



DEBATE & SPEECH
INSTITUTE
AFRICA

JUDGES Fellowship

Manual

Nurturing the pillars of the
African Dream

Foreword

Debate Institute Africa (DIA) has long been a beacon of excellence in nurturing critical thinking, effective communication, and leadership among young Africans. As we launch the Debate & Speech Judges Fellowship, we are taking a significant step forward in our mission to elevate the standards of adjudication and foster a thriving debate ecosystem in Uganda and beyond.

This fellowship is more than just a training program; it is a commitment to building a legacy. By empowering former high school debaters to transition into skilled adjudicators, we are not only strengthening the backbone of speech and debate competitions but also investing in a future where excellence is the norm.

Through structured mentorship, hands-on experience, and exposure to global adjudication standards, the Judges Fellowship represents a bridge between seasoned judges and aspiring ones. It is a platform where knowledge is not only shared but multiplied, ensuring that every tournament—whether local or international—benefits from a pool of competent and confident judges.

Foreword

We are particularly proud of the inclusivity and sustainability embedded in this program. The decision to make training resources freely available through an online archive underscores our belief that knowledge should transcend boundaries. By equipping adjudicators to serve any platform, we reinforce the ethos of collaboration and shared growth across the broader speech and debate community.

As you embark on this transformative journey, I urge you to embrace the responsibility and privilege of adjudication. Your role as a judge will shape not only the outcomes of debates but also the experiences of participants and the future of this discipline.

Thank you for being part of this pioneering initiative. Together, let us elevate the art of adjudication and continue to inspire the next generation of critical thinkers and leaders.

With gratitude and hope,

JOSEPH TAHINDUKA
Debate Institute Africa

Nurturing the pillars of the
African Dream

Acknowledgement

This manual would not have been possible without the invaluable contributions and support of numerous individuals and communities.

We extend our heartfelt gratitude to Harold Sewanonda, Head of Capacity Building at Debate Institute Africa (DIA), for his unwavering leadership and guidance throughout the creation of this manual.

To the senior judges who have generously volunteered their time and expertise to support this initiative, your dedication is deeply appreciated.

Special thanks to Berack Ntorainwe, for volunteering to steer this program with passion and insight. Your contributions have been pivotal in shaping the experience.

We also acknowledge the enthusiasm and commitment of the 60 judges who applied to be part of this program. Your willingness to learn and grow together is what inspires the very essence of this initiative.

Lastly, we owe a debt of gratitude to the Asian, South African, and World Schools Debate communities, whose meticulously crafted manuals provided a clear foundation and inspiration for the development of this resource.

Your collective efforts and contributions have laid the groundwork for what we hope will be an enduring legacy in adjudication excellence. Thank you for making this journey possible!

Table of contents

FOREWORD.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	4
COMPREHENSIVE DEBATE GLOSSARY.....	12
The Model Adjudicator.....	13
Hypothetical ‘ordinary intelligent voter’ Special Knowledge Disposition Judging as an ordinary intelligent voter	
JUDGING CRITERIA.....	22
Evaluating third speeches What is new material?	
EVALUATING REPLY SPEECHES.....	24
IDENTIFYING ISSUES.....	26
WEIGHING ISSUES.....	27
MARKING RANGE.....	28
SCORING CRITERIA.....	30
Notes on Content, Strategy, and Style in Debating Content	

Table of contents

Style

General Guidelines for Good Style in Debating

Strategy

Notes on Structure, Timing, and Strategy in Debating

SCORING AND MARGINS.....34

Summary and Guidelines for Points of Information (POIs)

Overview

Key Rules

Judges' Role:

Types of POIs

Best Practices

MARKING POINTS OF INFORMATION (POIS).....37

1. Primary Basis of Marks

2. Positive Adjustments

3. Negative Adjustments

4. Notes on Judging POIs

5. Summary of Adjustments

Table of contents

EFFECTIVE ORAL FEEDBACK AND ADJUDICATION.....	39
The Adjudication Speech	
Recommended steps for a good Oral Adjudication Speech	
THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF ADJUDICATION.....	42
Tabula Rasa	
Non-Intervention	
Education	
Adjudication Models	
“Truth of Motion” Model	
“Skill of Debaters” Model	
A Preferred Model: The “Movement” Model	
RELEVANT STANDARDS OF ADJUDICATION.....	47
Role Fulfillment	
The “Better Debate” Standard	
REACHING A DECISION.....	49
1. Identify the Proposition	
2. Identify the Issues	
3. Determine the Winner of Each Issue	

Table of contents

The Standard of Truth

Fidelity

Coherence

Validity

Execution

4. Determine the Importance of Each Issue

5. Assess Each Team's Efforts Relative to the Issues

6. Report the Decision

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHIEF ADJUDICATOR (CA)
AND CORE ADJUDICATION PANEL (CAP) IN A TOURNAMENT.....57

Roles of the Chief Adjudicator (CA)

Roles of the Core Adjudication Panel (CAP)

KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR JUDGE ASSESSMENT.....60

COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE CA AND CAP.....61

CONFERRAL ADJUDICATION.....61

Purpose of Conferral Judging

Key Steps in the Conferral Process

GUIDANCE FOR CHAIRS.....63

Table of contents

Guidance for Judges in Conferral Discussions.....	64
Comparison with Other Judging Systems.....	64
Best Practices for Effective Conferral.....	65
ADJUDICATING PUBLIC SPEAKING.....	66
INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC SPEAKING ADJUDICATION.....	67
Qualities of a Good Public Speaking Adjudicator.....	68
WHAT DOES A PUBLIC SPEECH TOURNEY LOOK LIKE AND HOW DOES ADJUDICATION HAPPEN?.....	70
Adjudicator Breaks and Feedback Loop.....	72
TASKS IN PUBLIC SPEAKING.....	73
AUDIENCE IDENTIFICATION IN TASK INTERPRETATION.....	75
JUDGING CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING.....	76
Content Evaluation:	
SPEECH STRUCTURE.....	78
Introductions	
Body	
Coherence	
Conclusion	

Table of contents

GUIDELINES FOR ASSIGNING SCORES.....	84
THE SCORING SYSTEM.....	85
ADJUDICATOR ETHICS AND PROFESSIONALISM.....	86
CHILD PROTECTION POLICY.....	89
ADJUDICATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES.....	90
FEEDBACK AND DEVELOPMENT.....	91
Step-by-Step Guide to Giving Personal Feedback: SPECIAL TOPICS IN ADJUDICATION.....	95
Improvisation and Creativity: Storytelling as a Special Topic: Judging Storytelling; CREATION OF CONFLICT AND RESOLUTION.....	96
The Power of Vivid Description, Imagery, and Compelling Language in Storytelling Identifying Vivid Descriptions and Imagery as an Adjudicator: The Allure of Compelling Language.....	102
CONCLUSION.....	105



DEBATE &
SPEECH
INSTITUTE
AFRICA

JUDGES Fellowship

ADJUDICATING DEBATE

Comprehensive Debate Glossary

Adj.Core/CAP/CA: Refers to 'Chief Adjudicators' and 'Core Adjudicators.' They create motion sets, allocate judges, and ensure the quality of the judge pool.

Adjudication: The process of evaluating debates or speeches to determine winners and provide constructive feedback.

Adjudicator: A judge responsible for evaluating debates and providing scores or feedback.

Assertion: An unproven claim or argument presented without evidence.

Badgering: Excessive or disruptive attempts to raise POIs or distract the speaker. Includes raising multiple POIs in quick succession or heckling loudly.

Break: Qualification of teams or judges for elimination rounds.

Clash: Points of disagreement or contention between opposing teams in a debate.

Comparative: A method of comparing teams' contributions, mechanisms, or impacts within the debate.

Content: The substance of the arguments presented in a speech.

Counterfactual: A hypothetical scenario that does not currently exist, used for argumentation.

Definition Challenge: Raised when a team believes the motion or its framing has been unfairly or improperly defined.

Fiat: The assumption that a policy proposed in a motion will be implemented without opposition to its enactment.

Frame/Framing: The context or perspective from which a team approaches the debate or motion.

Comprehensive Debate Glossary

Fidelity: The external consistency of an argument with known facts or evidence.

Hardline/Soft Stance: A hardline stance defends a position under all circumstances, while a soft stance allows for exceptions.

Impact: The effect of an argument or case on the broader debate or real-world scenarios.

Inrounds: Preliminary debate rounds before elimination rounds.

Judges' Role: Ensures fairness, evaluates engagement, and provides feedback based on arguments presented.

Mechanism: The explanation of how a case or impact works or occurs.

Meta: Analysis of a debate's structure, contributions, and teams' performance.

Motion: The proposition or topic being debated.

New Material: Arguments introduced for the first time in later speeches, often discouraged in formats like World Schools.

Order: A reminder to maintain decorum and debate etiquette, issued by the chair judge if necessary.

Outrounds: Elimination rounds following preliminary debates.

Points of Information (POIs): Short interjections during speeches for questions, rebuttals, or clarifications (max 15 seconds).

Positive/Negative Material: Positive material supports a team's case, while negative material counters the opposing team's arguments.

Protected Time: The first and last minutes of substantive speeches and the entirety of reply speeches, during which POIs are prohibited.

Reply Speech: A 4-minute summative speech provided by the first or second speaker to emphasize their team's case and arguments.

Comprehensive Debate Glossary

Role Fulfillment: A standard evaluating whether speakers fulfill the specific expectations of their roles.

Speaks/Speaker Scores: Scores awarded by judges to evaluate individual speaker performances.

Status Quo: The current state of affairs or societal context being debated.

Stepping In: When a judge fills in gaps in arguments or builds arguments for teams during their decision-making process.

Structural Reason: General truths or societal norms that support an argument.

Style: The delivery and manner of a speech, including tone, pace, and physical presence.

Symmetry: Situations where an impact or harm affects both sides equally in a debate.

Strategy: Structuring and prioritizing arguments and responses within a speech.

Tipping Point: The critical moment when small changes lead to significant effects or shifts.

Top Room/Bubble Room: High-stakes preliminary matchups, often involving teams close to breaking.

Weighing: Comparing the contributions or impacts of teams' arguments to determine which side is more significant or effective.

Adjudicating the World Schools Debate Format and Karl Popper Debate Format

The Model Adjudicator

Hypothetical 'ordinary intelligent voter.

Thesis: Even if a judge has the highest possible IQ in the world and contains all the knowledge in the world, they must assess the debate as an ordinary intelligent voter.

Special Knowledge

While the ordinary intelligent voter may regularly read a major international newspaper, they do not read technical journals, specialist literature, or the like. They are, in short, a smart person who has a good deal of knowledge that is broad rather than deep.

Debaters may certainly make reference to examples, facts and details the ordinary intelligent voter is not aware of, but they should explain rather than cite these examples, facts and details. While they may not know much on a specific topic by some debaters' standards, the ordinary intelligent voter is genuinely intelligent, and understands complex concepts, facts or arguments once they're explained.

Where such examples are not explained beyond name-checking a country, judges should discount material they do understand that the ordinary intelligent voter would not. Judges should be bold in applying this rule: it is unfair on other teams in the room not to.

Disposition

This hypothetical ordinary intelligent voter doesn't have preformed views on the topic of the debate and isn't convinced by sophistry, deception, or logical fallacies. They are open-minded and concerned to decide how to vote – they are thus willing to be convinced by the debaters who provide the most compelling case for or against a certain policy. They do not judge debates based on their personal beliefs or political convictions, nor do they enter a debate thinking that one side is indefensible.

As described in the section above, they are well informed about political and social affairs but lack specialist knowledge. They are intelligent to the point of being able to understand and assess contrasting arguments (including sophisticated arguments), that are presented to them; but they keep themselves constrained to the material presented unless it patently contradicts common knowledge or is otherwise wildly implausible.

Judging as an ordinary intelligent voter.

The ordinary intelligent voter is quite unlike most, or perhaps any, real world people. But the concept of the 'ordinary intelligent voter' is a useful way of revealing a set of important characteristics that judges should aspire to display in order to ensure that all teams receive a fair hearing in any debate. As such, the term "ordinary intelligent voter" describes the expectation that judges should:

- Be aware of basic facts about the world (e.g.: “*Syria is in the Middle East*” would be considered basic.

- Be familiar with issues and events that have made international headlines for a sustained period of time (e.g. judges should be aware that COVID-19 is a pandemic and has had a severe impact on many countries.

They should be expected to know that different countries had different models of response to COVID-19, with some countries deprioritizing the economy and implementing lockdowns, and some countries prioritizing keeping the economy open and relying on individual social distancing. They do not necessarily need to be aware of the specifics of individual models each country has implemented.

- Avoid utilizing personal knowledge that they have of the topic, unless it could reasonably be assumed to be held by someone who fulfills the previous two criteria;

- Give little credit to appeals merely to emotion or authority, except where these have rational influence on an argument;

- Avoid presuming a geographic, cultural, national, ethnic or other background when assessing arguments;

- Avoid preferencing arguments or styles of speaking that match personal preferences;

- Assess the merits of a proposed policy, solution or problem separate from any personal perspectives in relation to it.

This does not mean that speakers cannot make complex claims about complicated issues based on their own specialized knowledge, or indeed, that judges cannot be convinced by these claims. While judges should be assumed to have ordinary knowledge about various issues, they should also be fully capable of logically following and analyzing a debate and understanding complex concepts when explained.

If teams wish to bring in their own specialized knowledge to the debate, they must be able to explain them in a way that is free of jargon and understandable by the ordinary intelligent voter.

Everyone has biases! Catch them before it affects your call. Note that tournaments are a melting pot of different backgrounds so as much as possible, try to be objective as a judge when assessing debates.

- **Impartial:** Doesn't judge teams they have a personal bond with (nation of affiliation, teams they have coached, etc.).

- **Unbiased:** Has no prior idea who is going to win the debate. They set aside their personal opinion about the motion or specific arguments. They don't expect teams to argue their preferred arguments or discount arguments they don't like. They judge the debate that happened before them.

- **Open-minded and concerned to decide how to vote** – they are thus willing to be convinced by the debaters who provide the most compelling case for or against a certain policy.

● **Observant and diligent:** Listens carefully to what debaters say and doesn't construct ideas that haven't been explained well. They look for substantiation and evidence equally from both teams. They track arguments, responses, and POIs – and are able to fairly and accurately summarize the debate (not necessarily to the debaters, even just to themselves) before evaluating it.

● **Possessing general knowledge:** Take on the role of an average, intelligent listener and is aware of current affairs and basic facts without letting specialist knowledge interfere with the debate.

● **Expert on the rules:** Knows WSDC debating rules well and understands the words in the motion and the roles of teams/speakers.

● **Accountable & Constructive:** Can justify their decision based on a sound understanding of issues in the debate and the criteria for judging & gives debaters constructive and concrete feedback after the result of the debate is announced

Judges Should NOT:

● **Use extremely specific knowledge on a certain topic:** A judge should never say:

“The proposition claimed that 1 million electric cars were produced in the UK last year, and it wasn't attacked by the opposition, but since this is my field of expertise I know that the correct number is 39000 which is why the argument falls.” → adjudicators judge the debate as it happened.

Assess the content in the debate based on the arguments a team could have made. **A judge should never say:**

“I penalized you because you didn’t bring an argument about the economy, even though I think that is really relevant in the debate.” → adjudicators can not penalize teams for not bringing certain arguments. They can, however, give this as explicit feedback for teams to improve. Not as a legitimization of the call for the given debate.

- Assess the content based on refutation the judge is able to think of against an argument. A judge should never say:

“You explained your arguments about violence pretty well, but I thought of 3 different ways to rebut it which is why I penalized you on content. → Judges only take into account what has been said, not what could have been said in the debate.”

- Fill in the gaps in analysis or rebuttal that a team has themselves.

“You tried to explain why this policy harms minorities, and even though you didn’t give the right reasons, I do agree with you that it’s an important argument because of reason X, Y and Z. This is why I awarded you on content. → Judges only take into account what has been said, not what could have been said in the debate. They can only give such advice during feedback for improvement purposes, if teams want to know how to make their argument(s) stronger, not as a justification of awarding marks.”

JUDGES SHOULD;

- Be courteous and respectful to the teams and coaches.
- Do not allow coaches to make signs or signals to debaters beyond time signals, and maintains room decorum.
- Always makes themselves available for feedback.
- Pay attention in rounds.
- Not checking their phones
- Taking good notes.

JUDGING CRITERIA

Evaluating third speeches

- Unlike BP whips, 3rd speeches in WSDC style may include a small part of their teams substantive case, if flagged in the case division announced by the 1st speaker. However, they are not required to include new arguments in their case.
- The role of the 3rd speaker is to respond to the other team's case. "*Responding*" is a broad term covering direct rebuttal, weighing of arguments, new examples, etc. all forms of responsiveness often involve new ideas, logic, examples, components of arguments or new lines of rebuttal. It is acceptable for third speakers to bring these new aspects into their speeches.
- "*Newness*" in a third speech is not sufficient justification to discredit material at third. However, newness is not permissible if third speakers introduce an independent and entirely new concept or argument in the debate that didn't exist earlier.

What is new material?

The main role of a whip is to clean up the debate by comparing both teams based on issues or clashes. The whip cannot give "*new material*" as no other constructive speaker can respond to them, but the whips can introduce new responses and new analysis so long as these are built on material given by previous speakers.

New material is anything that cannot be reasonably derived from previous speakers. Anything considered completely separate from the material introduced by any of the previous two speakers on the bench is considered new material and should be discredited by judges. New examples, new weighing metrics, and new ways to explain previously existing arguments are not considered new material and are permitted in whip speeches.

In the instance where new material exists in a whip speech, judges should not add additional punishments to the speech. If present, judges should discard new material as if the speaker had not provided any reasonable contribution during that part of their speech.

For 3rd Speeches: Balancing Act

Extreme 1: Nothing that even sounds remotely new, makes 3rd speech obsolete

Extreme 2: So much new analysis barely allowing Prop room to respond

HAPPY MEDIUM: New material can be introduced in the form of some lines of analysis, new examples, new ways of balancing/comparative. Has to meet the standard of responsiveness. Even then, less time for the other side to respond = less engagement = bad strategic choice to bring so late.

EVALUATING REPLY SPEECHES

Reply speeches are special speeches given by either the first or second speakers of a bench, and would last 4 minutes. Neither reply speaker may introduce a new part of the team case. A reply speaker may not introduce a new argument.

Reply speeches are a crucial part of the debate - they can definitely swing the result of a debate

Good reply speeches do not just report on the debate that happened, but contribute to the team's overall strategy and approach in the debate, in order to shape how the debate has evolved and panned out . New weighing of arguments, framing, contextual observations, or examples can all serve this function and are permitted and credited in replies – however, these need to be clearly derivative of the existing events in the debate

Newness in Reply Speeches: Significantly stricter

Even if derivative of previous material, should be considered very late.

Some leeway: if 3rd Opp brings substantially new material, prop should have an opportunity to note this for the judge.

EPIPHANIES ARE GREAT, BUT THEY SHOULD HAVE HAD THEM EARLIER.

WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATE FORMAT JUDGING PROCESS.

The main role of reply speakers is to give what is known as a 'biased adjudication'. The speech is not a constructive speech, which means it is expected to not add new argumentative or responsive material to the debate. However, it can provide justification of why the team is winning, by showing:

- How and why the issues the team has won are debate-winning
- How and why the issues lost are not important for the debate

EVALUATING A REPLY SPEECH

The arguments that have not been properly responded to

- The importance and value of the context presented by the team.
- An effective reply will push the judges to cross-check their notes with the provided summary during that speech. It would also help the judges to value the stance and arguments more closely.
- A reply speech is in no way ceremonial. Judges should listen to the speech with as much attention as they would give to constructive speeches. In close debates, the ultimate weighing and assessment provided by the reply speakers can provide debate-deciding elements to the judges. So, it is essential that the judges do not start preparing for their decision and OA until these two speeches are over.

IDENTIFYING ISSUES

You must identify issues that were discussed in the debate in order to judge in a systematic manner. Issues are often questions and clashes that help you decide whether a particular motion should pass

- What are the main issues in a debate?
- The clashes/issues most discussed?

You have to identify the issues that are more crucial to winning the debate than others

How do you identify main issues in a debate?

Debaters do it for you

*Example - THW ban smoking: Is it a legitimate choice to smoke?
- Does banning smoking reduce harms on smokers and their families?*

With no clash – you track and evaluate arguments and engagement. It is important to identify and issues as they emerged in the debate, do NOT enter the debate and decide what issues should have emerged

- How do I do that?
- What does the motion require teams to prove?
- What were/became the most important issues raised in the debate
- Who won those issues effectively through arguments and evidence provided

WEIGHING ISSUES

After deciding the issues in the debate, you need to decide the importance of each issue in comparison with all others. This helps decide which issue is most crucial for a team to win in order to win the debate

How to rank issues:

What did teams explicitly agree on as important?

If that's not clear, then what did teams implicitly agree on as important?

If that's also not clear, then the reasons given by teams on why a particular issue matters more than other issues (weighing).

If there is no explicit weighing, ONLY then enter the debate to decide the ranking of issues (not as your personal self but as the average reasonable person we described earlier).. Examples of Weighing: Size of group impacted/Extent of impact

Finally, evaluate who won the issues, and subsequently, the debate
Compare the contribution of the two teams on a given issue (arguments + rebuttal)

Decide which team ultimately won the particular issue – was there important material that stood at the end that was unresponded to by the other side? Did the existing responses adequately take down the core of a point a team made?

MARKING RANGE

1. First, Second and Third Speeches (Out of 100)

Standard	Overall (100)	Style (40)	Content (40)	Strategy (20)
Exceptional	80	32	32	16
Excellent	76-79	31	31	15-16
Extremely Good	74-75	30	30	15
Very Good	71-73	29	29	14-15
Good	70	28	28	14
Satisfactory	67-69	27	27	13-14
Competent	65-66	26	26	13
Pass	61-64	25	25	12-13
Improvement Needed	60	24	24	12

MARKING RANGE

2. Reply Speeches (Out of 50)

Standard	Overall (50)	Style (20)	Content (20)	Strategy (10)
Exceptional	40	16	16	8
Very Good to Excellent	36-39	15	15	7.5
Good	35	14	14	7
Pass to Satisfactory	31-34	13	13	6.5
Improvement Needed	30	12	12	6

A team score is then totalled and the winner of each debate will evidently be the team with the highest total. Team points will be awarded as follows for tab purposes:

- Win 1
- Loss 0

SCORING CRITERIA

Content, Style and Strategy are the criteria used to review the performance of each team and assess scores to each speaker. 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.

Style: 40% (40 points)

Content: 40% (40 points)

Strategy: 20% (20 points)

The speaker scores are a mathematical expression of your decision and they help you evaluate individual performance of speaker. 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.

Notes on Content, Strategy, and Style in Debating.

Content

- *Content refers to the arguments presented by the speaker, independent of delivery style.*
- *Arguments that are weak should be marked down, regardless of whether the opposing team exposes their flaws.*

Notes on Content, Strategy, and Style in Debating.

- Judges should evaluate arguments based on strength or weakness, without letting their personal beliefs or specialized knowledge influence their judgment.

Style

- Style pertains to the manner of delivery of the speaker's speech.
- Judges should account for variations in accents, speaking styles, and debating terminology.
- Debaters for whom English is a second language should be judged as though they are native English speakers.
- The use of palm cards, lecterns, folders, notepads, or similar notes does not affect the score.
- However, speakers should not read their speeches verbatim and should use notes minimally.

General Guidelines for Good Style in Debating.

Audibility

- Ensure the speaker is loud and clear enough to be heard by the audience and judges.

Eye Contact

- The speaker should maintain appropriate eye contact to engage the audience effectively.

Tone and Pitch

- Vary tone and pitch to emphasize key arguments and maintain interest.

Pace of Speech

- Avoid speaking too fast to ensure clarity and comprehension.

Fluency

- The speaker should deliver their arguments smoothly without frequent hesitations.

Physical Presentation

- The speaker should avoid distracting physical tics (e.g., repetitive hand gestures) and strive to appear comfortable and confident while speaking.

Strategy

Strategy encompasses:

- Understanding the issues of the debate.
- The structure and timing of the speech.

A speaker who addresses critical issues effectively but with weak arguments can receive:

- Low marks for content (weak arguments).
- High marks for strategy (good understanding and structure).

Notes on Structure, Timing, and Strategy in Debating

Structure

- A good speech has a clear beginning, middle, and end with logical signposts guiding the audience.
- The sequence of arguments should be logical and flow naturally from one point to another.

Structure is equally important for:

- The first speaker outlining the team case.
- The third speaker providing rebuttals.

Timing.

Key Aspects of Timing.

Nurturing the pillars of the

African Dream

Speaking within the time limit:

- Significant overtime or undertime should be penalized.
- However, this is just one part of strategy and does not automatically lead to a very low score if other elements are outstanding.

Allocation of time to issues:

- Important issues should receive more time for thorough establishment.
- Trivial points should receive minimal time.

Rebuttal Timing:

- Rebuttal should typically come first in a speech, addressing opposing arguments before building the positive case.
- Prioritizing rebuttal ensures logical flow and effectiveness in addressing critical issues.

Understanding the Issues

- A good speaker must identify and thoroughly address the critical issues in the debate.
- Addressing trivial points while leaving major arguments unanswered reflects a poor understanding of the debate.

Such speakers should score poorly in strategy.

- Speakers who focus on the important issues and deal with them thoroughly should score well in strategy.

Strategy vs. Content

- *Content:* The strength or weakness of arguments.
- *Strategy:* The ability to identify and prioritize key issues and structure the speech effectively.

Nurturing the pillars of the

African Dream

Example:

- A speaker who provides weak rebuttals to critical issues should score poorly in content.
- However, if the speaker addressed the right arguments, they should score reasonably in strategy.

SCORING AND MARGINS

Simple checks:

The aggregate score of the winning team must be higher than that of the losing team. After entering all the scores, double-check if the team higher point on the tab platform is actually the team that is supposed to win the debate.

- You need to score in whole numbers for the constructive speeches (e.g. 67, 73, 81...)

Summary and Guidelines for Points of Information (POIs) in Debating.

Overview

Points of Information (POIs) allow interjections during an opponent's speech. These interjections aim to question, rebut, clarify, or challenge arguments and are essential for maintaining engagement in the debate.

Key Rules

- Timing:
- POIs can be offered only during unprotected time (from 1:00 to 6:00 in an 8-minute speech).

Nurturing the pillars of the

African Dream

Offering POIs:

- Must be concise (maximum 15 seconds).
- Use “*Point*” or “*POI*” to offer them without coding (e.g., avoid hints like “*on that argument*”).
- A cooldown period of 15 seconds applies between successive POI attempts from the same team.

Accepting POIs:

- Speakers should ideally accept at least two POIs during their speech.
- Excessive acceptance of POIs may disrupt speech control.
- Clear acceptance or rejection (e.g., “*Go ahead,*” “*Not now*”) is encouraged.

Cutting Off:

- A speaker can cut off a POI before the 15-second limit but should ensure the point is reasonably articulated.
- Judges may penalize speakers for cutting off POIs too early, leading to inadequate engagement.

Summary and Guidelines for Points of Information (POIs) in Debating.

Badgering:

- Repeatedly offering POIs in quick succession after rejection (known as badgering or barracking) is not allowed.
- Judges should intervene and call “*Order*” if necessary.

Engagement Responsibility:

- Offering POIs: Each team member should offer at least two POIs per speech.
- Accepting POIs: Speakers must engage by accepting reasonable POI attempts.

Judges' Role:

- Evaluate the quality and relevance of POIs and responses.
- Penalize teams that fail to engage meaningfully, either by not offering or not accepting POIs.
- Consider whether POIs were declined due to bad timing or strategic preference.

Types of POIs

1. *Standard POIs*: Rebuttal, challenges, or questions on arguments raised.
2. *Point of Clarification*: Questions seeking clarity on the opponent's setup or mechanism. These do not obligate special consideration but should remain within POI rules.

Best Practices

For Offering POIs:

- Be relevant and concise.
- Avoid offering POIs back-to-back or badgering the speaker.

For Accepting POIs:

- Accept meaningful and diverse POIs to show engagement.
- Balance acceptance to maintain control of the speech.

For Judges:

- Differentiate the quality of POIs and responses.
- Note both the number and timing of POIs offered and accepted.
- Highlight POI engagement during feedback to improve debaters' future performance.

POIs contribute significantly to the debate's interactivity and should be handled with strategic precision by both speakers and judges.

Marking Points of Information (POIs)

The evaluation of POIs involves both the quality and quantity of POIs offered by a speaker and how effectively they responded to POIs during their own speech. Here's a structured approach to marking:

Primary Basis of Marks

- A speaker's speech is the primary determinant of their overall mark.
- POIs (both offering and accepting) can adjust this mark by up to two points in either direction, based on the speaker's contribution through POIs.

Positive Adjustments

- Offering Superb POIs:

A speaker who offers high-quality, strategically relevant POIs during the debate can earn up to 2 additional points.

Example: A speaker whose speech deserved 70 may receive 71 or 72 for outstanding POIs.

- Engagement through POIs:

If the speaker demonstrates consistent and meaningful participation by offering POIs, they show active involvement and are rewarded.

Negative Adjustments

A speaker's score may decrease by up to two points for deficiencies in their engagement with POIs:

- Failure to Offer POIs:
- A speaker who offers few or no POIs (without valid reasons such as time limitations or protected time) shows a lack of engagement.

Example: A speaker whose speech deserved 76 may be marked down to 74 or 75.

- Offering Poor Quality POIs:
- If the offered POIs lack relevance, logic, or argumentative weight, they may lower the speaker's score.
- Refusing to Accept POIs:
- Failing to accept at least one or two POIs during the speech (if reasonably offered) signals reduced interaction and can result in a penalty.

Notes on Judging POIs

- Quality of Points:

Judges should assess the relevance and strategic weight of a POI independently from the response it receives. A good POI remains valuable even if it is well-counteracted.

- No Automatic Penalization:

If no POIs were offered to a speaker, they should not be penalized. Similarly, speakers should not lose marks for rejected POIs as long as they continue to attempt reasonable engagement.

Summary of Adjustments

- Positive Adjustments: +1 to +2 for excellent POIs offered.
- Negative Adjustments: -1 to -2 for:
 - Failing to offer enough POIs.
 - Offering irrelevant or weak POIs.
 - Refusing reasonable POIs without justification.

Effective oral feedback and Adjudication

The Adjudication Speech

Before the adjudication speech, but after ballots have been completed and handed to the chairperson, the judges have a brief opportunity to confer. This is not the time to try to persuade your fellow judges that they made a mistake on a particular issue or in their overall result. Their ballots are **locked in** like yours, and the only point of conferring is to help one of the judges give the adjudication speech. So, keep the discussion short and to the point. If you dissented and your views are quite different from the rest of the panel, briefly express your reasons and then stay out of the discussion.

The adjudication speech should explain the result of the debate to the audience. Teams can and should speak to the judges individually after the debate, but this is the only opportunity for the audience to hear the reason for the decision.

The adjudication speech should not refer to mistakes made by individual speakers: you can discuss these privately after the debate instead of belittling a speaker in public. The result to an audience that has just seen its first World Schools debate may require outlining the three categories in which we award marks and, where appropriate, identifying the category in which the decisive difference between the teams was to be found.

The adjudication speech should not summarize the content of the debate except insofar as is truly necessary to explain the result. The speech should be as short as possible – typically between 2 and 4 minutes – while communicating to the audience a clear, explanation of the result of the debate (*and expressing thanks to the hosts and sponsors*).

When giving the adjudication speech you should remember that you are speaking for the panel, not just for yourself. Where there are importantly differing views, especially if the decision is not unanimous, you need to try as far as possible to explain how those differences came about. If at all possible, you should explain the grounds on which one or more judge dissented in a way that emphasizes the reasonableness of the disagreement, rather than leaving the audience to think that one judge got it wrong.

In the unlikely and unfortunate event that you cannot present the dissenting view in a way that makes it sound reasonable, it is better to say nothing about it: just explain that the panel reached a majority verdict and then present the views of the majority. The final responsibility of the adjudicators is to report their decision. An effective oral adjudication is critical to good judging. The oral adjudication presents the adjudicators the opportunity to explain how they interpreted the round and to meet their obligation to the principle of education discussed earlier. If an adjudicator has progressed through the steps as outlined, an effective oral adjudication should be easy.

Recommended steps for a good Oral Adjudication Speech

We recommend using the steps as the structure for the oral adjudication.

- Begin by identifying the proposition.
- You'll want to explain how you arrived at that proposition, either from the motion, the teams' interpretation of that motion, or by your own assessment of the general point of focus for the teams' arguments.
- From there, you should identify the issues that you believe were contested between the teams by pointing to specific arguments that were made for and against that issue.
- The next three steps in the judging process are usually combined. The topics of which team won each issue, how important each issue was relative to the other issues, and which team made the greatest contribution to the effort to prove or disprove an issue are typically presented in concert with extensive references to specific arguments the teams made. At times, the same argument that wins an issue simultaneously proves that issue is most important.
- Identifying the debater (or team) responsible for making that argument is likely the way in which the adjudicators will highlight the argument that most affected their decision.
- At the end of the day, the judges must render a decision and present a rationale for that decision that is mindful of the guiding principles of adjudication discussed above. Their decision should adhere to the movement model and present a good faith effort to consider all the arguments made by each team and the relative merit of those arguments. When done well, the adjudicators' contribution is a satisfying accompaniment to the intellectual efforts of the debaters

THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF ADJUDICATION

Three principles should guide the adjudicators' appraisal of a debate:

- An adjudicator should be tabula rasa (literally, “a blank slate”) in her orientation toward the proposition;
- An adjudicator should operate under the principle of non-intervention regarding the debaters' efforts; and
- An adjudicator is first and foremost an educator entrusted with the responsibility of helping others improve their skills.

Tabula Rasa

The metaphor of the blank slate is appropriate for the adjudicator's orientation toward the arguments made in the round. Regardless of the particular preferences for the truth or falsity of a motion, the adjudicator must—to the greatest extent possible—set aside those preferences and embrace the artifice of impartiality. Adjudicators must avoid deciding the round based on what they believed before the round occurred rather than what occurred in the round.

That said, the artifice of tabula rasa is just that: an artifice. Subjectivity is the defining characteristic of the human experience; not surprisingly, it simply cannot be set aside when adjudicating. A tabula rasa orientation is an ideal toward which an adjudicator should strive, but simultaneously that adjudicator must recognize that such impartiality will likely never be achieved.

Non-Intervention

If the adjudicator is aware of the need to set aside her predispositions prior to the round, she should also be committed to avoiding intervening in the teams' efforts in the round. More to the point, non-intervention means one simple thing: adjudicators should let the debaters do the debating.

Nurturing the pillars of the

African Dream

In practice, this means adjudicators must resist two temptations. First, adjudicators should avoid doing the work of the debaters. They should not complete unfinished or inadequate arguments, connect lines of argument to opposing points the debater did not recognize, or fabricate a unifying strategy for a debater's disparate arguments that was not the debater's creation. Second, and by far the more significant sin, an adjudicator must never render the debater's efforts irrelevant. Ignoring a debater's efforts is contrary to the very purpose of the activity. An adjudicator is in the round to assess the efforts of the debaters, not to selectively recognize only those efforts that she prefers. That is not to say that the adjudicator has to give equal credence to every argument made simply because a debater articulated that argument; the very purpose of adjudicating a round is to evaluate the quality of the debaters' efforts. But adjudicators should make a conscious effort to consider all arguments made to avoid inserting themselves into the round.

Education

This principle is perhaps the most important for putting the adjudicator in the appropriate frame of mind to judge a round. Debating is connected to academia for a very important reason: debating is one of the most intellectually stimulating activities an individual may undertake. Skill development in persuasive communication and critical thinking will enhance a student's academic experience across the board. For providing opportunity and motivation to enhance these skills, debating has few peers. The adjudicators should take seriously their responsibilities regarding education; decisions should honor the significant intellectual energy the debaters have expended and constructive criticism designed to help the debaters improve their skills should be paramount.

Adjudication Models

A useful way to begin thinking about your responsibilities as an adjudicator is to consider the various models of adjudication available to you. These models provide you with a general orientation and perspective from which you may assess the efforts of the debaters in the round.

While none of these models is sufficient to address the complexity of rendering a decision after a debate, they do provide useful starting points for the discussion of how to do so. In general, there are two less practical and one preferred model.

“Truth of Motion” Model

Adjudicators who operate under the “truth of motion” model see their role as assessing the veracity of the motion. These adjudicators see the motion as a statement with truth value (i.e., it may be either more true or more false); the defining question they ask themselves when rendering a decision is “At the end of the debate, do I believe the motion is true or false?”

This model recognizes that the debate is ultimately a contest of ideas and that the most compelling arguments should carry the day. The approach is oriented toward the matter of the arguments; this type of adjudicator awards the win to the team whose arguments have the most significant influence on her assessment of the truth or falsity of the motion.

The risk of this model, of course, is that the adjudicator’s inherent bias may create an uneven playing field. These biases—whether explicitly acknowledged or implicit in the adjudicator’s interpretation of the round—may predispose her to believe the motion is true (or false) even before a round begins. The subjective nature of the activity means that an adjudicator will likely inherently prefer one side of the motion to the other. If the adjudicator is unable to set those biases aside (and adjudicators are unable to do so—see the discussion of the tabula rasa orientation above), the result is an unfair advantage for either the Proposition or the Opposition teams.

“Skill of Debaters” Model.

A contrast to the “truth of motion” model is the “skill of debaters” model. A judge who uses this model is primarily concerned with the teams’ execution of their arguments and broader strategy. At the end of the round, an adjudicator using this model asks herself “*Which team did the better job of debating?*”

The “*skill*” model focuses on the manner of the debaters. An advantage of this focus is that a factor the debaters can control—their own performance—is the basis for the decision. Adjudicators who render decisions using this model look to criteria such as role fulfillment, speaking style, structural clarity, and engagement of the opposing teams’ arguments to determine who prevailed in the round. But the “*skill of debaters*” model is not without risks. Chief among the perils of this model is the possibility that a technically strong team will make inaccurate or irrelevant arguments and thus be rewarded.

A Preferred Model: The “Movement” Model.

The “*movement*” model attempts to account for the weaknesses of the two previous models by combining the best of each. It recognizes that the adjudicator’s focus should be on the truth of the motion and the quality of the arguments that seek to establish that truth while also recognizing that the best efforts of the debaters—while able to make a significant impact on the adjudicator—may not result in the adjudicator changing her mind. The question the adjudicator using the movement model asks herself when rendering a decision is “*By the end of the round, which team moved me farthest from my original beliefs about the motion?*”

Imagine the adjudicator’s conviction as a point on a continuum; most adjudicators will have an opinion about the truth of the motion prior to the round. Before the round, the adjudicator’s belief about the truth of the motion may be represented as follows:

Throughout the course of the round, attentive adjudicators will listen to the arguments made by the various debaters, assess the quality of the arguments presented, evaluate the debaters’ presentation of those arguments, and react to the effort of the debaters to execute a particular strategy in the debate. Following the round and after consideration of all these factors, the adjudicators’ convictions may have shifted.

In this case, though the adjudicator continues to believe that the motion is true, the teams on the Opposition side would be more likely to win because they moved the adjudicator’s conviction the farthest.

Even though the adjudicators' opinion is that the motion is likely true, the Opposition team were successful in tempering that conviction. Though they didn't absolutely convince the adjudicators that the motion was false, they did affect the adjudicators more than did the Proposition teams.

The strength of this model is that it marries content (matter) to effort (manner) and is perfectly suited to Worlds-style debating, wherein each team must be evaluated for its contribution to the debate. The model also accounts for biases the adjudicator may possess and is capable of rewarding teams that challenge those biases even if they're unsuccessful at fully convincing an adjudicator of their position.

Relevant Standards of Adjudication

Adjudicators who specialize in Worlds-style debating employ a variety of standards to determine who wins the rounds, three of which are most common. None of these standards is definitive and each has its own strengths and weaknesses. Most importantly, these standards are best used in combination to produce a holistic assessment of the round.

Role Fulfillment

A common standard is to evaluate each team's merit by assessing whether that team's speakers met the expectations of their respective roles.

The “Better Debate” Standard.

Not many adjudicators would refer to this standard as the “better debate” standard, but I have little doubt that many adjudicators employ the criteria that are foundational for this standard.

Phrased simply, the “better debate” standard asks, “Which team contributed most to (or detracted most from) the quality of this debate?” In other words, adjudicators using this standard ask themselves what each team did to make this debate better. If this standard implies that adjudicators have in mind some Platonic form of the ideal debate, such an implication wouldn’t be entirely inaccurate. Whether that form is based on an amalgam of the best debates the judges have witnessed or is the product of the adjudicators’ more objective perspective about the appropriate focus of the round, the “perfect debate” is a standard against which many adjudicators evaluate debates.

In an effort to bring some objectivity to this standard, I recommend that adjudicators focus on four criteria to determine who most contributed to the quality of the round.

Inquiry: Do the teams interrogate the most germane issues in the round?

Advancement: Does each speech/speaker move the debate forward with new perspectives, arguments, or evidence? Focus: Do the teams avoid distractions and concentrate their efforts on the most substantive issues in the round?

Performance: Do the teams deliver a compelling oratorical effort?

These four factors allow a more structured and impartial means by which to determine which team has done the most to make the debate better.

The teams that contribute the most in each of these areas are typically those who make the debate better by moving it closer to the ideal debate round. Conversely, those who fail in these areas often detract from the overall quality of the round.

The better debate standard also implies that the best course of strategy isn't always the easy course. The natural inclination of debaters to attempt to define the debate in terms most favorable to them may not produce the best debate. The best debate is typically one that has ample ground for both sides, ground that allows each side to completely interrogate the full range of issues implied by the motion (or at least those issues that may potentially arise). Debaters would do well to keep in mind that the best debate for them (i.e. that which presents them with the most narrow, defensible ground) is rarely the best debate from the viewpoint of the adjudicators (i.e., that which presents the most ground for the proposition to be thoroughly tested).

Armed with a general model of adjudication and having discussed some of the most common standards adjudicators use, we can now turn our attention to outlining the process of rendering a decision following a round

Reaching a Decision

To reach a decision about which team should be ranked first, second, the adjudicators must sort through and evaluate the competing lines of argument made by each of the four teams.

Comparing the arguments of the debater that spoke in the first minutes of a debate round to those made by the debater who spoke in the last is a challenging task. In this section, I outline an approach that gives structure and direction to that process.

Comparing the relative efforts of teams in a debate round requires that adjudicators progress through six steps:

- Identify the proposition
- Identify the issues
- Determine the winner of each issue
- Determine the importance of each issue
- Assess each team's effort relative to the issues
- Justify and report the decision

To outline a plan for the evaluation of competing lines of argument, I'll treat each of these steps in order.

Identify the Proposition

To the list of benefits derived from clearly identified points of stasis I should add that clearly identified and articulated points of stasis allow adjudicators to more accurately and thoroughly evaluate each team's effort. By first identifying the places where each team's arguments clashed with their opponents', the adjudicator will be better able to assess the relative merits of each team's arguments.

The first point of stasis the adjudicator should identify is the primary point of stasis in the round: the proposition. As noted earlier, the proposition is the major dividing line between the Proposition and Opposition sides in the round and functions as the dividing line in the ground over which the Proposition and Opposition disagree.

Propositions may either come from the motion provided to the teams or they may emerge from the arguments made in that round. If the motion is very straightforward, the motion itself may serve as the proposition for the round. The motion *“This house would recognize the independence of Abkhazia”* defines clear ground for the Proposition and Opposition and, therefore, would likely serve as the proposition. Other motions, such as *“This house believes that religious leaders should listen to public opinion,”* provide less clear direction to the teams. These motions rely on the teams to negotiate the proposition in the round.

For example, the Proposition could choose to run a case that argues the Catholic Church should be more proactive in acknowledging and addressing issues of sexual abuse of minors by Catholic priests.

When the Proposition chooses to define a case that is more focused and specific than the motion offered, and when the Opposition accepts that case as the focus of the debate, that interpretation becomes the proposition for the round.

While the proposition will usually be explicit in the round, there will be cases in which neither side makes clear the central focus in the round. In this case, the adjudicator must phrase a proposition that functions as the central point of stasis. This effort is a starting point for her adjudication and will later serve as a touchstone used to assess the arguments made by the teams.

When creating a proposition, an adjudicator should phrase a statement that is clear and balanced. To be clear, a proposition statement should define ground for both the Proposition and Opposition teams in a way that makes obvious their responsibilities. A balanced proposition statement will avoid expressing the controversy in a way that might be weighted toward one side or the other.

Identify the Issues

While each debate is defined by the proposition that divides the ground between the Proposition and Opposition, more specific points of stasis will emerge as the debate progresses. Known as issues, these minor points of stasis are those places where the particular arguments of each team interact with the responses of the opposing teams. Issues emerge as the round progresses.

They may come from the explicit efforts of the debaters; in an ideal situation, the debaters on both sides agree on the relevant issues in the round. In certain rounds, all teams—explicitly or implicitly—may agree to structure their arguments around those issues. Unfortunately, in most cases the teams in a debate do not identify the issues so clearly.

When the teams fail to do so, adjudicators must sift through the arguments offered by each team, attempt to phrase reasonable issue statements that are material to the proposition and inclusive of the arguments made by the teams, and, finally, to evaluate the various arguments made relative to these issues.

Determine the Winner of Each Issue

Once the adjudicators have identified the round's proposition and the issues relevant to that proposition have been identified, the real work of adjudication begins. The adjudicators must now determine which side prevailed in capturing ground on each issue. To do so, the adjudicators must assess the arguments of each team and the interaction of each team's arguments with the arguments made by other teams in the round.

While determining which team's arguments prevailed is a complex and subjective exercise, a couple of points will make this process easier: first, if the former two steps have been completed properly, the adjudicators can easily recognize where (*i.e., over which issues*) the teams' arguments compete. This clear structure is essential to determining which arguments prevail: to know which argument on either side of a common point wins, you must first know which issues are in contest.

After structuring the arguments so they are clearly opposed to each other, the adjudicators must then assess the merits of each team's argument relative to each issue. Again, while determining which argument you personally find most compelling is an inherently subjective process, the effort may be guided by traditional standards of argument quality: truth and validity.

The Standard of Truth.

The standard of truth asks, "*Which side's arguments are most believable?*" To evaluate an argument's believability, an adjudicator may assess that argument's fidelity and coherence.

Fidelity.

Fidelity refers to the arguments maintenance of external consistency. Put simply, an argument maintains external consistency if it is consistent with what the adjudicator knows to be true. This is, of course, another way of asking if a particular claim is grounded in evidence that the judge finds acceptable; judges are more likely to believe claims supported by such evidence.

This is not to say that adjudicators automatically reject claims counter to what they believe is true, simply that adjudicators—like all human beings—are more skeptical of that which does not mesh with their perception of what’s right, true, and accurate.

Coherence

Coherence, on the other hand, refers to an argument’s maintenance of internal consistency. Internal consistency is maintained if an argument is not contradicted by some other argument made by the same team. Obviously, a coherent strategy is essential to a successful effort; the presence of contradictions between a team’s arguments is cause for concern.

Validity

To evaluate an argument’s validity, the adjudicator must look at how a team conveys an argument. In the terms of formal logic, validity refers to the structure of an argument; if the premises and conclusion of an argument conform to a recognized (and logical) pattern, that argument is judged to be valid. In more informal terms (and in terms more relevant to the evaluation of arguments in a competitive debate), an adjudicator may evaluate validity by examining the team’s execution and expression of that argument.

Execution

Execution refers to the reasoning used to connect the claim to the evidence offered. If the debater’s reasoning makes the support offered relevant to the claim advanced, the argument may be said to be valid.

In more holistic terms, an adjudicator may also look to the function of that argument in the team's broader strategy. If a particular argument a significant and necessary contribution to a team's strategy, or if that strategy is particularly compelling relative to the proposition, the team executed the argument well.

Another way to judge the validity of an argument is to assess the debater's expression of that argument. The force of an argument is a product of both its content and its expression; an argument that is well-structured and conveyed passionately will necessarily garner more attention than one that is poorly organized or presented with little enthusiasm.

These criteria allow adjudicators to assess the relative power of each side's arguments and decide which side prevailed on each issue. Once the adjudicators know which side won each issue, they must determine the relative importance of that issue to the proposition being debated.

Determine the Importance of Each Issue.

Once the adjudicators reach a determination about which side won each issue, they can then evaluate the relative significance of each issue. Any issue can be won by either the Proposition or the Opposition (*represented below by the horizontal movement of the dividing line in an issue*) and that same issue may occupy relatively more or less of the adjudicators' attention than other issues (*represented by the vertical expansion of issues relative to each other*).

To determine the relative importance of each issue, the adjudicators must return to the proposition around which the issues are focused. They may ask themselves which issues are most germane to the proposition at hand, giving greater weight to issues that more directly address the question and less to those issues deemed ancillary to the proposition. This is not, obviously, an exact science. Determining which issues are most significant requires the evaluation of a variety of factors, including assessing which are most relevant to the motion being debated, which issues the debaters claim are most important, and how each issue relates to the overall strategy of each team.

At the conclusion of this process, the adjudicators should have a clear picture of which side (*Proposition or Opposition*) won each issue and how significant those issues are to the proposition under consideration.

Assess Each Team's Efforts Relative to the Issues.

An adjudicator must also determine which teams contributed most significantly to the overall effort in the round.

Another way to express this, consistent with the “*mental map*” metaphor used throughout this book, is that the winning team is the one that occupies the majority of the adjudicators’ attention at the end of round. The second place team is the team that occupies the second most attention. Fortunately, the map metaphor may be adapted easily to this assessment. In addition to representing which side won each issue and the relative significance of each issue, the territory of the debate may be mapped to represent each team’s contribution to that effort:

- Public Health?
- Economic Consequences?
- Proposition
- Opposition
- Smokers' Rights?
- Proposition
- Opposition

According to the map of this round's territory, at the end of this round, the Proposition team would be ranked first, since they not only were on the winning side of the most critical issue, but in the adjudicators' assessment they were most responsible for proving that public health would benefit from a ban on tobacco. On the other issues—though ultimately the adjudicators' felt the Opposition side prevailed on both less important issues.

Report the Decision

The final responsibility of the adjudicators is to report their decision. An effective oral adjudication is critical to good judging. The oral adjudication presents the adjudicators the opportunity to explain how they interpreted the round and to meet their obligation to the principle of education discussed earlier. If an adjudicator has progressed through the steps as outlined, an effective oral adjudication should be easy.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHIEF ADJUDICATOR (CA) AND CORE ADJUDICATION PANEL (CAP) IN A TOURNAMENT

The Chief Adjudicator (CA) and the Core Adjudication Panel (CAP) play vital roles in ensuring the smooth running and fairness of a debate tournament. Their responsibilities encompass judge training, allocation, assessment, and overseeing the adjudication process.

ROLES OF THE CHIEF ADJUDICATOR (CA)

Judge Management and Training.

- Ensures all judges are familiar with the Judging Schedule and any Authorized Material.
- Conducts training sessions to equip judges with the necessary skills and knowledge before the tournament.
- Assesses judges' competence and ensures they understand and adhere to tournament rules.

Judge Allocation.

- Assigns judges to debates, including the Grand Final, based on competence, not titles or professions.
- Ensures judge allocation follows tournament Rules and maintains fairness and objectivity.

Evaluation of Judges.

- Reviews judges' performance using criteria such as:
 - Ability to provide clear, reasoned decisions.
 - Adherence to rules of debate and correct adjudication methods.
 - Conduct that upholds the integrity of the tournament (e.g., *avoiding bias or inappropriate behavior*).
- Considers factors such as complaints, judge feedback, and any personal representations when determining judge eligibility.
- Adjudication Oversight:
 - Records results from debates accurately.
 - Determines team rankings after preliminary rounds.
 - Sets up the draw for Break Rounds and the Grand Final.
- Maintaining Standards:
 - Addresses issues like incompetence, bias, or misconduct, including complaints about judges.
 - Ensures that judges' ability or perceived ability is not compromised by external factors (e.g., excessive fatigue, alcohol consumption, or illness).

General Responsibilities:

- Resolves adjudication-related matters during the championship.
- Makes final decisions on eligibility and allocation of judges to debates.

ROLES OF THE CORE ADJUDICATION PANEL (CAP)

- The CAP supports the Chief Adjudicator in managing the tournament and ensuring high standards of adjudication.
- Motion Setting:
Works closely with the CA to craft motions that are fair, balanced, and debate-worthy.
- Judge Calibration:
 - Assists in training judges and ensuring consistency in adjudication standards.
 - Provides oversight to maintain alignment with tournament guidelines.
- Judge Allocation Support:
Helps the CA in allocating judges, especially in critical debates like the finals.
- Quality Assurance:
Reviews the performance of judges and provides feedback to ensure continuous improvement.
- Break Rounds Management:
Collaborates with the CA to set up the draw and adjudicator allocation for elimination rounds and the Grand Final.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR JUDGE ASSESSMENT

When assessing a judge's eligibility or performance, the following factors are evaluated:

- Clarity and quality of reasons provided for their decisions.

- Adherence to the rules of debate.
- Competence, impartiality, and professionalism.
- Fitness to judge, considering factors like fatigue, illness, or inappropriate behavior.
- Complaints raised against the judge, if any.
- Feedback or representations made by the judge regarding their performance.

COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE CA AND CAP

While the CA takes primary responsibility for managing adjudication, the CAP serves as a critical advisory and support team. Together, they ensure the tournament adheres to the highest standards of fairness, professionalism, and excellence in adjudication.

CONFERRAL ADJUDICATION

Conferral adjudication is a judging process used to improve decision-making by incorporating discussions among judges before finalizing ballots. It is distinct from independent and consensus adjudication systems and emphasizes information sharing and clarification without requiring unanimous agreement.

Purpose of Conferral Judging

- Information Sharing: Allows judges to clarify their understanding of the debate by sharing perspectives.
- Improved Decision Quality: Ensures decisions are well-informed by incorporating additional context or resolving misunderstandings.
- Focus on Clarity, Not Consensus: Judges are not required to agree but should use the discussion to refine their own judgments.

Key Steps in the Conferral Process

Preliminary Verdicts (0-5 Minutes)

- Judges use their notes to form an initial decision independently.
- Preliminary verdicts are shared privately with the Chair.

Conferral Discussion (5-23 Minutes)

- Judges discuss key issues, seeking clarification on:
 - Rules-related questions (*e.g., new material, model setup*).
 - Substantive contributions (*e.g., tracking arguments, weighing impacts*).
- Discussion focuses on contentious or decisive areas rather than widely agreed points.

Final Decision and Ballots (23-28 Minutes)

- Judges reflect on the discussion and independently decide if their verdict changes.
- Ballots are completed without consensus requirements.

Oral Adjudication and Feedback (32-60 Minutes)

- The Chair delivers a single oral adjudication (OA), incorporating key points from the discussion.
- Judges provide team and speaker-specific feedback to enhance learning.

GUIDANCE FOR CHAIRS

Structure and Timing:

- Actively manage time, ensuring the discussion concludes within the 18-minute limit.
- Allocate 4-6 minutes per judge for contributions.

Facilitating Discussion:

- Clearly state the purpose of the conferral: to clarify, not persuade.
- Begin with clarifications about rules or factual misunderstandings.
- Progress to evaluation-based questions on key issues.

Handling Splits:

- Wing Splits: Invite the minority opinion first to avoid undue influence.
- Chair Splits: Guide both wings to articulate their views before explaining the differing perspective.

GUIDANCE FOR JUDGES IN CONFERRAL DISCUSSIONS

Openness:

- Be receptive to other judges' perspectives and willing to revise decisions if new insights arise.

Clarity:

- Ask specific, targeted questions rather than open-ended ones.
- Use language that invites discussion, avoiding definitive or confrontational statements.

Focus on Critical Issues:

- Spend more time on contentious or decisive areas rather than points with broad agreement.

Avoid Back-and-Forth Arguments:

- Prioritize sharing information over convincing others.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER JUDGING SYSTEMS

Aspect	Independent	Consensus	CONFERRAL
Timing for Discussion	Minimal	High (~15-20 min)	Medium (~12-18 min)
Purpose of Discussion	Formality	Agreement	Information Sharing
Final Decision Method	Individual	Group	Individual (Post-discussion)
Likelihood of Dissents	High	Low	Moderate

BEST PRACTICES FOR EFFECTIVE CONFERRAL

Chairs: Guide the process with neutrality and time discipline.

Judges: Contribute constructively, focusing on clarification and understanding.

Discussion: Prioritize critical areas that impact the decision while avoiding unnecessary debates.



DEBATE &
INSTITUTE
AFRICA

DEBATE &
SPEECH

JUDGES

Fellowship

ADJUDICATING PUBLIC SPEAKING

Public speaking is a crucial skill that empowers individuals to share ideas, inspire action, and contribute meaningfully to society. As an adjudicator, you play a vital role in fostering this crucial skill by providing constructive feedback and evaluating performances based on established criteria.

This manual serves as your comprehensive guide, encompassing essential modules that will equip you with the following:

- A thorough understanding of the role and responsibilities of an adjudicator.
- Mastery of the evaluation criteria used to assess public speaking performances.
- A step-by-step guide to navigating the adjudication process, from preparation to providing feedback.
- Exploration of valuable resources and tools to enhance your skills and knowledge.

Practical guidance on developing your expertise through active participation and continuous learning.

INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC SPEAKING ADJUDICATION.

As an adjudicator, you play a crucial role in public speaking competitions. Your feedback and evaluation help shape the skills and development of speakers. This module explores the key responsibilities and roles of adjudicators, providing you with a solid foundation for effective adjudication.

QUALITIES OF A GOOD PUBLIC SPEAKING ADJUDICATOR.

To excel as an adjudicator, you must embody certain qualities and characteristics. These include impartiality, expertise, communication skills, active listening, and time management. Your ability to evaluate speeches objectively, provide constructive feedback, and manage your time efficiently is essential for fair and accurate evaluation.

Insights from Experts:

Gain valuable insights from renowned public speakers or experts in the field. Their perspectives and tips will help you improve your adjudication skills and approaches, making you a more effective adjudicator.

This module is designed to help you improve your adjudication skills and approaches. By embodying the qualities of a good adjudicator and staying informed about emerging trends, you can enhance your effectiveness and contribute to the success of public speaking competitions.

Public speaking is the act of delivering a speech or presentation to a live audience. It is a valuable skill that allows individuals to communicate ideas, inspire others, and persuade or inform an audience. Public speaking can take many forms, including speeches, presentations, debates, and lectures, and is used in a variety of settings, such as conferences, meetings, and classrooms.

Adjudication in the context of public speaking refers to the process of evaluating and judging speeches or presentations. Adjudicators, also known as judges, are responsible for assessing the quality of speeches based on predetermined criteria such as content, delivery, and engagement with the audience. Adjudicators provide feedback to speakers to help them improve their public speaking skills and may also assign scores to speeches to determine winners in competitions.

An Adjudicator Is an individual who is trained to evaluate and judge speeches or presentations in a public speaking competition. Adjudicators are typically experienced public speakers or speech coaches who have a good understanding of the principles of effective communication and persuasive speaking. They are impartial and objective in their evaluations, focusing on the quality of the speech rather than personal bias or preference.

A Chief Adjudicator Is a senior adjudicator who oversees the adjudication process in a public speaking competition. The Chief Adjudicator is responsible for ensuring that the competition runs smoothly, that adjudicators are properly trained and briefed, and that the competition rules are followed. The Chief Adjudicator may also adjudicate speeches and provide feedback to speakers, but their primary role is to manage the adjudication process.

The CORE Adjudication Panel (CAP)'s a group of senior adjudicators who are responsible for adjudicating the final rounds of a public speaking competition.

For newcomers to public speaking adjudication, it is important to familiarize themselves with the rules and guidelines of the competition.

New adjudicators should also seek feedback from experienced adjudicators to improve their skills including how speeches are timed and what signals are used by adjudicators.

Speeches are typically **timed** using a stopwatch or timer, with specific time limits set for each speech. The timing of a speech is important, as it ensures that each speaker has a fair amount of time to deliver their message and that the competition runs smoothly. In many public speaking competitions, the first minute and the last 30 seconds of a speech are signalled to the speakers by the adjudicators. This helps the speakers to pace themselves and ensures that they finish their speeches within the allotted time.

WHAT DOES A PUBLIC SPEECH TOURNEY LOOK LIKE AND HOW DOES ADJUDICATION HAPPEN?

Competition Outlook in Public Speaking Adjudication

Understanding the competition outlook or blueprint is crucial for adjudicators in public speaking competitions.

It provides a visual imagery for how the competition will be structured, how speeches will be evaluated, and how winners will be determined. Here's an overview of typical competition formats and structures:

Competition Format: Public speaking competitions often consist of multiple rounds, including preliminary rounds and knockout rounds (also known as “*outrounds*”)

Preliminary Rounds: In preliminary rounds, each speaker delivers their speech independently of the others. Adjudicators evaluate each speech based on its own merits, considering factors such as content, delivery, and audience engagement. The goal is to select the top speakers to advance to the knockout rounds.

Knockout Rounds: In knockout rounds, speakers are directly compared to one another. Adjudicators assess speeches in relation to each other, determining which speakers are the most effective and should advance to the next round. The knockout rounds continue until the top finalists are determined.

Silent Rounds; Silent rounds are a unique component of some public speaking competitions, particularly in the preliminary rounds. In these rounds, adjudicators evaluate speeches without providing verbal or written feedback to the speakers. Instead, they submit their scores based solely on their assessment of the speech.

Silent rounds are an important component of preliminary rounds in public speaking competitions as they emphasize the evaluation process, ensure equal treatment of all speakers, and provide valuable experience for both speakers and adjudicators.

Competition Blueprint: The competition blueprint outlines the specific number of rounds, the criteria for advancing to the next round, and any special rules or considerations for each round. It provides a clear roadmap for participants and adjudicators alike, ensuring that the competition runs smoothly and fairly.

Model Blueprint: A competition may consist of 5 preliminary rounds, with the top half of speakers advancing to the knockout rounds. The knockout rounds may include quarter-finals, semi-finals, and a final round, with the winner determined based on their performance in the final round.

ADJUDICATOR BREAKS AND FEEDBACK LOOP.

In public speaking competitions, adjudicators who perform well in the preliminary rounds may be selected to judge in the later rounds, including the finals. This selection process, known as “*adjudicator breaks*,” is based on the feedback and assessment of both fellow adjudicators and the speakers themselves.

Selection Process: Adjudicator breaks are typically determined by a combination of factors, including the quality of feedback provided by the adjudicators, their consistency in applying evaluation criteria, and their overall professionalism and conduct during the competition.

Feedback from Fellow Adjudicators: Fellow adjudicators play a crucial role in assessing the performance of their colleagues.

They provide feedback on the quality and depth of their evaluations, their ability to communicate effectively with speakers, and their overall contribution to the adjudication process.

Feedback from Speakers: Speakers also provide feedback on the adjudicators, rating them based on their clarity, fairness, and helpfulness in providing feedback. This feedback is used to identify adjudicators who are particularly effective in their role and may be selected for adjudicator breaks.

Impact on Adjudication: Adjudicators who are selected for adjudicator breaks are entrusted with judging in the later rounds of the competition, including the finals. Their selection is based on their demonstrated ability to provide insightful and constructive feedback, their fairness and impartiality in evaluating speeches, and their overall professionalism and dedication to the adjudication process.

TASKS IN PUBLIC SPEAKING.

In public speaking competitions, **TASKS** are questions or topics on which speakers are required to present a speech. Tasks are designed to challenge speakers to think critically, express their ideas clearly, and engage with important issues. As an adjudicator, it is important to understand the nature of tasks and how they should be approached and interpreted.

Task Definition: A task is a question or a topic that serves as the basis for a speech.

Tasks are typically designed to be open-ended, allowing speakers to interpret them in different ways and present their own unique perspective.

Example Task: *“Record a 3-minute speech on the solutions to gender-based violence.”*

Task Approach: As an adjudicator, it is important to consider the task from the perspective of the speaker. This includes understanding the task requirements, such as the time limit and the specific focus of the speech. Adjudicators should also consider the audience and the context in which the speech is being delivered.

Task Interpretation: Task interpretation refers to how the speaker understands and responds to the task. As an adjudicator, it is important to assess the speaker’s interpretation of the task and how well they address the topic or question. This includes evaluating the speaker’s ability to stay on topic, develop a coherent argument, and engage with the task in a meaningful way.

Word-Per-Word Basis: Adjudicators should interpret the task on a word-per-word basis, meaning that they should consider each word in the task and how it contributes to the overall meaning. This helps to ensure that the speaker’s response is relevant and focused on the task requirements.

AUDIENCE IDENTIFICATION IN TASK INTERPRETATION.

In public speaking adjudication, audience identification is a critical aspect of task interpretation. Each task defines the limits within which a particular type of audience is addressed, and it determines the audience to whom the speech is given. As an adjudicator, it is important to consider how well the speaker identifies and understands the intended audience for their speech.

Task Interpretation and Audience Identification: When interpreting a task, adjudicators should assess how well the speaker identifies the intended audience and tailors their speech to suit that audience. This includes considering the demographic characteristics of the audience (*such as age, gender, education level, and cultural background*) as well as their interests, needs, and expectations.

Relevance to the Task: Adjudicators should evaluate the speaker's ability to address the task in a way that is relevant and meaningful to the intended audience. This includes considering whether the speaker's approach and content are appropriate for the audience and whether they effectively engage the audience's interest and attention.

Impact on Evaluation: Audience identification plays a significant role in how adjudicators evaluate a speech. A speaker who demonstrates a clear understanding of their audience and effectively tailors their speech to suit that audience is likely to receive higher marks for relevance, engagement, and overall effectiveness.

Example: For a task that requires a speech on solutions to gender-based violence, the speaker should identify the audience as individuals who are concerned about social issues and interested in finding practical solutions. The speaker should tailor their speech to address the concerns and interests of this audience, using language and examples that resonate with them.

JUDGING CRITERIA AND SCORING.

Module Introduction: This section lays the foundation for evaluating public speaking performances by introducing the main criteria used. It emphasizes the importance of these criteria in ensuring a fair and comprehensive evaluation of speeches.

Content Evaluation:

Judges assess the content of the speech, including its structure, accuracy, depth, originality, relevance, logical organization, and flow of ideas. A well-researched and organized speech with coherent arguments and relevant information scores higher in this category.

When assessing the quality of content, it is incumbent upon you, as an adjudicator to know the different types of speeches and then what content is suitable for that particular type of speech.

There are several different types of speeches, each with its own purpose and characteristics. Here are some common types:

Persuasive Speech: A speech that aims to persuade the audience to adopt a certain viewpoint or take a specific action.

Informative Speech: A speech that provides information about a topic to educate or enlighten the audience.

Impromptu Speech: A speech that is delivered without prior preparation, often in response to a prompt or question.

Special Occasion Speech: A speech delivered during a special event or occasion, such as a wedding toast or graduation speech.

Debate Speech: A speech presented as part of a formal debate, where the speaker argues for or against a specific proposition.

Motivational Speech: A speech intended to inspire and motivate the audience, often with a focus on personal development or achieving goals.

Entertaining Speech: A speech that aims to entertain the audience, often through humor, storytelling, or dramatic elements.

Explanatory Speech: A speech that explains a complex topic or concept in a clear and understandable way. These are just a few examples, and speeches can be further categorized based on their content, purpose, and audience.

Interpretive reading speech: the type that is quite common with *Chimamanda Ngozie* where a speaker reads out their speech or presentation on a paper or slides to the audience.

Knowing the types of speeches is not conclusive of content evaluation, Speech Structure and Task Interpretation followed by logic are vital aspects of content evaluation and we are going to cover those aspects one by one.

SPEECH STRUCTURE

This is quite simply understood as the outline, call it a map or a blue print of a speech and it includes the *Introduction, the body and the conclusion.*

INTRODUCTIONS

There are several types of *INTRODUCTIONS* that speakers can use to start their speeches effectively. Some common types include:

Narrative Introduction: Starting with a story or anecdote to engage the audience.

Question Introduction: Posing a thought-provoking question to grab attention.

Statistical Introduction: Presenting a surprising or relevant statistic to highlight the importance of the topic.

Quotation Introduction: Beginning with a quote that sets the tone for the speech.

Definition Introduction: Providing a definition or explanation of key terms related to the topic.

Historical Introduction: Starting with a brief historical background or context of the topic.

Current Event Introduction: Discussing a recent event or news related to the topic.

BODY

This simply reflects the main ideas of the task seen manifest within the speech of the speaker. Quite simply, it is the main course meal, if the task requires that the speaker talks about '*how to stop the start of another Rwandan genocide*' the *BODY* must comprise of ways or methods of how to stop the next genocide.

The body is split into *IDEAS* maybe for this task example they could be;

<Idea 1> Problem analysis- analysing the genocide, what it was, where it happened, why it happened.

<Idea 2> Solution analysis- analysing the solutions to the genocide or to prevent a subsequent genocide.

<Idea 3> Benefit analysis- showing the good result that will be attained when you apply the solutions suggested to the problem.

Coherence

Another important aspect of the BODY is *COHERENCE*; *Coherence* is a key aspect of effective public speaking. It refers to the clarity and logical flow of ideas in a speech, ensuring that the audience can easily follow and understand the speaker's message. Coherence is essential for ensuring that a speech is well-organized, easy to follow, and effectively communicates the speaker's message to the audience.

Here are some key points to consider:

- A coherent speech is well-organized, with a clear introduction, body, and conclusion. The ideas should be logically arranged, with each point leading smoothly to the next.
- Transitions are phrases or sentences that help to connect ideas and sections of a speech. They create a smooth flow between points and guide the audience through the speaker's argument or narrative.
- Coherence also involves consistency in the use of language, tone, and style throughout the speech. This helps to maintain a unified message and keeps the audience engaged.
- All points and examples should be relevant to the main topic of the speech. Irrelevant or tangential information can confuse the audience and detract from the overall coherence of the speech.

CONCLUSION

Lastly is *CONCLUSION* of a speech is a crucial part of its structure, as it is the final opportunity to leave a lasting impression on the audience and reinforce the key message of the speech.

A well-crafted conclusion should summarize the main points of the speech, reiterate the central message, and leave the audience with a sense of closure and a clear takeaway. Here are some key aspects of a strong conclusion in a speech:

- **Summarize Key Points:** The conclusion should briefly summarize the main points of the speech, highlighting the key arguments or ideas that were presented. This helps to reinforce the central message of the speech and remind the audience of the key takeaways.
- **Reiterate Central Message:** The conclusion should reiterate the central message or thesis of the speech, emphasizing why it is important and how it relates to the audience. This helps to ensure that the message is clear and memorable.
- **Create a Memorable Closing Statement:** A strong conclusion often includes a memorable closing statement that leaves a lasting impression on the audience. This could be a powerful quote, a thought-provoking question, or a call to action that inspires the audience to take action or think differently about the topic.

- **Provide a Sense of Closure:** The conclusion should provide a sense of closure to the speech, signaling to the audience that the speech is coming to an end. This can be achieved through a clear signal phrase, such as “In conclusion,” or by summarizing the main points one last time.
- **Leave the Audience with a Call to Action or Thought:** A compelling conclusion often includes a call to action or thought that encourages the audience to take action or further explore the topic on their own. This can help to make the speech more impactful and memorable.

DELIVERY EVALUATION.

Judges evaluate the speaker's delivery, including vocal clarity, projection, variation, eye contact, body language, stage presence, use of pauses, silence, and emphasis. A confident and engaging delivery enhances the overall impact of the speech.

Language Evaluation:

- Judges assess the speaker's language use, including grammatical accuracy, vocabulary choice, effective use of rhetorical devices, clarity, conciseness, and fluency. A speech that is clear, concise, and effectively communicates the message scores higher in this category.

Clarity and Structure of the Speech:

- Clarity: Judges assess how clearly the speaker communicates their message. This includes the use of clear language, organization of ideas, and logical flow between points.
- Structure: Judges evaluate the overall structure of the speech, including the introduction, body, and conclusion. They look for a clear opening that introduces the topic, a well-developed body that presents arguments or information cohesively, and a conclusion that summarizes key points and leaves a lasting impression.

Delivery and Style:

- Delivery: Judges consider the speaker's vocal delivery, including volume, pace, and articulation. They also assess the speaker's nonverbal communication, such as body language, gestures, and eye contact.
- Style: Judges look at the speaker's style, including their use of language, tone, and expression. They assess whether the style is appropriate for the topic and audience, and if it enhances the overall impact of the speech.

Content and Argumentation:

- Content: Judges evaluate the quality and relevance of the content presented in the speech. This includes the accuracy of information, depth of research, and originality of ideas.
- Argumentation: Judges assess the strength of the speaker's arguments. They look for logical reasoning, supporting evidence, and the ability to counter opposing arguments effectively.

Engagement with the Audience:

Judges evaluate how well the speaker engages with the audience. This includes the ability to capture the audience's attention, maintain interest throughout the speech, and create a connection with the listeners. Judges also consider the speaker's use of humor, storytelling, and other techniques to engage the audience emotionally and intellectually.

GUIDELINES FOR ASSIGNING SCORES.

Content: Evaluate the quality and relevance of the information presented. Consider factors such as depth of research, originality of ideas, and effectiveness of arguments.

Delivery: Assess the speaker's vocal delivery (e.g., tone, pace, clarity), nonverbal communication (e.g., gestures, eye contact), and overall presence on stage.

Structure: Evaluate the organization and coherence of the speech. Look for a clear introduction, body, and conclusion, as well as smooth transitions between ideas.

Engagement: Consider the speaker's ability to connect with the audience. Evaluate the speech's overall impact, including its ability to capture and maintain the audience's attention.

Overall Impression: Consider the overall impression created by the speech, including factors such as creativity, passion, and persuasiveness.

THE SCORING SYSTEM.

Content (30 points): Depth of research (10), originality of ideas (10), effectiveness of arguments (10).

Delivery (30 points): Vocal delivery (10), nonverbal communication (10), overall presence (10).

Structure (20 points): Organization (10), coherence (10).

Engagement (20 points): Connection with audience (10), overall impact (10).

Total Score: Add up scores from each category to get the total score out of 100.

Total Score Calculation: The total score for each speech is calculated by adding up the scores for each criterion, taking into account the weights assigned to each criterion.

Scoring System: Criteria: Identify the key criteria for evaluating speeches. This could include categories such as content, delivery, structure, and engagement.

Scoring Scale: Use a scale to assign scores for each criterion, such as a scale of 1-10 or 1-5, with 1 being poor and 10 (or 5) being excellent.

Weighting: Determine the importance of each criterion by assigning weights. For example, content might be weighted more heavily than delivery.

Total Score Calculation: Calculate the total score for each speech by adding up the scores for each criterion, taking into account the weights assigned to each criterion.

ADJUDICATOR ETHICS AND PROFESSIONALISM

Module Introduction;

This module explores the ethical considerations, professional standards, and child protection policies that adjudicators must uphold. It emphasizes the importance of maintaining integrity, fairness, and professionalism in all aspects of adjudication, especially when dealing with participants who are minors.

Ethical Considerations: Adjudicators must adhere to a strict code of ethics, including confidentiality, conflict of interest avoidance, fair play, and respectful communication. They should also avoid bias and ensure that their evaluations are objective and unbiased.

Ethical considerations are fundamental in public speaking adjudication, as they ensure fairness, impartiality, and integrity in the evaluation process.

Adjudicators are expected to adhere to a code of ethics that guides their behavior and decision-making. Some key ethical considerations in public speaking adjudication include:

Impartiality: Adjudicators should evaluate speeches objectively, without bias or favoritism towards any speaker or team. They should focus solely on the quality of the speech and its adherence to the evaluation criteria.

Confidentiality: Adjudicators should maintain the confidentiality of the adjudication process, including the content of speeches and the deliberations of the adjudication panel. They should not disclose any information about the speeches or the adjudication process to unauthorized individuals.

Conflict of Interest: Adjudicators should avoid conflicts of interest that could compromise their impartiality. This includes refraining from adjudicating speeches by individuals or teams with whom they have a personal or professional relationship.

Adjudicators should ensure that all speakers are given a fair and equal opportunity to present their speeches. They should not show any bias or favoritism towards any speaker or team.

Respectful Communication: Adjudicators should communicate with speakers and other adjudicators in a respectful and professional manner. They should avoid making derogatory or disrespectful comments that could undermine the integrity of the adjudication process.

Failure to adhere to ethical considerations in public speaking adjudication could result in dismissal from the adjudication panel.

Adjudicators who engage in unethical behavior, such as bias, conflict of interest, or disrespectful communication, may be removed from the panel and barred from adjudicating future competitions. Dismissal on ethical grounds is taken seriously to maintain the integrity and credibility of the adjudication process.

Cultural Considerations: Adjudicators should be aware of cultural differences and ensure that their evaluations are sensitive to these differences. They should also strive to be inclusive and respectful of diverse perspectives and backgrounds.

Professionalism: Adjudicators should conduct themselves in a professional manner at all times, both in and out of the competition venue. This includes being punctual, prepared, and respectful towards participants, fellow adjudicators, and event organizers.

Professionalism in public speaking adjudication extends beyond just the evaluation of speeches; it also encompasses **HOW** adjudicators present themselves and interact with speakers.

One aspect of professionalism is adhering to a dress code that is appropriate for the setting and respectful towards the speakers and audience. While the specifics of a dress code may vary depending on the event, there are general guidelines that adjudicators should follow:

Appropriateness: Adjudicators should dress in a manner that is appropriate for the setting and the audience.

Interactive Elements: To engage adjudicators, this module includes interactive elements such as case studies or role-playing scenarios. These activities allow adjudicators to explore ethical dilemmas and practice ethical decision-making in a safe and supportive environment.

Emerging Trends: This module also discusses emerging trends in adjudication ethics and professionalism. Topics such as the use of technology in maintaining ethical standards, the impact of social media on adjudicator behaviour.

CHILD PROTECTION POLICY.

Adjudicators must be familiar with and adhere to the competition's child protection policy. This includes guidelines for interacting with minors, recognizing signs of abuse or neglect, and reporting any concerns to the appropriate authorities.

To wrap it all:

By upholding ethical standards, maintaining professionalism, and adhering to child protection policies, adjudicators can contribute to the integrity and fairness of public speaking competitions, especially when dealing with participants who are minors.

ADJUDICATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES.

Module Introduction:

This module outlines the key steps involved in the adjudication process, from preparation to providing feedback. It emphasizes the importance of thorough preparation, active listening, and effective communication in the adjudication process.

Pre-Competition Preparation:

Adjudicators should thoroughly familiarize themselves with the competition rules and rubrics, review the speaker order and topics (if available), and prepare their note-taking materials and evaluation sheets. This ensures that they are well-prepared to evaluate speeches effectively.

During the Competition:

Adjudicators should actively listen to each speech, take detailed notes, and apply the evaluation criteria consistently and objectively. They should avoid distractions and focus on providing fair and accurate evaluations.

Post-Competition Feedback:

After the competition, adjudicators should provide specific, constructive, and respectful feedback to each speaker.

They should highlight strengths and offer suggestions for improvement in a professional and encouraging manner. Adjudicators should also be open to receiving feedback from speakers and other adjudicators to improve their own skills.

Interactive Elements:

To enhance learning, this module includes interactive elements such as simulated adjudication scenarios or group discussions. These activities allow adjudicators to practice their skills and receive feedback from peers and facilitators.

Feedback and Continuous Improvement:

Adjudicators should reflect on their performance and seek feedback from experienced adjudicators to identify areas for improvement. They should also continue to learn and develop their skills through workshops, seminars, and other learning opportunities.

FEEDBACK AND DEVELOPMENT.

Module Introduction:

This mini-module focuses on the role of adjudicators in providing effective feedback to speakers and helping them improve their public speaking skills over time. It emphasizes the importance of constructive criticism and ongoing development in the competitive public speaking arena.

Techniques for Providing Effective Feedback:

Adjudicators should provide feedback that is specific, constructive, and actionable. They should highlight both strengths and areas for improvement, offering practical suggestions for how speakers can enhance their performance. Techniques such as the sandwich method (start with a positive comment, provide constructive criticism, end with another positive comment) can be effective in delivering feedback.

Strategies for Helping Speakers Improve:

Adjudicators can help speakers improve their skills by providing targeted feedback and offering resources for further development. They can recommend practice techniques, speech coaching, or workshops to help speakers hone their public speaking abilities. Adjudicators should also encourage speakers to set goals for improvement and provide support as they work towards achieving them.

Incorporating Feedback into Future Adjudication Practices:

Adjudicators should use feedback from speakers to inform their future adjudication practices. They should reflect on the effectiveness of their feedback and adjust their approach as needed. Adjudicators can also use feedback to identify trends or common areas for improvement among speakers, allowing them to tailor their feedback to address these specific areas.

Interactive Exercises:

To enhance learning, this module includes interactive exercises such as role-playing scenarios or group discussions. These activities allow adjudicators to practice giving feedback in a supportive environment and receive feedback on their feedback, helping them refine their skills.

STEP-BY-STEP GUIDE TO GIVING PERSONAL FEEDBACK.

Preparation: Before providing feedback, take some time to review your notes and reflect on the speaker's performance. Identify key strengths and areas for improvement that you want to address in your feedback.

Setting: Find a quiet and private space to talk to the speaker. This allows for a more focused and meaningful conversation.

Start Positively: Begin by highlighting the speaker's strengths and what they did well during their speech. This sets a positive tone for the feedback session and helps the speaker feel more receptive to constructive criticism.

Be Specific: Provide specific examples from the speaker's performance to support your feedback. This helps the speaker understand exactly what they did well and what they can improve upon.

Address Areas for Improvement: Discuss the areas where the speaker can improve, focusing on actionable suggestions. Be specific about what they can do differently next time to enhance their performance.

Encourage Growth: Encourage the speaker to view feedback as an opportunity for growth and improvement. Emphasize that feedback is a valuable tool for honing their public speaking skills.

Listen and Respond: Allow the speaker to respond to your feedback and ask any questions they may have. Listen actively and address any concerns they raise.

End on a Positive Note: End the feedback session on a positive note, reaffirming the speaker's strengths and expressing confidence in their ability to improve. Encourage them to continue working on their public speaking skills.

Interactive Elements:

To enhance learning, this module includes interactive elements such as role-playing scenarios or group discussions on giving feedback. These activities allow adjudicators to practice giving feedback in a supportive environment and receive feedback on their feedback, helping them refine their skills.

To wrap it all:

By mastering the techniques for providing effective feedback, adjudicators can play a crucial role in helping speakers improve their public speaking skills and achieve their full potential. This module provides a comprehensive framework for adjudicators to deliver constructive criticism and support speakers in their development journey.

SPECIAL TOPICS IN ADJUDICATION.

Module Introduction:

This module delves into special topics and emerging trends in adjudication, providing adjudicators with innovative ideas and approaches to enhance their skills and effectiveness.

Improvisation and Creativity:

Adjudicators should appreciate and evaluate speakers' creative approaches, including improvised elements in a speech. They should assess the effectiveness of creativity in engaging the audience and conveying the message. Adjudicators can also encourage speakers to think creatively and explore new ways of presenting their ideas, rewarding originality and innovation.

Creativity in public speaking is the **ability to present ideas in a unique and engaging way that captures the audience's attention and leaves a lasting impression.** It involves thinking outside the box, using innovative techniques, and incorporating original elements into your speech.

Here are some key aspects of creativity in public speaking:

- *Originality:* Creativity involves presenting ideas in a way that is fresh and original. This can include using unique examples, anecdotes, or perspectives that are not commonly used.

Storytelling; Storytelling is a powerful tool for engaging audiences and conveying complex ideas in a memorable way. Creative speakers use storytelling techniques to create a narrative that resonates with their audience and brings their ideas to life.

Visual Aids: Creative speakers use visual aids such as slides, props, or multimedia presentations to enhance their message and make it more memorable. These visual elements can help to clarify complex ideas and engage visual learners.

Humor: Humor can be a powerful tool for connecting with an audience and making your speech more memorable. Creative speakers use humor judiciously to lighten the mood and keep the audience engaged.

Metaphors and Analogies: Using metaphors and analogies can help to make abstract concepts more concrete and easier to understand. Creative speakers use these rhetorical devices to create vivid imagery that resonates with their audience.

Interactive Elements: Creative speakers often incorporate interactive elements into their speeches, such as audience participation or demonstrations. These interactive elements help to engage the audience and make the speech more memorable.

Adaptability: Creative speakers are able to adapt their message and delivery to suit the needs and preferences of their audience. They are able to think on their feet and adjust their approach in real-time based on audience feedback.

Interactive Elements:

To engage adjudicators, this module includes interactive elements such as storytelling workshops or group storytelling exercises. These activities allow adjudicators to experience firsthand the power of storytelling and explore how it can be incorporated into public speaking.

STORYTELLING AS A SPECIAL TOPIC.

Storytelling is a powerful tool in public speaking, allowing speakers to connect with their audience on a deeper level. Adjudicators should evaluate how effectively speakers use storytelling techniques to engage the audience, evoke emotions, and convey their message. Key aspects to consider include the structure of the story, use of *vivid imagery and descriptive language*, and *the ability to create a compelling narrative arc*.

JUDGING STORYTELLING.

Storytelling in public speaking can be judged based on several key criteria:

Engagement: Judges assess how well the speaker captures and maintains the audience's attention throughout the story. This includes the use of compelling language, vivid descriptions, and emotional appeal.

Structure: Judges evaluate the overall structure of the story, including the introduction, conflict development, climax, and resolution. A well-structured story should have a clear beginning, middle, and end, with each part contributing to the overall narrative.

Conflict and Resolution: Judges look for the creation of conflict and its resolution in the story. The conflict should be engaging and meaningful, driving the narrative forward and creating tension. The resolution should provide a satisfying conclusion to the story, tying up loose ends and leaving a lasting impression on the audience.

Emotional Impact: Judges consider the emotional impact of the story on the audience. A powerful story should evoke a range of emotions, such as joy, sadness, or empathy, and leave a lasting impression on the audience.

Delivery: Judges assess the speaker's delivery of the story, including vocal variety, pacing, and gestures. The delivery should enhance the storytelling experience and help convey the emotions and nuances of the story.

CREATION OF CONFLICT AND RESOLUTION.

Effective storytelling often revolves around the creation of conflict and its resolution. A compelling story should introduce a conflict or challenge early on, which serves as the central focus of the narrative. The conflict should be meaningful and relatable to the audience, driving the story forward and creating tension.

As the story progresses, the conflict should escalate, leading to a climax where the tension is at its peak. The resolution should then provide a satisfying conclusion to the story, resolving the conflict in a way that is both believable and emotionally resonant.

To create conflict and resolution in storytelling, speakers can use techniques such as:

- Introducing a relatable protagonist facing a significant challenge.
- Building suspense through foreshadowing and pacing.
- Using vivid descriptions and imagery to evoke emotions.
- Incorporating plot twists or unexpected developments.
- Resolving the conflict in a way that is meaningful and satisfying to the audience.

The creation of conflict and resolution is essential in storytelling as it helps to engage the audience, drive the narrative forward, and leave a lasting impression.

THE POWER OF VIVID DESCRIPTION, IMAGERY, AND COMPELLING LANGUAGE IN STORYTELLING

Storytelling is an art form that relies heavily on the power of language to transport audiences to different worlds, evoke emotions, and leave lasting impressions. Two key ingredients that elevate storytelling to new heights are vivid descriptions and imagery alongside compelling language. This mini module explores how these elements contribute to effective storytelling and how adjudicators can identify them in a speech.

The Power of Vivid Descriptions and Imagery:

Vivid descriptions and imagery paint a picture in the audience's mind, allowing them to visualize the story's setting, characters, and events. This creates a more engaging and memorable experience by:

- *Drawing the audience in:* Vivid details create a mental picture, fostering a deeper connection with the narrative.
- *Eliciting emotions:* Descriptions can evoke strong emotions, making the story more compelling and impactful.
- *Enhancing understanding:* Vivid details can clarify complex ideas, making the story's message more accessible.

Identifying Vivid Descriptions and Imagery as an Adjudicator:

As an adjudicator, look for these key elements:

Descriptive language: Adjectives, adverbs, and figurative language (similes, metaphors) that create a clear mental picture.

Sensory details: Details that appeal to the five senses (sight, sound, smell, taste, touch) to bring the story to life.

Visualization: Does the audience get a clear picture of the story's elements?

Emotional impact: Do the descriptions evoke strong emotions and create a deeper connection?

Example of how Vivid Description and Imagery can be used in a speech;

Original spoken Sentence **without** vivid description and imagery

'The old woman walked down the street.'

Altered Spoken Sentence **with** Vivid Description and Imagery:

'The withered old woman shuffled down the cobblestone street, her cane tapping a rhythmic counterpoint to the distant clanging of a blacksmith's hammer. The pungent aroma of freshly baked bread wafted from a nearby bakery, momentarily distracting her from the aching in her joints. A stray cat, its fur matted and dusty, darted across her path, its emerald eyes glinting in the afternoon sun.'

This example demonstrates the use of:

- *Descriptive adjectives:* withered, cobblestone, tapping, clanging, pungent, freshly baked, aching, dusty, emerald.
- *Sensory details:* sound (tapping, clanging), smell (pungent, freshly baked), touch (aching), sight (cobblestone, dusty, emerald).
- *Figurative language:* counterpoint (simile) to describe the cane tapping.

This transforms a simple sentence into a vivid picture that engages the listener's senses and draws them into the scene.

THE ALLURE OF COMPELLING LANGUAGE:

Compelling language goes beyond mere description; it captures attention, holds interest, and leaves a lasting impression. It achieves this by:

Captivating the audience: Powerful language grabs attention from the outset and keeps them engaged throughout.

Building suspense: Compelling language can build tension and drama, making the story exciting and unpredictable.

Conveying emotion: Vivid language evokes empathy and understanding, making the audience connect emotionally with the characters.

Enhancing the message: Compelling language delivers the story's central theme in a way that resonates with the audience
Identifying Compelling Language as an Adjudicator:

Adjudicators can identify compelling language by focusing on:

Audience engagement: Does the language grab attention and hold interest throughout?

Emotional impact: Does the language evoke strong emotions and create a deeper connection?

Descriptive details: Does the language create vivid imagery and engage the senses?

Clarity and coherence: Is the language clear, concise, and easy to understand?

Overall effectiveness: Does the language enhance the storytelling experience and effectively convey the message?

Example of Compelling Language in a speech:

Original Sentence **without** compelling language:

‘We need to protect our environment.’

Altered sentence **with** Compelling Language:

‘Our planet, a fragile treasure hanging in the vast expanse of space, faces a growing threat. The very air we breathe, the water that sustains us, and the land that nourishes us are at stake. We stand at a crossroads, and the choices we make today will determine the fate of generations to come. Will we be the generation that allowed paradise to slip through our fingers, or will we rise to the challenge and become the guardians of our shared home?’

This example uses compelling language by:

- *Evoking emotion:* Words like “treasure,” “threat,” and “paradise” create a sense of urgency and importance.
- *Using powerful imagery:* “Fragile treasure,” “vast expanse of space,” and “paradise” create vivid mental pictures.
- *Building suspense:* “We stand at a crossroads” creates a sense of anticipation and importance.
- *Using strong verbs:* “Rise to the challenge” and “become the guardians” are action-oriented and inspire action.

This transformed sentence goes beyond simply stating a fact and instead aims to move the audience to take action.

To wrap it all:

By exploring creativity and storytelling as special topics in adjudication, adjudicators can enhance their skills and effectiveness. This module provides a platform for adjudicators to learn and practice these techniques, ultimately improving their ability to evaluate and provide feedback to speakers.

CONCLUSION: A FINAL WORD FROM THE AUTHOR

Congratulations! You have completed your training journey, gaining the necessary knowledge and skills to begin your rewarding career as a public speaking adjudicator.

As you embark on this new role, remember the power and responsibility that comes with it. Your evaluations will not only determine the competition results but also provide invaluable feedback that can shape the future of young speakers.

We encourage you to:

- Embrace continuous learning. The world of public speaking is constantly evolving, so stay updated on trends, best practices, and changes in competition guidelines.
- Refine your craft through practice. Actively seek opportunities to observe experienced adjudicators, participate in practice rounds, and seek feedback on your own evaluations.
- Maintain impartiality and objectivity. Always base your judgments solely on established criteria and the speaker's performance, unbiased by personal connections or external influences.

- Offer constructive and respectful feedback. Your words can have a lasting impact on speakers. Strive to provide clear, actionable feedback that encourages growth and improvement.
- Be a champion for public speaking. Recognize the importance of this critical skill and contribute to its development by creating a positive and empowering environment for all speakers.

We believe in your potential to make a significant impact on the lives of young speakers. As you embark on this journey, remember the power you hold as an adjudicator, and always strive to uphold the highest standards of professionalism, ethics, and integrity.

Thank you for choosing to be a part of this exciting world, and we wish you all the best in your endeavors!



DEBATE & SPEECH
INSTITUTE AFRICA

JUDGES Fellowship

THANK YOU!