

Judge's Handbook

Thank you for helping us as a judge this weekend. This handbook is a work in progress and does not pretend to be comprehensive. The goal is to help you make effective decisions within the rules while still allowing you to share your perspective, because despite how frustrating judge subjectivity can be, our competitors need to learn to appeal to people who see things differently.

If you need help navigating ballots on tabroom, this slideshow breaks down how to use the software step by step. [Tabroom Walkthrough](#)

Table of Contents

Debate [Idaho Debate Code](#)

- *Congress
- *Lincoln-Douglas (LD)
- *Policy (CX)
- *Public Forum (PF)
- *World Schools Debate (WSD)

Speech [Idaho Speech Rules](#)

- After-Dinner Speaking (ADS)
- Communication Analysis (CA)
- *Dramatic Interpretation (DI)
- *Duo Interpretation (DUO)
- *Extemporaneous (Extemp)
- *Humorous Interpretation (HI)
- Impromptu Speaking
- *Informative Speaking
- *Original Oratory (OO)
- Panel Discussion
- *Program of Oral Interpretation (POI)
- Radio/Broadcast Journalism
- Retold Story
- Salesmanship

*Indicates events recognized by the National Speech and Debate Association.

Congress

In congressional debate, anywhere from 8 to 20 students will be debating a series of bills (mostly written by students).

To access the bills (not required, but helpful), go to tabroom.com. In the right hand column, select "Idaho". Find the tournament in the list. When you select the tournament, it should bring you to a welcome page where, usually, you can find a link on the right entitled "congress legislation" or "congress docket"...something like that.

Definitions

Parliamentarian: The parliamentarian is an adult in the room who understands congress well enough to ensure that things run properly.

Presiding Officer: The "PO" or "Chair" is a student who will be elected to run the congress. Their time as PO counts as one speech in the round, and they should be considered in the final rankings.

Process

When debate is opened, students will be selected by the PO to speak for or against the bill. During their speech (maximum of 3 minutes), judges will give them feedback on how they addressed the chamber. After each speech, the speaker will respond to questions for 1-2 minutes (depending on how early they spoke on a given bill).

At the end of the speech/questioning period the judge will score the speech. Usually this is from 3-6 points. At the national qualifying tournament, it goes up to 8 points.

At the end of the round, the judge will rank the top 8 representatives including the Presiding Officer if they conducted the round effectively.

Things to Consider when Scoring and Ranking

Was the speaker adaptable? Did they effectively respond to previous arguments or move the discussion forward?

Was the speech scripted? This can be effective for the first few speakers, but if a speaker relies on the script, speeches can get repetitive, which benefits no one.

Was the speaker professional in their presentation?

Did the speaker disrupt the process of congress to draw attention to themselves (this is something I often consider when ranking them)?

Did the speaker support claims with evidence?

For the presiding officer, was the house (or senate) unruly

PO—Did the PO seem biased in whom they allowed to speak/ask questions?

PO—Was the PO effective at giving as many people the opportunity to speak or ask questions as possible?

Ranking: Quality over quantity—yes, I rarely rank someone who spoke once over someone who spoke three times, but three terrible speeches are not equal to one very effective speech. You do not need to rank students based on a sum of their speaking points. I like to consider both the sum, the average, and my very subjective gut instinct. Speakers are not scored for questions, but if they did ask effective questions during the debate, this can be an effective tie-breaker when ranking debaters.

If speakers asked lengthy questions that felt more like arguments, I usually rank them lower.

If you're curious, here is a list of motions commonly used in congress:

📄 [Parliamentary Motions.pdf](#)

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

LD is a one-on-one values-based debate where students will evaluate the resolution by considering it through a specific value (or lens). The Affirmative favors the resolution while the Negation opposes it.

2024 September/October Topic: **Resolved: The United States ought to require that workers receive a living wage.**

2024 November/December Topic: **Resolved: The United States ought to adopt a wealth tax.**

Definitions

Paradigm: How you prefer to judge a debate round.

Value: This is something people generally value that serves as the goal and as a lens through which to evaluate the resolution. Example: Many debaters will choose to view the round through the lens of "Justice".

Criterion: This is the measuring stick to evaluate whether we've achieved the value. Example: Justice might be achieved through a criterion of "Mitigating Oppression" or through "Maximizing Human Rights" (2019 National Final Round). The Criterion should be a verb, it's the thing we do to achieve the value.

Contention: This is a main argument

Subpoint: This is a supporting argument that should have evidence

Off-time Roadmap: This is when a competitor briefly tells what they will cover in the speech, so the judge knows where the speech will be added to their notes. Example: "As a brief off-time road map, I will address my opponent's case, then respond to the attacks they made on my case." It should not include any attacks.

Cross-Examination: This is when the opponent will ask the last speaker questions. Watch out for inexperienced debaters who will try to make arguments rather than asking questions.

You may see a plan or counterplan presented in Lincoln-Douglas debate. They are uncommon but not prohibited. Plans will include steps to solve the problem, a counterplan says that they accept the problems presented by the affirmative but believe that a different solution is needed to solve the problem.

You may also see Kritiks or Theory arguments, they aren't common in LD yet, but some students may try running them.

Kritik: Kritiks are when debaters argue that their opponent can't make an argument usually tied to some social issue and has even devolved to some teams claiming their opponent can't use an argument because of their race, gender, etc. I strongly discourage them in my paradigm.

Theory: Theory arguments are when debaters argue that something the opposing team is doing breaks the rules of the debate and causes the debate to be unfair. An example of this is claiming that the opponents are speaking too quickly which is unfair and ruins the educational aspect of debate. I strongly discourage theory arguments in my paradigm.

Process [Explanation of Speeches](#)

Affirmative Constructive 6 minutes

Cross-Examination 3 minutes

Negative Constructive 7 minutes

Cross-Examination 3 minutes

1st Affirmative Rebuttal 4 minutes

Negative Rebuttal 6 minutes

2nd Affirmative Rebuttal 3 minutes

Each competitor has 4 minutes of prep time to use incrementally throughout the round.

As a judge, you will want to "Flow" the debate. Here's a [template](#) that I find effective (as you get more comfortable with LD, many people will use different techniques to flow the debate) .

Things to Consider

Did the debater attack their opponent's case?

Did the debater ignore the value and criterion?

Did the flow seem one-sided?

Public Forum Debate (PF)

The goal of Public Forum Debate is to persuade the average person unfamiliar with the topic. As such, it is the duty of the debaters to communicate clearly, so a brand-new judge can understand.

2024 September/October Topic: **Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially expand its surveillance infrastructure along its southern border.**

2024 November/December Topic: **Resolved: The United State should substantially reduce its military support of Taiwan.**

Procedure [Explanation of Speeches](#)

Teams will complete a coin toss. The winning team will either choose Pro or Con or they can choose to speak 1st or 2nd. The team that lost the coin toss makes the other decision. This is the only debate where the Con may go first. Accordingly, we'll call them team A and B in the debate order below.

Teams are not allowed to present plans or counterplans in Public Forum debate.

Teams will likely ask for your [Paradigm](#) before the round begins.

A 1st Constructive 4 minutes

B 1st Constructive 4 minutes

Crossfire 3 minutes—both prior speakers ask and answer questions

A 2nd Constructive/Rebuttal 4 minutes

B 2nd Constructive/Rebuttal 4 minutes

Crossfire 3 minutes—the last two speakers ask and answer questions

A Summary 3 minutes

B Summary 3 minutes

Grand Crossfire 3 minutes—all debaters ask and answer questions

A Final Focus 2 minutes

B Final Focus 2 minutes

Each team has 3 minutes of prep time to use incrementally throughout the round.

Things to Consider

Did the teams support their claims with evidence?

Did both team members participate in the Grand Crossfire...or is this not really a team?

Did the teams attack their opponent's case in the second constructive speeches?

Were any major points ignored?

Did a team bring up new arguments in the summary or final focus (not allowed)?

Were the teams able to defend their case and make attacks with evidence or just with logic?

Logic is good; evidence is better; evidence with logic is best.

You may have teams try to bring in parts of policy debate to PF, specifically topicality, kritiks, and theory arguments. My paradigm strongly discourages this. Those arguments are lengthy,

complicated, and do not belong in a debate format intended to be accessible for the average person to be the judge.

World Schools Debate

Coming soon...

Policy Debate

In policy debate, the affirmative team introduces a policy to solve a problem (or problems) in the status quo, in most cases the negative defends the status quo. **There are 5 stock issues that the affirmative team must win in order to win the round. If the negative team can effectively disprove or devalue one stock issue, they win the round.**

2024-2025 Topic: **Resolved: The United States federal government should significantly strengthen its protection of domestic intellectual property rights in copyrights, patents, and/or trademarks.**

- Novice Policy Case Limits:
 - Patents: Emerging Technologies
 - Patents: Green Technology
 - Copyrights: Protect the Creative Arts
 - Trademarks: Trademark Trolls

Definitions

Stock Issues: 5 areas of the debate the affirmative team must achieve to win the round. Policy debate is different from other debate formats because the Affirmative has the burden of proof. The negative team only needs to win one point to win the round. So, if the affirmative wins 4 stock issues but the negative wins one, the ballot should go to the negative team.

- Harms: The Affirmative must show that harms in the status quo justify change.
- Inherency: The affirmative team must show that the plan has not been implemented previously due to some inherent barrier. They must also show that they have a way to overcome the inherent barrier (for example, a change of administration may favor legislation previously rejected)
- Plan: The affirmative will present a plan that fits within the resolution.
 - Plank: Many teams use plank 1, plank 2, etc. as ways to organize the plan. Others use:
 - Mandate: WHAT the policy does
 - Agency: WHO will make it happen
 - Fiat: Latin for “Let it be.” Many debaters will claim “All powers fiat”. In other words, rather than let the debate devolve into a discussion about whether the current legislative body will approve the legislation or if it would receive a presidential veto, we’re focusing on the merits of the plan. The political climate may still be a discussion in regards to inherency.
 - Funding: WHERE the money comes from
 - Enforcement: What government agencies will oversee enforcement
 - Timeframe: WHEN will the plan be implemented
- Solvency: The affirmative must make the connection between their plan and how it solves the Harms they outlined.

- **Topicality:** This is a negative attack stating that the plan doesn't fit the resolution. For example, if the resolution is about water resources, and the affirmative presents a plan to require chickens to be raised free-range, this would be non-topical. The Negative must bring this up in their first constructive speech. After that, the Affirmative automatically wins Topicality.

Status Quo: Things as they are now

Sign-posting: Telling the judge and opponents what part of the case you are addressing—I encourage sign-posting in my judge paradigm.

Paradigm: Telling the debaters what they need to do to win your vote in a round.

Kritik: Kritiks are when debaters argue that their opponent can't make an argument usually tied to some social issue and has even devolved to some teams claiming their opponent can't use an argument because of their race, gender, etc. I strongly discourage them in my paradigm.

Theory: Theory arguments are when debaters argue that something the opposing team is doing breaks the rules of the debate and causes the debate to be unfair. An example of this is claiming that the opponents are speaking too quickly which is unfair and ruins the educational aspect of debate. I strongly discourage theory arguments in my paradigm.

Counterplan: This is when the Negative team essentially accepts the harms but they believe the affirmative team doesn't solve the problem, so they present their own plan to solve. This changes the debate from status quo vs affirmative plan to affirmative plan vs negative counterplan.

Advantage: The affirmative team will often combine harms and solvency into "Advantages" rather than address them separately.

Disadvantage: The negative will often point out unintended harms of the plan. These could be considered an attack on "harms" showing the cure is worse than the illness or as an attack on the "plan". You can decide where it fits best.

Procedure Explanation of Speeches

1st Aff Constructive 8 minutes

Cross-Examination 3 minutes (the second negative speaker will ask questions)

1st Neg Constructive 8 minutes

Cross-Examination 3 minutes (the first affirmative speaker will ask questions)

2nd Aff Constructive 8 minutes

Cross-examination 3 minutes (the first negative speaker will ask questions)

2nd Neg Constructive 8 minutes

Cross-examination 3 minutes (the second affirmative speaker will ask questions)

1st Neg Rebuttal 5 minutes

1st Aff Rebuttal 5 minutes

2nd Neg Rebuttal 5 minutes

2nd Aff Rebuttal 5 minutes

The affirmative team has to prove there should be a change in the status quo, so they get the last word.

Each team may use a total of 8 minutes of prep time incrementally throughout the debate.

Here's a [template](#) for taking notes on Policy debate.

After-Dinner Speaking (ADS)

Time Limit: 7 minutes, 30 second grace period. No time signals provided

The intent of After-Dinner Speaking is to make a point with humor. The speaker should be presenting as if they are the keynote speaker at a conference and needs to identify an audience (real or imagined).

The speaker should use satire, wit, quips or other methods to make their point, but should not be just cracking jokes. Over the years, many schools' ADS teams have devolved into stand-up comedy routines. We would appreciate your help in discouraging this.

Things to Consider

Was there a point to the speech?

Did the speaker identify an audience?

Was the speaker actually funny?

Communications Analysis (CA)

Time Limit: 10 minutes, 30 second grace period. No time signals provided.

Speakers may or may not have a visual and/or audio aid. It is not a requirement to have aids, but it is allowed and many students may use them. The goal is to analyze a communication event of any kind. It could be a billboard, a political movement, a song, etc.

Generally, students will identify some kind of theory that they will then apply to the piece of media they chose to analyze. Use of a theory to analyze the piece is common but not required.

Things to Consider

Did the speaker make the subject more meaningful through their analysis?

Were audio or visual aids speech-enhancing or distracting?

Dramatic Interpretation (DI)

Time Limit: 10 minutes, 30 second grace period. No time signals provided.

Dramatic Interpretation will feel like a theater piece without props or costumes. Students may infuse the speech with humor to make the dramatic or inspiring points of the speech more poignant.

The speech is an interpretation of a published work and is not original material.

The student will have an introduction where they drop character and provide the title and author of the piece.

Things to Consider

Was the subject appropriate for the audience? (Some students seek provocative scripts without consideration of the audience. Speech teachers teach their students to gear speeches toward their audience, so I think it is relevant. That said, I've given first place to some dark speeches.)

Was the speaker able to develop their character?

Did the cutting (how they organized the speech) make sense?

Were they well memorized or were there significant struggles?

Duo Interpretation

10 minute maximum, 30 second grace period. No time signals provided.

Duo is a theatrical piece presented by two competitors. Outside of the introduction, competitors are not allowed to touch or look at each other directly. When done right, this can enhance the piece. When done poorly, it can feel very awkward. Duo can be funny, tragic, inspiring, or any combination. This can become difficult for judging, but we trust you to figure that one out.

The speech is an interpretation of a published work and is not original material.

The students will have an introduction where they drop character and provide the title and author of the piece. During the introduction only they can make eye contact with one another.

Things to Consider

Were the speaking parts about equal or was one partner more of a background object?

Were you able to follow the storyline?

Was there adequate character development?

Did movement enhance the speech or make it more interesting?

Did the speakers consider their audience when selecting a piece?

Note: There are some publishers who pump out 10-minute scripts intended for duo. Some may lack a storyline or characters. Judge them based on the overall quality of their presentation.

Extemporaneous Speaking

7 minute maximum, 30 second grace period. Time signals provided.

This is a limited prep event. Students will prepare in a separate room for 30 minutes before coming one at a time to the room where you are judging.

Students may choose international or domestic (national) topics. The draw room (prep room) manager will let them choose one of 3 topics in the form of a question. Some competitions will send them to round with their topics on a slip of paper; some have the topics on your ballot; and some tournaments trust the competitors to tell you what topic they were given. Likely topics are posted at <https://www.nfhs.org/activities-sports/speech-debate-theatre/>.

The speaker will research for 30 minutes and answer the question for you in a speech of up to 7 minutes. As a judge, you are expected to give time signals. Many judges hold up two fingers at two minutes left, one at one, and a bent finger at 30 seconds left. I bring an old iPad with a large, very visible timer app that I can just have on display for them...because I always forget to give time signals.

Humorous Interpretation (HI)

10 minute maximum, 30 second grace period. No time signals provided.

This is a theatrical piece that should be funny. The speaker may not use props or costumes. It may include a message and even some serious components, but if you're not amused, the speaker probably missed the point completely (granted, I find that what's funny to teens is not always funny to me—yay, generation gap).

The speech is an interpretation of a published work and is not original material.

The student will have an introduction where they drop character and provide the title and author of the piece.

Things to Consider

Did the speaker use comedic timing?

Was the speaker well-memorized?

Did it feel like the speaker has competed all year and is now just going through the motions?

Did the speaker consider the audience in preparing the speech?

Did the story line make sense? If not a story, did it at least flow well?

Were characters (if more than one) distinct?

Did they do awkward steps back and forth at character transitions that killed the momentum?

Impromptu Speaking

7 minute maximum for prep and speaking time. No grace period. Time signals provided.

You should either have 3 topics for each speaker in your online ballot, or you will need to make sure you get topics from the tabroom (depending on the tournament).

Show the first speaker the three topic options and start the 7 minute time. By the end of 7 minutes, the speech must be complete. They can decide how they divide their time between prep and speaking. They don't have to use the full 7 minutes. Repeat for each speaker.

Commonly, round one is abstract words, round two is quotes, and round three is current events, with a mix of the three in final rounds.

Things to Consider

Did the speaker have an effective, attention-grabbing intro with a conclusion that brought it all back together?

Was the speaker able to maintain a clear train of thought?

Was the speech well organized?

Did the speaker relate the topic to a completely different topic that they may have done a speech on before? Please judge these little cheaters harshly. They make me mad.

Was the speaker true to the topic? (yes, I'm repeating myself, because this is important)

Did the speaker make the topic relevant to their audience?

Informative Speaking

10 minute maximum, 30 second grace period. No time signals provided.

Presenters will have visual aids most of the time. The goal is to teach your audience something. It may be informing you on a topic you've never heard about or maybe giving you a new perspective on a topic you thought you knew. If you're not learning anything, the student probably didn't do enough research (please be lenient if you're an expert in the field).

Things to Consider

Did I learn something from the speech?

Was the focus of the speech to inform me? (a little humor or persuasion can make the speech more interesting, but if either becomes the focus of the speech, we have different events where they should be speaking)

Was the speaker focused more on their visuals or notes than on the audience?

Had the speaker practiced with the visuals?

Were the visuals visible?

Were the visuals speech-enhancing or more of a background decoration?

Note: Visuals may not be living or recently living things. Digital media is also not allowed (these rules are mostly in place, so we can avoid allergy situations, avoid escaping animals, and so we can run rounds in broom closets that don't have projector screens).

Original Oratory (OO)

10 minute maximum

This is a persuasive speech. Optimally, it should address a universal concept. For example, “Is debate a sport?” really won’t change lives, and the majority of the world doesn’t even know debate is a thing, let alone a sport. However, “We need to prioritize our lives” (with one supporting argument being how things like debate should be priorities as they benefit us) applies to far more people. Often speakers will logically weave an otherwise unrelated topic through the speech to make it flow and add entertainment?

Things to Consider

Was the topic too narrow?

Did the speaker appeal to logic, reason, and emotion?

Did the speaker seem to believe what they were saying?

If controversial, did the speaker acknowledge opposing opinions in a tactful way?

Were there components (like stories) to make the speech memorable?

Did this sound like a rant that revolved around the speaker’s own life?

Did the speaker adequately build a foundation to help the audience see why there is a societal problem?

Did the speaker offer solutions and explain why these solutions would solve the problem(s)?

Note: I’ve rarely heard an Original Oratory that aligns completely with my own views. Please set aside your personal biases and listen. I’ve often given first place to students due to the way they crafted and communicated their speech...while internally hoping that they see the light before their skills lead them to be a leader in the world (and yes, I’ve gained greater appreciation for opposing perspectives by listening to these speeches—even if I’m not convinced)

Panel Discussion

40 minute round, time signals provided

Each tournament releases panel topics about a week or two in advance. Each round has a different topic. Students may bring in a regular sized paper with notes on one side...in whatever size font they want to use. Generally, students will take turns giving opening statements, and then the conversation just goes wherever it will. Often, near the end, speakers will give closing statements, but it's not required.

Panel requirements are vague, though they do suggest that students should be working towards a consensus. ***In the fall a new rule was voted on to change the requirements for this event. It will be voted on in December before becoming the new rule for State. Some tournaments may run the new rules in preparation for the change, please check with the tournament which rules they will be using. Your ballot may have a section that details that at the top. The new rule is as follows:

“Emphasis should be on problem solving through engaging presentation of ideas, civil discourse, and unique perspectives, not group consensus.”

“Introductions should be no more than one minute per competitor and should be limited to your name, entry code, and a thesis statement that represents your initial view on the topic.”

“Conclusions should be limited to one minute per competitor and be a reminder of their name, entry code, and their final thought on the topic.”

Please note that introductions and conclusions are not required, but it has been the tradition that they are done. They can get lengthy and reduce the time spent on the actual topic so these timing limitations are an attempt to curb that.

Things to Consider

Did the student participate in the discussion?

Did the students dominate the discussion?

Did the student help other voices to be heard?

Did the student move the discussion forward, or were they more repetitious?

Did the student bring up valid points?

If you saw the student in the hallway later, would you detour to avoid them? (don't write this on the ballot).

Was the student's communication style appropriate for the group? (e.g. the student who yells like Dora the Explorer all the time—sometimes they think yelling=conviction).

For the new rules:

Did the student present a unique perspective?

Was the student civil in their discourse?

Was the student engaging? Did you want to hear more of their ideas because of how they presented?

Program of Oral Interpretation (POI)

10 minute maximum, 30 second grace period. No time signals provided.

POI is persuasive theater. Students may use three or more sources (plays, books, news articles, song lyrics, etc.) to share a message. They may bounce from one script to the other and back again often.

Students present with a small binder that they may read from and/or use as a prop. Often, they will turn the page as they transition from one source to another. They need to remain in contact with their binder at all times.

This can be fascinating; it can be compelling, it can be confusing; it can make you feel like you need a shower after watching that. Technically, there's no rule against a cheerful piece, but they tend to be pretty dark.

Things to Consider

Were controversial pieces presented in a tasteful way to be compelling, or was it geared more toward shock value?

Was the piece persuasive/motivating?

Did the speaker bring all of the different sources together?

Was the speaker relying too heavily on the script?

Were the sources so similar that it began to drag on?

Were characters distinct?

Radio/Broadcast Journalism

5:30-6 minutes. No grace period. No time signals.

This is a limited prep event. Students will prepare in a separate room for 30 minutes before coming one at a time to the room where you are judging.

Students will sit down with their back to you during this round to make it as similar to hearing them on the radio as possible. Many will seek to add humor through different voices. Here is my soap box moment: Humor is an effective tool to share the news or sell products, but it is not the goal. Radio is not an interpretation event. You'll likely hear many of the same news stories in a round. This is good, because all speakers received the same packet of articles in the draw room (prep room).

Timing is Everything in Broadcasting. Students **MUST**:

- Present at least 3 news pieces. (Current local or national events are common. Weather and sports count as a news piece.)
- Include an original commercial of at least 30 seconds (this is one they prepare in advance). The item for sale can be real or imagined, though if they are selling something real their commercial needs to be their original work and not use a company's slogan or jingle.
- Give their opinion on one of the news stories for 1-2 minutes in the last half of the broadcast.
- End between 5:30-6:00 (they can time themselves, so they have no excuses)

I find it very helpful to time this event on my phone with the stopwatch and utilizing the lap feature. I tap lap after the introduction, each news article, commercial, and when they start the commentary. I keep track on my notepad of what each lap was for so that I know if they are meeting the requirements, specifically the commercial and commentary portions.

Things to Consider

Did the speaker meet the time requirements?

Was the commercial at least 30 seconds long?

Could you understand the diction throughout the speech?

Did the speaker spend too much time on some articles? (I often comment about auditory attention spans)

Did the commercial sell a product or make fun of a product?

Did the editorial add insights to the article? Was it just a bunch of rambling or theater?

Was the overall broadcast informative?

Retold Story

6 minute maximum, no grace period. Time signals provided.

This is a limited prep event. Students will prepare in a separate room for 30 minutes before coming one at a time to the room where you are judging.

In the prep room, students choose between three childrens' books. They will then prepare to tell you the story (without the use of the book) as though you are a young elementary child. This should include a balance of narration and characterization to bring the story to life. There is usually an introduction that names the author and title.

The student should give you the book, which you will return to the tab room after the round. You can review the book after they leave the room but should not review the book while they are presenting. The story you were retold should follow the plot line of the book but not be a memorization.

The target audience for this event is kindergarten through second grade.

Please note that some students have developed habits of using more mature humor, which sadly has won over many judges who don't understand the audience intent of this event.

Another mistake students often make is adding so much of their own twist to a story that the author's initial plot gets lost or missed entirely. The plot of the story should be recognizable.

Things to Consider

Did the speaker meet the time requirements?

Could you understand the diction throughout the speech?

Was the plot of the story recognizable?

Was the content appropriate for the target audience?

Would children be engaged and enjoy the performance?

Sales

7 minute maximum, 30 second grace period. Plus questions from the Judge.

A sales speech is designed to sell a product. Students should select a product or products from a specific brand. The brand name must be identified. The actual product must be displayed. They may use visual aids and demonstrations to sell the product. The product may be demonstrated as part of the sales pitch. If the product is clothing or something that is worn it may not be worn into the room, it can be put on as part of the speech but must be removed after the demonstration.

Keep in mind that the goal of the sales speech is to sell the product, not to make fun of it. Sometimes students will choose products for the comedic value, but if they are using the product to sell humor, they've gotten it backwards.

There has been a rule change in early 2024, students may no longer share samples with you. They also .

At the conclusion of the speech, you as the judge get to ask them a few questions about their products. Please be consistent between competitors, ask about the same number of questions or use close to the same amount of time, ask questions of the same difficulty level.

Things to Consider

Did the speaker meet the time requirements?

Could you understand the diction throughout the speech?

Was the product correctly identified?

Was the product in the room?

Was the product sold in a way that could generate interest?

Did the speaker seem knowledgeable about the product?