

## JUDGING CRITERIA: TEAM DEBATE

**PHILOSOPHY: The California High School Speech Association believes the following goals from the CHSSA Mission Statement should be displayed during policy debate rounds.**

- 1. Every student will develop the critical and analytical thinking skills necessary for academic success.**
- 2. Every student will develop the oral communications skills necessary for effective public presentations.**
- 3. Every student will demonstrate ethical responsibility in the acquisition and practice of communication skills.**

1. Team Identity: Teams are assigned code numbers in order to ensure impartiality. Judges are not to ask contestants about their school affiliation. If you are assigned to a debate and know the contestants, please request another ballot.
2. Sides: Teams have been assigned to debate either affirmative or negative. Please judge only the quality of debate by both sides, setting aside any personal feelings you may have regarding the topic.
  - A. The Affirmative Team must uphold the resolution.
  - B. The Negative Team must argue against the affirmative proposal for adoption of the resolution by showing the affirmative proposal is faulty, be defending the present policy, or by offering a counter policy option that is not topical.
3. Speech Time: Speaking time is limited and must occur in the following order. Any arguments presented beyond a time limit should be disregarded.

A. First Affirmative Constructive:	8 minutes
B. Cross examination by a negative speaker:	3 minutes
C. First Negative Constructive:	8 minutes
D. cross examination by a negative speaker:	3 minutes
E. Second Affirmative Constructive:	8 minutes
F. Cross examination by a negative speaker:	3 minutes
G. Second Negative Constructive:	8 minutes
H. Cross examination by an affirmative speaker:	3 minutes
I. First Negative Rebuttal:	5 minutes
J. First Affirmative Rebuttal:	5 minutes
K. Second Negative Rebuttal:	5 minutes
L. Second Affirmative Rebuttal:	5 minutes
4. Preparation time: Each team has eight minutes of preparation time which they may use incrementally as they please before their speeches. No preparation time is allowed between the end of a constructive speech and the beginning of a cross examination. Cross examination time may not be waived to gain added preparation time. If there are no timers, please call off prep time in one minute intervals if debaters request you do so.
5. Cross examination/Oral prompting: Both members of a debate team must participate as a questioner and a respondent during cross examination, but only one member of each team may do so within a given cross examination period. Oral prompting by a participant of either the questioner or the respondent should be discouraged and may be considered as a factor in deciding the debate. 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.
6. Constructives/Rebuttals: All arguments a team intends to present during the debate must be presented in constructive speeches. Rebuttals are a team's response to opponent arguments from constructives or an extension of their own arguments. No new arguments may be introduced in rebuttals. New argument issued in rebuttals should be disregarded. New evidence and analysis supporting arguments from constructives are allowed in rebuttals.
7. Evidence: Should a serious challenge to the legality of evidence used in the round be issued during the debate, the judges should allow the round to finish and then return to the judge's room for further direction. Judges may only request evidence from debaters when its legality has been questioned. Judges may not call in evidence at the end of a debate to reread it. During cross-examination, the questioner may request to see evidence read by their opponents. All evidence must be returned at the end of cross-examination.

Full citations: The first time evidence is read in a debate round, the debater must read full citations on that piece of evidence. Full citations include: author, full source title, date and page number. Full citations are not necessary if the same source is cited a second time. Failure to read full citations shall void the

impact of that evidence in the debate.

8. Note Taking: Judges are encouraged to take notes during the round. Only contestants and judges are allowed to take notes during the round. Observers may not "flow" the debate.
9. Making a Decision: There are many models for judging debate. Two of the most prevalent are "Stock Issues" and "Policy Maker".
  - A. Stock Issues Judging Criterion: This criterion claims there are five voting issues in debate.
    1. Topicality: Does the affirmative plan reasonably adhere to the limitations of the resolution?
    2. Significance: Is there justification to change from the present system because the present policy generates harmful problems?
    3. Inherency: Is there a clear barrier which prevents the present system from solving the problems indicated by the affirmative?
    4. Solvency: Can the proposed plan solve the problem better than the present system?
    5. Disadvantages: Do the advantages claimed by the affirmative outweigh the disadvantages claimed by the negative?At the conclusion of the round if the judge feels the answer is "yes" to all of the above questions, the affirmative is awarded the win. If the judge feels there is a clear "no" answer to any one or more of the questions, the win is awarded to the negative.
  - B. Policy Maker Judging Criterion: This criterion claims that the winning team is the one that presents the superior policy option.
    1. The affirmative should win the round if their policy option meets the resolution (is topical) and gains advantages that outweigh the disadvantages presented by the negative.
    2. The negative team should win the round if they prove that the affirmative team's plan is not topical or if the disadvantages outweigh the advantages, or if the negative proves that a counter non-topical policy option it offers is superior to the affirmative's policy.

Please consider these areas on your ballot as a partial guideline for your decision:

- A. Analysis: logical explanation of critical issues: which team, on balance, did the better job of clearly explaining their arguments and of exposing the weakness of opponent arguments?
  - B. Proof: sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation of evidence: which team offered the clearest understandable evidence and better applied that evidence to support their arguments?
  - C. Organization: logical and orderly presentation: which team more clearly indicated what issue was being argued at each moment, presenting a clear and easy listening path to follow?
  - D. Refutation: direct responses to issues raised by the opponents: which team displayed the better ability to critically analyze opponent arguments and develop appropriate, clear, understandable responses with logical argument and effective use of evidence?
  - E. Delivery: understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation: which team displayed effective oral communication skills including effective reading of evidence, clear, understandable, persuasive vocal argument, use of effective stage presence, gestures, and eye contact?
10. Please make an independent decision: Please do not discuss your decision with other judges until after the ballots have been turned in. There must be a winning side; there are no ties in debate.
  11. No oral critiques/disclosures: Judges are not to give oral critiques or reveal their decisions to the debaters. Please fill out and sign your ballot: Indicate why each team won or lost as clearly and constructively as possible. Debaters appreciate your comments regarding the deciding arguments and considerations leading to your decision.