

WSDC - JUDGING IN A NUTSHELL

Kateřina Hanzelková (June 2011)

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- you should be like **blank canvas**, although you may have professional knowledge in some of the areas debated, it is only up to the debaters to present detailed description and explanation of the issues tackled. In a debate, you should be an empty leaf of paper, on which the debaters are putting down their arguments
- never debate about the debate, try to be **professional, impartial and objective**
- avoid being influenced by your own **personal viewpoint or specific knowledge** (you are expected to have knowledge of an intelligent person who reads newspapers) of a particular motion, you should judge only upon what has been said in the debate, not anything else
- never do the job for debaters, they should be the ones explaining everything to the very last detail, do not think for them or their opponents and analyze and **judge only upon what has really been said** during a particular round

DURING A DEBATE ROUND

- don't put down everything the debaters say, **jot down only important points** and rather watch the debaters and the flow of their speeches carefully
- keep track mainly of **key definitions, case division, main ideas behind argumentation** etc., try to analyze what debaters say in the moment, when they say it, think of what should have been said, but was omitted (e.g. missing definition, reaction, rebuttal, etc.)
- the best way to keep track of a debate is in a form of a **flow sheet** (any size paper with columns, where you can note all important points of each separate speech), you can put down also the number of POI's offered and accepted as well as the speaker's points before copying them into the judge's ballot

AFTER THE ROUND

- constructive criticism, provide one piece of it so that everyone can benefit from it and thus can improve in the future debates
- think of the reasons for awarding your ballot to either the proposition or opposition, be ready to justify your decision, try to keep it short and concise, prepare also few comments for both the teams and its speakers
- bear in mind that if a point was introduced, but not tackled by the opposing team, it is **always valid** unless the other team rebuts (if the burden of proof is met and it is not fallacious)

THE MARKING STANDARD

The speaker's points are awarded within the range of 80 to 60 points, reply speeches get halves. The average should be 70. It is useful to jot down the points on a separate piece of paper before copying them into the judge's ballot. Always make sure you do the maths correctly, double-checking your calculations would ease up the tabbing process.

Substantive Speeches (out of 100):

Standard	Overall (/100)	Style (/40)	Content (/40)	Strategy (/20)
Flawless	80	32	32	16
Excellent	76-79	31	31	15-16
Very Good	74-75	30	30	15
Better than Average	71-73	29	29	14-15
Average	70	28	28	14
Below Average	67-69	27	27	13-14
Poor	65-66	26	26	13
Very Poor	61-64	25	25	12-13
Appalling	60	24	24	12

Reply Speeches (out of 50):

Standard	Overall (/50)	Style (/20)	Content (/20)	Strategy (/10)
Flawless	40	16	16	8
Better than Average	36-39	15	15	7.5
Average	35	14	14	7
Below Average	31-34	13	13	6.5
Appalling	30	12	12	6

ROLES OF THE TEAMS

PROPOSITION

- should establish reasonable understanding of the motion - is not allowed to broaden or narrow down terms in the motion (for example if the motion was, that US military should withdraw from Asia, it is not legitimate to narrow it to just Japan or Korea)
- needs to present a reasonable case consisting of several levels of argumentation (with at least one level presented in the second speech which is outlined by the first speaker)
- all the arguments must support the debated motion and should show clear impact on the topic
- the arguments does not have to lead to specific value, but it is good when the team has a coherent line of argumentation and knows what they propose
- proposition also needs to refute the argument's of opposition or at least show that such arguments have negligible impact on the debate

OPPOSITION

- needs primarily to refute the proposition's case, but it is also necessary to present own arguments (some of which may be in the second speech provided they are properly outlined in the first speech)
- all the points brought by opposition should directly clash proposition's case; except for their own arguments which may directly oppose the motion
- similarly to proposition, opposition should have a clear team line expressing the direction of their argumentation
- opposition team can (but is not required to) present a counterplan, provided that it is mutually exclusive with the proposition model

ROLES OF THE SPEAKERS

EVERY SPEAKER

- starts his/her speech with a clear outline of the points he/she is going to talk about (uses the first protected minute to do so)
- summarizes his/her speech in the last protected minute
- accepts two POIs (provided that enough POIs is offered by the other party)
- offers 2-5 POIs during every speech of the other team

1ST SPEAKER

- presents the case of his/her team, it should contain:
 - definitions (of the disputable terms in the motion)
 - team line - standpoint of the team / goal of their plan etc.
 - plan to reach the goal (if necessary)
 - arguments
- outlines the levels second speaker is going to talk about
- (refutes the proposition's case)

2ND SPEAKER

- supports the case brought by the first speaker by additional evidence, examples, analysis = rebuilds arguments of his/her team
- refute the other team's case

OR

- finds the areas of clashes and tackles both cases at once
- (brings another level of argumentation)

3RD SPEAKER

- analyzes the main clashes in the debate
- uses all the possible pieces of evidence, examples, and analysis to show that his/her side of the motion is the correct one
- can bring a small part of argumentation, if it is properly outlined

REPLY SPEAKERS

- there are many ways of doing an efficient reply speech; the speaker should summarize the debate from his/her team's point of view, but he/she might choose various forms of doing that:
 - common summary - showing the mistakes of the other team and the reasons why his/her own team's argumentation was better
 - story - an allegory of the motion and results of the both team's approaches
 - practical results of implementing one or the other team's approach

ADJUDICATION CATEGORIES

CONTENT

- the amount and quality of ideas presented by the speaker, which break down to arguments, reactions, refutations, rebuttals, etc.
- how effectively speaker reacts on the point already mentioned in the debate
- quality of reactions on POIs
- should be evaluated as if judge was reading the speech (without any regard to style)

STYLE

- the way of presenting ideas
- body language
- overall appearance and manners of the speaker
- tone of the speech
- different accents should NOT be penalized

STRATEGY

- whether the speaker understands the issues of the debate
- structure and timing of the speaker's speech
- fulfilling the role of the speaker
- impact of the speech on the result of the debate
- consistency with the rest of the team
- accepting and answering the Points of Information (POI)

POIs

(±1-2 points accepted during a speech)

- are awarded, if the quality (but quantity as well) differs significantly, from the main speech (If the speaker got 75 for his speech, but failed to offer POIs/offered very weak ones, he will be penalized. In the same way speaker who got 65 and offered some very strong POIs should get a bonus).