

10th Anniversary Edition

Judge Manual

Written and edited by:

Rachel Bruce
Jessica Clark
Christina Huszcza
John McKiernan
Ruby Nunez
Alan Zimmerman

How to Judge Debate

written by:
Justin Eckstein



Last updated: November 9, 2017



October 26, 2017

Dear DUDL Volunteers,

During the 2017-18 school year, the Denver Urban Debate League (DUDL) will celebrate its Tenth Anniversary. Since the DUDL was launched in 2008, the organization has grown from serving one school district to four districts across the metro area; expanded programs to include competitive speech activities in addition to the core debate programs; and, served more than 2000 students. Some of these students, like Rachel Owusu and Zakira Seidu-Aroza who were raised in Ghana, joined the debate team to improve their English language skills and increase their confidence. Other students, like DUDL graduate Selene Figueroa, joined the debate team because they have ambitions to be the first generation in their family to attend college. Selene received a debate scholarship to attend college, and is now enrolled in a program at the University of Denver where she will complete her undergraduate degree and JD in five years. For DUDL graduate Viviana Andazola being on the debate team at her Mapleton high school was an important step on her path to Yale, where she will be a senior this fall. Viviana recently traveled home to Denver to share the stage with Michelle Obama at Together with the Women's Foundation of Colorado.

DUDL programs are deeply aligned with our community's education priorities. DUDL programs are based on a nationally successful model proven to boost student achievement, engagement and graduation rates in Title 1 schools. By using competitive speech and debate as a framework to engage students who might be struggling in a traditional classroom setting, DUDL's students develop valuable 21st century learning skills such as critical thinking, collaboration, problem solving, and creativity, while cultivating social and emotional intelligence. In the Denver Urban Debate League, speech and debate is much more than an after-school club, it is a collaborative community where students are inspired to take responsibility for their education and embark on a life changing trajectory. This community is not possible without the support of our volunteers who fill a wide variety of important roles in our organization, ensuring that resources are never a barrier to participate in the life-changing trajectory of competitive speech and debate. DUDL programs are designed to best serve traditionally underserved populations and we devote our resources to schools with at least 60% of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch. The unique learning community DUDL fosters offers a unique opportunity for all stakeholders to come together and work with individual students with a holistic approach. As DUDL graduate Reuben Aguirre, currently a third year law student at Northwestern Law School, from Denver says, "Debate saved my life. It taught me to think for myself and to question and resist norms of oppression and exclusion." Thanks to your support, the DUDL is able bring our impactful programs to more schools and more students like Reuben in our community

Sincerely,

Jessica A. Clark
Executive Director, Denver Urban Debate League
[720.878.2776](tel:720.878.2776)
JessicaClark@UrbanDebate.org

PS: Please Save the Date! For our Tenth Anniversary Celebration Fundraiser on Thursday, April 26th at the Denver Athletic Club with keynote speaker Ken Salazar. We are offering a discounted ticket for volunteers. Please visit [www. DenverDebate.org](http://www.DenverDebate.org) for more information.



Contents

How to use this manual	5
What debate format does DUDL practice?	6
What speech events does DUDL offer?	6
What debate format does DUDL practice?	6
What sets DUDL apart from other debate leagues?	7
What happens at the tournament?	7
Why is the tournament running late?	9
Why are DUDL volunteers so important?	9
JUDGING SPEECH EVENTS	10
What is the role of DUDL speech judge?	10
Student Congress	11
Impromptu	13
Drama	14
Original Oratory	16
Slam Poetry	17
JUDGING POLICY DEBATE	
What is the 2017-2018 topic?	19
What is the role of the judge?	19
How do I know what debate round I am judging?	20
I've heard that debaters speak really quickly. What happens if I can't understand the debaters?	20
What are the rules/norms of debate?	21
What are some general things I should know and/or expect?	22
What kinds of arguments will I hear?	23
Affirmative Arguments – The “Stock Issues”	23
Negative Arguments	24
What are the basic rules that I need to know in order to judge?	26
What are the speeches and the time limits?	29
What is the difference between a constructive and a rebuttal?	31



What is a “judging philosophy” and what are my choices?	32
Sample Judge Philosophy	33
What is a flow and how do you do it?	35
Sample Flow	36
How do I decide a debate?	38
How do I fill out my ballot?	39
Speaker Point Guide	40
Sample Ballot	41
How do I give an oral critique?	42
In Conclusion	43
Appendix	44
Glossary of key terms	44
Rubric to guide the oral critique	46
Building your skills: 9 tips for a better flow	47



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 speech events does DUDL offer?

In 2013 DUDL was the first Urban Debate League to offer competitive speaking events, in addition to competitive debate. In speech students enter as individuals (except in Drama where sometimes students enter as a duo), and are judged on the content and presentation of their speeches. DUDL currently offers six speech events which include Impromptu, Drama, Original Oratory, Slam Poetry and Student Congress. Students choose to enter either speech or debate. Students who compete in speech may enter Student Congress and, up to two additional speech events. If a student is entered in more than one additional speech event that student is “double entered”.

What debate format does DUDL practice?

DUDL tournaments offer one primary debate format which is called policy debate. Some people refer to policy debate as “C-X or Cross-Examination” debate. DUDL uses this debate format because it is a rigorous format of debate proven to boost academic and life outcomes. This is also the debate format used at the National Urban Debate Championship. Policy debate is an extracurricular 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. This year the policy debate topic that will be used at all DUDL competitions is: Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its funding and/or regulation of elementary and/or secondary education in the United States. DUDL piloted a new debate format last year called Big Questions debate. We have applied for funding to continue implementing this new debate format at select competitions, in addition to policy debate.



What sets DUDL apart from other speech and debate leagues?

DUDL is designed to serve students and schools who might not otherwise have the opportunity to compete in this life-changing activity. Other debate leagues rely heavily on the financial support of parents and schools. DUDL advocates for speech and debate funding at the district level and leverages private funding to ensure that resources are never a barrier for students to participate in our events. DUDL covers all competition costs including entry fees, supplies, transportation, awards, and meals. DUDL also offers full-time support of our member schools, their coaches, and their students to help them build and maintain speech and debate teams in the face of assorted challenges. DUDL emphasizes building a collaborative and inclusive learning community. DUDL tournaments offer a unique environment in which students from “rival” schools and different districts support each other as they work towards their goals. In case you were wondering, all of our member schools are also members of the National Speech and Debate Association (formerly the National Forensic League) and all of our schools are members of the Colorado High School Activities Association. Some of our schools participate in competitions with other leagues, and our organization supports additional competition opportunities with other speech and debate leagues.

What happens at a DUDL tournament?

At each DUDL tournament debate teams from all of our schools compete against each other in both debate and individual speaking events. We start early with registration typically beginning by 7:30am. It is a long day for our coaches and students with awards concluding around 7:30pm. Our teams also have long bus rides before and after the tournaments to get to and from their respective school sites. DUDL serves four school districts in the Denver Metro area, so sometimes the travel time can be significant for our students. At each tournament all participants and volunteers check-in at registration. The registration period is the most hectic time of day, as DUDL staff is working hard to get everyone checked-in, while also serving breakfast, and resolving last minute registration changes. We use a software platform called Speechwire to tabulate our tournaments. All participants and volunteers must be entered in the computer system in the morning. Our tabulations staff uses the program to automatically pair the students in competition groupings, assign judges, and assign room numbers.

We offer between 3-6 rounds of preliminary competition before advancing to final rounds. During each speech round students compete in room with 4-8 competitors and one judge each. During each debate round students debate in teams of two vs. teams of two from other schools. There is one judge in each preliminary debate rounds, but sometimes we assign judge mentors to new judges their first time-out. In the final rounds we have panels of judges who each decide the winners and rankings individually. Student Congress takes place in chambers of up to thirty students each. We usually hold two chambers of congress with one judge in each chamber. As a



judge, you will check-in at least 15 minutes prior to your scheduled shift. You will then wait in our hospitality lounge, or you might want to wait in the student area and get to know the students. When each round is about to begin we will post the “pairings” in the judges’ lounge and announce the names of the judges needed. If you are called, and/or see your name on the posting, you will obtain a ballot from tournament staff who will either be in the lounge or at the registration table. Please be sure to be in the lounge or near the table at the start time of each round. Generally, we need all of the judges present, but sometimes you might not end up with a ballot. This is just the random luck of the draw as judges are assigned by our computer system. In the event you do not have a ballot please remain on-call near the registration table until all of the debate and speech ballots are handed out. Often times an assigned judge may not show up, or we might have to make changes and it is very helpful to have extra judges ready to take ballots. If you end up not judging you are welcome to watch rounds, volunteer to help us in some other way, or simply relax and wait for the next round.

At the end of the speech or debate round, please fill in our ballot completely and return promptly to the registration table. The DUDL staff member will double check your ballot is complete and then you can relax until the next round. If you need more time to give oral comments to the students, you can return your ballot to the table and then go back to the discussion. You can ask to write more on your ballot later after the tabulations staff has entered the information into the computer. This will keep us from running behind schedule as the results from previous rounds need to be entered before we pair the next round. During the tournament we take breaks for meals and sometimes have special events. We conclude with an awards ceremony and all of our supporters are invited to attend to cheer on the students. Whenever your shift ends, or if something comes up and you have to leave, please check-out at the registration table so we can make sure we do not assign any more ballots to you.



Why is the tournament running late?

We strive to keep our competitions running on time. We know your time is valuable and we know how frustrating it can be when we hit roadblocks that cause confusion, or put us behind schedule. Sometimes there are factors beyond our control, such as buses running late, or meal times taking longer than expected. The biggest reason we run late is when there are changes in our competition entries or volunteer registration that take time to sort out and to make changes in our tabulation software. At DUDL tournaments our students are sometimes facing all sorts of barriers to being able to compete that we are not always aware of. Many of our students have jobs and help take care of siblings while their parents work on the weekends. Many of our students are involved in other activities at school. We try to adapt to all kinds of circumstances in order to give students as much access to the activity as we can. Sometimes working through these challenges takes time. Sometimes volunteer availability changes at the last minute, or additional volunteers arrive who we weren't expecting. That is all good and we understand! Again, adapting to these circumstances sometimes takes time. Finally, our judges often have such amazing discussions with students after the rounds, and this can slow down the tournament too. We try to collect ballots as quickly as we can. We promise. But.... sometimes we run behind. We are sorry. If you every have to leave before a round no worries at all! Just let us know.

Why are DUDL volunteers so important?

Quite simply we cannot run our competitions without the support of our volunteers. Having volunteer judges and tournament support staff saves costs for our small non-profit organization and that allows us to serve more students. Other debate leagues often pay judges \$10-\$15 per round. Additionally, DUDL differs from some other local debate leagues in that we ask our judges to have conversations with our students after each round. This helps our students learn faster, and allows volunteers and students to develop one-on-one relationships which encompass more than just the competition. Mentorship from our volunteers guides students along their path of college and career success. When we ask students what they enjoy most about DUDL, often times they report that they cherish having time when an adult is a captive audience and listens to what they have to say. DUDL competitors feel special that members of the community from so many different professions take the time to support them in this endeavor. Your presence at our competitions is truly invaluable. If you enjoy working with the league as a tournament volunteer there are other ways you can get involved, such as working as an assistant coach, serving on the Board of Directors, connecting us with new partners and sponsors, or donating meals and supplies. Please reach out the JessicaClark@UrbanDebate.org if you are interested in more volunteer opportunities.



What is the role of the speech judge?

Speech judges serve as active audience members and critics. Speech judges watch all of the speeches of the competitors in their speech rounds, keep time, and fill out ballots at the end of the round. Speech judges will rank all students on their individual comment sheets 1-3 place in the round, and give all remaining students a ranking of 4. They will also assign each individual speaker points for each speaker or duo team ranging from 70-100. Speech judges will also complete one master ballot/ranking sheet. On this sheet please rank the students 1-8, or trough however many students are present in the round. You should also give the students constructive oral commentary after the round. Please note that some students may be double entered and have to leave early or arrive late. When judging Impromptu the judge is also responsible for distributing topics. When judging Student Congress please refer to the specific instructions below. If you have experience judging speech events in other leagues, please familiarize yourself with the specifics of our events. There are some slight variations in DUDL's speech rules.



How do you judge Student Congress?

In your judging packet, you have an overview of the event rules from the National Association for Speech & Debate, a guide to student congress, a roster of all students/ master scoring sheet and scoring sheets to provide feedback for the individual speeches. Please turn these into the ballot table after the session has concluded. You will also find a voting record for the presiding officer, scratch paper, a copy of the docket, and a “cheat sheet” of motions. You also have the following items to distribute to students: copies of the docket, placard forms, amendment forms, “cheat sheet” of motions. Please collect the student ballots and return them to the registration table at the conclusion of the session.

TO BEGIN

To get started, take nominations for Presiding Officer (PO). You can take up to 3 nominees. The nominees may make a brief statement to the chamber as to why s/he should be elected. Then the nominees should be sent into the hall and the remaining students should vote for the P.O. Students should fill out their placards. The PO should complete the seating chart.

DURING THE SESSION

The speech order will be introductory proponent (authorship) (3 mins), introductory opponent (3 mins), proponent (3 mins), opponent (3 mins). Introductory proponent and introductory opponent speeches are followed by a 2-minute mandatory questioning period. Authorship speeches are scored. After each speech, please write comments on the ballot indicating what the student should work on to improve. Record scores on the score sheets (one for each piece of legislation). After each speech, please write comments on the score sheets indicating what the student should work on to improve. Record scores on the score sheets and on the master score sheet. This is a good double check that you have scored all speeches.

The speech order:

Introductory proponent (authorship) (3 mins), followed by 2-minute mandatory questioning period.
Introductory opponent (3 mins), followed by a 2-minute mandatory questioning period.
Proponent (3 mins), followed by 2-minute mandatory questioning period.
Opponent (3 mins).followed by 2-minute mandatory questioning period

AFTER THE SESSION

At the end of the session, you should assign the presiding officer points for up to 3 hours. The student may receive up to six points per hour. Complete the scores for all students on the Master Roster and



complete student ballots. Return the Master Roster, ballots for each student, nomination forms, master scoresheets, the voting record, and any congress materials should be returned to a tournament official.

ABOUT SCORING

There are many different ways to “score” congress. For our purposes, we will be awarding the top three students based on the calculation of total points given to each student. The Presiding officer will not be included in the top three. We will not have nominations or in chamber voting for these awards. All awards will be tallied in the tab room based on the paper ballots. When scoring speeches please consider: Content, Organization, Evidence, Language, Argument and Refutation/Delivery. You can consult the rubric on page 13 of the Congressional Debate Guidebook. When scoring the PO please consider: Speaker Recognition, Parliamentary Procedure, Delivery/Presence.

Sample Score Sheet

ROOM # _____ JUDGE NAME _____

DUDL STUDENT PRESIDING OFFICER SCORE CARD

Student _____ **School:** _____

NFL Points Awarded (0-6 points per speech)

Speech #1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:

Speech #2 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:

Speech #3 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:

Speech #4 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:

Speech #5 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
Topic:

Judge’s Signature: _____



How do you judge Impromptu?

Impromptu is a speech event where students draw a topic and present an organized speech on that topic with limited preparation.

When the judge has all competitors present, the judge will call the first speaker up and hand them the envelope with speaker one written on it (these will be in the folders provided to judges when given a ballot.) Speakers will present in the order on the ballot unless a competitor is double entered in other DUDL speech events and needs to leave early or arrive late to go the next round.

The competitor draws three prompts, choose one, and discard the other two. The competitor has 90 seconds (beginning when s/he discards the rejected topics) to prepare a speech. The speaker may use a 3 x 5 notecard to take notes and may use these notes during the speech. The competitor has three minutes to speak. All speakers in the round should remain in the room to watch the other speeches unless a competitor is double entered in other DUDL speech events and needs to leave early or arrive late to go the next round. *Speaker points are ranked out of 100, with the typical range being 70-100.* The following are considered when ranking speakers and assessing speaker points.

Content

- Originality and creativity in approaching the subject matter
- Effective Structure
- Clarity and effectiveness of argument/message/theme

Delivery

- To what degree did the speaker achieve one or more of the following: informed, entertained, persuaded, inspired, encouraged, and argued?
- How natural or practiced was the delivery?
- Vocal delivery pitch, pace and volume
- Gestures and body language
- Emotion – humorous, moving, thought provoking

Entertainment

- Engagement – to what degree did the performance connect with the audience
- Did they laugh, were they moved, provoked?
- Charisma
- Could the speaker have varied pace more?
- Did the gestures match the speech?
- A speaker who is more than 30 seconds over the time limit may be penalized



How do you judge DUDL Drama?

Competitors will enter room as a group. Some competitors might be “double entered” in other speaking events and have to arrive late, or leave early. Students may watch the other competitors perform. Material does not have to be memorized, but it may be memorized. Material may come from any source, employ any narrative structure, and be comedic or dramatic in nature. Material should not be original material written by the performer, but rather a published work. Students may perform as a single performer, or as a duo. Single performers might perform multiple characters and this is part of the challenge! Students should not use props or costumes and movement should be limited. Students may use one or two chairs. Please consider the following when judging the speakers

Selection:

Is the material appropriate for the student?

Does the material meet the rules of the category?

Is there an emotional/intellectual understanding of the material?

Introduction:

Effective, explanatory, attention-getting, sets mood/feeling

Vocal elements:

Vocalization - Volume, emphasis, intensity, diction, inflection, mumbling, speed/pacing, expressiveness, projection, enunciation, pitch

Phrasing/pacing - Fluid, choppy, flowing, rhythmic, hesitant

Physical presentation:

Eye contact - consistent, effective

Facial expressiveness/gestures - natural, appropriate, expressive

Speaker presence - Confident, poised, energetic, polished, lackadaisical, comfortable with material

Interpretation:

Character development - strong, appropriate, consistent, interesting, multiple characters are distinguishable

Emotion - appropriate to character/selection, believable, intensity, tone

Transitions - fluid, explanatory

Please give both positive and negative comments. Don't be afraid to criticize, but always offer constructive suggestions for improvement. Students work hard to perform for you and value your thoughtful evaluation of their strengths *and* weaknesses. *Do not give oral critiques.*



DUDL Drama: Structure and Rules

The competitor will select and perform a “cutting” (excerpt) of a published*, printed work from a play, novel, short story, or poem. The cutting needs to be within time (10 minutes) and tell a complete story (beginning, middle, end; introduction, rising action, CLIMAX, falling action, dénouement). The same “cutting” must be used for the entire competition.

•Students may compete as an individual or as a duo. If performing as a duo please see the special duo guidelines** below. Selections may be comedic, dramatic, poetic, prose or a combination of all three. The competitor will perform all roles, directions, text, etc.

- Selections must be from published, printed material of plays, novels, short stories, and poems
- Does not have to be memorized, but may be memorized. Students should present material from a plain folder if not memorized.
- Must be within ten minute time limit with thirty second grace period (Should try to use all of the time, or AT LEAST five minutes)
- An introduction is strongly encouraged (names author, title, gives any necessary information, and sets the tone) and given after a minute or so of the piece has been delivered, at a natural break-point
- No props or costumes
- All pops, or character transitions, are to be smooth, quick, and fluid
- Interpretation is most of what you will be ranked by, so know the plot, the characters, the theme, EVERYTHING
- All gestures, stances, facials, vocals/intonations need to support that character (and needs to be unique to that particular character), help tell story, and be clear
- Diction is important
- Moving should be limited—you must stand in one place, but are allowed to change stance for different characters

***If from an online publication, must be from an authorized online commercial**

** Students should not make physical contact during the duo drama presentation. They should face the audience and use pantomime and dramatic vocal choices to interpret the literature. Movement should be limited.



How do you judge Original Oratory?

In this event, competitors have written original pieces. Although many orations deal with a current problem and propose a solution, the judge is expressly reminded that this is not the only acceptable form of oratory. The oration may simply alert the audience to a threatening danger, strengthen its devotion to an accepted cause, or eulogize a person. The orator should be given free choice of subject and judged solely on the effectiveness of its development and presentation. The composition should be considered carefully for its rhetoric and diction.

The use of appropriate figures of speech, similes and metaphors, balanced sentences, allusions, and other rhetorical devices to make the oration more effective should be noted especially. Delivery should be judged for mastery of the usual mechanics of speech -- poise, quality and use of voice, bodily expressiveness, and for the qualities of directness and sincerity which impress the oration upon the minds of the audience. An orator should not be penalized for a few seconds overtime. No particular style of delivery is to be set up as the one correct style to which all contestants must conform. Rather, each contestant is to be judged upon the effectiveness of his/her delivery, free to choose or develop whatever style will best give him/her that effectiveness with his/her particular oration.

The time limit in this Original Oratory competition is 10 minutes with a 30 second “grace period”. Speakers should encouraged to speak for at least 3 minutes. If the judges in the round agree that the student has gone beyond the “grace period”, the student may not be ranked 1st, but need not be ranked last based on time. The ranking is up to each individual judge’s discretion. Speaker points are ranked out of 100, with the typical range being 70-100.

If you have any questions/concerns, or the rules are questioned during the round, please stop the competition and consult a tournament official.

Judges should consider thought, composition,creativity, and delivery, The orator should not be expected to solve any of the great problems of the day. Rather, s/he should be expected to discuss intelligently, with a degree of originality, in an interesting manner, and with some profit to his/her audience the topic s/he has chosen. Any appropriate subject may be chosen but the orator must be truthful. Any non-factual reference, especially a personal one, **MUST** be so identified.

NOTE: DUDL encourages students to write speeches that are persuasive in nature, This should not be improvised. Students who are taking the time to write (in advance) interesting speeches which express an opinion on relevant issues are rewarded. DUDL is supportive of the use of poetry as a narrative device.



How do you judge Slam Poetry?

Competitors will enter room as a group. Some competitors might be “double entered” in other speaking events and have to arrive late, or leave early. Students may watch the other competitors perform. Material does not have to be memorized, but memorization is encouraged. Please consider the following when judging the speakers. Competitors may enter as an individual only. Speaker points are ranked out of 100, with the typical range being 70-100.

Selection:

- Is the material appropriate for the student?
- Does the material meet the rules of the category?
- Is there an emotional/intellectual understanding of the material?

Introduction:

Effective, explanatory, attention-getting, sets mood/feeling

Vocal elements:

- Vocalization* - Volume, emphasis, intensity, diction, inflection, mumbling, speed/pacing, expressiveness, projection, enunciation, pitch
- Phrasing/pacing* - Fluid, choppy, flowing, rhythmic, hesitant

Physical presentation:

- Eye contact* - consistent, effective
- Facial expressiveness/gestures* - natural, appropriate, expressive
- Speaker presence* - Confident, poised, energetic, polished, lackadaisical, comfortable with material

Interpretation:

- Character development* - strong, appropriate, consistent, interesting, multiple characters are distinguishable
- Emotion* - appropriate to character/selection, believable, intensity, tone
- Transitions* - fluid, explanatory

Please give both positive and negative comments. Don't be afraid to criticize, but always offer constructive suggestions for improvement. Students work hard to perform for you and value your thoughtful evaluation of their strengths *and* weaknesses. *Do not give oral critiques.*



Rules for DUDL Slam Poetry:

Poems and Performance:

1. Poems can be on any subject and in any style.
2. Each poet must perform work that he/she/they have created.
3. No props. Generally, poets are allowed to use their given environment and the accoutrements it offers — microphones, mic stands, the stage itself, chairs on stage, a table or bar top, the aisle — as long as these accoutrements are available to other competitors as well. The rule concerning props is not intended to squelch the spontaneity, unpredictability, or on-the-fly choreography that people love about the slam; its intent is to keep the focus on the words rather than poets who inadvertently use a prop (for example, a timely yet unwitting grab at a necklace) can be immediately penalized two points if the emcee of the bout deems the effect of the violation to have been appreciable but sufficiently lacking in specific intent.
4. Poets may not use musical instruments or pre-recorded music.
5. No costumes.
6. 3-5 minutes in length- there will be a 10 second grace period, but anything over will result in penalties for 1 point per 10 seconds.
7. Students are encouraged to have their material memorized- though it is not a requirement.
8. Movement is allowed as long as it does not incorporate props or members of the audience

Sampling:

1. It is acceptable for poets to incorporate, imitate, or otherwise "signify on" the words, lyrics, or tune of someone else (commonly called "sampling") in their own work. If they are ripping off another poet's words, they should expect to receive the same repercussion as if using a prop. This includes a retroactive score of two points less than the lowest scoring poem in that bout.
2. The same goes for pop culture references- while they are allowed, they should be used sparingly and delicately. If the judge determines that a poet's use of pop culture references is not contributing to the poem or that they - the score will reflect the same penalties (2 points lower than the lowest score in the round).

Censorship:

1. There is no censorship whatsoever, but gratuitous use of profanity could work against you when it comes to scoring. It is recommended that teams regulate themselves and try to avoid excessive violence, sexually explicit content and/or language that is degrading to any group of people.



JUDGING POLICY DEBATE

What is the 2017-2018 topic?

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its funding and/or regulation of elementary and/or secondary education in the United States.

What is the role of the debate 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 1NC 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, 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 any time 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

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



2AR	5 minutes	Summarize the round and explain why the 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

Technical proficiency

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

0

1

2

Rarely (only in certain circumstances)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Always

10+

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

Never

0

1

2

Rarely (only in certain circumstances)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Always

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:

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 are 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	INC	2AC	2NC/INR	1AR	2NR	2AR
<p>1. [unclear]</p> <p>2. [unclear]</p> <p>3. [unclear]</p> <p>4. [unclear]</p> <p>5. [unclear]</p>	<p>1. [unclear]</p> <p>2. [unclear]</p> <p>3. [unclear]</p> <p>4. [unclear]</p> <p>5. [unclear]</p>	<p>1. [unclear]</p> <p>2. [unclear]</p> <p>3. [unclear]</p> <p>4. [unclear]</p> <p>5. [unclear]</p>	<p>1. [unclear]</p> <p>2. [unclear]</p> <p>3. [unclear]</p> <p>4. [unclear]</p> <p>5. [unclear]</p>	<p>1. [unclear]</p> <p>2. [unclear]</p> <p>3. [unclear]</p> <p>4. [unclear]</p> <p>5. [unclear]</p>	<p>1. [unclear]</p> <p>2. [unclear]</p> <p>3. [unclear]</p> <p>4. [unclear]</p> <p>5. [unclear]</p>	<p>1. [unclear]</p> <p>2. [unclear]</p> <p>3. [unclear]</p> <p>4. [unclear]</p> <p>5. [unclear]</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: Wieboit 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 OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Morga Whitworth

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: 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 profit. 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

Morga
4:00R

Neg:

- You are reading responses to the Core Files' Make power case, but that is not the same as the Aff's plan. Most of the WLC 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 misinterpretations of alternative fuel that equate it to renew

Morga
4:00R
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!



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 shorthand 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 of tricks that help them flow.