

Briefing for Debate Judges

Good morning / afternoon / evening - Welcome to (event).

I'm _____, the Director of Judging.

Thank you for helping - we couldn't operate without you - hope you enjoy

If you haven't completed and turned in your blue **Judges Registration Form** yet, please do so now. You should tear off and retain the bottom portion to keep track of the teams that you judge, so that you don't judge any twice.

We have ___ teams - all will debate the same topics simultaneously.

Each debate should have a moderator / timer and 2-3 judges.

Moderator will follow script and make procedural rulings - if a serious problem arises that your moderator isn't sure how to deal with, please send for me.

This round of debates is in Academic/Cross-Examination/Parliamentary style on the topic "Be it resolved that _____".

The debaters are all junior / senior high students.

The topic is impromptu / has been available to them for over a month, so they are expected to have prepared thoroughly for it.

Each debater will have a ___-minute constructive speech, (___-minute question period and ___-minute rebuttal-defence-summary speech, and be questioned by an opponent for up to ___ minutes).

Before reviewing the rules of debating, let's examine some of the items in the Judging Kit:

Debate Judging Criteria - summary of nitty gritty considerations listed under three main categories - *Preparation, Presentation, Debating Skills* - which you should try to *weight equally* - and penalties - not exhaustive.

Please remember that you are judging a debate, not just public speaking:

you should evaluate students on their abilities to *listen, reason and respond* as well as their speaking skills. A good debate features **CLASH** of facts, ideas and arguments, but **NOT** personalities.

Flow Sheets - not to be turned in - scrap paper - good for comparing and/or contrasting arguments and evidence - *keep tentative scores here*

Score Sheets - of critical importance, so let's examine in detail.

Has everybody one copy of the Score Sheet?

Note how the sample in the Judge's Kit is completed.

On NCR paper - please press hard to make three copies - but *don't* write with one on top of the other.

Some of sheet can be filled in now - please print in style - round - date - your name - and sign under signature.

Please write Room # under Location as soon as you are assigned to a room.

When you get to room, please copy in the top line of each box the names of the debaters in their speaking order as listed on the blackboard.

We encourage you to assign each student letter grades for the seven categories in the middle of the Score Sheet, using the first letter of the various words in the Grade Range at top of page. (e.g., "P" for "Poor"). A brief summary of what to look for regarding each category.

Please write comments in the student's box. Because of tight schedule, no time for verbal critiques. If you speak to students between debates: please be constructive and encouraging, but don't reveal outcome

The critical scores are the numerical scores assigned to each debater on the bottom line of each box - maximum 85, minimum 60 - outside these parameters, scores disregarded. Please use *whole numbers only*. Refer to *suggested scoring range* for guidance.

Please try to award about one-third of each score for Preparation, one-third for Presentation, and one-third for Debating Skills.

Debating is not just Public Speaking - canned speeches not acceptable - Evaluate debaters on Listening, Logic and Refutation. They are expected to RESPOND to opponents' case and audience reaction. Unless there is a Counter-Plan, negative role is to rebut so they are not expected to adduce as much evidence as affirmative.

The team championship will be decided on basis of teams' total scores (sometimes after lopping the two extreme scores of each student).

An individual champion may be from a weak team, so watch out for "diamonds in the rough".

Debaters have different functions to perform - do not mark them higher or lower because of their position on a team

Please don't complete scoring until you've heard both rounds of debate - keep notes from first round and tentative scores on a Flow Sheet, so that you can enter only final revised results on Score Sheets.

If you change a score, please scratch out your original mark and initial the correction.

Before turning in your Score Sheets to Timekeeper, please check to be sure you have filled in all 12 scores legibly.

After each debate, please fill in the name of the team that won the argument under "Winning Team" - this is not necessarily the team with the higher scores or whose students were the better debaters.

The resolution may be weighted in favour of one side or the other, but any such disadvantage in a debate is nullified because all teams must debate each side of the topic once.

If you have difficulty in deciding which team has won the argument, refer to the Team Evaluation form on back cover of Judging Kit - process of elimination.

Summary of General Rules of Debate

Burden of Proof on affirmative - unless counterplan - no ties

Standard of Proof - balance of probabilities (unless criminal Mock Trial)

**Definitions - responsibility of 1st affirmative - consequence of failure
responsibility of 1st negative to challenge unfair, unreasonable,
or produces truism or tautology - consequence of failure
responsibilities of succeeding speakers
if only common issue - decide on basis of better interpretation**

**SQUIRRELING means using very unconventional definitions –
it is allowed only during impromptu rounds and only if a clear
link to the resolution is established – MUST BE RELEVANT**

A Plan is required if proposition of policy, except in impromptu debate or in Cross-Examination style - in these cases, optional.

CounterPlan possible only if Plan - if CounterPlan, burden of proof shifts

Plan must be introduced during 1st speech - completed before last - CP too

CounterPlan must be shown to be alternative solution to problem, significantly different from & demonstrably superior to Plan

Debaters may talk about anything except *illegal remarks* or *personal comments*

Judges decide whether remarks are *Relevant*, and if so, what *Weight* they deserve

Judges must consider everything said, unless illegally introduced - please disregard improperly introduced arguments and evidence - but may reject unsubstantiated assertions or purely emotional appeals

If serious questions not answered satisfactorily - consider point won by questioner

Except for role-playing, or reasonable imagination in impromptu, all assertions of fact must be accurate - documented if challenged

Penalize students for inaccurate evidence - report any fabrication or falsification

Rebuttal - not restricted to official rebuttals, but no new constructive arguments or evidence during final affirmative rebuttal

Except for heckling, debaters must stand to speak.

They may read verbatim quotations - make reasonable reference to notes

Penalize for reading or memorization if it results in stilted, distracting or unnatural delivery

Penalize for unnecessary repetition - a certain amount acceptable - may introduce, state and review a point with impunity

No coaching by others in room - report any - debaters may not consult with or prompt colleagues while one of them is speaking - Otherwise reward teamwork, co-operation and coordination

Visual aids OK - become available for use of opponents

Debaters must be courteous, not disrupt opponents' speeches

Disregard illegally introduced evidence

Penalize debaters for rule violations, unfair tactics, discourtesy

Rules of Academic Style

Format - constructive speeches, rebuttals (by all in Cambridge, only 1 in Oxford)

References to others in third person

Heckling - sometimes allowed (today?)

Worlds style Points of Information - sometimes allowed (today?)

No Points of Order or Privilege but opportunity to complain at end

Rules of Cross-Examination Style

If resolution in question form, affirmative answers "Yes"

Format: constructive speeches, question periods, rebuttal-defence-

summaries, complaints of rule violations and misquotations

Treat each other with dignity: penalize rudeness, flippancy, browbeating, belittling

No heckling or other interjections but complaints about rule violations

or misquotations

May refer to other debaters informally, should address moderator by title

While cross-examining:

Fair questions on relevant topics, but not necessarily arising from speech

Penalize for arguing or making speeches instead of asking questions

Witnesses must be given reasonable opportunity to answer, but examiner may ask

moderator to cut witness short for stalling or answering at unnecessary length

While Answering:

Witnesses must give direct, honest answers: may be ordered if irrelevant

May not evade but may impose reasonable qualifications

May not object to answer or answer with question (except for clarification of a

confusing query)

Rules of Parliamentary Style

Playing role of MP's (or MLA's) at present time

May speak only after being recognized by Speaker - only one on floor at a time –

must surrender floor if Speaker rises

Must direct remarks through Speaker - address at outset

Must refer to other debaters in third person, usually by office

Parliamentary jargon - Bill, House, Speaker, Government, Opposition, etc.

Must avoid unparliamentary language (e.g., liar, words abusing Monarch, etc.)

Must abide by Speaker's rulings or may be named and expelled

Format - constructive speeches include rebuttals - except Prime Minister's

Rights of Interruption:

Verbal heckling welcome if brief, witty, incisive, infrequent - like a dagger-

penalize if thoughtless, excessive - reward for handling well

Points of Order - raised immediately to complain of rule violation other

than repetition or irrelevance - procedure - ruling - time

Points of Privilege - raised immediately if misquoted, misrepresented,

slandered or derided - procedure - ruling - time

NO Points of Information are permitted

Practical Tips

Sit apart from other judges - don't confer with them – we want your individual assessment

Don't fraternize with any debaters - ignore comments about debaters' backgrounds

Judge debate solely on basis of what students say, not on your own personal knowledge, opinions or prejudices

Try to appear interested even if debaters are boring

Don't let debate begin if judges missing

Interrupt if you can't hear

Try not to ask for time between speeches to make notes

If an official errs, try to compensate victim

When we are assigning judges to debates, please indicate if you have a conflict of interest or have judged one of the teams previously

Between rounds - return here for coffee and reassignment

Any questions or problems?