



SASKATCHEWAN ELOCUTION AND DEBATE ASSOCIATION

2006 GUIDE TO JUDGING

JUDGE'S DUTIES

- pick the winning team
- evaluate the debaters
- provide a constructive critique

Definitions

Resolution or Bill: the topic of debate

BIRT: Be it resolved that

Status Quo: current state

Affirmative/Government: supports the resolution and bears the burden of proof

Negative/Opposition: opposes the resolution

Clash: Point-counterpoint attempt to undermine arguments of the other side

Constructive: new arguments presented

Rebuttal: debate is summarized and arguments refuted, teams explain why they should win

See ballot for duties of each speaker.

POLICY DEBATES

Affirmative must:

- propose a *significant* change
- state the reason(s) for it ("*needs*")
- create a plan for carrying it out.
- show the plan is feasible but not necessarily legal or constitutional.
- defend attacks on their position and clash with opponents' arguments.

Other strategies: criteria, goals, comparative advantage cases, "case lines" and negative cases.

Negative must clash with the Affirmative's major points and may use "global or direct clash" to:

- question the Affirmative's needs or arguments
- question the feasibility and benefits of their plan.
- challenge the *significance* of the changes
- argue that the plan's disadvantages outweigh its benefits.
- argue that minor repairs to status quo are better
- offer own constructive case or propose a counter plan and assume the burden of proof

PLANS AND COUNTER PLANS

Plan must be completely outlined during the first Affirmative speech and completely described before the end of the second Affirmative speech.

Counter plans must be completely described in the first Negative speech.

- Counter plan without adopting resolution: agree with analysis of status quo, but disagree with the plan, propose alternate
- e.g. "Be it resolved that Canada introduce an elected Senate." Counter plan that abolishes the Senate
- Counter plan within the resolution
- e.g. the Negative introduces a counter plan including an elected Senate, but different from the Affirmative plan.

VALUES AND CASE LINE DEBATES

The Affirmative does not introduce a plan or needs for change but rather an issue of principle or philosophy is evaluated. Both teams carry the burden of proof. Evidence is more anecdotal than fact based. In case line debates, both teams present competing but equally valid cases.

EVALUATING THE SPEAKER

Each ballot has a section for evaluating the speaker. Each speaker is graded from poor to outstanding in five categories: arguments and evidence, case development and structure, deconstruction, delivery, and style. Unless the debater's performance was a total disaster, judges should not score less than 50 percent. Half marks are usually allowed, but check with the tournament hosts first.

When assigning final scores to the debaters, please try to observe the following scoring guidelines:

<u>Score</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>% of Scores</u>
25	Impossibly perfect	0%
24	Extraordinary, incredible	1.5%
23	Superlative, excellent	10%
21-22	Very good	25%
20	Good	25%
17-19	Average to Good	33%
15-16	Poor	4.5%
13-14	Very Weak, Unprepared	1%
12.5 and under	Rude, Violates the Rules	0%

MAKING COMMENTS

At the conclusion of a debate you may be asked to make comments on the debate. The objective of a debate tournament is to help develop and spread the skills of debate. It is important to point out major errors but equally important to make positive comments.

If the debate tournament is running behind schedule, please do not make comments.

PLEASE NOTE

- Judges must not discuss the debate with *anyone* until after they have reached and recorded a decision.
- You may *not* award a team tie!
- Please fill out the ballots completely. *The front and back rubrics are just guides to help you.*
- Record the winning team and be sure to give each debater an individual score out of a possible 25 points.

FILLING OUT A BALLOT

All information **MUST** be entered so the proper scores are awarded to the correct debater. Enter your name, room and round number and the last names of both affirmative and both negative team members. **In the grid enter:**

first/last name of 1st affirmative speaker

first/last name of 1st negative speaker

first/last name of 2nd affirmative speaker

first/last name of 2nd negative speaker

Make notes inside the ballot. After the debate, fill in scores. Addition is checked and corrected as needed. Write Affirmative or Negative on the line below "Judge's Decision". Return ballot to moderator after all comments are made. Do not ask debaters what school they represent.

PICKING A WINNER

Decision based on which team best:

- presented a clear main point with supporting arguments and evidence
- logically supported their case
- rebuilt own ideas that opponents attacked
- deconstructed specific arguments of opponents' case (direct clash)
- attacked the basic premise of opponents' case (global clash)
- identified and attacked assumptions of opponents' case
- identified and attacked logical inconsistencies of opponents' case
- presented their ideas clearly, effectively and persuasively
- clarified the crux of the debate and what it was really about

Note *significant* arguments, and evidence. Determine which team presented the most convincing case. Clash is critical to debate. Note which major arguments are refuted and which are not. A team's failure to respond to significant points can cost them the debate. You may know that an argument is illogical — even naïve — but it remains a given unless challenged. You must not let your personal opinions or biases influence your decision.

Rule violations can also count against a team.

Judges must determine:

- whether an alleged infraction is legitimate;
- how serious it is;
- what penalty (if any) is appropriate.

Judges should disregard any petty rule violations.

DISCUSSION SPEAKING TIMES

	Begginner/Intermediate	Junior
1st Affirmative	4 min.	5 min.
1st Negative	4 min.	5 min.
2nd Affirmative	4 min.	5 min.
2nd Negative	4 min.	5 min.
Discussion	6 min.	10 min.
Break	5 min.	5 min.
1st Neg. Rebuttal	3 min.	3 min.
1st Aff. Rebuttal	3 min.	3 min.

RULES FOR DISCUSSION STYLE

- During the discussion period debaters raise their hand, and upon being recognized by the chair, proceed to ask, and respond to questions from their opponents.
- No new constructive arguments may be introduced, although it is permissible to introduce new evidence.
- Each contribution should not exceed one minute.
- Questions should alternate from side to side.
- An equal contribution must be made by all debaters. Judges should penalize lack of participation by a debater.

PARLIAMENTARY SPEAKING TIMES

Prime Minister's Introduction	5 min.
First Opposition Speech	8 min.
Second Government Speech	8 min.
Opposition Leader Speech	8 min.
<i>The last three minutes of this speech are a rebuttal.</i>	
Prime Minister's Rebuttal	3 min.
Please carefully enter the names of the speakers in the correct order on the ballot.	

REFUTATION, REBUTTAL & SUMMARY

A good debater articulates a clear understanding of opponents' cases, distinguishes between relevant and irrelevant points, summarizes and synthesizes opponents' cases, uses both direct and global clash along with case line to refute all critical points, summarizes key themes and points out logical weaknesses.

RULES FOR PARLIAMENTARY STYLE

- The moderator of a Parliamentary debate is styled the Speaker. All debaters must address themselves to "Mr. Speaker" or "Madame Speaker" at the outset of their speeches and throughout the debate. The Affirmative is called the Government and the Negative is the Opposition. Participants in the debate and members of the audience are referred to collectively as the House, while the resolution is termed the Bill. The House represents the Canadian House of Commons, unless otherwise specified.
- Debaters must always refer to one another in the third person (for example, the Prime Minister, Leader of the Opposition, Minister of Recreation and Honourable Member).
- Only one debater at a time may hold the floor of the House. As soon as another member rises to address himself to the Speaker, an interrupted debater shall surrender the floor by sitting down. When the Speaker rises to his or her feet, all debaters must immediately cease speaking and resume their seats.
- Heckling is not only permitted, it is encouraged, as long as it is pertinent, brief and infrequent. Wit is welcome but should not be used just to disrupt the delivery of a debater. Judges should severely penalize debaters who lower the level of debate through excessive or irrelevant heckling.
- A debater may question an opponent during the latter's speech by rising to his or her feet and once recognized by the Speaker inquiring, "Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member entertain a question?" If the honourable member agrees to consider the question, the question may be posed; otherwise, the questioner must resume his or her seat. Neither the time taken to ask such a question nor the period required to answer it shall be included in the speaking time of the interrupted speaker. While occasional formal questions are welcome, such questions should not be used just to disrupt the delivery of opponents. Judges shall severely penalize debaters who lower the level of debate through excessive or thoughtless formal questions.
- There is no protected time during any speaker's speeches. Heckling, questions, points of Personal Privilege and Order are allowed at all times, including during official rebuttals.

- Debaters must not defer answering questions to the end of their speeches.

- Every debater may insist on the observance of the rules of Parliamentary debate and may rise on a Point of Order immediately after he or she believes a rule has been violated. A Point of Order may involve a debater other than the one holding the floor.

- To raise a Point of Order, a debater stands and once recognized by the Speaker says, "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Order." The Speaker then says to the complainant, "Please explain your point." After the complainant explains his or her objection, the Speaker rules whether the point was "well taken" (valid) or "not well taken". If the Point of Order is well taken, the offender must apologize. The Speaker then calls upon the interrupted debater to continue his or her speech.

- If a point is well taken and involves a rule infraction by the interrupted debater, the time used during the interruption is included in his or her speaking time. Otherwise, the interrupted debater is allowed additional time to compensate him or her for the interruption.

- In Parliamentary debates, the timekeeper should make every effort to stop the clock when a speaker stands to pose a question and to start the clock when they are reasonably sure the speaker has completed their response. If the timekeeper is unable to stop the clock, they should add approximately 30 extra seconds for each question posed, to a maximum of an extra minute, to the end of a speaker's time.

- The Speaker may call any member to order on his or her own initiative even though no other debater has objected to a member's conduct.

- A debater may rise on a Point of Personal Privilege if he or she has been misquoted or misrepresented, slandered or otherwise insulted. No member may raise such a point on behalf of another member. The same procedures and time adjustments apply as those governing Points of Order. If a Point of Personal Privilege is well taken and involves a distortion of the complainant's remarks, the Speaker may allow the complainant to clarify his or her position (though not to introduce any new material in doing so). The offending party should apologize.

CROSS EXAMINATION SPEAKING TIMES

1st Affirmative Constructive	5 min.
1st Affirmative cross-examined by 1st Negative	3 min.
1st Negative Constructive	5 min.
1st Negative cross-examined by 2nd Affirmative	3 min.
2nd Affirmative Constructive	5 min.
2nd Affirmative cross-examined by 2nd Negative	3 min.
2nd Negative Constructive	5 min.
2nd Negative cross-examined by 1st Affirmative	3 min.
5 minute break	
1st Negative Rebuttal	4 min.
1st Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min.

RULES FOR CROSS-EXAMINATION STYLE

a) The examiner controls the cross-examination. The respondent should be permitted reasonable — but not unnecessary — time to answer questions.

b) The respondent must answer all relevant questions and must not ask questions except to request clarification.

c) A debater shall not seek assistance from his or her partner while asking or answering questions.

d) Judges should penalize speech-making, irrelevance, flippancy, discourtesy or any attempt to personally discredit an opponent. Judges should also penalize lack of co-operation by a respondent and browbeating and rebutting by an examiner. (Examiners should only ask questions.)

e) New contentions and evidence may be introduced during cross-examination.

f) The examiner should ask fair, relevant questions. Questions need not directly relate to the speech just delivered but should relate ultimately to the topic at hand.

g) If an irrelevant answer is given to a relevant question the moderator, on request or on his or her own initiative, should order the respondent to answer the question properly.

JUDGE'S DUTY TO DECLARE CONFLICT OF INTEREST

- Any debater, judge or coach who believes there is a conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest between a judge and a debater must inform the tournament host prior to the start of the debate round so all reasonable effort can be made to reassign judges.
- Debaters have the right to register actual or perceived conflict with the tournament hosts after a debate if participants have not self-identified prior to the start of the round. However, this is not a mechanism to reverse a decision they are not happy with.

THANK YOU FOR JUDGING!

You are playing an essential role in a cultural activity.

SEDA is a non-profit, cultural organization that promotes speech and debate activities in English and French to students from grade 6-12, at the two universities, and to the community. SEDA co-ordinates an annual program of speech and debate tournaments and other special activities, including a model legislature and adult tournament. SEDA's staff, along with printed and audio-visual materials, are available to assist any individual or group interested in elocution and debate.

1860 Lorne Street, Regina, SK S4P 2L7
Telephone: (306) 780-9243 Fax: (306) 781-6021
E-Mail: info@saskdebate.com Web: <http://www.saskdebate.com>

EVALUATING THE SPEAKER

Argument & Evidence (must meet majority of the criteria to receive the mark)

- 5 Understands all aspects of the issue. Excellent research and clear logic shown
- 4 Understands both sides of issues well, presents effective evidence, with considerable logic shown
- 3 Understands one side of the issue well and uses some evidence to substantiate the case

- 2 Some logic and research evident
- Case is incoherent or research is absent; said nothing or was offensive

Case development and structure

- 5 Ideas are cleverly organized, effectively sequentialized, designed to develop a central thesis. The case is well coordinated between partners, the case as a whole flows and is naturally persuasive.
- 4 Ideas are well organized, deliberately sequenced and related to a main point. The contentions of the debater are consistent with the partner
- 3 Ideas are loosely organized and relate to the resolution
- 2 Ideas are stated but not related and may be contradictory at times
- Ideas are confused, scattered or non-existent; said nothing or was offensive

Deconstruction

- 5 Demonstrates seamless integration of appropriate methods
- 4 Clashes with a variety of methods but does not summarize
- 3 Some variety of clash and attempts summary
- 2 Clashes directly with some critical points
- No relevant clash or understanding of opponents; said nothing or was offensive

Delivery

- 5 Persuasive, memorable, effective use of voice and body
- 4 Good pace, tone, eye contact, does not rely solely on notes, fairly persuasive
- 3 Delivery flaws in pace, tone and diction which reduce persuasiveness, reads notes
- 2 Uncomfortable, lacks confidence, reads entire speech
- Delivery is offensive or non-existent

Discussion style (1 point for each demonstrated)

- concise and well thought out questions and answers
- obey rules of discussion period (no new contentions, etc.)
- avoids making speeches
- participates effectively (asks and answers questions equally with partner)
- courteous and appropriate

Cross-Examination style (1 point for each demonstrated)

- gives concise, well worded questions and answers
- obeys the rules of cross-examination
- anticipates the significance of questions and build lines of questions
- the cross-ex period is related to the entire debate/
- is courteous and appropriate as both the examiner and witness

Parliamentary style (1 point for each demonstrated)

- knows when to interrupt with questions, points of order & privilege
- is actively engaged throughout the entire debate
- uses parliamentary tools to persuade (language, address, rules, etc.)
- uses heckles appropriately and effectively - brief, witty and to the point
- is respectful of their partner, their opponents, the Speaker and the House

SEDA PATRONS/AFFILIATIONS

Honorary Patron – Dr. Gordon L. Barnhart
Saskatchewan Lotteries Trust Fund for Sport,
Culture and Recreation
Saskatchewan Law Foundation
Celebrate Canada Committee for Saskatchewan
Saskatchewan Government
Luther College High School
Official Minority Language Office
Mrs. Morris Shumiatcher, Q.C.
Archer Family
Olivia Shumski
Canadian Student Debating Federation
SaskCulture Inc.



CULTURE BUILDS COMMUNITY

Buy lottery tickets & benefit over 12,000 groups! Everyone Wins!

2006 GENERAL RULES OF DEBATE

1. DEFINITIONS

First Affirmative must define key words so they do not receive a competitive advantage not inherent in the resolution, or produce a self-evident fact or truism.

First Affirmative must accept reasonable definitions proposed by the first Negative if they did not provide any. Each speaker in turn has right to define, if it was not done before their turn.

First Negative may challenge and redefine terms. Judges then decide which are best supported by evidence and argumentation.

If there is no other clash between Affirmative and Negative cases, the debate must be decided solely on the issue of the interpretation of terms.

2. EVIDENCE

a) Assertions of fact must be accurate and supported by proof and specific authorities (publications, page, author, date).

b) Visual aids and tangible evidence are permitted, and may then be used by their opponents.

c) Reasonable role-playing is allowed, subject to rule a). Opponents may ask to examine the actual publication (or a copy).

d) Interview evidence is allowed, if a signed transcript is available.

e) Letters from experts may be used as evidence and must be available to the opposing team.

f) Evidence must not be fabricated, misquoted, distorted, or quoted out of context.

g) Judges may request full documentation at the end of the debate, before rendering a decision and should severely penalize debaters for using inaccurate evidence.

h) If a judge is certain a debater has *deliberately* fabricated or falsified evidence they should report this to the tournament host immediately. The debater becomes ineligible to win any prize at the tournament.

3. TEAM OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS

a) Right to speak

Moderator or Speaker introduces a debater. A debater is obliged to surrender the floor when ordered to do so by the moderator or timekeeper.

b) Delivery

i) Debaters stand during speeches and while asking and answering questions in cross-examination debate. Debaters remain seated during the discussion period.

ii) Debaters must not read their speeches, though they may make reasonable reference to notes and may read quotations. Judges should penalize debaters for excessive reading, and for memorization which results in stilted or unnatural delivery.

c) Forms of address

i) Formal address is used in Parliamentary style.

ii) Debaters must refer to one another in the third person (for example, my worthy opponent).

d) Refutation

i) Refutation means attacking the opposing arguments and evidence and defending one's own arguments and evidence.

ii) Refutation is not restricted to the official rebuttal period. The Affirmative must not wait until the official rebuttal to respond to important opposition points in the debate.

iii) The functions of refutation and defence shall be divided among the members of each team. All debaters must attack the opponent's case while developing their own. Judges will score debaters on how well they discharge their respective responsibilities.

iv) No new constructive arguments or evidence may be introduced during an official rebuttal except that the Affirmative may respond to new arguments or evidence introduced during the second Negative constructive speech.

v) The Negative team's primary duty is to clash directly with Affirmative arguments. Judges should severely penalize debaters in the refutation category who rely heavily upon prepared negative speeches rather than direct refutation.

e) Rule violations

After the rebuttals both teams may register rule violations. Each team is allowed to speak once, debate is not allowed, and each alleged violation must refer to a specific rule. Judges must determine whether the alleged infraction is legitimate, how serious it is, and what penalty (if any) is appropriate.

4. CONDUCT

a) Debaters should always conduct themselves with dignity and be courteous towards everyone present. They should not make personal comments about their opponents. Judges should penalize debaters guilty of any attempt to personally belittle another debater. The moderator should try to protect debaters from abuse.

b) Debaters must not disturb a speaker with interruptions or distractions such as loud whispering, shuffling papers, etc.

c) Debaters must use appropriate language.

d) Debaters should not try to unduly influence judges.

e) Debaters may speak on any relevant topic but should not be obscene, blasphemous, or defamatory.

f) Debaters may not communicate with or prompt colleagues in any way while one of them is speaking, nor shall a speaker consult them for assistance, but they may consult with one another quietly while an opposing speaker delivers his or her speech.

g) At a tournament, debaters and coaches must not attend debates involving potential opponents to gain a competitive advantage. Coaches may observe their own teams debate.

h) A team must not seek information regarding the case of potential opponents.

i) No ostensible signs of school affiliations are allowed in a debate room.

In the event that you are unable to decide the debate on the issues discussed to this point, then and only then are you justified in awarding the debate on speaker points.