Committee members should be practicing professional designers.

The role of the Pre-selection Committee is to reduce the number of submissions to a number that can be reasonably examined by the Jury. They need to be provided with broad guidelines on which to base their recommendations, including:

- target number of entries that must be reached
- clarity of judging criteria and scope (including a process to eliminate the submissions that obviously shouldn't make the cut)
- contingency plans for submissions with missing information or lack of clarity
- process to ensure that multiple Pre-selection Committee members see each entry (a minimum of three members per work)

Allowances should be made to allow the Pre-selection Committee to make suggestions to improve or expedite the pre-selection process including suggestions to reduce the number of passing entries if the quality of the pool is very uneven.

Managing a High Volume of Entries: Problem with Pre-Selection

The Organiser should be aware that if a Pre-selection Committee is used, the Jury does not see all of the work. There is therefore the

risk of eliminating innovative work too soon in the process. One way to deal with this is to reduce the volume of entries. This generally increases the quality of the overall award. Techniques for reducing volume include:

- increasing submission requirements
- limiting the number of entries per person, per category—to one

RETURN OF MATERIALS AND EXHIBIT

Protection and Return

The Organiser is responsible for the safety of all submissions received. This pertains to both the condition of physical objects received and the privacy and safety of digital work uploaded. Organisers should include in their Competition Rules a statement regarding the handling of the submissions after they have been judged (i.e. erasing of a digital file, disposal of, or return of physical submissions), the terms and conditions regarding charges for the return (where applicable) and the timeframe in which it will happen.

When the submissions received are physical products to be returned, Organisers are advised to insure them against loss or damage in handling, until they have been restored to the Entrants.

Published by:

ico-D Secretariat

50 Rue Royer Ouest
Montréal, QC
H2Y 1W7
CANADA

Phone: +1 514 875 7545

Email: info@ico-D.org

Website: www.ico-D.org

For more information contact:

Ana Masut

Managing Director

md@ico-d.org

© 2019 International Council of Design