



JUDGE WORKBOOK

Written by:

Justin Eckstein

Edited by:

Alan Zimmerman

Christina Huszcza

Last updated: October 4, 2011

Contents

Judging Tiers.....	3
5 Tips for becoming a better judge.....	4
Judge Mentorship program	5
Before your first round check list	6
Keeping track of your progress.....	7
Judge Philosophy Card	8
Diagnostic 1 (with answers).....	10
Diagnostic 2 (with answers).....	12
Diagnostic 3 (with answers).....	13

Judging Tiers

There are 4 different tiers of judges. Below you will find the name and corresponding description of each judge tier. Remember, you are there not just to render a decision, but also to explain the process and how the debate can improve.

What you will find in this book is a guide to help you ascend the levels of judging.

Bronze Judge – This is an entry-level judge. A bronze designation indicates that the judge has participated in our judge orientation program, judged one round with a mentor, and has watched 6 or fewer solo rounds. This judge has also passed or reviewed the first diagnostic test.

Silver Judge – This is an intermediate judge. S/he has accomplished all of the tasks of the bronze judge and has evaluated an additional 6 rounds (12 in total) as well as passed or reviewed the second diagnostic.

Gold Judge – This judge is considered an expert in policy debate. These judges have satisfied all of the requirements to attain silver status. In addition, they have judged 6 more rounds (18 in total) and passed or reviewed the third diagnostic test.

Platinum Judge – This judge has completed all three previous tiers. This judge must have adjudicated a minimum of 26 debate rounds. Platinum judges will be selected at the end of the year by the coaches. This judge will mentor the younger judges helping answer their questions.

Please fill out a new judge philosophy card with each promotion.

5 Tips for becoming a better judge

We solicited some of the best policy debate judges in the country and asked them “what makes you so good?” Below is a summation of their tips and advice.

- 1. Be consistent:** it is important to be clear, predictable, and uniform in what you want debaters to do.
- 2. Keep an open mind:** there may be more than one right way to approach a debate. Even if the debaters choose to do something that you wouldn't do, that doesn't necessarily make it a wrong choice.
- 3. Learn from your colleagues:** watch the elimination rounds, see how those judges adjudicate debates and provide oral critiques.
- 4. Utilize the resources afforded to you:** hound the platinum judges with all your questions. These judges have literally over hundreds of rounds worth of experience and are more than happy to impart their wisdom.
- 5. Formulate comments as the round progress:** be actively engaged and considering “what does x team need to do to win” between each speech. It is far better than waiting until the end and trying to reconstruct the round. This will ensure that you have lots of advice to give the debaters.

Judge Mentorship program

What is it?

The purpose of the judge mentorship program is to ensure that our newer judges feel comfortable adjudicating a round. This program works by pairing a Bronze judge with one of our Platinum judges. After the round, the two judges will come together and discuss what they just watched.

Where do I find my mentor?

Your mentor will be assigned to you when you arrive at the tournament. Be sure to let the judging table know that this is your first time judging debate. They will make sure to assign you with one of the platinum critics.

What to do and what to avoid:

You should...

1. Try to take rigorous notes (or flow) during the debate round;
2. Write down a reason for decision after the round (RFD) and be ready to discuss it;
3. Fill out a sample ballot and compare it to your mentor's ballot after the round is completed;
4. After the round and the oral critique are over, ask your mentor lots of questions;
5. Be ready to discuss the debate round once it is over;
6. Take note of the kinds of comments your mentor is giving the debaters;
7. Help the mentor by offering to keep track of time during the debate;
8. Feel free to ask the mentor questions throughout the day/tournament/debate season.

You should NOT

1. Talk to your mentor during the round (or generally be disruptive);
2. Give the debaters an oral critique;
3. Attempt to collaborate on adjudicating the round.

Also, please note that you have the option of requesting a second round with your mentor. If you still do not feel like you're ready to decide a round, please let the judging table know.

Before your first round check list

- ___ Complete New Judge Orientation
- ___ Watch a debate and take notes with mentor (ask your mentor lots of questions)
- ___ Take or review the first diagnostic test
- ___ Fill out your judge philosophy card

Keeping track of your progress

Name:

Mentor:

Round	Aff	Neg	Who did you vote for	Comments
0 (with mentor)				
First diagnostic for Bronze status				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
Second diagnostic for Silver status				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
final diagnostic for gold status				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
Platinum eligible				

Judge Philosophy Card

Date _____

Name _____

Rounds Judged _____

Affiliation _____

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

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	Rarely(only in certain circumstances)						Always			
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10+

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

Never	Rarely(only in certain circumstances)						Always			
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10+

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:

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.

Diagnostic 1 (with answers)

1. What is the name of the proposition the debaters are given each year?

The resolution

2. What is this year's topic?

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

3. What three things you need to be filled out on your ballot

Assign speaker points;
Circle a winner;
Give a Reason for Decision

4. When a round is over where should you bring your ballot?

The Judges Table and/or the Tab Room

5. What are the times for the following speeches:

A constructive is 8 minutes long

A rebuttal is 5 minutes long

Cross Examination is 3 minutes long

Prep time is 5 minutes long

6. What are the 3 roles of a judge?

Referee
Educator
Decision Maker

7. What is a judge philosophy?

It is a short-hand explanation that describes your predispositions and discloses how you will decide a round.

8. What is the note taking method called?

Flow

9. How often should you give speaker points below 25?

Never

10. True or False:

- a. There is only one way to adjudicate a round: False
- b. You can tell the speaker to speed up or slow down during a speech: True
- c. You can tell the speaker to be clear during her/his speech: True

Diagnostic 2 (with answers)

1. What is the burden of the of the affirmative

To defend the resolution through the passage of a plan.

2. What is the goal of the negative team

To prove that the status quo or a competitive policy option is preferable to the affirmative plan.

3. What are the HIPS?

Harms
Inherency
Plan
Solvency

4. What are the three basic elements of a disadvantage

Uniqueness
Link
Impact

5. What is it called when the negative responds to the affirmatives case?

Direct Refutation

6. What is a counter-plan and how does it function

It is a competitive policy option that solves the affirmatives harms but dodges a net benefit. It functions to test if the affirmative is really the best policy option.

7. What should you do first: turn in your ballot or give your oral critique?

Turn in your ballot

Diagnostic 3 (with answers)

1. Defining the jargon: please 1) define the following term, 2) give a one sentence description of its function and 3) provide your flow short hand
 - a. Uniqueness: A component of the disadvantage that illustrates what is currently occurring in the status quo. It functions to prove the harm of the disadvantage will only occur with plan passage

U/

- b. Link: An “if/then” statement that establishes how one action causes another. This determines how arguments interrelate with one another

L/

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

ⓘ

- d. Perm: this tests the competition of either a counter-plan or an alternative. It determines whether the aff and the neg are mutually exclusive.

P/

- e. Plan Solvency: It illustrates that an action will resolve a previously discussed harm and/or problem.

Ⓢ

2. Provide an example of an impact turn

They argue that economic downturn is bad and will lead to war. However, our argument is that crashing the economy will not lead to war and force people to live within their means.

3. What is the difference between on case/off case arguments

An on case directly refutes a claim made by the affirmative—these tend to question the truth of the affirmatives claims.

An off case is a fully formed position that outlines the effects and/or costs of plan passage.

4. Please identify three major judge philosophies and provide a one sentence description of them

Tabula Rasa: Latin for “clean slate,” these judges walk into a debate with no preconceived notions of how debate should operate.

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

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

5. Please list and define three basic rules needed to judge

1. Be Objective: Do not let your preconceptions cloud the debate.
2. You should only vote on arguments made in the last two speeches
3. An uncontested argument is a true argument

4. What is time allocation

This concept describes the ability to appropriately divide time up between arguments. Appropriateness is determined by the priority of arguments they cover and how long they spend on each. For example, if they spend 5 minutes on a dropped topicality argument, this would be a misuse of time.