

BQCFL Congress/Debate Judge Guide

12/14/2024 at Berkeley Carroll

<u>Topics</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- PF topic: “Resolved: The US Should accede to the Rome Statute of the ICC”- LD Topic: “Resolved: The United States ought to become party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and/or the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.”- Congress Legislation Packet	<u>Tab Room Contacts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The Tab Room is located in the Social Studies Office, at the end of the 1st Floor West Hallway For any issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- WK Kay: 917-533-9590 (text only)- Kieran Larkin: 718-755-3792 (text or call)- Equity Concern Reporting Form
---	---

Overview

Thank you so much for volunteering your time to judge this weekend, as our tournament literally could not run without you!

We will be running 3 preliminary PF rounds and 2 preliminary sessions of Congress. Elims will be run in Varsity debate events as needed, depending on the number of entries, and there will be a Super Session of Congress. In order to run such a tight schedule, we need a few things from you:

- ***Please stay in the judges’ lounge if you are not judging a round:*** we may need to pull you into a round if a judge we paired in is unavailable, and we may even need you to judge an event different from the one(s) you signed up to judge. Please be in the lounge so we can find you and plug you into rounds.
- ***All judges must submit ballots immediately after their round ends:*** you can edit and submit feedback right up until the end of the tournament, but decisions and ranks need to be submitted ASAP after the round ends. Do not disclose the round’s result to students, and do not give verbal feedback after the round beyond “Great job and good luck!”. There is plenty of room for feedback on your ballot.

Important Reminders:

- **Silence all devices before a round starts**
- Please keep official time in PF rounds, even if students are timing themselves. Congress will be timed by the Presiding Officer.
- All ballots are online ballots. Speak to WK or another member of the tab staff after the morning judges’ meeting if you’re not sure how to access your online ballots
- We recommend taking your notes in a separate document (e.g. Google Doc or Notes app), then copy and paste your notes into Tabroom later. This will ensure that you don’t lose your feedback

Debate: Format and Speeches

Public Forum

3 min. of prep time per side

- **Pro 1st Speaker (Constructive): 4 min.**
 - States Pro's main arguments
- **Con 1st Speaker (Constructive): 4 min.**
 - States Con's main arguments and may begin to respond to Pro's
- **First Crossfire: 3 min.**
 - Both side's first speakers ask each other questions. Pro gets the first question
- **Pro 2nd Speaker (Rebuttal): 4 min.**
 - Pro refutes Con's main arguments and defends their own; may begin to frame the main points of clash
- **Con 2nd Speaker (Rebuttal): 4 min.**
 - Con refutes Pro's main arguments and defends their own; may begin to frame the main points of clash
- **Second Crossfire: 3 min.**
 - Both side's first speakers ask each other questions. Pro gets the first question.
- **Pro 1st Speaker (Summary): 3 min.**
 - Does some more refutation, mainly outlines major points of clash in the round and summarizes how Pro won them
- **Con 1st Speaker (Summary): 3 min.**
 - Does some more refutation, mainly outlines major points of clash in the round and summarizes how Con won them
- **Grand Crossfire: 3 min.**
 - All four speakers ask questions back and forth. Pro gets the first question.
- **Pro 2nd Speaker (Final Focus): 2 min.**
 - Crystalizes the debate and writes your RFD for the Pro side. NO NEW ARGUMENTS OR RESPONSES CAN BE MADE IN THIS SPEECH
- **Con 2nd Speaker (Final Focus): 2 min.**
 - Crystalizes the debate and writes your RFD for the Con side. NO NEW ARGUMENTS OR RESPONSES CAN BE MADE IN THIS SPEECH

Lincoln-Douglas

4 min. of prep time per side

- **Affirmative 1st Speech (AC): 6 min.**
 - States Aff's main arguments
- **Cross Examination: 3 min.**
 - Neg asks Aff questions
- **Negative 1st Speech (NC/1NR): 7 min.**
 - States Neg's main arguments and usually begins to refute Aff's
- **Cross Examination: 3 min.**
 - Aff asks Neg questions
- **Affirmative 2nd Speech(1AR): 4 min.**
 - Aff responds to Neg's case and defends their own
- **Negative 2nd Speech (NR): 6 min.**
 - Neg further responds to Aff's case and defends their own, and summarizes the round for the judge. New evidence/arguments frowned upon because 2AR has minimal time to respond.
- **Affirmative 3rd Speech (2AR): 3 min**
 - Aff addresses the arguments of the previous speech and summarizes the round for the judge. No new evidence or arguments since Neg cannot respond.

What should my ballots look like?

In addition to logging your Reason For Decision (RFD), which will be visible to all students who participated in the round and their coaches, tabroom.com will also give you tabs to include feedback specifically for each team, which only they and their coaches can see.

A Good Ballot

A Ballot That Needs Improvement

<p>RFD</p> <p>Neg prevails because they argued that the U.S.'s surplus resources can help other nations seemed truer than that the U.S. would tend to give away resources that would help its own citizens.</p> <p>Much of the debate focused on vaccines, with competing fact claims about whether the U.S. had a shortage. Even if the U.S. does not have surplus vaccines, I was not convinced that the resolution requires the U.S. to treat people in other nations so equally as to seize vaccines from the shoulders of Americans. Neither side does the weighing on this issue, so it ends up being a wash. Ignoring vaccines, I took Neg's broader point as that the U.S. often has more resources than it needs. How exactly technological or other resources help other nations was not explained, but it is more convincing than Aff's assertion that other nations find the U.S. annoying (there are plenty of arguments for why the U.S. might be found annoying, but they were not made).</p> <p>Aff had an outsourcing jobs argument that I only heard in their first speech and then not again. If the argument on the value of jobs or more employment had more developed and weighed against the benefits of other nations getting surplus U.S. resources, or the surplus U.S. resources were argued to make U.S. enemies stronger, or that other nations' governments often use the U.S. resources that they receive to oppress their citizens, those would be some interesting ideas to directly take on Neg.</p>	<p>Neg won because they had a stronger argument</p> <p>Aff, make your argument clearer next time</p>
--	--

Congress

Types of Speeches

though the types of speeches in Congress are not explicitly stated, speeches will fall into one or more of the following categories

- Authorship/Sponsorship - 1ST SPEECH ON EVERY BILL
 - Introduces the bill/resolution for debate
 - Should establish that there is an issue that needs solving (inherency) and how the bill solves the issue (solvency)
 - 1st Negation - 2ND SPEECH ON EVERY BILL
 - constructs opposition by explaining how attempting to solve/mitigate a problem using this legislation will fail to meet objectives or will make the problem worse
 - “Doesn’t do enough,” or “actively does harm”
 - Rebuttal
 - Directly responds to and refutes arguments made on the other side of the debate with evidence and active analysis/explanation
 - NOT just namedropping other competitors
 - Extension
 - Expands and expounds upon a previously made argument with new evidence/analysis
 - NOT just namedropping other competitors and repeating/rehashing
- SPEECHES AFTER THE FIRST CYCLE ARE OFTEN A COMBO OF REBUTTAL AND EXTENSION, AND EARLIER ON WILL OFTEN CONSTRUCT NEW ARGUMENTS**
- Crystallization
 - summarizing positions of both sides, and weighing the impacts to prove why one side wins over the other. This speech establishes key voting issues in the round. They will be in the last few speeches of the debate.

What makes a good speaker?

- Content: organization, evidence and language; logical arrangement of ideas; depth of thought; support from a variety of credible quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (expert testimony) evidence analyzed to draw conclusions; compelling language; memorable introduction and conclusion; and cohesive transitions to establish speaker’s purpose and frame perspective of the issue’s significance
- Argument & Refutation: arguments have clear claims, are substantiated with sound, analysis and evidence, and explain the impact on those affected; these ideas are either new/fresh, or clear extensions rather than mere repetition of what has already been said; refutation of opposing arguments actually disproves

them, rather than simply listing and saying they're wrong; answers to questions are given in similar structure.

- **Delivery:** vocal control and physical poise are deliberate, crisp and confident. Delivery should be extemporaneous and engaging others in the room, with few errors in pronunciation. Eye contact is effective and consistent.
- **Good Legislator:** command of parliamentary procedure; asks questions; makes motions; takes actions that are in service of the chamber; plays the role of Congressperson effectively; respects the chamber and all those in it

So who wins?

- You will rank the top 8 speakers in the room, with 1 being the best and 8 being the furthest from the best. Your ranks will be averaged with the other judges' to determine who advances to the elimination rounds and final placements for the day.

How do I score/rank the PO?

- You are evaluating them based on:
 - **Speaker Recognition:** methods are clearly explained at the beginning of the session and executed consistently. The PO is consistent in recognition (very few errors) and rulings, distributing speeches throughout the room, equally between schools of the same size, and among individuals.
 - **Parliamentary Procedure:** command of parliamentary procedure (motions) to transparently run a fair and efficient session, seldom consulting written rules and ruling immediately on whether motions pass or fail, but consulting the parliamentarian when necessary to ensure accuracy.
 - **Delivery/Presence:** dynamically fosters order and trust, and relates to peers well through vocal and physical presence. Word choice is economical and eloquent. The PO does not hesitate to rule abusive or inappropriate motions out of order. they foster trust by peers
- Unless the PO has made a noticeable and dramatic series of mistakes, they should get a rank from you commensurate with their performance in the aforementioned areas.

What should my ballots look like?

Congress

You will write a critique and give speaker points (3-6, 3 being barely intelligible and 6 being better than actual Congresspeople) for each speech a student gives. Separate from these critiques for individual speeches, you will also rank the top 8 speakers in the room, with 1 being the best and 8 being the furthest from the best. Your ranks will be averaged with the other judges' to determine who advances to the elimination rounds and final placements for the day. Ranks are based on cumulative performance in the session, inclusive of all speeches/activity in that session. To do this, your ballot on tabroom.com will have two tabs: one to record feedback on individual speeches, and the other to input ranks. Please see WK Kay at the conclusion of the session if you are struggling to navigate tabroom.com

A Good Ballot

Fracking Aff - Time was 3:02

- Love the intro, but slow it down to make sure we catch the wordplay
- Good to go right for the text of the bill and explain the "it's not in the bill" debate that was happening a bit early on
- Excellent work of speaking extemporaneously and not relying on your notes
- You're doing solid crystallization in a relatively early cycle speech, nicely done
- Warrant "entire towns can perish" more: you don't tell us how that happens
- Rhetoric is strong in the "harming our constituents" bit of the first point
- Investopedia is not as helpful as you think as it is - find what they're citing from and cite that instead; you wouldn't cite Wikipedia, don't cite this
- Great clash with Smith, who has the strongest Neg so far
- make your gestures stronger: we lose anything you do below the waist
- Strong rhetoric in conclusion, just don't stumble during the wordplay (which was clever!)

A Ballot That Needs Improvement

You are a good speaker, you had a good pace and tone. Just be careful with your balance with your notes and eye contact with the chamber. Time 3.03

Access this doc at <https://tinyurl.com/bqdb81026>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Well done in questioning, stood strong especially against Johnson- Great questioning against Jones late in the debate, nice job to re-insert yourself in the debate	
--	--