

# JUDGING

@ShyRuparel

MLH Office Hours | March 7th 2016

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- » 01. Objectives & Constraints
- 02. Judging Styles
- 03. Briefing the Judges
- 04. How to Run Judging
- 05. Dealing with Issues
- 06. Q&A





**SHY**  
CSHYRUPAREL

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER**  
MAJOR LEAGUE HACKING

**MLH**



**JUDGING**



**MAJOR LEAGUE HACKING**

POWERED BY



# OBJECTIVES



## WHAT'S OUR GOAL?

Participants feeling like they got a fair shot, everyone feeling like the best hacks won, & the audience having seen a good show.



## WHAT IS YOUR ROLE?

Your role is to help explain how the process works, supervise that things are happening correctly, & deal with any issues that arise.





Celebrate  
Every Hack

MLH



Make Hackers  
Feel Awesome

# CONSTRAINTS

Judges are  
**Arbitrary**

Judges Are  
**Subjective**



Judges are  
**People**

Judging Time  
is  
**Finite**

A Judge can't  
**Evaluate Projects**  
they haven't seen

A Judge can't judge  
**Two Prizes**  
at once

# **STYLES OF JUDGING**



# **PRESENTATION**

## **US.**

### **EXPO**

# **PRESENTATION STYLE**

# Everyone demos on Stage





300> Hackers



# Logistically Simple



March 6th - 8th, 2015  
[hackarizona.org](http://hackarizona.org)

#HackArizona

NO SMOKING

MLH



A group of people, mostly young adults, are seated in rows in a room with a grid-patterned wall. They are engaged in various activities: some are looking forward, some are looking down at papers or devices. In the foreground, a woman in a blue hoodie is writing on a clipboard labeled 'HACK 00'. Other people are also writing or looking at papers. The overall atmosphere is one of focused activity.

3-5 Judges

**EXPO STYLE**





Everyone demos  
**Simultaneously**





300+ Hackers

MLH





# Logistically Complex



A photograph of a man with glasses and a dark jacket, likely a judge, standing behind a purple-covered table. He is holding a small notepad and a pen, and is engaged in conversation with two young men in the foreground. The young man on the left is wearing glasses and a dark shirt, while the one on the right is also in a dark shirt. On the table, there is a silver laptop, a black DSLR camera, and a small white sign with the number '35' written on it. In the background, other people are visible, including a man in a red jacket and another in a grey hoodie with 'WATERLOO' printed on it. The setting appears to be a large indoor hall with wood-paneled walls.

Variable # of Judges

WHY DO WE JUDGE  
**SMALL & LARGE EVENTS**  
DIFFERENTLY?



Score	Description	Argumentation	Refutation	Structure	Presentation
75-79	This is an average and slightly above average performance. The speaker is competent and does some things well but is just as likely to make significant errors. This is a good speech – the speaker is capable and confident, although there are inconsistencies in style and substance. The speaker knows her/his role and tries to accomplish it.	The speaker follows the A-R-E model consistently, although some assertions do not have sufficient reasoning and many do not have strong evidence. It is more likely that the speaker repeats reasoning as evidence. The speaker competently identifies obvious major issues but does not develop nuanced or complex issues.	The speaker understands her/his own positions but spends too much time repeating those ideas rather than developing or amplifying them. Unlikely to establish the qualitative (matter of degree) and quantitative (number affected) significance of issues. Unlikely to compare opposing views. Uses direct refutation well but offers little advanced refutation.	Organized and generally effective. Attempts a narrative structure but is not able to consistently adhere to it at one or two points of the speech. Loses some clarity integrating opposing arguments. Effective use of time throughout the presentation – the speech is balanced with an appropriate mix of the speaker's argumentation and answers to the opponents' issues.	Speaks in a clear, comprehensible way. There is consistent nonverbal communication (eye contact and gestures). The speaking style is competent but not supremely confident. Speaks in a monotone rather than with a dramatic tone. Attempts 1-2 POIs and gives reasonable but unspectacular answers to POIs when holding the floor.
80-84	This is a solid, clearly above average performance. This is a consistently good debate speech. The speaker appears to be comfortable with the format, confident. There are no significant inconsistencies in the performance. There may be minor distractions. Sufficiently strong presentation that an ineffective reply will be a serious risk for the opponents.	The speaker is able to make effective arguments throughout the speech. Using the A-R-E format, the speaker consistently applies reasoning and, more often than not, uses evidence to support issues. The debater appears prepared to discuss the important issues of the debate. The speaker uses challenging argumentative POIs and heckles, although does not do this more than once or twice.	The speaker maintains her/his own or team's positions, supplementing them with thoughtful analysis and examples. The speaker has more difficulty integrating opposing arguments but it is a testament to the speaker's ability to respond to some of the issues. The speaker primarily uses only direct refutation (simple disagreement) but does so consistently and effectively.	Simple, effective narrative structure for own arguments but has some difficulty integrating multiple counter-positions into speech. Uses speaking time efficiently – uses the full amount of time and appropriately allocates time to the important issues. The speech is well organized that it is reasonable that audience members not taking notes are able to follow the development of issues.	Speaks in an engaging manner – clear but only occasionally highly entertaining and powerfully persuasive. Demonstrates confidence and credibility. POIs relevant to the debate. There are occasional verbal distractions. The speaker is not a distraction. May be an ineffective or confusing, unclear communicator at 1 or 2 notable times during the speech.
85-89	This is an extraordinarily fine speech from a consistently strong debater delivering a clearly well above average speech. Confident and capable – this speech is an effective model for new debaters to learn the craft of public speaking and debating.	The speaker is able to establish clear positions that demand a sophisticated reply. The speaker uses A-R-E with highly effective reasoning and consistent application of different varieties of evidence. Explains and analyzes evidence. Significance established for all issues.	This speaker uses direct refutation and advanced refutation techniques, including opportunity cost evaluation and turn/capture of opposing positions. Outstanding expressions of significance and impact assessment with opposing side's major arguments.	Logical organization, which is easy to follow and flow. May have either an effective intro or conclusion but unlikely to have both. Able to organize own positions and opponents' into a well-integrated speech. Likely to use all speaking time but may not because of word economy and argument efficiency.	An animated speaker able to present a clear and convincing case. Persuasive and credible. Strong POIs and replies to POIs. Infrequently distracted by the other team. Strong public speaker in all but one respect.
90-94	Near brilliant. This is an outstanding debater delivering a highly successful speech in ALL respects. The presentation would be a rousing speech for a general audience and a substantive presentation for an audience of field experts.	Not only is the speaker able to make powerful arguments, but the speaker is able to do so on-the-spot. The issues are detailed and complex, with substantial evidence to support sound reasoning. Evidence is detailed and well analyzed.	Understands how arguments interrelate. The speaker investigates inconsistencies among opponents' claims. Identifies and exploits opportunity costs and underlying and hidden assumptions.	Strong narrative structure. Persuasive introduction and conclusion. Speech is sophisticated and yet, easy to follow and understand. Seamlessly integrates arguments from both sides in one compelling presentation.	A persuasive presentation that effectively uses rhetorical devices like humor, effective pausing, and vocal inflection to add depth to the speech. Thoroughly engaged – the speaker attempts many clever POIs and replies to them effectively. Effective argumentative heckling.
95 and higher	A near flawless performance. It is difficult to identify any error of omission or commission. A 98-100 is <u>flawless</u> – a combination of Winston Churchill, Barbara Jordan, and Denzel Washington. It is highly unlikely that there will even be one speech of this ranking in several years.	Sophisticated understanding of issues and opponent strategies. Develops arguments with multiple causes and diverse consequences. Creates clever impromptu arguments. Uses different types of evidence and introduces and analyzes more evidence as the debate develops.	Regularly integrates advanced refutation into argumentation, using ideas from opponents to advance the speaker's own side. Uses POIs and heckling as opportunities for powerful refutation. Accounts for or has an outstanding reply to every important opposing point.	Uses a clear, well-organized (effective structure and clear transitions) and efficient narrative speech structure. Despite argument complexity, the speech can be followed by nearly any listener. Speaker is capable of restoring order to even a confusing debate.	Has exceptional knowledge about the subject, delivered in a highly entertaining and informative manner. Outstanding verbal and nonverbal skills, including eye contact, volume, pace, clarity, and humor. Speech would make an ideal demonstration for even experienced peers.

Judging Time  
is  
**Finite**

# JUDGING BRIEFING

WHAT SHOULD YOU  
COVER DURING YOUR  
**JUDGES BRIEFING?**

# JUDGING CRITERIA

How should the judges evaluate the hacks they see? Remember, this is not a business pitch competition.



# TIME CONSTRAINTS

Odds are that you'll be racing against the clock to establish the top 10.

Make sure judges know how long to spend with each team.

# SPONSOR PRIZES

Sponsors will have to pick the winners of the prizes they are offering first. Don't count on them to help you pick a top 10 until they are done.

# HOW TO JUDGE

# Judging Presentation Style

## ① **SET THE DEMO ORDER**

You should have enough time for each team to demo to each judge (either on stage or in private). Establish an order and send it out to participants.

## ① **CONVENE THE JUDGES**

Bring the judges together privately after they have had the chance to see all the demos. I like to open the discussion with each judge mentioning a hack that really stood out to them.

## ② **TAKE NOMINATIONS**

Ask the judges to formally nominate teams for the top X spots. As each judge nominates a team, have them explain what it was again for the group in one sentence.



### ③ **VOTE FOR TOP 3 PICKS**

Each judge should give their top 3 picks in order. Give each hack 1 point for 3rd, 2 points for 2nd, & 3 points for 1st. Establish clear outliers and repeat the process for close votes.

# EXAMPLE

What are your **top 3** ice cream flavors?



# Judging Expo Style

**HOW MANY**  
JUDGES DO I NEED?

ON AVERAGE, YOU CAN EXPECT  
EACH JUDGE TO SEE  
**1 TEAM EVERY 5 MINUTES.**



YOU SHOULD AIM  
TO HAVE **EACH TEAM** SEEN BY  
**AT LEAST 2 JUDGES.**

$$\frac{\# \text{ OF TEAMS} \times 2 \times 5}{\# \text{ OF JUDGES}} = \text{ONE ROUND OF EXPO}$$

$$\frac{\# \text{ OF TEAMS} \times 10}{\text{ONE ROUND OF EXPO}} = \# \text{ OF JUDGES}$$

# EXAMPLE

$$\frac{98 \text{ TEAMS} \times 10}{45 \text{ MIN EXPO ROUND}} = 22 \text{ JUDGES}$$

## ① **ASSIGN TABLE BLOCKS**

Assign each judge a block of 10 tables to look at. Ex. Judge 1 sees tables 1 - 10, Judge 2 sees tables 11 - 20, etc. Their task is to establish their top 3 picks from that group.



## ① **REPORT THE TOP 3**

Once the judge has seen their ~10 teams, they should report their top 3 teams in order to you. Give a 1st place 3 points, 2nd place 2 points, & 3rd place 1 point.

## ② **REPEAT UNTIL DONE**

Repeat steps 0 & 1 until you've got enough data to establish clear winners from each block. Once you have clear winners from each block, they should move on to the next round of judging.

# EXAMPLE

Let's walk through our 98 team expo example from earlier.

A ZILLION THINGS CAN  
**GO VERY, VERY WRONG.**

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO WHEN  
**SH\*T HITS THE FAN?**



**MAJOR LEAGUE HACKING**

POWERED BY





# QUESTIONS?