

Tournament:		Date:
Round: 1	Room:	Print Judge Name: TANVI JAIN
Motion:		

PROP TEAM name/code: _____

OPP TEAM name/code: _____

List the last names of the speakers of each team below, along with their score (*see rubric on the back*).

REMINDER: Scores should be between 60-80 for the first three speeches, 30-40 for the reply speech (*see scoring standards on back*).

Proposition Speakers			
1	Name: _____		
Content: (24-32)	Style: (24-32)	Strategy: (12-16)	
Speaker 1 Total Points (60-80):			/ 80-60
2	Name: _____		
Content: (24-32)	Style: (24-32)	Strategy: (12-16)	
Speaker 2 Total Points (60-80):			/ 80-60
3	Name: _____		
Content: (24-32)	Style: (24-32)	Strategy: (12-16)	
Speaker 3 Total Points (60-80):			/ 80-60
REPLY	Name: _____		
Content: (12-16)	Style: (12-16)	Strategy: (6-8)	
Reply Total Points (30-40):			/ 40-30
PROP TOTAL POINTS:			_____

Opposition Speakers			
1	Name: _____		
Content: (24-32)	Style: (24-32)	Strategy: (12-16)	
Speaker 1 Total Points (60-80):			/ 80-60
2	Name: _____		
Content: (24-32)	Style: (24-32)	Strategy: (12-16)	
Speaker 2 Total Points (60-80):			/ 80-60
3	Name: _____		
Content: (24-32)	Style: (24-32)	Strategy: (12-16)	
Speaker 3 Total Points (60-80):			/ 80-60
REPLY	Name: _____		
Content: (12-16)	Style: (12-16)	Strategy: (6-8)	
Reply Total Points (30-40):			/ 40-30
OPP TOTAL POINTS:			_____

THE TEAM WITH THE MOST POINTS, WINNING THE DEBATE IS: (*There are no 'low point wins'—the team with the higher score wins*)

TEAM CODE: _____ REPRESENTING THE (*circle one*): _____ PROPOSITION _____ OPPOSITION _____

COMMENTS:

Judge Signature: _____	School/Affiliation: _____
------------------------	---------------------------

WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATE

Instructions to Judges

DIRECTIONS:

In World Schools debate, the winning team is the team with the most points, so there are no low point wins. The score for each speech is based on a combination of *style, content, and strategy*: they are not merely “speaker points.” Please use the guidelines below in determining your scores, bearing in mind that your score should reflect a combination of the three criteria and not simply reflect the quality of the speaker’s delivery overall.

Style: 40% of the total score. Speakers should communicate clearly using effective rate, pitch, tone, hand gestures, facial expressions, etc. The use of notes should not be penalized unless it hinders delivery; however, speakers should not read their speeches. Notes are to be used only for reference.

Content: 40% of the total score. This portion of the score should focus on the argumentation used by the speaker, divorced from the style. Weak arguments should be marked accordingly, even if the other team does not expose a weak argument. Judges should not be influenced by their own personal beliefs or specialized knowledge when making this decision.

Strategy: 20% of the total score. Strategy consists of whether or not the speaker understands the importance of the issues in the debate and the structure/timing of the speech. Debaters should identify the most substantive issues and allocate their time to covering issues based on the relative importance. Strategy may also consider answers to points of information and choosing when/how to address them. Strategy is not content: a speaker who answers the critical issues with weak responses should get poor marks for content but good marks for strategy.

STANDARDS FOR SCORING:

Every speech is scored out of a possible 80 points, except for the final reply speech, which is worth 40 points.

Note: For purposes of consistency, scores should be between 60 and 80 for the first three speeches per team and 30 and 40 for the reply speeches. Judges should not go outside this range.

You may give or take away 1 or 2 points, per debater, for strong/weak offering and receiving of Points of Information.

CONSTRUCTIVE SPEECHES (80)				
POINTS	32	32	16	80
STANDARD	STYLE	CONTENT	STRATEGY	OVERALL
EXCEPTIONAL	32	32	16	80
EXTREMELY GOOD	30-31	30-31	14-15	74-79
GOOD	28-29	28-29	14	70-73
SATISFACTORY	27	27	13-14	67-69
COMPETENT	26	26	13	65-66
POOR	25	25	12-13	61-64
MINIMAL QUALITY	24	24	12	60

REPLY SPEECHES (40)				
POINTS	16	16	8	40
STANDARD	STYLE	CONTENT	STRATEGY	OVERALL
EXCEPTIONAL	16	16	8	40
EXTREMELY GOOD	15-16	15-16	8	37-39
GOOD	14-15	14-15	8	35-36
SATISFACTORY	13	13	7-8	33-34
COMPETENT	13	13	7	32-33
POOR	12	12	6-7	31-32
MINIMAL QUALITY	12	12	6	30

Motion: this house believes that school detention is ineffective:

Proposition/ Affirm:

1. Owen Gong:

Content: 30

Style: 28

Strategy: 15

Feedback: very strong points presented and the argument structure was very strong. However, at time sit felt repetitive and felt that you were reading from a script instead of using it as extra support. Very strong opening and overall effort.

2. Zachary Zhi

Content: 31

Style: 30

Strategy: 15

Great debate overall. The argument was very well structured and the pointed presented were logical and rebutted the arguments made by the opponent.

3. Lucas

Content: 28

Style: 28

Strategy: 14

Strong argument points and delivery. However, the presentation of the debate could be clearer and more concise.

4. Zachary Zhi

Content: 15

Style: 14

Strategy: 7

Same as before, great debate overall. The conclusion was very well structured and the pointed presented were logical and rebutted the arguments made by the opponent.

Total- 294

Opposition:

1. William Choi:

Content: 26

Style: 28

Strategy: 15

Feedback: the argument was clear and concise and the points were presented very well. However, for some argument points as pointed out by the opponent, they were supporting the opponents argument better and you could have rebutted the better.

2. Noah Choi

Content: 26

Style: 26

Strategy: 14

While the argument points were present, for some argument points as pointed out by the opponent, they were supporting the opponents argument better and you could have rebutted the better.

3. Ashlyn Kim

Content: 30

Style: 25

Strategy: 15

Very strong argument points and content.

4. William Choi

Content: 15

Style: 13

Strategy: 7

Total: 240