

Judge Manual



Written by:
Justin Eckstein

Edited by:
Alan Zimmerman
Christina Huszcza

Last updated: October 4, 2011



September 1, 2011

Dear Friends of the Denver Urban Debate League,

This fall the Denver Urban Debate League (DUDL) will begin our fourth year of programming in the Denver metro area and we are excited to welcome you to our community as a DUDL volunteer this season! Our organization relies heavily on the support of our volunteers, who allow us to offer valuable academic programming to Denver's young people at no cost to students or their families. This helps DUDL ensure that resources are never a barrier to students who wish to participate in the life-changing activity of competitive debate. At the core of our programming are six DUDL sponsored debate competitions, hosted by our member schools and sponsored by our generous supporters. Each debate tournament requires dozens of volunteers to adjudicate debate rounds, mentor our students, and assist with administration of the tournament. Our tournaments literally could not happen without your support, and we are deeply grateful for your service.

During the 2010-2011 school year, after launching in 2008 under the auspices of the National Association for Urban Debate Leagues, DUDL became its very own 501(c)3 nonprofit, an important milestone in our organization's development. We reached more children than ever during 2010-2011, doubling the number of students we serve. We also welcomed our first set of middle school students into the program. We significantly deepened students' engagement with our program; with a 146% increase in the number of debate rounds at our tournaments and a 101% increase in the number of students participating in three or more tournaments. Moreover, year-end surveys revealed the powerful effects debate is producing in our students' lives. At the Contemporary Learning Academy, for example, 83% of debaters strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, "What I learn through debate helps me be more successful in school." This is an incredibly strong indicator of the impact in an alternative public school that, as one student put it, "is for students who think that graduating is not a option." We are proud to report, for the second year in a row, 100% of our 2010-2011 seniors graduated from high school as expected — an astonishing achievement in a school district where roughly 65% of seniors graduate on time.

Such accomplishments would not be possible without your involvement in the league, and I thank you, so very much, for standing with DUDL this year. For more information on DUDL please visit <http://www.denverdebate.org> and <http://www.urbandebate.org>. If you have any questions or suggestions about our programming and/or volunteer opportunities, please contact me at [303.871.6575](tel:303.871.6575).

Best regards,

Jessica A. Clark
Executive Director, Denver Urban Debate League



Contents

How to use this manual	4
What is policy debate?.....	4
What is the 2011-2012 topic?	4
What is the role of the judge?	5
How do I know what debate round I am judging?.....	6
I've heard that debaters speak really quickly. What happens if I can't understand the debaters?	6
What are the rules/norms of debate?.....	7
What are some general things I should know and/or expect?	8
What kinds of arguments will I hear?	9
Affirmative Arguments – The “Stock Issues”	9
Negative Arguments	10
What are the basic rules that I need to know in order to judge?	13
What are the speeches and the time limits?	15
What is the difference between a constructive and a rebuttal?	17
What is a “judging philosophy” and what are my choices?.....	18
Sample Judge Philosophy	19
What is a flow and how do you do it?	21
Sample Flow	23
How do I decide a debate?.....	24
How do I fill out my ballot?	25
Speaker Point Guide	26
Sample Ballot	27
How do I give an oral critique?	28
In Conclusion.....	29
Appendix	30
Glossary of key terms	30
Rubric to guide the oral critique	32
Building your skills: 9 tips for a better flow	33



How to use this manual

This manual is intended to answer judge's frequently asked questions. If you do not find the answer to your question, feel free to ask us.

What is policy debate?

Policy debate is an extra-curricular activity where two teams of two people competitively discuss issues of United States governmental policy. Each year, a yearlong topic is determined and teams debate whether that topic, or "resolution," is a good or bad idea. The affirmative will advocate for the resolution by proposing a plan. Conversely, the negative will argue against the affirmative plan by proving that the affirmative has not met their prima facie burden and thus a policy change is not warranted; that a better policy option exists; that the plan is philosophically unsound; or, that the plan is procedurally unfair.

What is the 2011-2012 topic?

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its exploration and/or development of space beyond the Earth's mesosphere.



What is the role of the judge?

Judges in debate fulfill three important roles:

1. The judge is a decision-maker. The judge must ultimately vote for the team that presented the better arguments. New judges usually understand this best by imagining themselves in a position to put the affirmative plan into effect (like Congress would). In that position, the judge would need to weigh the merits of the plan based on the arguments made in the debate. The judge must set aside their own personal opinions about the topic and evaluate the debater's positions. An argument the judge sees as particularly strong may not factor into the decision if made only briefly in a constructive speech and not referenced later in the debate. (Arguments that are not referenced later are considered “dropped.”)

While there is quite a bit of jargon in policy debate, the activity is, at heart, about persuasion. Debaters have a duty to adapt to their judges. Some judges have judged many debates and are familiar with debate terms and jargon. Newer judges less familiar with such terms should not feel inadequate. Just listen carefully to the arguments made. It is the debater's responsibility to ensure that a judge understands what is going on in a debate. If a debater says things you don't understand, it is the debater's fault; not yours. Having a variety of experienced and newer judges exercises the debater's ability to adapt to different audiences—an important skill! Judge philosophy cards, filled out by judges, will ensure that the debaters can adapt to their judges.

2. The judge is an educator. Judge feedback after the debate helps students to advance their skills and become more persuasive. Generally judges help in two ways: first, oral critiques after a debate provide immediate comment that help debaters hone their skills and win subsequent rounds. Second, written remarks on a ballot allow debaters and coaches to understand the judge's decision making process and what concerns to target for improvement.

3. The judge is a referee. Judges must keep track of the time of the debate. The judge's clock is considered the “official clock” of the debate. Occasionally, a judge may intervene during a debate if there is a serious problem. This might include anything from partner disagreement to missing evidence. The judge should do her/his best to help mediate these issues. If unable to resolve the situation, the judge will get a tournament official.



How do I know what debate round I am judging?

The list of debates is posted on a “pairing.” This is a sheet of paper listing the Affirmative team, the Negative team, the room number, and the Judge. When the pairings are released, simply go to the ballot table, look for the ballot that has your last name on it, and report to the room where you are assigned. An example is provided below:

<u>Affirmative</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Room</u>	<u>Judge</u>
West ST	MLK HP	213	Margesson, Rob
Manual PQ	Montbello SS	223	Donaldson, Aaron
TJ SE	AUL SH	149	Eckstein, Justin

I’ve heard that debaters speak really quickly. What happens if I can’t understand the debaters?

While it is true that some debaters speak very quickly, it is not true for all debaters. Remember at all times that the debaters’ job is to convince you. If you cannot understand them, you won’t be convinced. It is acceptable for you say, “Please slow down” or “I can’t understand you” in the middle of their speech. In policy debate, this is not considered rude. In fact, this helps the students understand how they need to adapt to meet your needs as a judge.



What are the rules/norms of debate?

This question is far more complex than it may initially seem. The simple answer is that there are very few codified rules. Debate, by definition, allows students to argue about what is best—including what would be the best application of the rules. The only steadfast rule is the time constraints. (See p.9 for the timings.)

While there are very few rules, there are governing norms—including those dictated by you. For example, debaters may ask how you feel about “tag-team” (or “open”) cross examination, where both debaters (on a team) may ask/answer questions. Feel free to respond whichever way you’d like. The debaters should follow that norm for the entire round. Here is a brief, and certainly not exhaustive, list some norms to consider before the debate:

Can both members of a team ask question? How about answer them?

Should the speaker stand? Or, is she/he allowed to sit?

Can partners speak to one another during speeches? What about during prep?

Is it ok for a debater to interrupt her/his partner’s speech to draw attention to a possible argument?

What is the “correct” answer? Whichever argument was most persuasive to you!



What are some general things I should know and/or expect?

- The students are not allowed to enter the room without the judge present. The debaters should be respectful of the classroom space. Please remind them of this rule if necessary.
- Each team should set-up on opposite sides of the classroom. They may push desks together and get their pads and papers ready.
- Please fill out a judging philosophy card before you go to the round. This gives the debaters valuable information they will use to craft their strategy.
- The debaters may use a desk to serve as a podium. They might even set a file box or stack of books on top of the desk, so they can place their papers on top.
- Novice debaters may not know the order of the debate. They may forget what to do, or who speaks next. If they seem confused and unsure, do intervene to help them through the debate. You can tell them what speech is next, who speaks, or the general goal of the next speech. For example, if the INC has no clue what to say, ask them if they have a “disadvantage” to read.
- When keeping time, both speech and prep, be sure to announce time to the debaters. If they are speaking, hand signals work best—5 fingers for 5 minutes remaining, etc. If they are in prep time verbal cues are better: e.g. “4 minutes of Prep time remaining.” If this seems difficult, request a time keeper at the ballot table.



What kinds of arguments will I hear?

There are two teams in each debate round. One is “Affirmative” or “aff,” and their job is to establish why the resolution is a good idea. The other is “Negative,” or “neg,” whose burden is to either prove the affirmative wrong or establish that the resolution is bad.

Affirmative Arguments – The “Stock Issues”

The case is established in the 1AC. Generally, the affirmative will present an argument as to why the status quo is bad, some problem that is not being solved now, and how they can fix it. The affirmative should tell a story that establishes its advocacy of the resolution, generally through a specific plan action. It will involve the “Stock Issues,” or things that it is necessary to prove.

Sometimes the stock issues are called the HIPS, they are:

Harms: That there’s something bad going on in the status quo.

Inherency: That the plan isn’t being done now, and that the status quo isn’t solving the problem

Plan/Topicality: That the plan makes sense and is part of the resolution to be discussed.

Solvency: That the plan can fix the problem, and that the world would be a better place with the plan

The affirmative proves these things by reading evidence on each of their points, and then proposing a plan that would fix the problem. The affirmative plan may include a specific piece of legislation to be passed, or a course of action (such as: The US should give \$80 billion to the Denver Urban Debate League).

For example: A popular aff on this year’s topic is Helium 3 Lunar Mining.

Harms: We are currently running out of fossil fuel on the planet. This could destabilize the economy and precipitate multiple wars.

Inherency: Currently the US is not mining the moon for helium 3 (H3) deposits.

Plan/Topicality: The United States federal government should guarantee funding to establish a Lunar Base dedicated to mining the Moon.

Solvency: The use of H3 can provide the US with millions of years’ worth of energy.



Negative Arguments

In general, the five kinds of negative arguments are as follows: direct attacks against the affirmative case (also known as “on case”), procedurals, counterplans, disadvantages, and “kritiks.”

Direct refutation: The negative will usually try to make specific arguments that directly counter things the Affirmative claimed. They’ll try to show that the Affirmative did not prove one or more of the “HIPS” stock issues by directly refuting claims made during the first affirmative constructive.

Procedural arguments: These are arguments about the way that the debate itself is conducted. They include arguments about the game. Usually, these arguments are assumed to come before substantive arguments (everything that’s not procedural) because they affect whether people have been able to argue fairly within a debate round. While the negative has an arsenal of theoretical objections, they most often will make a topicality argument. **Topicality** is an argument that says the affirmative plan is outside the resolution. Generally, the affirmative must be “topical” in order to be “fair” to the negative team. Otherwise, the negative team would have no idea what the affirmative would propose in the round.

Counterplan: This argument presents an alternate way of solving the harms described by the affirmative. Sometimes the status quo really is bad, and it is difficult for the negative to defend it. To avoid giving the affirmative an advantage in such a situation, the negative team may offer their own proposal. A counterplan typically has four parts:

- **Text:** Similar to a plan, a the text outlines the counter plan’s action
- **Competition:** This explains how the counterplan and the affirmative plan are mutually exclusive.
- **Net benefit:** Net benefits describe the advantage(s) of doing the counterplan that the affirmative plan cannot capture. Put simply, in the aggregate, is the counter-plan more beneficial?
- **Solvency:** Will the counterplan solve the harms outlined by the affirmative plan?

Sometimes, all of these parts aren’t explained in the 1NC, but are rather implied and explained more in later speeches. There is no requirement that negative run a counter-plan. It is just one potential strategy in their arsenal. However, any counterplan should always be run in the 1NC.



For Example: The Free Market Counterplan

Competition: The difference between the plan and the counterplan lies in the agent of action. This counterplan would allow the free market to dictate our exploration beyond the mesosphere, rather than the United States federal government.

Net Benefit: The net benefit of the counterplan would be a spending disadvantage. Allowing the free market to dictate space exploration would save the US government money.

Solvency: This would include evidence that indicates that the free market is both capable and willing to enact the counterplan.

Disadvantage: These positions argue that something bad will happen if the affirmative plan is passed. They are usually compared to the affirmative scenarios to determine whether the effects of the plan are net advantageous or disadvantageous – whether it would be a good or bad idea to do the plan. A disadvantage usually has three components:

- **Uniqueness:** Uniqueness establishes that the disadvantage will not happen in the status quo. This shows that the only thing that could cause something bad to happen is the affirmative plan.
- **Link:** The link can be thought of as an “if/then” statement that explains why the affirmative plan causes something bad to happen.
- **Impact:** What it is that will happen, and how bad it is. Usually impacts are things that are large and harmful, like wars or environmental damage, or the inability to do something really good, like colonize space.

For Example: A Spending Disadvantage

Uniqueness: Currently, the government is controlling its spending

Link: The plan causes the government to spend more money

Impact: This will lead to economic downturn and war



Kritik: Pronounced “critique,” (though historically using the German spelling) this kind of argument forwards an ethical, ideological, and/or methodological objection to the plan. Usually this is because the affirmative plan relies on problematic assumptions. For example, a Kritik, may argue that the Affirmative utilizes gendered language by refer to all humans as “mankind” and that such an error means the affirmative harms women. A kritik usually has three parts: a link, an implication, and an alternative.

- **Link:** The link is the unique way that the affirmative entrenches, obscures, marginalizes, naturalizes, proliferates, or makes worse, the assumptions or systems being criticized.
- **Impact:** This answers the “so what” question of the argument. Kritiks can be run in many different ways. Usually there are two types of implications: implications for solvency, and external implications. Solvency implications are reasons why the assumptions/structures of the aff mean it is unable to solve the problem. External implications are reasons why entrenching said assumptions/structures cause other bad things to happen that are independent of the aff case.
- **Alternative:** An alternative is what the negative advocates instead of the system they’re criticizing, and instead of the aff plan. So for example, an alternative may implore you to evaluate *how* systems of capitalism implicate privilege.

For example: A Security Kritik

Link: The affirmative uses the term “rouge states” to describe North Korea.

Impact: This operates under a legal metaphor that serves to reduce the entire field of international relations to black/white easily graspable good/bad guys. This justifies never ending interventionist wars because we view everything do as good.

Alternative: Vote negative to integrate the use of legal metaphors in foreign policy.



What are the basic rules that I need to know in order to judge?

- **Be an objective observer** – Your job as the judge is to serve as an objective evaluator of the arguments presented to you. At no time should you allow your personal opinion or stance on an issue influence your judgment. Sometimes debaters make silly arguments. Your job is not to judge the validity of the argument in the real life. Instead, you should evaluate how well the two teams are explaining their arguments and attacking their opponents’ arguments. In other words, it’s not a silly argument unless their opponent tells you it’s silly.
- **Make sure students do not speak longer than they are allowed** – While you may feel bad cutting students off, we need to hold firm to the rules of timing. Yell “TIME” when time expires. They should finish within a couple sentences thereafter. Please do not let the students speak longer than they are supposed to.
- **Evaluate the argument, not the style** – The focus of debate is on the logic presented by the debaters, similar to a judge in a courtroom. No matter how great the presentation by a lawyer, the judge should always evaluate the legal argument. The same holds true for you as a debate judge. You will have an opportunity to award speaker points based on style, but winning the round is based on the logic and argumentation.
- **Flow (take notes)** – Write down debaters’ arguments in short hand. In order to evaluate the arguments and logic presented in the debate, you need to have a detailed list of the arguments. In order to do so, it helps to take detailed notes.
- **An argument that goes unanswered is considered true** – Arguments that are not answered are considered “dropped” or “conceded” arguments. If an argument is conceded and the opponent “extends” and explains the argument throughout the round, it must be evaluated in your final decision. No matter how ridiculous the argument is, if an argument is not answered, it must be considered true.
 - o **NOTE:** That does NOT mean that the team automatically loses. It does mean that when you are looking at the entire debate at the end of the round, you must give conceded arguments equal consideration as other arguments a team actively wins.
- **You should only vote on arguments that are explained in the last two speeches** – Information that is said at the beginning but is not “extended” throughout the debate cannot be brought up at the end. No matter how amazing the argument was, if it is not said in the team’s last speech, it should be considered “dropped;” and you should not consider it in your evaluation of the round.
- **Evaluate impacts at the end of the debate** - At the end of the debate, you need to piece all the arguments together. Evaluate the impacts explained by both sides and decide which side explained the impacts of their arguments best. Another way to think of this is



to imagine that you are a policy maker that needs to decide whether to vote for or against a policy. Imagine what the world would look like if the policy passed and if the policy was rejected. The team that creates a better world deserves your vote.

- **Be supportive of the students!** – Our coaches are doing a great job of recruiting new individuals. This means that many students will be debating for the first or second time and may not know what is going on at times and will make mistakes. No matter what types of students you are judging, continue to be supportive. Encourage them to answer the opponent’s arguments and help them through a speech if they need it. Remember that they are participating in an academic activity when many of their peers are sleeping or partying. The fact that they showed up is an accomplishment that we want to acknowledge.
- **Keep accurate track of prep time used** – Each team has a total of 10 minutes of prep time for the entire debate round. Students can use prep time anytime before their speeches. Once they start speaking, they are not allowed to stop and use prep time during the speech.
- **Many students do not have timers** – Be prepared to keep time on a timer you bring: your cell phone, the school clock, or your computer.
- **At the end of the round, provide positive, constructive feedback for the students** – Everyone is new to the activity and will have significant room for improvement. Many of our students have never debated before. We need to encourage the students and applaud them for their effort and courage. The general rule is three (3) positive comments for each constructive criticism you provide.
- **Do not disclose who won the debate.** That decision should be written on your ballot which you turn in—not discussed with the debaters.
- **Know that your decision is ALWAYS correct** – The job of the debater is to convince you that their side is correct. No matter how well they think they explained an argument, if they do not convince you, they didn’t do their job correctly. Do not worry about making the “wrong” decision because **there is no such thing**. (ONLY Exception: if you base your decision on personal opinions and biases, instead of basing it solely on arguments made in the round.)
- **Have fun** – Students give up their weekends to participate in debate, and you are making the tournament possible! Have fun with the students and enjoy the difference that you are making in their lives!



What are the speeches and the time limits?

You will be keeping time during the debate round. During both speech and prep, be sure to announce time to the debaters. If a student is speaking, hand signals work best. If the students are in prep time, verbal cues are acceptable.

Speech	Time	General Purpose
1 Affirmative Constructive (1AC)	8 minutes	Present the affirmative case
The second negative asks the 1AC questions	3 minutes	Ask questions, clarify arguments, set up positions
1 Negative Constructive (1NC)	8 minutes	Present the negative “off-case” and attack the affirmative
The first affirmative asks the 1NC questions	3 minutes	Ask questions, clarify arguments, set up positions
2AC	8 minutes	Attack negative positions and rebuild the affirmative case
The first negative asks the 2AC questions	3 minutes	Ask questions, clarify arguments, set up positions
2NC ¹	8 minutes	Develop some of the negative positions and defend them against the affirmatives attack
The second affirmative asks the 2NC questions	3 minutes	Ask questions, clarify arguments, set up positions
1 Negative Rebuttal (1NR)	5 minutes	Develop a couple of the negative positions and defend them against the affirmatives attack
1 Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)	5 minutes	Rebuild the affirmative case and answer the positions developed in the “negative block.”
2NR	5 minutes	Summarize the round, pick a negative positions, and explain why the negative should win
2AR	5 minutes	Summarize the round and explain why the

¹The 2NC and the 1NR are often referred too as the “negative block” and are treated as one long speech. The negative should divide its positions up between these two speeches.



		affirmative should win
Prep Time	Each team has 10 minutes of preparation time (prep time) that they may use before their speeches. Keep a running tally of the amount of prep time they have left.	

You'll notice that while the two teams have equal speech time (2 8-minute constructives, 2 5-minute rebuttals, and 2 3-minute cross examinations, in addition to 10 minutes prep time), they do not just switch off speaking. The affirmative speaks first and last, while the negative gets 13 minutes in the middle to talk. This mirrors a courtroom, where the prosecution or plaintiff speaks both first and last. It is generally harder to convince someone to change or take action than it is to stay with the status quo.



What is the difference between a constructive and a rebuttal?

A **constructive** is one of the first four speeches in a debate round. It is an 8-minute speech where one "constructs" an argument, making new and different arguments. There are no constraints on what types of arguments can be made in these periods.

A **rebuttal** is one of the last four speeches in a debate round. It is a 5-minute speech where one "rebutts" the other team's argument and extending previous arguments. The student uses these arguments to strengthen his or her original position. Only arguments that are already in the debate round may be made at this point. One may read new evidence to support an argument, but may not make an entirely new argument.

Each partner gets one constructive and one rebuttal. After preliminary arguments are made, each team extends their arguments in the 1AR and the 1NR. While extending arguments, students explain their arguments in more depth and answer all of the objections made by the other team. In the last rebuttal speeches, the 2AR and the 2NR, each team answers those specific arguments, but also makes more broad arguments about why the specific arguments presented in the debate mean that they should win. Each team needs to make sure that they answer the important arguments made by the other team, or they risk losing because arguments have been "dropped," which is considered conceding them.



What is a “judging philosophy” and what are my choices?

A “judging philosophy” is a short-hand explanation that describes your predispositions and discloses how you will decide a round. These are extremely important to the debaters because different philosophies emphasize some arguments over others. If you’re a new judge, it is normal not to have a philosophy yet. Judging philosophies are developed from watching debate rounds and figuring out what you find persuasive. Below is a brief explanation of some of the more popular judge philosophies. These are not clean, distinct categories and often times they may overlap (for example, being a policy maker and games player are not mutually exclusive). If you do not fit into any of these categories, be sure to articulate your views to the debaters.

Stock issues: This judge believes that the affirmative must meet all of their “HIPS” burdens (for fuller discussion please see affirmative arguments page). If the negative is able to prove that the affirmative cannot fulfill all their burdens, the negative wins. Similarly, if the affirmative is able to win all the stock issues, they win the round.

Tabula Rasa: Latin for “clean slate,” these judges walk into a debate with no preconceived notions of how debate should operate. This kind of judge allows the debaters to dictate her/his judging calculus.

Policymaker: This judge wants to craft the best policy. These judges adopt a “cost benefit analysis” perspective that seeks to maximize advantages while minimizing harms.

Games player: Games judges are unconcerned with the “probability” of an argument. Instead, they are interested in its strategic value. Games judges have no problem voting for a plan that nukes the earth to reduce the population, as long as that choice is net beneficial.

Speaking Skills: Speaking skills judges favor eloquence over strategy. They make their decision based on the most persuasive speaker.



Sample Judge Philosophy

Name: Justin Eckstein

Rounds Judged 10 +

Affiliation The University of Denver Debate Team

1. Please circle your judge rank:

Bronze

Silver

Gold

Platinum

In order to assist the debaters whom you will judge in adapting to the particular audience that you provide as a judge, please indicate your policy debate judging experience and preferences.

2. Your experience with policy debate (check those that apply):

None/Community member College policy debater

Policy debater in HS College Parli Debater

LD/PF debater in HS College LD debater

College BP debater Legal professional (lawyer, judge, law student)

Competitive speech Other (please specify):

3. I have been involved with specifically policy debate for 12 years.

4. Which best describes your approach to judging policy debate (refer to the judging book for definitions of these terms):

Speaking skills Stock Issues

Policymaker Tabula rasa

Games-playing Other, if you select other please explain:

5. What is your preferred rate of delivery?

Slow, conversational style---Typical conversational speed---Rapid conversational speed

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 +

Does the rate of delivery weigh heavily in your decision? Yes / No

Will you vote against a student solely for exceeding your preferred speed? Yes / No

6. Quantity of arguments (No preference)

A few well developed The more arguments the better

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 +



7. Communication and issues

Elocution

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Technical proficiency

8. Please describe your personal note-taking during the round.

I do not take notes.

I only outline the important arguments of each debater's case.

I write down the key arguments throughout the round.

I keep detailed notes throughout the round.

I keep a rigorous flow.

9. I am willing to vote on topicality:

Never

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Rarely(only in certain circumstances)

Always

10. I am willing to vote on conceded theory (also known as rules of the game) arguments:

Never

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Rarely(only in certain circumstances)

Always

11. Critique (kritik) arguments: Acceptable/Unacceptable

12. Will you vote for an argument that you personally disagree with? Yes No

If you say no, please explain what arguments you will not vote for:

N/A

13. In approximately 100 words or less, please add any brief comments that you feel are appropriate. You might want to include information about practices that you encourage or discourage in a round.

I will listen to any argument as long as I have a way to adjudicate that argument. I want explicit standards and how your argument (whether it be throwing things, dancing, etc) interacts with the other teams arguments. There is nothing I hate more than watching debates where the two teams are like two ships passing in the night. The framework provided also must be presented in a way that the other team has the ability to challenge and debate. Preferably, those arguments should be presented earlier rather than later in the debate. I am less inclined to vote for you or your argument if you provide judging criteria in the 2ar, or even the 2nr.



What is a flow and how do you do it?

Because debates often involve lots of different arguments going on at the same time, debaters use specialized note taking procedures to keep track of different arguments. This also helps when debaters are talking fast during the debate round. This specialized note-taking process is called “flowing.” Judges “flow” the arguments by writing each claim in the debate down in the column in which the speaker makes the argument.

Tips:

- Make seven columns on a sheet of paper to keep speeches separate. There is eight speeches, but the negative block is functionally one long speech by two people, so it can share one column.
- Use at least one sheet of paper for each stock issue presented in the first speech (usually labeled as “observations,” “contentions,” or “advantages”), as well as one sheet for each major negative position (disadvantages, topicality, and similar important arguments are often labeled “off case” arguments).
- Label each piece of paper. Good debaters should give you the name of the argument, i.e, the Politics Disadvantage. Use these names as the label for your flows.
- As a speech is given, write down what is being said in that speech's column. Don't crowd things together, leave a little space. If things are all packed together on your flow, it will be hard to read. Do not be afraid to use many pages, with a different major point on each page. Leave open space in the beginning so it will be there if and when you need it.
- Use structure. Structure and label all the arguments on your flow in the same way that the speaker is structuring and labeling his or her arguments.
- Put competing arguments next to each other. If the 2nd Negative speaker makes an argument against something the 2nd Affirmative speaker said, jot the negative argument beside the affirmative one so you can easily see that they clash.
- It's okay to miss things – everybody does. Just do your best. If you miss something, get the next argument. But try to write down everything you can.



Use shortened phrases, abbreviations, and symbols. Sometimes it is difficult to keep up with the debaters. Developing a short hand enables you to write faster and catch more of the debate. One way to abbreviate words is just to leave the vowels out when you write.

Some common abbreviations and symbols

Symbol/Abbreviation	Meaning
↑	Increasing or increases
↓	Decreasing or Decreases
=	Same as
→	Leads to, Causes
>	Greater than
<	Less than
Any of these can be negated by drawing a line through it	
X	Piece of evidence
Δ	Change
T	Topicality
D/A or DA	Disadvantage
K	Kritik
H	Harm
S	Solvency
C/P	Counterplan
VI	Voting issue

Feel free to adopt any of these that you think will help you—or create your own

Please see the Appendix for “Building Your Skills: 9 Tips For a Better Flow”



BLANK FLOWSHEET

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC/1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
<p>1. Tax</p> <p>A) Debt ceiling will pass. New APP II</p> <p>B) Plan caps Obama P.C. Hissin II</p>	<p>1. NU/Debt ceiling Pass</p> <p>2. Obama P.C. low Donaldson II</p> <p>3. Plan increases P.C. Eusebia 10</p> <p>4. NU (1)</p> <p>5. Debt ceiling default May 10</p> <p>6. Econ down T. 7 was Springs 8</p> <p>7. Global NW Head 9</p>	<p>1. Refer our evidence, better source</p> <p>2. Still will pass + has support Davis II</p> <p>3. Obama P.C. high - Obama Tibbitt II</p> <p>4. Conservatives make New spending (for ID)</p> <p>5. Then May 10 evidence is terrible, does @ assume</p> <p>6. Refer OJ, Hissin 9/6 talks 9/6 WIDZ</p> <p>7. Debt ceiling collapse → US debt USG Adams 10</p> <p>8. Discale → Est Smith 97</p>	<p>1. NU/Debt Many procedures</p> <p>2. Tea Party not + are a deal, wealthy Standard II</p> <p>3. Conservatives like defense spending, Ault's Eusebia 10</p> <p>4. Refer our May 10 talk about New mag</p> <p>5. Then May 10 evidence is terrible, does @ assume</p> <p>6. Refer OJ, Hissin 9/6 talks 9/6 WIDZ</p> <p>7. Debt ceiling collapse → US debt USG Adams 10</p> <p>8. Discale → Est Smith 97</p>	<p>1. Davis indicates two tax law direction year 17 will pass</p> <p>2. REP are fighting the prison strings, economy will miss P.C. Hissin II</p> <p>3. Debt will collapse that's the SBYT II</p> <p>4. Head 9 P. Hissin 9/6 talks 9/6 WIDZ</p> <p>5. Spring 8, Hissin 9/6 talks 9/6 WIDZ</p>	<p>1. Use OJW</p> <p>2. NU/ID PASS</p> <p>3. Conservatives have the Plan Eusebia 10</p> <p>4. No more Hissin 9/6 talks 9/6 WIDZ</p> <p>5. Spring is the only study</p>	



How do I decide a debate?

The first thing to understand is that **there is not one correct way to judge a debate**. There is no formula that will render a decision. Instead, we suggest asking yourself a series of questions (normally informed by your judging philosophy-described above) to guide your decision making process. Here is a list of sample questions that can help make sense of the round:

- Pretend you are the United States federal government, which side presents the more attractive policy option?
- If you had to pick a world to live in, which world would you prefer? A world where the plan passes? Perhaps a world of the counter plan? Maybe you want to keep the status quo? Be able to articulate which side presented the most attractive world.
- If you knew nothing about this topic before the debate, which side would convince you that it is correct?
- When a point was contested, which side gave the better arguments, evidence, and/or support? Which side provided better comparative analysis?
- What important points were not contested? Did one side fail to respond to an important argument? What is the implication of that argument?
- Were there any procedural arguments? Did the debaters argue that the round was unfair or uneducated? Do you agree with them? Do you believe these considerations should be the basis for your decision?



How do I fill out my ballot?

- Please fill out your ballot neatly and in ink. These will be photo copied and distributed to the debaters and their coaches after the tournament. (They will pore over your every word, looking for ways to improve!)
- At the start of the round, make sure that each student's name appears in the appropriate spot, along with their speaker position (1A, 2A, 1N, 2N); and that each team's school code is also present.
- Write comments in the lower portion of the ballot. During the debate, please write down at least one great thing (three things are better!) that each speaker did. Please be specific. You can give helpful, positive advice as well. Help us build these kids up! Prep time is a great time to write these comments.
- At the end of the round, evaluate which team provided the better arguments and write down your "reason for decision" (RFD). The RFD is a detailed account of *why* you voted the way you did. You should explain what arguments you found the most persuasive and why. Remember that you should base your decision on the arguments; not personal ideas. Please try to provide a detailed explanation of your decision.
- Record your decisions: "affirmative" or "negative" and write in the winning team's code (e.g., AB-1).
- Rank the students in the round with 1 being the top debater and 4 being the bottom debater. Please note: no speaker can receive the same rank as another speaker in the round.
- Give each student speaker points. Below is a commonly used scale for assigning speaker points. Please note: you **can** give the same number of speaker points to multiple debaters in the round. See the next page for a speaker point index.
- Sign the ballot and write your school affiliation.
- Talk to the students for a few minutes about the debate round. Make sure that you turn your ballot in first. The tab room needs results from your round to pair the next debates and keep the tournament running smoothly.



Speaker Point Guide

30 Points Absolutely brilliant! An outstanding speaker. A flawless performance. (**You should rarely give 30 speaker points more than once at a tournament**)

29.5 Points An excellent speaker, exceptionally persuasive. Extraordinary. (**You should NEVER give 29.5 speaker points more than once or twice at a tournament!**)

29 Points An extremely good speaker. Well above average. Unusually effective; highly persuasive.

28.5 Points A very good speaker. Above average, though not quite yet among the most impressive.

28 Points A good speaker. Slightly above average. Clear room for improvement.

27.5 Points An average speaker. Strengths and weaknesses are nearly balanced.

27 Points In the lower-middle of the pack. With strengths, but also with obvious flaws.

26 Points An ineffective speaker, overall, though with some glimmers of skill.

25 Points A significantly flawed speaker.

Please do not give less than 25 points



Sample Ballot

Room: Wiebolt 507
Start: 11:00
Open

2 Whitworth, Morga

CHASE NATIONAL DEBATE CHAMPIONSHIP Chicago, IL April 24-26, 2009

Please return ballots asap and give a brief oral critique so round 3 can be paired. Thanks!

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Central (St. Louis)	POINTS	RANKS
1	Lorrie Leong	27.5	2
2	Kayla Massey	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Jefferson (Denver)	POINTS	RANKS
2	Byron Moore	27	3
1	Christain Ulrickson	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from ST. LOUIS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Morga Whitworth

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFB: AFF wins proliferation adv. and ↓ nuclear waste. NEG kicks (T) and is mostly nonresponsive on-case. All debaters spoke well and debate with decorum

AFF

- Good research in the IAC
- Hammer on the proliferation Adv. loose makes/rogue state profl. is by far the most likely scenario for nuclear war today
- Use all of your time in every speech
- re-state your warrants when responding to clean coal

4:00R

Neg:

- You are reading responses to the Core Files' Nuke power case, but that is not the same as the Aff's plan. Most of the IAC case args are thus nonresponsive
- Try to read another off case arg in the IAC
- Clean coal isn't a counterplan, plus the source is biased
- Don't give up on the (T) violation; there are plenty of interpretations of alternative fuel that equate it to renewal

1:15R



How do I give an oral critique?

The debate is designed to provide a learning experience for all those involved, including you as a judge. Giving criticism immediately after the round in the form of an oral critique helps the debater improve for the next round. A good oral critique should include at least three different suggestions for each side. Critiques might last about 5 minutes, but should not take more than 10.

Some questions to help guide your oral critique

- Did they communicate their ideas well? What are some ways they could better articulate their arguments?
- How was their “time allocation?” Did they spend too much time on one argument or position?
- How was their issue selection? Do you feel like they went for the right arguments in the round? Why or why not?
- How was the debater’s use of evidence? Did the evidence help supplement the argument or was the evidence a crutch?
- How was the cross-examination? Was it effective?
- Did the debaters seem organized?

Please see the Appendix for a “Rubric to Guide the Oral Critique.”



In Conclusion

Debate is a fun, educational activity. Have fun and learn things alongside the debaters!

Always be encouraging to the students.

Pay attention to the arguments and make a decision based on those arguments; keep your own personal biases and opinions out of your decision. If you do that, you will make the “correct” decision regardless of which way you voted.

Give positive, encouraging oral comments immediately after the round and fill out your ballot with specific written comments (again, more positive than negative). Make sure you give a specific Reason for Decision.

Turn in your ballot to the judge’s table as promptly as possible.

Remember, participating in debate helps these students academically and personally.

THANK YOU for making these debate tournaments possible. We really appreciate your help!



Appendix

Glossary of key terms

This list is not comprehensive – but here are definitions of terms you may hear during a debate.

Advantage: n. An advantage is a description used by the affirmative to explain what beneficial effects will result from its plan.

Affirmative: n. The team supporting the resolution.

A priori: n. Literally, prior to. Usually an argument indicating that a particular issue should be resolved before all others. Frequently used to argue that procedural concerns, such as topicality, should be considered before substantive issues such as advantages.

Conditional: adj. 1) To be considered only if contradictory positions are rejected. 2) Able to be dropped without detrimental effect on a team’s other arguments or their position as a whole.

Constructives: n. The first four individual speeches of the debate. Arguments are initiated in these speeches and extended in rebuttals. The four speeches are the first affirmative constructive (1AC), the first negative constructive (1NC), the second affirmative constructive (2AC), and the second negative constructive (2NC). These speeches are interrupted by cross-examination periods of each speaker.

Contentions: n. 1) A major point advanced or maintained in a debate. 2) A subdivision of an affirmative case.

Counterplan: n. A counterplan is proposed by the negative as an alternative method of solving the same problem cited by the affirmative, or as an alternative that goes beyond the affirmative’s plan.

Critic: n. The judge

Cross-examination: n. This is a three-minute period following each of the constructive speeches where a member of the opposing team directly questions the most recent speaker.

Disadvantages: n. A disadvantage, sometimes referred to with the shorthand phrases “DA” or “Disad,” is an undesirable effect of a plan.

Extensions: n. This is the development and explanation of an argument made in a previous speech.

Fiat: n. Fiat is an assumption that allows us to debate an affirmative plan as if it were adopted. We assume the affirmative team has the power to implement their plan—they have “Fiat.”

Flow: vb. To take notes of the debate, argument by argument in a linear fashion.

Impact: n. The consequences of an argument, including theoretical arguments, which make the argument important in evaluating the debate.



Kritiks: n. A philosophical objection to an argument.

Link: n. An “if/then” statement, establishing how one action causes another.

Permutation: n. A type of argument used by affirmatives to illustrate non-competitiveness of counterplans. Permutations suggest that both the plan and counter-plan could be done simultaneously.

Resolution: n. A proposition of fact, value, or policy the affirmative is obligated to support.

Roadmap: n. An outline of the different arguments a debater will cover in a given speech.

Status quo: n. The current system, the way things are now, the world as we know it exists now.

Stock issues: n. (1) The issues that the affirmative must substantiate, i.e., significance, inherency, solvency and topicality, in order to win a debate. (2) A paradigm or perspective for evaluating rounds based on the notion that the affirmative has to meet the burdens of significance, inherency, solving, and topicality.

Tag-team cross-examination: both members of a team are allowed to ask and answer questions.

Uniqueness: n. A component of the disadvantage that illustrates what is currently occurring in the status quo. That is, the disadvantage impact would not occur absent the affirmative plan.



Rubric to guide the oral critique

Below is a guide for giving oral critique and providing judge comments. Read through the different boxes and ask yourself how effectively debaters were in those areas. This list is far from exhaustive, as you judge more debate rounds you will develop your own catalogue of skills you look for.

	A	C	F
Strength of Positions 1AC, 1NC	Their arguments were logical, clear and substantive	Their arguments were somewhat logical, clear and substantive	Their arguments were not logical, clear and substantive
Warrants: They explained why their argument is true	All of the arguments had developed warrants	Some of the arguments had developed warrants	Few of the arguments had developed warrants
Impacts	Impacts to arguments were clear	Impacts to some arguments were clear	Impacts to few arguments were clear
Refutation 1NC, 2AC, 2NC, 1AR, 1NR	Refuted all of opposition's contentions	Refuted more than half of opposition's contentions	Refuted less than half of opposition's contentions
Cross Examination - Questions	Questions draw out useful information and set up arguments.	Questions draw out somewhat useful information.	Questions do not draw out useful information.
Cross Examination - Responses	Answered questions strategically and effectively	Answered some questions strategically and effectively	Answered few questions strategically and effectively
Rebuilding 2AC, 2NC, 1AR, 1NR	Responded effectively to each of the opposition's criticisms of your side's contentions	Responded effectively to more than half of the opposition's criticisms of your side's contentions	Responded effectively to less than half of the opposition's criticisms of your side's contentions
Rebuttal 2NR, 2AR	Made a convincing argument for why your side won the debate	Made a somewhat convincing argument for why your side won the debate	Did not make a convincing argument for why your side won the debate
Use of Time ALL	Used most or all of time effectively	Used more than half of time effectively	Used less than half of time effectively
Speaking Skills ALL	Spoke audibly, articulately and engagingly	Spoke either inaudibly, inarticulately or not engagingly	Spoke inaudibly, inarticulately and not engagingly



Building your skills: 9 tips for a better flow

- 1. Practice, practice, practice.** You should watch and flow elimination rounds and debates online. Also, try flowing things like the evening news. You will be surprised how brisk the news moves.
- 2. Spread out arguments on the page.** Make sure you have enough space to keep track of the different arguments being made.
- 3. Use multiple sheets of paper.** Ideally each position should be on its own piece of paper. This ensures that you have enough room on each position to follow the various arguments being made.
- 4. Use different colors.** Make the affirmative one color and the negative another. This allows for you to easily track who made what kind of argument
- 5. Never stop writing when a debater is talking.** It is always better to err on the side of writing down too much, than too little.
- 6. Develop your own abbreviations.** In debates you will hear a lot of the same arguments over and over again. You should start to develop your own short hand for these terms. We have provided an excellent list in the new judges manual.
- 7. Sit closer.** Sometimes it is hard to hear the debaters. It is ok to want to sit closer to the speaker to try and hear them better.
- 8. Get what you can.** Sometimes, whether through inexperience or a team's lack of clarity, flowing breaks down completely. Attempting to make sense of what you missed will trade off with the rest of the speech. Instead concentrate on trying to get down as much as you can.
- 9. Solicit advice from those who flow better than you.** This list is far from exhaustive, do not be afraid to ask other judges if they have any tips or tricks that help them flow.