Dear Judge,

Thank you so much for offering your time and expertise to judge this event. The ESU Public Speaking Competition is now in its sixty-second year and is once more being generously sponsored by the International Churchill Society. Without your support in generously giving up your time to judge, this competition could not continue to run and help so many young people discover their voice.

In this document you will find the format of the competition, the timings of the speeches and the weighting of the marks. It also includes a guide as to the standard of speech with respect to the approximate number of marks to be awarded.

It is essential that our judges adhere to the criteria for judging. Teams have been coached to these criteria and will be expecting feedback relating to them. Please do not ever refer to a student’s dress sense, hairstyle, any physical characteristic, including voice. Such remarks are at best inappropriate and at worst hurtful. Also, you may come across unfamiliar names; please give the student the respect of your best attempt at pronunciation!

It is important that all judges, not matter how experienced, have read the Judge Role Description, signed the ESU Volunteer Agreement and have completed our Online Training. This is because the ESU, as an educational charity, and you, as volunteers both have a duty of care to the young people who take part in our programmes. The training not only covers the rules and judging, but also alerts you to key safeguarding issues.

Full information about the competition can be found at www.esu.org/competitions/ and the Role Description, Volunteer Agreement and Online Training can all be found at www.esu.org/volunteer/.

This year round 1 will take place via Zoom while all subsequent rounds will be held in person. You will be briefed on the procedures relevant to the format of the particular heat you are judging. You will need these guidelines as reference and should have this handbook with you when doing so.

When you get together as a panel, on Zoom for round one or in person thereafter, one judge will be appointed chair of the panel. Usually there are 3 judges but should there be an even number, 2 or 4, the Chair will have a casting vote on any controversial decision. The Competitions Team staff or a senior ESU Volunteer will take you through the mechanics of the marking sheets and the deliberation (decision-making).

At the end of this document is a page on the art of giving feedback. There is a very reasonable expectation from students and teachers that they will learn something about the skill of public speaking. The most important thing to remember is to keep an overwhelmingly positive tone and to make sure that criticism is done in a most constructive way. We want every child to come away from the event with a feeling that they have gained something from the experience, win or not.

We hope that you enjoy the competition and, certainly, most judges to whom we speak are surprised and delighted by the quality of what they hear.

Thank you once more for giving so freely of your time and expertise; good luck!

Yours faithfully,

ESU Competitions Team
FORMAT

Each presentation involves three participants. The Chairperson and Questioner of one school are partnered up with the Speaker from another.

(NB this different from the Rotary Club “Youth Speaks” format where the Chair, Speaker and Vote of Thanks all present as an integral team)

20-30 minutes before the first presentation, the Chairperson and Questioner of each school team are told with which Speaker they will be working. They are then given time to prepare by asking the Speaker questions about their personal connection to the topic, and the approach they intend to take in their speech.

Each presentation lasts for fourteen minutes. The time breakdown for the presentation is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Guest Speaker</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Questioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 minute</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 minutes</td>
<td>Questioner’s Questions</td>
<td>Questioner’s Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Audience Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Timekeeper will give an audible signal when the Speaker’s five minutes have elapsed, and after 14 minutes when the presentation should have finished. It is, however, the responsibility of the Chairperson to ensure that the presentation runs according to time and fits within the 14 minutes allocated.

Judges need not worry about time infringements during the presentations since the timekeeper will inform them of any serious infringements after the end of the presentations.
INTRODUCTION TO THE MARKING CRITERIA

In 2021-22 the ESU competitions are being run with a hybrid model. During round one, on Zoom, rounds may be affected by connection problems, technical issues and unfamiliarity with equipment from participants and/or judges. Our aim is that no participant should be disadvantaged by these.

If you have any concerns in advance please do get in touch with the competitions team at competition@esu.org. Should any issues arise during a heat, as far as possible be accommodating and supportive. Report any issues which do occur to the competitions team.

Whilst the three roles are marked separately, it is worth noting throughout that the Public Speaking Competition is very much a team effort, and should be marked accordingly. The best teams will be those that show strength in all three roles, rather than relying on a single member who covers up for deficiencies in the other two roles.

Adjudication is given on the basis of three main criteria;

1. Content
2. Effectiveness in role
3. Style

These criteria are weighted in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Effectiveness in Role</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson (30)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (40)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioner (30)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numerical scores are only a guideline for discussions and so the panel should talk about the strengths and weaknesses of each participant and to try and reach agreement.

When competing via Zoom, students might not have their cameras turned on. They may not be able to, or may choose not to use it. It may also be difficult to see participants clearly, or see all of their movements and gestures.

Competitors should not be disadvantaged because of this. Factors such as body language and eye contact are always judged as parts of Style – there are no marks specifically ‘for’ these specific factors. If judges are unable to assess a certain part of that category for any reason, then they should give a score based on how well the other elements of the category are performed.
As a general guide, the marks should be distributed in the following way.

**Chairperson and Questioner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Effectiveness in Role</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>13 – 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9 – 10</td>
<td>26 – 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>10 – 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 – 9</td>
<td>21 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 – 6</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speaker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Effectiveness in Role</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>17 – 20</td>
<td>9 – 10</td>
<td>9 – 10</td>
<td>33 – 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>13 – 16</td>
<td>8 – 9</td>
<td>8 – 9</td>
<td>25 – 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9 – 12</td>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>17 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>5 – 8</td>
<td>5 – 6</td>
<td>5 – 6</td>
<td>9 – 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>0 – 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a description of the expected performance per role. Team members will vary in their ability to execute that role (see marking table above).

Should one of the presentations touch on a topic about which a judge has specialist knowledge, they should try to put aside personal biases and assess how well the speaker meets the judging criteria, not whether they are always correct. While factual accuracy is important, judges should remember the age of the participants and temper expectations.

Judges’ personal preferences for style should not have a bearing on marking a speech. Various styles and tone are part of a presentation and what matters is how well suited they are to the topic and content.
Chairperson

Content
• Makes a relevant introduction demonstrating interest in the topic
• Effectively links the Speaker and topic
• Summarises key themes of the presentation at the end

Effectiveness in Role
• Creates a warm and friendly atmosphere
• Introduces speaker and questioner
• Manages the audience questions, asking for re-phrasing or repetition, or re-asking the question directly where appropriate
• Effectively manages time, ensuring presentations do not over run or spend too much time on any one section of the presentation

Style
• Ensures speakers feel welcome and appreciated and lead applause
• Interrupts firmly but politely to keep participants to time

Speaker

Content
• Shows evidence of careful consideration of topic and delivers a logical case
• Gives arguments supported by evidence, and relevant analogies
• Considers alternative viewpoints to their own

Effectiveness in Role
• Employs a clear structure that is easy to follow
• Spontaneous comments where appropriate to be rewarded
• Answers questions comprehensively yet succinctly, demonstrating a greater knowledge of the topic over and above that displayed in the speech

Style
• Use of sheets or notes appropriate, but does not over rely on them
• Does not appear to have memorised the speech
• Natural fluid style that makes use of carefully chosen language and rhetoric. Seeks to draw an audience in with tools such as good eye contact, and appropriate body language
Questioner

Content
• Asks relevant questions that show they have listened to the speech as given, not merely pre-prepared questions
• Shows evidence of understanding of the topic by introducing other aspects where appropriate

Effectiveness in Role
• Attempts to deepen understanding of the topic, and add clarity where necessary
• Suggestions of alternative lines of argumentation or views
• Offers clear and succinct questions
• Willingness to ask follow up questions where appropriate

Style
• Employs a non-combative style, being courteous but probing
• Engages in a friendly dialogue with the speaker in the questioning period
• Good use of stance, gesture, and eye contact to include the audience in the questioning period
**JUDGES’ FEEDBACK**

Feedback is of 2 types: General and Individual. The first MUST happen, the second CAN and SHOULD occur if time allows.

**General Feedback** happens after you have deliberated your decisions in private and returned to the main room, and BEFORE you announce the winners. (In round one you will deliberate in a Zoom break-out room before returning to the main Zoom call. In round two onwards you should have a private room or quiet space to deliberate.) This is your chance to offer constructive feedback and advice to the speakers.

This is often done by dividing the roles between the judges - a division of labour that should be sorted out before the speaking.

**The Sandwich Method:**
Before you provide feedback, try to have a clear idea of what you would like to convey to the students – positive and critically encouraging.

Start by illustrating the key features you were looking for in the role.

Then mix in a couple of things that were particularly challenging about the role (e.g. summary for the speaker) and suggest ways to improve, without giving the feeling that you are telling anybody off. Do not make specific references to the competencies or difficulties of encountered by specific participants.

Finish by returning to the praise and generalising on the significance of what they have just achieved.

**Individual Feedback** can be done in break-out rooms after the results are given.

Some teams will want to make a swift exit but for those who have the time, it can be a useful learning experience for them.

There **MUST** be a teacher or parent present when you give individual feedback. The vast majority of students - qualifying for the next round or not - are just keen to find out how they can do better. A very few students, however, can be a little tense if they have not received the verdict which they wanted and it is sometimes useful to have another adult present. It is very rare indeed that students get upset, but it does support both you and the ESU if someone from school or home is there.

The speakers must accept the judges’ decision; you should refer to your mark sheets for detailed comments, but the speakers have no right to see them.
**MY FEEDBACK:** the role of...

What I was looking for; how my expectations were fulfilled:

What other techniques could have made the role even better:

**Conclusion**

How can the skills they have learned doing this competition benefit them in their future lives? If you have relevant experience in your job/career/life where public speaking has been a useful/important skill to you, do say so.
EQUITY POLICY

The English-Speaking Union is committed to providing opportunities for individuals of all backgrounds to access and develop communication skills. We expect all ESU events to be welcoming, inclusive, and to foster a safe and supportive atmosphere in which all individuals feel that they are able and encouraged to express themselves.

In such a safe space, individuals should feel that:

- They are afforded the same high level of respect that is due to all
- They are never in a position where they feel under physical or psychological threat
- They will never be judged on things they cannot change
- Their opinions and beliefs can be challenged, but will always be respected
- If their safety and well-being is threatened, that others will listen and support them

The responsibility is placed on all individuals (students, school staff, ESU staff and members, judges etc.) to ensure that such a safe space is created and maintained. Any person who is found to breach these rules may be excluded from this or future events.

If any individual feels that these guidelines have been violated, whether the incident was directed against them or not, they should:

- Approach any member of ESU staff at the event
- Contact a member of staff at the ESU if an issue is not, or cannot, be resolved satisfactorily at the event
- If an issue remains unresolved, direct any complaints towards the ESU Safeguarding Lead, Gavin Illsley (gavin.illsley@esu.org) or to one of the deputies: Matthew Christmas (matthew.christmas@esu.org); Ameena Khan (ameena.khan@esu.org).

ENGLISH-SPEAKING UNION

The ESU is a unique educational charity and membership organisation dedicated to helping people realise their potential through giving them the skills and confidence in communication to articulate their ideas and share them with others.

For more information about the ESU and to view our other educational opportunities, please speak to a member of staff or visit our website at www.esu.org.

You can also find us on Facebook at www.facebook.com/the.esu or on Twitter @TheESU/@ESUdebate