

College Fed Challenge: Truth in Judging Statement

In comparing College Fed Challenge teams, judges seek to answer the following question:

Which team most convincingly demonstrates its understanding of U.S. monetary policy?

Components of this understanding include how and why the Federal Reserve establishes and implements monetary policy, how this policy affects the overall economy, and which issues are driving present-day policy debates.

Answering this question involves a considerable degree of subjective evaluation. In the above question, “understanding” is a key to victory, but so is “convincingly demonstrates.”

The scoring rubric requires our judges to compare teams on five dimensions:

- Knowledge of monetary policy and of the Federal Reserve’s role in its implementation;
- Responses to judges’ questions;
- Quality of the presentation;
- Quality of the research and analysis; and
- Evidence of teamwork and cooperation.

The primary thrust of College Fed Challenge is economics, not forensics, so judges tend to place the greatest weight on knowledge of monetary policy and the Fed’s role. At the same time, forensic performance is important. Winning teams are likely to be strong on all five criteria. Judges generally place the highest weight on a team’s performance in the Q&A period because this activity will most likely reveal analytical strengths or challenges. However, a strong Q&A performance will not be sufficient to carry the day if the team’s presentation is weak or analytically flawed. Teams must demonstrate a cooperative and cohesive spirit during their delivery.

The judges will use all criteria outlined in the rubric to the best of their abilities to answer the overarching question at the top of this page.

College Fed Challenge Scoring Rubric

Scoring Grid

| Category | 10 | 8-9 | 5-6-7 | 3-4 | 1-2 |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Knowledge of the Fed, current state of the economy and monetary policy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Always presents accurate information and demonstrates a thorough understanding of basic and sophisticated concepts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently presents accurate information and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the basic concepts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently presents accurate information and demonstrates average understanding of the basic concepts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixes accurate and inaccurate information and demonstrates less than average understanding of the basic concepts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides little accurate information and demonstrates poor understanding of the basic concepts. |
| Response to judges' questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Always answers to the point and shows poise under pressure. Always demonstrates the ability to think quickly. Extremely persuasive in defending positions that are challenged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently answers to the point and shows poise under pressure. Consistently demonstrates the ability to think quickly. Convincing in defending positions that are challenged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently answers to the point and shows poise under pressure. Frequently demonstrates the ability to think quickly. Adequately defends positions that are challenged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occasionally answers to the point and shows poise under pressure. Occasionally demonstrates the ability to think quickly. Less than adequately defends positions that are challenged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely answers to the point or shows poise under pressure. Rarely demonstrates the ability to think quickly. Provides poor defenses for positions that are challenged. |
| Presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extremely persuasive in advocacy role. Always demonstrates logical and coherent organization. Each student speaks with great confidence and with sufficient volume to be heard by all. Always integrates audio-visual aids/media appropriately. Never read from notes or a script. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Persuasive in advocacy role. Consistently demonstrates logical and coherent organization. Most students speak with confidence and with sufficient volume to be heard by all. Consistently integrates audio-visual aids/media appropriately. Rarely read from notes or a script. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently persuasive in advocacy role. Frequently demonstrates logical and coherent organization. Some students speak with confidence and with sufficient volume to be heard by all. Frequently integrates audio-visual aids/media appropriately. Occasionally read from notes or a script. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occasionally persuasive in advocacy role. Occasionally demonstrates logical and coherent organization. Few students speak with confidence and with sufficient volume to be heard by all. Occasionally integrates audio-visual aids/media appropriately. Frequently read from notes or script. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely persuasive in advocacy role. Rarely demonstrates logical and coherent organization. Students speak with a minimum of confidence and with insufficient volume to be heard by all. Rarely integrates audio-visual aids/media appropriately. Always read from notes or a script. |
| Research and analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions drawn from the data are always logical and insightful. Recommendations are always supported by relevant data. A wide variety of authoritative sources are used. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions drawn from the data are, most often, logical and insightful. Recommendations are consistently supported by relevant data. Mostly authoritative sources are used. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions drawn from the data frequently are logical and insightful. Recommendations are frequently supported by relevant data. Some authoritative sources are used. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions drawn from the data occasionally are logical and insightful. Recommendations are occasionally supported by relevant data. Few authoritative sources are used. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions drawn from the data lack logic and insight. Recommendations are rarely supported by relevant data. Authoritative sources are ignored. |
| Teamwork and cooperation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each team member plays a substantial and integral role. Demonstrates extensive evidence of coordination among team members. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although some team members play a greater role than others, each student contributes significantly. Demonstrates significant evidence of coordination among team members. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some team members dominate, while the others contribute to varying degrees. Demonstrates some evidence of coordination among team members. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some team members dominate, while the others make modest contributions. Demonstrates little evidence of coordination among team members. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or two team members dominate, while the others contribute negligibly. Demonstrates insignificant evidence of coordination among team members. |