



AVGOULEA-LINARDATOU SCHOOL

“Debating Skills: Democracy and Citizenship in Europe, National Selection Debate Event”

Welcome debaters, teacher-coaches and adjudicators to the 1st National Selection EFEE Debate Event, to be held on Saturday 25th January 2025 at Avgouleia-Linardatou School.

The theme of the event is: “Democracy and Citizenship in Europe”

Applications are open till 12th December; you can sign up your school at:
<https://forms.office.com/e/mUAcejR0Tr>

ABOUT

In cooperation with the Hellenic Independent Schools Association, Avgouleia-Linardatou School organises the 1st National Selection EFEE event on 25th January 2025.

10th, 11th and 12th graders can participate in the debate event. All teams must comprise 3 core student members, 1 or 2 substitute student members and 1 or 2 teachers-coaches. We would appreciate it if teachers-coaches could act as adjudicators.

The 3 best speakers of the debate event together with one teacher-coach will form the Greek Team to participate in the European Debate Event set to be held in Belgium, between 23rd and 25th April 2025, by the European Federation of Education (EFEE) (<https://educationemployers.eu>) and CEPCEP (Research Centre on People's and Cultures: <https://ciencia.ucp.pt/en/>) will be responsible for all the expenses, including transfer, accommodation and food, of the Greek Team.

OBJECTIVES

- Cultivation of public speaking skills
- Improving critical thinking, problem-solving and decision-making skills
- Enhancing the ability to form balanced, informed arguments and use reasoning and evidence

- Honing effective reasoning and persuasive skills
- Increasing learners' confidence, poise and self-esteem
- Developing effective speech composition and delivery
- Encouraging teamwork and communication
- Critical approach to civic and democratic engagement
- Practising the use of the English language

MISSION

To promote debate as an educational tool that enables secondary school students to speak up for themselves, promotes their empathy, critical thinking and creative thinking skills and empowers them to work towards strengthening democracy and citizenship in 21st century.

RULES OF THE DEBATE COMPETITION*

*the rules presented here will apply both in our National Selection Debate Event and the European Debate Event. They were written by experienced educators, with the support of the *Netherlands Debat Instituut* and are pedagogically adapted to upper secondary students entering structured debate initiatives.

(Source: CEPCEP – Centro de Estudos dos Povos e Culturas de Expressão Portuguesa, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, May 2023)

School Teams - Process

The school teams should consist of

- 3 core student participants
- 1 or 2 teachers-coaches
- (optionally** 1 or 2 substitute student participants).

The 3 students will participate as first, second and third or rebuttal speakers. If a student, for justified reasons, cannot participate in the debate the last minute, either one of the substitute students or one of the main team members may assume their partner's role.

Our school will invite an extra shadow team that will debate without their scores counting in the process, in case there is an odd number of teams registered or a registered team drops out of the event.

The event includes two rounds of debate with all the school teams, followed by a final round with the two teams with the highest scores. The debates in each round will take place simultaneously.

Each debate is conducted by a table that includes a Chairperson (acting as a judge as well), two more judges and a Timekeeper. At the end of the debate, the judges will assess both teams and provide feedback. The 3 best delegates, who will come from the first two rounds of the event, will be the winners and will travel to Belgium in April. The team which will win the finals will be presented with the Debate Champion 2025 Award.

The closing session includes a ceremony to publish results and deliver the awards, honorary recognitions and participation certificates.

Motions

Motions are the ideas, topics, propositions to be debated by the teams.

The motions for the national selection event are proposed by the participating schools, discussed with our academic advisors and approved by the Organising Team. In all the 10 motions to be used in the debate event will be published 20 days before the event.

We will ensure the random distribution of the motions on the day of the debate event.

Debate

The debate includes a proposition team that defends the motion and an opposition team that opposes the motion.

The teams will know 30 minutes before the first and similarly before the second round the motion that will be debated. They are given a 30-minute period for preparation, during which they are not allowed to use any digital devices.

The teams must present themselves to the Chairperson 5 minutes before each debate. The chairperson tosses a coin in the presence of both teams. The team winning the toss is the proponent of the motion. During the debate, the speakers cannot have with them or use any electronic devices.

The proposition team makes the first intervention. The constructive speeches, delivered by the first two speakers of each team, have a time limit of five minutes.

The summary or rebuttal speeches, delivered by the third speaker of each team, have a time limit of three minutes.

Between each intervention, there is a 1-minute break.

The interventions follow the structure and use the time limits as presented in the table below:

1 st Speakers	Proposition: 5 min Opposition: 5 min	Motion definition Setting issues for debate Presenting the team's case
2 nd Speakers	Proposition: 5 min Opposition: 5 min	Handle definition if needed Answer other team's arguments Continue to build the team's case
Summary Speakers	Proposition: 3 min Opposition: 3 min	Refute the other team's arguments Sum up the team's case

The Timekeeper tracks speakers' time using a desk bell to indicate the beginning and end of the speeches. A double ring of the desk bell will signal the beginning of the speech, a second ring will signal the beginning of the last minute, and a third and double ring will signal the end of the time, reinforced by another double ring after 10 seconds. The end of the 1-minute break will be marked with one ring.

Summary or rebuttal speakers cannot present new arguments.

At the end of the debate, adjudicators have 4 minutes to decide on each team's score, fill in the score sheet and put the sheet in a closed envelope. Then, they have 3` to give brief feedback to both teams. The Chairperson closes the debate.

In all the rounds, the teams' scores are delivered to the Coordination Team, which updates the scoring board.

Adjudication

Adjudication is the process of assessing teams' participation in the debate. In this event, teams are assessed by two judges using specific criteria and a score (0-20).

Judges are selected among teachers unrelated to any of the teams.

The Coordination Team provides prep training for the adjudication team before the event, assuring judges' readiness, equality, and fairness.

Each judge is responsible for rating both teams' performance using three criteria: (i) Attitude regarding the debate, including team engagement and contribution; (ii) Content

or the compelling strength of each team case, arguments, and refutation; (iii) Delivery meaning the ability to present their arguments persuasively and expressively.

The table below presents the three criteria, their value, and main indicators.

Attitude	0-8 points	-Ability to listen and respond -Team members support -Respect for the other team -Valuing the structure and rules of debate
Content	0-8 points	-Argumentation relevance and strength -Rebuttal pertinence and quality -Overall compelling and consistent case
Delivery	0-4 points	-Body language -Vocal style -Rhetoric techniques

Code of conduct

During the event, all participants and other people present should:

- a) Value debate as an opportunity to develop empathy, critical and creative thinking
- b) Understand the critical importance of debating for the common good and shared future
- c) Acknowledge both teams` roles in deepening each motion
- d) Exercise active listening
- e) Show respect for each other at all times and in all roles
- f) Comply with existing regulations
- g) Avoid remarks or casual jokes that can be easily misinterpreted
- h) Contribute to a positive debate environment where everyone's voice and ideas are heard

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ATTITUDE	CONTENT	DELIVERY
<p>Excellent ability to listen/respond: they repeat opposing arguments precisely and respond convincingly to their opponents.</p> <p>Strong support between team members.</p> <p>All speakers are very respectful to opponents.</p> <p>Promotion of debate structure and rules.</p> <p>8</p>	<p>All arguments are relevant and supported with explanations and examples.²</p> <p>Rebuttals clearly strengthen the case of the debater(s).</p> <p>The overall case is very compelling and consistent: debaters structure and lead the debate with their line of argumentation.</p> <p>8</p>	<p>Body language is excellent; debaters stand firmly and use fitting hand gestures to support the message. They are the argument.</p> <p>The variation in vocal style (volume, pace, and intonation) elevates the message and makes it very convincing</p> <p>The use of many rhetorical techniques makes the message especially convincing.</p> <p>4</p>
<p>Good ability to listen/respond: they repeat opposing arguments correctly and respond well to these.</p> <p>Team members support each other.</p> <p>All speakers are respectful to opponents.</p> <p>Team values debate structure and rules.</p> <p>6</p>	<p>Most arguments are relevant and supported by either an explanation or an example.</p> <p>Debaters rebut most opposing arguments; the rebuttals are compelling.</p> <p>The overall case is compelling and consistent: debaters structure debate, and there is one clear line in argumentation.</p> <p>6</p>	<p>Body language is good; debaters stand firmly; some hand gestures support the message.</p> <p>The variation in vocal style (volume, pace, and intonation) supports the message and makes it convincing</p> <p>Various rhetorical techniques support the message and make it more convincing.</p> <p>3</p>
<p>Some ability to listen/respond: opposing arguments not always repeated correctly and, thus, not always well responded to.</p> <p>Team members try to support each other.</p> <p>All speakers are somewhat respectful to opponents.</p> <p>Respects the debate structure and rules.</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Argumentation seems relevant but lacks strength: arguments are not always supported with explanations or examples</p> <p>Debaters rebut some opposing arguments, and the quality of the rebuttals is average.</p> <p>Case of average quality: argumentation consistent but not always compelling (or vice versa). Structure is not always visible.</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Body language is neutral; debaters try to stand firmly and use small hand gestures.</p> <p>Variation in vocal style (volume, pace, and intonation) is present; it doesn't distract from the message but does not support it.</p> <p>Debaters try to use rhetorical techniques to support the message and make it convincing</p> <p>2</p>
<p>Lack of ability to listen/respond: opposing arguments are not repeated and are only responded to in the form of loose statements.</p> <p>Team members barely support each other.</p> <p>Speakers ignore or are rude to opponents.</p> <p>Some contempt regarding the debate structure and rules.</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Argumentation is irrelevant and/or very weak: what is being said are statements rather than arguments</p> <p>Debaters do not rebut opposing arguments.</p> <p>Overall case is not compelling nor consistent: the debate lacks structure and is hard to follow</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Body language is absent or distracts from the message; debaters move a lot or stand frozen</p> <p>Variation in vocal style (volume, pace, and intonation) barely present or distracts from the message.</p> <p>Scarce use of rhetorical techniques that do not always support the message or make it convincing.</p> <p>1</p>
<p>Debater(s) did not participate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevance, ability to listen/respond, and relation to team/opponents cannot be addressed. <p>0</p>	<p>Debater(s) did not participate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argumentation is non-existent There are no rebuttals or reactions No argumentative case <p>0</p>	<p>Debater(s) did not participate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nor body language, vocal style, or rhetorical techniques can be adjudicated <p>0</p>

Notes:

- The judges can discuss the speakers' performance, but their assessment is individual. At the end, the speakers' and the team's score for each debate is achieved by adding the 2 judges' and the Chairperson's assessment in a final score.
- It is possible to give points between two categories (e.g. 7 or 7.5)
- An argument includes the statement (ASSERTION), explanation (REASONING) and illustration (EVIDENCE)

Here you can see an Assessment Template for judges

Template 1 – Assessment template for judges

Judge _____ Date _____ Room _____

Motion _____

Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Delivery (0-4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ability to listen and respond ✓ Team members support ✓ Respect for the other team ✓ Valuing the structure and rules of debate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Argumentation relevance and strength ✓ Rebuttal pertinence and quality ✓ Overall compelling and consistent case 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Body language ✓ Vocal style ✓ Rhetorical techniques

Proposition		
1st Speaker	Name:	
Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Delivery (0-4)
Notes:		

Opposition		
1st Speaker	Name:	
Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Delivery (0-4)
Notes:		

2nd Speaker	Name:	
Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Attitude (0-4)
Notes:		

2nd Speaker	Name:	
Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Delivery (0-4)
Notes:		

3rd Speaker	Name:	
Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Delivery (0-4)
Notes:		

3rd Speaker	Name:	
Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Delivery (0-4)
Notes:		

Final score		
Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Delivery (0-4)
Total:		
Notes:		

Final score		
Attitude (0-8)	Content (0-8)	Delivery (0-4)
Notes:		

Notes:

1. Argumentation structure: (a) Statement/label (main idea); (b) Explanation (why it is true and why it is relevant); (c) Illustration (examples that can prove the argument's soundness)
2. Refutation clearness: (1) They say that...; (2) But they are wrong ... ;(3) Because ... ;(4) Therefore,...

TEACHERS-COACHES' TRAINING SESSION

1 or 2 training sessions will be organised for the teachers-coaches between 15th December and 15th January.

More information will be sent to the participating schools.

COST

Cost: 20€ per student/ participant - no fees for teachers- coaches

REGISTRATION

Applications are open till 12th December; you can sign up your school at:

On 13th September you will receive an email from the Organising Team giving you information about the next step: fee payment and student registration.

PROGRAMME

- 08.00- 09.00 School and Student Registration
- 09.00- 10.00 Introduction and Announcement of Team pairs for the first round
- 10.00 - 10.30 Preparation for Debates- Announcement of Judges
- 10.45 – 11.45 1st round of Debates
- 11.45- 12.15 Group photo – Press team interviews attendees
- 12.15- 12.45 Lunch break
- 12.45 – 13.15 Announcement of Team pairs for the second round
- 13.15- 13.30 Preparation for Debates- Announcement of Judges
- 13.30- 14.30 2nd round of Debates
- 14.30- 15.00 Short break- Student attendees create social media videos to be uploaded on the project's Instagram account – Teacher networking session
- 15.00-15.30 Announcement of the four semifinalists (4 best teams) and Preparation for the Semifinals
- 15.30-16.30 Semifinals
- 17.00-18.00 Finals
- 18.00-19.00 Announcement of the 3 Best Delegates, the Best Team and other places

*there might be adjustments in the schedule

Saturday 25th January, 2025

DRESS CODE

Attendees should opt for business jackets, proper shirts and shoes as well as formal trousers/ dresses/ shirts. They should refrain from wearing sports shoes and denim.

ORGANISING TEAM

Foteini Sifinou fsifinou@avgouleaschool.gr

Areti Veli Veliareti@avgouleaschool.gr

Antigoni Koutini akoutini@avgouleaschool.gr

Denia Kouroumalou dkouroumalou@avgouleaschool.gr

ACADEMIC ADVISORS

Rodrigo Queiroz e Melo, Vice- president of CEPCEP- Research Centre from the Portuguese Catholique University and of EFEE. With experience in international project management, Rodrigo brought together the different institutions to build the debating skills.eu project with a higher focus on inclusion

Muni Archer de Carvalho, educator and researcher with experience in personal and social development projects, including debate projects and teacher training.

CONTACT

You can contact the Organising Team at: alssda@avgouleaschool.gr (preferable), or call on: 2115002300

In April 2023, a similar European Student Debate Event occurred in Lisbon. Like in the present project, this international event followed local events. This is what some of the participants said:

“It helped me to see some things about me and the world more clearly”
(Student)

“I think the event forced me to step out of my comfort zone, which helped me in my development as a person
(Student)

“I fell in love with debating over and over again “ (Teacher)

Applications are open till 12th December; you can sign up your school at: <https://forms.office.com/e/mUAcejR0Tr>

We look forward to welcoming everybody to our school in January.

If you have any further inquiries, please contact the Organising Team of the event at alssda@avgouleaschool.gr