

Adjudication Guideline Spring Greenery Competition

2019/06/08

1. The Tasks of Adjudicators

The primary task of adjudicators is to determine as objectively as possible which team better succeeded the process of persuasion by delivering the argumentation.

At the conclusion of the debate, adjudicators should fill in the evaluation sheets and hand them to runners. Then, adjudicators are to provide debaters their decision as well as the reasons for it verbally. Also, the adjudicator should provide advice on further improvements for each debater.

2. Evaluation Categories

Adjudicators should evaluate each speech based on four categories: Matter, Manner, Speaker Roles, and the use of Point of Information (POI).

2.1. Matter

Matter means the contents of the speech. It is the arguments the speaker uses to persuade the audience. In other words, Matter is the assessment on what each speaker delivers in his or her speech.

Adjudicators must consider the following elements in assessing Matter of the speech:

- (a) Reasoning
 - Did the speaker develop arguments with careful explanation?
 - Did the speaker avoid assertions, logical flaw?
- (b) Elaboration
 - Did the speaker show his or her deep understanding of the topic by providing relevant information?
- (c) Response
 - Did the speaker appropriately respond to the arguments and refutation made by the other team?

It should be noted that the response for Prime Minister is evaluated based on his or her willingness to offer and take POI(unless Prime Minister takes no POI and offer no POI, give full marks) .

2.2. Manner

Manner means the way debaters present their speeches, focusing on speech structures and styles. In other words, Manner is the assessment on how each speaker delivers his or her speech.

Adjudicators must consider the following elements in assessing Manner of the speech:

(a) Time Management

- Did they avoid speaking over the time limit or ending the speech long before the time limit?

(b) Structure

- Did the speaker clearly order his or her speech so that the audience could follow it easily?

(c) Speech Delivery

- It should be noted that there is not evaluation for the speakers' proficiency in English pronunciation. If the speech is less intelligible due to an issue with pronunciation, it is assumed that the speakers' matter is compromised accordingly.

2.3. Role fulfillment

Speakers are expected to fulfill the duties assigned to the speaker roles (e.g. Prime Minister) as follows.

a) Prime Minister

- Was the definition explained clearly?
- Was a team line explained clearly?
- Was the team allocation provided clearly?

b) Leader of the Opposition

- Did the speaker clearly respond to the definition provided by the Prime Minister?
- Did the speaker give a team line?
- Was the team allocation provided clearly?

c) Members

- Did the speaker confirm the team line provided by his or her partner?
- Did the speaker sufficiently explain the new argument(s) allocated by his or her partner?
- Did the speaker provide further support (i.e. new elaboration or additional reasoning) to the argument provided by his or her partner?

d) Reply Speaker

- Did the speaker summarize the round focusing on key issues, questions, or crash points?
- (In case of Prime Minister Reply) Did the speaker respond to the new argument given by the Member of the Opposition?

* Note that the role fulfillment of reply speakers is evaluated in the category "Key Issues" in the evaluation sheet.

2.4. Use of P.O.I.

- Did the speaker actively participate in the debate by raising P.O.I. to weaken the other team's arguments, or strengthen that of his or her own?
- Did the speaker immediately and confidently handle the P.O.I. offered by the other team?

3. How to Decide the Winning Team

It should be noted that only what the debaters have said, or Matter should influence the result.

In this competition, it is recommended that adjudicators follow the following procedures to reach their decisions.

- (a) [Argument] Which team presented the most persuasive argument?

If one team provided far superior arguments to the other, the team should win the round.

- (b) [Refutation and Reconstruction] Which team's responses were superior?

If the quality of overall arguments are found equal, then the adjudicator should look into the refutation and reconstruction attempted in the round. If adjudicators find any impressive responses that influenced the flow of the round, the team which provided them should win the round.

- (c) [Elaboration] Which team provided the best elaboration?

If the quality of the overall arguments and their responses to the other team are found equal, then the adjudicator should look into the elements of the arguments. If adjudicators find any impressive example or other elaboration that significantly contributed to the quality of the round, the team which presented it should win the round.

- (d) [Manner & POI] Which teams' speech manner was superior?

When and only when the adjudicator cannot decide the winning team based on the quality of overall argument, responses, and elaboration, he or she can look into the elements of Manner. However, to reach a decision based on manner is assumed to be an emergency measure only allowed to avoid the deadlock that would seriously hamper the management of competition.

4. Speaker Scale

4.1. Score Range

Guidelines for total marks given to each team is as follows:

- (a) Constructive speeches are marked out of 14 marks; Judges are to give a single mark for each debaters, assessing Matter, Manner, and Speaker Roles.

- (b) Speaker scores for summary speeches are marked out of 7.

4.2 How to Evaluate Each Speaker

4.2.1. Constructive Speech

Adjudicator should evaluate each debater based on the following calculation schema.

Speaker Points Calculation Schema (Total: 14)
<p>« I . Manners »</p> <p>[Time Management 1 point]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• not too short or too long = +1 / too short or too long = 0 (too short or too long for more than 30 seconds) <p>[Structure of Arguments 1 point]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear signpost, clear flow of argument, easy to follow responses = 1• problem in one of them = 0 <p>[Delivery 3 points]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• showing 1) good eye contact, 2) loud voice, 3) effective use of gestures, and 4) good uses of facial expressions. = +3• problems with one of the four categories above = +2• problems with two of the four categories = +1• problems with more than one of the four categories = 0 <p>« II . Matters »</p> <p>[Reasoning 2 points]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• good reasoning = +2• at least understandable reasoning = +1• clear flow in or lack of reasoning = 0 <p>[Elaboration 2 points]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• two or more good examples or illustration = +2• one good example or illustration = +1• no good example or illustration = 0 <p>[Response 2 points]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• covering all the refutation with good reconstruction, attacking major points of the opponents' arguments (In case of PM, only to the new argument by MO). +2• responded but fail to do so adequately, leaving one good argument or refutation intact. = +1• fail to respond at all, or left more than one important argument or refutation without a response. = 0

« III. Speaker Roles »

[Speaker Role 3 points]

Speakers are initially given three points. Then, when the speaker fail to fulfill the duties listed below, one point is subtracted for one failure.

a) Prime Minister

- Was the definition explained clearly?
- Was a team line explained clearly?
- Was the team allocation provided clearly?

b) Leader of the Opposition

- Did the speaker clearly respond to the definition provided by the Prime Minister?
- Did the speaker give a team line?
- Was the team allocation provided clearly?

c) Members

- Did the speaker confirm the team line provided by his or her partner?
- Did the speaker provide further support (i.e. new elaboration or additional reasoning) to the argument provided by his or her partner?
- Did the speaker adequately introduced the argument(s) allocated by his or her partner?

4.2.2. Point of Information

It is assumed that speakers provide numerous POIs. If speakers did not, points are subtracted from their team scores.

[Taking]

When it is apparent that the speaker is avoiding taking POI, 1 point is subtracted. If both speakers are found avoiding, two points are subtracted.

4.2.3. Reply Speech (7points)

[Structure 1 point]

- It should be made clear at the beginning of speech what the reply speaker is going to explain. Otherwise, the speaker gets no point for structure.

- If the speaker fail to • not too short or too long = +1 / too short or too long = 0
(too short or too long for more than 30 seconds)

*note that we have no separate category for time management for reply speeches

[Delivery 2 points]

(refer to the evaluation criteria for constructive speeches)

[Key Issues or Questions 2 points]

- Summarized the entire round effectively by referring to key issues, key questions, or crash points. = 2 points
- Summarized the entire round by referring to key issues, key questions, or crash points, but the choice of issues being poor or the explanation of the issues being inadequate.
= 1 points
- Summarized in point-by-point approach, or failed to summarize at all.
= 0 point

[Elaboration 1 point]

- The speaker provided at least one further elaboration. Otherwise, the speaker gets no point for this category.

4.3 Low Score Win and Tie Score

Low score win and Ties must not be awarded in the tournament. There is no exception to this rule.