

# Speaker Point Guidelines

Evaluating an oratorical effort is a subjective experience, based on the interpretations of individuals. Even in the face of that subjectivity, however, some standardization is possible. Adjudicators should look to a speaker's Matter, Manner and Method when assigning speaker points.

**Matter** relates to the issues addressed in the debate and the material used to substantiate argumentation. Adjudicators should evaluate the quality of the issues identified by the debaters and the strength of the evidence offered to support the debater's claims

**Manner** refers to the presentation and delivery of a speaker. Adjudicators should not assess debaters solely on their proficiency in English as a foreign language but should look beyond proficiency to evaluate presentational efforts

**Method** refers to the strategy and tactics of the debaters. Adjudicators should evaluate how the debaters organized their individual speeches and whether they addressed the most relevant issues in the round. Adjudicators should also evaluate cooperation among team members to advance a consistent and coherent strategy.

Based on the above criteria, the guidelines below are intended to standardize adjudicators' approaches to assigning Speaker Points to individual debaters. The guidelines rely on traditional conceptions of letter grades, where 90% performance and above constitutes a grade of "A;" 80% - 89% constitutes a "B," and so on. Please use these guidelines when assigning Speaker Points.

| Speaker Points | Qualitative Significance   |
|----------------|--|
| 45 - above     | An outstanding speaker in almost every way. Exceeds the majority of expectations. Likely to be in late elimination rounds.   |
| 42-43          | A solid speaker. Exceeds expectations in most areas. Likely to be in early elimination rounds.                               |
| 40             | An average speaker. Meets minimum expectations but does not exceed expectations. May or may not be in elimination rounds.    |
| 37-38          | Below average speaker. Fails to meet most minimum expectations. Not likely to advance to elimination rounds                  |
| 35-below       | A poor speaker. Significant in his or her failure to meet even minimum expectations. Will not advance to elimination rounds. |



# Ballot for “FLTRP Cup” National English Debating Competition

## “外研社杯”全国英语辩论赛评分表

Proposition: \_\_\_\_\_ Opposition: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Motion \_\_\_\_\_

ROUND \_\_\_\_\_  
 VENUE \_\_\_\_\_

Procedures: 1. Please take detailed notes of the arguments from each speaker. 2. Fill in the Ballot and hand in the Ballot within 5 minutes. 3. Oral Adjudication

| Proposition |  | Manner/10 | Matter/20 | Method/20 | Total/50 | Opposition |  | Manner/10 | Matter/20 | Method/20 | Total/50 |
|-------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| LP          |  |           |           |           |          | LO         |  |           |           |           |          |
| MP          |  |           |           |           |          | MO         |  |           |           |           |          |
| Team        |  | (100)     |           |           |          | Team       |  | (100)     |           |           |          |

| Speaker Points | Meaning       |
|----------------|---------------|
| 45             | Excellent     |
| 42-43          | Above Average |
| 40             | Average       |
| 37-38          | Below Average |
| 35             | Poor          |

| Margin | Meaning  |
|--------|--|
| 1-3    | Close Debate: Minor differences seperating both teams.                                 |
| 4-8    | A relatively clear decision with one team having an obvious advangtage                 |
| 9-12   | A very clear win with the losing team having failed in one or more fundamental aspect. |

Winner: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Margin: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Adjudicator's Signature:  
 \_\_\_\_\_