

Public Forum Judge Training and Certification

Resolutions for Remainder of Season

Nov/Dec 2021: Resolved: Increased United States federal regulation of cryptocurrency transactions and/or assets will produce more benefits than harms.

Jan 2022: Resolved: The United States federal government should legalize all illicit drugs

Public Forum Debate Judge Certification

- Understand the order of speeches in a round
- Understand the role and responsibility of the judge in deciding the round and completing a ballot
- Understand how to evaluate evidence allegations and other issues that arise during a round*.

*Many other issues are covered in the intro to judging presentation.

Introduction

- Every round begins with a coin toss
- Winner picks either speaking order or side, loser makes the remaining choice.
- The resolution changes during the season.
 - (Sept/Oct, Nov/Dec, January).
- The Pro has the responsibility to prove the resolution true.
- The Con has the responsibility to prove the resolution false.

Speech order

- Speaker 1 Constructive, 4 minutes
- Speaker 2 Constructive, 4 minutes
- Speaker 1 and 2 Crossfire, 3 minutes
- Speaker 3 Rebuttal, 4 minutes
- Speaker 4 Rebuttal, 4 minutes
- Speaker 3 and 4 Crossfire 3 Minutes
- Speaker 1 Summary, 3 minutes
- Speaker 2 Summary, 3 minutes
- Grand Crossfire (All debaters), 3 minutes
- Speaker 3 Final Focus, 2 minutes
- Speaker 4 Final focus, 2 minutes

Overview of the Round

- Every debater will give 2 speeches and participate in 2 crossfires.
- Constructive (4 minutes)
 - Introduce contention arguments
 - Use evidence to support their claims. Authors and dates are expected.
 - Argue a framework/observation
- Crossfire (3 minutes)
 - Debaters take turns asking and answering questions that:
 - Seek clarification
 - Compare/contrast arguments/evidence

Overview of the Round continued

- Rebuttal
 - Make attacks against opponents case
 - Respond to attacks from the other team
 - Clear up issues raised in crossfire.
- Summary
 - No new arguments may be made. New evidence may be read.
 - Starts to narrow the debate to a few key issues.
 - Teams may elect to leave behind arguments they deem less important
 - Continues to respond to attacks
- Final Focus
 - Brings the debate to a close by providing key reasons the judge should vote for their team
 - New evidence is uncommon, new arguments/responses are not allowed.
 - May provide voters or compare/contrast Pro/Con worlds.

Role of the Judge

- Listen objectively to the debate
 - We all have opinions, they stay at the door
- Do not intervene in the round*
 - Don't make arguments for the debaters
 - Don't interrupt speakers, unless their time has elapsed
 - The only time a judge intervenes during the round is in the case of a formal evidence allegation. If that happens, follow the appropriate process.
- Flow (take notes on) the arguments presented by each side
- Keep accurate track of speech and prep time
 - Each team gets 4 minutes total per round. This time can be used before any of their speeches. The time can be divided up before multiple speeches, so long as the total time does not exceed four minutes.
- Disclose your decision at the end of the round after submitting your ballot.

When to Recuse Yourself...

There might be times that you cannot objectively evaluate a debate round. If that happens, it's important the tab room is notified ASAP, and a different judge be placed into the round. Here are some examples of when a judge should recuse themselves. This is not an exhaustive list, if you are unsure, please ask! **If you know you shouldn't judge a particular student or school, please tell the coach hiring you or the tournament director before the tournament begins.**

- You are alumni of the school and graduated in the last 4 years (so, you were a senior when current seniors were a freshmen).
- You are currently or have had a romantic relationship with a competitor.
- A competitor has asked you out romantically at any point in the past.
- You personally know the competitor from any aspect of life (family, friends, neighbors, debate camp, etc.)
 - This includes being a coach for a different activity the student is a part of. For example, if you also coach swim and the student is on the swim team, you should not judge them.
- You have helped coach the student in any way this year in a practice/outside of a tournament setting. For example, the student shares their case with you for you to review and provide feedback beyond what would typically occur in a post-round oral critique.
- You regularly interact with the competitor when at tournaments, traveling to tournaments, etc. This includes driving competitors to tournaments.
- You feel you cannot evaluate the round objectively or avoid any appearance of impropriety.

Flowing Suggestions

- Have one piece of paper per side. Could have two different colored sheets of paper so each side is different.
- Use unlined paper. Our brains subconsciously want to fit within the lines, so unlined paper can be helpful. You can also get bigger paper if you want.
- Use two colors-one color ink for affirmative, one for negative
- Have one column per speech, so you'll end up with five columns.
- Use shorthand/abbreviations that make sense to you as much as possible-saves time and space.
 - Goal is to write down author/year and notes about the argument (e.g. the tag or other notes that pop out to you).
 - If you miss the citation, you can give yourself a visual indication it was evidence (like an empty circle) by the argument notes. This helps you to remember what was supported by an author versus an analytical argument.

Virtual Debate

Tech Time:

Each SIDE gets 15 minutes of tech time. This is time to restart computers, address internet issues, etc. This time should be devoted only to fixing the tech issues NOT working on their arguments. Once a side has reached 10 minutes of tech time used, please notify the tabroom.

If a student is not in the virtual competition by the round start time, please notify the tabroom immediately. This also counts as the start of their tech time.

Other Rules:

Students do not need to have cameras on. Everyone should be muted unless when speaking. Ideally, judges should have their camera on during round.

Evidence

- Tag: Brief summary of the evidence. A debater writes this, so it could be exaggerated
- Citation: Debater only has to read author and year, but should have a full citation)
- Evidence: Actual quote from written literature.
 - Don't have to read every word but can't change the author's intended message. Kids will typically read whatever is underlined, bolded, or highlighted. Often whatever is not read will be a small font size.
 - Only what is physically said counts, they can't argue any claims or warrants that they didn't read it.
 - **Claim:** Argument author is making
 - **Warrant:** Why that claim is true/believable

STEM education is low now – millions don't have access

Randazzo 5/10/17 (Matthew Randazzo - Opinion contributor to US News, chief executive officer of the National Math and Science Initiative – “Students Shouldn't Live in STEM Deserts” – 5/10/17 - <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-bank/articles/2017-05-10/the-us-must-address-disparities-in-access-to-stem-education>)/TK

E
v
i
d
e
n
c
e

More than ever, a high-quality math and science education is the foundation for opportunity. By 2020, almost two-thirds of all jobs will require post-secondary education or training – education that is supported by the critical thinking and problem-solving skills learned in math and science. In the same period, almost as many jobs will require basic literacy in science, technology, engineering and math. ¶ Yet, we as a nation continue with a familiar pattern in which access to high-quality STEM learning is unevenly distributed. Millions of students across the country live in what we call STEM deserts – school communities without access to rigorous and engaging math and science courses. ¶ Lack of STEM access is a critical equity issue in education, particularly for students in urban and rural communities, where access to high-level math and science courses is often out of reach. Soon, the impact of students living in STEM deserts will not only be reflected in those students' high school and college competition rates, but will also take a toll on the country's technological superiority, its economy and national security.

Completing The Ballot

- Ballots are completed either online or on paper.
- Write specific comments for each speaker
- Write a complete Reason For Decision (RFD)
 - Must contain the argument(s) you are voting on and why you were persuaded by that side.
 - Referencing evidence is not required but helpful to both teams
- Oral critiques of your decision aren't required. If you choose to offer the teams comments after the round, you must submit your ballot first so the tournament can proceed. These comments should be supportive and constructive to the students. Remember to include positive things too!

Speaker Points

- Speaker points are points given to each student, reflecting how well they as an individual performed in the round.
- Higher points means the student did well. So, the #1 speaker in the round should have the highest points.
- You might have a situation where the student who spoke better still lost the round on the arguments. This is ok, it is called a low point win.
- Speaker points can be given in .5 increments. So, someone could have 28.5 speaker points.
- When giving speaker points, here are some things judge may think of. Please note, this is not a required list to consider. It is meant as a tool for those who may not know where to start for speaker points.
 - Time allocation in speeches
 - Organization
 - Analysis
 - Effective use of cross-ex time
 - Use of evidence to support their claims
 - Refutation of opponent's arguments

Paperless Debating

- One or both teams may opt to use a computer instead of paper.
- Teams have the responsibility to share their evidence with the other team by doing one of the following:
 - Offering a viewing computer to the opposite team.
 - Sharing their evidence via flash drive, email chain, etc.
- If a team refuses to share the evidence they read, the opposing team may make an allegation of nonexistent evidence. Evaluate that allegation as you would any other one.

Wireless Use

- In the Fall of 2018 the WDCA clarified the rules for wireless connectivity.
- Teams may access files online during the round.
- They may not receive assistance from anyone else (text, email, etc.) during the round.
- Judges may not alter this rule based on their personal preferences.

Evidence Allegations

Evidence is any statistic, idea, conclusion, etc., that is attributed to someone besides the debater. Debaters must, at a minimum, give the author's last name and date in a round. Full written citations must be available and presented if requested. A written citation must include but is not limited to: Full name of the primary author(s) & qualifications, Publication Date, Source Title, Date accessed (if digital) Full URL, Page number(s). These standards apply to evidence that is paraphrased as well.

Types of Violations A. Distortion: debater adds or deletes words that alter the author's intended message (e.g. removing the word "not") B. Nonexistent evidence is when: a. The debater can't or won't produce it when requested by the opposing team or judge. The time required to find the evidence is not counted as prep time and should not be excessive. b. The source provided does not contain the evidence cited. c. The evidence lacks an original source to verify the information. d. The debater fails to present a full citation when requested. C. Clipping. When a debater claims to have read more of a piece of evidence than was actually read in the round. D. Straw Argument. Intentionally reading evidence that argues a position that the author(s) presents for the purpose of refuting it, while, in fact, advocating for a different position.

Penalties The penalty for an evidence violation is loss of the round. In the case of a Straw Argument (referenced above), the judge must disregard the evidence presented, however the offending team does not forfeit the round and the judge renders a decision like the evidence wasn't read.

Formal Allegation A team may make a formal allegation of an evidence violation during any of their speeches by clearly telling the judge(s) that they are making an allegation and state the specific violation(s) they believe the other team to be guilty of.

Judges should: Stop the round after a formal allegation is made. If a judge is not sure if a formal allegation is being made, the judge can ask once it's it formal or an analytic argument (as losing a formal allegation could cost the accuser the round). If it is an analytic argument against a piece of evidence, the round should continue and the judge should evaluate this point like any other argument made in the round.

After verifying that a formal allegation is being made, the judge must stop the round and examine the evidence in question. At this point, there is no more debating in that round. If the judge determines that the allegation is legitimate and a violation has occurred, the team committing the violation receives a loss by forfeit. If the judge determines that the allegation is not legitimate and no violation has occurred, the team making the allegation receives a loss by forfeit. Either way, after rendering a decision on the ballot, the judge must inform both teams of the decision as well as the WSDT Director.

Evidence Violation Procedures

Evidence read in a round must be available to the opposing team and judge to verify its content, accuracy, etc. Debaters must, at a minimum, read the author and date when introducing evidence but must have a complete citation available upon request. From time to time, debaters might make an allegation of a violation of the WDCA evidence guidelines. This guide's purpose is to help the judge navigate those allegations in accordance with the WDCA Standing Rules. Judges, coaches, and debaters are encouraged to read the entire rule at WDCA.org.

The team making the allegation needs to identify which type of violation they are alleging (distortion, non-existent evidence, clipping, straw argument). Judges are permitted to list the types of allegations.

- a. Distortion occurs when the evidence contains added and/or deleted words that substantially alter the original conclusions of the author(s).
- b. Non-existent evidence is one or more of the following:
 - i. The debater citing the evidence is unable to produce it when requested by the opposing team, judge, or tournament official.
 - ii. The source provided does not contain the evidence cited.
 - iii. The evidence is referenced parenthetically but lacks an original source to verify the information. This happens frequently in LD and PF where a debater paraphrases evidence without reading a direct quote.
 - iv. The debater has the original source but refuses to provide it to their opponent, the judge, or a tournament official, in a timely fashion.
 - v. The debater fails to present a full citation when requested.
- c. Clipping. When a debater claims to have read more of a piece of evidence than was actually read in the round.
- d. Straw Argument. Intentionally reading evidence that argues a position that the primary author(s) presents for the purpose of refuting it, while, in fact, advocating for a different position.

Here are the procedures to follow: (A flow chart to help is on the back)

When a team makes an allegation, stop and ask them if they are making a formal allegation (Yes, you get to talk to the team). If they say they are, stop the round. There won't be any more speeches. Listen to the allegation and be certain you know which piece of evidence is in question and what kind of allegation is being alleged. If they aren't, evaluate their assessment of the evidence the same way you evaluate any other argument in the round.

Evaluate the allegation. It's your job to either uphold the allegation or not. If you uphold the allegation, the accusing team wins the round. If you do not uphold the allegation the accused team wins the round. Tell the debaters your decision and come to the tabroom and tell them about the allegation and your decision. If you are balloting online, don't complete your ballot. The tab staff will do that. You and/or the debaters are allowed to go online to check an online source, e.g. a web page.

