

ADJUCATION CRITERIA

Each jury member judges on four EQUAL criteria:

1. ARGUMENTS

This regards both the content of the speech and the research done for it. As far as the arguments are concerned:

- Ask yourself how consistent the speech is.
- How pertinent or logical it is.
- Is the speaker easy to follow?
- How original is he or are his arguments?
- Has substantial research been carried out for this speech?
- Also pay a lot of attention to the examples used:
 - Quality of the examples or anecdotes used to illustrate or justify the arguments
 - Pertinence of the examples

2. PRESENTATION

You also have to judge how the content is put over. This includes several elements:

- Speaking style
- Structure of the speech
- Timing
- Use of rhetorical devices
- Humour (very important in FDA)
- Eye contact: the speaker shouldn't read his/her notes too much

3. TEAMWORK AND STRATEGY

Teamwork regards the linking with one's team, the presence of a coherent team line. Strategy concerns the handling of points of information and the line of attack adopted etc.

a. TEAMWORK

On an individual level:

- There should be a sense of progression; speakers should refer back and forward. Speakers should respect their roles. More precisely, let's stress the specific roles of the first and fifth speakers:

- o First speaker: three important elements: defines and interprets the motion, describes his/her team line, introduces his/her team and gives a foretaste of their arguments.
- o Fourth speaker: gives a summary speech, in which he/she points out the clash between the two teams, ties up the rebuttal, briefly sums up their side's arguments, and ... underlines how much better they were than the other side's!

Collectively:

- Speakers must never contradict other members of the team
- There has to be a clear party line and a sense of cohesion

b. STRATEGY

Handling of the Points of Information:

- Is the speaker destabilized?
- Is the answer satisfactory?
- Does the speaker actively participate in the debate by ASKING Points of Information?

Rebuttal:

- Are the arguments of the opposing team acknowledged and dealt with?

Remember: the better team is not the collection of the five best speakers. We must feel that a team has worked together, that it clicks together and that it creates an overall atmosphere of understanding, cohesion and spirit.

4. STAR QUALITY (The famous “je ne sais quoi”)

Teams should be awarded extra credit:

- If they were particularly entertaining
- If they managed to destabilize their opponents
- If they did a good job of defending the harder point of view (be careful about the extremely subjective nature of this criterion)

On the reverse, teams should be penalized:

- if they did not ask enough POI's, or poor ones, or badly formulated ones
- If they were unclear or boring
- If they contradicted each other, failed to rebut
- If they did not respect the rules or the spirit of the game