



GUIDE FOR THE PUBLIC SPEAKING & DEBATING DIRECTOR

Index

1. Introduction

2. Rules for debates

3. Guidelines for debaters
Matter – 40 points
Manner – 40 points
Method – 20 points

4. Adjudicators notes for debating

5. Guidelines for public speakers

6. Rules for Public Speaking.

7. Acknowledgments

8. Appendix
Debating scoresheets
Public speaking scoresheets

“It usually takes more than 3 weeks to prepare a good impromptu speech.”

Mark Twain (1835-1910)

“People generally quarrel because they cannot argue.”

Gilbert K. Chesterton

Your Club List of adjudicators and their phone numbers.

Name

Telephone

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1. Debating – Introduction

Debating in Apex is designed to be enjoyable and at the same time develop the Apexians ability to express themselves in public.

In a debate, each speaker has a specific role to play, and it must be remembered that debating is a team effort involving argument, and not necessarily three good public speakers.

Debating provides an important facet of leadership training in that:

1. It provides an opportunity to practice speaking in public;
2. Creates an interest to gain further knowledge (research of topic);
3. Forces one to listen to the other mans' point of view;
4. Teaches one to recognize a weakness or weaknesses in an argument;
5. Encourages sound thinking and to use logic;
6. Teaches the operation and value of teamwork;
7. Trains men and women to think whilst on their feet.

The development of these attributes helps to mould our character, and assists us in playing a greater role in our communities as leaders and accepting leadership roles.

2. Rules for Apex Debating

1. A debate is a contest between two teams of three speakers each.
2. The first debater for the affirmative team speaks first, followed by a speaker from the negative team, alternating until the final speaker, who is always from the negative team.
3. The final speaker from the negative team may not introduce new material into the debate.
4. Each speaker shall speak for five (5) minutes with a warning bell at four minutes and two bells at five minutes.
5. To speak longer than the allotted time is unfair, and therefore adjudicators should ignore what is uttered after the five minute bell.
6. All competitions to use the official Apex debating scoresheets.
7. All competitions to have three adjudicators whose decision is final.
8. Each adjudicator shall add up the Speakers' marks to determine whom he thinks won the debate. The winning team is decided by either a majority 2-1, or unanimous 3-0 verdict. Note the adjudicators total scores are not to be added together as this can produce an incorrect result.

9. If a team fails to attend within fifteen minutes of the scheduled starting time of the debate, then they are considered to have forfeited that debate. (District Governor discretion may be required in extenuating circumstances).

10. All competitions to have an official time keeper who must inform the adjudicators how long an individual spoke for.

11. The official dictionary used in Apex debates is the Australian Concise Oxford Dictionary.

12. With respect to Secondary School debating, the competition is open to all students under the age of eighteen years on the 30th of June in that particular year.

13. Organizers should endeavour to present official certificates, with names already printed on them, to debaters on the night.

14. Certificates and scoresheets are available from Supply House.

3. Guidelines for Debaters

General

What's the difference between debating and public speaking?

Good question. A public speaker may deliver a well prepared speech, may deal with a subject close to the speakers heart, and may have the speech well rehearsed.

A debater needs to prepare information and arguments, but cannot rehearse these. The final configuration of his argument will depend on the arguments presented by his own team members and members of the opposition. A debater may also find himself debating a topic he has little interest in, or find himself debating for the side of the argument he personally disagrees with.

Therefore, good debaters are able to think on their feet, divorce themselves from their own beliefs and construct a sincere argument regardless of the topic. This requires imagination and research.

Teamwork in the form of co-ordination between the arguments of all debaters is desirable and should be apparent. In particular, the second and third speakers should present arguments consistent with the interpretation of the subject presented by the first speaker.

Teamwork is exemplified by the manner in which debaters support, elaborate and emphasise each others' arguments to strengthen their case, while destroying the arguments of their opponents

All debaters need to come to grips with the arguments of the opposition and rebut them whenever possible.

In the event of a conflict upon a point of interpretation, subsequent speakers should not overlook or ignore the conflict, but seek to clarify their team's case.

Each speaker after the first affirmative should not fail to deal with the arguments of the speaker immediately preceding him.

Debating is a team event, and the better team always wins.

Matter – 40 points

Talk sense. What you say must make be logical. Stick to your guns, be convincing and avoid a hesitant presentation. It is better to deliver simple arguments that you understand yourself and can convey with confidence, than lofty, abstract arguments that have you grasping for words and failing to convince your audience.

Presentation. Sometimes in debating, less is more. Many people fall into the trap of wanting to avoid standing there with nothing to say. So they compile 20 minutes of arguments to ensure safety ie. That the bell will ring and they can sit down having over filled five minutes. This inevitably results in the speaker failing to summarise his teams case or doing it in a rushed fashion, and most importantly the speaker fails to rebut the opposition case. Debating is not about who can present the greatest number of reasons for their case. It is primarily about destroying the opposition argument and building your own credible case.

Dictionary, encyclopaedia and personal quotations should receive appropriate but minimal use. Avoid statistics unless they are essential. Avoid reciting passages. Speak as you would to a friend. Put what you have read and learned into your own words.

Definitions. Avoid beginning the debate with a dictionary definition of every word. Define only what is essential for a reasonable listener to be able to understand your interpretation of the case. Some debates get bogged down in definition debates, or quibbling over the meaning of words, which is bad debating, and certain to discourage the audience and future debaters. Definitions should not be used to excuse a debater from answering the opponent's case.

A debate is a verbal fight. Each speaker except first affirmative must join issue with his opponents demolishing their case while consolidating their own.

Consider vocabulary carefully. Some words are powerful and create an image the audience will be sympathetic to. Other words are wishy washy and put listeners to sleep.

While preparing your case, consider the other side. Study counter arguments and prepare rebuttal in advance. This will help you on the night and allow you more thinking time to consider the unexpected arguments of the opposition and rebut those thoughtfully.

Cards are best. Avoid the large sheet of paper – it's too easy to get lost on a single page in the thrust of a debate when you're gesturing and thumping the lectern. With cards, when in doubt where you're up to, simply turn over to the next card and maintain your momentum. Keep it to one or two ideas in point form on a card. Don't write half your debate in tiny print on a single business card.

Keep in mind an average speaker speaks at a rate of 180 words a minute. Therefore if you have 20 cards, each card should last fifteen seconds or about forty-five words which is the same number in this paragraph. Read it aloud and check.

Did you take fifteen seconds? Excellent if you did. That's a comfortable listening rate for your audience. If you took more than 20 seconds then you're too slow – you're audience will be anticipating your words before you say them and they will soon drift off to sleep. If you took less than ten seconds, then you're a bit of a motor mouth. Your audience won't be able to keep up, and you'll lose them after sixty seconds. Pace yourself, by using cards. They are an excellent tool.

Be original. Avoid cliches. Try and present arguments that will catch out your opposition and when they fail to rebut them, reiterate them and remind them of their failure.

Manner – 40 points

Appearance - relaxed stance, eye contact with audience, neat dress, gesture in controlled fashion, poise, confidence.

Voice Pitch - The debater must be heard. Pitch to be adjusted for size of hall.

Enunciation – Careful, crisp, clear. Avoid slurring, dropping voice at end of sentences or upward inflection at end of sentences.

Speed – slower for large halls, but deliberately slow for emphasis only. Variation of speed is desirable.

Emphasis - very important to place emphasis on points you want audience to recall.

Diction - vocabulary reflects background of speaker. Use short words rather than long words. Your audience will understand you better.

Phrasing - avoid cliches, technical jargon and acronyms. If you must use them explain them.

Language - suitable colloquialisms allowed.

Technique - Reiterate keywords phrases, paraphrases. Avoid rote learning and recital in debate. Good opening and good conclusion vital to attract attention and leave an unambiguous message in the minds of the audience. Quote the source or the authority for statistics definitions, or quotations. Humour is very good to use.

Etiquette Always address the chairman and not the adjudicators or other individuals. Speak as a team : “We think” not “I think”.
Observe time limit.
Cast scorn on your opponents' arguments, not your opponents.
You can question an opponents facts or sources, but not their truthfulness or their sincerity.

Method – 20 points

Speech Construction - Introduction and first contact with the audience is critical. Make it interesting. A quotation, or brief relevant story may be appropriate.

Foreshadow the ground to be covered by the speech – the main points.

Body – development of stated theme or enlargement or emphasis on main arguments.

Conclusion – vital – the final words to the audience should be clear, concise and leave a lasting impression.

1st Affirmative Speaker

Should give a general interpretation of the subject defining particular terms where necessary, outline his teams' case and how the team will deliver it, introduce the rest of his team, and begin the task of developing their case. As the first speaker has no opportunity for rebuttal, his argument should be very well planned and constructed with a brief summary and finish on time.

2nd Affirmative speaker

Should reaffirm the definition (if opposed); Should indulge in criticism of the negative case; Support the first affirmative speaker and develop the affirmative case as outlined by the first affirmative speaker; Introduce as much new material as possible. Provide a summary of the argument.

3rd Affirmative speaker

Attack the negative case; Attack the arguments of the 2nd negative debater; Then attack the arguments of the 1st negative debater; Bring to a logical conclusion the affirmative case, (may use new material); Should debate strongly against the negative case, soundly sum up both cases and contrast the two. Should present a strong, unambiguous conclusion.

1st Negative speaker

Should deal with the affirmative's interpretation of the subject where necessary. There may be an opportunity for a prepared attack on the opposition. This speaker needs to accept or reject the 1st affirmatives definition. If the 1st negative does not comment on the definition, then it is assumed his team agrees with it. This speaker needs to indicate the negative attitude to the affirmative case, deal with the 1st affirmative speakers main arguments, introduce arguments in favour of the negative case, introduce the rest of the negative team, and provide a brief summary of the negative case.

2nd Negative speaker

Opening attack on the affirmative case;
Attack arguments of second affirmative speaker; Attack any arguments of the first affirmative speaker overlooked by 1st negative; Should indulge in criticism of the affirmative

case and develop the negative case as outlined by leader with argument and by the introduction of as much new material as possible;
Summary.

3rd Negative speaker

Strong Introduction; Attack affirmative speakers' arguments in reverse order; Contrast affirmative and negative cases; Should debate strongly against the affirmative case, round off and sum up the negative case without introducing new matter; (The third speaker may only utter something previously unsaid, without penalty, if it is in direct rebuttal against an affirmative argument.)
Summary.

4. Guide to Adjudicators of debating

Functions of the adjudicators are twofold: evaluate and educate.

The main function is to compare the overall performance of the two teams arriving at a decision regarding who has won the debate, announce the decision and very importantly explain the reasons for the decision.

Debaters put a considerable effort into their preparation, and it behoves adjudicators to make a commensurate effort.

The second function of the adjudicators is to offer some level of helpful advice. A thoughtful and imaginative adjudicator can contribute a great deal to the participants' development and the success of the occasion.

It is therefore imperative for the adjudicators to fully understand the rules and nature of debating. Adjudicators should not shrink from being critical when criticism is warranted, but debaters should be told of their strengths as well as their weaknesses.

The following should serve as a guide for novice adjudicators and a refresher for experienced judges.

1. The adjudicator should consider himself part of the audience;
2. The adjudicator should remember the debate is between the two teams and not one or both teams and the adjudicator.
3. The adjudicator must be objective and not allow his personal judgements on the subject under debate to influence the decision;
4. Adjudicators should make remarks and offer advice appropriate to the age and standard of the debaters;
5. Adjudicators must be prepared to discuss matters afterwards. Some remarks about individual debaters may be better made then;
6. Adjudicators should not take advantage of their position as a critic;
7. Only the information that was presented should be assessed;

8. The adjudicator must not enter the debate, but he must assess the arguments presented. If a speaker presents what is a very weak argument, and his opponent fails to point out the weakness, it is wrong to regard the weak argument as strong. The correct approach is to give a low mark for the weak argument, and a low mark for the opponent who failed to pick it up. It is wrong to suspend judgement, or inflate the marks for the weak argument. In this fashion low marks reflect the poor quality of a debate;
9. It should be remembered that the adjudicator decides the outcome of the debate – not the marks. The marks assist the adjudicator to arrive at his decision, but if at the conclusion of the debate his decision and his marks are in conflict, he should reconsider his marks, and if necessary adjust them. The adjudicator may amend his own marks as he sees fit;
10. Judging the matter – the adjudicator is not expected to be an expert on the subject under debate;
11. The adjudicator must be prepared to keep an open mind and listen to both sides of an argument. Credit must be given for arguments that are sound based on commonsense, general knowledge, common beliefs or attitudes and quoted authorities;
12. It is not for the adjudicator to defend, rebut or add any argument put forward, but he may comment on why a particular line of argument appealed to him. Under no circumstances should he add arguments of his own. He should recall the one inflexible rule that the third speaker negative may not introduce new matter, except by way of attack or defence of material already introduced;
13. In judging debates, the speakers manner must be divorced from his matter. One of the most common faults of adjudicators is that they fail distinguish between the three marking categories;
14. When the subject is a quotation eg. *“To be or not to be”*, the interpretation of the quote is open to argument between the two teams;
15. Tautology – A team may not attack their opponents interpretation on the basis that it makes their own case undebatable, and therefore the interpretation be dismissed. That is not valid ground for dismissing the opposing interpretation. They must prove it wrong for it to be rejected;
16. Parallel cases-a definition debate may arise when one side assumes a literal meaning and the other a metaphorical meaning, and on the face of it, both are reasonable. In this case the debaters should argue why their interpretation is the correct one;
17. Universality – as a general rule, a general proposition is satisfactorily affirmed if it shown to be generally true; it is satisfactorily negated if it is shown to be generally untrue;
18. 3rd negative and new matter – often difficult for adjudicators to be 100% on this. As a general rule, a new concept offends against the rule, but new matter introduced as direct rebuttal is not;
19. The adjudicator should assess whether the speaker has projected himself as a sincere personality giving regards to use of voice, eye contact, notes and gestures;
20. Humour- a good test to bear in mind is whether the humour helps the speaker to do something he should be doing in the debate.

A good adjudicator is a valuable asset for any Club, not only for his ability as an adjudicator, but also for his capacity to disseminate knowledge to debaters and novice adjudicators.

5. Public Speaking Guidelines

Introduction

The ability to speak in public is arguably the greatest benefit Apexians gain from joining this great Association. Nervous first timers experienced campaigners and confident blokes who are perhaps a bit ocker, are thrown together in Apex and typically a fine blend of speaker emerges. Usually Apexians who can think on their feet, propose a humorous toast or formal vote of thanks and most importantly become more effective members of their community, because they can communicate verbally.

Public Speaking challenges you to communicate what is inside your own head, into the head of every other person listening to you, and most importantly, keep it there.

This requires a certain knowledge, imagination and an array of speaking strategies, to emphasis your ideas and successfully deliver them.

We were told that computers would give rise to paperless offices. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are inundated with the written word, with less and less time to read it. There is only so much we can read ourselves. The person who can communicate their ideas by speaking confidently, has such a huge advantage. When you attend public meetings, you will easily distinguish the bumbling rambling's of the untrained from the confidence and poise of past and present Apexians. Apexians are people who can make their point and raise the questions that have to be asked.

It falls to the Public Speaking Director in each Club to be inventive, creative and enthusiastic about his portfolio, and infect the rest of his Club with that enthusiasm.

Apex conducts two great National Public Speaking competitions. The first is for Apexians. It commences with the Club Annual Public Speaking contest, usually held shortly after handover. Each Club winner proceeds to the District Final, which is usually, but not always, held at the District Convention. Each District winner proceeds to the State Final, which is held in each State at the respective State Convention. Finally the State winners receive a trip to the National Convention to decide the National Public Speaking Champion.

Apex also conducts a Secondary School Public Speaking competition. The District Governor announces the date the competition will be held, and local schools are invited to nominate a speaker. Each District winner proceeds to the State Final, which is usually conducted at the Executive Training Seminar (ETS). The State winners proceed to the same National Convention with their Apexian counterparts, where the two competitions are run concurrently. Both of these competitions are highlights of the National Convention.

It is the duty of each Public Speaking Director to ensure his Club is represented at his District Final, and that his local Secondary School(s) has been invited to nominate a student.

South Australians have a terrific record in both the Apex and School competitions, especially the South-East District. The success stems from well run and competitive Club, District and State Finals.

How can the Director encourage Public Speaking?

Often the Director is faced with the word “No” from Apexians he has invited to partake in a form of Public Speaking. It may be a nervous no or a stubborn refusal. In many cases, the blokes who reckon they “can’t speak” are the same Apexians who speak on every motion, give lengthy Director’s reports to the Club, and stay at the bar till 1.00am spinning yarns. Yet when the director asks them to speak for five minutes on their first job or their first car or their first girlfriend, they reckon they can’t do it.

Persistence, variation and fun are the keys to coaxing the nervous and stubborn to have a go.

Each Club can help its’ members, both weak and strong speakers, to increase their speaking ability and improve their style by conducting contests, debates and shorter forms of speaking which force the Apexian to stand on his feet and address the Club.

Ideas for Club Public Speaking

The **fine session** is a great place to start. Tell a new member a joke and ask him to tell it during the course of fining someone. Or, ask an Apexian to give an **introduction** for the guest speaker or a formal **vote of thanks**.

Club Competition: This really is a must. Include the whole Club. Have four or five speakers each meeting until the whole Club has spoken. Ensure you have past Apexians present to give a proper adjudication, encouragement and advice to the speakers. Ensure that you use the official Apex scoresheets, which are particularly useful and easy to use. Have the adjudicators nominate a winner for each meeting. Then have your own Club Final, to decide the Club winner to represent you at the District Final. If you do not have a Club Public speaking trophy – then you should. Take the initiative to instigate one immediately, with the Club champion receiving the trophy at the annual handover dinner.

A useful tip. Often the greatest stumbling block, especially for newer members, is deciding exactly what to talk about. You can ease Apexians into speaking by choosing a topic for them. This saves them the angst of selecting their own.

Chain speaking: This can involve the entire Club. The Chairman gives the first speaker his subject and two minutes to talk. During the course of the two minutes, the Chairman hits the gong, repeats the last word or words of the speaker, which then become the subject for the next speaker and so on. By judicious use of the gong, the Chairman can make the subjects and the whole event great entertainment. A winner can be chosen.

Critique: This has declined in use in recent years in many Clubs, but asking a member to provide a critique is not only an excellent speaking opportunity, but also a way to sharpen up the Club’s meeting procedure. Give it a try. A different member each meeting is asked to comment in constructive fashion on the chairmanship and speaking at the meeting. This is done toward the end of the meeting and should take about one to three minutes.

Table topics: Each meeting a member is selected and advised in advance of a current topic. eg. Mobile phones and brain tumours; the cricket match fixing scandal; the Wilcannia Aborigine problem; Qantas contemporary flight safety record are all suitable table topics. The Apexian then gives a brief introduction to the topic and then asks three pertinent questions to different members at the meeting. The Apexians who are questioned are required to stand up and offer their opinion. Often, you will find that more than three Apexians will want to share their views. The Chairman may then elect to extend the session to include those views. Table Topics is guaranteed to raise the most reticent member of the Club to his or her feet, given the right topic. If you're trying to invigorate Public Speaking in your Club after a conspicuous absence, then Table Topics is the place to start.

Impromptu speaking:

1

Sometimes you will find that whenever a certain Apexian is scheduled to speak at the meeting, he mysteriously becomes an apology, or a very late arrival. In these cases, you may be better off springing a topic on him by surprise at the start of the meeting, and getting him to speak for only 1 or 2 minutes later on. You are not out to embarrass anyone, but while he might not thank you on the night, down the track he will recall the night well, and probably have a good laugh about it. At the same time you will have done him a great favour. Remember evolution is better than revolution. It's better to at least get the shy ones speaking, even if only for a minute, and then build up to a five minute speech, than to try and turn the whole Club into Eddie McGuire clones overnight.

It is a good idea to be completely familiar with the rules of Public Speaking and Debating, and to keep this guide handy.

You can be assured that an Apexian, teacher, parent or student will challenge you on how to score a debate, or how long speakers are meant to speak for. Be firm, and stick to the rules.

If your District is one of those that runs seven minute debates or three minute public speaking, then this is the year to conform. In the past there have been embarrassing moments when State Finals have been contested with speeches and debates of different lengths.

Keep your Club interested in Public Speaking by trying different ideas and changing formats before interest wanes. If you do, you will have a most rewarding year as the Director. All the best.

6. Rules for Public Speaking Competitions

1. Official Apex scoresheets to be used.
 2. All competitions to have three adjudicators and their decision is final.
 3. In addition to announcing a winner, the adjudicators shall announce a Runner-up.
 4. In the event that the winner cannot proceed to the next level of competition, the Runner-up shall substitute.
 5. All competitions to have an official timekeeper, who must inform the adjudicators how long an individual spoke for.
 6. All speakers to speak for five minutes. A single, loud, warning bell is to be rung at four minutes, followed by two rings at five minutes.
-

7. The time starts from the first sound that is uttered by the speaker.
8. Adjudicators are to ignore what is said after the five minute bells.
9. All competitions to have a chairman to introduce each speaker.
10. The order of speaking is to be determined by ballot.
11. A suitable trophy to be awarded at District, State and National level.
12. A Perpetual trophy to be awarded at Club, District, State and National level.
13. With respect to Secondary school Public Speaking, the competition is open to all students under the age of eighteen years on the 30th of June in the year of the competition.
14. Organizers should endeavour to have official Apex Public Speaking certificates, with the names already printed on them, for presentation on the night.
15. Certificates are available from Supply House. Scoresheets are available on disc or hard copy from Supply House, or you can copy the one in the Appendix.

7. Acknowledgments

This manual has been compiled, plagiarised, copied, rewritten, added to, adulterated, edited, censored and put together by Apexian Peter Oswald from a variety of sources which deserve recognition:

Apex Club of Hummock Hill – Public Speaking & Debating (Author unknown)

Apex Clubs of Australia “Guide to Public Speaking and Debating Director” (Author , year unknown)

Life Member, Garth Whitchurch, National Board, Apex Liasion Officer

Alan Witham

Recollections and anecdotes from my days as public Speaking and Debating director at the Naracoorte and Kadina Apex Clubs.

8. Appendix

Debating scoresheets

Public Speaking scoresheet

DEBATE MARKING SHEET

1. First Speaker Affirmative

Name _____

TITLE OF DEBATE :		MATTER	MANNER	METHOD
OPENING	Ineffective 0 Aroused attention 4 Too long 0			/4
Introduction of their side	Vague 0 Clear 6			/6
Definition	Vague 0 Clear 5	/5		
Arguments	1 2 3 4 5 etc Too many? (max 25 marks)	/25		
Delivery	Unenthusiastic 0 Well modulated 10 Overacted 0		/10	
Effect on audience	No contact 0 Good contact 10		/10	
Conclusion	Too vague 0 Clear 7			/7
Overall preparation	None 0 Well prepared 10 Mechanical 0	/10		
Timing	Too short 0 On time 3 Too long 0			/3
Appearance	Untidy 0 Neat 4		/4	
Notes Gestures Stance	Indifferent 0 Natural 16 Distracting 0		/16	
		Column totals		
		Maximum	40	40
		Final Total		100

DEBATE MARKING SHEET

2. First Speaker Negative

Name _____

TITLE OF DEBATE :		MATTER	MANNER	METHOD
OPENING	Ineffective 0 Aroused attention 4 Too long 0			/4
Introduction of their side	Vague 0 Clear 6			/6
Definition	Vague 0 Clear 5	/5		
Arguments	1 2 3 4 5 etc Too many? (max 17 marks)	/17		
Rebutal	Clear? Effective? (max 8)	/8		
Delivery	Unenthusiastic 0 Well modulated 10 Overacted 0		/10	
Effect on audience	No contact 0 Good contact 10		/10	
Conclusion	Too vague 0 Clear 7			/7
Overall preparation	None 0 Well prepared 10 Mechanical 0	/10		
Timing	Too short 0 On time 3 Too long 0			/3
Appearance	Untidy 0 Neat 4		/4	
Notes Gestures Stance	Indifferent 0 Natural 16 Distracting 0		/16	
		Column totals		
		Maximum	40	40
		Final Total		100

DEBATE MARKING SHEET

3. Second Speaker Affirmative Name _____

TITLE OF DEBATE:		MATTER	MANNER	METHOD
OPENING	Ineffective 0 Aroused attention 4 Too long 0			/4
Arguments	1 2 3 4 etc (max 18 marks)	/18		
Rebutal	(max 12)	/12		
Delivery	Unenthusiastic 0 Well modulated 10 Overacted 0		/10	
Effect on audience	No contact 0 Good contact 10		/10	
Tie in with 1 st speaker	No co-ordination 0 Spoke as planned 4			/4
Conclusion	Too vague 0 Clear 9			/9
Overall preparation	None 0 Well prepared 10 Mechanical 0	/10		
Timing	Too short 0 On time 3 Too long 0			/3
Appearance	Untidy 0 Neat 4		/4	
Notes Gestures Stance	Indifferent 0 Natural 16 Distracting 0		/16	
		Column totals		
		Maximum	40	40
		Final Total		100

DEBATE MARKING SHEET

4. Second Speaker Negative

Name _____

TITLE OF DEBATE :		MATTER	MANNER	METHOD
OPENING	Ineffective 0 Aroused attention 4 Too long 0			/4
Arguments	1 2 3 4 etc (max 18 marks)	/18		
Rebutal	(max 12)	/12		
Delivery	Unenthusiastic 0 Well modulated 10 Overacted 0		/10	
Effect on audience	No contact 0 Good contact 10		/10	
Tie in with 1 st speaker	No co-ordination 0 Spoke as planned 4			/4
Conclusion	Too vague 0 Clear 9			/9
Overall preparation	None 0 Well prepared 10 Mechanical 0	/10		
Timing	Too short 0 On time 3 Too long 0			/3
Appearance	Untidy 0 Neat 4		/4	
Notes Gestures Stance	Indifferent 0 Natural 16 Distracting 0		/16	
		Column totals		
		Maximum	40	40
		Final Total		100

DEBATE MARKING SHEET

5. Third Speaker Affirmative

Name _____

TITLE OF DEBATE:		MATTER	MANNER	METHOD
OPENING	Ineffective 0 Aroused attention 4 Too long 0			/4
Arguments	1 2 3 4 etc As outlined by First speaker (max 12 marks)	/12		
Rebutal	(max 18)	/18		
Delivery	Unenthusiastic 0 Well modulated 10 Overacted 0		/10	
Effect on audience	No contact 0 Good contact 10		/10	
Team Summary & Conclusion	No co-ordination 0 Good & Clear 13			/13
Overall preparation	None 0 Well prepared 10 Mechanical 0	/10		
Timing	Too short 0 On time 3 Too long 0			/3
Appearance	Untidy 0 Neat 4		/4	
Notes Gestures Stance	Indifferent 0 Natural 16 Distracting 0		/16	
		Column totals		
		Maximum	40	40
		Final Total		100

DEBATE MARKING SHEET

6. Third Speaker Negative

Name _____

TITLE OF DEBATE :		MATTER	MANNER	METHOD
OPENING	Ineffective 0 Aroused attention 4 Too long 0			/4
Rebutal	1 2 3 4 etc Max points 30 (minus points for introducing new material)	/30		
Delivery	Unenthusiastic 0 Well modulated 10 Overacted 0		/10	
Effect on audience	No contact 0 Good contact 10		/10	
Team Summary & Conclusion	No co-ordination 0 Good & Clear 13			/13
Overall preparation	None 0 Well prepared 10 Mechanical 0	/10		
Timing	Too short 0 On time 3 Too long 0			/3
Appearance	Untidy 0 Neat 4		/4	
Notes	Indifferent 0			
Gestures	Natural 16			
Stance	Distracting 0		/16	
		Column totals		
		Maximum	40	40
		Final Total		100



EFFECTIVE SPEAKING – MARKING SHEET

Note: Peruse all sections before the speaker begins, but do not attempt to evaluate ratings while the speaker is in action.
Listen to what the speaker says, and how he/she says it.

NAME OF SPEAKER: _____

SUBJECT	0	2	4	6	8	10	8	6	4	2	0	MATTER 40
	UNINTERESTING				INTERESTING				VAGUE			
INFORMATION	0	4	8	12	16	20	16	12	8	4	0	_____
	NONE				AMPLE				CONFUSED			
PREPARATION	0	2	4	6	8	10	8	6	4	2	0	_____
	NONE				WELL PREPARED				MECHANICAL			

EFFECT ON AUDIENCE	0	2	4	6	8	10	8	6	4	2	0	MANNER 40
	NO CONTACT				COMPLETE CONTACT				ANTAGONISTIC			
PRESENTATION NOTES & GESTURE	0	2	4	6	8	10	8	6	4	2	0	_____
	INDIFFERENT				NATURAL				DISTRACTING			
DELIVERY	0	3	6	9	12	15	12	9	6	3	0	_____
	UNENTHUSIASTIC				WELL MODULATED EFFECTIVE LIGHT AND SHADE				OVERACTED			
APPEARANCE	0	1	2	3	4	5	4	3	2	1	0	_____
	UNTIDY				NEAT				OVER-DRESSED			

OPENING	0	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	0	METHOD 20		
	INEFFECTIVE				AROUSED ATTENTION				TOO LONG			
ARGUMENT	0	2	4	6	8	6	4	2	0	_____		
	NO PLAN				LOGICAL				POINTLESS			
CONCLUSION	0	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	0	_____		
	NONE				LEFT WITH CLEAR IDEAS				CONFUSED			
TIMING	0	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	0	_____		
	TOO SHORT				CORRECT				TOO LONG			

TOTAL (100) _____