SPEAKER SCALE[1]

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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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.

[1] The scale is consistent with the one used at Warsaw EUDC