

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ORATORICAL FESTIVAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGES

DEAR PANEL OF JUDGES,

Thank you for assisting us by serving as judges in our Oratorical Festival. The information that follows will familiarize you with the procedures to be used and with the requirements expected of our speakers.

1. The Festival Chairperson will provide you with SPEAKER EVALUATION FORMS which are to be completed, one for each speaker. (Sample is on page 21.)
2. One member of the judging panel will be asked to serve as a Coordinating Judge for the deliberations.
3. After all the speakers in the junior or senior division have finished, the judges will depart to a private room for deliberation. At this time, you will be given the "Timekeeper's Report" to determine if any penalties are to be assessed. In scoring, a calculator should be used as scores are often very close.
4. The Parish Priest is not a member of the judging panel. However, he is available as a resource person for verification of religious matters, if needed. Please do not hesitate to request his assistance.
5. After tallying the Ranking Points of each speaker, the top speaker in each division advances to the next level. An exception to this rule at the Parish Festival is if there are four or less churches within a District that have a local Oratorical Festival, then the top two speakers in each division advance to the District Festival. The local Parish Chairperson will inform you about this during the Orientation Session. At the District Festival it is the top two speakers in each division who advance to the Metropolis level. They are referred to as finalists, not first or second place speakers. At the Metropolis Oratorical Festival only the first place speakers in each division advance to the Archdiocese finals.
6. Positive and encouraging comments, to the speakers and audience, are encouraged and beneficial. (Judges should be sensitive to the ability of speakers to understand and accept remarks which may be critical.)
7. The details of the judging panel's deliberations should not be discussed publicly. This can create problems and anxieties among young speakers and also their parents. If, however, a speaker wishes to see how he/she can improve his/her writing and/or oratory skills, the speaker may have a copy of his/her "Speaker Evaluation Form." Under **no** circumstances should comparisons be made with other Speaker Evaluation Forms.
8. Upon completion of deliberations, the Speaker Evaluation Forms are to be given to the Festival Chairperson for future reference.

We hope you will enjoy this experience with us, and again we thank you for your participation in the St. John Chrysostom Oratorical Festival.

Sponsored by
THE DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE OF AMERICA

SPEECH REQUIREMENTS

Participants: Junior Division - Students in grades 7–9
Senior Division - Students in grades 10–12

The Speech: The speech Topic must be taken from the official list compiled by the Department of Religious Education. Speakers are expected to have prepared their own speech through research and personal experience. Quotations should be used effectively as supportive material and must have sources identified. No audio-visual material can be used. The delivery must largely be given from the lectern and should **not** be a dramatic presentation.

The Length: Juniors, 3–4 minutes; Seniors, 4–5 minutes. A 15-second grace period will be given to speakers who run under or overtime. The **penalties** assessed are one point lost for every five seconds beyond the 15-second grace period. Such points will be deducted from **each judge's** "TOTAL" for "Content and Delivery" found at the bottom of the "Speaker Evaluation Form." The report of the timekeeper will determine if any penalties are in order.

JUDGES' CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SPEECHES

CONTENT

Organization: Is there a clear introduction that draws the listeners into the speech? Is the body clearly organized with supporting information? Is the development of ideas logical and easy to follow? Does the conclusion draw the ideas together and give clear emphasis to the thesis of the speech?

Persuasiveness: Did the speaker offer persuasive arguments, through logic or other means and cause a new thinking about the topic rather than just summarizing it?

Adaptation of Topic: Did the speaker approach the topic in an innovative way? Was the speech well-researched? Did the speaker use appropriate, descriptive, and convincing language? If personal experience was referenced, was it effective?

Theology: Is the content theologically sound, reflecting Orthodox Tradition accurately? Did the speech draw upon scriptural, liturgical, and historical resources?

Conclusion: Did the speaker offer a call-to-action and/or final thoughts that are designed to move the audience to the speaker's point-of-view?

DELIVERY

Vocal Skills: Was the speaker's voice expressive, easily understood and heard? Did the speaker's voice effectively express the mood and feeling of the speech?

Expressiveness: Did the speaker demonstrate a desire to communicate his/her thoughts? Were pauses and phrasing effective?

Physical Movements: Did the speaker exhibit poise via posture, eye contact, facial expression? Was there effective use or overuse use of movements, gestures? Did these emphasize key points?

Effective Use of Manuscript: It is not a requirement for the speech to be memorized. If a manuscript is used, did the speaker use it discreetly without relying on it throughout or having it become a distraction to the audience?

Communication: Did the speaker effectively communicate his/her thoughts with the audience by making contact with them in a conversational style?

SPEAKER EVALUATION FORM

Topic: _____ Speaker order number: _____

Category: (Check one) _____ Junior Division _____ Senior Division

Point Scale: Outstanding, Superior.....9–10 points
Good, better than average.....7–8 points
Satisfactory, fair, average.....5–6 points
Below average.....3–4 points
Ineffective.....1–2 points

CONTENT

Points

- _____ **Organization:** Was the speech content effective and organized with a clear introduction, body and conclusion?
- _____ **Persuasiveness:** Did the speaker offer persuasive arguments and a clear point-of-view, rather than just summarizing the topic?
- _____ **Adaptation of Topic:** Did the speaker approach the topic in an innovative way? Was the speech well-researched? If personal experience was referenced, was it effective?
- _____ **Theology:** Is the content theologically sound, reflecting accurate Orthodox Tradition? Did the speech draw upon scriptural, liturgical and historical resources?
- _____ **Conclusion:** Did the speaker offer a call-to-action and/or final thoughts that are designed to move the audience to the speaker's point-of-view?
- _____ POINTS - **Content Subtotal (50 is a perfect score)**

DELIVERY

Points

- _____ **Vocal Skills:** Effectiveness of vocal skills via diction and volume. Did the voice express the mood and feeling of the speech?
- _____ **Expressiveness:** Did the speaker communicate his/her thoughts with enthusiasm, and were pauses and phrasing effective, yet not too theatrical?
- _____ **Physical Movements:** Were physical movements, eye contact, posture, poise and facial expressions effective?
- _____ **Effective Use of Manuscript:** If a manuscript was used, was it distracting during the delivery of the speech?
- _____ **Communication:** Did the speaker effectively communicate his/her thoughts with the audience?
- _____ POINTS - **Delivery Subtotal (50 is a perfect score)**

_____ **TOTAL POINTS** — (Content plus Delivery)

_____ Minus time penalty, if applicable

_____ **GRAND TOTAL**

JUDGE _____

PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN SCORING SPEAKERS JUDGES' RANKING SHEET - FORM C

The judging of speakers is sometimes very close. In using the ranking system, judges are further able to refine their grading of speakers and assure the fairest possible scoring. The procedures are as follows:

1. **Each judge** takes his/her set of Speaker Evaluation Forms and **arranges them** in order from highest number of "Total Points" to lowest number of "Total Points."

2. **On the "Speaker Evaluation Form"** (top right-hand corner), you will find "Rank ___." On this line, place the number of the order in which you have arranged the evaluation forms with the highest number of "Total Points" being "Rank 1," your next highest "Rank 2," and so on to your last form.

When placing the Speaker Evaluation Forms in ranking order, sometimes you will have two or more speakers with the same "Total Points." If this occurs, assign the **same** Rank to these speakers. When ranking the next speaker, the assignment of his/her Rank should take into consideration the number of speakers who have already received equal Ranks. See example below: Judge A gave speakers no. 4 and 6 a Rank of 2. Speaker 3, the next highest, would then receive a Rank of 4. Judge C gave speakers no. 3, 7 and 8 a Rank of 1. Speaker 6, the next highest, would then also receive a Rank of 4.

Sample: JUDGES' RANKING SHEET - FORM C

(See page 24 for actual form.)

Speaker Number:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Judge A	9	7	4	2	6	2	5	1	8			
Judge B	9	4	7	6	8	2	1	3	5			
Judge C	7	8	1	5	6	4	1	1	9			
Total Ranking Point6	25	19	12	13	20	8	7	5	22			

Speaker No. Points Speaker Name

RANKINGS: First Place (Lowest number of Ranking points) 8 5 1. _____
 Second Place (2nd lowest number of Ranking points) 7 7 2. _____
 Third Place (3rd lowest number of Ranking points) 6 8 3. _____

3. **After each judge** has completed placing the Rank on his/her Speaker Evaluation Forms, the forms should be re-arranged by “Speaker order number.”

4. **When all the judges** have completed this procedure, the Coordinating Judge will ask each judge to read off the Rank given to each speaker. Confusion at this crucial time can be avoided if each judge uses the following term when recording the Rank of each speaker on Form C. Speaker #1 received a Rank of ____; Speaker #2 received a Rank of ____; Speaker #3 received a Rank of ____; etc.

5. **If there is a wide difference** in the ranking points of speakers who might place in the top three positions – for example, one judge ranks a speaker “1,” the second judge “2,” and the third judge “6” – then a discussion should take place as to why such a difference exists. By reviewing the Speaker Evaluation Forms for these speakers, and sharing comments, an equitable scoring agreement can be reached. This, however, does not necessarily mean that a judge has to change his/her score. You might find this comparison of rankings necessary to determine the third place speaker and the next ranked (or “Honorable Mention”) speaker.

6. **The speaker with the lowest “Total of Ranking Points”** will be ranked **first place**, the speaker with the second lowest total **second place**, and the third lowest total **third place**. All speakers after third place are designated “**Honorable Mention.**”

7. If there is a tie in “**Total Ranking Points**” on Form C for any of the top four speakers (for example, those who receive a tie of Total Ranking Points of 5, 6, 8 etc.), then each judge must refer to his/her **Speaker Evaluation Forms** for the speakers in question. Once the Total Points are found, this number should be placed in the corresponding square for each judge and speaker number. These Total Points are then added and the speaker with the highest Total Points receives the higher rank (the lowest Ranking Point number) and the tie is broken. If there is still a tie, then a discussion among the judges must take place until the tie is broken.

By using the ranking system, our speakers are given the best possible considerations in scoring.

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ORATORICAL FESTIVAL JUDGES' RANKING SHEET - FORM C

1. Each judge is to place in every square the Rank given to each speaker on his/her "Speaker Evaluation Form. Division: _____ Junior
 "Confusion at this crucial time can be avoided if each judge uses the following term when recording the Rank of each speaker on Form-C. Speaker #1 received a Rank of _____; Speaker #2 received a Rank of _____; Speaker #3 received a Rank of _____; etc. _____ Senior

Date: _____

2. When all rankings are entered, the Ranking points for each speaker are totaled.

3. If there is a tie in "Total Ranking Points" on Form C for any of the top four speakers (for example, those who receive a tie of Total Ranking Points of 5, 6, 8 etc.), then each judge must refer to his/her **Speaker Evaluation Forms** for the speakers in question. Once the Total Points are found, this number should be placed in the corresponding square for each judge and speaker number. These Total Points are then added and the speaker with the highest Total Points receives the higher rank (the lowest Ranking Point number) and the tie is broken. If there is still a tie, then a discussion among the judges must take place until the tie is broken.

Speaker Number:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Judge A												
Judge B												
Judge C												
Total Ranking Points												

Speaker No. Points Speaker Name*

RANKINGS: First Place (Lowest number of Ranking Points)

Second Place (2nd lowest number of Ranking Points)

Third Place (3rd lowest number of Ranking Points)
