

Integrity Matters

ROLE OF THE ADJUDICATOR

The Adjudicator must:

- (a) Confer upon and discuss the debate with the other Adjudicators;
- (b) Determine the Team grades;
- (c) Determine the individual Speaker marks (optional);
- (e) Provide a verbal adjudication to the Members; and
- (f) Complete any documentation required by the *Integrity Matters Tertiary Level Debates Competition*.

- The Adjudication Panel, which comprises three judges, should attempt to agree on the adjudication of the debate. Adjudicators should therefore confer in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect
- Adjudicators should acknowledge that each of them may form different or opposite views of the Debate. Adjudicators should therefore attempt to base their conclusions on these rules in order to limit subjectivity and to provide a consistent approach to the assessment of debates.
- Adjudicators must watch the debates objectively, putting aside their own views on the Motion. They should adopt the role of an *average reasonable person with an average reasonable knowledge of the subject under debate, but with expert knowledge of the rules of debating*.
- Adjudicators are not required to maintain order (Moderator) or supervise time limits (Timekeeper) during the Debate. These tasks fall to the Moderator. However, Adjudicators should consider any breaches of order or time limits in their assessment of the Debaters.

JUDGING CRITERIA

Debating is the art of persuasion and therefore persuasiveness is the paramount criteria for judging a debate. There are three criteria that specify what makes a Team persuasive:

1. Matter
2. Strategy
3. Style

MATTER

Relevance
Analysis
Skills
Logic

STRATEGY

Theme
Teamwork
Evidence
Timing

MANNER

Delivery
Public Speaking
Structure

JUDGING CRITERIA

Debating is the art of persuasion. Therefore judging revolves around scoring those elements, which comprise a persuasive argument.

Matter

Manner

- *Structure*
- *Style*

MATTER

Richness of Positive Material
Relevance
Rebuttal arguments
Consistency of argument
Points of Information
Evidence
Timing

MANNER

Style
Moderator/Audience connection
Tone of voice
Supporting hand gestures
Language
Delivery (scripted or free speech)

Structure

Logical progression
Allocation of time
Team approach to argument
Team sharing of Positive Material

Assessing matter

- The matter or content presented should be persuasive. 'The elements of matter' should assist an adjudicator to assess the persuasiveness and credibility of the matter presented.
- Matter should be assessed from the viewpoint of the average, reasonable person, with an average knowledge of the topics under discussion. Adjudicators should analyse the matter presented and assess its persuasiveness, while disregarding any specialist knowledge they may have on the issue of the Debate.
- Points of information should be assessed according to the effect they have on the persuasiveness of the cases of both the Member answering the point of information and the Member offering the point of information.

Assessing Manner

- Adjudicators should assess the elements of manner in consultation with each other in order to determine the overall effectiveness of the Member's presentation. Adjudicators should assess whether the Member's presentation is assisted or diminished by their manner.

- Adjudicators should be aware that there are many styles which are appropriate, and that they should not discriminate against a member simply because the manner is not one with which they are familiar.
- Adjudicators should not allow bias to influence their assessment. Members should not be discriminated against on the basis of religion, sex, race, colour, nationality, language, sexual preference, age, social status or disability

A score sheet is provided to assess the competitors' marks but Adjudicators are urged to make notes on a separate sheet of paper during the debate, before filling in the score sheets. In the final analysis, it is the overall impression of which Team has presented its case most convincingly that will determine the verdict.

Adjudicators must be familiar with the Guidelines provided to the competitors in the *Integrity Matters Debates*. In addition, the *Glossary of Common Terms*, the *Stylistic Points*, and the section on *Points of Information* provide in-depth information with which Adjudicators should be familiar.

JUDGING CRITERIA

1. CONTENT

Content comprises everything that a Team says in a debate. It includes the definition of the subject, any subsequent justifications of the definition, arguments, evidence, points of information and rebuttal. Content should be judged by the way it establishes an argument. Adjudicators should reward Speakers who offer intelligent arguments, logically presented and supported by relevant examples.

Important elements of content include:

- Subject knowledge
- A clear analysis of the motion
- Relevant and topical arguments, logically explained
- Evidence (facts, examples, statistics and expert opinion)
- Arguments and evidence presented in *rebuttal* of the other side's case.
- Points of information (and responses to points of information)
- A fair definition (First Proposition Speakers only)

Relevance: Presentations should be relevant to the motion and the definition of the motion. Competitors should not avoid specific issues that need to be addressed.

Analysis: A Speaker should demonstrate an understanding of the larger issues, including the overall theme of the Debating Competition. All points should be tied to the motion. Examples should be used to prove points. Presentations should not contain unsubstantiated assertions or logical flaws.

Evidence: Relevant examples and authorities are vital and their absence should be penalised. However, if an Adjudicator has expert knowledge in a particular field and sees a mistaken use of an example in a Speaker's case, the Speaker should not be penalised unless the opposition has highlighted the error.

Logic: Logic is the chain of reasoning used to prove an argument. The Speaker must state, explain and illustrate each of his or her arguments.

2. STRATEGY

Strategy covers how well a Team puts its arguments together and how well it uses the time allocated to make points effectively. Strategy should be judged at both the Team and the individual level.

Important areas of strategy include timing, and use of points of information.

Duties of the Speaker: Each Speaker has a role to fill and Adjudicators must decide how well each person has carried out their specific responsibility. Questions to ask include:

- Did the First Proposition Speaker define the motion clearly, and was it a fair definition?
- If the First Opposition Speaker challenged the definition, was it a fair challenge?
- Did the First Opposition Speaker and both Second Speakers rebut previous arguments satisfactorily? Did they each offer arguments developing the case?
- Did the Summary Speakers recap the major issues of the debate and offer good rebuttals of the other Team's case? Note: Summary Speakers *must not* introduce new arguments.

Teamwork : Did the two Speakers work together well, and did their arguments complement each other? The first Speaker should lay out the basic case and some specific arguments, the second should develop the case further, and summary speeches should go over all the major issues that have been raised.

Rebuttal: This is the most demanding and interesting feature of a good debate. After the first Proposition Speaker, each subsequent Speaker must spend some time addressing arguments raised by the other side. Adjudicators must decide whether the Speakers have achieved this goal. It is not enough for Speakers to address trivial arguments - they must deal with the major arguments offered by the other Team. A Speaker who undermines their opposition while consolidating their own defence should be rewarded.

Structure: A Team's argument should be logically ordered in a sequence that flows naturally from point to point. Each individual speech should reflect the Team's overall case (a thematic approach is preferable to a collection of independent arguments). Speeches should be clearly structured, easy to follow, and should respond to the dynamics of the debate. A well structured speech will have:

- An interesting opening which captures the attention of the audience
- A clear statement of the purpose and general direction of the speech

- A logical sequence of ideas which shows a clear development of the Speaker's argument
- A proportional allocation of time to the speech as a whole, and to each major point.
- A conclusion or summary of the major points made in the speech

Points of Information: Points of information (POIs) are questions or comments offered by an opposing Speaker during a speech. Teams can use POIs strategically to throw a Speaker off track, to stump a speech, or to undermine a point or argument offered by the Speaker. POIs can only be offered during non-protective times: any time between (but not including) the first and last minutes of a speech. They cannot be offered during the Summary Speeches. A POI must be stated in 15 seconds or less.

Speakers who do not offer, do not accept, or do not respond to points of information are not debating and should not advance in the debates.

In an 8-minute speech a Speaker should accept two POIs and must respond immediately (however, they may respond by saying that they will deal with the point later in their speech). In the *Integrity Matters Debates*, the rules are that a maximum of two Points of Information may be offered.

POIs show Adjudicators that a Debater is an active participant in the debate. Each Team member should offer two points of information during a speech from the other Team.

Timing: Adjudicators should look at two aspects of timing:-

- (1) External timing: Speeches should not exceed or fall short of the official time limits by very much; and
- (2) Internal timing: Speakers should devote an appropriate proportion of their speech to each argument and point.

Length of Debates

AFFIRMATIVE

Affirmative 1: 8 mins

Affirmative 2: 7 mins

Summation: 3 mins

NEGATIVE

Negative 1: 8 mins

Negative 2: 7 mins

Summation: 3 mins

Teams are requested to arrive 45 minutes before the start of the Debates, and may be penalized by the Adjudicators if they cut their arrival too close.

- There will be no pause between presentations by Team Members.
- There will be a 10-minute pause between Debates. This is for Teams to exit and enter the stage, and for the Adjudicators to deliberate.
- At the end of each Stage, a Verbal Adjudication will be delivered. It should not take more than 15 minutes to deliver the Verbal Adjudication.

3. STYLE

Adjudicators are looking for Speakers who engage with the audience extremely well and are easy to follow and understand. Good public speaking skills include: use of gesture, fluency, audibility, variety of tone, and ability to relate to the audience, particularly via eye contact. Humour and gesture, while important, should not overwhelm. "Props" are not allowed. Reading speeches or reciting them from memory should be penalised. However, Speakers can refer to brief notes during the course of the debate to rebut the opposition.

ADJUDICATORS' SCORING

- After all of the debates in the round are complete, the Adjudicators will consider their decisions.
 - The score sheet allows each Adjudicator to allocate marks for each individual Speaker as well as for each Team. These marks should *reflect or guide your decision* rather than make it for you. Adjudicators are urged to make their decisions relatively quickly.
 - Adjudicators are asked to select one winner for each debate.
 - Adjudicators should note that this is a *Team* competition. A Team may include one very impressive Speaker and one who is less so, but unless the Team is clearly better than their competition, it is preferable to reward a better all-round Team effort.
 - When announcing the decision, the Chief Adjudicator is asked to comment on the merits of each debate. This advice is very valuable for less experienced Debaters. Adjudicators are also urged to take some time to talk privately to Teams after the Debate.
 - When explaining your decision
 - Highlight critical differences between the two Teams
 - Be specific in weighing the relative merits of the cases and the important elements of the cases that were crucial in determining the verdict
 - Deliver criticism in constructive terms.
1. The score sheet gives each (8 and 7-minute) speech a maximum of 15 marks for content, 15 marks for strategy, and 10 marks for style for a total of 40 points.
 2. Summary speeches receive a maximum of 5 marks for content, 10 marks for strategy, and 5 marks for style for a total of 20
 3. The Team total is therefore 100.

Penalties: Speakers have been warned that they will be penalised for a number of different things. Exactly how much they are penalised is up to the Adjudicators, as is the decision whether penalties for minor transgressions should outweigh the credit a persuasive Team may have amassed. In general:

1. Minor timing problems, isolated occasions of discourteous humour, an over-weighted definition, **the acceptance or offering of excessive points of information**, limited new arguments in summaries, or stylistic

problems are not regarded as serious and should only be penalised by one or two points.

2. Major timing problems (especially blatant refusal to obey time signals), the reading of scripted speeches, failure to offer, accept or respond to points of information, an overly truistic definition, or repeated abuse to opponents should, normally, result in the Speaker and his or her Team losing the debate.

Adjudicators are not required to hand in score sheets at the end of debates.

REACHING A DECISION

At the beginning of the debate the Adjudicators should choose a "Chief Adjudicator" who will deliver the results at the following stages:

March 11th

Preliminary A

Round 1: 2 Teams debate

Round 2: 2 Teams debate

Adjudicators provide a verbal adjudication on which Team wins Round 1 and which Team wins Round 2. These 2 winners will proceed to the Semi-Finals.

March 12th

Preliminary B

Round 3: 2 Teams debate

Round 4: 2 Teams debate

Adjudicators provide a verbal adjudication on which Team wins Round 3 and which Team wins Round 4. These 2 winners will proceed to the Semi-Finals.

March 18th

Semi-Finals

Round 5: Winners, Round 1 (Affirmative) vs Winners, Round 2 (Negative)

Round 6: Winners, Round 3 (Affirmative) vs Winners, Round 4 (Negative)

Adjudicators provide a verbal adjudication on which Team wins Round 5 and which Team wins Round 6. These 2 winners will proceed to the Finals.

Final

Round 7: Winners, Round 5 (Affirmative) vs Winners, Round 6 (Negative)

Adjudicators provide a verbal adjudication on which Team has won Round 7. This will be the Champion Team.

