A World Schools Marking Guide

Disclaimer and warning

- Rough and general descriptions
  - Speeches **needn't have every feature described** to fit in a particular band
  - **Find the best fit** - weight the overall impression of both the good and bad things the speaker has done during the speech for each category
  - Be able to **justify said marks** to speakers or coaches (or just to ourselves), if need be
    - In such a case, be ready to point out specific things about the speech which merit the score awarded.

- Use the full range of the scale

  - Do not revel in being a 'harsh' marker

  - Mark in line with these guidelines and the rest of the judging pool

  - Speaker marks can determine which teams break, and ranking well on a speaker tab can be a big achievement for many students, so please give speaks the thought they require.

Marking Criteria - *Suggestion from CAP*

Content, Style and Strategy are the **criteria** used to review the performance of each team and assess scores to each speaker. However, judges should understand that these are all **connected**, and it is the combination of the three areas that determines how **persuasive** a speech is. Rather than rigidly seeing them as discrete elements when determining speaker scores/which team won, these three areas should help a judge understand what team did a best job during the debate **overall**, i.e. which team won the debate.

What is the relationship between this marking guide and your judgment / decision?

- The speaker scores are a mathematical expression of your decision and they help you evaluate individual performance of speakers
- For example, if you write down your speakers' scores and when calculating the totals they indicate that team A won but you honestly think team B should win because they were overall more convincing and did a better job, then you should review the scores you've awarded as your decision and the final scores should not contradict themselves. And, in that case, **holistically** you believe that team B should have won.

Scores Margin

- Scores are
  60 – 80 points per speaker
  30 – 40 points for reply speech

- Average speech is **70** (28, 28, 14)

- Check your numbers!
  No low-point wins, no draws!

Marking Criteria

You should judge a debate on all of:

- **Style:** 40% (40 points) → *24 – 32 pts.*
- **Content:** 40% (40 points) → *24 – 32 pts.*
- **Strategy:** 20% (20 points) → *12 – 16 pts.*

  - Marks for **reply speeches** are halved.
  - **Points of Information** – a modifier of up to +/- 2.
    - Can not push the Total Score outside the 60-80 points range
  - Half marks are the lowest fraction allowed.

Marking Scores

- Fill out the heading of your ballot completely
  It needs to be complete for the purpose of tabbing

- Fill out your ballot before you start giving feedback

- Margins between teams
  ***0-2 pts** – very close debate*
  ***3-5 pts** – close but rather clear*
  ***5-10 pts** – one team clearly better, but not dominating*
  ***10-20** – winning team dominated the debate*
  ***20+ pts** – winning team "shredded" the losing team*

Scoring a speech

- An average speech is considered “Average” when the scores are:
    - **70** for the **main speech**
    - **35** for the **reply speech**
- You look at the aggregate of the things they have done during their speech.
- If the aggregate impression of the speech is **above average** for that particular category, you are going to award **above average** marks in that category
    - Above 28 in style and content; above 14 in Strategy
- If the aggregate impression of the speech is **below average** for that particular category, you are going to award **below average** marks in that category
    - below 28 in style and content; below 14 in Strategy

Role Fulfillment

- Small set of rules exist to make debating fair (ex. 1P must define, replies can’t present new material, new parts of case presented in third speeches need to be flagged, accept at least one POI, etc.)

- When scoring speakers, keep in mind the specific roles they are supposed to fulfill in debate (ex. disregard new material in reply speeches, etc.)

Marking the Style of Speeches (out of 40)

Mark	Standard
24 - 25.5	Speaker is mumbling or barely speaking. It can also mean that the speaker is so quiet (or loud) that it prevents any chance of hearing the arguments. This would also apply in cases where speaker uses undue profanity or is being excessively aggressive.
26 - 27	Speech pattern is choppy and/or there's overuse of verbal crutches (e.g. "uhm"). Speaker needs to be reminded to speak louder (or more softly). Speed of the speech is too fast paced to comprehend substance of the argument or too slow to retain the focus of the audience.
27.5 - 28.5	Speech has a natural speed to it with occasional unnatural breaks or pauses. Speed of the speech may be slightly above average speaking speed, but can be easily understood.
29 - 30	There is a natural flow to the speech. Words are chosen in a way so as to be most effective when explaining the argument while engaging the audience on an emotional level. Some minor flaws may be evident, but they do not interfere with the flow of the speech.
30.5 - 32	Speaker modulates their volume and speed in a way that adjusts to the debate room and accentuates certain parts of the speech. Speaker uses pauses to allow the audience to digest the argument without losing their attention or to emphasise a point.

Marking the Content of Speeches (out of 40)

Mark	Standard
24 - 25.5	Speaker has used unsubstantiated claims, which had major logical leaps or were internally inconsistent. Little to no use of evidence, examples or an explanation. Speaker's material does not engage with the opposing team's.
26 - 27	Arguments and rebuttal derive from plausible premises but lack sufficient explanation. Instead of deeper analysis and credible examples, speaker would likely just rephrase the claim or conclusion in a different way. Examples are presented but not usually rigorously explained/tied to the claims being made. Examples are not usually proven to be plausible in a majority (or significant majority) of cases.
27.5 - 28.5	Arguments are mostly well explained, with some logical gaps. Evidence such as statistics or historical examples from the real world are present, but only occasionally. Weaknesses of opponent's arguments are exposed and analysed. Rebuttals mitigate opponents' arguments but do not necessarily defeat them.
29 - 30	Most arguments are backed up by deep and compelling analysis, with regular use of very credible examples. Sophisticated responses to the most arguments of the opponents, including engagement with opponents' examples and evidence.
30.5 - 32	Well explained arguments supported with highly relevant and credible examples that are shown to be applicable in a broad range of cases. Rebuttals were developed against the strongest versions of the opponents' arguments and significantly damage the opponents' case. Speaker demonstrates how their team's specific arguments and rebuttal come together into a bigger picture.

Marking the Strategy of Speeches (out of 20)

Mark	Standard
12	Speaker barely spoke (less than 4 minutes) or went significantly over time limit (more than 45 sec). Lack of structure is so severe, that it impacts audience's ability to comprehend the arguments. Arguments were barely relevant. Speaker ignored most of the opposing team's arguments or conceded them.
13	Speaker left a chunk of the speaking time unused or went quite a bit over time. Audience had to focus intently to follow the structure of the speech, which made it harder to fully grasp the presented arguments. Some arguments were relevant, though simplistic or easy to challenge. Some central arguments of the opponents are challenged, but some are missed.
14	Speaker used up the entire time of the speech with individual points that were clear enough to follow easily, even if not explicitly outlined by the speaker. Arguments were relevant or mostly relevant and rebuttals addressed the central issues in their opponents' case.
15	Individual points were identified by speaker themself at the onset of the speech or before each point separately. Flow between various sections of the speech was mostly natural and most of the time was allocated to the more important arguments and rebuttals.
16	All points are identified clearly by the speaker and flow from one section to the other is effortless and easy to follow. Arguments address exclusively main issues in the round. Timing of arguments and rebuttal is carefully chosen to effect most damage. Arguments were put into broader context of the motion and debate itself.

Substantive Speeches (out of 80)

Mark	Standard
60	● Content is not relevant to the motion and what the team needs to prove. ● All points made are claims, with no analysis, and are confusing. ● The speech is hard to follow throughout, so it is hard to give it any credit.
61-63	● A few marginally relevant claims. ● No analysis provided in the claims, which are mainly lines without explanation. ● Parts of the speech are clear, but significant parts are still hard to follow.
64 - 66	● Some of the points made are relevant to the debate. ● Arguments / rebuttals are made with some explanation and analysis, but with significant logical gaps in the explanation. ● Sometimes the speech is difficult to follow.
67 - 69	● Most of the points made are relevant to the debate. ● All arguments / rebuttals have some explanation, but it still has logical and analytical gaps in important parts of the argument and lacks evidence. ● Mostly easy to follow, but some sections may still be hard to understand.
70	No major shortfalls, nor any strong moments. ● Arguments are almost exclusively relevant, although may fail to address one or more core issues sufficiently. ● All arguments have sufficient explanation without major logical gaps and some examples, but are simplistic and easy to attack. ● Easy to follow throughout which makes the speech understandable, though style does not necessarily serve to make the speech more persuasive.

Substantive Speeches (out of 80)

Mark	Standard
71 - 72	● Arguments are all relevant, and address the core issues in the debate. ● All arguments have sufficient explanation without major logical gaps and most have credible evidence. Some points raised may have minor logical gaps or deficits in explanation. ● Easy to follow throughout. On occasion the style may even serve to make the speech more engaging and persuasive.
73 - 76	● Arguments are relevant and engage with the most important issues. Arguments have sufficient explanation without major logical gaps. Occasionally, the speaker provides more sophisticated and nuanced analysis, making their arguments hard to attack. ● Easy to follow throughout. On occasion the style may even serve to make the speech more engaging and persuasive.
77 - 79	● Arguments are all relevant and well-illustrated, and address the core issues in the debate, with thorough explanations, no logical gaps, and credible examples, making them hard to attack ● Easy to follow throughout. The style serves to make the speech's content more engaging.
80	● Plausibly one of the best debating speeches ever given in a schools competition. ● It is incredibly difficult to think up satisfactory responses to any of the arguments made. ● Flawless and compelling arguments, made with outstanding delivery.

Reply Speeches (out of 40)

Mark	Standard
30	The speaker did not describe the debate as it happened. They misunderstood or misrepresented central arguments and responses.
31-34	Instead of actually identifying or analysing points of clash, speaker mostly just retold the debate as it happened or attempted to keep arguing for their side.
35	Speaker identified the major points of clash between two teams and was able to provide some basic justification for awarding the win to speaker's team.
36-39	Almost perfect overview of the debate. Particular interactions from the debate were analysed and used as evidence for awarding the win to the speaker's team.
40	Flawless analysis of the debate that just occurred. Speaker was able to accurately identify turning points in the debate (including the strongest arguments and rebuttal of their opponents) and why they their side wins on balance

Acknowledgment

Judging guidance documents for WSDC 2016 in Stuttgart, Germany (prepared by the WSDC 2016 CAP)
Judging guide for Brastislava Schools Debating Championship 2017
Debate Judging Guide for the Panhellenic Forensics Association Tournament in January 2017