

## **Speaker Point Scale**

Judges must follow the speaker point scale, regardless of what they are used to or may prefer, so that there is a fair standard across all rounds. Plus, if we have a standard, points provide meaningful feedback instead of being arbitrary and useless! The other thing to keep in mind with regard to speaker points, is that **you can tie teams, giving them all the same points, or giving two or three speakers the same points.**

**30:** I wish I could frame your speeches – hard to imagine a better speaker

**29.0-29.5:** you left no doubt about who won and are an excellent speaker

**28.0-28.5:** you were effective and strategic, and made only minor mistakes

**27.5:** you hit all the right notes, but could improve (e.g. depth or efficiency)

**27.0:** you mainly did the right thing, but left something to be desired

**26.5:** you missed major things and were hard to follow

**26.0:** you advanced little in the debate or cost your team the round

**25.0-25.5:** you are not ready for this division/tournament

**Below 25:** you were offensive, ignorant, rude, or tried to cheat (MUST come to tab)

**\*Low-point wins (where the winning team has fewer points than the losing team) are allowed.**

**\*Remember that Varsity students and Novice students do not speak the same, so you should not hold novices to the same standards as Varsity.**

### **Other things to remember when filling out a ballot:**

-Crossfire is not a way to determine who wins a round. If something important happens in crossfire, it has to be brought up in a speech to be a reason to affirm or negate.

-Pick a contention that has won the round based on how students respond to it or don't respond to it. Explain why the winning team has persuaded you on that contention.

-Some students will collapse on an argument (choose one of their contentions) in summary. That is a strategic choice, and they want you to vote on that contention on their side of the flow. It is not a reason to penalize them for having less arguments on the flow.

-If you are judging novices, please do not give them speaker points below a 26, and if you give low speaker points, please explain why you did.

**Sample Ballots on:**

**Resolved: The United States federal government should legalize all illicit drugs.**

My main voting issues were prison sentences for non-violent offenses and cartel violence. PRO won on both counts as CON did little to refute their case and provided no evidence to do so beyond the vague reasoning that lack of full solvency on the issues in a PRO world means that it's not worth trying to do anything. PRO effectively refuted this point as fallacious in their summary. Thus, these major wedge issues flowed through the debate for PRO.

Going forward, I would recommend that the CON team spend less speaking and crossfire time telling me how I should judge/diagnosing the problems with debate as an activity, and more time convincing me to actually vote for you in this round on the substantive issues pertaining to the resolution. Also, you always need empirical evidence when you're making an empirical claim.

RFD: overall I thought both teams did a good job weighing and pointing out where there was clash. I do not buy the idea that decriminalization leads to legalization. I think they are separate things which is something that the con also extends throughout the case. I think con first voter is weak but it flows through. I also think that opioid deaths as an all-time high was not the most persuasive way to consolidate the arg about less deaths, but it does get flowed through and gives offense. The pro wins the human trafficking arg and extends it across the flow, but con also links in summary speech.

a note for con: a lot was dropped in your final two speeches that could have given you guys a lot of offense the whole econ angle specifically. maybe you extended but I just got a lot of debate abt decriminalization vs legalization so the focus was unclear in the last two speeches.

A note for pro: even if pro won all of its impacts off the contention level, I do not think that the scope of people who will mitigate HIV because of clean needles is a strong arg that will get you much offense when weighing. I did not think of the arg like this when evaluating round just thought I should mention in case you have another tournament. I also think having Portugal/ switz just gets you in a rabbit hole and now all of a sudden you have the burden of doing more work to make a distinction abt decriminalization and legalization which is not fair.

RFD: I vote for the PRO team in this round. I vote for them on their first contention on the war on drugs. The con team does not respond to the argument about racial disparities in incarceration in the rebuttal. The pro team tells me that 80% of drug related arrests affect black or latinos and that

we should reverse war on drugs policy to reverse racism. I needed the con team to develop defense on this argument and to pick up offense on cartels by explicitly explaining the ramifications of making cartels desperate, and then to also argue why the magnitude of e.g. human trafficking is more important than scope of reducing cartel influence in order to win the round.

Feedback for everyone:

- \* Set up weighing in rebuttals, and definitely weigh more throughout the back half of the round
- \* Make quality extensions of warranting/evidence
- \* Impacts are typically a number and a talking point. You need to talk about them more when you weigh. To make it easier on yourselves, you can use a common framework like deontology or utilitarianism which suits your case.

IMSA LG: I think your next step is to implement overviews and frameworks that compel me to vote with a certain preference of impacts. Also, I would recommend that you add more historical context to your first contention about the war on drugs so you can make a compelling case for that the USFG really messed up and needs to change.

Sandburg SP: You guys are good speakers, but you need to use evidence and warranting which more directly connects to your opponents case when you go line-by-line in the rebuttal.

RFD: I voted CON in this round for the following reasons: 1) CON's point of the direct effects of lobbying on regulation and the lack thereof went unaddressed throughout the round. The attacks made against it were towards small businesses but did not adequately address the impacts and the access to them. 2) The empirical difference between decriminalization and legalization creates a stark difference in the impacts. PRO was arguing off of evidence that was brought from decriminalization, not legalization. 3) PRO lost direct access to their impacts due to CON proving structural violence being worse in the PRO world. The systemic nature of police violence on marginalized folx was proven to not be dependent on specific laws, but rather their ability to find reasons to commit the same acts they are already making. The added point that financially, the police would see the same money that is supposed to be redirected to social programs coming back to them through taxes.

Anna (she/her): Great first speech! You were very poised at the podium and did a great job of conveying your impacts. Where I would offer constructive: Your contention is incredible in theory, however, your access to your impacts is fundamentally weak. Especially in terms of a systemic oppressive cycle, it is hard to establish a guarantee that legalizing drugs would directly lead to a defunding of police. As nice of an idea that is, future opponents could point out that the police have

gone through extensive defunding and reforming cases that ultimately did not impact their ability to perpetrate racist systems of power. I think where there needs to be more evidence and argumentation is in the link of reinvesting this money into social programs. That qualifies a lot of impacts and the access to them, but there is not evidence that this will actually happen.

Ella (she/her): Loved your first speech! Your delivery was incredibly smooth and gave great emphasis on your impact analysis which was really nice to see on the flow. Where I would offer constructive case wise: Your first contention is extremely strong, but I think in concept, your 2nd contention is weak. In your development of your argument, I see the importance come out, but I think your case can be strengthened. There is a card I've heard that would pair really nicely with your first contention, essentially it says that illicit drug legalization would follow alcohol and tobacco models, which would go really well with your statistics on those addictions being perpetuated through their legal status.

Noa (she/her): That was an amazing rebuttal!! I really loved your ability to go down the flow in a smooth and efficient manner. I think you took a really niche counter argument with small businesses. Although this may be true but on an impact analysis, lobbying and the inefficient regulation of such has a much higher magnitude and scope and I think that needed to be directly addressed.

Gabe (he/him): That rebuttal was absolutely phenomenal. Where I would offer constructive: Ask for the relativity of how much money will be gone. They cite 1.6 billion dollars, but its important that you put that into context and there were very plausible attacks to be made off that. The more critical link that I wish you addressed was the lack of practicality of this money being reallocated to the right places. Historically that has not been done and there isn't much evidence saying it will. But i think you did a great job in addressing the systemic nature of this oppression and how the root cause will persist even without the specific drug laws being addressed.

RFD: PRO wins this debate on two points. First, PRO effectively argues that opioids like Fentanyl are being used today...but because people don't know the potency they are more at risk...with regulation...you can also regulate the potency. This was a fairly compelling argument that I don't feel the CON had a good response for beyond arguing that they can't access this because drug use will increase in a PRO world...so they don't get to access any of their opioid impacts...this may actually be true...but if that is the case, then CON should have spent more time flushing out whether usage will actually increase. Second issue that I believe flows to PRO is violence...PRO argues that 50% of violent crimes are drug related...and only CON response was that gun violence has nothing to do with drugs...but the PRO card linked that in the opening remarks. For CON...I don't really have any offense left at the end of the round to vote on because I think PRO effectively dismantled your date rate claim...and did so by using your evidence against you.