



*Member of Qatar Foundation*

**World Schools Debating Championships**  
Qatar 2010

**Principles for Assessing Applications  
for Sponsored Adjudication Positions**

QatarDebate is intending to pay for thirty adjudicators to attend the next World Schools Debating Championships, being held in Qatar on 8 – 19 February 2010. On 16 June, we issued a formal Call for Applications for those positions. That call stated that applicants would be chosen on the basis of adjudication experience and the need for diversity. In this note, we outline in more detail the principles that will be used for implementing those criteria. This note is intended to ensure transparency in the process of selecting sponsored adjudicators. We do not intend this note to change any of the guidance previously issued, and we believe that all applications received so far have provided sufficient information to apply these principles. (Nonetheless, any applicant who wishes to submit further information in light of these guidelines is very welcome to do so.)

The aim of the pool of 30 sponsored adjudicators is to provide a core group of competent judges who, between them, are easily capable of judging any debate in the championship. The ‘capability of judging’ requires not only competent and experienced judges of the highest order, but judges drawn from as many nations as is reasonably practicable.

The task of selecting the sponsored adjudicators is therefore more complicated than finding the 30 most experienced judges. National diversity is a key requirement. The process will therefore necessarily require subjective weightings to be made. However, we intend to do that in the most transparent manner possible.

We therefore intend to follow three steps.

**1. The threshold step**

All sponsored judges must be likely to be assessed, after the judges’ briefing at the beginning of the Championship, as suitable to judge from Round One.

The most useful demonstration of this likely suitability will be an applicant’s previous experience judging at the World Schools Debating Championships, especially in the later stages of the Championships. However, other experience will also be useful. Such experience may include (but need not be limited to): (i) judging at the highest level of national schools championships run on rules similar to those of WSDC, (ii) judging at the World University Debating Championships, especially in the later stages, (iii) judging at higher levels of significant regional and international tournaments for schools or universities. In the case of applicants with no previous judging at WSDC, we will seek comments from nominated referees as to their likely ability to judge according to the WSDC requirements.

## **2. The need for experienced judges**

Judges passing the threshold step will be ranked in order of proven adjudication experience and demonstrated competence (for example, experience in judging finals rounds, being a member of the CAP, etc). The first 10 judges will be selected for sponsorship.

In the case of applicants with no previous experience judging at WSDC, we will seek comments from nominated referees including, where necessary, information about the nature of the competitions that applicants have judged, the level in that competition at which they have judged, their competence at judging those competitions, any relevant information about the rules applicable to those competitions in comparison to WSDC, and an opinion about the applicant's likely competence to judge at WSDC.

## **3. The need for diversity**

Judges not yet selected will remain eligible for selection if (i) they have passed the threshold step, and (ii) there is not yet a sponsored judge selected from their country. If an applicant is eligible to be associated with more than one country, the applicant's own preferred affiliation will generally be taken to be the relevant affiliation unless the applicant's background shows a significant affiliation with another nation as well as, or instead of, the applicant's preferred affiliation.

If 20 judges or fewer remain eligible for selection, those judges will be selected. In that case, the remaining places will be allocated on the basis of the earlier rank of proven adjudication experience.

If more than 20 judges remain eligible, the 20 selected judges will be chosen by the earlier rank of proven adjudication experience.

The Chief Adjudicators consider that, for the purposes of the selection process, this step will ensure cultural and other diversity among the sponsored adjudicators.

### **The selection process**

The selection will be made by the Chief Adjudicators, in ongoing consultation with the Chief Adjudicators' Panel. In the case that either of the Chief Adjudicators or members of the Chief Adjudicators' Panel have a friendship with an applicant, that person (i) will offer only limited comment on the applicant, and (ii) will be heavily guided by the opinions of others involved in the process. It will be open to the Chief Adjudicators and members of the Panel to recuse themselves from considering particular applicants if they feel more comfortable doing so.

The Chief Adjudicators and Chief Adjudicators' Panel will not publicise the list of those who applied for sponsored positions, nor release the ranking of proven adjudication experience and competence. Brief reasons will be provided to unsuccessful applicants, but only if requested by that applicant. Those reasons will not include any comparative assessment of the applicant against any other applicants in a way that may reveal the identity of other applicants.

Should a sponsored adjudicator be unable to take up the sponsorship, the Chief Adjudicators and Chief Adjudicators' Panel may replace that person with another judge. This replacement will be selected on the same criteria set out above (for example, if the replaced applicant was chosen in the first 10 judges, a replacement will be more likely to be chosen on the basis of proven experience and competence; if the replaced applicant was chosen on the basis of the need for diversity, a replacement will be more likely to be chosen on this basis).

Simon Quinn  
Chris Erskine  
27 July 2009