



ORANGE COUNTY DEBATE LEAGUE

Judge Guide

A guide for judging in the OCDL

By David Anderson, Edited by Ben Hughes (updated November 2017)

Table of Contents

JUDGING OVERVIEW	4
STANDARD OF DEBATE PERFORMANCE	4
JUDGE DUTIES	5
REQUIREMENTS TO BECOME A JUDGE	5
JUDGE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	6
JUDGE LEVELS	6
Judge Trainee	6
Judge Candidate	6
Shadowing Process	6
Certified Judge	6
Senior Certified Judge	6
Judge Trainer	6
Head Judge	6
SHADOW JUDGE PROCESS	7
RULES OF THE DEBATE	8
20-MINUTE PREP TIME	8
SPEAKER DUTIES	8
1 ST PROPOSITION SPEAKER (CONSTRUCTIVE)	8
1 ST OPPOSITION SPEAKER (CONSTRUCTIVE)	8
2 ND PROPOSITION SPEAKER (CONSTRUCTIVE)	8
2 ND OPPOSITION SPEAKER (CONSTRUCTIVE)	8
OPPOSITION REBUTTAL	9
PROPOSITION REBUTTAL	9
NARROWING THE TOPIC	9
RULES FOR NARROWING	10
CHALLENGING THE NARROW	10
ASSERTION, REASONING, EVIDENCE, AND IMPACT (AREI)	11
POINTS OF INFORMATION (POI)	12
HECKLING	12
REFUTATION AND THE IMPORTANCE OF “CLASH”	13
DIRECT REFUTATION	13
4-STEP METHOD OF REFUTATION	13
ARGUMENT EXTENSION	14
USE OF EVIDENCE IN DEBATES	14
NEW ARGUMENTS	14
GUIDE TO JUDGING DEBATES	15
THE FINE ART OF JUDGING	15
WHAT TO BRING TO A DEBATE	16
TIMING A DEBATE	16

SPEAKER POINTS	17
60-69 POINT RANGE	17
70-79 POINT RANGE	17
80-89 POINT RANGE	17
90-100 POINT RANGE	17
FLOWCHARTING	18
SAMPLE FLOWCHART	19
OCDL RUBRIC	20
REFERENCES	22

Orange County Debate League

Judge Guide

It's all about Consistency and Fairness

Judging Overview

The Orange County Debate League (OCDL) prides itself on establishing a *fair and consistent* judging program. To maintain fair and consistent judging, all OCDL judges **must** participate in a mandatory training/shadowing program before being permitted to judge in any OCDL tournament.

Consistent judging can be a challenge, primarily because judges are human with different backgrounds and experiences. The league must balance the need for a well-trained set of consistent-scoring judges; while at the same time, keep in mind that league judges are volunteers comprised of teachers, coaches, parents, and students.

In an effort to aim for consistent scoring, the OCDL trains judges to follow the OCDL RUBRIC when allotting speaker points. In any life situation, the audience of a debater will be different depending upon the audience's personal background; therefore, debaters, coaches, and parents need to understand that some inconsistencies are bound to occur.

The goal of the debater is to convince the majority of people a majority of the times

Standard of Debate Performance

The RUBRIC is a standard of debate performance that the OCDL uses to narrow the scoring variance between judges. The league's goal is to have between a 5-10 point variance between judges. For example, if one student were to be judged by three different judges in the same debate, the OCDL expects that the scores for that student remain within the 5-10 point variance between the three judges, keeping in mind that a student's performance is likely to remain relatively consistent throughout the day of a *single* tournament.

Variations greater than 10 points are, in most cases, due to inconsistencies in the judge's interpretation of the debater's performance against the RUBRIC

Judge Duties

- Judges **must** write detailed and helpful information on ballots. Copy of all written ballots are provided to every coach after the tournament to assist student learning and assessment.
- OCDL rules *require judge certification*, comprehensive oral and written feedback, productive criticism to assist debater skill development, and accountability for decisions to a responsible tournament tabulation staff.
- Ballots may be recorded by tournament tabulation staff (win/loss and speaker points) and then RETURNED to judges to make additional comments if that is more convenient for judges, or if the tabulation staff determines that it is needed.
- Before the start of each tournament, all judges must meet with the Head Judge to review/refresh/update the rules of conduct/scoring in an OCDL tournament.
- Judges should be tolerant of conventions and practices (not rules, but behavior) that differ from their experience or expectations. For example, to reject a point of information, some students use a subtle gesture to 'wave down' opponents as they stand for a point of information. Other students give a verbal reply – "No, thank you." Either is acceptable.
- A judge may not be familiar with a practice but that is not a reason to penalize a student for 'unusual behavior.' It is, in fact, new behavior that innovates practice and promotes excellence.
- When judging a 2-person team, judges should give individual scores for each speech, resulting in 3 separate scores.

Requirements to Become a Judge

To become a certified judge in the OCDL, a person must meet the following criteria:

1. Be the proper age:
 - OCDL judges must be at least 16 years of age or high school sophomore **OR**
 - A former (speaker chart ranking¹) debater in the OCDL with *at least* two years of experience
2. Pass the OCDL judge certification process with a certification of *at least* "Certified Judge"
3. If a judge is in the system, that judge can judge any team from any school except his/her own school affiliation. It is not appropriate to say that one school's judges can never judge a different school's teams.
4. The Tournament Administrator will fairly accommodate a judge when he/she is affiliated with two or more schools.

¹ Speaker Chart Ranking: Placed in the top 20

Judge Certification Program

The judge certification program is created to ensure that all judges receive the proper training for judging in any of the league's debate tournaments.

Judge Levels

Only OCDL-certified judges are permitted to judge OCDL tournaments, unless approved by the Head Judge or OCDL President *in advance*. OCDL judges will be categorized into the following groups:

Judge Trainee

Newly registered judge not yet trained. At successful completion of the training, the *Judge Trainee* will automatically be promoted to *Judge Candidate*.

Judge Candidate

Has participated in the OCDL judge training class/workshop; i.e. has attended training but is not yet certified and **must** complete the shadowing process before certification.

Shadowing Process

- The *Judge Candidate* must shadow a *Judge Trainer* or *Head Judge* for a minimum of two (2) debate rounds.
- To become certified, the *Judge Candidate* must demonstrate consistent scoring with the debate judge across two debates within the same day tournament
- If the *Judge Candidate's* scores across two debates are not consistent with the scores of the debate judge, then the *Judge Candidate* must shadow another debate round.

Judge Candidates who received training on the day of a tournament shall not be permitted to judge during the *same* tournament. Only the Head Judge or President may approve exceptions to this rule

Certified Judge

Fully certified to judge independently in any OCDL tournament.

Senior Certified Judge

Certified to judge and shadow new judges.

Judge Trainer

Certified to judge, provide judge training, and shadow new judges.

Head Judge

Part of the administrative staff: The Head Judge is the **final authority** on any decisions related to judge scoring during a tournament. Since more than one tournament can be held at the same time, a Head Judge would be required at each event. If a qualified Head Judge is not available for a specific tournament, the OCDL President (or his/her designate) will act as the Head Judge. Other responsibilities for the Head Judge include maintaining the list of judges and their certification levels and co-managing the training needs for the league.

Shadow Judge Process

Judges that are certified to shadow new judges (Senior Certified Judge and higher) and who have been asked to shadow recently trained judges must follow the process below.

1. You will be asked by the Head Judge to shadow one or many Judge Candidates to help in completing their certification. There is no defined limit on the number of judges assigned to you; however, you have the right to control the number of judges assigned to you.
2. Arrive early to the debate room so that you can spend a few minutes with the judge candidates to explain the process, as follows:
 - a. Explain to the judges that they will participate “as-if” they are the real judge, by flowing the debate, and after the round is completed, decide on the winning team (and reasons why) and assign speaker points for all debaters.
 - b. The judge candidates *may not participate before and during the debate round*; i.e. you (judge in charge) is the only person that may interact with the students.
 - c. After the debate is over, the students (and their parents and friends) will be asked to leave the room when judge deliberations will start.
 - d. At this time, explain to the candidate judges that the first priority is to complete the deliberation process as quickly as possible, and therefore, no “shadowing related” questions or comments will be taken. This is so the ballot may get submitted to the Tournament Administrator as quickly as possible.
 - e. Once you have completed your deliberation, call in the students and *ask for a volunteer runner to take your ballot to the Tournament Administrator* (make sure to copy your scores onto your flow sheet). The point here is that shadowing discussions should only occur *after* the round has been completed and results submitted.
 - f. After you have provided your decision and speaker points to the debaters, you may announce to the debaters that you have shadowing judges in the room who, as part of their training, will provide one (1) minute of verbal feedback – **no scores from the candidate judges should be given to the debaters!** This will provide you with a chance to observe the candidate’s feedback style (i.e. do they provide encouragement along with the suggested improvements, etc.)
 - g. Ensure to let the debaters know that the comments provided by the candidate judges will, in no way, affect the decisions made by you.
 - h. After the debaters have left the room, you and the candidate judge(s) will spend a few minutes together to compare and contrast the results to determine whether the candidate judge “passes” the round.
3. The process for comparing your results to that of the candidate(s) is largely left up to you. Your objective is to determine whether the candidate judges’ scores are in alignment with your own (within 5-10 points).
4. Anything with a larger variance is an opportunity for the candidate judge to explain why they provided the score they did, and an opportunity for you to correct the variance.
5. An effective question to ask is “*What from the Rubric made you decide on your score?*”
6. More often than not, the large variance is caused due to the non-use of the Rubric or a misunderstanding of the Rubric’s meanings.
7. Once the shadowing is complete, sign their judge training form to indicate a pass or fail.

Rules of the Debate

20- minute Prep Time

Once the topic has been announced, the debaters have 20 minutes to prepare for the debate. Only notes handwritten on the specified paper color for the round may be used during the debate round. Judges need to understand the rules that apply during the 20-minute prep time:

- No published materials may be taken into the debate room
- No electronic devices shall be used during the 20-minute prep time or in the debate room
- Verbal coaching from individuals outside the debate team is acceptable; however, they shall not write any notes on behalf of the debater.
- No debater shall enter the debate room without a judge present.

Speaker Duties

The OCDL uses a modified parliamentary debate style. Each team is made up of three debaters (1st speaker, 2nd speaker, and rebuttal). The role for each debater is summarized below.

1st Proposition Speaker (Constructive)

- Makes a case for the motion-for-debate
- Provides assertions, reasoning, evidence, and impact (AREI) in support of the motion
- May offer a specific interpretation of the motion

Time: 5 minutes

1st Opposition Speaker (Constructive)

- Presents arguments against the case presented by the other team
- Uses direct and indirect refutation to undermine the case and show why the other side's position is wrong and dangerous

Time: 5 minutes

2nd Proposition Speaker (Constructive)

- Supports the case presented by the first proposition speaker
- Should answer all arguments made by the previous speaker
- Should bring in new ideas to bolster their side's position

Time: 5 minutes

2nd Opposition Speaker (Constructive)

- Extends upon partner's arguments against the case
- Continues to refute proposition's arguments
- Should bring in new ideas to bolster their side's position

Time: 5 minutes

Opposition Rebuttal

- Continues to refute proposition's major points
- Should explain how, given the arguments advanced in the debate, the opposition wins the debate

Time: 5 minutes

Proposition Rebuttal

- Refutes the arguments advanced and extended by the opposition side
- Extends partners' arguments
- Shows how, given the arguments advanced in the debate, the proposition wins the debate

Time: 5 minutes

Narrowing the Topic

The Proposition team may reasonably interpret/shrink/define the topic.

In the same way that the prosecution in a trial does not offer every possible way that the defendant might be guilty – “He did it with a gun, and a knife, and a bazooka, in the car, and the yacht, and the ballroom J”; the proposition team is not expected to offer *every possible* proof of the motion. The prosecution/proposition have the burden of proof; therefore, they are given the advantage for narrowing the topic.

Let's review a common debate example:

Topic: “Junk food in school should be banned”

In this topic, “*school*” is quite **broad** and involves people of all ages; therefore, it stands to reason that the topic is implicitly referring to the banning of junk food at schools with young children; i.e. not adults.

With this in mind, the proposition may decide to narrow the topic by defining “school” as those schools that enroll children less than the age 18 (i.e. high school, middle school, and elementary/pre-school).

Important: Once a narrow has been defined, the rest of the debate shall stay within the new definition of the topic (unless refuted). This means that from a judge's perspective, if the opposition team offers arguments/evidence outside the scope of the topic, the judge is directed to ignore it, as-if it was never stated. They are, in effect, out of order.

Rules for Narrowing

- Although there is no rule against it, only the 1st speaker of the proposition *should* narrow the topic, as the 1st speaker is typically responsible for introducing the topic, which includes the definition of the topic.
- The debater should make it clear that they are narrowing the topic by using the words similar to:
 - We narrow the topic to...
 - We further define/focus the topic as...
 - We define the topic 'as-is'; i.e. no narrowing of the topic
- If the proposition team does not narrow the topic, the opposition team has the opportunity to focus the topic in their favor
- If the proposition narrows the topic to 'as-is', the topic is considered 'narrowed' or defined and therefore, the opposition may not focus the topic in their favor
- The judge does **not** decide whether the narrow is "appropriate" during the debate round (remains silent). It is the debaters' responsibility to challenge (refute) the narrowing.

Narrowing Example:

Topic: LA is a much better place to live than NY

Proposition then narrows with: "We further define the topic as: 'The State of Louisiana (LA) is a much better place to live than the State of New York (NY)'"

Challenging the Narrow

In the narrowing example above, you may be thinking that this is an "unfair" narrowing (and you wouldn't necessarily be wrong); however, it is up to the debaters to "challenge (refute)" the narrow on their own.

How do the debaters know whether the challenge to the narrow was effective or not?

Since the judge does not inform the debaters of any success or failure of the challenge during the debate round, the debaters are taking a *calculated risk*. At the end of the debate, the judge will decide during deliberation whether they believe the challenge to the narrow was effective or not. If the judge decides that the narrow was not successfully refuted, then any arguments/evidence outside of the scope to the narrow shall be ignored.

Note: It is common for debate teams to get wrapped up in refuting the narrowed topic (on both sides) and can waste precious time, preventing them from completing their arguments during the time allotted. If this occurs, the judge should be sure to discuss it as part of the feedback to the students.

Assertion, Reasoning, Evidence, and Impact (AREI)

AREI is a formal way to form a complete argument and is comprised of four components:

ASSERTION: Assertion is a claim about the world, or a simple statement:

- “Homework should be banned.”
- “Poverty is harmful.”
- “The United Nations should be reformed.”

An assertion itself is **not** an argument. It has no support, and so by itself, it’s basically nothing other than a baseless claim.

REASONING: Reasoning is the “because” part of the argument. Reasoning is essential to making arguments:

- “Homework should be banned because it interferes with effective learning.”
- “Poverty is harmful because when families are poor, they cannot regularly feed their children.”
- “The United Nations should be reformed because it is not effective now.”

Adding reasoning to the assertion helps to make it an argument; however, it’s just an opinion and needs evidence to back the reasoning.

EVIDENCE: Evidence provides proof of your reasoning. The most common type of evidence is the example. So, for the arguments we’ve been looking at, we might say:

- “Homework should be banned because it interferes with effective learning. For example, students have to stay up late to finish their homework, and this makes them tired in class so they can’t pay attention.”
- “Poverty is harmful because when families are poor, they cannot regularly feed their children. For example, often poor families have to choose between paying their rent and buying food.”
- “The United Nations should be reformed because it is not effective now. For example, the U.N. is so disorganized that it cannot conduct effective peacekeeping operations, like the operation in Rwanda that failed because there weren’t enough troops and so many people died.”

IMPACT: Impact represents the “so what?” factor in an argument. How does your particular reasoning in your argument make any significant difference?

- “Homework has a direct correlation with the performance of students, and in if allowed to continue, GPA scores will most certainly be negatively affected.”
- “If we, as a people, ignore poverty conditions, we not only cause harm to the health of our citizens, but we will also lower our societal values that we hold so dear.”
- “If we do not place a priority on reforming the United Nations, future peacekeeping will be negatively impacted. Imagine a world without a governing body such as the United Nations to hold nations to higher standards?”

Points of Information (POI)

A point of information (POI) is a request to the speaker that holds the floor to yield some of their time (up to 15 seconds, give or take) to a question or comment from the opposing team. The POI is a critical element in the “game” of debate, as it is the POI that challenges an opposing speaker’s point(s) of view. Here are some guidelines for points of information:

- Students may make a non-verbal or verbal request. Nothing needs to be said by the student requesting the POI
- A student may make a verbal request by saying “Information” and may be made only once
- The speaker may decide to accept or reject POIs at the time they are requested
- Points of information are only allowed in the middle three minutes of the 5-minute “constructive” speeches (1st and 2nd speakers)
- There is no rule about how many should be offered, or how many must be taken
- Every debater should plan to accept and request POIs to receive higher scores
- Proficient debaters display control of the floor
- It is bad practice for a speaker to reject all points
- It is bad practice for the speaker to accept all points, if it means losing control of their speech
- Because points of information are considered to be part of the debate, the judge should take notes about them

Heckling

Heckling is permitted in middle school debates. Heckling, done well, improves debates by increasing interaction among participants and making the debate more dynamic.

- Only “*argumentative*” heckling is permitted and should be limited to 1-3 words
- Debaters may use positive heckles – they may, for example, knock on the table or say, “hear, hear” to signify their support for an argument made by the speaker
- Positive heckles should be done judiciously and used with care
- Debaters should avoid disruptive behavior during the debate. If debaters do behave in a disruptive manner, the judge may deduct speaker points from their total
- Debaters may also use negative heckles, although they should use them judiciously. They may, for example, say “shame” in a low voice to signify their strong feeling that a speaker has misrepresented one of their arguments
- Debaters should not use negative heckles when they simply disagree with a speaker; that’s why we have debates, after all J
- Audience members (except for public debates) are **not permitted** to heckle during the debate

Refutation and the Importance of “Clash”

Good debates are debates where there is an abundance of *clash* between arguments and opposing sides. It is **not** enough for debaters to simply deliver impassioned speeches about their side of a motion. *Debaters must also directly refute the arguments made by the other side and show why the balance of arguments means their side wins.*

Direct Refutation

Disputing the argument analysis or fact claims of the opening speaker is called **direct refutation**. For example, with the topic of “Junk food should be banned in schools”, an example argument that the proposition might say is:

Banning junk food in the schools will be an important step towards improving their health because students will eat healthier foods in their cafeterias.

An example of a direct refutation from the opposition might be:

Banning junk food will not solve the problem because students will just go off campus or to vending machines to get their sugary, high-fat snacks.

In this example, the opposition is providing a counter argument without including full reasoning for why the counter argument is better than the proposition’s argument.

4-Step Method of Refutation

A more effective refutation technique is called the 4-Step Method of Refutation. The OCDL coaches train debaters to use a simple four-step refutation process, as follows:

1. “They say...” (Briefly repeats the argument of the other side)
2. “But we disagree...” (Answers the argument of the other side)
3. “Because...” (Gives a reason for her disagreement or counterargument)
4. “Therefore....” (Explains what the consequence of winning this argument is)

The OCDL RUBRIC makes reference to both direct refutation and the 4-step method of refutation. The judge should be careful to differentiate between the uses of direct refutation vs. the 4-step method of refutation.

Without clash (active refutation), there is no “Debate” J

Argument Extension

The *twin* of refutation is argument extension. Argument extension is what happens in debates when subsequent speakers develop an argument. Argument extension occurs when the subsequent speaker extends the original argument by answering the objections to the argument and re-iterating the argument, possibly developing it through new examples.

- Debaters should extend the arguments made by their teammates
- In good debates, arguments grow through the process of extension – debaters answer the objections from the other side and use those objections as springboards to flesh out their side’s position
- Rebuttal speeches are also expected to extend the arguments made by their teammates

Use of Evidence in Debates

Evidence is *critical* to making a good argument. One of the skills taught to debaters is learning to use facts, examples, and other evidence to prove their points. This is an important skill because it teaches students to make informed arguments with good reasoning and grounding in facts and experience (i.e. not just their own opinion).

New Arguments

A new argument is an *entirely new line of reasoning without any foundation in the constructive speeches*. An entirely new argument made during the last proposition speech is unfair to the opposition team, as they do not have a subsequent opportunity to answer these arguments.

- If an argument has a foundation in the constructive speeches, it is not a new argument
- Only the constructive speeches (1st and 2nd speakers) are allowed to make new arguments
- If there is an argument introduced in one of the opening speeches of the debate, and that argument is abandoned until the rebuttal speeches, when it is brought up again, that is also considered a new argument

Note: If a new argument is presented in the rebuttal speech, the judge should take note of the newness of the argument, as it is delivered and do not let new arguments factor into the decision

Guide to Judging Debates

One of the things that distinguishes debate from simple argument is that in debate, you are trying to persuade a 3rd party – sometimes, many 3rd parties if there is a panel of judges or an extended audience.

- In competitive debates, the judge is the person who is responsible for deciding who wins and loses a debate
- The judge also assigns a range of points (60-100) to individual debaters
- After the debate, the judge tells the debaters how they voted and why they voted that way. *This includes verbally providing individual speaker points and constructive criticism*
- The judge also explains their decision on the paper ballot, provided by the tournament administrator
- **Ballots must be completed and handed in to the tournament administrator ASAP**
- Ballots are distributed to the participating teams and their coaches at the conclusion of the tournament, so PLEASE DO make detailed comments
- If you need to return the ballot before you've had a chance to provide detailed comments, then ask the tournament director to return the ballot to you once the scores have been recorded.

The Fine Art of Judging

It is important to remember that the team that wins the debate **may not always be the team that is “expected” to win**. Even world-class debate teams have critical slip-ups every now and again. You should try to be fair and judge each debate based on its own merits, rather than on speculation, past performances in debate rounds, or other factors.

- It **is** possible to have the higher speaker points awarded to the losing team
- In order to judge fairly, you need to keep a few things in mind:
 - Judges are a “blank slate”; i.e. it is up to the debaters to “catch” errors in logic or evidence.
 - It is up to the debaters to identify an error and challenge it. If the assertion goes unchallenged, the team that made that assertion “wins” that point

1+1 can, in fact, be equal to 3!

- Apply reciprocal standards for evaluating arguments
- Presume that the debaters are acting in good faith
- Be patient J
- Give debaters the benefit of the doubt about their choices
- **Do not pre-interpret the topic**

What to Bring to A Debate

- Paper and a pen
- A timing device
- You **MUST** “flow” the debate (see the section below on Flowcharting)
- Take good notes
- You are responsible for timing the debate; however, we recommend that you find someone to time for you. Parents, students, and children will often volunteer to time for you

Timing a Debate

- “Constructive” speech’s first and last minute are in “Protected” time.
- Protected time is when no interruption of the speaker is permitted
- The full five minutes in the Rebuttals are in protected time**

During protected time, no POI’s are permitted

- The best way to signal the end of “protected time” (when the first minutes has elapsed) is to slap the table in an audible fashion so that debaters know they can now attempt points of information
- Similarly, you should slap the table when the last minute of the constructive has begun so that debaters know any points of information will be out of order

The easiest way to give time signals is with your hands:

- With 30 seconds remaining, hold up you hand and form a “C”
- With 10 seconds remaining, use your 10 fingers to count down the remaining time
- When time is up, hold up a fist to show that the debater should stop talking

Speaker Points

In addition to deciding the winners of the debate, you will have to fill out your ballot and assign points to the individual debaters. Speaker points are a measure of performance by individual debaters. Most tournaments give speaker awards, which are trophies given to individuals based on their aggregate point accumulation during the course of a tournament. You **must** rank the debaters on a 100-point scale, using the **RUBRIC** as your guide.

The total number of points does not decide which team wins the debate!

We ask that you rank students within the range of **60-100 points**. The RUBRIC will be your guide and must ALWAYS be used. Use the following *guidelines* to interpret the RUBRIC:

60-69 Point Range

A score between 60-69 *typically* means that the debater is **new to debate**; factors include:

- Debater did not make use of their full time (1 or 2 minutes)
- AREI is incomplete, usually with assertion with little or no reasoning present
- Incomplete refutation, typically stating their own facts but cannot be challenged
- Nervous speaker, reads off their notes, and not engaged in clash

Note: Although scores in this range are typically given to new debaters, it does not mean that a more experienced debater will never be scored in this range. The score is based on how the debater *actually* performs, and is measured against the RUBRIC.

70-79 Point Range

A score between 70-79 *typically* represents an *average* debater; factors include:

- Most (if not all) of the time is used
- Some AREI and refutation is used but is not consistently applied
- Evidence and Impact are typically “weaker”, where sources are simple references to a website or using one’s own experience (impromptu debates are the exception)
- Impact is absent in many cases
- Not all arguments have been refuted

80-89 Point Range

A score between 80-89 *typically* represents an *above average* debater; factors include:

- Full command of AREI and Refutation**
- Well delivered speech – articulate, impactful, etc.
- Active in the debate with POI activity, etc.
- Refutes most, if not all opposition arguments effectively

90-100 Point Range

A score between 90-100 *typically* represents an *exceptional* debater; factors include:

- All parts of the debates (AREI, Refutation, etc.) are executed brilliantly
- The “Wow!” factor is clearly present
- A very enjoyable experience listening to (and watching) this debater!

Flowcharting

Taking notes in a debate is called “flowing a debate.” A flow sheet is divided into columns, where each column is labeled for a speech (1st proposition speaker, etc.) Students and judges use each column to keep track of arguments made in that speech.

Example:

Let’s say that the proposition team makes a brief case for student uniforms. They might advance three basic arguments:

- Cost. Many students can’t afford to look sharp every day for school, and students get embarrassed if they don’t have the latest fashions
- Uniforms aren’t as distracting, and will help students focus on their classwork, not their clothes
- Uniforms reduce violence, because students can’t wear gang clothes or gang symbols

The judge should write down these three points in the respective column. When flowing a second speaker or rebuttal, draw lines from the rebuttal argument that matches the respective argument made by the opposing speaker, thus creating a “visual flow” of the debate.

Note: It is highly recommended to use the bottom portion of the flowchart page to make “speaker point notes” that will help you to remember some key aspects of the speaker’s performance (ex: Ums, Clear speaker, speak louder, etc.)

An example flowchart is provided in the next page.

Sample Flowchart

First Proposition Constructive	First Opposition Constructive	Second Proposition Constructive	Second Opposition Constructive / Opposition Rebuttal	Proposition Rebuttal
<p>Boxing = legalized attack of a person (knock out)</p> <p>1. Boxing has a violent goal, unlike other sports ex: cornucopshits ex: football does not have this</p> <p>2. Injury / bad health ex: Parkinsons ex: second-impact syn.</p> <p>[Why does boxing thrive?] ↳ popularity has gone down ex: Norway / Sweden banned boxing</p> <p>3. Illegal in real life ex: arrested for boxing on the street</p> <p>4. Scotland's death safety didn't help ↳ Ben = less death, violence injury stop brain washing, barbarity</p>	<p>Boxing is well-respected</p> <p>2. other sports have subcon serious violence ex: football / hockey tackle / check</p> <p>[No one has in boxing?] ↳ Yes, there are rules, Don't punch in the gut, There are rules and medals</p> <p>3. Old boxers retire, promote good health [Shouldn't we teach words?] ↳ Fishers shake hands after a match</p> <p>4. Don't know much abt banned sports ex: children ab boxing box</p> <p>5. Every sport can have illegal aspects on the street ex: football tackle</p> <p>6. Scotland was a here ex: Ellen Salkers</p>	<p>1. Stop pressure of children boxing</p> <p>2. Sports II, found boxers are most exploited, most injured</p> <p>3. Scotland's death, other than this are bad</p> <p>4. Boxing wouldn't be strong on the street, theoretical, people see it on TV and do it outside of the ring ↳ Traditions aren't always good, sliver</p> <p>[Understand = more death] ↳ Who can we show that Ben it, still a decision</p> <p>5. ↓ crime ex: Illegal gambling violence [Is it about violent?] ↳ irrelevant, boxing causes harm. [Boxing isn't barbaric, it's civilized] ↳ Death ↳ Means of killing death in boxing, from damage exist</p>	<p>1. We should ban wrestling instead ↳ Wrestling is irrelevant ↳ Global take is irrelevant</p> <p>2. Underground boxing → more death, injury, gambling [Drugs are still illegal] ↳ No safe way to do drugs, there is safe boxing</p> <p>[Gladifiers were bad]. ↳ Gladifiers were in Roman times, slaves</p> <p>3. Take honor out of boxing, murders [It's illegal on the street] ↳ Negativ and medias make it's age</p> <p>[Medics don't help] ↳ Better some than none ↳ Billion dollar empire</p> <p>4. Less jobs, more violence, more death ↳ Understood → death no safety, no matter ↳ They cause more harm</p> <p>2. No more safety ↳ Guarantee safety, can't force this / Court crime, legalize murder other sports have violence</p> <p>5. Wrestling is staged ↳ Boxing is fight / guaranteed ↳ regulated / safe</p>	<p>1. Boxing has a more dangerous goal than other sports ex: soccer</p> <p>2. Scotland / AI must not happen again</p> <p>3. Understood does not mean we shouldn't legalize</p> <p>4. Less crime in Norway / Sweden due to ban</p> <p>5. Children should not follow boxer fathers ↳ better life</p> <p>6. Less death / better life</p> <p>7. Barbaric → slanders</p> <p>8. Less crime, death, Norway / Sweden</p> <p>9. Deped!</p> <p>↳ Scotland's death, not more!</p>

References

The best place to learn more about the middle school debate program is by visiting the OCDL website (<http://orangecountydebateleague.com>) or the Middle School Public Debate Program (MSPDP) website (<http://middleschooldebate.com>). The Orange County Debate League's rules are based from the MSPDP program; therefore, any discrepancies between the rules of the OCDL and MSPDP, unless specifically noted, the rules of MSPDP take precedence.

There is a resource section on the OCDL and MSPDP websites, where you can find all the teaching and judging resources you need.

Credits: *Much of this guide was created by using information taken from the MSPDP website*