

DSABC OFFICIAL JUDGING SCORESHEET

Judge's Name:

Room:

Round: 1 2 3 4

Novice | Junior | Senior

1st Affirmative/1st Proposition						<u>Team Code</u>	1st Negative/1st Opposition						<u>Team Code</u>		
Name:							Name:								
Criteria	15 Poor	16 Weak	17 Avg.	18 Good	19 Great	Totals		Criteria	15 Poor	16 Weak	17 Avg.	18 Good	19 Great	Totals	
Organization/ Structure								Organization/ Structure							
Evidence/ Analysis								Evidence/ Analysis							
Rebuttal/ Clash								Rebuttal/ Clash							
Delivery/ Etiquette								Delivery/ Etiquette							
Questioning/ Responding								Questioning/ Responding							
<u>Comments:</u>						<u>Total Score</u>		<u>Comments:</u>						<u>Total Score</u>	
						/100								/100	
2nd Affirmative/2nd Proposition						<u>Team Code</u>	2nd Negative/2nd Opposition						<u>Team Code</u>		
Name:							Name:								
Criteria	15 Poor	16 Weak	17 Avg.	18 Good	19 Great	Totals		Criteria	15 Poor	16 Weak	17 Avg.	18 Good	19 Great	Totals	
Organization/ Structure								Organization/ Structure							
Evidence/ Analysis								Evidence/ Analysis							
Rebuttal/ Clash								Rebuttal/ Clash							
Delivery/ Etiquette								Delivery/ Etiquette							
Questioning/ Responding								Questioning/ Responding							
<u>Comments:</u>						<u>Total Score</u>		<u>Comments:</u>						<u>Total Score</u>	
						/100								/100	
1st Aff./1st Prop.						/100	<u>Final Team Totals</u>		1st Neg./1st Opp.						/100
2nd Aff./2nd Prop.						/100			2nd Neg./2nd Opp.						/100
Total Score						/200			Total Score						/200

I therefore award this Debate to the _____. Signed: _____

DSABC - Official Judging Criteria
--

Organization/Structure:

- a. An effective introduction is one that defines the terms of the resolution, outlines the affirmative or negative plans for dealing with issues, and attracts the interest of the audience. The negative can challenge the definition or provide one if the affirmative fails to give definitions.
- b. The conclusion should contain an effective summary of the main contentions dealt with in the speech.
- c. Each point should be clear and distinct, and the whole speech should be organized in such a way that the judge feels that he/she is following a well-lit, signposted route rather than having to bushwhack through the jungle.

Evidence/Analysis:

- a. The contentions raised should be argued logically and backed up sufficiently by examples, statistics and credible authorities.
- b. Strong debaters are able to analyze the main issue or issues in the debate and explain to the judges why their contentions are correct and their opponents' contentions are not.
- c. Most debates are now values debates, not policy debates. In values debates, it is not necessary to introduce a detailed plan for change or for the opposition to introduce a counter-plan. The focus should be on the main ideas of the debate, not smaller details of a plan.

Rebuttal/Clash:

- a. This area is judged by the ability demonstrated by each debater to use logic and evidence to refute the contentions of his/her opponents. All speakers *must* rebut their opponent's points.
- b. In Cross-Examination, 1st speakers for both sides will rebut in their final speech. For all others, rebuttal should occur in their constructive speeches.
- c. In CNDF style, speakers include rebuttal in their constructive speeches. In addition though, each 1st speaker will make a reply speech that summarizes the key points and main clashes of the debate.

Delivery/Etiquette:

- a. The following qualities should be taken into consideration in the delivery of the material: audibility, enunciation, use of variety in tone, speed and volume for interest and emphasis, stage presence, avoidance of distracting mannerisms, good eye contact instead of simply reading, naturalness and conviction instead of obvious artifice and memorization.
- b. Debaters must treat opponents with respect at all times and show polite attention to all speakers. They are to attack the **argument** not the **individuals**; judges **must** deduct points for discourteousness.
- c. In CNDF style, protected time must be respected, and a debater's use of Points of Information must not lower the quality of debate.

Questioning/Responding:

- a. Cross-Ex. - Questions should weaken the opponent's case and/or build the examiner's case.
- b. Cross-Ex. - Witnesses must respect the right of the examiner to control the cross-examination time, and not try to take over for themselves. However, the witness may try to respond effectively to support his/her contentions.
- c. CNDF- Questions are asked and responded to during the speeches. Debaters should raise points of information in a manner that enhances the level of debate.

DSABC – Official Scoring Range Descriptions

The purpose of the table below is to give judges a guideline for scoring a debate and to help maintain consistency between judges. Please note that the level of tournament being judged (whether regional or provincial) should have an effect on the scoring percentages given.

<u>Score (/100)</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Regional Score %</u>	<u>Provincial Score %</u>
>95	A debater receiving this score would be perfect and the best debater in Canada. This score would virtually never be given and could only be given only with the permission of the Tournament Organizer.	0.1	0.1
92 – 95 Excellent	Scores in this range are for the best debaters in a tournament; those with exceptional skills beyond what you have seen from other students. Speeches in this range should all be articulate, learned, eloquent, and captivating.	4.9	9.9
88 – 91 Good	Debaters in this range are likely some of the better debaters in the tournament. They definitely take control of the debate, and their arguments, rebuttal and questioning skills combine to build a convincing case. They are able to convey their ideas in an interesting, well-proven, and engaging manner and be able to clash directly and specifically with their opponents' points. Debaters in this range may not be the top students in the tournament but will be in the running for awards.	20	25
83 – 87 Average	An average debater, one who is able to provide the expected arguments and speak well. A student at this level may be beginning to formulate persuasive arguments, and should show some insight into the topic. They clash adequately with the opposing team and are able to rebut most of their opponents' points.	35	35
79 – 82 Weak	Students in this range are beginning to learn debating skills and may be good public speakers or good at arguing but perhaps not both. They understand the format but are unable to provide clash for the other team, and may use repetition as a form of rebuttal. These are slightly below-average debaters.	30	25
75 – 78 Poor	This range reflects a debater who is having difficulties with the topic, rules and/or format. They may be very hesitant speakers, asking few if any questions, and providing few if any rebuttal points. However, they are trying and may improve as they gain experience.	9.9	4.9
<75 Inadequate	Scores in this range are for debaters who are the worst in the tournament, either because they say very, very little, are completely unfamiliar with the rules and/or format, or are purposely offensive. This score would rarely be given and could only be given only with the permission of the Tournament Organizer.	0.1	0.1