



JUDGING TIPS FOR LD & PF DEBATE

Finding your ballots

- Log in to your account at www.tabroom.com.
- Click on your email address in the upper right corner.
- If the ballots have been published, you will see your ballots on the next page. You will know because you'll see a green button that says "START ROUND."

Starting the round

- Go immediately to your assigned room. No competitors are to enter the classroom before you.
- Click "START ROUND" to access your ballot so the tournament admin know you are present and aware of the round. **Do this as soon as you are in the room so the tournament staff knows you are in place.**
- Confirm that the students in the room are the students that are in your ballot as competitors.
- Confirm that all competing students have arrived before beginning the debate. Other students are allowed to observe at the wishes of both sides and the judge. If you or either side are not comfortable with observers, it is your call to ask observers to leave or not.
- If you have students who have not arrived by five minutes past the start of the round, our tab staff asks you to please notify us so we can begin looking for the student and get them to the appropriate room. Tabroom can be reached at a phone number announced the day of the Tournament.

JUDGING TIPS FOR LD & PF DEBATE

Running the round

Lincoln Douglas Debate

- The sides are already locked in advance, which you will see on your electronic ballot.
- See also below in the **Both Lincoln-Douglas and Public Forum** section.

Public Forum Debate

- The teams will always flip for sides. A coin will be flipped and a team will call Heads or Tails. The winner decides either their speaking order or which side they want to debate. The other team will then decide the other. In other words, if Team 1 wins the coin flip and decides they want the negative speaking position, Team 2 can decide if they want to speak first or second.
- Please confirm and/or correct the speaking order and speaking position in Tabroom before beginning the round. A default is already entered, but this may change based on the coin flip and which partner in a team speaks first.

Both Lincoln-Douglas and Public Forum

- The first speech is the Constructive speech. This is a prewritten speech by both sides outlining their main arguments. This is where the basis of the debate begins for the judge to understand what the key issues in the round are.
- Judges should go into every round removing all preconceived notions of the topic and what they have heard in previous rounds. Every round is a brand-new round, and judges should imagine it's the first time they have heard the debate on the topic and the debaters.

JUDGING TIPS FOR LD & PF DEBATE

- Students will use the second speech as Rebuttal to their opponents' Constructive. This is considered the speech that most directly conflicts with the other students' main points to create "Clash." Clash is the act of directly responding to and refuting an opponent's arguments. Clash is the most important element for judging debate as it directly correlates with a student's ability to break down the other side's main arguments and why their arguments should be considered the winning arguments.
- The final speeches are considered the Crystallization of the debate round in which the students bring up the main arguments in the Constructive and Rebuttal and weigh them on which are most important, why they win these main arguments, and/or why the opponent loses on the main arguments.
- **NO NEW ARGUMENTS CAN BE BROUGHT UP AFTER THE REBUTTAL.** New arguments should not be evaluated in the final speeches; new evidence may be presented until the final speech, but no new arguments.
- As the students speak, you should take some notes to help you make your decisions at the conclusion of the round. You can take these notes in Tabroom or in a separate document, **though it will be much faster for the tournament and for you if you take the notes in Tabroom as they can be the basis of your comments.**
- If a student asks for time signals, please give them. Students and Judges should both be keeping their own time. Students are not allowed to continue speaking after the timer is finished, and any time spent after the timer should not be considered in your notes. Please see the ballot or attachments for appropriate times in each speech for both types of Debate.
- When the round has concluded, thank **all** competitors for their time. Judges are asked to **not disclose their results** or give feedback to keep the tournament flowing. If students ask for feedback, be respectful and let them know all feedback will be on your ballot and can be seen on

JUDGING TIPS FOR LD & PF DEBATE

Tabroom when they are posted after the tournament.

- **R E S P E C T**

Remember that students are to be respectful and kind to each other.

It is common to have middle school and high schoolers debating each other, but this age difference should not allow either team to be rude, condescending, or disrespectful to the other team, nor should anything else.

In Cross Examination/Cross Fire, teams should respect the other team's ability to ask questions. Students are not allowed to make personal comments about the other team.

Any language that is disrespectful or unkind should reflect in the speaker points.

Submitting your ballot

- You will score each competitor a score between 20 and 30. A score of 20 is extremely low and rare. Students are rarely scored below 25 unless it is an egregious error, and disrespect has occurred of some kind.
- The winning side does not have to be the strongest speakers; this is called a low-point win. A student's ability to present and strong oratory skills does not immediately designate a winner as a Judge should evaluate the ability to Clash and Crystalize the main arguments of the debate as the primary reason for a win or a loss.
- You may be hearing arguments and ideas with which you disagree, and

JUDGING TIPS FOR LD & PF DEBATE

some students might have arguments that are mature in nature. Please keep personal biases out of your decisions and judge only on the students' presentations in the round.

- You must write at least a little feedback for each competitor before the site will allow you to submit. **It is very important that you submit your ballots quickly.** As soon as you have decided on the decision and speaker points, write a quick reason for decision and submit your ballot! You can add more comments/feedback later. Don't delay the tournament moving forward! Please DO write those comments in later, but please also keep the tournament on time as debate tournaments are long enough as they are already! 😊
- You will be the only judge in the room for the early rounds, but don't worry! Students will compete for up to 5 times for up to 5 separate people before breaks occur, so just trust your gut. For outrounds, there will be 3 judges in the room.

Making written comments

- Written comments are arguably the most important part of a ballot! They are what help students and coaches improve their presentations for future competitions.
- Try to encourage the competitors with positivity. Many are participating in Speech and Debate not to win but to gain speaking experience. This should be an easy, friendly environment for them.
- At the same time, it's frustrating for students to lose a round and not know why they didn't win. Try to maintain a balance of praise and advice. Students want to know how they can improve! See the next pages for tips.

JUDGING TIPS FOR LD & PF DEBATE

Try to use both praise and constructive criticism. Examples below.

Eye Contact:

- "excellent focus on the audience"
- "eyes moved from walls to ceiling"
- "made me feel a part of your speech"
- "looked around and over the audience"

Poise:

- "confident and polished presentation"
- "fidgeting with hands"
- "your professionalism impressed me"
- "avoid pacing back and forth"

Articulation:

- "excellent volume and speaking rate"
- "some mumbling and slurring of words"
- "good variation of tone and vocal emphasis"
- "needed to speak more slowly"

Quality of Arguments/ Appropriate Relevance:

- "Arguments were very relevant for topic"
- "Arguments were not relevant or not clearly articulated"
- "Arguments had strong evidence to support"
- "Evidence did not support the reasoning"

JUDGING TIPS FOR LD & PF DEBATE

Quality of Clash / Skill of Interpretation:

"Clash was strong and showed grasp of key "Little to no clash/ did not directly interact with opponents issues in the round arguments"

"great use of evidence to show how you win "Lacking in clarity on how side wins the debate, the key issues of the debate" main arguments were not supported throughout the debate"

Reason for Decision

Even when all competitors in your round are great and it is difficult to rank them explain why a certain side won over another. Please offer very explicit decision explanations.

Examples:

"Both sides were excellent debaters and speakers. My decision was a tough one, but ultimately came down to the flow of arguments from summary and final focus. Team X better flowed their arguments from summary and their speeches into final focus, while Team Y had excellent arguments but did not raise their arguments or substantive rebuttals to Team X in their final focus. Therefore, Team X substantively won the debate despite Team Y being a great team (and great speakers!).

"The NEG did a great job in demonstrating the net benefits of immigration and clearly won the impact arguments. Their ability to effectively weigh the impacts in the round gave them the edge. Moving forward, ensure that every argument is tied back to the impacts and framed in a way that resonates with your framework. Keep focusing on building strong comparative analysis between your case and your opponent's to further strengthen your position. Great work overall!

Helpful Words

Strong

amazing
breathtaking
beautiful
brilliant
decent
delightful
dynamic
enjoyable
excellent
extraordinary
fabulous
fine
first-class
first-rate
grand
great
impressive
incredible
logical
lovely
marvelous
perfect
pleasant

remarkable
satisfactory
spectacular
splendid
stunning
superb
terrific
wonderful

Weak

artificial
awkward
broad
dull
faulty
flawed
incoherent
mellow
monotonous
mumbled

JUDGING TIPS FOR LD & PF DEBATE

Areas of Critique

believability
characterization
cohesion
confidence
content
delivery
enthusiasm
enunciation
eye contact
facial expressions
gestures
innovation
movements
posture
rate of speech
stage presence
volume

Posture, Gestures

at ease
calm
charming
elegant
face the audience
fidgety
graceful
hunched
natural
poised
repetitive
tense
unnatural

This document was created for use in debate by Pedro Sanchez Villa, WWDL Director, with help from KHSSL Director Steve Meadows. The original Judge Tips document for Speech was written by Rachael Castillo from Atherton High School. Thanks, Rachael!

**SEE BALLOT SAMPLES
NEXT PAGE!**

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: 11/07 - 11/08			Tournament Location: West High School		
Round/Flight: IA	Room: 322	Division: V	Judge Name: Jameela Judge	Judge School: West High School	
Affirmative: Pink AB			Name or Code →	Negative: Yellow CD	
Aff. Points: 29	← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) →				Neg. Points: 28.5
		20-21 Below Average	22-23 Average	24-26 Good	27-28 Excellent 29-30 Outstanding
Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative		Winning Team/Code: Pink AB			Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to them as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of their opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

- The affirmative case was well structured. While the links to the criterion are mostly present within the case, there are some specific arguments without direct links to the criterion. An example of this was the Smith evidence in your second contention.
- The 1st rebuttal had an issue with covering the bottom portion of the Aff case.
- Solid extensions!
- The 2nd rebuttal covered the key issues. While rushed at times, it was well structured.
- The negative case offense was solid, but the preemptive arguments to the affirmative were not necessary, especially since most of them didn't apply to the aff your opponent read.
- The coverage of the aff case was easy to follow, but was defensive oriented.
- The second rebuttal was scattered and lacked a clear summary and comparison of key arguments.

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Aff + Neg: both had very clear statement of value & criteria.

Each sides flows had nice opportunity for clash and opposition. Overall, this was a good debate.

Aff's constructive argument was organized and cleanly delivered with evidentiary warrants supporting.

Neg's Cx only used about half allotted time and did not set up strong ammunition for rebuttals that followed.

Neg's constructive argument had two strong main points. The delivery came across more strained and not as polished.

Aff's Cx asked solid questions, particularly strong probing/undermining question about opponent's Egypt example.

Aff Rebuttal directly answered Neg's attacks and constructive arguments head on

Neg Rebuttal did an admirable job attempting to point out where opponent had dropped or failed to answer Japan example, though in reiterating Japan example, it was unclear exactly how it pertained to military aid rather than warfare per se.

Aff Rebuttal 2 did a good job countering Neg Rebuttal and reaffirming Aff positions.

Overall close with a slight edge to Aff debater.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Affirmative Constructive	6 min..
Neg. Cross-Ex of Aff	3 min..
Negative Constructive	7 min..
Aff. Cross-Ex of Neg	3 min..
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min..
Negative Rebuttal	6 min..
Affirmative Rebuttal	3 min..
Each debater has 4 min. prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.	

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date: 11/07 - 11/08		Tournament Location: West High School	
Round/ Flight: IA	Room: 322	Division: V	Judge Name: James Judge Affiliation/ Occupation: West High School
Resolution/ Topic: Resolved: The United States should end its economic sanctions against Venezuela.			

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) *or* the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
Code: Green AB	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points	Code: Violet CD	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name: Aiden Ayodele		28.5	Speaker 2 Name: Chloe Cho		27
Speaker 3 Name: Barack Bousaid		28	Speaker 4 Name: Diana David		30

Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Team/Code: Violet CD
--	----------------------

- ❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- ❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- ❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- ❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- ❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- ❖ **No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

- The chemistry of the team was good.
- The summary did an effective job of highlighting the key issues in the round.
- The final focus discussed a couple arguments that the summary did not focus on.
- The argument about the developmental harms was persuasive but not developed in the later parts of the round.

Comments to debaters:

- The first speaker's confidence is strong in the first speech but lacks in the summary
- The rebuttal was impressive with the turns placed on the con case.
- The summary speech dropped a couple arguments.
- The final focus did an effective job comparing arguments and crystallizing.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Out of neg summary on the neg case, there's a lot of uniqueness argument extensions about Maduro being bad and how he's at the core of the issues in Venezuela and not sanctions. But at no point is a solvency argument extended, meaning out of summary I don't have any link extension that tells me voting neg will actually change Maduro's status in office.

That means I'll evaluate aff off any harm I think sanctions impose. The medical supplies argument is good enough, for example. The only response read on this argument is that Maduro is the actual problem. Aff reads that, while imports were low before sanctions, they went down more, so even if removing sanctions keeps Maduro in power, it still provides a bit more medicine that saves some lives. Given that there's no argument about sanctions removing Maduro, giving a bit more medicine to save some lives is sufficient enough offense for me to affirm.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1.....	4 min.
Speaker 2.....	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*.....	3 min.
Speaker 3.....	4 min.
Speaker 4.....	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*.....	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary.....	3 min.
Speaker 2 Summary.....	3 min.
Grand Crossfire (all).....	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus.....	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus.....	2 min.
3 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	