

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

This packet is intended to serve as a training primer for new coaches and judges who need a comprehensive guide to judging and managing rounds of competition in intercollegiate individual events (speech) and Lincoln-Douglas Debate. In most cases, judges are expected to be capable of adjudicating a round of competition in any event offered at a tournament. Consequently, you will need a basic understand of events that are commonly offered at forensics tournaments. This packet will take you through the entire process systematically, from arriving at the tournament ballot table to submitting your ballots for tabulation.

This document will discuss basic judging responsibilities, how to manage a typical individual events (IE) round, IE ballot completion, individual event descriptions with key judging criteria, Lincoln-Douglas (L-D) debate with stock judging issues, L-D round management, L-D ballot completion.

BASIC JUDGING RESPONSIBILITIES

Tournament headquarters for most tournaments will be the same place as tournament registration. Ballots may be picked up and dropped off at the ballot table in that building. Please try to **check-in 15 minutes prior to your first round.**

Once you pick up your ballots for a given round of competition, you should try to arrive at the round a few minutes early. This will give you an opportunity to fill out basic information on the ballot like event, round, section, contestant name and code, your name and affiliation. The typical round of competition will have 5-6 contestants and will be allotted an hour and fifteen minutes for completion.

Your role is to manage the round so the competition runs smoothly and on time and that competitors comport themselves in a way that is courteous and ethical. You are expected to provide an objective evaluation of each performance and rank/rate performances without bias or undue influence. Contestants should not be asked to identify their school affiliation or any other information that is not pertinent to judging the content of their performances. You should feel free to write ballot comments and penalize contestants who exhibit any unsportsmanlike conduct, such as being a bad audience member or acting in a discourteous or disruptive manner.

MANAGING A TYPICAL INDIVIDUAL EVENTS ROUND

The following section is intended to acquaint you with the round management duties of a judge in an individual event round. It will let you know what the contestants' responsibilities are as well as how to interpret what is written on the blackboard by them so you can determine the

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

order of performance and keep the round moving smoothly. This is followed by a discussion of timekeeping.

The Blackboard Lingo

In prepared events, contestants are asked to sign in before the round is scheduled to begin if possible. They will sign in with their contestant code and their name. Although the contestant will sign in according to the printed schedule, this DOES NOT mean that they will perform in that order. Several (most) contestants are entered in other events that are scheduled at the same time. Contestants who are entered in other events will either arrive late or leave after their performance. Please allow them priority when they have another event to go to. They will indicate they are double entered on the blackboard (or, in the event that a chalkboard is not available, they will usually sign in via paper and pencil).

To become familiar with the blackboard lingo, an **example** is provided and explained below:

PROSE Rd. 1 Section A

- 1) A6 John White
- 2) D4 Bob Wilson (DE)
- 3) Y3 Jo Ann Tom (DE)
- 4) F2 Loretta Johnson
- 5) K13 Tad Walton (DE)
- 6) M3 Tommie Tricky (DE)

There are only two individuals in this round who should remain in the room throughout the entire round (John and Loretta). It may be appropriate to acknowledge the importance of listening to other contestants (via the written ballot) IF contestants who should remain decide to leave before the round is over. In this round, ask the contestants present at the beginning time of the round if they are the individuals who are double entered in other events (DE). If they are, ask them to perform first (Bob and Jo Ann are likely to be there at the start). After all of the contestants present who are DE perform, ask the remaining contestants to perform in order. Late arriving students (most likely Tad and Tommie) will cross out the (DE) to indicate they have finished their other event scheduled for this time.

Be sure to call each contestant aloud by code and name when you are ready to hear them to make sure that the code and name on the board and the code and name on your ballot match the person whose performance you are getting ready to judge.

In Extemp, speakers will sign in when they arrive to speak.

In Impromptu, before the round begins with the first speaker, all other speakers should be asked to leave the room since they all speak on the same quotation/topic. Contestants may enter the room only when it is their turn to speak, not before (**ONLY IN EXTEMP OR IMPROMPTU**).

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

In all individual events, it is customary and expected that you will write your ballot comments mainly during the contestants' performances, not in between performances. This helps keep the tournament running on time. In preliminary round competition at regular season tournaments, you will be the sole judge. In final round competition, three judges are typically assigned to the round.

Timekeeping Duties of Judges

Judges are expected to keep accurate records of the length of all speeches and performances in rounds. Each event has a time limit; time violations should result in significant penalties for the competitor.

- ~ Prepared individual (Public Address & Interpretation) events are 10 minutes maximum.
- ~ The Extemporaneous Speaking event is 5-7 minutes.
- ~ In Impromptu, contestants have a total of 7 minutes to divide between preparation and speaking; they must speak for at least 3 minutes.

As a judge, you may find using time as a criterion for evaluation difficult since there is no set penalty. Feel free to exercise your right as a judge to enforce the rules. Some of the best performances may go over time. The rules for each event specify the time maximums. Violators should be punished. However, the individual judge must determine how severely to punish those who violate time limits and other guidelines.

In Extemporaneous Speaking rounds you must provide time signals to let the speaker know how much time they have remaining to speak. After a contestant has spoken for two minutes, hold up five fingers (make sure they see it) to let them know they have five minutes remaining. Once you are sure they have seen the time signal you may put your hand down. Count downward each subsequent minute displaying one finger for each minute remaining down to one minute (one finger) remaining, then thirty seconds (a hooked index finger), 15 seconds (a pointing to the side index finger), and finally count down the last five seconds dropping fingers to a balled fist, which means "stop, time is up." Penalize contestants who talk past the stop signal.

In Impromptu Speaking rounds you must provide time signals to let the speaker know how much time they have used in preparation for the speech as well as how much time they have remaining to speak. Once a speaker sees the topic, you start timing them. Call out the amount of **preparation time used** aloud in 30-second intervals ("30 seconds used . . . one minute . . . one thirty . . . etc.) until the speaker starts to speak. Note the amount of prep time used on the ballot, but keep the time running. At this point you continue to signal the **time remaining to speak** out of their seven total minutes using hand signals. Count downward each passing minute using fingers to signify the number of minutes remaining down to one minute (one finger) remaining, then thirty seconds (a hooked index finger), 15 seconds (a pointing to the side index finger), and finally count down the last five seconds dropping fingers to a balled fist, which means "stop, time is up." Penalize contestants who talk past the stop signal.

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

INDIVIDUAL EVENTS BALLOT COMPLETION

Judges comments are extremely important. Judges (experienced and new) must feel comfortable with providing written constructive criticism. No performance is perfect. Every contestant deserves to know what you, the judge, think about the message and performance. Thus, judges are required to provide written feedback that justifies and explains the rank and rate. Judges are NEVER wrong, but must feel empowered to provide comments that will assist the contestant with future performances. Students are accustomed to judges writing these comments while the student is performing; do not wait to write comments after the performance as you may forget key suggestions and the round will run very late making the tournament run on time.

Judges are asked to:

1. Complete the requested information on the front of the ballot (i.e. contestant name, code, event, round, section, etc.).
2. Use the ballot to provide at least three positive comments and three comments that: a) provide constructive criticism; b) question the choices the contestant has made; or c) provide suggestions for improvement. (Judges are encouraged to provide additional comments, but should, at the very least, provide these suggested types of comments.)
3. After all contestants have performed, **rank contestants 1(best) to 6 (worst)** and give each **speaker points to correspond to the rank awarded; 100 points is for perfect performances; 70 is for performances with no redeeming value whatsoever. Some tournaments use a 25 (perfect score) to 1 (lowest score) scale. It is customary not to go below 15 points on this scale unless a performance is extremely poor or patently offensive.**

Once the round of competition is finished and you have ranked and rated all contestants, you must return your ballots to the ballot table for verification. Verification of the ballots is to assure that no more than one of each rank (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th) are given AND that the rates points correspond to the rank given each contestant. Do not delay returning your ballots; this will delay the whole tournament.

INDIVIDUAL EVENT DESCRIPTIONS and SOME KEY JUDGING CRITERIA

ALL MATERIALS USED IN COMPETITION SHALL NOT HAVE BEEN USED BY THE STUDENT IN INTERSCHOLASTIC COMPETITION PRIOR TO SEPTEMBER 1

A contestant may not use the same cutting/content or any portion of that cutting/content in more than one prepared event at any given tournament.

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

Limited Preparation Events

Extemporaneous Speaking: Contestants will be given three topics in the general area of current events, choose one, and have 30 minutes to prepare for a speech that is the original work of the student. Maximum time limit for the speech is 7 minutes. Limited notes are permitted. Delivery should be fluent and conversational.

Key criteria: The speaker should provide an introduction that minimally includes a verbatim reading of the question chosen, establishes the significance of the issue, takes an unambiguous position on the question, and provides a clear preview of the main points in support of the chosen position. Main points should be independent, but interlocking, reasons to support the chosen position. Each main point should have clear analysis and adequate supporting evidence. The conclusion should summarize the main points, restate the question verbatim, reinforce the argued position and tie back to the opening attention getter.

Impromptu Speaking: an Impromptu speech, serious in nature, with topic selections varied by round, section by section. Topics will be of a proverb nature. Speakers will have a total of 7 minutes for both preparation and speaking. Timing commences with the acceptance of the topic sheet. Each speaker in a given section will speak from the same topic offered.

Key Criteria: The speech should be well organized. The speaker should take a clear stance on the quotation. The main points should be a clear defense of that stance. Examples used should serve to explicate and crystallize main points. Delivery should be fluent and conversational. The best impromptu speakers will prep for under 2 minutes and speak for at least 5 minutes.

Prepared Speaking Events

After Dinner Speaking: An original humorous speech by the student, designed to exhibit sound speech composition, thematic, coherence, direct communicative public speaking skills, and good taste. The speech should not resemble a nightclub act, impersonation, or comic dialogue. Audio-visual aids may or may not be used to supplement and reinforce the message. Minimal notes are permitted. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes.

Key criteria: The topic should have an inherently serious point that can be carried throughout the speech in a humorous manner. The speech should be well organized and easy to follow. The speaker should incorporate a variety of forms of humor. The humor should be well integrated into the arguments being made, not tagged on as “punch lines” to otherwise serious passages of speech. The speaker should exhibit effective comic timing. The humor should not be offensive to the reasonable audience. Delivery should be fluent, and very conversational. Ultimately, a good speech will provoke thought about human nature and/or societal norms and behaviors.

Informative Speaking: An original, factual speech by the student on a realistic subject to fulfill the general aim to inform the audience. Audio-Visual aids may be or may not be used to supplement and reinforce the message. Multiple sources should be used and cited in the

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

development of the speech. Minimal notes are permitted. Maximum time is 10 minutes including the introduction.

Key criteria: The speech introduction should create information hunger; it should make you want to know more. It should also provide a clear and compelling justification for the subject of the speech. The introduction should, also, set forth a clear preview of main points to be covered in the body of the speech. The body of the speech should be well-developed. Main points should have clear internal structure. Each sub-point should be clearly explained and bolstered by clearly cited research. At the end of the speech you should feel that you have learned something you needed to know or that was really neat to know. Delivery should be fluent and conversational.

Persuasive Speaking: Typically a problem/causes/solutions speech that intends to motivate the audience to take action to help solve a concrete societal problem. The traditional organization of the body tends to be: a) scope of the problem (physical, emotional, financial-- individual and societal); b) causes (structural and/or attitudinal--governmental, institutional, and personal), and the solutions (governmental, institutional, and individual specific immediate actions). The best topics are those in which the problem directly impacts the audience and in which they can participate in some of the solutions. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes.

Key criteria: The introduction should establish that the topic is a significant one worth of our concern and attention and lay out the structure of the speech. The body of the speech should be clearly organized. The speech should incorporate both sound reasoning and effective emotional appeals. The delivery of the speech should be fluent and assertive without becoming aggressive or strident. At the end of the speech you should feel that the speaker has presented a well developed speech motivated by clear convictions and an earnest effort to effect positive change.

Rhetorical Criticism/Communication Analysis: an original speech by the student designed to offer an explanation and/or evaluation of a communication event such as a speech, speaker, movement, poem, poster, film, campaign, etc. through the use of rhetorical principles. Audio-visual aids may or may not be used to supplement or reinforce the message. Manuscripts are permitted. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including the introduction.

Key criteria: The speech should be about some communication event that is significant for sociological, historical, and/or rhetorical reason(s). The introduction should provide a clear and compelling justification for the method of analysis being used in the speech and provide a clear preview of the structure of the speech. The first main point should outline the method of analysis in a way that any normal person can understand how the analysis should unfold. The second main point should exhibit a faithful and clear application of the method to the communication event. The third main point should provide sound arguments about implications and conclusions we can draw about the communication event, the method of analysis, this type of communication, and/or the social consequences that derive directly from the analysis in the second main point. Delivery should be fluent and conversational.

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

Oral Interpretation Events

Duo Interpretation: The American Forensic Association (AFA) allows a performance from any genre(s) of literature or texts, humorous or serious, presented by two individuals. The National Forensic Association (NFA) permits use of only the dramatic literary genre. This is not an acting event; thus no costumes, props, lighting, etc. are to be used. Presentation is from the manuscript and the focus generally should be off stage and not to each other; no actual touching of one another. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.

Key criteria: The material should have a message that is clear and compelling. The piece, pieces, or cutting used should fit together in such a way that the script flows logically and smoothly from beginning to end. The participation of duo partners should be relatively balanced. The blocking should be integral to communicating the action/emotion/meaning of the text. Characters should be fully developed and clearly distinguishable. Bottom line: Did the literature/performance/performer bring an experience to life that captured your imagination?

Dramatic Interpretation: A cutting that represents one or more characters from a play or plays of literary merit. This material may be drawn from stage, screen, or radio. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes, including introduction.

Key criteria: The material should have a message that is clear and compelling. The piece, pieces, or cutting used should fit together in such a way that the script flows logically and smoothly from beginning to end. Any blocking should be integral to communicating the action/emotion/meaning of the text. Characters should be fully developed and clearly distinguishable. Bottom line: Did the literature/performance/performer bring an experience to life that captured your imagination?

Poetry Interpretation: A selection or selections of poetry of literary merit, which may be drawn from one or more source. Play cuttings are prohibited. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes, including the introduction.

Key criteria: The material should have a message that is clear and compelling. The poem should be cut or poems should fit together in such a way that the script flows logically and smoothly from beginning to end. Cutting together poems should highlight the intertextuality of material—the interplay between sections should be clear. Any blocking should be integral to communicating the action/emotion/meaning of the text. Any characters should be fully developed and clearly distinguishable. You may use the lyrical quality of the literature or the lack thereof as a judging criterion if you so choose. Poetry should not sound like prose. Bottom line: Did the literature/performance/performer bring an experience to life that captured your imagination?

Program Oral Interpretation: A program of thematically-linked selections of literary merit, chosen from two of the three recognized genres used in the program. Two genre means that material must appear in at least two distinct literary works. The intent is that one of the genres should not be only a portion of the other larger/longer piece (e.g. a poem included in a short story

Mark Hickman
West Chester University

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

that appears only in that short story). Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including original introduction and/or transitions.

Key criteria: The material should have a message that is clear and compelling. The pieces used should fit together in such a way that the overall script flows logically and smoothly from beginning to end. The incorporation of multiple genres should be reasonably balanced (for instance, performing a brief introductory poem followed by a long short story is not the intent of the event—the generic mix should be creative and evident). Any blocking should be integral to communicating the action/emotion/meaning of the text. All characters should be fully developed and clearly distinguishable. Bottom line: Did the literature/performance/performer bring an experience to life that captured your imagination?

Prose Interpretation: A selection or selections of prose material of literary merit, which may be drawn from more than one source. Play cuttings are prohibited. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time is 10 minutes including the introduction.

Key criteria: The literature should have a message that is clear and compelling. The story should tap into some universal experience in a unique way. There should be movement—the situation or the main character should undergo significant change through the cutting. Characters should be clearly delineated vocally and physically. The performance should have appropriate builds through emotional peaks rising to the climax of the story. The performer should connect well emotionally with the literature and with the audience. Bottom line: Did the literature/performance/performer bring an experience to life that captured your imagination?

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

In intercollegiate debate, Lincoln-Douglas format is a policy debate. The National Forensic Association adopts a topic that sanctioned for use at the national tournament and at all qualifying tournaments. Debaters research both sides of the issue and prepare to debate half of their rounds affirming the resolution and half of their rounds opposing or negating the resolution.

The AFFIRMATIVE person supports the Resolution. He or she will try to uphold the resolution's call for change by presenting a case focused on a concrete problem that clearly falls under the umbrella of change called for by the resolution. **IN ORDER TO WIN THE DEBATE THE AFFIRMATIVE MUST MEET THE CRITERION JUST STATED AND MUST WIN ALL MAJOR (STOCK) ISSUES IN THE DEBATE—SIGNIFICANT HARM, INHERENCY, AND SOLVENCY OR ADVANTAGES. LOSING A CRITICAL ISSUE MEANS THEY SHOULD LOSE THE ROUND.** The affirmative should present a case that explains:

1. Significant harm, why the harm won't go away without changes in the status quo (inherency), a plan that solves the harm by removing the barriers that prevent the harm from going away (solvency), and/or evidence that the plan provides significant benefits (advantages). This is called a NEEDS CASE.

Mark Hickman
West Chester University

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

OR

2. that a proposed plan will accrue significant advantages over the current system that cannot be achieved without the proposed change. This is called a COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES CASE or simply a C/A CASE.

OR

3. the current system has certain significant goals that it is incapable of achieving, a plan for achieving these goals, and evidence that the plan will accomplish what it claims. This is called a GOALS CASE.

The NEGATIVE person opposes the Resolution. He or she will try to defeat the affirmative in a number of ways. IT IS KEY TO REMEMBER THAT THE NEGATIVE NEED ONLY CONVINCING YOU THAT THEY ARE CORRECT ON ONE MAJOR (STOCK) ISSUE IN ORDER TO WIN THE ROUND.

1. The speaker may provide evidence and reasoning to demonstrate that the affirmative's plan falls outside the parameters of the agreed upon debate topic (this is called topicality and should be argued early in the negative constructive).
2. The speaker may provide evidence and reasoning to convince the listeners/judges that the affirmative's claimed harms do not exist.
3. The speaker may provide evidence and reasoning to convince the listeners/judges that the affirmative's claimed harms are not significant.
4. The speaker may provide evidence and reasoning to convince the listeners/judges that there is no barrier to enacting the affirmative's plan under the status quo.
5. The speaker may provide evidence and reasoning to convince the listeners/judges that those who can effect change are predisposed to make the necessary changes, thus the problem is being fixed now or will be fixed soon in the status quo.
6. The speaker may provide evidence and reasoning to demonstrate that the plan will not solve the problem.
7. The speaker may provide evidence and reasoning to demonstrate that unintended negative consequences (disadvantages) inherent in the affirmative's plan of action outweigh any solvency and advantages claimed by the affirmative.
8. The speaker may provide evidence and reasoning to demonstrate that solving the problem can be achieved by making minor repairs to the status quo (or

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

sometimes by demonstrating that the affirmative's plan constitutes only a minor repair and not a significant structural change).

9. The speaker may present a counter plan that is outside the parameters of the debate topic. Then, s/he may demonstrate through evidence and reasoning that this plan is superior to the affirmative's plan because it is more effective at solving the problem, accrues better advantages, and/or creates fewer significant unintended negative consequences (disadvantages).

MANAGING A TYPICAL LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE ROUND

The following section is intended to acquaint you with the round management duties of a judge in a Lincoln-Douglas debate round. It will let you know what the contestants' responsibilities are as well as how to interpret what is written on the blackboard by them so you can determine the order of performance and keep the round moving smoothly.

In L-D debate, contestants sign in at the beginning of the round. They will designate whether they are the Affirmative or the Negative speaker for the round, and they will sign in with their contestant code and their name. Transcribe this information onto the debate judging ballot in the appropriate spaces. Contestants usually have a set amount of time to appear before they forfeit the round (usually 10-15 minutes after the round is scheduled to begin). You should ask at the ballot table what the forfeiture rule is for the tournament.

Before the debate begins, debaters will usually ask you if you have any preference during the debate. This where you get to tell them how you intend to judge the round/what is important to you and how you will signal debaters are violating your expectations. For instance, I don't like debaters to speak really fast; I think good persuasive style matters. I tell them that if they go too fast, I will put my pen down. If I don't write their argument down because I have put my pen down, as far as my judging of the round is concerned the argument did not happen. So, they should go slow enough to keep me writing.

Lincoln-Douglas Debates include **5 different speeches**, **2 cross-examinations**, and provide a total of **4 minutes of prep time** to each speaker. Speakers may use the prep time whenever they wish; they will typically use parts of that time before each of their speeches, not cross-ex. The speeches are in this order:

- ~ 6 min affirmative constructive
- ~ 3 min cross examination of the affirmative speaker by the negative opponent
- ~ 7 min negative constructive
- ~ 3 min cross examination of the negative speaker by the affirmative opponent
- ~ 6 min affirmative rebuttal
- ~ 6 min negative rebuttal
- ~ 3 min affirmative rejoinder

Mark Hickman
West Chester University

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

You must keep track of all time used by each debater in the round:

During **speeches**, debaters are given hand signals telling them how much time they have left to speak. Count down by minutes for the last five minutes of each speech (only 3 minutes for the last speech of the debate). Hold up five fingers (make sure they see it) to let them know they have five minutes remaining. Once you are sure they have seen the time signal you may put your hand down. Count downward each subsequent minute down to one minute (one finger) remaining, then thirty seconds (a hooked index finger), 15 seconds (a pointing to the side index finger), and finally count down the last five seconds dropping fingers to a balled fist, which means “stop, time is up.” Let debaters finish the sentence they are speaking, but that is it. Do not listen any further.

Cross-examination between constructive speeches typically happen right after the constructive speech is done. Debaters who do not rise to cross-exam their opponents immediately should be warned that they must use some of their preparation time if they are not ready to cross-examine the speaker. Typically, hand signals are used to let debaters know how much time they have left in cross-examination.

Preparation time may be requested by the debater who will be speaking next in the round. Debaters each have four minutes to use however they see fit. **Prep time used** is called out in 30 second intervals through the first two minutes then switches to calling out **prep time remaining** for the final two minutes. When the speaker rises, prep time is stopped and recorded on the flow sheet to help you keep track of how much prep time each debater has left through the debate. If the speaker rises but does not begin to speak, continue to charge their prep time.

NOTE: It is not uncommon for debaters to have their own timing devices. This may absolve you of the responsibility to give hand signals, but it does not release you from your obligation to officially keep track of time to make sure each debater gets a fair amount of time based on the rules. If your timekeeping and theirs disagree, yours trumps theirs.

BALLOT COMPLETION

To judge the round you must create a flow chart of the debate or “flow the debate.” Ballot writing is reserved until the round is completely done. So, you must keep good notes of the arguments made and responses to those arguments; this is why the “flow” is used. In a series of side-by-side columns (one for each speech in succession in the debate) you should note what arguments are made and what counterarguments are offered in response. Debaters should tell you which of their opponent’s arguments they are addressing at any given point so you know exactly where to “flow” their response. At the end of the debate you should have a good outline of the whole debate. At this point you are ready to complete your ballot. The ballot usually has two sections. The first section allows you to make comments on the speeches made by the debaters as well as the cross examinations. Tell them what they did well as well as areas in

Mark Hickman
West Chester University

Forensics Judge Training Packet

(For Individual Events and Lincoln-Douglas)

which you would like to see improvement. On the second part of the ballot you get to give your reasons for the judging decisions you make. It is up to you to make two judgments:

1. First, based on your understanding of speaker responsibilities, which debater won the debate and why. You should base this on your assessment of who won the necessary stock judging criteria discussed above. Remember, the negative speaker need only win one major issue to win the debate. Be explicit; debaters like to know the grounds on which they won or lost the round.
2. Second, independently of who won the debate, you need to assign each speaker points based on their communication and argumentation skills displayed in the round. This is done on a 30 point scale. 30 points is for a perfect performance. Giving below 15 points should be avoided unless the debater was abrasive or abusive. Unlike in individual events, it is possible to win a debate but have lower speaker points than one's opponent; this is called a low-point win. The ballot will usually have a box or a space to check to confirm that this is your intent as a judge.

If you need extra time to complete the details of your ballot, you should at least submit your decision on who won the round and speaker points awarded to the ballot table staff immediately upon completion of the round. This allows tabulation of results and pairings for later rounds to proceed without delay. Complete your ballot comments as soon as possible and return the fully completed ballot before the next debate round is scheduled to begin. Never take a ballot home with you to complete at a later time.

CONCLUSION

The information in this packet was intended to serve as a training primer for new coaches and judges who need a comprehensive guide to judging and managing rounds of competition in intercollegiate individual events (speech) and Lincoln-Douglas Debate. This packet has taken you through the entire process systematically, from arriving at the ballot table to pick up your ballots to submitting your ballots for verification and tabulation. My hope is that this document makes judging a much less daunting task for inexperienced and new judges. Ultimately, you must trust yourself and know that you will grow more comfortable with the process with experience. If there are questions you have that are not addressed here, please feel free to contact me, Mark Hickman, at 610-436-6942 or mhickman@wcupa.edu.

Happy judging!