ADJUDICATION SCHEDULE OF THE HEART OF EUROPE DEBATING TOURNAMENT

Adapted from World Schools Debating Championships (www.schoolsdebate.com).

Table of Contents

A. Marking Standard 1
B. Definitions and Cases 2
C. The Roles of the Speakers 4
D. Points of Information 6
E. The Adjudicating 6

A. Marking Standard

1.1 Each speaker's substantive speech is marked out of 100, with 40 for content, 40 for style and 20 for strategy.

1.2 The reply speech is marked out of 50, with 20 for content, 20 for style and 10 for strategy.

1.3 In order to encourage consistency of marks, speeches are marked within the accepted range of marks and Adjudicators may not go outside that range. **(See the Marking Standard - Annex 2).**

1.4 Adjudicators may not use any other marking standard or categorise of marks.

1.5 If a debater declares that they are unable to make their speech after a debate has begun, another member of their team who was announced by the chairperson as being a speaker in that debate may speak in their place. In such a situation Adjudicators shall award the speech the lowest possible score within the Marking Standard, regardless of the quality of the speech.

Czech Debate Society, z. s. 2020
All Rights Reserved. www.c-d-s.cz
FB CzechDebateSociety | YT theczechdebatetv

2.1 Content is the argument used by the speaker, divorced from the speaking style.

2.2 If an argument is weak it should be marked accordingly, even if the other team does not expose its weakness.

2.3 In deciding the strength or weakness of an argument, Adjudicators should not be influenced by their own personal beliefs or specialised knowledge.

3.1 Style is the way speakers speak.

3.2 Adjudicators should make allowance for different accents, speaking styles and debating terminology.

3.3 Debaters for whom English is a second language shall be adjudicated as if they were native English speakers.

3.4 In general, the use of palm-cards, lecterns, folders, notepads or other forms of speakers notes should not affect the mark a speaker is given.

3.5 However, speakers should not read their speeches, but should use notes that they refer to only from time to time.

4.1 Strategy covers two concepts:

4.1.1 Whether the speaker understands what are the issues of the debate, and

4.1.2 The structure and timing of the speaker's speech.

4.2 A speaker who answers the critical issues with weak responses should get poor marks for content but good marks for strategy.

B. Definitions and Cases

5.1 The Proposition must present a reasonable definition of the motion. This means:

5.1.1 On receiving a motion, both teams should ask: 'What is the issue that the two teams are expected to debate? What would an ordinary intelligent person reading the motion think that it is about?

5.1.2 If the motion poses a clear issue for debate (i.e. it has an obvious meaning), the Proposition must define the motion accordingly. When the motion has an obvious meaning (one which the ordinary intelligent person would realise), any other definition would not be reasonable.

5.1.3 If there is no obvious meaning to the motion, the range of possible meanings is limited to those that allow for a reasonable debate. Choosing a meaning that does not allow the Opposition room for debate would not be a reasonable definition. Truisms and tautologies leave the Opposition no room for debate and are clearly illegitimate. Defining absolute words literally may prevent a reasonable debate, and they can therefore be read down.

5.1.4 When defining the words in the motion so as (i) to allow the obvious meaning to be debated or (ii) (when there is no obvious meaning) to give effect to a possible meaning which would allow for a reasonable debate, the Proposition must ensure that the definition is one the ordinary intelligent person would accept.

Czech Debate Society, z. s. 2020
All Rights Reserved. www.c-d-s.cz
FB CzechDebateSociety | YT theczechdebatetv

5.2 The definition must match the level of abstraction (or specificity) of the motion, so that the debate is as specific or general as the motion itself. Specific motions should be defined specifically and general motions generally.

5.3 Motions expressed as general principles must be proven true as general principles. A single example will neither prove nor disprove a general principle. Finding arguments that explain the majority of relevant examples will be more important.

5.4 When suggesting parameters to the debate, or proposing particular models or criteria to adjudicate it by, the Proposition must ensure such parameters, models or criteria are themselves reasonable. They must be ones that the ordinary intelligent person would accept as applicable to the debate.

5.4.1 The Proposition's ability to set reasonable parameters to a debate does not provide a licence to restrict the motion arbitrarily.

5.4.2 When the motion requires the Proposition to propose a solution to a problem and the Proposition has to set out the details of its proposed solution to prove its effectiveness, the Proposition must ensure that the detailed solution given (the Proposition's 'model' or 'plan') is a reasonable one, such that the ordinary intelligent person would accept it is applicable to the debate.

5.5 If the Proposition's definition is unreasonable, the Opposition may:

5.5.1 Accept it anyway (and debate the Proposition's case regardless);

5.5.2 Challenge it (argue that the definition is unreasonable, put up an alternative, reasonable definition and a case based on this);

5.5.3 Broaden the debate back to the words in the motion (if the Proposition has unreasonably restricted the motion and is arguing a narrower version of it);

5.5.4 Challenge the definition (as in 5.5.2), but argue that "even if" it is reasonable, the Proposition's case is flawed (as in 5.5.1).

5.6 The definition settled, each team has to present a case, supported by arguments and examples.

5.6.1 A case sums up the team's arguments and states why its side of the motion is correct.

5.6.2 Arguments are reasons or rationales why the team's case is correct.

5.6.3 Examples are facts, events, occurrences and the like that show the team's arguments are correct.

5.7 Whereas an unduly restrictive definition (such as limiting a general motion to a single example) is illegitimate and can be challenged or broadened, a Proposition that runs a

Czech Debate Society, z. s. 2020
All Rights Reserved. www.c-d-s.cz
FB CzechDebateSociety | YT theczechdebatetv

restrictive case (such as limiting itself to a single argument) acts legitimately and cannot be challenged for doing so, but runs the risk of the Opposition being able to more easily counter that case (by disproving that one argument and/or by raising other arguments that disprove the motion, as defined).

C. The Roles of the Speakers

6.1 The role of the first speaker of the proposition is to define the topic, establish the issues for the debate, outline the proposition case, announce the case division between the speakers, and present his or her part of the proposition case.

6.2 The proposition may define the topic in any way provided that the definition -

6.2.1 is reasonably close to the plain meaning of the topic,

6.2.2 allows the opposition team reasonable room to debate,

6.2.3 is not tautological or truistic, and

6.2.4 is otherwise a reasonable definition.

6.3 Squirreling, place-setting and time-setting are not permitted

6.3.1 Squirreling is the distortion of the definition to enable a team to argue a preprepared argument that it wishes to debate regardless of the motion actually set;

6.3.2 Place-setting is the setting of a debate of general application in a particular place

6.3.3 Time-setting is the setting of a debate of general application in a particular time,

past or future.

7.1 The role of the first speaker of the opposition side is to challenge the definition if necessary,

present an alternative definition if the definition is challenged, respond to the proposition case, outline the opposition case, announce the case division, and present his or her part of the opposition case.

7.2 The first opposition may challenge the definition only if it does not conform to 5.2 or 5.3. If it challenges the definition, the first opposition must propose a new definition that conforms to 5.2 and 5.3.

7.3 If the first opposition does not challenge the definition, the opposition is taken to have

the definition and the opposition may not challenge the definition in any other speech unless the proposition significantly alters the definition in their subsequent speeches.

7.4 In responding to the proposition case, the opposition team may produce a positive choice of its own, or merely attack the case presented by the proposition. If it chooses to produce a positive case of its own, it must in fact produce that case through its speeches, and not concentrate solely on attacking the case presented by the proposition.

Czech Debate Society, z. s. 2020
All Rights Reserved. www.c-d-s.cz
FB CzechDebateSociety | YT theczechdebatetv

8.1 The role of the second speaker of the proposition is to deal with the definition if it has been challenged, respond to the opposition case, and continue with the proposition case as outlined by the first speaker.

8.2 If the second proposition does not challenge a re-definition of the debate made by the first opposition, the proposition is taken to have accepted the opposition's re-definition and no further challenges to the definition may be made.

8.3 The role of the second speaker of the opposition is to deal with the definition if it is still in issue, respond to the proposition case, and continue with the opposition case as outlined by the first speaker.

9.1 The role of both third speakers is to deal with the definition if it is still in issue, and respond to the other team's case.

9.2 The third speaker of either team may have a small part of the team's case to present, but his is not obligatory as the third speaker's primary role is to respond to what has gone before in the debate.

9.3 If the third speaker is to present a part of the team's case, this must be announced in the case division by the first speaker.

10.1 The more the debate progresses, the more each speaker must spend time dealing with what has been said by previous speakers.

10.2 Hence the more the debate progresses, the less time will be spent by each speaker in presenting a new part of the team case and the more time will be spent responding to the other team's arguments.

11.1 The role of the reply speeches is to sum up the debate from the team's viewpoint, including a response to the other team's overall case and a summary of the speaker's own team's case.

11.2 The reply speaker may be either the first or second speaker of the team, but not the third.

11.3 The reply speakers are in reverse order, with the opposition reply first and the proposition reply last.

11.4 Neither reply speaker may introduce a new part of the team case.

11.5 A reply speaker may respond to an existing argument by raising a new example that illustrates that argument, but may not otherwise introduce a new argument.

12.1 The proposition team does not have to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt, but merely that its case is true in the majority of cases or as a general proposition.

12.2 The opposition team must prove more than a reasonable doubt about the proposition case.

12.3 Where the topic is expressed as an absolute, the proposition must prove the topic true in the significant majority of cases, but not in every single conceivable instance.

Czech Debate Society, z. s. 2020
All Rights Reserved. www.c-d-s.cz
FB CzechDebateSociety | YT theczechdebatetv

12.4 Where the topic is expressed as an absolute, the opposition must do more than present a single instance where the topic is not true and prove that it is not true for at least a significant minority of cases.

D. Points of Information

13.1 Between the first and seventh minutes of a speaker's substantive speech, members of the other team may offer points of information.

13.2 The purpose of a point of information is to make a short point or ask a short question of the speaker.

13.3 Points of information need not be addressed through the person chairing the debate, and may be in the form of a question.

13.4 A point of information should be brief, and no longer than 15 seconds.

14.1 Points of information are an important part of the clash between the teams, and enable speakers to remain a part of the debate even when they are not making a speech.

14.2 Hence a speaker should offer points of information both before and after that speaker has given his or her substantive speech.

15.1 The speaker has the absolute right to refuse to accept a point of information, or to accept it only at the end of the next sentence.

15.2 However, a speaker is obliged to accept some points of information, provided that they have been offered at reasonable times in the speaker's speech.

15.3 As a general rule a speaker should accept at least 2 points of information in his or her speech. But a speaker who accepts a significantly greater number of points of information risks losing control of his or her speech.

15.4 Members of the opposing team should not offer an excessive number of points of information to the point that they are barracking. As a general rule each team member should offer between 2 and 4 points of information per speech, and should not offer them within a short time of a previous point of information having been offered.

16.1 The response by the speaker to a point of information should be included in the mark for that speaker's speech.

16.2 The offering of points of information should be included in the mark for the speaker offering points.

E. The Adjudicating

17.1 Adjudicators mark independently of each other, and should sit apart from each other during the debate so that they cannot see each other's mark-sheets.

Czech Debate Society, z. s. 2020
All Rights Reserved. www.c-d-s.cz
FB CzechDebateSociety | YT theczechdebatetv

17.2 At the end of the debate, the Adjudicators fill in their mark-sheets independently, and hand them to the person chairing the debate before leaving the debate room briefly to confer.

17.3 The purpose of the conference is to brief one of the Adjudicators to give a short adjudication on behalf of the Adjudicators.

17.4 The adjudication should be short, and should explain the result to the audience. In particular, it should set out the key reasons why the winning team won, and comment on significant matters of debate style or technique that were displayed in the debate.

17.5 The adjudication should be constructive, not negative.

Czech Debate Society, z. s. 2020
All Rights Reserved. www.c-d-s.cz
FB CzechDebateSociety | YT theczechdebatetv