RANGE OF MARKS OF THE HEART OF EUROPE DEBATING TOURNAMENT

RANGE OF MARKS HEART OF EUROPE DT

Adapted from A. Höness (Germany).

1. Substantive 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

2. Reply Speeches (out of 50)

Standard	Overall (/100)	Style (/40)	Content (/40)	Strategy (/20)
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

In marking reply speeches it might be easier to mark them out of 100 and then halve each mark. That will leave you with half-mark steps, but that is not a problem. Thus a reply speech could be given, say, 13.5 for content, 14.5 for style and 7.5 for strategy, for a total of 35.5.

HOW TO DECIDE A DEBATE (EVALUATION CRITERIA – TIPS FOR ADJUDICATORS)

STYLE = rhetorical skills + manner, delivery of a speaker

1. How freely does the speaker speak and to chat degree, how skilfully does he/she use the palm cards?
2. How comprehensible, correct and sufficient is the delivery and language i.e. expressions, vocabulary, language level?
3. How fluently, precisely and convincingly does the speaker express him/herself in terms of eloquence, fluency and ability?
4. Does the speech contain appropriate entertaining and humorous elements which do not verge on bad taste or impoliteness, or personally attack the opponents?
5. How adeptly does the speaker react to Points of Information?
6. How much is the speaker able to build a positive relationship with the opposition and audience?
7. How effectively can he/she use his/her voice?
8. How much do gestures compliment the speech delivery?

CONTENT = strength of arguments + examples + weight of rebuttal or clash

1. Did the speaker understand topic / problem? Did the team understand and analyse the topic precisely?
2. Is the speaker well prepared and informed?
3. Does the speech contain and include arguments, not just a list of general comments, banal statements or overall declarations?
4. Are the arguments relevant, strong, significant and appropriate?
5. Were they presented in a logical order and convincingly supported with carefully collected evidence?
6. Are the arguments of the opponents logically analysed and effectively undetermined?

STRATEGY = structure + logical sequence of arguments + timing

1. Does the speech fit to some degree into the time allowed?
2. Does the speech clearly consist of several parts? When and how was the rebuttal included?
3. How good were the different parts of speech, i.e. beginning, middle and end? Was the emphasis placed on the middle part and was the argumentation centred or middle? (with a logical line of argument or by refuting the opponents' stance?)
4. Were the main body of the speech and the arguments used logically, connected purposeful or chaotically strung together instead?
5. To chat extent was the speaker and his/her speech connected to the standpoint of the team?
6. Did his/her behaviour during the debate show that he/she supported the arguments and tactics of the team?