

AIDA Adjudicator Accreditation Guide

AIDA Adjudicator Accreditation began in 1995 and has since then accredited hundreds of adjudicators across Austral-Asia. It is a peer-review process of grading adjudication that functions outside of debate tournaments. Adjudicators watch two pre-recorded debates and write an adjudication of the debate. This is then blind marked by two AIDA markers and a score is determined. Scores range from 0 (which means the candidate failed the test) to 4 (which is the highest score and qualifies the candidate to be a marker).

Objectives of the AIDA Adjudicator Accreditation

- to support adjudication development outside of debate tournaments
- to help create a consistent and stable Australasian adjudication pool

It is important to note that AIDA Adjudication Accreditation is meant to be complementary to other adjudication accreditation or assessment methods (for example adjudication tests at debate tournaments). It is not meant to replace adjudicator assessment at tournaments.

Terminology

- AIDA Adjudication Sheets – Forms produced by AIDA which candidates fill after watching each test debate. These sheets are sent to AIDA markers.
- Accreditation Test Package – Everything you need to run an AIDA Accreditation Test (except the candidates). It includes two videos, a guide on how to conduct the test, procedures to submit the test and adjudication sheets for candidates to write their debate adjudication. At least one package will be released a year and each package will have an identification number. Candidates should write the test package number on their answer sheets.

Guide to Conducting and Taking the AIDA Accreditation Test

It is important for the AIDA test to be conducted in fair, consistent and credible manner. It is also important to ensure a chain of responsibility over the Adjudication Sheets. AIDA tests are often

preceded by workshops on adjudication, but this is not a requirement for the test.

Test Schedule

10 minutes	Brief Candidates on Test Procedures
1 hour	Watch 1 st Debate Video
45 minutes	Write Adjudication
10 minutes	Short Break
1 hour	Watch 2 nd Debate Video
45 minutes	Write Adjudication
	End – Collect Adjudication Sheets

There are two important roles in every AIDA Accreditation Test, that of the Test Coordinator (person who conducts the test) and the Test Candidates (persons who take the test).

The Test Coordinator is the person who is responsible for conducting the test. This person should

1. Ensure the test environment is properly set up. This includes but is not limited to ensuring proper sound and audio equipment and sufficient Adjudication Sheets are available to the candidates.
2. Ensure that all Adjudication Sheets are anonymized before they are sent for marking, and hold the corresponding list of names and contact information. This is important to ensure the markers do not know who they are marking. The best approach would be for candidates to write a personal number that people would generally not know but is familiar to them (a social security number, mother's birthday) so that the answer script might be identified even in the unlikely situation that the corresponding name list is misplaced.
3. Ensure the timing structure for test is strictly followed, and that candidates are not discussing the debate during the test period.
4. Send the answer scripts to the AIDA VP Adjudication or whoever else he or she determines
5. Upon receiving the results of the test, to send the AIDA VP Adjudication the list of the real names of the candidates and their results, and send this information to the candidates.

The Test Candidate is the person who sits for the test. This person should

1. Not write their name, university, country, birthday or any other information that might identify

themselves. They should also not indicate who they are or talk about their debate or adjudication experience at any part of the test.

2. Only use the time allocated for the test and not any more
3. Not discuss the debate with other candidates during the test

Introduction to the AIDA Adjudicator Accreditation Test

The test package will include two debate videos, one copy of the AIDA Adjudication Sheet (to be photocopied for candidates) and this document.

The test consists of watching two debates and evaluating them. The evaluation is to be written in the adjudication sheets provided, and is to be done in 3 parts.

- Part 1 – Who won the debate and why?

This is the most substantial part of the test, in terms of how much time candidates usually take when completing it and what markers base most of their judgments on. Candidates are encouraged to be as detailed and balanced as possible. There is no limitation on the number of words that may be used, but brevity and clarity is encouraged

- Part 2 – Score the debate

Candidates are required to write a score for each speaker. Markers will evaluate if that score was appropriate for the speech, consistent with the candidates decision and feedback, and proportional to the scores given to other speakers in the debate.

- Part 3 – Give feedback to each speaker

Candidates should give personal feedback to each speaker, focusing on things the speaker did well or could do to improve.

Candidates will get 45 minutes to evaluate each debate. This time begins from the moment each debate ends. Between each debate, candidates should be given a short break (10 minutes or so). Candidates can move back to make adjustments to their evaluation of the first debate during time allocated for the second debate if they choose, but since both debates have an equal impact on the overall assessment, candidates should prioritize them equally.

AIDA Accreditation Marking Guidelines

AIDA testing and grading will be based on the Austral-Asian Adjudication Handbook, written by Ray D'Cruz and available for free on the AIDA website.

AIDA Level 0

- Candidate shows a misunderstanding of fundamental rules of debate and the format. Overall poor read of the debate.
- A majority of the test was not completed.

AIDA Level 1

- Candidate shows a clear understanding of fundamental rules of the debate and the format, but poor application of these rules (for example, inconsistent or overly harsh application of rules). Result of both debates right or close*, but justification simplistic and doesn't correctly identify key clashes**, strengths/weakness and turning points*** in the debate.
- Adjudication suffers seriously from one or more of these faults; getting into the debate, bias towards a position, team, speaker, side or argument.
- Parts of the test (scoring and feedback) incomplete, lacking or not within range.

AIDA Level 2

- Fair justification and adjudication across both debates. Application of rules consistent, key clashes correctly identified, no serious adjudication faults.
- Parts of the test (scoring and feedback) incomplete, lacking, not within range or not consistent with adjudication of debate.

AIDA Level 3

- Good justification of both debates. Scoring and feedback consistent with adjudication of debate. Score not consistent with Australs standards and/or feedback not constructive or otherwise

lacking.

- One component of debate not properly analyzed or ignored (Matter, Manner or Method).

AIDA Level 4

- Good justification of both debates, consistent with scores and feedback. Scores consistent with Australs standard.

* Markers are not looking for candidates who completely agree with them, as debates can be close and result in split decisions. Markers look for strong justifications for the decisions reached, i.e. well reasoned explanation that is comprehensive and are consistent with the Australasian debate format and adjudication guide.

** Clash points are issues or arguments on which teams spend the most time engaging each other, or arguments which are the most contentious.

*** Turning points are moments in the debate that have a large impact on the debate. For example, one speaker's lack of responsiveness which makes the entire team then take a more defensive stance or a particularly strong speech that the other team are not able to beat and are from then having to play catch-up.

Marking Guide

Here are some of the thoughts that go through the heads of markers as evaluate Adjudication Sheets.

Explaining the Decision

- Does the candidate clearly explain the decision and the main justifications for it? Are these justifications clearly explained?
- Is the reasoning for the decision
 - Consistent with the rules of the Australasian Format?
 - Reflective of the major issues in the debate? Does the candidate weight these issues and appropriately prioritize them?
 - Balanced? Winning team has faults and losing team has strengths, or is the winning team all good and losing team all bad?
 - Comprehensive? Includes a discussion of Matter, Manner and Method?

Adjudication Errors

- Does the candidate exhibit bias? – Unequal application of rules, too much onus on one team/person compared to the other, attach value to a speech/argument because of the person making it
- Does the candidate get into the debate? – Does the candidate develop and argument/example, provide new information, infer the value of an argument/example, estimate the weakness/strengths or an argument/policy, and use this in determining the result of the debate?

Rules/Roles

- Misunderstanding of roles of speakers – too rigid or lax expectations placed on speakers, enforcing guidelines as rules (ie the need for signposting, stances, stylistic elements)
- Misunderstanding of roles of teams – what a government or opposition team should do, how they should run a case (ie need for a policy, counter prop, positive case)

Feedback section

- Candidates should provide balanced, relevant and useful feedback. Are the issues correctly identified and weighted appropriately? Is the feedback all negative or all positive? Is it related

to what happened in the debate? Is it consistent with their evaluation of the debate and the scoring of the speeches?

Scores

- Are the scores within the scoring range?
- Are the scores consistent with the adjudication and feedback?
- Are the scores of speakers proportional to their contribution to the debate and relative to each other?
- Do the scores match the standards applied at Australs?

Feedback to Candidates

Markers will give brief feedback to candidates. This will help explain why the candidates scored as they did as well as how they candidate can improve.

Deciding the Debate

Evaluation	Poor	Poor/Fair	Fair	Fair/Good	Good
Scale	1	2	3	4	5

Section 1 : Deciding the Debate

Understanding and application of debate rules	
Identification and evaluation of issues in the debate	
Influenced by adjudication errors	
Scores reflective of debate, consistent with adjudication and feedback	
Scores proportional between speakers	
Scores consistent with Australs Standards	
Feedback reflective of debate, consistent with adjudication and scores	

Other Comments :