



WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEBATING LEAGUE
INCORPORATED

2019 Adjudicator Reference Book

Adjudicator Handbook	2
<i>Adjudicator Reference Sheet</i>	2
<i>Debating Outline</i>	4
Remuneration Instructions	10
Volunteer Dress Code	12
Policy on Conduct Unbecoming During Debates	14
Policy on Complaint Management.....	17

Adjudicator Handbook

Adjudicator Reference Sheet

1. Speech times

Senior substantive: 7 minutes; warning bells at 1 and 6.

Junior: 5 minutes; warning bell at 4

Novice: 4 minutes; warning bell at 3

2. Range of marks

	Matter (/40)	Manner (/40)	Method (/20)	
1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd	26~34	26~34	13~17	No half points

3. Scoring guidelines

Matter & Manner	Method	Meaning
26	13	Poor (rarely awarded)
27-29	14	Below average
30	15	Average
31-33	16	Above average
34	17	Excellent (rarely awarded)

4. Points of information

First, work out the **starting point**, which depends on the **number of points** offered by the speaker:

0 if the speaker has offered 2 or more to each opposition speaker

-1 if s/he has offered only 4-5 in total in the debate

-2 if s/he has offered 3 or less in total in the debate

Next, add or subtract marks from the starting point depending on the **quality of the points offered**.

-2 for several very poor points, grossly contradict own case (rarely awarded)

-1 for several poor points (overtime, confused, irrelevant)

+1 for consistently good points, 1 excellent point

+2 for consistently good points and a 'killer' point (rarely awarded)

5. Margin

Every debate must be given by at least **1 point**. A debate **cannot** be tied or given by 0.5 points.

Margin	Meaning
1-2	Very close
2-4	Close but clear
4-6	Moderately clear
7-12	Clear
12+	Very clear (rare)

Debating Outline

Debating is an exercise in the art of persuasion and different people react quite differently in terms of what they find persuasive. Assessing a debate is therefore an inherently subjective task. However, although adjudicators will be making subjective judgments as to the impact of argument, style and structure, they do so within a framework of procedural rules and guidelines, which channel and limit this subjectivity. This outline is for debaters and adjudicators. It sets out the criteria for the marking of debates, tips on case preparation and the rules for senior debates.

1. Role of the Adjudicator

The adjudicator must adopt the role of an average person who only has an average person's knowledge of the subject under debate - but who has an expert knowledge of the rules of debate. They must:

1. Eliminate from consideration any preconceived ideas as to the merits of the issue of debate and any specialist knowledge of the subject matter;
2. Ensure that personal likes and dislikes in terms of speaking style are only relevant to the extent to which they are likely to be shared by a cross-section of the audience;
3. Ensure that although they may be an experienced debater and successful in identifying weaknesses in argument and recognising possible lines of rebuttal, they must avoid entering the debate and making arguments for the speakers. They must ask themselves "How convincing would this argument be to the average, reasonable person?"
4. Remember that the average person role does not extend to ignoring the rules of debate and in this regard they must adopt an independent stance of expertise.

2. Function of the Adjudicator

First, the adjudicator must decide which team has won. Debates cannot be tied. The decision should be made by an evaluation of the debate according to the adjudicator's notes and impressions. Second, the adjudicator must deliver an adjudication. The remarks should be appropriate to the age and standard of the debaters.

The adjudicator should:

1. deliver the adjudication on a team rather than a speaker by speaker basis;
2. be positive and criticize speakers in a constructive manner and give the teams some comments as to how they can improve their performance;
3. succinctly state the definition, tests and models presented;
4. discuss the manner and method of each team;
5. discuss the matter of each team, referring only to the key arguments presented. The adjudicator should point out the main strengths and weaknesses of each case and the extent to which these were identified by the opposing team. Conclude which team won on matter;

6. explain clearly and succinctly why the successful team won the debate;

The official adjudication should not exceed 10 minutes. The adjudicator should make it clear that he or she will be available briefly to discuss the debate and the performance of individual speakers informally at the close of the debate.

3. The Marking System

The marking scheme adopted by WADL and by the Australian Debating Federation allows a maximum of 100 marks to be awarded for substantive speeches (50 for reply speeches): 40 marks for matter, 40 marks for manner and 20 marks for method (20, 20 and 10 for reply speeches). A debater whose overall performance was of a standard to be expected at that level will score 75 marks (30, 30 and 15).

Marks can vary within these categories as follows:

- (a) Matter and manner: 26 (substantially lower than the expected standard) - 34 (exceptional);
- (b) Method: 13 - 17.

The adjudicator must mark within these limits

4. Assessing Matter

- (a) Logic, relevance and proof are the cornerstones of matter;
- (b) The topic must be debated. In the case of negative teams the words 'It is not the case that...' should be the basis of the argument;
- (c) Hung cases are not acceptable;
- (d) Cases cannot be comprised solely of examples. Examples should be used to reinforce a substantive case, not used *as* the case;
- (e) References to experts, while they may be cited to support a case, can not used as a substitute for an argument. Just because Einstein believed something does not prove that it is true. The speaker should explain why what he or she said was valid;
- (f) Watch out for the following invalid authorities: fictional characters, the status quo, metaphorical or hypothetical examples, religious authority;
- (g) No new material at third negative. For reasons of fairness the third negative speaker cannot introduce new matter (even in Senior debates);
 - a. The third negative speaker may:
 - i. use fresh examples to illustrate an earlier argument;
 - ii. argue in rebuttal of an opposing argument; or
 - iii. defend the negative case.
- (h) Don't attach too much weight to statistics;
- (i) Humorous or mocking arguments. The test of the effectiveness of these arguments is persuasiveness. In particular:
 - a. does the use of humour make the argument more persuasive;
 - b. does the audience accept the spirit and material of the humorous case;
 - c. is the speaker insincere.

5. Assessing Manner

The test is persuasiveness. There are no hard and fast rules to good manner, but there are some factors that may influence an adjudicator's assessment of the persuasive abilities of the speaker, in particular:

- (a) Vocal style: volume, clarity, pace, variety in style, fluency and a confident and authoritative speaking style;
- (b) Use of language: should not vary markedly from normal speech. The language used should be appropriate given the audience (i.e. not unnecessarily complex, or "loose" and colloquial). Obscene language must be heavily penalized;
- (c) Use of palmcards: encourage the use of palmcards with abbreviated notes, not full sentence speeches written on them;
- (d) Eye contact with the audience should be maintained, not with the back wall or only the adjudicator. Speakers should not rebut while facing the opposing team;
- (e) Gestures where appropriate, as long as they are not distracting;
- (f) Stance: speakers may stand or walk, as long as they are not distracting;
- (g) Impression of sincerity: debaters should convey an impression of conviction for their argument, whether or not they really believe it;
- (h) Personal attacks: derogatory personal references are firmly discouraged - speakers should play the ball not the person.
- (i) Humour is an important debating tool and should be encouraged as long as it is appropriate and enhances the persuasiveness of the argument.

Please note that manner is an impression as to how persuasive a speaker is to the audience. Therefore the above is only a guide and should not be used as a checklist for good manner (i.e. if a debater was persuasive but stood really still and did not gesture, marks should not be deducted). The test is whether the speaker was persuasive.

6. Assessing Method

Method is a critical element of debating. There are three distinct elements of method:

- (a) the structure and organisation of each individual speech (internal method);
- (b) the structure and organisation of the team case (team method); and
- (c) the ability of the team to react to the dynamics of the debate.

Internal Method

Good internal method consists of:

- (a) an interesting or engaging opening;
- (b) a clear statement of the purpose and general direction of the speech;
- (c) a logical sequence of ideas, making it easy to follow the development of the argument;
- (d) arguments which are consistent
- (e) rebuttal of key opposition arguments;
- (f) appropriate acceptance of, and answers to, points of information;

- (g) proper timing of the speech (see below); and
- (h) an effective conclusion.

Team Method

Good team method consists of:

- (a) an appropriate theme, test, model and split;
- (b) each speaker properly fulfilling his or her individual speaker role .

The speaker roles are as follows:

First Speaker

Affirmative: define the topic; give outline of the team's overall argument (theme); give the team split; establish the test or model (if any); present matter; summarise.

Negative: challenge the definition (if appropriate); rebuttal; as above.

Second Speaker

Both: deal with definitional issues; clarify test/model (if appropriate); rebuttal; present matter; summarise.

Third Speaker

Affirmative: deal with definitional issues; confirm test or model; confirm theme; rebuttal of key opposition arguments; short summary of team case (60-90 seconds)

New matter allowed but not recommended.

Negative: no new matter allowed; otherwise as above

Dynamics of the Debate / Rebuttal

Adjudicators will consider the extent to which debaters understand and react to the dynamics of the debate. This is demonstrated through a structured examination of the most contentious issue in the debate and through the effective use of points of information.

Rebuttal

Rebuttal distinguishes debating from public speaking. This may consist of showing that the opposing argument is based on an error of fact, is irrelevant, is illogical or that while true, should be accorded little weight. Effective rebuttal is:

- (a) best delivered at the beginning of the speech, however more sophisticated speakers may integrate rebuttal and substantive material; and
- (b) focused upon the key issues in the debate, not a "shopping list" of points made by the opposing team.

Timing

Timing is primarily a method issue. Speakers must not lose method marks on this basis if they make it to the warning bell or finish soon after the bell. Speakers may lose a mark if they are considerably under time or overtime. Although timing is primarily a method issue it can affect matter marks. Matter delivered after the final bell must be ignored and does not attract matter marks. Further, if someone is drastically under time it may affect his or her matter marks (he or she may not have delivered as much matter as he or she should have). Timing is also important from an internal structure point, of view. If a speaker spends 2 minutes answering a trivial point of information or spends a disproportionate period of time on rebuttal this will affect the speaker's method (and possibly matter) marks.

7. Points of Information

POIs in Senior debates promote dynamic debate and should not be feared. They can be used to point out factual inaccuracies, for clarification or to highlight a contradiction or inconsistency.

- (a) POIs can be offered between the first and sixth minute. If they are offered outside that time the adjudicator must immediately declare the POI "out of order";
- (b) each speaker must accept at least 2 POIs during his or her speech (unless they are not offered);
- (c) All speakers must offer at least 2 POIs to each opposing speaker during the course of the debate;
- (d) Each POI may be of a maximum of 15 seconds duration. The adjudicator must call "time" after the 15 seconds has elapsed and order the speaker delivering the POI to sit down;
- (e) The speaker is always in control. The speaker may elect politely to accept or refuse a point;
- (f) The adjudicator will look not only to the quality of the point of information, but also to the reaction of the speaker;
- (g) The method of marking POIs is as follows:
 - Starting Point: No. of POIs: 0 = 2+ per speaker
 - 1 = 4-5 per debate
 - 2 = 1-3 per debate
 - Variation from Starting Point: +2 = 2+ excellent points, 1 killer
 - +1 = 2+ good points, 1 excellent point
 - 0 = average points, not taken
 - 1 = 1+ poor points (overtime, confused, etc.)
 - 2 = 1+ very poor points, grossly contradictory
- (h) A speaker's method marks can be reduced if the speaker accepts too many POIs, accepts them at a bad time (i.e. in the middle of a point) or allows his or her speech to be unnecessarily disrupted.

8. Case preparation

When you get a topic:

- (a) Work out what the issue is.
- (b) Brain storm for ideas independently.
- (c) Discuss the possible case lines. Possible examples to substantiate the case.
- (d) Define the topic. The definition must be reasonable. What would an average person on the street think that the topic means? Avoid unreasonable definitions. Don't block out the opposition. There has to be an issue to debate (no truisms!)
- (e) Develop a theme, an idea which will be underlining all three speeches.
- (f) Develop a split, on argument not example.
- (g) Work on individual speeches. The third speaker should think of possible lines of rebuttal.
- (h) Before the end of the preparation session, come together again and go over definition, theme and arguments so that everyone is comfortable with the case.

Remuneration Instructions

This section details the steps you will need to follow in order to receive an honorarium for the services you provide to WADL as an Adjudicator. Following this section correctly will ensure you are paid promptly at the conclusion of each round.

If you require further clarification on any part of this section, please get in contact with the league's Treasurer Felix King (treasurer@wadl.org).

1. Payment Information

The first form you will complete at the start of the year is the Adjudicator Payment Information form. WADL will provide an honorarium you for some services you provide via electronic funds transfer (EFT) to your nominated bank account.

Please ensure all fields on this form are completed and that your BSB and account number are correct. Sign and date the declaration on the bottom of the page and return it, together with your "Statement by a supplier" form, to your Head Adjudicator prior to the start of your first debate. It is imperative to ensure that the name provided on this form matches **exactly** to the name provided to your banking institution.

2. "Statement by a supplier" form

The second form you will complete at the start of the year is the Australian Tax Office (ATO) "Statement by a supplier" form. The services that you provide to WADL are considered as a "private recreational pursuit or hobby" and therefore do not require you to quote an Australian Business Number. In order for you to receive the full extent of your pay, you must indicate this on the form.

Please ensure both Section A and Section B of the Statement are completed in BLOCK LETTERS, using black pen, with one character in each box. Under Section A, question 3, please place an X next to the box as highlighted below. Sign and date the Statement and return to your Head Adjudicator prior to the start of your first debate.

3 Your reason/s for not quoting an ABN? Place ☒ in the appropriate box/es.

☐ The payer is not making the payment in the course of carrying on an enterprise in Australia.

☐ The supplier is an individual aged under 18 years and the payment does not exceed \$120 a week.

☐ The payment does not exceed \$75, excluding any goods and services tax (GST).

☐ The supply that the payment relates to is wholly input taxed.

The supplier is an individual and has given the payer a written statement to the effect that the supply is either:

☒ made in the course or furtherance of an activity done as a private recreational pursuit or hobby, or

☐ wholly of a private or domestic nature (from the supplier's perspective).

☐ The supply is made by an individual or partnership without a reasonable expectation of profit or gain.

☐ The supplier is not entitled to an ABN as they are not carrying on an enterprise in Australia.

☐ The whole of the payment is exempt income for the supplier.

a. PO Box 3263 Broadwa
a. Nedlands 6009

3. Remuneration rates

The pay rates per debate for 2019 are as follows.

- **Standard and Shadowing Adjudication:** \$26.50 per debate (with \$80 provided for three debates)
- **Metropolitan Head Adjudication:** \$40 per debate timeslot.
- **Regional Head Adjudication:** \$30 per debate timeslot
- **Finals Adjudication:** \$30 per debate.
- **BP Competition:** \$120 per day round.

4. Payment procedure

Each night which you adjudicate, head adjudicators will be provided a time sheet which lists the shifts adjudicators are expected to do and the opportunity to edit these as the night progresses. At the end of the night adjudicators will sign this pay sheet. Upon receipt of a completed timesheet the head adjudicator will submit this to the Treasurer.

At the end of each round, the Treasurer will process these payments according to the Financial Internal Control policy. Failure to sign the adjudicator time sheet will lead to non-payment for services.

Further it is expected as volunteers that adjudicators donate at least 1 adjudicator honoraria throughout the season to the league. On each paysheet, adjudicators will have the opportunity to indicate that they would like to donate any honoraria to the League.

4. Receiving Your Pay

WADL will pay you for your services via EFT, with the transfer being submitted one week after the end of a given round. After this payment has been processed a round specific invoice will be sent to you for your financial records this will include venue specific line items and note any donated honoraria.

Funds should clear your nominated bank account within one to two business days. Please contact the WADL Treasurer should there be any issue with an invoice payment not being received.

Volunteer Dress Code

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This policy details WADL's dress standards for volunteers, ensuring that all volunteers present themselves neatly and conservatively, reflecting the fact that they are providing professional services. All volunteers are required to adhere to these standards during the execution of their duties. Failure to do so will be deemed a Category C Breach under the WADL volunteer Code of Conduct, for which penalties may apply.
- 1.2. A set of dress standards are provided in this policy

2. Dress Standards

- 2.1. Acceptable volunteer dress includes the following
 - (i) Smart pants (including smart-looking jeans)
 - (ii) A skirt of a conservative length (generally below mid-thigh)
 - (iii) A smart dress of a conservative length (generally below mid-thigh)
 - (iv) A smart top or blouse (not required if the volunteer is wearing a dress)
 - (v) A button-down shirt
 - (vi) A smart polo shirt
 - (vii) A T-shirt, provided that the entirety of the shirt is covered by a jacket or jumper
 - (viii) Professional and conservative footwear
 - (ix) Smart trousers (including smart-looking jeans or chinos)
- 2.2. Unacceptable volunteer dress includes the following
 - (i) A singlet
 - (ii) Shorts
 - (iii) Gymwear or exercise clothing
 - (iv) Ripped or torn clothing
 - (v) Thongs
 - (vi) Leggings
 - (vii) Hooded jumpers
 - (viii) Hats or headwear (unless worn for religious reasons)
 - (ix) Any sheer or see-through garment
 - (x) Any garment exposing the midriff or excessive amounts of cleavage
 - (xi) Any garment bearing the logo of or otherwise promoting another community group, business, school, religious group or club or society

- (xii) Any garment bearing slogans or images that would be deemed by the average reasonable person to be offensive
- (xiii) Any heavily branded or otherwise non-professional garment

2.3. volunteers shall at all times adhere to a high standard of personal grooming

3. WADL Uniform

At any point, the Executive may decide to introduce a uniform for WADL volunteers. This uniform may consist of one or more items, and may not necessarily adhere to the standards set out in this policy. The executive may determine when this uniform shall be worn by volunteers.

- 3.1. When a volunteer has not received explicit instructions to wear the WADL uniform, they shall at all times during the execution of their duties dress in accordance with this policy
- 3.2. If the uniform consists of less than a full outfit, then the parts of a volunteer's outfit not regulated by the uniform shall be regulated by this policy

4. Photography and Accountability

As a part of their relationship with WADL, all volunteers agree to be photographed at any time during the execution of their duties, and for these photographs to be used by the Executive to determine whether breaches of this policy have occurred. volunteers may have their relationship with WADL terminated if they refuse to be photographed in this way.

Policy on Conduct Unbecoming During Debates

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This is a WADL policy outlining the action to be taken by adjudicators in the event of conduct unbecoming by debaters, teachers or members of the audience during a WADL debate.

2. Noise and Distraction

- 2.1. Where debaters, chairpersons, timekeepers or members of the audience are being unacceptably loud or are distracting the speaker during a debate the adjudicator has the right to intervene. The adjudicator should:
 - 1.1.1 Wait until the end of the speaker's debate before intervening. The adjudicator should not interrupt a debater mid-speech; and
 - 1.1.2 Politely speak to the person or persons involved and ask them to stop the offending conduct. The adjudicator should not lecture or discipline the person or persons involved.
- 2.2. If the offending conduct continues, the adjudicator should:
 - (i) In the case of a debater, warn the debater again and deduct manner marks accordingly (whether or not that person has already spoken); and
 - (ii) In the case of a chairperson or timekeeper or member of the audience, warn the person again. If the conduct still persists ask that person to leave the room. Adjudicators should seek the assistance of the Head Adjudicator if they are not comfortable asking the person to leave.

3. Offensive Behaviour

- 3.1. Offensive behaviour for the purposes of this policy is any behaviour by word or action which is likely to offend a participant or participants in the debate or a member or members of the audience. Offensive behaviour includes but is not limited to behaviour which:
 - (i) Is racist;
 - (ii) Is sexually explicit;
 - (iii) Constitutes a personal insult to a participant or participants in the debate; or
 - (iv) Involves the use of obscene language or gestures.
- 3.2. Where debaters, chairpersons or members of the audience are engaging in offensive behaviour during a debate the adjudicator has the right to intervene. The adjudicator should:

- (i) In the case of a debater currently giving his or her speech, interrupt the debater and ask them to stop the offensive behaviour, without lecturing or disciplining the debater. The adjudicator should also deduct manner marks immediately;
- (ii) In the case of a debater not currently giving his or her speech, wait until the end of the speaker's debate before intervening. The adjudicator should then politely speak to the person or persons involved and ask them to stop the offending conduct. The adjudicator should also deduct manner marks immediately (whether or not that person has already spoken); and
- (iii) In the case of a chairperson, timekeeper, member of the audience, or debater not currently giving his or her speech, wait until the end of the speaker's debate before intervening. The adjudicator should then politely speak to the person or persons involved and ask them to stop the offending conduct. The adjudicator should not lecture or discipline the person or persons involved.

3.3. If the offending conduct continues, the adjudicator should:

- (i) In the case of a debater, warn the debater again and deduct further manner marks (whether or not that person has already spoken); and
- (ii) In the case of a chairperson or timekeeper or member of the audience, warn the person again. If the conduct still persists ask that person to leave the room. Adjudicators should seek the assistance of the Head Adjudicator if they are not comfortable asking the person to leave.

4. Report to WADL Executive

- 4.1. If an adjudicator is required to act according to this Policy, the adjudicator must:
 - (i) Inform the Head Adjudicator at the venue at the end of the final debate, and
 - (ii) Prepare a brief written report outlining the details of the conduct involved, and forward the report to the Technical Vice-President within 48 hours of the debate.
- 4.2. After receiving the written report, the Technical Vice-President must inform the Executive.
- 4.3. After receiving the written report, the Technical Vice-President must prepare a written complaint:
 - (i) Within 7 days of receipt of the written report;
 - (ii) Addressed to the appropriate Debating Coordinator and Headmaster/Headmistress;
 - (iii) Outlining the conduct involved, the standards expected by WADL and a request that the person or persons involved be approached and spoken to about the standards expected by WADL; and

- (iv) Demanding a written response within 14 days.
- 4.4. The Technical Vice-President must report to the WADL Executive and the adjudicator involved regarding the written response.

Policy on the Management of Complaints

1. Introduction

WADL is committed to the professional well-being of its volunteers. While the League encourages parents, teachers and students to voice suggestions and criticisms, this policy endeavours to ensure that all WADL volunteers understand how to manage complaint professionally and productively. This policy outlines the procedure that volunteers should follow in the event that a WADL client complains about or questions either the work of an individual or the League.

2. Handling Concerns at a WADL Event

Debating is a competitive sport that necessarily has a winner and loser. It is not uncommon for WADL clients, particularly teachers and parents, to question an adjudicator after the result has been declared. This can happen publicly, during student feedback, or after an event in a private conversation. It is advised that all adjudicators answer questions with respect, and without appearing defensive. It is important that adjudicators do not second guess their decisions.

In the event that these interactions become distressing for any party, adjudicators must direct the complaint to the Head Adjudicator at the venue. Adjudicators should shut down any aggressive or persistent questioning and seek out the Head Adjudicator as quickly as possible. From there, the Head Adjudicator may decide to handle the complaint in person, or advise the client to voice their concerns in an email to the Technical Vice-President or WADL President. The Head Adjudicator must also inform the client that all WADL adjudications are final, and that, except in the case of a previously undisclosed rule break, WADL will not overturn a decision made by any adjudicator. It is recommended that adjudicators write down the details of any incidents that occur throughout a round. These notes will assist the Technical office in assessing the validity of a formal complaint.

If an adjudicator has been made to feel unsafe or has experienced any significant distress, the Head Adjudicator may offer to fill out an incident report, to be filed with the Technical Vice-President within 48hrs of the incident.

3. Handling Other Concerns

3.1 Online Contact

The personal contact details of WADL volunteers should never be shared with any WADL client. In the event that an adjudicator receives a complaint or question through any form of contact after or outside of a WADL event, such as via email or Facebook message, the adjudicator must inform the Technical Vice-President, who will assume all responsibility for any further correspondence.

3.2 Gossip

If an adjudicator should overhear any pernicious or insulting gossip about the outcome of a debate or the quality of an adjudication, they may exercise their best judgement as to whether to intervene. It is advised that adjudicators shut down gossip among clients by reminding them that other parents or students may be upset if they overheard, and to direct their frustration to the Technical Vice-President or WADL President in an email. If an adjudicator feels uncomfortable, they may ask the Head Adjudicator to step in and shut down the gossip instead.

Adjudicators are not to gossip about WADL, other volunteers, or the quality of any debates while working at a WADL event. Head Adjudicators have the authority to shut down any discussions that may be overheard and jeopardise the perception of WADL or its volunteers. Volunteers are also invited to share their concerns with the Technical Vice-President or Technical Officer in a private forum.