

Denver Urban Debate League



Information for Judges

published: October 2022

WELCOME ... AND THANK YOU

for your interest in the Denver Urban Debate League (DUDL). With your generous support, we can offer students experiences that they cannot get in the classroom. Speech and debate activities are not just another after-school club, but a life-changing experience that sets a trajectory with a lasting impact on our community and beyond.

Historically, competitive debate and speech programs have been academic activities where mostly male, white, and privileged students participated, succeeded, and gained skills for their lives. In Denver, some former debaters appreciated what the activities did for them. They recognized a problem with a lack of full and equitable access to these activities for youths living in poverty and students of color and began searching for ways to grow opportunities for nontraditional participation. They soon found a best practices model developed in Atlanta, Chicago, and New York that became the National Association for Urban Debate Leagues (NAUDL). Working from that model, the Denver Urban Debate League (DUDL) began in 2008. In 2010 the DUDL became an independent 501(c)(3) organization and moved into office space at the University of Denver Sturm College of Law, partnering with their efforts to diversify the pipeline to the legal profession.

DUDL began working exclusively with Denver Public Schools, but looking beyond the borders of Denver proper, a need was found for this type of programming. So DUDL has expanded, seeking to serve areas of greatest need in our community by developing strong partnerships with additional school districts. DUDL began serving Mapleton Public Schools in 2011 and Aurora Public Schools in 2014. Responding to interest among the participating schools, the DUDL added several competitive speaking events in 2015.

Our programs continue to use the power of debate and to elevate learning, literacy, and life skills which prepare youth to succeed in the information age, breaking barriers by enriching educational and personal outcomes for students of color and low-income students. In fostering academic skills and resiliency, DUDL exists to ensure students excel in high school and beyond. DUDL students become equipped to interact with the world around them. Our students develop a “growth mindset,” a set of aspirations and attitudes strongly associated with success in life. Many of our students have graduated, gone on to success in undergraduate and graduate educations, and are now adding their more diverse voices to our civil discourse, acting as engaged citizens well versed in issues of equity and public policy, and making a difference in their communities.

Table of Contents

WELCOME ... AND THANK YOU	2
JUDGING FOR DENVER URBAN DEBATE LEAGUE EVENTS	4
A FEW WORDS ABOUT OUR DIVERSE PARTICIPANTS	7
JUDGING STUDENT CONGRESS	8
JUDGING POLICY DEBATE	9
JUDGING PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE	10
JUDGING INTERPRETATION – 1 OR 2 READERS	11
JUDGING SLAM POETRY	12
JUDGING IMPROMPTU SPEAKING	13
JUDGING MIXED SPEECH (Informative or Original Oratory)	14
USING SPEECHWIRE FOR BALLOTING	16
ADAPTING TO VIRTUAL TOURNAMENTS	16

JUDGING FOR DENVER URBAN DEBATE LEAGUE EVENTS

Start with our assurance: **Your decisions are always correct.** Do not worry about making the "wrong" decision because there is no such thing! Students are learning, and one key lesson is to realize that not every person sees things in the same way. The students are expected to appeal to the person judging the round, adapting to different levels of experience with an event, priorities and preferences for various aspects of communication, and the fact they are competing against other students who also want to win the ballot. As long as you judge fairly, giving each student an even chance and NOT evaluating on the basis of agreement with your prior knowledge or beliefs, your choices are fine. As long as you are able to explain the decisions to the students, they will be able to learn something about communication.

All ballots will be electronic, provided by Speechwire. You will need a device to connect to the internet. New judges will be sent emails describing the process of signing up for an account, then using the software to select the tournament. There will be instructions in the email AND there are learning tools online to explain how a judge will receive, fill in, and submit ballots.

Please do your best to be on time to get the ballots, to move through all the speeches of the round efficiently, submit your ballot, and offer brief oral comments to recognize excellence and help our students improve.

- DUDL encourages students to go to their assigned round in order to see all the competitors and perform. So, you ought to have most or all those assigned to your round to form a small audience. Guests are welcome, so you may have a few more: other students, occasionally parents, a coach or other teacher, or someone connected to DUDL who wants to watch.
- For debate rounds, all competitors should be present for the round to begin.
- Some speech competitors might be "double entered" and have to arrive late or leave early to be able to compete in both events. These students should check-in with you at the beginning of the round.
- As much as possible, have the students speak in the order listed.
- After each speaker, you may find it helpful to compare those you have heard, tentatively ranking them as better or worse. Writing a brief note or entering a comment on the ballot may help you remember a key to your comparison that will help you at the end of the round when you will write more extensive comments and complete the ballots.
- When all speeches are done, DECIDE and fill in the ballot with your decisions on winning (for debate rounds), rankings (comparing performances), and ratings (speaker points). **The software requires decisions (for debate events), rankings, and ratings on the ballot before it can be submitted, and it can be submitted only once.** If you make a mistake and want to change your decision, rankings, or points, please contact the tournament staff as quickly as possible. **Comments can continue to be added until the end of the tournament.**

- If there is time before the next assigned round, we encourage judges to provide brief immediate reactions by describing what was seen and heard and explaining the understanding or emotion that resulted. DUDL has a policy that wins, rankings, and ratings be communicated ONLY on the ballots, NOT in any oral comments at the end of the round or in later conversation at the tournament. Coaches and the participants will see the ballots with those specifics after the tournament.
- In any oral comments, you can speak generally or say something about each performance. If there are specific aspects that did not work as the speaker probably intended, if there were violations of the rules of the event, or if something was likely to be objectionable to someone in the audience, informing those in the audience (including a specific competitor) immediately allows them to improve in their next performance. If a speaker did something particularly well or worthy of praise, the reaction is likely to be most welcome by immediate and specific feedback.

Whether you are putting comments on the ballot OR making remarks orally, we urge you to remember that you are helping to EDUCATE the participant. So, include a balance of remarks that will:

- Provide ENCOURAGEMENT. One of the best ways to encourage competitors is by identifying one or two strong elements of the presentation and explaining how you reacted to them. Were you impressed by the speaker's sincerity? Intrigued by some important bit of information? Helped by the clear organization? If you have seen them several times, did you think they did something better than the last time you judged them? Let the student know.
- Offer EXPLANATIONS. Pick out one or two things you expected from the performance and tell the students what you heard or saw. If it impacted your evaluation of the performance for good or bad, describe how.
- Urge EXCELLENCE. Point to one or two specific ways that the student improve as a competitor and communicator. It is not your role to provide comprehensive instruction – so pick one or two things and clearly suggest how a student can change to accomplish them.

Judges will award points and ranks for competitors, and the two ought to correspond.

For **Student Congress**, judges will rank their top six participants and assign individual speech ratings on a scale of 1 to 6.

For **Policy Debate** and **Public Forum Debate**, ranks will be 1, 2, 3, and 4. Ratings are points on a scale of 30, with the typical range being 25-30. We allow half point distinctions, but not quarters or tenths, We recommend

- 30 as a rare score, for near flawless debating;
- 29 for well above average.
- 28 for above average.
- 27 for average.

- 26 for below average.
- 25 for significantly below average.

We discourage anything below 25 but recognize some judges may want to go lower to communicate objections to flagrant violations in the use of evidence, significant unprofessional behavior, or abuse of other debaters or the judge.

For Interpretation and Speaking events, ranks will be 1, 2, 3, and all others getting 4. Ratings are based on a scale of 100, with nearly all being between 70 and 100 points.

- 95-100: a rare score, reflecting near professional quality performances
- 90-94: outstanding performance with significant strengths and few weaknesses
- 80-89: above average performances
- 75-79: average performance, showing some strengths and some significant weaknesses
- 70-74: below average performance,
- 69 and below: a very rare score, reflecting major problems: rule violations, selections being inappropriate for student performance or student audiences, an incomplete performance, or disruptive actions while others are performing.

Of course, if you have any questions about the rules, expected behaviors, or how to use the technology for the tournament, please contact the DUDL tournament staff with a text or call the number provided or send an email to sarahirsch@urbandebate.org.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT OUR DIVERSE PARTICIPANTS

The Denver Urban Debate League works hard to welcome any and every student from our schools who wants to compete, all the school staff who work as coaches and assistants, all of our judges, and every member of the wider community who wants to participate. We embrace the diversity of backgrounds, experiences, and communities who join us in wanting to help students. We seek to provide situations and instructions that provide equity among our participants. We want to be welcoming, allowing everyone to feel they can be included in our activities.

We have a special awareness that diversity means we have participants with various communication skills. Some are native speakers of American English – others are learning that language while speaking other languages in their home and community. Many of us are fully able to communicate – some face difficulties due to physical or mental challenges. Throughout the academic year, coaches continue to recruit students and urge more experienced students to try new events, so you can expect to see some who are quite experienced and others just beginning to learn how to perform in our events.

So, please consider how you are communicating, providing a good model for others involved with our organization.

- *We are all influenced by implicit bias, or the stereotypes that unconsciously affect our decisions. When judging, our implicit biases negatively impact students who are traditionally marginalized and disenfranchised. Before making comments or a decision on who wins, the rankings, or the ratings, please take a moment to reflect on any biases that may impact your decision-making process.*
- Be patient as you communicate. Everyone is adapting to the activity, so take time to help everyone understand each the rules and each other's expectations.
- Some judges at DUDL tournaments do not have a great deal of experience judging speech or debate. Others have extensive experience as a competitor, coach, and judge in other levels or leagues of competition. In either case, be aware that the DUDL students may well be able to help you navigate the rules and expectations for this league.
- We suggest that you take this questionnaire to become familiar with your own implicit biases: <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/>

JUDGING STUDENT CONGRESS

Congress has students learning to use parliamentary procedure and public speaking to advocate for votes on legislation introduced on a general topic. It is known to develop both communication and civic awareness.

Students are given a chance to submit legislative proposals. Those submissions (and possible DUDL supplements) are organized into a “docket” for distribution approximately a week before the tournament. Coaches can then work with students to develop an understanding of each proposal, choose a position of support or opposition, and prepare short speeches justifying their position.

One person is (or more are) assigned to a chamber to judge the event. We also try to assign a parliamentarian, someone familiar with the event and parliamentary procedure to assist but not score the students.

When the session begins, the judge or parliamentarian will briefly preside to organize the chamber, asking students for up to three nominations for Presiding Officer (PO). If there is more than one nominee, they each may make a brief statement to the chamber as to why they should be elected. Then there is a secret ballot. If there is no majority, the lowest person is withdrawn, and a second vote is taken. Once a winner is determined that student is in charge (with assistance from the parliamentarian). Students should fill out their name placards. The PO completes a seating chart to help track the session.

A major task of the Presiding Officer is to fairly allocate speaking opportunities after the initial speech of an Author or assigned Proponent. The PO ought to recognize (in sequence)

- a student who has not spoken during the session. If none of those seek to speak,
- a student who has spoken the fewer times, and as a last possibility.
- a student who spoke least recently.

Congress competition focuses on advocacy speaking. Speeches and answers are scored. Questions, Motions, and procedural discussions are not, but they may be commented on.

On each bill, the expected order of speeches is:

- Author or an assigned proponent speaks for up to 3 minutes in support of the bill.
- 2-minute question period, with the PO determining who can ask a question, and brief answers from the author or proponent.
- Opposition, chosen by the PO, giving a speech of up to 3 minutes in opposition to the bill.
- 2-minute question period with the PO determining who can ask, and brief answers from the opposition speaker,
- Alternating pro and con speeches followed by one minute of questioning by other delegates. That continues until there is a motion to end debate passed by the chamber.

For each speech and any answers to questions, judges will consider Content, Organization, Evidence, Language, Argument and Refutation, and Delivery when scoring a round. Award each speech 1 to 6 points, with ONE (1) being the worst and SIX (6) being the best. Provide comments to explain your score and constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, judges will use the combined score as a basis to holistically and comparatively RANK the top six students in the chamber. Consistent excellence on several speeches ought to be considered better than a higher point total from more (but less impressive) speeches.

The Presiding officer should be scored by 1 – 6 points per hour of presiding, with ONE being the worst and SIX being the best. Consider the ability shown with PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE, fair and efficient SELECTION of speakers and questioners, CONTROL of the chamber for decorum and efficiency, and COMMUNICATION (both speaking and listening) with others in the chamber. Provide comments to explain your score and constructive suggestions for improvement. Presiding Officers are recognized and awarded separate from the speakers of the chamber.

JUDGING POLICY DEBATE

Policy debate is one of the most popular choices for competition in DUDL. Debate has been shown to improve student skills in critical thinking. Specifically, students learn standard expectations for making policy decisions, develop analytical approaches to assess claims and evidence, broaden vocabulary use, become better readers, improve research skills, and develop a wider range of organizational strategies. They improve listening, note taking, and memory. They improve teamwork and professional interactions. Most find greater self-confidence, become willing to take chances to win and lose, and develop awareness of longer-range improvement. Debaters take more advanced classes, raise their GPAs, improve class and standardized test scores, have an increased graduation rate, and improve chances of college acceptance and completion. Many take their advocacy skills into their community and professional lives, becoming life-long leaders. You can ask us – there is a great deal of research support showing the benefits of policy debate participation in urban debate leagues.

So, your judging will play an important role in making all those good things happen. You probably have skills in some (or all) of those intellectual areas, and can use that background to make the most of your time with the students. In each round, there will be representatives of Affirmative and a Negative sides of the resolution. Generally, each will have two debaters.

The activity is expected to have developed arguments on an assigned topic, presented to persuade. The 2022-2023 high school policy topic is:

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its security cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in one or more of the following areas: artificial intelligence, biotechnology, cybersecurity.

The judge must ultimately vote for the side that presented the better arguments. Be an objective observer, evaluate the arguments and not whether the point agrees with your prior belief or knowledge of the subject. Unanswered arguments are to be presumed to be true and relevant to the round.

Take notes. Write down debaters' arguments in a way that allows you to see the "flow" of the round,, a team's arguments and the opponent team's responses.

Time the debate [experienced debaters may want to time their own team].. Students ought to stay within the time limits – only being allowed to finish a sentence or perhaps reading to the end of a piece of evidence before being cut off.

Policy debate speeches: The first four, called constructives, are each 8 minutes long, each followed by a 3 minute cross-examination where the other team asks questions. The last four, called rebuttals, are each 5 minutes long. The sequence is: 1st Affirmative (A), Cross Examination (CX), 1st Negative (N), CX, 2nd A, CX, 2nd N, CX, Rebuttals 1st N, 1st A, 2nd N, 2nd A. In addition, each team has a total of 10 minutes of "Preparation Time" they may use before any of their speeches or cross examinations.

At the end of the round, the judge will rank debaters 1 through 4 and assign points on a scale of 30, with the typical range being 25-30.

At many tournaments, DUDL will have a separate division for Novice debaters. That level of experience ought to influence the expectations for speaker points;

On the ballot, judges must specify which team won and what side they represented.

- Debate is about who made the better argument on the resolution, so it is possible the win may be awarded to a team with fewer speaker points. This is called a low-point win, judges should clarify this on the ballot.
- Students get these ballots after tournaments, generally with a coach helping to explain the judges' feedback and comments as to how they evaluated the debate.

If you would like to learn more about policy debate, we can recommend some additional reading and viewing. The video on denverdebate.org under the Volunteer Resources tab can be used as a guide.

JUDGING PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE

Public Forum [PF] is a debate event specifically developed to promote communication with a member of the community on a current topic affecting society. Students in PF usually debate in teams of two about a topic that changes every two months, increasing the focus on sound reasoning, succinct organization, credible evidence, and clear delivery and diminishing the impact of extensive research. Judges ought to consider arguments when they are clearly explained and discount arguments that are too fast, too garbled, or too jargon-laden to be understood by an intelligent high school student or a well-informed citizen.

Usually there is a coin flip, with the winner choosing either a side (Proponents or Opponents) or a position (First or Last speech). The loser makes a choice on the other. Once the sides and positions are set, please fill in the team and names on the ballot.

- The judge ought to vote for the side that presented the better arguments. When deciding the round, judges should ask, “If I had no prior beliefs about this resolution, would the round as a whole have made me more likely to agree or disagree with the resolution?”
- Take notes. Write down debaters’ arguments in a way that allows you to see the “flow” of the round, a team’s arguments and the opponent team’s responses. Unanswered arguments are to be presumed to be true and relevant to the round.
- Time the speeches [experienced debaters may want to time their own team]. Students ought to stay within the time limits – only being allowed to finish a sentence before being cut off.
- Public Forum debate speeches:
 - An initial speech from each side: 4 minutes each
 - Crossfire questioning for 3 minutes between the two initial speakers. They usually alternate between asking and answering.
 - A second speech from each side from the teammate. 4 minutes each
 - Crossfire questioning for 3 minutes between those who gave the second speech.
 - A Summary speech from each side – 3 minutes each
 - Crossfire questioning between all 4 debaters for 3 minutes.
 - A Final Focus speech from each side – 2 minutes each.
- In addition, each team has a total of 3 minutes of “Preparation Time” to use in the round.
- At the end of the round, judges will use the ballot to say which team and side won.
- The judge will rank debaters 1 through 4.
- At the end of the round, the judge will rank debaters 1 through 4 and assign points on a scale of 30, with the typical range being 25-30. If the debate is identified as being between Novice debaters, please adjust your expectations of the quality of speeches and then award speaker points.
- Debate is about who made the better argument on the resolution, so the win may be awarded to a team with fewer speaker points. This is called a low-point win, judges should clarify this on the ballot.
- Students get the ballots after tournaments, generally with a coach helping to explain the judges’ feedback and comments.

If you would like to learn more about Public Forum debate, please ask and we can offer suggestions for reading or viewing.

JUDGING INTERPRETATION – 1 OR 2 READERS

Interpretation gives students the opportunity to select, interpret, and perform published material.

- DUDL allows an entry to be one or two competitors.
- Students may use a single source or a program combining selections from published prose, poetry, drama, or screenplays. During the presentations, the contestant/team must announce the author and source of all selections.
- The performance can be humorous or dramatic, emphasize a topic, actions, or characters – as long as there is some central element for the judge and others to focus on.
- Presentations may not use physical objects or costuming. Although gestures or pantomime and movement may be used, they should be used with restraint. The performance must begin and end from a single area of the space.
- Material does not have to be memorized, but memorization is encouraged. The student may use a script, but it is not required.
- The performance ought to be between five and ten minutes.

Judges are urged to consider

Selection of Literature	Performance of Material	Development of Meaning
Does the material meet the rules of the category?	Is there appropriate use of voice: variations of volume, pace & rhythm, and pitch?	Are there clear, consistent, and distinct character portrayals?
Is there an emotional understanding of the content?	Is there appropriate use of physical presentation: eye contact & focus, facial gesture, body gestures & movement?	Is emotion indicated in the literature effectively portrayed by the student(s)?
Is there an intellectual understanding of content?	Is there appropriate use of language: both the material of the selected literature and during any introduction or announcement of sources?	Are any transitions within or between selections made clear to the audience?

Judges will award points and ranks for competitors, and the two ought to correspond in sequence.

- Points are based on a scale of 100, with nearly all being between 70 and 100.
- Ranks will be 1, 2,3, and all others getting 4.

JUDGING SLAM POETRY

This event gives students the opportunity to use their own written material, selecting and interpreting it for the judge and others in the audience.

- DUDL allows an entry to be one or two competitors.
- Material used must be the creation of the student(s). Coaches, teachers, and others may be involved as editors, but the original idea, the majority of creative development, and creation of any cutting or script must be done by the performing student(s).
- Students may use a single work or create a program combining selections of their own written work.
- If work is presented in another language, a translation may be provided to the judge to help with understanding of the message/meaning.
- The performance can be humorous or dramatic, emphasize a topic, actions, or characters – as long as there is some central element for the judge and others to focus on.
- Presentations may not use physical objects or costuming. Although gestures or pantomime and movement may be used, they should be used with restraint. The performance must begin and end from a single area
- Material does not have to be memorized, but memorization is encouraged. The student may use a script, but it is not required.
- The performance ought to be between **three and ten minutes**.

Judges are urged to consider

Literary Merit	Selection of Material	Performance of Material	Development of Meaning
Does the material demonstrate a creative and compelling use of language?	Does the material meet the rules of the category?	Is there a clear and appropriate use of voice: variations of volume, pace & rhythm, and pitch?	Are there clear, consistent, and distinct character portrayals?
Does the performer possess a unique literary voice or perspective?	Is there an apparent emotional understanding of the material?	Is there a clear and appropriate use of physical presentation: eye contact & focus, facial gesture, body gestures & movement?	Is emotion indicated in the literature effectively portrayed by the student(s)?
Does the poem have an impact on the audience?	Is there an apparent intellectual understanding of the material?	Is there a clear and appropriate use of language, both the material of the literature and during any introduction?	Are any transitions within or between pieces made clear to the audience?

Judges will award points and ranks for competitors, and the two ought to correspond.

- Points are based on a scale of 100, with nearly all being between 70 and 100.
- Ranks will be 1, 2,3, and all others getting 4.

JUDGING IMPROMPTU SPEAKING

Impromptu is a speech event where students learn to communicate with VERY limited preparation. The applications for those skills are all around. Answering questions in classes or on a test, responding to someone asking a question in conversation, participating in committee meetings or in a small group – all can be helped by having a main point, an organized sequence of thoughts, some supporting material, and fluent delivery.

When judging an Impromptu round, please follow these steps:

- The tournament staff will provide topics in groups of three, given in an envelope/folder with topics separated out for each competitor.
- Try to have students speak in the assigned order.
- A student may NOT use prepared materials or do research during preparation time. The student may make notes on an index card during the preparation time and use the card during the speech. They may not take notes on their phone.
- Call a student and give them the envelope for their speaker number. The competitor selects ONE of the three to speak on and tells you.
- At that point, you should put 7 minutes on a timer and start. The speaker may use up to 5 minutes for preparation to present a minimum of a two-minute speech, or the student may use as little preparation time as they wish and present a speech up to seven minutes long.
- The student should notify you when they are ready to speak. Stop the timer briefly and note the remaining time so you can record the preparation and speaking times on the ballot.
- Let the student know how much time is left for their speech. Start the timer and have the student speak.
- During the speech, use hand signals to indicate how much time remains. [Some students may prefer to use their own timer.]
- A speaker ought to stop within the 7 minutes but may go slightly overtime. When the student concludes, note the time. One who is more than 30 seconds over the time limit may be penalized.
- Repeat this process for the rest of the students on the list.

For your comments, ranks and ratings, follow the chart from left to right and consider each of the questions. Then consider some specifics:

Overall Impression	Structure	Content	Delivery
Are you able to clearly understand the speaker's message and/or theme?	To what degree did the speaker achieve one or more of the following: informed, entertained, persuaded, inspired, encouraged, and argued?	Award originality and creativity in approaching the subject matter	How natural was the delivery? Did it seem conversational, professionally fluent, or particularly related to the topic and core message of the speech? Or was it halting and choppy?
You are not judging whether you agree or not.	Is there an appropriate structure to the body of the speech, such as chronological, problem-solution, cause-effect, or cleanly-divided topical sequence?	Is the selection of content appropriate to create a relationship between the speaker and his or her audience?	Did gestures and body language match the speech? Were they too extreme, too limited, or "just right"?
Engagement did the speaker connect with the audience? Was there eye contact? Did the audience respond?	Does the speaker have a clear introduction, body, and conclusion? Are there effective transitions?	Did the speaker reveal any emotion – is the speech humorous or moving?	Was there effective variation in vocal delivery – pace, pitch, and volume? Could the speaker have varied pace more to maintain interest or show importance?

JUDGING MIXED SPEECH (Informative & Oratory)

Students can learn a great deal by preparing an informational or persuasive speech. More than other events, students learn to select a topic and purpose, narrow to a main point, organize subordinate ideas and supporting material, and develop excellent delivery skills. Those skills help in school, professional settings, and civic life.

In this event, competitors **prepare** (not improvise) a presentation with the goal to inform or persuade an audience on a significant topic. Students who take time to create an interesting speech and expresses an opinion on a relevant issue are preferred. The speech must be an original work of the student. It should NOT be a created or composed by copying someone else’s speech or be written for the student by another person. Quoted material ought to be limited to about 10% or 150 words of the speech and include the source.

Students may use an optional visual aid. Visual aids can be nearly anything that helps the audience’s understanding the topic: presentation/poster boards, models, or props (School appropriate: no guns, controlled substances, etc.). Set-up and removal ought to be efficient but is not a part of the time limit. If the aid is not original work, the source should be clearly identified.

The time limit is 10 minutes with a 30 second “grace period”. Speakers are encouraged to speak for at least 3 minutes. Going beyond the “grace period” may impact ranking and ratings.

For your comments, ranks and ratings, begin with an overall impression: are you able to clearly understand the speaker’s message and/or theme? You are not judging whether you agree or not. Then, consider some specifics:

Relevance	Structure	Content	Delivery
Has the student done an adequate job of explaining why this topic is relevant?	To what degree did the speaker achieve one or more of the following: informed, entertained, persuaded, inspired, encouraged, and argued?	Award originality and creativity in approaching the subject matter	Engagement – did the speaker connect with the audience? Did the audience respond?
Does the speaker connect the topic to an audience?	Does the speaker have a clear introduction, body, and conclusion? Are there effective transitions?	Did the speaker reveal any emotion – is the speech humorous or moving?	How natural was the delivery? Did it seem conversational, professionally fluent, or particularly related to the topic and core message of the speech? Or was it halting and choppy?
Judges should consider if the speech is appropriate personally and for an audience of high schoolers or adults in the community.	Is there an appropriate structure to the body of the speech, such as chronological, problem-solution, cause-effect, or clearly-divided topical sequence?	Is the content helpful in creating a relationship between the speaker and audience?	Did gestures and body language match the speech? Were they too extreme, too limited, or “just right”?
		Is the content recent? Is it already well-known or does it add something new?	Was there appropriate eye contact with the judge and any others in the audience?
			Was there effective variation in vocal delivery – pace, pitch, and volume? Could the speaker have varied pace more to maintain interest or show importance?

Speaker ranks will be 1, 2,3, and all others getting 4. Ratings are based on a scale of 100, with nearly all being between 70 and 100 points.

If you have any questions/concerns or rules are questioned, please stop the round and consult a tournament official.

USING SPEECHWIRE FOR BALLOTING

Speechwire has a video tutorial: [Judging Speech and Debate on SpeechWire with Electronic Ballots](#)

ADAPTING TO VIRTUAL TOURNAMENTS

(information to come)