



WARSAW EUDC 2016

SPEAKER SCALE

The mark bands below are rough and general descriptions; **speeches need not have every feature** described to fit in a particular band. Throughout this scale, **'arguments' refers both to constructive material and responses**. Please **use the full range of the scale**. Speaker marks determine many of the breaking teams, and tab finishes can be big achievements, so please give them the **serious thought** they require.

95-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plausibly one of the best debating speeches ever given; • It is incredibly difficult to think up satisfactory responses to any of the arguments made; • Flawless and compelling arguments.
92-94	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An incredible speech, undoubtedly one of the best at the competition; • Successfully engaging with the core issues of the debate, arguments exceptionally well made, and it would take a brilliant set of responses to defeat the arguments; • There are no flaws of any significance.
89-91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brilliant arguments successfully engage with the main issues in the round; • Arguments are very well-explained and illustrated, and demand extremely sophisticated responses in order to be defeated; • Only very minor problems, if any, but they do not affect the strength of the claims made.
86-88	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments engage with core issues of the debate, and are highly compelling; • No logical gaps, and sophisticated responses required to defeat the arguments; • Only minor flaws in arguments.
83-85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments address the core issues of the debate; • Arguments have strong explanations, which demand a strong response from other speakers in order to defeat the arguments; • May occasionally fail to fully respond to very well-made arguments; but flaws in the speech are limited.
79-82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments are relevant, and address the core issues in the debate; • Arguments well made without obvious logical gaps, and are all well explained; • May be vulnerable to good responses.
76-78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments are almost exclusively relevant, and address most of the core issues; • Occasionally, but not often, arguments may slip into: i) deficits in explanation, ii) simplistic argumentation vulnerable to competent responses or iii) peripheral or irrelevant arguments; • Clear to follow, and thus credit.
73-75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments are almost exclusively relevant, although may fail to address one or more core issues sufficiently; • Arguments are logical, but tend to be simplistic and vulnerable to competent responses; • Clear enough to follow, and thus credit.
70-72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments are frequently relevant; • Arguments have some explanation, but there are regular significant logical gaps; • Sometimes difficult to follow, and thus credit fully.
67-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments are generally relevant; • Arguments almost all have explanations, but almost all have significant logical gaps; • Sometimes clear, but generally difficult to follow and thus credit the speaker for their material.
64-66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some arguments made that are relevant; • Arguments generally have explanations, but have significant logical gaps; • Often unclear, which makes it hard to give the speech much credit.
61-63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some relevant claims, and most will be formulated as arguments; • Arguments have occasional explanations, but these have significant logical gaps; • Frequently unclear and confusing; which makes it hard to give the speech much credit.
58-60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claims are occasionally relevant; • Claims are not be formulated as arguments, but there may be some suggestion towards an explanation; • Hard to follow, which makes it hard to give the speech much credit.
55-57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or two marginally relevant claims; • Claims are not formulated as arguments, and are instead are just comments; • Hard to follow almost in its entirety, which makes it hard to give the speech much credit.
50-55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content is not relevant; • Content does not go beyond claims, and is both confusing and confused; • Very hard to follow in its entirety, which makes it hard to give the speech any credit.