

Claremont High School

Speech and Debate



Judges' Handbook:

Guidelines for judging speech and debate events

Written and compiled by
Roger A. Russell
September, 2003
Updated September, 2008



Introduction:

Judging speech and debate events is quite rewarding. Why? Because it provides an opportunity to view young people, as they compete in various events that reveal the remarkable results of hard work and diligent effort. Judges are entertained, informed, and challenged by the material presented by these students. It is often a moving and exhilarating experience.

In some ways, judging is rather simple. Judges are asked to do just three things:

- a) To rank competitors and/or select winners
- b) To evaluate the performance of each student
- c) To offer brief positive comments and constructive criticism at the conclusion of the round.

Yes, there is responsibility in judging, but it is a shared responsibility (competitors are evaluated in multiple rounds and by more than one judge). It need not be a cause for worry. For one thing, a competitor's college career, self-esteem, and ultimate destiny do NOT rely upon a single ballot. Further, the whole purpose of competing and judging is to give students a forum for communication, which means addressing various sorts of audiences (i.e., judges). And the competitors know this and know that to be successful they need to recognize differences between judges and speak accordingly. Also, judging is always relative, not absolute. In other words, competitors are judged in comparison to each other (they are either ranked, or a winner determined), not in comparison to some "ideal" or absolute standard of what a speech or debate should be like. So, for example, when judging speeches given in a particular round, the judge compares all the speeches heard during that round to each other, not to the best speech he or she has ever heard. In the end, the primary and most important requirement for judging is fairness, which includes following the judging guidelines for each event and not allowing personal beliefs, biases, or preferences to interfere.

This handbook was prepared to assist those who judge speech and debate tournaments. It is designed in such a way to provide each judge with both general and specific information about the various events in speech and debate tournaments and some guidelines for judging them. Consequently, it is not necessary to read this handbook from cover to cover. Since the information presented goes from general to specific, the reader can read the general information and then decide in each instance how much detail he, or she needs to read in order to judge an event. Finally, at the end of this handbook are several appendixes, which contain judging resource materials for each of the events that occur in a speech and debate tournament. Copies of these materials will be available to CHS judges at the time of a tournament, so they may be used during actual judging.



General Considerations:

Before discussing the various events in a speech and debate tournament, there are a few general considerations that apply to judging all events, many of which may be addressed by tournament organizers at the time of a particular tournament (either in written form or verbal instructions for judges). While they may vary somewhat from tournament to tournament, the following discussion provides a good overview of what to expect.

Providing and coordinating judges:

Each team at a tournament is responsible for providing some of the judges who will judge the individual events. The number of judges required from the team depends upon the number of team members entered in the tournament. If a team does not supply enough judges, there can be some negative consequences (such as, judging fines, or being dropped from the tournament), so it is crucial that we meet our responsibility. A further negative consequence is having a preponderance of judges from other teams making the decisions, which can work against our team.

Coordination of judges who come from Claremont High School (CHS) is provided by a parent volunteer and a member of the CHS Speech and Debate Team. These individuals are responsible for identifying and securing judges for each tournament and for providing assistance (along with the coaches) to judges during tournaments. All judges from CHS will be expected to check in with the team coach and/or judge coordinators when they arrive at a tournament site.

General judging information and norms:

There are many similar aspects involved in the process of judging the various tournament events. Also, there are general expectations regarding the process of judging for all events.

A. Judge's Room:

All speech and debate tournaments provide a room for judges (signs and/or tournament officials at the Registration Desk will direct judges to that room). For the most part, judges remain in that room between judging rounds. Often coffee, tea and snacks (such as fruit, donuts, etc.) as well as lunch are provided in that room. Tournament officials speak with judges in that room and provide judging assignments and additional information regarding the tournament.

B. Checking in:

Upon arrival at a tournament, judges go to the judge's room and sign-in with tournament officials (judges do not sign in at the Registration Desk) to let them know they are there. When signing-in, there are several things to do:

1. First and foremost; it is essential to indicate that you are judging for Claremont High School to insure that we are given credit for your efforts.
2. Also, indicate to the tournament officials which events you prefer to judge
3. Finally, if your son or daughter is competing (which usually will be the case), state his or her events, so they may avoid assigning you a round in which he or she is competing.

In addition to signing in with tournament officials, it is also necessary to let the team judge coordinators and/or coaches know you are present; they will then be able to assist you as needed.

C. Judging Materials:

There are a few basic supplies that are necessary and/or helpful when judging:

1. Paper and two or three pens or pencils (just in case one breaks!) to help take notes during a round and write comments on ballots at the end.

2. A timepiece for timing the speeches (either a digital watch with a stopwatch function OR any other timepiece which can easily track time)
3. A book, newspaper, project, or any other material that will help to fill any waiting time between rounds

D. Ballots (Judging Forms):

Judges are given ballots (judging forms) for each event they judge, and while there may be some variation in what they contain, depending upon the event and/or depending upon the particular tournament, there are many common aspects to them and what judges do with them.

1. Swapping ballots: This refers to swapping a ballot with another judge, after they have been distributed to the judges by the tournament organizers. **NEVER DO THIS**. To make judging fair, those who assign judges work to assure that judges see as many different teams as possible and do not end up judging their own teams. Swapping ballots will undo these efforts. If for any reason a judge does not wish to accept a particular assignment (particularly if the judge notes that he or she knows any of the competitors personally), he or she should let the tournament directors know and, when possible, they will make the necessary change.
2. Room Assignment: The ballot will provide the room assignment (where the round will take place). Tournament officials provide a map of the institution where the tournament takes place, so judges can find their way to the room where the round is to be conducted.
3. List of competitors: All ballots indicate the competitors involved in the event; they are not identified by name but by a code number that has been assigned to each.

Order of speaking: The list of competitors indicates the order in which they are supposed to speak; to increase fairness, the organizers for the tournament will vary the speaking order for individual competitors, so they will have the opportunity to speak at different times during the different rounds. There are, however, exceptions to this rule, which will mean that speakers will NOT speak in the order specified on the ballot. For example, sometimes students are double entered (meaning they are competing in two events during the same round), so they will have to speak early in one, then leave and speak later in the other event.

Listing names and topic titles on whiteboard: Competitors in individual speech events/rounds are often encouraged to write their names and the titles of their presentation on the whiteboard in the order in which they are going to speak (as indicated on the ballot). This is particularly helpful when there are participants who have to leave, or who arrive late.

No-shows: If a student fails to have written his, or her name on the whiteboard at the beginning of the round AND does not arrive within 65 minutes of the start, his or her code should be entered on the ballot and marked "No show."

4. Judge's decisions: All ballots also include space for recording the judge's decisions regarding the event being judged, as well as the judge's name and his or her school affiliation.

Ranking: When applicable (e.g., for individual speech events), ballots will contain information for ranking competitors at the end of a round (often 1st through 4th,

with all those below 3rd tied for 4th). It is important to remember that this ranking involves comparing the individuals in the round to each other, not to any external standard, or “ideal” presentation. Also, remember that there are multiple preliminary rounds, so each competitor is ranked in more than one grouping. Appendix A provides a form for ranking competitors as the round progresses.

Declaring a winner: In debate events, judges are asked to declare a winner; that is, which team or individuals did the best job debating.

Speaker points: In many cases speaker points are also awarded on a scale (often from 1 – 30). The points assigned should be consistent with the ranking (for example, a person ranked second should have less points assigned than the person ranked 1st) and/or determination of the winner (e.g., in team debate, the total points for the team that loses should not be more than the total for the team that wins). As a general rule, and in order to maintain a positive experience for students, points are only given in the top two ranges (e.g., 25-30 for superior and 20-24 for excellent, and usually falling between 23 and 27). Those who clearly don't perform at the typical level, or who violate rules for their event, can receive points in the next range (e.g., 15-19 for fair).

5. Judging criteria and time limits: Ballots often include information regarding judging criteria, including time limits. These criteria are very helpful in comparing the merits of individual presentations, and they can also be used in providing feedback to a competitor. Judges do not tell competitors at the time if they exceed a time limit, but they do record the fact and can use it in judging. At the novice level, judges generally allow students to go over the time limit more than at the varsity level, without penalty. However, at the varsity level, exceeding the time limit by more than 15 seconds can lead to a lowering in rank by one (for example, someone who otherwise would have been ranked 2nd will be ranked 3rd).
6. Feedback to competitors: Judges are usually given an opportunity to provide feedback to the individual competitors in the form of written comments and points, often on separate sheets of paper. This is particularly true for all individual events. The critique of the individual student is drawn from the notes the judge takes during the round. Some judges choose to take the notes on separate sheets of paper, then sum up and transfer to the individual student pages at the conclusion of the round, while others prefer to take the notes on the individual student pages during the round (this shortens the writing time by eliminating the need to transfer notes).

Written comments: It is expected that the written comments will inform the competitor about what she or he did well plus provide constructive criticism regarding areas for improvement (these will also help the competitor understand why the judge assigned the particular rank). Participants look forward to reading these comments, so it helps to be encouraging and constructive, while indicating how he or she might do better in the future. Rarely will a student be rude, but if and when that does happen, rude comments in reply are inappropriate—at such times, the rude behavior may be noted and the student chastised for that behavior.

Points: The separate sheet for feedback often includes a space to rate the competitor's performance on a scale (often from 1 – 30). The points assigned should be consistent with the ranking (for example, a person ranked second should have less points assigned than the person ranked 1st). As a general rule, and in order to maintain a positive experience for students, points are only given

in the top two ranges (e.g., 25-30 for superior and 20-24 for excellent, and usually falling between 23 and 27). Those who clearly don't perform at the typical level, or who violate rules for their event, can receive points in the next range (e.g., 15-19 for fair).

Oral Comments: Sometimes students seek oral feedback, and/or judges have a wish to provide such feedback. It's understandable why this might happen, since such verbal feedback can be even more helpful than the written comments. Judges DO NOT have to provide any oral comments, even if asked. On the other hand, judges are not prohibited from giving verbal critiques, BUT such critiques MUST NOT be provided until AFTER the ballots have been turned in for tabulation, and such comments MUST NEVER reveal the judge's actual decision (i.e., ranking, or who won or lost). In other words, strengths and weakness may be discussed after ballot have been turned in, but judges *NEVER INDICATE THE RESULTS TO ANY STUDENT AT ANY TIME*. Finally, if in doubt, say nothing.

Participant's attire: Students do not all have the same financial resources, so some may not be able to afford the level of attire worn by more affluent competitors. Consequently, it is not appropriate to comment upon the student's quality of attire. However, tidiness, cleanliness and appropriateness do merit attention.

7. Checking Ballots: Judges are asked to be sure to check over their ballots before turning it in, making sure they have made a decision (e.g., ranked competitors) and assigned speaker points, as well as indicating the school they represent and their name.
8. Turning in Ballots: Do NOT leave without turning in a ballot immediately after an event. If judges fail to turn in ballots (leave for lunch, go home, etc.), the whole tournament can be delayed, because later rounds cannot be assigned without all decisions in hand.

E. Conducting a Round:

Judges are in control of what happens during a round—they run the show. They determine when the round actually begins and when each speaker is to start speaking. They make certain the round proceeds in a timely manner.

Before the round begins, judges take whatever time is necessary to prepare for judging and assure that competitors are present and aware of the order in which they are speaking. In some cases, competitors may ask the judge questions about his, or her approach to judging (e.g., policy debaters may wish to know how the judge views "spreading"), or other facets of the competition. In most cases, answering questions and/or giving instructions should not take more than five minutes.

What judges do during the round depends somewhat upon the nature of the event being judged. For all events, judges have to monitor time limits, and they are encouraged to take notes, which they can use for basing their decisions as well as for giving written feedback to competitors. All events have time limits, so it is important to have a means for watching and recording the time. A stop watch is probably the best method for keeping time, but wall clocks and wrist watches can also be used (especially if they have a second hand), in which case, judges usually tell the competitors when they can begin (usually when the second hand is on 12). For some timed events, judges give times (verbally, or by hand signals), whether asked to or not, while in others judges may provide time signals upon request. Depending upon the specific event, there are different kinds of notes to take; speech events usually have notes regarding the quality of the presentation, while debate events track the flow of the debate (arguments and counter-arguments).

At the conclusion of the round, it is common for the judge to thank the competitors and express appreciation for the opportunity to judge, and for the competitor to similarly thank the judge for his or her efforts.

F. Speech and Debate Tournament Structure and Levels of Competition:

Every speech and/or debate tournament is divided into events and rounds. Some tournaments focus on speech events, other focus on debate events, and still others have both kinds of events. The following outline is an overview of the types of events that typically occur during a tournament (detailed information about each event is provided in later sections of the handbook):

Outline of events:

- I. Speech Events
 - A. Original events
 - 1. Original Oratory
 - 2. Original Advocacy
 - 3. Expository
 - 4. Original Prose and Poetry
 - B. Spontaneous Events
 - 1. Impromptu Speaking
 - 2. Extemporaneous Speaking
 - C. Interpretation Events
 - 1. Thematic Interpretation
 - 2. Humorous Interpretation
 - 3. Dramatic Interpretation
 - 4. Duo
 - 5. Oratorical Interpretation
- II. Debate Events
 - A. Lincoln-Douglas Debate
 - B. Policy Debate
 - C. Student Congress
 - D. Public Forum Debate
 - E. Parliamentary Debate (a new event at the high school level)

Rounds: There will be multiple rounds for each event in a particular tournament.

Preliminary Rounds: Students in several different speech events are grouped according to their specialized events (such as, Original Oratory) and sent into separate rooms in groups of approximately seven. Each room will also be sent an odd number of judges (usually 1 for preliminary round, and possibly 3 for final rounds). During the first preliminary round (Round 1), the judge or judges rank the first group (many tournaments specify that judges tie all ranks beyond 4th or 5th). For Round 2 and any other preliminary rounds, new groups of seven are created and sent to new rooms with new judges who again rank them. By arranging for multiple preliminary rounds with different groupings for each, competitors get a chance to be ranked next to all the others. A similar process is followed in preliminary rounds for debate events, though ranking is reserved only for Congress while Lincoln-Douglas and Policy debates require the declaration of a winner.

Final Rounds and Overall Placement: After a set number of preliminary rounds, scores are tabulated to determine the top 14 (semifinalists) or top 7 (finalists) in each speech event. These students will then proceed to either semifinal or final rounds, depending upon the number of students entered in the tournament and the structure of the tournament itself. These competitors are also ranked from 1st through 7th places (usually, there are no ties) and their total tournament scores determine their overall placement in the tournament. A similar process occurs for debate events.

Levels of competition: There are two levels of competition: Novice and Varsity. Those students who are competing in their first year in an event (regardless of their year in school) are novices. Once a student passes a year as a novice, she or he then competes at the varsity level. Many tournaments are open, so novice and varsity compete together, but there are those which are restricted to just one level (novice or varsity). Judging criteria are somewhat higher for varsity competitors.



Speech Events:

What is a speech? Generally, a speech is seen as a formal, spoken communication by one person to an audience. What is communicated and why? To an extent, the answer to that question depends upon the type of speech, and as a result, in a speech tournament there are several different types (see the outline above). For the most part, speeches entertain and/or inform and/or persuade. Probably the most important aspect of a speech is the notion that it involves some sort of clear and coherent verbal communication from one person to an audience. In judging speech events, it is important to keep in mind that, regardless of whether it oratorical or interpretive, there must be some clear point to the communication, one that makes it more than simply a performance.

Since speech is an oral presentation, there are some general guidelines that apply to judging all speeches, regardless of type (see Appendixes for more specific judging criteria for each event). These concern the delivery of the speech, and they include such things as:

1. Effective oral presentation skills (volume, diction, clarity of speech, speed and pacing of delivery)
2. Poise, sincerity and comfort in delivery
3. Effective body language (gestures, facial expression, eye contact)
4. Avoidance of slang, poor grammar, and mispronunciations

Original Events:

The following four events, (Original Oratory, Original Advocacy, Expository, Original Prose & Poetry) are speeches that the students have written themselves. When judging these events, judges must consider both the composition as well as delivery. With regard to composition, the following questions apply to all original events:

1. Did the speech display effective writing?
2. Was the speech organized clearly and easy to follow?
3. Did the speech contain good reasoning and logic rather than shallow thinking and broad generalization?
4. Did the speech contain evidence, examples, or expert opinions in support of ideas or conclusions?
5. Did the speech exemplify the highest standards of language usage, style and vocabulary?

However, as this is a contest in speech rather than essay writing, the emphasis should be placed on the speech aspect. Consequently, the general judging criteria for judging all speeches (see above) is more important.

1. **Original Oratory (OO)**: In this event, the student writes and delivers his, or her own speech. The speaker will persuade you that some action (the specific action is not important) must be taken on any issue or topic dealing with society or individuals. The choice of subject is wide open, but it should be appropriate to the speaker and to the audience. The speech must have been written by the speaker delivering it (which thereby makes it original). The speaker's thesis must be clear and understandable. No props are allowed. Citing sources such as magazines, authors, etc. increases the credibility of the speech. The speaker is not expected in any way to solve the great problems of the day. Rather they should be expected to discuss intelligently, with a degree of originality, in an interesting manner and with some profit to the audience, the topic chosen. Time limit is 5 to 10 minutes. (See Appendix B for judging sheet)
2. **Original Advocacy (OA)**: This event is very similar to Original Oratory with two main exceptions: (a) The speaker must give a specific solution to the problem, and (b) The topic usually deals with local, national or governmental issue. Their thesis and solution must be clear and understandable. Time limit is 5 to 10 minutes. (See Appendix C for judging sheet)
3. **Expository (Expos)**: This event is also a speech written by the speaker. This speech should be informative. This is the ONLY event in which props are allowed and encouraged so long as they ADD to the speech, not detract from it. The number of visual aids is not important as long as they show a sense of a professional presentation. Citing sources such as magazines, authors, etc. increases the credibility of the speech. Time limit is 5-10 minutes INCLUDING the time it takes to set up and take down all their audio and visual aids. (See Appendix D for judging sheet)
4. **Original Prose and Poetry**: This event is also a speech written by the speaker. Topics are open here as long as the speaker effectively conveys a message or story. Speakers may use characters, gestures, voices, rhyme, prose or the like in conveying their story. The speech may be humorous, dramatic or both. Time limit is 5 to 10 minutes. (See Appendix E for judging sheet)

Spontaneous Events:

The following two events, (Impromptu and Extemp) are speeches that the students have written themselves on the spot. When judging these events, it is important to consider both the composition as well as delivery. However, as this is a contest in speech rather than essay writing, the emphasis should be placed on the speech aspect

1. **Impromptu Speaking**: In this event, the student actually prepares the speech during the round. One at a time, the contestants will be given (by the judge) a piece of paper with three predetermined topics on it (e.g., a quotation or old saying). From the time the student is given the piece of paper, they have 2 minutes to prepare a speech (5 minutes if judging a NOVICE TOURNAMENT). Students should speak, in an organized manner, on the topic they have chosen from the 3 given to them, in the process revealing that they understand the selected topic. The maximum speaking time is 5 minutes. Most students appreciate (and many will request) time signals given by hand to let them know how much time is remaining (4 minutes, 3 minutes, 2 minutes, 1 minute, 30 seconds), so it's often a good idea to ask if they would like this. (See Appendix F for judging sheet)

2. **Extemporaneous Speaking:** This event is also a speech written by the speaker. The students have been given a question in the prep room and had only 30 minutes to prepare and research. They will come to the room where the judge is in 7 minute intervals. They will give the judge the question they drew (judges may ask them for their slip of paper with the question on it.) The speech should be organized in a manner which effectively communicates with the audience. Though they have had time to prepare their speech in advance, competitors must deliver their speech from memory, without the aid of notes. The speakers must give some sort of answer to the question. Speakers should also be held accountable for the question/topic. They must stay on topic. Citing sources such as magazines, authors, etc. increases the credibility of the speech. Students may stay in the round after they have spoken if they so choose. The maximum speaking time is 7 minutes. Most students appreciate (and many will request) time signals given by hand to let them know how much time is remaining (4 minutes, 3 minutes, 2 minutes, 1 minute, 30 seconds), so it's often a good idea to ask if they would like this. (See Appendix G for judging sheet)

Interpretation Events:

The following five events, (Thematic, Humorous, Dramatic, Duo, Oratorical) come from material (poems, plays, stories, or speeches) that has previously been published in print. The students will be attempting to recreate the characters in the story presented and make them living and real to the audience; however, this is interpretation, not solo acting. The students will "interpret" the meaning of the literature by modulating their voices, posture, gestures, and facial expressions. It's similar to yet more difficult than acting, since: (a) the students are not allowed to use costumes, props, or scenery, and (b) it is more a matter of interpreting the material in a meaningful way to the observer (i.e., judge) than it is in acting out the material. In other words, as in all the other speech events, there has to be some point, or points, to the material presented, which arises from the interpretation offered by the student, and which is usually explained in the introductory material written and delivered by the competitor.

The material selected will generally come from a larger piece (e.g., a portion of a novel, or some lines from a play), which the student has cut from that larger work in order to present a shorter work that conveys a point, or issue, that has meaning in itself—this point or issue need not be one the author of the larger work intended. The clarity and quality of the student's interpretation are most important in judging these events. Students are not to be downgraded for interpreting a piece of literature the judge does not consider one of her or his favorites.

PLEASE NOTE THAT: (a) Singing and dancing are allowed in all interpretation events, (b) Unless otherwise indicated, no props may be used for interpretation events, and (c) The time limits for interpretation events is 10 minutes (note that speeches significantly shorter than the time limit tend to be, due to their shortness, less likely to be as strong as those near the limit, because they will be less developed as a result of their brevity).

1. **Thematic Interpretation (TI):** In this event, the student attempts to communicate a particular theme (or motif), which she or he has selected. Themes are not the same as topics. So, for example, "Friendship" is a topic, but "The Value of Friendship" is a theme. Themes always contain some message and/or meaning beyond the simple topic being presented. In other words, the theme is what arises from the student's selection and interpretation of the material presented in the topic. Students present a theme by using at least three previously published literary selections, which reveal, illustrate and develop that theme. While there is only one theme in Thematic Interpretation, the best have both diversity and variety in the three pieces chosen. This diversity and variety helps convey the theme by presenting it in different contexts, which helps clarify and convey the theme. So, for example, the theme "The value of Friendship," might have three pieces that show this value in three different ways. In presenting the program, the student must indicate the title and author of each selection. The introduction (which includes a statement of the theme), explanatory and connective material must be in the contestant's own words and must not exceed 1/3 of the total presentation. The literary selections

must be interpreted from a manuscript held by the contestant (the manuscript will usually be in a ring-binder). In judging, consider the development of the theme, the literature used to illustrate that theme, and the quality of the contestant's delivery (which includes how genuine they make the material for the audience). Also, consider the degree to which the student's interpretation involves the development and exposition of a theme that is more than simply presenting aspects of a particular topic. (See Appendix H for judging sheet) The binder/manuscript may be used as a prop during Thematic Interpretation, but no other props may be used.

2. **Humorous Interpretation (HI)**: In this event, the speaker will give a presentation of a humorous story, play, poem, novel or other literary material (excluding speeches). The piece must come from a published source. The student will attempt to interpret the story through the use of characters, voices, gestures and facial expressions. They must state the title and author. Consider the quality of the student's interpretation, do not downgrade a student for interpreting a piece of literature you do not consider one of your favorites. Also remember, Humorous interpretation does NOT mean the funniest speech wins. As noted above, this is not acting but interpretation, so the first place should go to the student who does the best job of interpretation. (See Appendix I for judging sheet)
3. **Dramatic Interpretation (DI)**: Essentially the same as Humorous Interpretation (see above), but without an emphasis on humor (there may be some humorous aspects, but that will not be the main emphasis of the speech). Dramatic Interpretation does NOT mean most dramatic piece wins. As noted above, this is not acting but interpretation, so the first place should go to the student who does the best job of interpretation. (See Appendix J for judging sheet)
4. **Duo Interpretation (Duo)**: This event is similar to Humorous Interpretation and Dramatic Interpretation, but it involves two speakers, instead of just one. In this event, each of the two speakers will play the parts of one or more characters to interpret a story, play, poem, novel or other literary material (excluding speeches). The piece may be humorous or dramatic. During the performance, the students must give the title and author of the piece. The piece must come from a published source. The students will attempt to interpret the story through the use of characters, voices, gestures and facial expressions. Because it is not acting, but a speech event, the two students will never touch each other, look at each other, or appear to directly interact with each other. In judging, consider the quality of the students' interpretation, and do not downgrade a duo for interpreting a piece of literature you do not consider one of your favorites. The first place should go to the students who do the best job of interpretation. The time limit is 5 to 10 minutes. (See Appendix K for judging sheet)
5. **Oratorical Interpretation (OI)**: In this event, students will interpret a speech that was actually given at some previous point in time (e.g., Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Martin Luther King Junior's "I Have a Dream" speech, Bill Gate's commencement address). During the performance, the student must give the title and author, and any other relevant information of the speech. The speech may be dramatic, humorous or formal. Do not downgrade a speaker for interpreting a speech you do not consider one of your favorites. The first place should go to the student who does the best job of interpretation. ((See Appendix L for judging sheet)



Debate Events

What is a debate? In general terms (and as defined in a dictionary), it is a discussion, or argument between two or more people involving opposing points of view. In more formal terms, it is an argument in which two opposing individuals or teams defend and attack a given proposition. It is important to keep these definitions in mind when judging debate events, because the objective in judging is to determine who does the best debating, not who is

correct, or most valid in the points they make. In most cases, then, it is more a matter of how the debaters present their points and counter each other's points, than it is a matter of how correct or valid their points are. For this reason, if a debater offers information or an idea the judge knows or believes is incorrect, it is usually up to the other person or team to point this out; if they don't, it must be accepted.

"Clash":

A key element in all debating is "clash." Debaters are supposed to do more than present the pros and cons regarding the subject of debate. They are also supposed to clash with each other. That is, they must react (via conflict, attack and confrontation) to what each other states. In fact, without clash, it is not really a debate (as discussed below, a key element of judging debate events is to observe and take notes regarding the clash, usually on a "flow sheet").

Types of events:

During Speech and Debate tournaments, there are generally five debate events: (a) Lincoln-Douglas debate, (b) Policy debate, and (c) Student Congress (d) Parliamentary Debate and (e) Public Forum debate.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

Rules

Length and order of speeches:

Affirmative Constructive	6 min	Negative Constructive	7 min	Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Cross Examination	3 min	Cross-Examination	3 min	Negative Rebuttal	6 min
				Affirmative Rebuttal	3 min

Preparation Time:

1. No more than three minutes of total preparation time shall be allowed to each side during the debate.
2. Each debater may allocate the time as s/he sees fit during the round, utilizing time prior to speeches their side.
3. A debate may not use prep time to make prefacing remarks to his/her speeches.
4. A speaker's time begins when s/he begins to speak.
5. Neither side may forfeit cross-examination time to gain additional preparation time.
6. Preparation time begins for a debater as soon as the previous speaker has finished with a speech or a cross-examination; no preparation time is allowed between constructive speeches and cross-examination.

Evidence:

1. Debaters are responsible for all evidence read in the debate. In all rounds of debate, all debaters shall have available, if challenged during each round by the opponent, complete citations for each piece of evidence introduced to include the name of the author, qualifications, complete source title, complete date and page number. Lack of a full citation shall void any effect of that piece of evidence in the round. Either no internal ellipses (ellipses occur after the first word of the quotation and before the final word) may be used in evidence cited on a card, or ellipses may be shown on cards, if the original source or a xerox copy is present. The evidence may be read in ellipsed form but the entirety of the evidence must be available in one of the two ways cited. Personal letters of telegrams shall not be admissible as evidence.
2. Evidence Challenges.
 - a. The burden of proof rests with the individual that challenges the validity of any evidence
 - b. The individual challenging evidence must indicate prior to the conclusion of the round a challenge will be made and indicate the specific evidence to be challenged.
 - c. The round will be completed and the judge(s) will withhold decisions, returning ballots to the tournament judge room. Decision will be rendered on the ballots only after the protest has been resolved by tournament officials. The judge(s) may be asked if the evidence in question was or would have been significant in their decision.
 - d. If the evidence challenge is not upheld, the judges will be asked to render a decision and turn in their ballots after they have been informed that the evidence in question was not found to be falsified or inaccurately presented.
3. Evidence exchange/note-taking.
 - a. Judges may not request nor be given any evidence or written material from either debate except when the evidence in question should be collected by the judge and delivered to the Tournament Committee.
 - b. Each side may request evidence from the opponent during cross-examination only and must return the requested evidence before the next speech.

Constructive/Rebuttal Speeches:

1. All arguments each side intends to present during the debate must be presented in constructive speeches.
2. Rebuttals are a debater's formal response to opponent's arguments from constructive speeches or an extension of their own arguments
3. No new arguments may be introduced in rebuttals. However, new evidence and analysis supporting arguments from constructive speeches are allowed in rebuttals

Cross-Examination

1. Questions must pertain only to materials and arguments offered by the opposition.
2. The respondent may decline to answer only if a valid reason is give for doing so.
3. The questioner controls the time and may interrupt a lengthy reply. Any form of time-wasting is considered unethical.
4. Cross-examination time may not be yielded for the purpose of gaining additional preparation time.

Guidelines for Judging Lincoln Douglas Debate

- These are guidelines only, not rules, based in the Standards of the California Frameworks for Social Studies/History and English/Language Arts; they should be used only when appropriate to the debate.
- There is no requirement that a contestant must use a particular style of delivery

Cases:

- ✓ Did the debate present a reasonable discussion of the values presented?
- ✓ Did the debater present persuasive argumentation?
- ✓ Did the debate present definitions and/or parameters for the debate that were helpful in weighing the values presented?
- ✓ If the debate presented a value criterion, did that criteria provide a rationale standard to measure their value against?

Evidence (see comments on evidence in Description and Overview above):

- ✓ If either debater used evidence was it appropriated and sufficient to support the arguments it was used to support?
- ✓ If either debater used evidence did the debater apply that evidence clearly and logically?
- ✓ If either debater used evidence did the debater properly establish and defend the validity of the evidence presented?

Argumentation:

- ✓ Did the debater respond directly to opposing arguments, interpretations, and/or analyses offered during the debate?
- ✓ Did the debater do the better job of clearly and logically explaining his/her arguments and of exposing the weakness of his/her opponent's argument?
- ✓ Did the debater make a logical and orderly presentation, clearly indicating what issue was being argued at each moment, presenting a clear and easy listening path to follow?
- ✓ Did the debater apply clear evaluative criteria to the arguments, interpretations, and/or analysis offered during the debate?
- ✓ Did the debater demonstrate an age-appropriate understanding of the social, political, and/or economic issues involved in the debate?
- ✓ Did the debater rely more upon the quality of judiciously selected arguments than the quantity of arguments presented?

Delivery:

- ✓ Did each debater use good oral presentation skills (effective reading of evidence, understandable and persuasive delivery, poised stage presence, appropriate gestures, sufficient eye contact)?
- ✓ Was each debater respectful and courteous to his/her opponent and the judges?
- ✓ Did each debater exemplify the highest standards of language usage, style, and vocabulary, avoiding slang, poor grammar, poor diction, and mispronunciation?
- ✓ Did each debater communicate in a clear, organized, and understandable manner, presenting an easy listening path to follow?

Speaker Points:

- rate the assessment of the effectiveness of each debater's delivery, style and skills overall by circling a number for each debater on the following scale: **21-22 = poor; 23-24 = average; 25-26 = good; 27-28 = excellent; 29-30 = superior**

Policy Debate Ballot

Rules

Preparation Time:

1. No more than eight minutes of total preparation time shall be allowed each team during the debate.
2. Each team may allocate this time as they see fit during the round, utilizing time prior to speeches for their side.
3. Preparation time begins for a team as soon as the previous speaker has finished with a speech or cross examination.
4. Teams may not use prep time to make prefacing remarks to their speeches; a speaker's time begins when s/he begins to speak
5. No team may forfeit cross examination time to gain additional preparation time.

Evidence:

1. Debaters are responsible for the validity of all evidence read in the debate. In all rounds of debate, all debaters shall have available, if challenged during the round by the opponent during each round complete citations for each piece of evidence introduced to include the name of the author, qualifications, complete source title, complete date and page number. Lack of a full citation shall void any effect of that piece of evidence in the round. Either no internal ellipsis (ellipses occur after the first word of the quotation and before the final word) may be used in evidence cited on a card, or ellipses may be shown on cards, if the original source or a xerox copy is present. The evidence may be read in ellipsed form, but the entirety of the evidence must be available in one of the two ways cited. Personal letters or telegrams shall not be admissible as evidence.
2. Evidence challenges.
 - a. The burden of proof rests with the team or individual that challenges the validity of any evidence.
 - b. The team challenging evidence must indicate prior to the conclusion of the round a challenge will be made and indicate the specific evidence to be challenged.
 - c. The round will be completed and the judge(s) will withhold decisions, returning ballots to the tournament tabulation room. Decisions will be rendered on the ballots only after the protest has been resolved by tournament officials. The judges may be asked if the evidence in question was or would have been significant in their decision.
 - d. If the evidence challenge is not upheld, the judges will be asked to render a decision and turn in their ballots after they have been informed that the evidence in question was not found to be falsified or inaccurately presented.
3. Evidence exchange/note-taking.
 - a. Judges may not request nor be given any evidence or written material from teams or individuals except when the evidence is challenged as illegal by the opposing team during the round. The evidence in question should be collected by the judge and delivered to the Tournament Committee.
 - b. Teams may request evidence from opponents during cross examination only and must return the requested evidence before the next speech.

Cross Examination:

1. The questions must be directed to the speaker who has just completed his/her constructive speech and must be answered by that speaker alone.
2. Questions must pertain only to materials and arguments offered by the opposition
3. The respondent may decline to answer only if a valid reason is given for doing so.
4. The questioner controls the time and may interrupt a lengthy reply. Any form of time-wasting is considered unethical.
5. Both members of a debate team must participate as a questioner and respondent during cross-examination, but only one member of each team may do so within any given cross-examination period.
6. Oral prompting by a participant of either the questioner or the respondent should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate.

Oral Prompting: Oral prompting by the speaker's colleague while the speaker has the floor in debate should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate.

Computers: Computers may be used in Policy Debate. Computers should be used to flow the round, store evidence and access cases; however, students may not access the internet and may not communicate with a person outside of the round.

Guidelines for Judging Policy Debate

- These are guidelines only, not rules; they should be used only when appropriate to the debate.

Case:

- Did the affirmative team present a compelling reason (case) for change? Or did the negative team present a compelling reason to maintain the present system (status quo)?
- Did the affirmative team prove that the present system (status quo) is not addressing the need for change, or is doing so in an ineffective manner? Or did the negative team prove that the present system (status quo) is addressing the need for change in an effective manner?

Plan:

- Did the affirmative team propose a plan which effectively addresses the need for change? Or did the negative team demonstrate that the proposed plan would not effectively address the need for change?
- Did the affirmative team prove that the plan clearly remains within the topic area of the resolution? Or did the negative team prove that the proposed plan clearly is outside the topic area of the resolution?
- Did the affirmative team demonstrate that the advantages of the plan would outweigh the disadvantages presented by the negative?
- If the negative team presented an alternative plan (counterplan), did they prove that it was superior to the affirmative's plan?

Evidence: Did each team:

- supply appropriate and sufficient evidence to support its arguments, and apply that evidence clearly and logically?
- adequately explain and/or analyze the evidence offered during the debate?
- demonstrate sufficient research in the selection and presentation of evidence?
- establish the validity and reliability of the evidence presented?

Argumentation: Did each team:

- present logical, consistent, and convincing arguments, with clear and reasonable discussion of policy issues presented?
- respond directly to opposing arguments, interpretations, and/or analyses, with clear explanations of the weakness of opposing arguments?
- apply clear evaluative criteria to the arguments, interpretations, and/or analyses offered during the debate?

Presentation: (There is no requirement that a contestant must use a particular style of delivery) Did each debater:

- use good oral presentation skills (effective reading of evidence, understandable and persuasive delivery, poised stage presence, appropriate gestures, sufficient eye contact)?
- exemplify the highest standards of language usage, style and vocabulary, avoiding slang, poor grammar, and mispronunciations?
- communicate in a clear, organized, and understandable manner, presenting an easy listening path to follow?

Parliamentary Debate Ballot

Rules

Length and order of speeches:

First Prop	7 Minutes	Second Prop	7 Minutes	Opp Rebuttal	5 Minutes
First Opp	7 Minutes	Second Opp	7 Minutes	Prop Rebuttal	5 Minutes

Preparation Time: At the end of twenty minutes of preparation time, the First Proposition begins

1. A topic is presented to both teams twenty minutes prior to the start of the round. The teams have twenty minutes of preparation time from the announcement of the topic to prepare for each debate.
2. Students may consult other competitors, dictionaries, reference materials, and prepared notes during the preparation period.
3. The next speaker must get up to speak within 20 seconds of the end of the preceding speech.
4. All speaking time must be timed, including “thank you’s” and “roadmaps”

Evidence: The intent of Parliamentary Debate is to encourage an extemporaneous or impromptu style of argumentation. Reference to “outside materials” should be limited; instead, students should rely on general knowledge, common sense, and application of logic and analysis. Nevertheless, the use of “outside materials” is allowed within the following parameters:

1. No prepared materials may be brought into the debate round for the debater’s use.
2. Debaters are not permitted to read published material in the speeches of the debate to support their argument claims.
3. During the debate, students may consult notes prepared during the preparation period.
4. Debaters may take and use notes during the debate.

Oral Prompting/Heckling: Oral prompting by the speaker’s colleague while the speaker has the floor should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate. Heckling is not allowed.

Constructive/Rebuttal Speeches:

1. All arguments a team intends to present during the debate may be presented in each team’s first two speeches.
2. Rebuttals are a team’s formal response to opponent arguments or an extension of their own arguments.
3. No new arguments may be introduced in rebuttals. However, new analyses of prior arguments are allowed in rebuttals.
4. Rebuttals must be given by the first speaker for each side.

Points of Information:

These are common practice in parliamentary debating. To make a point of information, a member of the opposing team rises for recognition by the speaker. The speaker then has the discretion to accept or refuse the point. If the point is accepted, the opposing team member directs a statement or question to the speaker. The speaker is technically yielding time from his/her own speech for the point of information and the time for the point is deducted from the speaker holding the floor.

1. Points of Information are allowed in every speech of the debate.
2. Points of information must be concise statements or questions lasting no more than fifteen seconds.
3. Debaters may or may not take points of information at their discretion. The speaker accepts a single point; the opposing speaker is not permitted to make following questions or arguments unless again recognized by the speaker holding the floor.
4. Opening and closing minute of each speech are ‘protected,’ i.e. no Points Of Information are allowed. Points may be made after the first minute and before the last minute of each speech. The judge should tap the desk top to indicate that one minute has elapsed and points of information may commence. Judges should tap the desk top to indicate that one minute has elapsed and points of information may commence. Judges should tap the desk top when one minute remains in each speech to indicate that no more points may be attempted.
5. **No other parliamentary points are permitted.**

Guidelines for Judging Parliamentary Debate

- These are guidelines only, not rules, based in the Standards of the California Frameworks for Social Studies/History and English/Language Arts; they should be used only when appropriate to the debate.
- There is no requirement that a contestant must use a particular style of delivery.

Evidence: Since Parliamentary Debate is a spontaneous form of debate, the use of outside evidence is not allowed. However, this does not mean that students cannot make reference to a recent news article or something they may have recently read. Most of the evidence used in Parliamentary debate will be historical and current event examples, hypothetical examples and logical reasoning. Students may use notes and analysis that they developed during prep time and prior to the debate. However, they may not bring into the round any outside sources such as news magazines or encyclopedias.

During the debate, did each team:

- supply appropriate and sufficient logical reasoning to support its arguments?
- adequately explain and/or analyze any examples or anecdotes offered during the debate?

Argumentation:

- sufficiently address the topic in an organized and consistent manner and provide clear evaluative criteria?
- clearly, reasonably and effectively discuss, analyze and evaluate the arguments offered during the debate?
- respond directly and effectively to opposing arguments, interpretations, and/or analyses?

Presentation: Did each debater:

- communicate in a clear, organized, and understandable manner, presenting an easy listening path to follow?
- exemplify the highest standards of language usage, style and vocabulary, avoiding slang, poor grammar, and mispronunciations?
- use effective body language (stage presence, appropriate gestures, facial expression, sufficient eye contact)?
- use effective oral presentation skills (volume, diction, speed of delivery, persuasive delivery)?

Courtesy:

- Was each debater respectful and courteous to opponents and judges?

Speaker Points:

- rate the assessment of the effectiveness of each debater's delivery, style and skills overall by circling a number for each debater on the following scale: **21-22 = poor; 23-24 = average; 25-26 = good; 27-28 = excellent; 29-30 = superior**

Public Forum Debate Ballot

Rules

Speaking Order and Times:

Aff speaker 1 =	4 Minutes	Summary (Aff Speaker 1) =	2 Minutes
Neg speaker 1 =	4 Minutes	Summary (Neg Speaker 1) =	2 Minutes
Crossfire between First Speakers =	3 Minutes	Grand Crossfire (All Speakers) =	3 Minutes
Aff Speaker 2 =	4 Minutes	Final Focus (Aff Speaker 2) =	1 Minute
Neg Speaker 2 =	4 Minutes	Final Focus (Neg Speaker 2) =	1 Minute
Crossfire between Second Speakers =	3 Minutes		

Preparation Time: Each team will have two minutes of preparation time.

5. No more than two minutes of total preparation time shall be allowed to each side during the debate.
6. Each team may allocate the time as they see fit during the round, utilizing time prior to speeches their side.
7. Prep time ends and speaking time begins when the debater begins speaking.
8. No prep time may be taken between speeches and cross-fire.

Evidence: Debaters are responsible for all evidence read in the debate. In all rounds of debate, all debater shall have available, if challenged during the round by the opponent, complete citations for each piece of evidence introduced to include the name of the author, qualifications, complete source title, complete date and page number. Lack of a full citation shall void any effect of that piece of evidence in the round. Either no internal ellipses (ellipses occur after the first word of the quotation and before the final word) may be used in evidence cited on a card, or ellipses may be shown on cards, if the original source or a photocopy is present. The evidence may be read in ellipsed form but the entirety of the evidence must be available in one of the two ways cited. Personal letters or email shall not be admissible as evidence.

5. Evidence Challenges:
 - a. The burden of proof rests with the individual that challenges the validity of any evidence
 - b. The individual challenging evidence must indicate prior to the conclusion of the round a challenge will be made and indicate the specific evidence to be challenged.
 - c. The round will be completed and the judge(s) will withhold decisions, returning ballots to the tournament judge room. Decisions will be rendered on the ballots only after the protest has been resolved by tournament officials. The judge(s) may be asked if the evidence in question was or would have been significant in their decision.
 - d. If the evidence is not upheld, the judges will be asked to render a decision and turn in their ballots after they have been informed that the evidence in question was not found to be falsified or inaccurately presented.
6. Evidence exchange/note-taking.
 - a. Judges may not request nor be given any evidence or written material from either debater except when the evidence in question should be collected by the judge and delivered to the Tournament Committee.
 - b. Each side may request evidence from the opponent during cross-examination only and must return the requested evidence before the next speech.

Speeches in the Debate:

1. Constructive Speeches: All arguments a team intends to present during the debate must be stated in the team's first two speeches.
2. Summary: The team's formal response to the opponent's arguments from constructive speeches or an extension of their own.
3. Final Focus: The synthesis of a team's argument. No new arguments may be introduced. However, new analyses of prior arguments are allowed.

Crossfire:

5. In crossfire, the Neg team receives the first question.
6. In the first two crossfires, only the speakers indicated above may participate. Both debaters may ask and answer questions.
7. Grand Crossfire: All four debaters may participate. All may ask and answer questions.

Guidelines for Judging Public Forum Debate

- These are guidelines only, not rules, based in the Standards of the California Frameworks for Social Studies/History and English/Language Arts; they should be used only when appropriate to the debate.
- There is no requirement that a contestant must use a particular style of delivery.

Argumentation:

- sufficiently address the topic in an organized and consistent manner and provide clear evaluative criteria?
- clearly, reasonably and effectively discuss, analyze and evaluate the arguments offered during the debate?
- respond directly and effectively to opposing arguments, interpretations, and/or analyses?

Evidence: Evidence refers not only to statistics, facts and references to authority, but also to items of common or general knowledge. During the debate, did each team:

- supply appropriate and sufficient evidence to support its arguments?
- adequately explain and/or analyze the evidence offered during the debate?

Presentation: Did each debater:

- communicate in a clear, organized, and understandable manner, presenting an easy listening path to follow?
- exemplify the highest standards of language usage, style and vocabulary, avoiding slang, poor grammar, and mispronunciations?
- use effective body language (stage presence, appropriate gestures, facial expression, sufficient eye contact)?
- use effective oral presentation skills (volume, diction, speed of delivery, persuasive delivery)?

Cross Fire: Did each debater:

- ask questions that were relevant and brief?
- answer on point?
- conducted the questioning in a civil manner?

Courtesy:

- Was each debater respectful and courteous to opponents and judges?

Speaker Points:

- rate the assessment of the effectiveness of each debater's delivery, style and skills overall by circling a number for each debater on the following scale: **21-22 = poor; 23-24 = average; 25-26 = good; 27-28 = excellent; 29-30 = superior**

Appendix A

LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE FLOW SHEET

Use this sheet to “flow” (follow the flow of) the debate by taking notes during each speech. Then, align the next speaker’s responses directly to the right of the argument that the speaker is answering.

Affirmative Constructive: 6 min Cross: 3 min	Negative Constructive: 7 min Cross: 3 min	First Affirmative Rebuttal: 4 min	Negative Rebuttal: 6 min	Second Affirmative Rebuttal: 3 min

Appendix B

POLICY DEBATE FLOW SHEET

Use this sheet to “flow” (follow the flow of) the debate by taking notes during each speech. Then, align the next speaker’s responses directly to the right of the argument that the speaker is answering.

First Affirmative Constructive: 5 min Cross: 3 min	First Negative Constructive: 5 min Cross: 3 min	Second Affirmative Constructive: 5 min Cross: 3 min	Second Negative Constructive: 5 min Cross: 3 min First Negative Rebuttal	First Affirmative Rebuttal: 5 min	Second Negative Rebuttal: 5 min	Second Affirmative Rebuttal: 5 min

Appendix C

Individual Event Ranking Sheet and Guidelines

Enter the code number for each individual speaker in the box at the far right.

After you listen to each speaker, write your numerical ranks (1-7 or more) within the grid's small boxes.

As #1 finishes, mark him or her "1." (*The "1" in the first box on the left signifies that the first person to speak will automatically be ranked first after only one speech. However, the ranks should be reconsidered based upon your opinion after each speaker.*)

After the second speaker, decide who should be "1" and who "2." Immediately after each speech, fill in another column, moving to the right, adjusting your ranks each time a new speaker is heard. **Adjust your rankings after each speaker and you will be finished after the final one!**

1							Speaker #1
							Speaker #2
							Speaker #3
							Speaker #4
							Speaker #5
							Speaker #6
							Speaker #7

Notes to Myself while Judging:

Appendix D

CBSR Individual Event Comment Sheet

Round:_____ Event:_____ Code:_____

Title of Speech:_____

Ranking: 1st. 2nd. 3rd. 4th.
(ties permitted only at 4th place)
Speaker Rating: Superior Excellent Good Poor

Comments:
(Use back of paper if needed)

Judge Name

Appendix E

Speech Judging Results

Round: _____ Event: _____ Room: _____

Rank the students in your panel 1st thru 4th. All remaining students tie at 4th place.

	<u>Student Name</u>	<u>Speech Topic/Title</u>
1st:	_____	_____
2nd:	_____	_____
3rd:	_____	_____
4th:	_____	_____
4th:	_____	_____
4th:	_____	_____

Judge's Name: _____

Appendix F

Appendix G