ANA RATING SHEET FOR NUMISMATIC EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT TITLE _____ JUDGE NUMBER _____

_____ _____Convention

CATEGORY (CLASS) _____ EXHIBIT NO. _____ NO. OF CASES _____

RATING ELEMENT	COMMENTS	SCORE
TITLE and SCOPE - 5 points The title should be obvious, with short statements of the exhibit's scope and of the story the exhibitor intends to tell.		/5 start 4
BASIC NUMISMATIC INFORMATION - 10 points The numismatic specifications of the exhibited items should be described to the extent needed by the exhibit's scope to answer the questions of another numismatist. Examples: mint and mintage, composition, dimensions, designer, engraver, variety identification, bibliographic/catalog references.		/10 start 8
SPECIAL NUMISMATIC INFORMATION - 15 points Enough additional information should be given to answer the questions of a general viewer. Examples: historic, biographic, geographic, economic, cultural, and artistic information.		/15 start 12
INSPIRATION and EDUCATION - 10 points The exhibit should tell a story that stimulates an interest in this or related material and suggests ways to collect it.		/10 start 8
CREATIVITY and ORIGINALITY - 10 points The exhibit should be novel and imaginative in concept, content, scope, design, or presentation.		/10 start 7
ATTRACTIVENESS - 10 points The exhibit should be neat, well-designed, and eye-catching; the color scheme pleasing and effective; the title and text easy to read and not faded or dingy from repeated display. Grammar and typographic errors will be addressed here.		/10 start 8
BALANCE - 10 points The numismatic items, the information, and the related materials in the exhibit should be balanced and related to the exhibit's scope.		/10 start 8
COMPLETENESS - 5 points The exhibit should present all the numismatic material necessary to support the title and statement of scope. Allowance should be made for material not generally available to collectors or for which there is insufficient exhibit space.		/5 start 5
DEGREE OF DIFFICULTY - 10 points The exhibit should show dedication to collecting, in that the numismatic material or the related information was difficult to assemble or to present. Examples: multiple rare pieces, new research, a collection that took years to assemble.		/10 start 1
CONDITION - 10 points The numismatic material should be the best that is reasonably available to the exhibitor, who may make a statement about availability for the benefit of viewers or judges.		/10 start 1
RARITY - 5 points Rarity is judged by the number of pieces believed / known to exist, not the value of individual pieces; exhibitor can advise.		/5 start 1
TOTAL - 100 points		/100

Optional judge's signature _____

2022 ANA Exhibit Scoring Standard Updates for the Three Judging Elements related to Numismatic Material and Research

Adopted by the ANA Exhibit Committee March 10, 2018. Modified August 2022 to reflect an experimental change in rarity scoring.

Current ANA judges, exhibitors, and judging apprentices have requested written guidance on the scoring of the three judging elements related to the numismatic material and research. Review of recent judging results shows that there are, at times, significant differences, both higher and lower, from how we would like to see these criteria applied. The following information should enable more accurate scoring of these elements of the current ANA judging standards.

The monetary value of the material being displayed is not a factor in any of these three categories. An exhibitor who makes a statement that material relevant to the exhibit's scope is too expensive to acquire, but who adequately discusses and illustrates said material, should not be penalized as heavily as one who ignores the expensive material and fails to acknowledge it. Of course, an exhibit of the same scope that includes the expensive material will get appropriately higher scores.

Degree of Difficulty

The start point is one (1). Typically, scores will range from three (3) to nine (9) and a very occasional ten (10).

1-3: All of the material is common. "The exhibit material can be purchased at any show" is a typical judging comment. No evidence of new research.

4-6: There may be multiple rare items (fewer than 100 known) with no evidence of new research. Fewer rare pieces and/or relatively common pieces with good new research not normally known to collectors and/or specialists in the type of material being displayed should also score in this range. An exhibitor can also make a statement about the years/decades of work required to acquire the material, which should earn one (1) to three (3) extra points beyond an exhibit that does not make this observation.

7-8: Same criteria as the four (4) to six (6) point range with the additional difficulty of multiple rare or very rare (fewer than ten known) items, one or more important ownership pedigrees, new discoveries, and evidence of new research ranging from an intermediate level to very high level.

9-10: Multiple rare and very rare items, some of which may be unique, and the exhibit also includes new research ranging from an intermediate to very high level.

Note: An exhibit displaying a "fortuitous find(s)" normally does not get extra credit in degree of difficulty. The exception to this is research by which the exhibitor concluded that the material existed, then spent years/decades searching for the material. Or, alternatively, it took considerable research to determine that the material was previously not known to numismatists.

Condition

The start point is one (1). Typically, scores will range from three (3) to ten (10) with most falling into the five (5) to eight (8) range.

Condition should take into account the overall average condition of each piece of numismatic material that is reasonably available to an exhibitor. For example, a rare or very rare piece with a condition of VF that is described as "finest known" should be averaged in with the balance of the material as a ten (10). Likewise, a very rare piece with a known population of two (2) that is the second finest known should be averaged in as a seven (7) or eight (8) even if it is heavily worn or is in a no-grade certified holder. An exhibitor may make a statement about difficulty of acquiring better material than is shown. It is not the intent that a judge tally a score for each item shown and divide by the total items. Use your gut. The point is that one or two "finest known" items should not drive an exhibit to a ten if other pieces could be upgraded with only moderate effort.

An exhibit scope that intends to display low grade or environmentally damaged material or a condition progression, low condition to high condition, should not be penalized. Judges have discretion to assign an appropriate score in these cases. An exhibit displaying one or more low quality but easily available items should receive an appropriate deduction.

Rarity

The start point is one (1). Typically, scores will be one (1) or two (2). Only scarce and rare material will merit scores of three (3) to five (5). A score of one (1) is appropriate if all of the material is very common, such as an exhibit of U.S. State quarters. The rarity score is very dependent on the exhibit class.

Rarity is judged based on the single rarest item related to the scope of the exhibit. It is judged on the number of like pieces believed to currently exist outside institutional collections, not the original production number. Remember that the financial value of the material is irrelevant in judging this element.

For example, the rarity for a typical U. S. coin exhibit will be in the one (1) or two (2) range. U.S. fiscal paper will typically be in the four (4) or five (5) range due the much rarer material regularly displayed in that exhibit class.

The condition of the material is not relevant to this element. It has already been addressed in the "Condition" element above.

The recommended distribution of points for rarity is shown below:

1 - 10 known 5 points
11 - 100 known 4 points
101 - 1000 known 3 points
1001 - 10,000 known 2 points
10,001 + 1 point

In the case where an exhibitor makes a statement that most known pieces are in institutional collections, with only a few documented as "in the wild," a score of four or five will be appropriate. Sources for this information should be provided. A judge's comment of "not very scarce" accompanying a score of five (5) is obviously not correct.

Brett Irick, ANA Director of Judge Certification
Joseph E. Boling, ANA Chief Judge
March 3, 2018 (revised 25 August 2022)