

### Judging Parliamentary Debate

1. GO TO YOUR ROUND – THE ROOM IS LISTED ON YOUR BALLOT.
2. AT THE BEGINNING OF THE ROUND, FILL OUT THE BALLOT INFORMATION: write team school name, your name, round number, and then the names of the students on the debate ballot.
3. PROVIDE INSIGHTS INTO YOU AS A JUDGE: the debaters may ask about your “judging paradigm” or your “judging preferences.” To the extent you are comfortable, provide the debaters with a sense of what you would like to see in the debate. In other words, what is your experience with judging and debating? Will you weigh delivery skills heavier than the arguments being made? Do you have an expertise in a particular field? One other note: there is nothing wrong with telling the debaters you are new to judging debate. Doing so will help them to better adapt to you, creating a more pleasant experience for all involved.
4. CALL THE “HOUSE” TO ORDER. Teams received the topic prior to the debate round and had a set amount of time to prepare. During that preparation time, the government team may use the room if they so choose. *If one of the teams has not returned after a two minute grace period, declare a forfeit.* Recognize the prime minister, and begin the debate.
5. DURING THE ROUND, TIME THE DEBATERS: give them time signals. Stop debaters when their time is expired, allowing them to only finish a sentence or two that do not constitute a new argument. Times are as follows:

#### ***Constructive Speeches (with questions):***

- Prime Minister – 7 minutes
- Leader of Opposition – 8 minutes
- Member, Government – 8 minutes
- Member, Opposition – 8 minutes

#### ***Rebuttals (no questions):***

- Leader of Opposition – 4 minutes
- Prime Minister – 5 minutes

Teams may “heckle” their opponents in tasteful moderation.

6. DURING THE ROUND, ADDRESS POINTS OF ORDER AND PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. The debaters may raise “Points of Order” and “Points of Personal Privilege.” **The time should stop once a “point” has been called and resume after you have offered your ruling or response.**
  - A. Points of Order may be recognized when:
    - a new argument is presented in the rebuttals
    - a debater exceeds the time limit
  - B. Points of Personal Privilege may be recognized when a debater verbally or physically assaults another competitor.
  - C. Give competitor an opportunity to respond to these challenges if they wish.

**Respond to these points by saying "Point well taken," "Point not well taken," or "Point to be considered."**

7. **AT THE END OF THE DEBATE, RATE AND RANK THE DEBATERS.** Each debater should be rated 1-30 (outstanding is generally 28-30, excellent is 25-27, good is 22-24, and fair is 18-21). Generally points below 18 are punitive statements in response to rudeness or other bad behavior. There can be ties on ratings. Debaters should be ranked 1-4 (1 being the best) – there may **not** be ties in rankings.
8. **MAKE A DECISION.** At the top of your ballot, vote for the government or opposition based on which side's case was stronger. You may offer comments to the teams **AFTER** you turn in your ballot so long as offering comments would not make you or the debaters late for your next round. **IF** the team with the most points loses, please indicate that your decision was a low point win.
9. **HOW SHOULD I MAKE A DECISION?**

**Policy Topics:** List the advantages and disadvantages of the plan. Do the advantages of providing economic aid to \_\_\_\_\_ outweigh the disadvantages? Does the affirmative plan support the topic? **USE THE NOTES YOU TAKE DURING THE DEBATE TO HELP.** Here is an example decision:

*-“I felt that the government showed that governmentally provided entitlements would risk economic harms. The opposition tried to say the return would make up for the expenditure. But the government argumentation showed the risk was likely and would outweigh any return from investing in these programs, so I voted government.”*

**Value Topics:** List the arguments for and against the government's case. Be sure to consider the value and criteria presented in deciding which side's arguments are more important. Does the government case support the topic? **USE YOUR NOTES OF THEIR ARGUMENTS.** Here is an example decision:

*-“The government established that capital punishment deters crime. The negative tried to focus on the immorality of the death penalty. The government demonstrated, however, that preventing crime and deterrence are more important values than mortality issues because life is so precious. The opposition also tried to argue that there was no proof that capital punishment deters crime. However, the government presented good reasons to believe it does.”*

**When you write your decision,** explain why you voted the way you did.

**Policy:** Why did the advantage outweigh the disadvantage?

**Policy Example:** *“I voted government because they showed increasing entitlement spending would...”*

**Value:** Why is/isn't capital punishment justified?

**Value Example:** *“I voted opposition. Capital Punishment would...”*

Explain why you did not vote for the arguments of the losing team. Try to point to arguments that the winning team made against these arguments that convinced you.

Policy Example: *"The opposition tried to show that current aid is enough. But the government convinced me that the current funds are too little and perpetuate classism."*

Value Example: *"The government needs stronger arguments that are more focused on capital punishment and less discussion of abstract philosophy."*

**Can I interject my opinion into my decision?**

You should not make a decision based solely on your beliefs. For example, it would be wrong to vote against a policy simply because you didn't like it. Do not make arguments against a team. Make your decisions based on the arguments that the teams present in the debate. However, if you find one team's arguments unpersuasive, then you don't need to vote on it. Be open minded, but if a team tells you to kill every criminal or that Russia does not exist and that is why you should vote for them, you do have the right to say this is not a persuasive argument. On the other hand, if a team gives you a good reason and their opponents do not respond, you probably should vote for the team's reason even if you do not agree with it. Blame the opponents who couldn't even make a response to the weak argument.

**Give comments on what they did well and how they could improve.**

-Avoid vague "you need to improve" and "you did a good job." Be specific: "Look at the audience more" and "Your reasoning was very strong."

-Avoid leaving people without a way to improve. Give specific suggestions: "Practice in front of your coach" and "Work on cutting out long transitions."

-Avoid commenting on things like "Your voice just sucks." Focus on things people can change: "You need to rework your argument. Focus more on..."

10. TURN IN YOUR BALLOT TO THE BALLOT TABLE. Then pick up your next round's ballot.

\*Thanks to Washington University for their contribution to this set of guidelines.

## Judging Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Lincoln-Douglas debate at the collegiate level is different from the same format in high school. The collegiate model is a policy debate format in which an affirmative debater will propose a change from the present system (status quo) that meets the framework of the resolution. This year's resolution is presented at the bottom of this description.

Affirmative must prove four things, or stock issues. First, they must show **significant harms**, or problems that need to be addressed. Second, they must show **inherency**, or a barrier to the status quo resolving these problems absent a new policy (i.e. the affirmative plan). In other words, there should be a reason that the affirmative plan won't happen or is not currently happening in the present system. Third, the affirmative must propose a plan that falls within the resolution (**topicality**) that has outlined mandates, as well as means of funding and enforcement. The affirmative has what is called **fiat**, which simply means that the debate can progress assuming that everything needed for the affirmative plan to be put into place (congressional votes, presidential signature, money, etc.) will happen. Finally, the affirmative must prove that their plan has solvency, or evidence that the plan can solve the harms they argued earlier. The affirmatives needed to have these issues in order to have a **prima facie case** or legitimate defense of the resolution.

Negatives may select a number of strategies. They can indict the case, refuting the arguments made by the affirmative. They may also argue **workability** or **disadvantage** arguments, proving that either the affirmative plan will not work, or that it will lead to harms or other costs that outweigh any benefits. Negatives may also propose a **counter-plan**, or a counter-proposal that argues that a change is called for, but not one asked for by the resolution or proposed by the affirmative. While the negative may agree with the harms, they will be disagreeing on the best way to solve those harms. There may also be reason for negatives to argue **topicality**, suggesting that something about the affirmative plan is actually outside the parameters of the resolution, making their plan "illegitimate."

Judges can expect to hear evidence cited for many of the arguments presented. Decisions should, most importantly, reflect a **fair and objective** assessment of the debate and debaters. Beyond that, judges may rely on logic and comparisons of evidence, arguments, etc. to make their decision. Delivery and persuasion skills may enter into decision making as well. Debaters may well suggest to judges ways for them to weigh arguments and make their decisions; judges should consider these and, ultimately, select the decision-making paradigm that they feel is most appropriate.

Judges should select a winner, rate each debater 1-30 (outstanding is generally 28-30, excellent is 25-27, good is 22-24, and fair is 18-21), and offer reasons for the decision, as well as suggestions for improvement. Generally points below 18 are punitive statements in response to rudeness or other bad behavior. It is important to remember as long as the decision is reached objectively and without bias, and there is an explanation for why the decision was as it was, there is not a "wrong" decision.

Topic for 2010-11: Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should substantially reform the provision of mental health services to the chronically mentally ill.

**Time Limits/Formats:**

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross Examination	3 minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes

During the debate, each debater has four minutes of preparation time to be used prior to their speaking times. This works like a credit card—four minutes for the entire debate; as some is used, less time is available for later speeches.

(New arguments can be made in constructive arguments. There can be no new arguments in rebuttals—only a rebuilding or extending of existing arguments.)

## Judging British, or Worlds Parliamentary Debate

### Background

British Parliamentary debate, or Worlds, consists of four teams of 2 students competing on two sides of a debate topic: the proposition and the opposition. Every speech is seven minutes in length and the main focus of each debater is to advocate their positions, also called points of positive matter. The evaluation of the debating is not based on things like terminology. In fact the use of debate terminology is mostly forbidden and can receive 'shames' from the audience and opposing teams. The number one judging criteria of most Worlds' judges is role fulfillment, or how well each student performs their specific role in the debate. The following is a basic list of the speeches in the debate and the roles each position (or speaker) should be filling:

#### *Front Bench:*

##### 1<sup>st</sup> Speaker—Prime Minister (PM)

This speaker should outline any definitions, and then preview their partners' case before outlining their own points of positive matter.

##### 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker—Leader of Opposition (LO)

This speaker should preview their partner's case, refute the statements presented by the PM (refutation should be relatively short because this type of debate is more about the arguments and points YOU present), and then outline their own points of positive matter.

##### 3<sup>rd</sup> Speaker—Deputy Prime Minister (DPM)

This speaker should refute arguments presented by the LO and then present their own points of positive matter that were previewed by the PM.

##### 4<sup>th</sup> Speaker—Deputy Leader of Opposition (DLO)

This speaker refutes arguments and then presents own points of positive matter.

#### *Back Bench*

The two teams on the back bench should be trying to further the arguments presented by the front bench, while also creating their own style. There should be some differentiation. However, a 'knife' occurs when a back bench team is in direct conflict rhetorically with their front bench counterparts. A knife should put the back bench team in the fourth position in the debate. This can be determined via the judgment of the critics, or opposing students in the debate can also bring it up in questioning or speeches.

##### 5<sup>th</sup> Speaker—Member of Government (MG)

This speaker should refute points from the DLO and then present their own points of positive matter.

##### 6<sup>th</sup> Speaker—Member of Opposition (MO)

Again, this speaker should refute points and then present their own points of positive matter.

##### 7<sup>th</sup> Speaker—Government WHIP

This speaker's job is to synthesize the debate. Almost like the rebuttal in American parliamentary debate, these speakers will present 'voters' that judges can contemplate as they evaluate the debate.

##### 8<sup>th</sup> Speaker—Opposition WHIP

Just like the Government Whip, this speaker synthesizes the debate and presents reasons to vote for the opposition.

**Questioning:**

During the course of these speeches, the opposing side will have the opportunity to question the other side during their speeches. This period of questioning starts at one minute into the speech and ends one minute before the end of time. A critic should somehow indicate the beginning and end of this questioning period, generally with a slap to the table.

**Deliberation and the Ballot:**

After the round is over, judges should collaborate on a decision for no longer than ten minutes. (Note—this time limit will be strictly enforced by the tournament director). After the ten minute collaboration, the head judge will make the final decision, and rank the teams from 1-4 while also providing speaker points on a 1-30 scale for each speaker. This total should always follow ranks, with the 1<sup>st</sup> place team receiving the most speaker points and so on until 4<sup>th</sup> place. There should never be a low-point 1<sup>st</sup> place in this event. The secondary judge will take the ballot to the ballot table and the head judge will stay to give oral critiques to the contestants. Critiques and post-round discussion should not last longer than an additional ten minutes.

IPDA  
**PUBLIC DEBATE JUDGES' INSTRUCTION SHEET**

YOU WILL LIKELY LISTEN TO TWO SEPARATE DEBATES UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED. THEY WILL BEGIN BACK-TO-BACK. PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU HAVE THE CORRECT DEBATERS AND USE THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA TO HELP YOU JUDGE THE ROUND. AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP IN MAKING THIS TOURNAMENT POSSIBLE.

**TIMES OF EACH DEBATE**

1 <sup>ST</sup> AFFIRMATIVE	- 5 MINUTES
NEGATIVE CROSS EXAM	- 2 MINUTES
1 <sup>ST</sup> NEGATIVE	- 6 MINUTES
AFF. CROSS EXAM	- 2 MINUTES
2 <sup>ND</sup> AFFIRMATIVE	- 3 MINUTES
2 <sup>ND</sup> NEGATIVE	- 5 MINUTES
FINAL AFFIRMATIVE	- 3 MINUTES

- The debaters should be timing themselves, but if they don't, please try to provide signals and keep them true to time.
- As you listen, **please make comments on the ballot** in the appropriate areas for each debater.
- **Please keep the debate moving.** Speakers should be prepared to speak immediately following each other. Allowing reasonable time (10 seconds) is okay, but no more.

**RULES OF THE DEBATE**

- **EVIDENCE** – Debaters may refer to any evidence they like. It is important that you weigh its credibility when asked to by their opponent. However, they may not read from written materials in the round (IE Newspapers, Magazines, etc...). They may write quotes etc... in their speaking notes that they use for the debate. "The use of evidence cards and/or verbatim written materials is prohibited. Such materials may be studied, memorized and/or paraphrased, but they may not be physically present in the round. The "reading" of such materials should be highly penalized."
- **THE AFFIRMATIVE HAS THE RIGHT TO DEFINE, BUT MUST DO SO REASONABLY.** Affirmative interpretations and definitions must leave Negatives fair ground for the debate. If an Affirmative's case is too lopsided and/or tautological (used to define itself as winning by definition), this opens the door for the Negative to provide an alternate set of definitions. But the Negative can only redefine terms if the Affirmative has abused its prerogative.

**FILLING OUT THE BALLOT AND DECIDING THE ROUND**

- **ETHICS IN JUDGING** - Though a debater may be arguing a position that you may differ with, please let the debaters do the arguing. Judges should at all times practice objectivity and openness to new ideas, and work to provide positive and constructive comments, decisions, and evaluations to help competitors achieve success, regardless of affiliation.
- **VOTE** – Simply vote for the best debater in the round. That may be the person that persuaded you the most, or it could be the best speaker. When you vote, please **CIRCLE** negative or affirmative **AND CIRCLE** the name of the person who won.
- **SPEAKER POINTS** – The total number of points you may give each competitor is 40. Under each competitors name there are boxes. Please rate how you feel the competitors did in each of the 8 categories. Remember 5 means superior and 1 is poor. These should be added up to establish how the speaker did in the round.
- **LOW POINT WIN?** – If you add up the points and it turns out that competitor who won the debate has fewer points than the loser, please check to make sure you circled the correct winner. Also, please check to make sure you added points correctly. If your decision was correct, please note on the ballot that you intended for the winner to have fewer points.
- **PROVIDE COMMENTS** – Please provide comments for the debaters. These are the only window through which debaters may improve. It is especially important for you to provide reasons for voting the way you did.
- **RUSH THE BALLOT TO THE RETURN TABLE** – As soon as you are finished judging your complete round of debate, please get the ballot(s) back to the judges' table so that tabulation can begin immediately.



## **Judging Individual Events**

For all individual events, you will hear a select number of individuals—usually five or six. For each student you will complete a ballot.

1. Provide the requested information at the top (name, event, round, student code, etc.).
2. Provide a rank, 1-5 or 1-6 (depending on what is asked for on the ballot): a “1” is the best in the round. There may not be ties on ranks.
3. Provide a rating (1-25 or whatever is asked for on the ballot)—the higher the rating, the better the performance. There may be ties in assigned ratings. Generally, ratings should be no less than 14-15 unless the performance is extremely unprepared or has ethical problems.
4. Provide comments that provide both your observations as to what was effective and ineffective about the performance, how the student can improve, and why s/he received the ranking and rating that you assigned.
5. Sign the ballot.

While your own personal opinion is inherently a part of your judging, please make every effort to maintain objectivity in your decision-making. You may, for example, be against same-sex marriage and hear an interpretation or speech that promotes civil unions: strive to evaluate the student and performance on their own merits.

## **PREPARED PUBLIC ADDRESS**

### **After-Dinner Speaking (ADS)**

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 night club act, an 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.

Effective after-dinner speeches are generally ones that combine the clever use of rhetorical devices (exaggeration, analogy, examples, etc.) with argumentation that leads to a serious conclusion. After-dinner speeches follow an organizational pattern similar to that of a persuasive speech. To that extent, the same expectations of sound logic and reasonable solutions apply to after-dinner speeches.

Successful after-dinner topics from the past include religious dogma, criticism, objectification of women, and homophobia.

### **Communication Analysis (CA)**

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 and reinforce the message. Manuscripts are permitted. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes.

Critics in this event generally expect a strong relationship between the artifact selected for analysis and an appropriate rhetorical model. Models, found in communication journals and texts, are frameworks authored by scholars that can be applied to various forms of communication in an effort to determine communication's effectiveness/impact/purpose. A great deal of emphasis is placed on the student's ability to draw appropriate and reasoned conclusions from the application of the model to the artifact.

Past artifacts have included advertising directed toward women, AIDS commercials, church statements, social movements, campaigns, and popular books.

### **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 or may not be used to supplement and reinforce the message. Multiple sources should be used and cited in the development of the speech. Minimal notes are permitted. Maximum time is 10 minutes including introduction.

The best informative speeches find ways to examine topics that impact the general audience by expanding on information we do not already know. This is perhaps the most flexible of public address events in terms of topic development and organizational strategies. The essential trait of an effective informative speech is that it does not focus on solutions to controversial issues.

Topics of successful informative speeches of the past include various scientific and medical innovations, the pencil, and handwriting analysis.

### **Persuasive Speaking**

An original speech by the student designed to inspire, reinforce or change the beliefs, attitudes, values or actions of the audience. Audio-visual aids may or may not be used to supplement and reinforce the message. Multiple sources should be used and cited in the development of the speech. Minimal notes are permitted. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes.

Criteria for evaluation generally centers around the strength of advocacy, including logic in argument development and focus within the development of the problem. Students should provide reasonable solutions that address each problem outlined in the speech. As a general rule, the Monroe Motivated Sequence is a strong organizational pattern to follow in the writing of persuasive speeches.

Examples of successful persuasive topics include student credit card abuse, health care reforms, oversight of financial institutions, and infrastructure improvement.

## **LIMITED PREPARATION EVENTS**

### **Extemporaneous Speaking (EXTEMP)**

Contestants will be given three topics in the general area of current events, choose one, and have 30 minutes to prepare a speech that is the original work of the student. Maximum time limit for the speech is 7 minutes. Limited notes are permitted. Students will speak in listed order. Posting of topics will be staggered. Judges should provide time signals to the speaker.

The best extemp speeches are those that combine the use of a variety of data to support the original claims of the speaker. The speech should have analysis that is focused on the topic selected. Organizational strategies should be appropriate to the manner in which the topic is written. Speeches should be persuasive in that the student communicates a clear position.

Topics might include "Can the current Congress pass effective welfare reform?" or "What influence should the United States have on the democratization of Cuba?"

### **Impromptu Speaking**

An impromptu speech, serious in nature, with topic selections varied by round and 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 topics sheet. Limited notes are permitted. Each speaker in a given section will choose to speak from one of the same two topics offered. Judges should provide time signals to the speaker.

A variety of skills make up an effective impromptu speech. Speakers must be able to prepare in no longer than 2 to 3 minutes. Students must also be able to advocate clear, well reasoned, focused positions on the given topic. Students will learn to use topoi and organizational strategies in their analysis of impromptu topics.

While not always, most impromptu topics are quotations. Examples include "Don't be agnostic--be something," and "Only the foolish and the dead never change their opinions."

### **Editorial Impromptu Speaking**

An impromptu speech in which the student presents an argumentative response to an editorial. The student can agree or disagree with the editorial. S/he is allowed nine minutes to divide between preparation and speech time. Speakers must speak for at least five minutes. Limited notes, prepared in the round, are permitted. Judges should provide time signals to the speaker.

The same skills central to impromptu speaking are also important in this event. The difference is the expectations of the speaker. S/he should tailor their critique directly to the editorial presented.

## **INTERPRETATION EVENTS**

All interpretation events, while different, share common traits. Introductions are required and should include (1) an audience motivational link, (2) statement of social significance, (3) brief statement of the material's content, and (4) identification of author/selection. All material must be delivered with a manuscript in a scriptbook that will be made available by the team. All selections that contain characters/dialogue should be delivered with focal points and appropriate nonverbal mannerisms that distinguish characters from one another. No properties or costumes are allowed in any interpretation performances. Teasers, or brief excerpts of selections to establish characterization and mood may or may not be used. Material can be serious or humorous in nature. As a general rule, movement is limited largely to the upper body. The expectation is for the performer to be able to communicate the literature without literally acting out the material.

### **Dramatic Interpretation (DI)**

A cutting which 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.

The focus of this event is on the development of believable characters within the context of the literature. Performers are encouraged to find the fine line between interpreting the character(s) and becoming the characters. Factors such as distinct and appropriate characterizations are critical in this event.

Possible dramatic selections include anything performed on Broadway or on stage in any other theatre.

### **Duo Interpretation (DUO)**

This event is performed by two individuals. Performances can be from any single selection of literature, or a collection of literature from multiple genres. If a collection of literature is performed a theme should emerge through that combination. Presentation is from the manuscript and the focus should be off-stage and not to each other. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.

Critics in this event generally look for balance in the selection (each taking equal roles in the delivery of the introduction, character development being relatively equal, etc.). Additionally, blocking the selection should strike a balance between purpose, creativity, and interpretation (as opposed to acting). The interaction between the characters should be believable while maintaining suggestive and off-stage acknowledgement of one another.

The selections appropriate for dramatic duo are largely the same as those in any of the other oral interpretation events. The distinguishing factor is the presence of two or more characters and the interaction of those characters, along with their ability to clearly communicate the themes within the literature.

### **Poetry Interpretation**

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

Performers can select either one long poem, or a collection of poetry that falls into a common theme. The focus within this event is on making performance choices that bring to life the stylistic devices that characterize verse. Audience members should be able to visualize the images within the literature as a result of the performer's interpretation. Programs of poetry should either (1) briefly introduce each piece as the program evolves, or (2) keep each selection distinct via the delivery of the material. Song lyrics can also be used in poetry performances.

A program of poetry selections might be various versions of "Casey at the Bat" within a baseball theme. As well, a performer might opt to deliver a single poem.

### **Program Oral Interpretation (POI)**

A program of thematically-linked selections of literary merit, chosen from two or three recognized genres of competitive interpretation (prose/poetry/drama). A substantial portion of the total time must be devoted to each of the genres used in the program. Different genre means the material must appear in separate pieces of literature (e.g., A poem included in a short story that appears only in that short story does not constitute a poetry genre). Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including original introduction and/or transitions.

The key element within POIs is the thematic linkage of the selections. Programs should contain literature that clearly fits into the established theme. Likewise, the program should contain a balance between genres. Finally, performance choices should reflect what is unique in the performance of each genre represented within the program (e.g., imagery in poetry, characterization in dramatic, and a combined narration/characterization in prose).

**Prose Interpretation**

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

The uniqueness within this event is the combination of narration and descriptiveness with characters that are developed within the literature. Performers should be able to balance narrative language with the dialogue of one character or between more than one character. The effective prose performance resembles someone telling a captivating story.

## EXPERIMENTAL EVENT DESCRIPTIONS

### **Editorial Impromptu Speaking**

An impromptu speech in which the student presents an argumentative response to an editorial. The student can agree or disagree with the editorial. S/he is allowed nine minutes to divide between preparation and speech time. Speakers must speak for at least five minutes. Limited notes, prepared in the round, are permitted. Judges should provide time signals to the speaker.

The same skills central to impromptu speaking are also important in this event. The difference is the expectations of the speaker. S/he should tailor their critique directly to the editorial presented.

### **Discussion**

The discussion topic is *How can America best improve K-12 education?* Each contestant will participate in the same group for all three rounds. Groups will be sectioned randomly. Each group should follow the decision-making process outlined within the judging criteria:

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Round 1 | Define the problem, limit the problem, analyze the problem  |
| Round 2 | Criteria for solution, suggest and consider other solutions |
| Round 3 | Selection of solution, actuation of the solution            |

Each group will have a resident judge (the same for all three rounds) and a visiting judge (different for each round) who will evaluate each round. The Tournament Director arbitrarily assigned chairpersons for each group.

Judges should evaluate students on their small group discussion skills, including but not limited to appropriate agreement and disagreement, ideas contributed, ability to keep the group on task and/or return the group to their task if and when they stray, appropriate nonverbal behavior, active listening, etc. In each round speakers will be ranked and rated, with a "1" being awarded to the most effective group member. The resident judge will rank only once, at the end of the third round, and in a way that represents the cumulative contributions and performance of each student over the course of all four rounds.

### **To Honor Immigrants**

This is designed to highlight written and spoken advocacy on behalf immigration. Unlike other individual events, results in this event will be based on only three ballots. A different presentation will be given in each round as follows:

**Round 1---Impromptu:** Speakers will present an impromptu speech based on selected quotations from public address and literature dealing with issues related to immigration. Speakers will have a total of 7 minutes to prepare and speak. Limited notes are permitted. Judges should provide time signals to the speaker.

**Round 2—Public Address:** Speakers will inform the audience about a significant example of public address that highlights some aspect of immigration. The public address can be from any field, time period, nation, or setting. The purpose of the speech should be historical in that the audience should learn about the speaker, audience, occasion, message, and impact of the address. Notes and/or audio visual aids are permitted. Time limit is a maximum of 10 minutes.

*Round 3—Program Oral Interpretation:* Speakers will present a thematic program of selections from prose, poetry, and/or drama dealing with immigration. Presentation must be from a manuscript. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including an introduction.

Each round should be evaluated in the same manner as impromptu speaking, program oral interpretation, and a combination of communication analysis and informative speaking are judged.

### **Broadcast Journalism**

A contestant will present a well-organized, clearly communicated simulated radio broadcast. The focus of this event is to demonstrate skill in selection, organization, and presentation of a simulated broadcast news program. Contestants will not be expected to simulate the use of teleprompters and may read their material. Source material for each round will be distributed 30 minutes prior to the beginning of the round. For two rounds, material will be a combination of newspaper and wire copy stories. Speakers will choose and edit the provided material to be exactly five minutes in length. One round will focus on commentary. Students will be given a topic area and material to support the topic area, as well as other news and information. They will be expected to write and deliver an editorial commentary that is part of the five minute broadcast. The commentary should be at least one minute in length. All material in the broadcast must be from what is provided by the tournament with the exception of hypothetical station call letters, time, and current weather conditions/forecast.

Judges will evaluate the student with his/her back turned so as to focus more on the vocal delivery of the material. Consequently, while time is an essential element in this event the judge will not show students time signals. Presentations should be five minutes in length.

### **Reader's Theatre**

Reader's Theatre is defined as interpretation of literature by a group of oral readers who act as a medium of expression for an audience. While reader's theatre is both oral and visual, the emphasis is on the oral interpretation of the printed word and its resultant effects on the minds, emotions, and imaginations of the listeners/viewers. The audience should have the feeling of a unified whole in which each performer at all times contributes to the total effect desired. The time limitation for the performance is 25 minutes. An additional two minutes shall be allowed for both set-up and takedown of material. Reader's theatre entries must include a minimum of three and a maximum of 14 participants. Programs (handouts) are not allowed in this event.

Mechanics of presentation are limited as follows:

1. The audience must have a sense of production being interpreted from a manuscript. Director, performer, and judges should be allowed freedom to exercise artistic, interpretive judgment; however, manuscripts must be interpreted from during the presentation.
2. Suggestions in contemporary or ensemble dress may be used. The literature should determine the nature of this suggestion, although costuming should not be a focus of the presentation.
3. Reading stands, chairs, stools, ladders, platforms, steps, props, and/or lighting effects may be used. However, the limitation of facilities (space, time, equipment, etc.) should govern a director's concept.
4. Readers may sit, stand, or both and may move from one reading stand or locale to another so long as the movement is consistent with the ideas or moods of the literature and the director's concept.
5. Music/sound effects, recorded or live, are acceptable as background accompaniment and part of the context.
6. A performer whose sole function is to play a musical instrument on or off stage will be counted in the total number of performers.

### **Legislative Debate**

The legislative debate topic area is ***Furthering the Welfare of Children in the United States***. The first two rounds will be allocated to finalizing the legislative docket. Numbers for each division do not warrant committees; consequently, each chamber will be as a complete group. During these rounds the following will take place:

- A faculty representative will help regulate the discussion and keep legislators on track.
- This is a time for refining bills. It is also appropriate to create new bills.
- A final set of bills will be presented to the tournament director by each chamber at the end of the second round.
- Committee work is NOT judged as part of the final placements for this event.
  - Packets of legislation were sent to all chapters' sponsors. Additional copies of this legislation are not available. A reminder—each chamber with finalizing documents to be forwarded to the general sessions that will take place in the final four rounds. Each committee should...



- **NEATLY** handwrite or type final versions of each document. Editing of original, previously provided documents is acceptable. Upon request, the tournament director can also email the original packet of legislation, on which editing comments can be made.
- Appoint a person to serve as the recorder, making changes and creating the final documents to be forwarded to the chambers.
- The assigned observer in each committee session should return these documents to the ballot table immediately following the completion of round two (the second committee session).
- A reminder—there are no rankings or ratings assigned in the committee sessions.
  - These final documents will be copied for each participant and provided at the ballot table before round three (the first of four chambers of the legislature).
- The last four rounds will be sessions of congress. One chamber for each division will be created.
- Each chamber will receive the final packet of bills as amended, created, and approved by committees.
- Each chamber will elect a presiding officer. This will happen during the first session.
- Each chamber will move through its agenda of bills.
- Authorship speeches will be given, with only one author speech per person, per session *until* each author in the session has had a chance to give one speech.
- As is outlined in the invitation, students will be allowed to deliver five minute speeches with up to three minutes of cross-examination to follow.
- *Every effort should be taken* to insure all students seeking recognition for speaking have an opportunity to contribute prior to awarding multiple participation opportunities to other members of the session.
- At the end of the final session students will vote for the top legislator. Students will be able to cast two votes, neither of which can be for a student from their own school.

Two judges will adjudicate each session. One judge will be permanent for all four sessions and will submit rankings/ratings only at the end of the fourth session to represent the students' cumulative performance over all four sessions of debate. Other judges will rank/rate at the end of their respective sessions. Thus, five ranks/ratings will be accumulated to determine superior, excellent, and good ratings. The permanent judge can keep whatever notes s/he desires during the first three sessions.

Ideally legislators should speak or otherwise participate in the session in order to receive point consideration. Ranks should tie at 10 should there be more than 10 legislators getting ranked. Ranks are not to be tied until reaching a rank of 10. Points should be awarded on a 100-60 scale. Points can be tied.

Judges should also serve as moderators for the session should there be procedural or other issues that arise. Among other examples this includes exercising any necessary influence in creating a context of fairness and opportunity for all students in the chamber.

Mi.

GOOD BALLOT  
Reunawak nuihine

Student's Name: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Code: MM 104

Event: Frse

Round: 2B

Section: 3

Rank: 5

(1-5 Prelims)

Rate: 95

(70-100 Pts)

Adults caring for parents. Parents Reelling "Why is my Mother getting a stroke?"

\* It'd be nice to see these characters become more distinct.  
The lines are funny but the Mom is the only one  
we get a full sense of but there ~~isn't~~  
~~and~~ could still be more of a pop.

\* Christopher seems like a caricature - is that on purpose?

\* Giving dad the tapes -> Good moment

\* the mern is a great character but she is the only one  
really driving the scene

\* Great job.

Such a tough Round!

Judge: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Affiliation: BSU

(9.5/)

# POOR BALLOT



Round: 1

Section 3

Name: [REDACTED]

Code 00113

Critic: [REDACTED]  
Name (please print)

Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

Event: EXT PER (PRO) POI DUO IMP INF POE DI CD ADS

Rank (Rank speakers 1-5 in prelims; 1-6 in elims) 1 Rate: 90

Comments: Billy Crystal

Good characterization

Clear good cutting good flow

Start: ASAP  
WKU Fall Fiesta

# POOR BALLOT

Cherry 17

Western Kentucky University  
September 25th and 26th

## PROPOSITION

POS	School: <u>GCC CD</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
PM	Speaker: <u>[redacted]</u>		
	Speaker: <u>[redacted]</u>		

## OPPOSITION

POS	School: <u>Webster</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
LO	Speaker: <u>[redacted]</u>		
	Speaker: <u>[redacted]</u>		

The better debating was done by the Prop from GCC CD  
PROP or OPP TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [signature]

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Better Org + 2 much dead time

Opp didn't ~~think~~  
defend correctly  
or with enough depth

**AFFIRMATIVE**  
Webster GB

WON!

**NEGATIVE**

Southeastern Oklahoma CW

Pos Name  
PM [redacted]  
ML [redacted]

Pts Rank  
29 1  
27 3

Pos Name  
MO [redacted]  
LO [redacted]

Pts Rank  
26 4  
28 2

Please circle above both the SIDE and the TEAM to whom you award the decision.

Low Point Win? Y/N N

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

REASON FOR DECISION / COMMENTS:

83 Round: 4 Webster GB vs. Southeastern Oklahoma CW

1) Great publ2 speaker.

Your ~~are~~ speaking style is very similar to mine so as such watch out for a sing-a-long speech pattern!

2) Good catch on the OPP failing to extend their case.

3) Format 1's correctly... where are the voters or standards??

4) Great analysis but work on calming down... the frantic hand gestures and large tone projections hurts your presentation.

5) Be careful about NEW arguments

6) Your contentions have been dropped the whole round! "..."

RTD: It came down to the amount of analysis and ~~clash~~ presented by the Gov outweighed that of the OPP. If the OPP was more organized and more analysis was presented on the VC they could have won the round but as Megan so aptly put it "with out an ends then for the means?"

1. Good job on catching the structural problem of the 1.

2. You should still argue the VC of the OPP.

3. You didn't even use time to argue against the OPP case!! Why??

1) Work on organization during your constructive b/c you were everywhere.

2) Nice touches of humor!

3) Trent you made me smile on the inside... you are a performer to the I!

4) Work on structure and organization and you will be one of the best.