Report of the World Schools Debating Championships Tournament Committee Executive 2015-16

The members of the WSDC Tournament Committee Executive for 2015-16 were elected by the WSDC Tournament Committee in Singapore in 2015 to serve through to end of WSDC 2016 in Germany. The members of the Executive for 2015-16 are:

Mark Gabriel (Singapore) − Chairperson
Taimur K. Bandey (Pakistan) − Vice-Chairperson
Irene McGrath (Scotland) − Secretary
Ignacio Furfaro (Argentina)
Tracey Lee (Canada)
Anna England-Kerr (England)
Joshua Park (Korea)
Bojana Skrt (Slovenia)
Cindi Timmons (United States)

General Activities of the Executive for 2015-16

A. Postal ballot

A proposal to introduce a new Partial Double Octo-Final round for WSDC 2016 (thus increasing the number of teams which make the break from 16 to 24) was jointly developed by the Executive and the organisers in Germany. A postal ballot on a proposed temporary amendment to the WSDC Rules was held in April 2016 with Mark Gabriel and Irene McGrath serving as the Returning Officers. 36 of the 49 nations eligible to cast votes in the postal ballot did so. The nations which cast their votes were: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Hungary, India, Israel, Lithuania, Macau, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Scotland, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Turkey, United States and Wales. The results of the ballot were:

> Votes in favour of the Partial Double Octo-Final proposal − 36
> Votes against the Partial Double Octo-Final proposal − 0

Therefore there will be a Partial Double Octo-Final round at WSDC 2016. This issue will also be on the agenda for the Tournament Committee meeting in Stuttgart, where the possibility of permanently introducing this for future WSDCs can be considered.

B. Advice and guidance for future hosts

The Executive has been available to give advice and guidance to the organisers of WSDC 2016 in Germany and WSDC 2017 in Indonesia.

The organisers of WSDC 2017 in Indonesia were asked to submit a progress report to the Executive in February 2016, which they did. Following the submission of the report, the Executive engaged with members of the organising team in Indonesia with follow-up questions and suggestions. This enabled the Executive to give the organisers in Indonesia reassurance on areas of the preparations for which they were on track, as well as recommendations regarding a small number of areas of their organisational plans which the Executive felt warranted some reconsideration. The Chair of the Executive, Mark Gabriel, also made an overnight trip to Jakarta in April 2016 to meet with members of the WSDC 2017 organising committee and get an update briefing on their plans.

The idea of having future hosts submit official update reports to the Executive is something which we feel was helpful, and is a practice which we would advise the Executive to continue to do in future years.

Having the Chairman of the Executive (or another representative of the Executive) personally visit the future host nation to meet with the organising team was also very helpful, but is probably not something which can be done every year (it was possible this year because Mark Gabriel lives in a neighbouring country to Indonesia and so was able to travel there relatively conveniently).

C. Receiving bids for WSDC 2018

At the Tournament Committee meeting in Singapore in 2015, 3 nations indicted that they intended to make bids to host WSDC in 2018 – Croatia, Korea and Nigeria. The Executive stayed in touch with all 3 of these nations during the past year in order to determine whether they wished to proceed with their bids (and all 3 confirmed that they did). The Executive decided to ask all the bidding nations to submit their draft bid documents to the Executive for review at the beginning of June 2016 before the bid documents were released to the WSDC community. After reading the draft bids documents, the Executive sent a few questions to each of the bidding nations in order to seek clarification about specific aspects of their bid. This led to all 3 nations making some changes to their final bid documents which specifically clarified the questions raised by the Executive. The draft bid documents were also sent to the members of the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors. The Executive then released all 3 bid documents to the WSDC community at the same time in mid-June.

The practice of having bidding nations send a draft bid document to the Executive for review before the final bid documents are released to the WSDC community is something which we recommend be continued in future years.

D. Issue of home-schooled students

In September 2015, the Executive was contacted by a nation asking whether a home-schooled student would be eligible to be a debater on their team at WSDC 2016. The WSDC Rules state that debaters should be full-time students at a secondary school in the nation they represent. Although the Rules are not entirely clear on whether a home-schooled student should be eligible, the Executive after discussions decided that the wording of the present rules on debater eligibility are sufficiently ambiguous as to allow a home-schooled student to be permitted to be a debater provided they represent the nation in which they live and are studying at secondary (and not tertiary) level. Nevertheless, to make this explicitly clear in the future, the Executive is proposing an amendment to the WSDC Rules to be considered by the Tournament Committee in Stuttgart which specifically states the circumstances under which home-schooled students may be members of debating teams at WSDC.

E. Multiple registrations from the same nation for WSDC 2016

In some past years, the issue of multiple organisations from the same nation registering a team for WSDC has taken up quite a bit of the Executive's time. For WSDC 2015 in Singapore, there were several cases of multiple registrations which the Executive needed to deal with. This year, there was only one such case of multiple organisations from the same nation attempting to officially register for WSDC 2016. The Executive received submissions from both groups regarding their claims to represent the nation at this year's tournament in Germany, and ultimately made a decision as to which of those organisations would be allowed to send the team to compete in WSDC 2016.

F. Motions Committee for WSDC 2016

The Tournament Committee elected 5 individuals in Singapore last year to serve on the Motions Committee for WSDC 2016. The Executive contacted all of these individuals early in 2016 to check that they were still able to serve on the Motions Committee, and all 5 of them confirmed that they were able to do so. As required by the WSDC Rules, the host organising committee in Germany all appointed 2 further Motions Committee members. The Executive put together a document containing advice and guidance for the Motions Committee, relating to areas such as timelines to be followed and issues to consider when selecting motions, which was given to all the members of the Motions Committee in January 2016. The WSDC Rules require the Executive to appoint 2 official advisers to the Motions Committee, whose job is to review the provisional lists of motions selected for the prepared rounds and impromptu rounds and either approve the lists or recommend that certain motions be reconsidered. The advisers appointed by the Executive were the Chair of the Executive, Mark Gabriel, and Julio Meyer from Mexico.

G. Establishment of Working Groups/Exploratory Group

The 2015-16 Executive decided to establish four official Working Groups and one Exploratory Group. Each group was co-chaired by two or three members of the Executive, and members of the WSDC community were invited to join these groups.

The four Working Groups were:

- **The Adjudication Issues Working Group**
- **The Draw Working Group**
- **The Hosting Issues Working Group**
- **The Language Issues & New Nations Working Group**

The Exploratory Group was:

- **The Power Pairing Exploratory Group**

The following pages contain reports and recommendations from these groups.

Adjudication Issues Working Group

Co-Chairs: Tracey Lee & Joshua Park
Working Group Members: Justa Wawira (Kenya), Daniel Wilson (New Zealand), Mehvesh Mumtaz Ahmed (Pakistan), Sharmila Parmanand (Philippines), Scott Ralston (Scotland), Miha Andrić (Slovenia), Lucas Li (Singapore), Aaron Timmons (United States), Susan Foley (United States) & Zanele Ncube (Zimbabwe)

The Adjudication Issues Working Group was asked to look at the pros and cons of the existing WSDC Marking Standard and discuss: (i) what possible changes to the Marking Standard the WSDC community may wish to consider, and (ii) the pros and cons making such changes vs sticking with the existing Marking Standard. The Working Group also identified 2 additional areas for consideration: adjudicator training and adjudicator feedback.

1. The WSDC Judging Ballot

One of the main challenges with adjudication currently stems from the allocation of marks on the judge's ballot sheet. The Adjudication Working Group spent most of its time discussing the pros and cons of the following options:

A. Revising the weighting of the 3 categories giving strategy more value and content/style less (having all three categories weighted evenly – **see example in Appendix 1**).

B. Considering the 3 categories in determining a holistic score (but not specifying a weighting allocation – abolishing all delineations and going with a holistic 100, perhaps now making it uniform to the Australasian Intervarsity Debating Championship/United Asian Debating Championship/World Universities Debating Championship kind of scoring metric where 75 becomes the 'average').

C. Keeping the 3 categories and existing weighting but improving understanding of how to assess style and strategy.

The details of the WSDC Marking Standard are laid out in the WSDC Judging Schedule, which are part of the WSDC Rules. Therefore a two-thirds majority vote of the Tournament Committee would be required to change to option A or B.

2. Adjudicator Training

The WSDC Rules do not specify anything about how adjudication training should be conducted, so any new ideas regarding adjudication training do not necessarily require the approval of the Tournament Committee or any changes to the Rules. However they do require the Chief Adjudicators to be willing to implement them.

The recommendation from the group is that the adjudication training manual should be revised in terms of the following:
1. Updated definitions of each score category.
2. Addressing how content and strategy interplay.
3. Common and increasingly complex judging conundrums that judges will face (e.g. can a team win on style only?, what is new matter versus evolution?, etc).
4. Links to videos of around five high-quality/problematic rounds, with sample adjudication speeches and sample deliberations.

Note: Any changes to the WSDC Notes for Adjudicators document written by Chris Erskine requires the approval of the Tournament Committee (but only a simple majority, not a two-thirds majority vote, is required to approve changes to this document).

The Adjudication Working Group also strongly recommends that judges should be trained and calibrated for longer than presently, in principle. We would encourage host nations to consider the following:
1. Requirement to bring judges otherwise delegation will not be allowed to break or participate.
2. Individual nations should implement a roughly uniform screening process to qualify all judges brought to WSDC.
3. Setting aside a pool of money for adjudicator subsidies, with the specific aim of bringing in A-ranked judges instead of ensuring diversity (diversity can be taken care of if each nation brings at least one of their own judges).
4. Assistance to be provided to new nations' judges, e.g. earmarking selected CAP members or senior judges to adjudicate a WSDC round with the sole purpose of evaluating and guiding trainees from newer nations.

During the tournament, we agree in principle that we need to limit the impact of C judges while balancing to some extent the aims of exposure. There are a few options under this:
1. Implementing judge conferral (this would require a two-third majority vote of the Tournament Committee).
2. Abolish the A-B-C ranking system altogether in favour of a judge feedback and numerical ranking system – the closest analogue would be that currently in use at the United Asian Debating Championship (a university-level tournament), which bases the first round allocations on a judge test and thereafter assigns greater weightage to feedback.
   Note: This system, however, would almost certainly require relaxing some of the other constraints, e.g. regional representation, gender balance, etc.
3. Publishing a list of judges confirmed to be at the tournament, a month prior (so that teams have some idea what the pool is like even if they don't know who is judging them until the night before the round).

Draw Working Group

Co-Chairs: Tracey Lee & Cindi Timmons
Working Group Members: Cheng Kwok Hung (Hong Kong), Paul Lau (Hong Kong), Mark Webber (Mexico), Menno Schellekens (Netherlands), Mehvesh Mumtaz Ahmed (Pakistan), Cristina Loayza (Peru), Banislav Fečko-Čegiň (Slovakia), Miha Andrić (Slovenia), Luke Churchyard (South Africa), Greg Malis (United States), Joe Vaughan (United States) & Josie Maidment (Wales)

The Draw Working Group was charged to look into the ways in which the draw for WSDC tournaments is currently produced and advise on how the draw can be kept as fair and balanced as possible for all the teams involved, as well as to advise on the draw for WSDC 2016 in Stuttgart and give general advice and support on draw-related matters.

Goals established by the Working Group:

A. Equity of draw – sides/motions
1. As far as possible, each team should have 4 prepared motions and 4 impromptu motions.

2. As far as possible, each team should have 4 rounds in proposition rounds and 4 in opposition (2 prepared rounds on each side and 2 impromptu rounds on each side).
3. Equity in power distribution.
4. Consistency of draw solution across draw sizes.
5. As far as possible, avoiding bye-round issues (e.g. having extra impromptu motion, another venue, extra day, etc).

B. Diversity/variety of draw
1. Geographic/regional diversity of teams debated in prelim rounds to degree possible, subordinate to goals in noted above in A.
2. Equivalent power distribution of teams.
3. Variety in sides/types of motions on a given day.
4. Reasonable chance of winning at least one round.

C. Issues of round distribution
1. As far as possible, the rounds should be evenly distributed over the days (e.g. no team has 4 prepared motions in a row, etc).
2. Venue issues – as far as possible, the draw should be able to be reasonably broken down into smaller subsets so that teams do not need to switch venues on any given day.

D. Transparency of draw/community awareness
1. Draw process is transparent and more easily understood by the WSDC community.
2. Transparent process/community buy-in for change process required by drops, etc.
3. Soliciting community input on draw changes/timeframe for adopting changes.
4. Publishing a list of "ranked" teams can influence judges – what steps should be taken to reduce potential bias?

E. Tournament outcomes
1. Produce a set of tournament results wherein the rankings after the preliminary rounds reflect strength or the 'real ranking' of teams.
2. Rank teams based on final results rather than on prelim round results.
3. Produce an official set of results from past tournaments – put on WSDC website.

Recommendations of the Working Group (as agreed by consensus following deliberations):

1. The draw procedure should be shared with the WSDC community prior to draw being conducted to communicate the process and display transparency.

2. For the purposes of seeding the teams in order to conduct the draw, the complete tournament results for the previous 3 WSDC championships should be used. Ideally A-H groupings should be avoided to reduce perception of power groupings. New teams/nations not attending during previous 3 years should be randomly listed at the bottom of the seedings. Judge training should include advice on avoiding bias based on perceived power of teams selected for match-ups.

3. Using an algorithm to create the draw would be preferable to the present system of dividing teams into 8 groups. This method would see all teams equivalent power distributions of rounds based on #2. This algorithm would not be dependent on groupings of 8 or 4 or any other numerical division.
   An example of how this might work:
   For each of the last 3 years, nations could be assigned levels based on their final placement according to the following formula:
   1st place – level 1

2nd place – level 2

Losing in semis – level 3

Losing in quarters – level 4

Losing in octos – level 5

Enough wins to make octos but not enough ballots/points – level 6

1 win away from having enough to break – level 7 (if no teams fall in level 6 (i.e., no tie breakers needed to determine who breaks), then this category and all others below will move up by 1)

2 wins away – level 8

3 wins away – level 9

This continues to as many levels as needed for a particular year.

If a nation did not participate in a particular year, that team gets placed in the level below the 0 win level (i.e. if 0 wins is level 12, then a nation which didn't compete is assigned to level 13)

Then, a point value for each country is computed to obtain the average level over the last 3 years.

The computer will create a pairing that has two statistical goals:

   i.   Across all 8 rounds, all teams should have as comparable opposition as possible, measured by mean and standard deviation of oppositions' levels

   ii. Within round types (impromptu motion vs prepared motion), all teams should have as comparable opposition as possible, measured by mean and standard deviation of oppositions' levels.

This method is significantly different to the group-based method as it does not pre-determine pods of equal numbers of teams. It acknowledges that the distribution of strength of team is probably not uniform and that more teams are closer to average than farther from average. Thus, this pairing procedure should make it less likely for teams to have a considerably easier or harder set of opponents than others. We see the greatest benefit of this system is that it's independent of the number of teams in the field.

The pre-determined pods mathematically work best when the number of teams is a multiple of 8. Multiples of 4 work well, too. However, when the number of teams could be 61 or 57, the pod system will increase likelihood of unequal sets of opponents. The algorithm method has the potential to solve these problems.

4. Eliminate the bye-round. In ANY round that an odd number of teams exists, whether by an odd number of entries OR a drop for any reason once the tournament begins, the host nation should be encouraged to provide a 'swing team' to debate to prevent a team from not having an opponent. The result of the judges' decision would stand for the competing team in the debate (be it a win or a loss). In no case would the 'swing team' be eligible to advance to the knock-out rounds.

Draw for WSDC 2016:

The recommendations of the Working Group regarding creating an algorithm to produce the WSDC draw rather than determining the draw using 8 seeded groups were shared with the WSDC 2016 organisers and Chief Adjudicators. However in the end the number of participating team at WSDC 2016 turned out to be 56, which is a multiple of 8. This meant that the draw for WSDC 2016 could be created using the 8-group method without making any significant compromises to the fairness of the draw. The organisers and Chief Adjudicators therefore decided to create the draw using 8 groups rather than trying to develop an algorithm in a fairly short timeframe.

The number of teams participating in WSDC is not likely to remain a convenient multiple of 8 in future years, however. It is therefore recommended that the algorithm method of creating the WSDC draw be further investigated with a view to an algorithm being potentially used for the WSDC draw in future years.

Hosting Issues Working Group

Co-Chairs: Bojana Skrt & Cindi Timmons
Working Group Members: Bojan Marjanović (Croatia), Hamish Saunders (New Zealand), Iqbal Hafiedz (Malaysia), Cristina Loayza (Peru), Sharmila Parmanand (Philippines) & Zanele Ncube (Zimbabwe)

Issue 1
Bid process – presentation of bids, bid requirements, holding potential hosts to the specifics of their bid, potentially adding a step of the Executive approving bids before they are presented to the Tournament Committee, consideration of which meeting bids are voted on at, experience of hosts, accountability.

Recommendations of the Working Group:
A. Potential hosts should submit bids to the Executive for review first before proceeding to any type of promotion to the delegates (e.g. social media). The Executive should determine the viability of the bid and then give all potential hosts the same timeframe for sharing their bids with the WSDC community.
B. The Executive should remind potential hosts that significant departure (as determined by the Executive) from the approved details of the bid could lead to the removal of hosting status. Such changes could include changes in dates, venues and key personnel.
C. The timeframe between presentation of bids and voting on bids should be established (e.g. split between 2 Tournament Committee meetings).
D. Suggest adding role of ex-officio Convenors to the host committee (a previous WSDC host approved by the Executive) to facilitate successful administration of the event.
E. Bid packet template option should be added to Wiki page on hosting.

Issue 2
Dates and locations – consideration of timeframe, regional rotation/geographic equity, access by new nations.

Recommendations of the Working Group:
A. Location of WSDC should vary between regions of the world when comparable competitive bids exist. Effort should be made to avoid returning to same region more than twice in a 4-year period.
B. Reminders about option of hosting in January-February should be given to respect needs of nations in the Southern Hemisphere.
C. No suggestion here is intended as favouring a poor or inadequate bid over a more competitive bid. Rather, equity in access suggests that rotating geographically and in terms of the calendar is more in keeping with the spirit of the WSDC community.

Issue 3
Financial considerations – cost of hosting, cost of attendance, sponsorships and scholarships, financial obligations of hosts, fixing fees, pursuit of grants, fund-raising options.

Recommendations of the Working Group:
A. Serious consideration should be given to reducing schedule by 1-2 days to save costs associated with attending. Sightseeing opportunities could be provided before/after the event to accommodate those nations wishing to include them.
B. Alternative hotel properties could be suggested with possible two-tier fee structure to allow some flexibility in fees.

C. Official documentation in the form of a letter from the Executive or Board could be created for national organisations to use to help with fund-raising.

Issue 4
Security/liability issues – security history, requirements of hosts, reasonable expectations, need for emergency plans both for emerging threats before the event and during the actual event.

Recommendations of the Working Group:
   A. Part of bid document from potential hosts should address security concerns related to that area and steps taken to address them.
   B. Minimum security/liability standards should be set by the Executive including but not limited to: having access to security presence at each venue, emergency contact info available to all, letters from local law enforcement officials and/or higher government agencies indicating knowledge of the event and plan of action to take care of international guests, visible hotel security (could be provided by hotel), local host communication of no alcohol policy for competitors, local host escorts available for evening events, addresses of embassies available, contact info for medical personnel, nurse for first aid at each venue (usually schools – could be school nurse), requirement of travel/medical insurance documentation, written emergency plan in place for natural or man-made tragedy, food allergy plan, etc.
   C. Sensitivity to any unique security needs posed by delegations due to geo-political concerns.

Issue 5
Venue/transportation logistics – prioritising cultural experience with student needs, respect for local hosts combined with requirements of a well-run tournament, minimal expectations required of hosts in venue/transportation selection.

Recommendations of the Working Group:
   A. Local host person to help co-ordinate local travel needs for sightseeing, meals, etc, before and/or after the tournament.
   B. Possible discount secured in advance for public transportation.
   C. Venues close to local public transportation.
   D. Minimise travel time to reduce fatigue – travel time should be appropriate for the event (e.g. no 90-minute bus rides to dinner venues).
   E. Transportation should keep security issues in mind (e.g. train stations, etc).

Issue 6
Tournament schedule – balancing considerations of impact on students, cost of event (duration) and respect for host/cultural experiences, window for early arrival/spar rounds.

Recommendations of the Working Group:
   A. Schedule could be shortened. An example pf how this could be done is:
      Days 1-3 could include 3 rounds on 2 of the days and 2 on the other (could keep this flexible based on local venues).
      Keep Saturday off.
      Then do Octos/Quarters on one day and Semis/Finals on another.
      That makes 6 days plus an arrival day and meeting day – 8 total.
   B. Discuss the need to balance between parts of the year to meet needs of Southern Hemisphere nations.

Language Issues & New Nations Working Group

Co-Chairs: Taimur Bandey, Ignacio Furfaro & Bojana Skrt
Working Group Members: Cristina Massa (Argentina), Sam Greenland (Australia), Pradeep Ghimire (Nepal) & Cristina Loayza (Peru)

Compared to some of the other Working Groups, the Language Issues and New Nations Working Group did not attract as many members or as much interest. The members who were involved in the Language Issues and New Nations Working Group conducted discussions and research to individualise the main concerns for the community in connection with language issues and new nations. The most relevant issues were as follows:

1. **Participating nations:** The Working Group feels that it is necessary (for the community itself, the Executive and future host nations) to compile a complete list of all nations that have ever participated in WSDC. This list should be publicly available and contain certain details, including but not limited to the years of participation, the region to which they belong, the main language and the official organisation/institution that represents them.

2. **Recent nations to join the community:** The Working Group feels that it would be useful to have a list of all nations that have recently joined WSDC. It has been suggested that nations should be considered as "recent nations" if they have joined in the last 5 years (however it should be pointed out that no reasons have been provided in order to back this timeframe).

3. **Problems faced by recent nations:** The Working Group feels that it would be useful to ask those recent nations what they have found difficult to face and solve when joining WSDC. This could help as generate some guidelines and/or handouts to help ease the "accession process".

4. **New nations – Preparation:** The Working Group feels it is necessary to assess whether new nations are truly prepared to engage in a WSDC tournament. The general feeling is that underprepared teams will not enjoy a tournament and may leave the community, as well as potentially harm – or disappoint – the teams they debate against. (This has been raised taking into special consideration the performance of one new nation which considered dropping out of WSDC 2015 in Singapore part way through the preliminary rounds, though eventually decided to stay on and participate in the remaining rounds with the support of members of the WSDC community.) Nonetheless, no suggestions in connection with the enforceability of this idea have been made so far.

5. **Outline of plan for upcoming years:** The Working Group feels it is necessary to outline a plan for the upcoming years including the path we want WSDC to follow (i.e. to keep on growing spontaneously; to keep on growing in an ordered and directed way – maybe promoting debate in certain specific regions; to limit the number of nations participating; etc).

Power Pairing Exploratory Group

Co-Chairs: Anna England-Kerr & Joshua Park
Exploratory Group Members: Christopher Erskine (Australia), Sam Greenland (Australia), Bojan Marjanović (Croatia) , Paul Lau (Hong Kong), Mark Weber (Mexico), James De Jager (Qatar), Serban Pitic (Romania), Bojana Skrt (Slovenia), Luke Churchyard (South Africa) & Josie Maidment (Wales)

The Power Pairing Exploratory Group was established to produce a report which (a) clearly outlines both the potential benefits and the potential drawbacks of implementing power pairing at WSDC, and (b) outlines the organisational and logistical issues which would need to be tackled **if** the WSDC community was to decide to implement power pairing at some point in the future and recommend precisely which method of power pairing would work most effectively for WSDC.

The Power Pairing Exploratory Group did **not** have an agenda either in favour of or opposed to the imposition of power pairing at WSDC. The group's remit was to examine the idea from a neutral and unbiased point of view, and to genuinely look into both the pros and cons of power pairing, putting its findings into a report so that the WSDC community can have an opportunity to genuinely consider all the issues which the idea of power pairing raises.

The Power Pairing Exploratory Group's report has been published in a separate document.

APPENDIX 1

Example of a possible new Adjudication Marking Standard for the World Schools Debating Championships

Substantive Speeches *(out of 60)*

STANDARD	OVERALL *(/60)*	STYLE *(/20)*	CONTENT *(/20)*	STRATEGY *(/20)*
Exceptional	60	20	20	20
Excellent	56-59	19	19	19
Extremely Good	53-55	18	18	18
Very Good	49-52	17	17	17
Good	48	16	16	16
Satisfactory	44-47	15	15	15
Competent	41-43	14	14	14
Pass	37-40	13	13	13
Improvement Needed	36	12	12	12

Reply Speeches *(out of 30)*

STANDARD	OVERALL *(/30)*	STYLE *(/10)*	CONTENT *(/10)*	STRATEGY *(/10)*
Exceptional	30	10	10	10
Very Good to Excellent	25-29	9	9	9
Good	24	8	8	8
Pass to Satisfactory	19-23	7	7	7
Improvement Needed	18	6	6	6

In marking reply speeches it might be easier to mark them out of 60 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, 8.5 for style, 7.5 for content and 8.5 for strategy, for a total of 24.5.

Sample Adjudicator's Score Sheet using the Marking Standard from the previous page

ROUND: _____   DATE: _____

MOTION: _____

Proposition Team: _____

SPEAKER'S NAME	STYLE	CONTENT	STRATEGY	P.O.I. ADJUSTMENT	TOTAL
First Speaker	/ 20	/ 20	/ 20	/ +/- 2	/ 60
Second Speaker	/ 20	/ 20	/ 20	/ +/- 2	/ 60
Third Speaker	/ 20	/ 20	/ 20	/ +/- 2	/ 60
Reply Speaker	/ 10	/ 10	/ 10	–	/ 30
				TOTAL TEAM SCORE:	/ 210

Opposition Team: _____

SPEAKER'S NAME	STYLE	CONTENT	STRATEGY	P.O.I. ADJUSTMENT	TOTAL
First Speaker	/ 20	/ 20	/ 20	/ +/- 2	/ 60
Second Speaker	/ 20	/ 20	/ 20	/ +/- 2	/ 60
Third Speaker	/ 20	/ 20	/ 20	/ +/- 2	/ 60
Reply Speaker	/ 10	/ 10	/ 10	–	/ 30
				TOTAL TEAM SCORE:	/ 210

WINNING TEAM: _____

_____   _____
ADJUDICATOR'S NAME   ADJUDICATOR'S SIGNATURE

APPENDIX 1 *(continued)*

Notes on the possible new Marking Standard

This is an example of a Marking Standard designed to give equal weight to each of the 3 judging criteria – style, content and strategy (although not necessarily the first or only option which the Adjudication Issues Working Group would endorse).

To achieve this aim, this Marking Standard slightly expands the full range of marks which the adjudicator can give to each speaker – to a 24-point range (minimum 36, maximum 60), as compared to a 20-point range in the existing WSDC Marking Standard (minimum 60 maximum 80).

At first glance, this appears to be quite a radical change to the WSDC Marking Standard, though in reality it's not as radical a change as it first appears to be. Style and content for substantive speeches continue to be marked using an 8-point range as they are under existing Marking Standard. However strategy is now also marked using the same 8-point range (instead of a 4-point range). So strategy can now be marked in the same way as style and content are in the existing Marking Standard (using and 8-point mark range – a range which current WSDC judges are quite familiar with because it's the range they're used to for style and content).

The sample score sheet on the previous page includes a POI Adjustment column which allows adjustments for points of information using the same range of +/- 2 as in the existing WSDC Marking Standard. However we could see a case for extending the maximum POI adjustments to +/- 2.5 to keep it in line with new 24-point scoring range (thus keeping the maximum adjustment at approximately 10% of the marking range).