

Judging at Climb Camp and Tournaments



Table of Contents

OVERALL.....	2
WHEN THE DEBATE IS OVER—PRACTICE ROUND.....	2
WHEN THE DEBATE IS OVER—“REAL” ROUND.....	2
MAKE DECISIONS ON YOUR OWN	6
HOW SHOULD I MAKE A DECISION?	6
CAN I INTERJECT MY OPINION INTO MY DECISION?	8
DO I PRESENT MY DECISION ORALLY TO THE DEBATERS?.....	8

OVERALL

--at all times, treat students, other judges, coaches, etc. with respect, professionalism, and care. show you are a good community member.

--you need a laptop, tablet, or smartphone with access to your email—ballots are sent to you via email and you reply to the email to turn in your decision/points and then to turn in your full ballot with comments.

--debates are in rooms or online, the ballot will state what room to go; if online, you'll see your name in the list of debates

--start the debate promptly; keep us on time

--take notes of the arguments in the debate

WHEN THE DEBATE IS OVER—PRACTICE ROUND

--keep comments positive—focused on improvement

--start with comments on at least 2 specific things each student did well

--identify at least 2 specific things each students need to improve on

--have the students redo those specific things (may take time for them to re-prep)

--good idea: email jim or lab leader with comments on what the debaters need to work—including fixes to cases and rebuttals

WHEN THE DEBATE IS OVER—"REAL" ROUND

1. email jim the ballot with just who won and points (reply to jim's ballot email)

points are in .1 increments from 24.1 to 29.9

27.3 28.6 29.4 good

27 not good; 28.5 not good unless your other scores are 27.9 28.3 etc

24.1 needs serious improvement (eg the debater spoke for 30 seconds; the debater supported opponent's case; debater was rude, etc)

25.2 needs major improvement

26.3 fair debater, needs significant improvement

27.4 okay/decent debater, needs some improvement

28.5 good debater, needs small improvements

29.6 amazing debater, fantastic in almost every way

29.9 top debater you will judge this entire year

here is an example of what you email to jim for your ballot . . .

—note that this includes the ballot code which is included in the ballot he will send you—jim needs that. (when you reply to jim’s email, you can just fill in the win and points, and send)

Affirmative Overheart HS FabuolaMisty: WIN
Fabuola POINTS: 27.9
Misty POINTS: 27.7

Negative Northline HS KimKordo:
Kordo POINTS: 28.1
Kim POINTS: 26.9

Ballot Code: 11

note: even though it is pro and con—the ballot will say aff and neg.

2. AFTER YOU EMAIL your ballot—speak to the students providing 1) comments about what they did well; 2) comments about how they can improve; 3) a reason for decision.

--keep comments positive—focused on improvement

--bad debate? great—opportunity to start sentences with “you should _____” “your argument would be stronger if you _____”

--NO NO NO “this debate was not good” “that argument stinks”

--I’d start by saying who won the debate and then state why

--then, I’d give each debater at least one thing they did well and at least one thing they can improve on

3. AFTER YOU TALK WITH THE DEBATERS . . . email jim your full ballot with

--AT LEAST one comment of what each debater did well and

--AT LEAST one comment of what each debater could do to improve

--REASON FOR DECISION—that states the best aff and best neg arguments and why you did not vote for the losing side’s arguments

--this feedback is emailed to the coaches who then give it to the debaters; it helps the coaches do practice to improve students’ debating

EXAMPLE BALLOT (written by judge Tate Adams)

note—this was for an ipda debate

RFD: I vote Neg because of a really clever redefinition that just never gets responded to. AFF tells us in the IAC that the rights of clones are likely to be violated because they are perceived as just copies and that to create clones there will be perverse incentive structures that target marginalized female bodied people to get their eggs and produce new life. NEG rejects the definition of clones as fully functional humans and says that at the very least we should maintain the ability for medical care providers to

clone human stem cells and organs because it doesn't create new sentient life (and thus doesn't trigger AFF's impacts), but could lead to saving a lot of lives.

Feedback for AFF:

+I like your arguments about how these clones are likely to have their rights infringed upon, and I think your framework makes this argument one of the more important ones in voting.

-A huge strategic deficit is incurred when you choose not to challenge the redefinition from the 1st NEG speech. They hinge all of their case on it, so it would be wise to respond to it.

-Leave a bit of time in your first rebuttal to extend your case.

-Give clearer voters in the second rebuttal.

-The use of hypothetical questions in your refutation works against you, in my opinion. Using direct, declarative statements about how your opponent is wrong will make your rebuttal rhetorically stronger.

-I think this round would be better structured as a policy. You say that it's already being done in some places so you would rather it be a value debate, but I think that you can just say "we would prefer a world wherein we ban human cloning everywhere."

Feedback for NEG:

+Great redefinition and work on the framework (FW) debate.

-Try to utilize more comparative analysis and 'even if's. If you would have lost your definition, the round would likely follow. Why are your opponents' arguments wrong even if they fit in the scope of the round? Why are they less important than yours even if they are right?

-Tell me which FW is more important and why you win under that lens. Then tell me why you win on the other one, even if I choose to use it.

Great job to both speakers, this was an interesting round.

TIME SIGNALS

Judges usually give hand signals or out loud signals to indicate how much time remains during each speech. Usually, debaters also time themselves. Signals at 2 left, 1 left, 30 seconds left (hand signal is bent finger), time is up, fist in air or shape of a T (for time). Most judges allow a debater to finish up a sentence when time expires and then require the debater to stop and do not consider arguments after the time has expired.

MIDDLE SCHOOL PARLI/PUBLIC DEBATE (not public forum debate)

- First Aff/Prop Speaker: Constructive Speech 5 minutes, make case for the resolution
- First Neg/Opp Speaker: Constructive Speech 5 minutes, make case against the resolution and refute the affirmative case
- Second Aff/Prop Speaker: Constructive 5 minutes, defend the affirmative case and respond to the negative case
- Second Neg/Opp Speaker: Constructive 5 minutes, defend the negative case and reattack the pro case

- Third Neg/Opp Speaker: Rebuttal 5 minutes, defend the negative case, reattack the affirmative case with an emphasis on voting issues for the negative side
- Third Neg/Opp Speaker: Rebuttal 5 minutes, defend the affirmative case, reattack the negative case with an emphasis on voting issues for the affirmative side
- Between each speech, each team gets 1 minute of preparation time
- During minutes 2-4, debaters may ask questions or make points against their opponent who is speaking. The speaking opponent chooses whether to take the point/question though usually speakers are expected to take at least 1 or 2 points/questions.

Note that teams don't present new arguments in the rebuttals other than they present new responses to arguments/new responses the other team made.

PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE SPEAKER DUTIES AND TIMES (HS and MS)

- Pro First Speaker: Constructive Speech 4 minutes, make case for the resolution
- Con First Speaker: Constructive Speech 4 minutes, make case against the resolution
- Crossfire 3 minutes, question and answer between first speakers
- Pro Second Speaker: Rebuttal 4 minutes, respond to the con case
- Con Second Speaker: Rebuttal 4 minutes, respond to the pro case
- Crossfire 3 minutes, question and answer between the second speakers
- Pro First Speaker: Summary 2 minutes, defend pro case and/or address key issues in debate
- Con First Speaker: Summary 2 minutes, defend con case and/or address key issues in debate
- Grand Crossfire 3 minutes, question and answer among all the speakers
- Pro Second Speaker: Final Focus 2 minutes, show why winning the key issues
- Con Second Speaker: Final Focus 2 minutes, show why winning the key issues
- Between speeches, each team gets 4 minutes of preparation time for the whole debate

Note that after the constructive speeches—teams don't present new arguments other than they present new responses to arguments/new responses the other team made.

LD DEBATE SPEAKER DUTIES AND TIMES

- First Affirmative Constructive Speech 6 minutes, make case for the resolution
- Cross-Examination 3 minutes, Neg debater asks the Aff debater questions
- Negative Constructive Speech 7 minutes, present negative case against the resolution and refute the affirmative case
- Cross-Examination 3 minutes, Aff debater asks the Neg debater questions
- First Affirmative Rebuttal: 4 minutes, respond to the negative case and defend the affirmative case
- Negative Rebuttal: 6 minutes, refute the affirmative case again, defend the negative case, lay out voting issues
- Second Affirmative Rebuttal: 3 minutes, covering all the key issues, defend the affirmative case and re-attack the negative case.

- Between speeches, each debater gets 4 minutes of preparation time for the whole debate

Note that after the constructive speeches—teams don't present new arguments other than they present new responses to arguments/new responses the other team made.

POLICY-CX DEBATE SPEAKER DUTIES AND TIMES

- 1. First Affirmative Constructive (IAC) 8 minutes, present plan/advocacy and advantage/arguments
- a. Cross-examination of First Affirmative by Second Negative 3 minutes
- 2. First Negative Constructive (INC) 8 minutes, present disadvantages, counterplans, kritiks, topicality or theory arguments, and refute the affirmative case
- a. Cross-examination of First Negative by First Affirmative 3 minutes
- 3. Second Affirmative Constructive (2AC), defend the affirmative case and respond to the INC disadvantages, counterplans, kritiks, topicality, and theory arguments
- a. Cross-examination of Second Affirmative by First Negative 3 minutes
- 4. Second Negative Constructive (2NC) defend negative arguments, reattack the affirmative case
- a. Cross-examination of Second Negative by Second Affirmative 3 minutes
- 5. First Negative Rebuttal (1NR). Defend negative arguments, reattack the affirmative case BUT not same ones the second negative constructive defended and reattacked
- 6. First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR) Defend the affirmative case and reattack the negative arguments
- 7. Second Negative Rebuttal (2NR) Defend negative arguments, reattack the affirmative case
- 8. Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR) Defend the affirmative case and reattack the negative arguments
- Between speeches, each debater gets 4 minutes of preparation time for the whole debate

Note that after the constructive speeches—teams don't present new arguments other than they present new responses to arguments/new responses the other team made.

MAKE DECISIONS ON YOUR OWN

At the end of the debate, on your own, without speaking to anyone including other judges, make your own decision. Conferring with another person about your decision is a MAJOR no—it is considered a serious breach of unfair influence and bias.

In elimination rounds, when you have 3 judges, you still make your decision on your own—don't talk with the other judges. After you decide on your own, you hand the chair a folded slip of paper with who you think won; the chair will look at the slips of paper after the chair has finished deciding his/her/their decision. It is common for there to be 2-1 decisions and for the 3 judges to have different decisions about who won—consensus does happen but only by having each judge arrive at their own decision.

HOW SHOULD I MAKE A DECISION?

Note to those used to BP debate: the decision is NOT about who did their job duties best; it is NOT about who presented new matter (new matter is more or less not allowed in this debate—the goal is to go in-depth on the arguments presented in the first speech cases). the decision is based on the arguments presented in the debate and asks the question: “does the pro or con side of the resolution have stronger support?” that is, based on the arguments presented in the debate, “should capital gains taxes be ended or not” or “should spain grant catalonia independence or not.”

List out the good and the bad of the pro advocacy. USE THE NOTES YOU TAKE DURING THE DEBATE TO HELP.

Example if the debaters were arguing a Peacekeepers topic:

Peacekeepers keep fighting groups separated so they don't engage in violence (good).

Peacekeepers allow fighting groups to build up weapons so when they fight, it is even worse (bad).

Then, consider which arguments were most persuasive to you. If the debaters provided a way to evaluate which are the most persuasive arguments, use those ways. In Public Forum debate, this is often done through a “framework” presented in the cases—eg “Avoiding violence is the highest priority—whichever side best prevents violence should win the debate.” If the debaters’ arguments show that is the way to judge the debate, then use that way.

Some additional considerations for making your decision:

--with the three items immediately below, unless an extreme situation, the debaters should have made these arguments, if not, don't make the arguments for the debaters

--Does the pro advocacy support the resolution? If not, their case may not be relevant and may not be fair for the con to be prepared to respond against (remembering to give the pro a chance to respond).

--Did either side make an argument that was abusive to the other side—should you reject that abusive argument or perhaps, should you reject the entire case/debater for making that abusive argument?

--Any other issues that would lead you to reject the pro or the con debater's advocacy?

WHEN YOU WRITE YOUR DECISION

Write out your decision AFTER you email your ballot with who won and points—so the tournament stays on schedule.

Explain in, at least, a paragraph, which issues convinced you to vote the way that you did. If you need more room, ask the ballot table for an additional ballot.

- Explain your decision. USE COMPLETE, CLEAR SENTENCES. *"I voted Pro because they showed peacekeeping would . . ."*
- Explain why you did not vote for the arguments of the losing team. Try to point to arguments that the winning team made that convinced you against these arguments. *"The con arguments about peacekeepers failing ignored the three affirmative studies showing improvements."*
- Explain what the losing team needed to do to win the debate. *"The Con needed better evidence that showed why these programs would not work."*

Here is an example (short) decision:

- *"I felt the Pro showed that their peacekeeping policy is the most just way to stop genocide in Sudan. The Con tried to say that genocide would continue. But the Pro evidence showed that peacekeepers have stopped such atrocities in the past and that stopping genocide is the number one imperative of our time. So, I voted Pro. To win, the con needs to show the peacekeepers failed in previous efforts and/or give a convincing reason the peacekeepers would fail rather than just asserting that they would fail."*

CAN I INTERJECT MY OPINION INTO MY DECISION?

Avoid it. You should not make a decision based solely on your beliefs. For example, it would be wrong to vote against a case simply because you didn't like it. **DO NOT MAKE ARGUMENTS AGAINST A TEAM.** Make your decisions based on the **arguments that the teams present** in the debate.

But the argument key to my decision was really bad! Well, two things: 1) Give weak arguments full credit as a weak argument—no less and no more; 2) Blame the team that couldn't even show that it was a weak argument—rather than blame the team that made the weak argument. ***Don't make your decision based on your opinion—make it based on the arguments and responses made by the debaters. That is the point of debate—it is for the debaters, not the judges, to argue.***

DO I PRESENT MY DECISION ORALLY TO THE DEBATERS?

--No for "practice rounds" unless you think it will help the students see how they can improve.

--Yes for "real rounds." Send in your ballot with who won and speaker points and then, explain your decision to the debaters and offer them comments on what they did well and what they need to do to improve.

Problem: One of the debaters is arguing with me! 1) Put a stop to it: Authoritatively say: "I'm not here to argue with you; I'm explaining my decision and I'll answer questions but not arguments you are now making; 2) If the debater doesn't stop: Authoritatively say: "Thanks for the debate; I'm finished and moving on to my next round" and leave. If the debater is rude—lower their speaker points by emailing jim and make note of the rudeness on the ballot.