



Seattle IV 2022

Judging Online Friday

Jim Hanson

with thanks to

Parker Davidson, SU

Aine Foran, SU

Noah McDonald, UBC



The background features a diagonal split. The upper-left portion is white, while the lower-right portion is black and filled with a repeating pattern of dark gray circles.

Judging at the Tournament

**Step 1:
During the
Debate—Be a
Supportive Judge**



Step 1: Be a supportive, treat people right judge.

- Provide opportunity for each debater to state pronouns and anything that is important to them—respect what they say
- Treat each and every participant with support and equity.

Step 1: Be a supportive, equitable judge.

- Don't favor someone;
don't disfavor someone
- Make the round
inclusive—everyone
should feel empowered to
participate
- Carefully listen to the
debaters
- Take Notes.

Step 1: Be a supportive judge respecting differences.

- Be supportive of those who speak differently from what you are used to hearing
- Be supportive of those whose experiences are different than yours.

Step 1: Be a supportive, listening judge.

- Take notes
- Listen thoughtfully
- Show support for each debater.

A Few Things on Info Slides

- **INFO SLIDES** help provide information and context for topics.
- **INFO SLIDES** do not preclude additional information that debaters may provide in a debate.
- **INFO SLIDES** are not argument slides; they explain the situation in which you debate the motion.

A Few Things on POIs

- Debaters have 15 seconds to ask a question during unprotected time. Speakers can and should interrupt at 15 seconds.
- Speakers should take 1 or 2 POIs; teams should take 3 or 4 POIS.
- Judges should take note of who is seeking POIs and which team's POI's are being taken.
 - Example: If OG has requested a POI 4 times and CO doesn't take them but takes CG the first and only time they stand up, that is likely indicative of CO being unwilling to engage with OG.
- Debaters who are waved down from asking a POI, along with the rest of the bench need to wait 15 seconds before requesting another POI.

Step 2:

Debate Concludes

**Judges rank and score
speakers to themselves**



- **As a Judge**

- Consider yourself an average, intelligent person

- Without specialized knowledge but also not unaware.



As a Judge . . .

- Be Open Minded
- Assess arguments as the _debaters_ made and refuted them
- Judges do NOT refute arguments—that is the debaters' job
- Judge should be willing to be persuaded
- Should follow BP Rules
- and Common Sense.



How NOT to judge

- DO NOT: Count the number of arguments and use that as a basis to determine a winner
- DO NOT: Rank based on style, speaking—your ranking should be based on the teams that presented the most important arguments.



How NOT to judge

- DO NOT: Insert your specific knowledge into assessing an argument
 - If a team makes a statement you know is factually wrong, but no other team challenges it, you cannot use the fact that you know it is factually wrong to adjudicate the debate.
- However, if a team says something that goes against common sense, it's fine to penalize them
 - For example: 'Joe Biden lost the election', 'North Korea is a functional democracy', 'China is a country in Africa.'

- TEAM RANKINGS
ARE 1, 2, 3, 4.
- The team with the
 - *unique material that is
 - *best mechanized
 - *and most relevantshould be ranked better with consideration for refutation, modeling in the PMC, and adherence to BP rules during a debate.

- **UNIQUE MATERIAL**—The argument/analysis was first presented by the team in the debate
- Teams making arguments that were already raised in the debate—those arguments should not count (or at least count very little).
- However, if a team makes significantly new analysis and points on an issue—that new analysis and points should count.

- **BEST MECHANIZED**—The argument is explained well, shows how it works/happens, supported by good reasons, examples, evidence and is believable.

- **MOST RELEVANT**—The argument is applicable to the key issues on the motion. Usually, this means the argument is:
 - 1) relevant to the stakeholders—the people/group/institution most important to the motion
 - 2) Relevant to the burdens/frameworks the debaters have presented
 - 3) Is shown to be most probable/likely and the strongest principal and/or consequences relevant to the stakeholders/burdens/motion.

- So again . . . After you've identified the **UNIQUE MATERIAL—WEIGH WHICH ARGUMENT WAS BEST MECHANIZED AND MOST RELEVANT**
- With these provisos . . .

- Teams are also assessed based on . . .
- Refutation
- Rebuilding of Partner's Arguments (NOT rebuilding of other teams' arguments including closing debaters do NOT get assessed very much if at all on rebuilding the opening team's arguments)
- Debaters do their speaking position in a way that helped advance arguments in the debate (especially the PMC with MODELING—setting up what is to be debated)
- Adherence to BP Rules.

Teams are NOT ranked
based on

- How well they speak
- The personal/group identity experiences expressed in arguments don't match up with yours
- Carefully crafted wording that may not be accessible to all in the round.

- From the USUDC Debater and Judge Briefing 2020

BP IS NOT AN ORATORY COMPETITION

- A team that gets up and repeats the arguments made by a team in their front half in a fancier sounding way with no additional substantive contributions is **NOT** making a new contribution to the debate
- **DO NOT** justify rankings based on “X speaker was more rhetorically persuasive” or “X speaker was a better orator.” BP judging is based on a holistic assessment of the contributions made by teams in the round, not on the basis that a team made a point in a nice sounding way.
- **Be careful** and be aware of implicit biases you may have regarding accents, ESL/EFL status, etc. Explicitly calling out a team(s) or speaker(s) rhetorical performance as inferior and using this to justify why they lost is an equity violation
- Having a deep voice and being a cis man is not grounds to bump a debater's speaks

Step 3: Chair asks for discussion of Rankings



Involve All

- Chairs . . .
- Give each judge a chance to state their rankings
- and
- to give concise rationales for those rankings
- Differences in opinions?
Focus on that and find out a way to compromise considering the reasons for the rankings.

Weigh Unique Arguments best mechanized and most relevant

- REFRESHER
- After you've identified the UNIQUE MATERIAL—WEIGH WHICH ARGUMENT WAS BEST MECHANIZED AND MOST RELEVANT
- With the PROVISO that you consider Refutation, Rebuilding of _Partner's_ arguments, Modeling, and BP Rules.

Finish up in 15 minutes

- Chairs should give each person a chance to be heard but . . .
- keep on track to complete the rankings & speaks in 15 minutes
- Compromise when it makes sense, support rankings when that makes sense
- Can't all agree?
 - Have 3 Judges? You can have a split with 2 of 3 judges deciding.
 - Have 2 Judges? The Chair decides.

Step 4:

Discuss Speaks





Step 4 Discussing Speaks

Chairs . . .

- Give each judge a chance to state their speaker points
- Remember that teams with better rankings must get better speaker points
- Often, averaging panelists' scores solves differences.
- **REMEMBER:** Deliberation including speaks can be 15 minutes **AT MOST**. If no consensus, vote.



Point Scale Refresher

86+ Unbelievably good—flawless.

80-85 Very good—arguments at a high level in all ways.

76-79 Above average—mostly good arguments

70-75 Average—some decent and some weak arguments

65-69 Needs major work—weaker arguments

64- Very serious problems in arguments, rude or inappropriate

****Stronger arguments are unique, well mechanized, and very relevant.**

And, consider modeling, refutation, rebuilding and rules adherence.**

REMEMBER

- Style is important for clarity, but is ultimately irrelevant for content. **Be careful of bias in favour of native english speakers.**
- Be careful of bias in favor of experiences and identities especially those prominent in your larger community/culture. Accept and respect difference in the speaker points you give.

REMEMBER

- No one should receive high points nor rank highly in a round by reputation alone
- Do not reduce a score because the other speeches were bad, and do not increase one because everyone else was excellent.

Step 5: Submit the Ballot!



Submit Ballots within 15 minutes

Type in your rankings and points!

You have 15 minutes—we will go to your room and request a ballot asap if we have not received it.

Step 6: Talk to the Debaters



Step 6: Give your RFD (Reason for Decision)

Give an RFD after ALL PRELIMS.

— SU does NOT HAVE ANY Closed Prelim Rounds.

The Chair gives the RFD unless the two panelists “rolled the vote” (outvoted the chair)—in which case one of the panelists gives the RFD.

Step 6: Give your RFD (Reason for Decision)

— Your RFD should be concise (<5min).

Announce the rankings, then explain why.

PLEASE TELL EACH TEAM concisely what they could have done to rank higher.

Give feedback to individual debaters
after the round IF they request it.

Please do NOT keep everyone in the
room to speak to one or two debaters
for long periods of time

Debaters and judges need to get to the
next round. DO NOT HOLD UP THE
TOURNAMENT.

Be Ready for the Next Round and Have a Great Tournament!

—

