

Appendix A: The WUDC Speaker Scale⁵

The mark bands below are rough and general descriptions; **speeches need not have every feature described to fit in a particular band**. Many speakers will range across multiple bands depending on the feature assessed - for example, their style might appear in the 73-75 range, while their engagement might be closer to the 67-69 bracket, and their argumentation closest to the 70-72 range. Judges should not treat any individual feature as decisive in and of itself, but should rather aim to balance all features of the speech to come to the speaker score that seems most appropriate. Throughout this scale, **‘arguments’ refers both to constructive material and responses**. Judges should assess all speakers in a fair manner and must take note of the fact that **neither language proficiency nor accent influence a speaker’s speaker score**. Please use the full range of the scale.⁶

Score	Qualitative Comments
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.

⁵ Speaker scale initially created by Sam Block, Jonathan Leader Maynard and Alex Worsnip and updated by the Warsaw

⁶ See section 3.4 for more detailed information about filling in the ballot and determining speaker scores.

Score	Qualitative Comments
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.

Score	Qualitative Comments
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.

Appendix B: Chair Feedback Scale⁷

The mark bands below are rough and general descriptions; judges need not satisfy every feature described to fit in a particular band.

Score	General Description	Qualitative Comments
10	Exceptional	<p>Accuracy: Extremely accurate call, reflected through precise appreciation and very meticulous assessment of ‘close’ comparisons between teams; comprehensive recognition of all necessary inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Extremely well-justified justification, evidenced by flawlessly or near-flawlessly outlined explanations that are in-depth, insightful, and nuanced; explicit identification and strong justification for any weighing metrics or assumptions employed in judging.</p> <p>Discussion: Offers highly astute and insightful comments on the debate; highly efficient, and demonstrates profound acumen in managing the panel discussion and (where appropriate) offering constructive feedback to teams.</p>
9	Excellent	<p>Accuracy: Very accurate call, reflected through appreciation and correct assessment of ‘close’ comparisons between teams; comprehensive recognition of most necessary inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Very well-justified justification, evidenced by well-outlined explanations that are in-depth, insightful, and nuanced; good attempts made to justify weighing metrics in judging.</p> <p>Discussion: Offers very insightful comments on the debate; consistently efficient, and demonstrates effectiveness and judgement in managing the panel discussion.</p>

Score	General Description	Qualitative Comments
8	Very Good	<p>Accuracy: Accurate call, reflected through largely correct judgement regarding ‘close’ comparisons between teams; detailed recognition of most necessary inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Comprehensively justified justification, evidenced by well-outlined explanations that are in-depth and nuanced; very occasional slippage into minor assumptions or personal biases in judging, or minor lack of clarity in one or more inter-team comparisons; metrics for judging are identified but not explicitly justified.</p> <p>Discussion: Offers mostly insightful comments on the debate; largely efficient, and demonstrates effectiveness in managing the panel discussion.</p>
7	Good	<p>Accuracy: Accurate call, reflected through generally correct rankings but potentially wrong regarding ‘close’ comparisons between teams; careful acknowledgment of most necessary inter-team comparisons in consideration.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Generally well-justified justification, evidenced by well-outlined explanations; occasional slippage into minor personal biases and assumptions, or minor lack of clarity in some inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Discussion: Offers generally relevant comments on the debate; efficient with occasional slip-ups and flaws or imbalance in managing discussion; demonstrates an appropriate level of judgement (at times limited) in oral adjudication.</p>
6	Above Average	<p>Accuracy: Mostly accurate call, although may fail to get ‘close’ comparisons between teams correct.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Good attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating some appreciation of key clashes and how they are resolved; occasional slippage into minor or insignificant personal biases and assumptions; lack of clarity in some inter-team comparisons. Discussion: Offers some helpful or useful comments on the debate; somewhat inefficient and barely satisfactory at leading discussion; demonstrates a lack of understanding of the key issues in the debate in oral adjudication.</p>

Score	General Description	Qualitative Comments
5	Average	<p>Accuracy: Broadly accurate call that gets the ‘obvious’ clashes correct; may fail to produce accurate judgement regarding ‘close’ comparisons, or may neglect a significant but not substantial part of the debate.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Some attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating some appreciation of key clashes and issues; regular slippage into personal biases and assumptions, some of which may undermine the quality of the justification; lack of clarity regarding specific inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Discussion: Mostly inefficient at leading discussion; at times, struggles with catering to one or more voices on panel without reason; demonstrates lack of mature judgement in oral adjudication.</p>
4	Below Average	<p>Accuracy: Inaccurate call that nonetheless identifies the ‘obvious’ rankings correctly; call reflects one or more misunderstandings of the debate; some inability to track important arguments/responses.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Unsatisfactory attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrate some appreciation of key clashes and issues, but may not warrant or justify the posited call; frequent slippage into personal biases and assumptions, some undermining the quality of the justification; lack of clarity regarding most inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Discussion: Incompetent at managing discussion; struggles to consider or include all members on panel; somewhat irrelevant in oral adjudication.</p>
3	Poor	<p>Accuracy: Inaccurate call failing to identify one or more of the ‘obvious’ rankings correctly; call reflects several misunderstandings of the debate, some of which may be fundamental; some inability to track important arguments/responses.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Poor attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating no appreciation of key clashes and issues; frequent slippage into personal biases and assumptions, most of which certainly undermine the quality of the justification and severely distort the results; lack of clarity regarding most inter-team comparisons; justification occasionally slips into utter irrelevance.</p> <p>Discussion: Incompetent at managing discussion; struggles to consider or include all members on panel; mostly irrelevant in oral adjudication.</p>

Score	General Description	Qualitative Comments
2	Very Poor	<p>Accuracy: Wildly inaccurate call that completely fails to identify more than one of the ‘obvious’ rankings correctly; call reflects several core misunderstandings of the debate; clear inability to track important arguments/responses.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Little to no attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating no appreciation of key clashes and issues; frequent slippage into personal biases, irrelevance and assumptions, that cumulatively undermine the quality of the justification and severely skew the results; lack of clarity regarding most inter-team comparisons Discussion: Very incompetent at managing discussion; struggles to consider any views of all members on panel; irrelevant and potentially counterproductive in oral adjudication.</p>
1	Abysmal	<p>Accuracy: Completely inaccurate call that absolutely fails to identify more than one of the ‘obvious’ rankings correctly; call reflects a fundamental and foundational misunderstandings of both the debate and British Parliamentary debating in general; clear inability to track important arguments/responses.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Effectively no rationalisable attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating no or deeply erroneous appreciation of key clashes and issues; consistent slippage into unwarranted personal biases and assumptions that cumulatively undermine the quality of the justification and severely skew the results; utter irrelevance.</p> <p>Discussion: Entirely incompetent at managing discussion; struggles to consider any views of all members on panel; irrelevant and very counterproductive in oral adjudication.</p>

Appendix C: Panellist and Trainee Feedback Scale⁸

The mark bands below are rough and general descriptions; judges need not satisfy every feature described to fit in a particular band.

Score	General Description	Qualitative Comments
10	Exceptional	<p>Accuracy: Extremely accurate call, reflected through precise appreciation and very meticulous assessment of ‘close’ comparisons between teams (reflected through speaker scores); comprehensive recognition of all necessary inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Extremely well-justified justification, evidenced by flawlessly or near-flawlessly outlined explanations that are in-depth, insightful, and nuanced; explicit identification and strong justification for any weighing metrics or assumptions employed in judging; certainly should chair.</p> <p>Discussion: Outstanding contribution to the discussion that reflects exceptional judgement concerning what is relevant and useful to discussion, with a clear sense of prioritisation; highly helpful; incisive in commentary.</p>
9	Excellent	<p>Accuracy: Very accurate call, reflected through appreciation and correct assessment of ‘close’ comparisons between teams (reflected through speaker scores); comprehensive recognition of most necessary inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Very well-justified justification, evidenced by well-outlined explanations that are in-depth, insightful, and nuanced; good attempts made to justify weighing metrics in judging; should chair. Discussion: Valuable contribution to the discussion that reflects good judgement concerning what is relevant and useful to discussion; very helpful.</p>

⁸ Wing and Trainee scale originally created by the 2019 Athens EUDC CAP.

Score	General Description	Qualitative Comments
8	Very Good	<p>Accuracy: Accurate call, reflected through largely correct judgement regarding ‘close’ comparisons between teams; detailed recognition of most necessary inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Comprehensively justified justification, evidenced by well-outlined explanations that are in-depth and nuanced; very occasional slippage into minor assumptions or personal biases in judging, or minor lack of clarity in one or more inter-team comparisons; metrics for judging are identified but not explicitly justified; high potential to chair.</p> <p>Discussion: Comprehensive contribution to the discussion that reflects good judgement concerning what is relevant and useful to discussion; very helpful.</p>
7	Good	<p>Accuracy: Accurate call, reflected through generally correct rankings but potentially wrong regarding ‘close’ comparisons between teams; careful acknowledgment of most necessary inter-team comparisons in consideration.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Generally well-justified justification, evidenced by well-outlined explanations; occasional slippage into minor personal biases and assumptions, or minor lack of clarity in some inter-team comparisons; has potential to chair.</p> <p>Discussion: Good contribution to the discussion that reflects mostly good judgement about what is relevant and useful to discussion; helpful, with only minor lapses in attention and judgement.</p>
6	Above Average	<p>Accuracy: Mostly accurate call, although may fail to get ‘close’ comparisons between teams correct.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Good attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating some appreciation of key clashes and how they are resolved; occasional slippage into minor or insignificant personal biases and assumptions; lack of clarity in some inter-team comparisons. Discussion: Good contribution to the discussion that reflects mostly good judgments concerning what is relevant to discussion; helpful, with some lapses in attention and judgement.</p>

Score	General Description	Qualitative Comments
5	Average	<p>Accuracy: Broadly accurate call that gets the ‘obvious’ clashes correct; may fail to produce accurate judgement regarding ‘close’ comparisons, or may neglect a significant but not substantial part of the debate.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Some attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating some appreciation of key clashes and issues; regular slippage into personal biases and assumptions, some of which may undermine the quality of the justification; lack of clarity regarding specific inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Discussion: Average contribution to the discussion that reflects some judgement concerning what is relevant to discussion; mostly helpful, but may be unresponsive to prompts or generic at times.</p>
4	Below Average	<p>Accuracy: Inaccurate call that nonetheless identifies the ‘obvious’ rankings correctly; call reflects one or more misunderstandings of the debate; some inability to track important arguments/responses.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Unsatisfactory attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrate some appreciation of key clashes and issues, but may not warrant or justify the posited call; frequent slippage into personal biases and assumptions, some undermining the quality of the justification; lack of clarity regarding most inter-team comparisons.</p> <p>Discussion: Average contribution to the discussion that can be at times irrelevant; sometimes helpful, but frequently unresponsive to prompts or generic.</p>
3	Poor	<p>Accuracy: Inaccurate call failing to identify one or more of the ‘obvious’ rankings correctly; call reflects several misunderstandings of the debate, some of which may be fundamental; some inability to track important arguments/responses.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Poor attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating no appreciation of key clashes and issues; frequent slippage into personal biases and assumptions, most of which certainly undermine the quality of the justification and severely distort the results; lack of clarity regarding most inter-team comparisons; justification occasionally slips into utter irrelevance.</p> <p>Discussion: Below-average contribution to the discussion that reflects somewhat flawed understanding; rarely helpful; generic or occasionally unhelpful commentary.</p>

Score	General Description	Qualitative Comments
2	Very Poor	<p>Accuracy: Wildly inaccurate call that completely fails to identify more than one of the 'obvious' rankings correctly; call reflects several core misunderstandings of the debate; clear inability to track important arguments/responses.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Little to no attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating no appreciation of key clashes and issues; frequent slippage into personal biases, irrelevance and assumptions, that cumulatively undermine the quality of the justification and severely skew the results; lack of clarity regarding most inter-team comparisons Discussion: Poor contribution to the discussion; unhelpful; at times counterproductive to discussion.</p>
1	Abysmal	<p>Accuracy: Completely inaccurate call that absolutely fails to identify more than one of the 'obvious' rankings correctly; call reflects a fundamental and foundational misunderstandings of both the debate and British Parliamentary debating in general; clear inability to track important arguments/responses.</p> <p>Reasoning/Justification: Effectively no rationalisable attempt at justifying decision; explanations demonstrating no or deeply erroneous appreciation of key clashes and issues; consistent slippage into unwarranted personal biases and assumptions that cumulatively undermine the quality of the justification and severely skew the results; utter irrelevance.</p> <p>Discussion: Very poor contribution to the discussion; highly obstructionist; detrimental to the panel.</p>