

# The Hague Inter-University Law Debate Tournament

# Overview of the match grading criteria

MATCH ROUND:	
JUDGE:	
TEAM:	

## A. Content of the arguments to support the debate position [point range 0-5 per element]

- 1. Clear structure (beginning to end)
- $2. The goal of argument \hbox{--} clarity and explanation \\$
- 3. Clear conclusion
- 4. The originality of ideas/concepts used
- 5. Effectiveness of argumentation style
- 6. Use of hard law
- 7. Use of relevant case law (reliability)
- 8. Relevancy of the examples
- 9. Logos (reasons, origins, context)
- 10. Pathos (emotions of the audience)
- 11. Ethos (elaboration on the concepts and values)
- 12. Reactivity (using opponent's arguments in own favour)

#### B. Presentation of the position

[point range 0-6 per element]

- 1. Language
- 2. Modulation
- 3. Effective use of Body Language / gestures
- 4. Persuasiveness
- 5. Effort of preparation (as perceived during the match)

### Overall impression of the team's performance

[point range 0-10]

#### Extra (possible point deductions)

- 1. Going over speaking time [up to -2.5]
- 2. No courtesy shown to the opposing team and/or jury [up to -2.5]
- 3. Misunderstanding of the topic [up to -2.5 if minor, up to to -5 if major]
- 4. Reading (on screen/device/material) {up to -5]

Every team will receive grading sheet after the match.

Members of the jury may decide to include commentary & feedback relevant to each team's performance during the match.

The feedback may include tips for future match preparations, advice on what to avoid during the match and presentation or specific feedback for members of the team.

The level and extent of the feedback depends on each judge.

Each team can receive maximum 300 points per match prior to the Final Round (ie max 100 points per judge).

## \*FOR TRAINING PURPOSES ONLY

This document outlines the grading criteria that will apply in the ed. 2023.

The actual grading sheet shall be made available to the members of the jury and then provided either in its original form or in its processed form to the teams with the feedback provided by the members of the jury.