

# Judge Orientation



*Ziggy Online Debate™*

Revised Jan 2020

Part 1 of 4: Welcome!

# Introduction

---

- ❖ Welcome to Ziggy Online Debate!
- ❖ We are truly grateful that you are willing to devote some of your time to judge debates over the next few months.
- ❖ Based on data from the past several years, **if each judge judges 5 debate rounds in total, ALL debate rounds would have a judge.**
- ❖ Your feedback helps to develop the communication skills that young people need to be effective witnesses for Christ.
- ❖ This guide will help give you some tips as to how to judge debate rounds, and specifically Ziggy Online Debate.

# Role of the Judge

---

- ❖ The purpose of debate is to communicate complex ideas in an understandable and respectful way.
- ❖ It's the debater's job to ensure that you understand, not your job to decipher what they mean.
- ❖ It is not your job—or your role—to argue with the debaters. You must **never** bring your own biases (*religious, political, personal, or otherwise*) into the round. If you feel you cannot judge without bias, please do not judge.
- ❖ You are a communicator, and your role as the judge is to give debaters advice on how to communicate **better**.
- ❖ This presentation will explain how to be the best kind of judge.

# What to Expect

---

- ❖ The debaters will email you to ask you to judge their round at a particular day and time. **They will send you a link to a website that will show all the round details. You will click the button that says “I Can Judge,” and you will fill out your ballot online on that website after the debate is over.**
- ❖ Most debates will take place over Skype or Google Hangouts. There may be unexpected drops, so plan for a few minutes longer than the debate actually is.
- ❖ Your ballot will be saved by clicking the “**Save Draft**” button, so you can start drafting it and come back to it later. **Be sure to click this button REGULARLY so your ballot doesn’t get lost, especially if you know you are going to be coming and going from your computer.)**
- ❖ Plan to be ready at your computer a few minutes before the scheduled time. You’ll want to make sure everyone can hear each other clearly.
- ❖ **Be sure to take LOTS of detailed notes!**
- ❖ Debaters will time themselves. Feel free to ask each team to also time each other for accountability purposes, or feel free to time them yourselves if you want—but you don’t need to.
- ❖ We ask that you judge a minimum of 5 rounds. Based on data from past years, that will help ensure that no round is without a judge!

# What the Online App & Ballot Look Like

Home / Tournaments / Ziggy Fall 2019 / Round 1 / Obi-Wan Kenobi vs. Anakin Skywalker

## Affirmative

? **Obi-Wan Kenobi**  
darnoc.s1@gmail.com

Speaker Position  Update

## Negative

? **Anakin Skywalker**  
d.arnocs1@gmail.com

Speaker Position  Update

## Judge

This debate does not have a judge yet.

I can judge

## Schedule

Date

MM/DD/YYYY

Time

HH:MM:AM

e.g. "10:00 AM" in your own timezone (US/Eastern)

Finalize Schedule

## Discussion

Comment...

Post

## Affirmative

1A **Obi-Wan Kenobi**  
elijah.schow+obiwan@gmail.com  
098-765-4321

Rank  of 2

Persuasiveness  of 5

Organization  of 5

Delivery  of 5

Support  of 5

Cross examination  of 5

Refutation  of 5

Total 0

Comments

## Negative

1N **Anakin Skywalker**  
Darnocs1@gmail.com  
123-456-7890

Rank  of 2

Persuasiveness  of 5

Organization  of 5

Delivery  of 5

Support  of 5

Cross examination  of 5

Refutation  of 5

Total 0

Comments

Winner

Affirmative

Undecided

Negative

Reason for decision

Conflict of interest

None

I, the judge, am NOT a parent, relative, friend or coach of either debate team.

Potential

I, the judge, AM a parent, relative, friend or coach of either debate team.

Save draft

Finalize

# A short video explaining the app

---

Click this link to see a 1 minute video explaining how to use the app (the video does not have sound):

<https://youtu.be/419S1KQtcBo>

# Part 2 of 4: Debate Basics

*You only need to view the slides for the type(s) of debate that you will be judging.*



# Ethics

- ❖ Ziggy operates from a Christian ethical perspective, meaning that debaters must be respectful and must speak and act in a way that is considered God-honoring at all times.
- ❖ Most ethical violations may be handled by the judge (you) and may be resolved at your discretion.
- ❖ Ethical violations do **NOT** mean “I disagree with the moral/ethical argument a debater is making.” The fact that you personally disagree with a debater’s viewpoint should **never** be part of your decision.
- ❖ Ethical violations are only if a debater is conducting themselves in an improper way during the debate.
- ❖ If you have a question or concern, feel free to contact Ziggy.

# Overview of Debate\*

---

- ❖ The topic of debate is called **the resolution**.
- ❖ The Affirmative Team is for the resolution.
- ❖ The Negative Team is against the Affirmative case and/or the resolution.
- ❖ Each debater/team will alternate between arguing each side of the resolution throughout the competition.
- ❖ Each speaker will participate in Cross Examination (“CX”) where they ask a member of the opposing team questions. Each speaker will also have an opportunity to answer questions asked by their opponents.
- ❖ \*Parli is slightly unique; a future slide will explain more.

# Lincoln-Douglas Overview

---

- ❖ LD is a debate over **ideas, values, philosophy, and logic**.
- ❖ About 38 minutes long
- ❖ One-on-one debate
- ❖ Emphasizes **principles** over examples.
  - ❖ Examples can be used as illustrations, but debaters should not treat them as “proof.” They should clearly explain each example and give thought out reasoning to support any argument.
  - ❖ LD does not *require* using evidence (like studies, expert opinions, etc.), although doing so is permitted (and many debaters do so).

# LD Resolutions

---

- ❖ **NCFCA:** “In the context of innovation, the proactionary principle ought to be valued above the precautionary principle.”
- ❖ **Stoa:** “In the field of biomedical engineering, restraint ought to be prioritized over scientific advancement.”
- ❖ See NCFCA’s website for more details: [www.ncfca.org/debate](http://www.ncfca.org/debate)
- ❖ See Stoa’s website for more details: <https://stoausa.org/debate-events/>

# Lincoln-Douglas Structure

---

- ❖ Each debater has 3 minutes of prep time total
- ❖ The pattern of speeches is as follows:
  - Aff Constructive (AC): 6 minutes
  - Neg Constructive (NC): 7 minutes
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Aff Rebuttal (1AR): 4 minutes
  - Neg Rebuttal (NR): 6 minutes
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff Rebuttal (2AR): 3 minutes
- ❖ The Constructives are for **building** the arguments; Rebuttals are for extending the **analysis**. Completely new arguments should not be brought up in the Rebuttals.
- ❖ Many debaters will have a **value** in their case, but they do not have to. Judge the round primarily on logic and argumentation, not on the style or structure of the case.
  - ❖ Do not bring your own interpretations of the resolution into the round (i.e., if you think they should bring up X or Y argument, but they don't, it should NOT be a factor in your decision unless it is a factor in the round)

# Team Policy Overview

---

- ❖ TP is a debate over the implications of **proposed policies of actual organizations** (the US federal government, the 50 states, international agencies, etc.).
- ❖ About 1 hour 15 minutes long.
- ❖ Two teams of two
- ❖ Emphasizes **proof** of a policy's effectiveness or ineffectiveness.
- ❖ Evidence **is** a core element of Team Policy, as are clear logical proofs and arguments.

# TP Resolutions

---

- ❖ **NCFCA:** “The United States Federal Government should significantly reform its policy regarding convicted prisoners under federal jurisdiction.”
- ❖ **Stoa:** “The USFG should substantially reform the use of Artificial Intelligence technology.”
- ❖ See NCFCA’s website for more details: [www.ncfca.org/debate](http://www.ncfca.org/debate)
- ❖ See Stoa’s website for more details: <https://stoausa.org/debate-events/>

# Team Policy Structure

---

- ❖ Each team has 5 minutes of prep time total
- ❖ The pattern of speeches is as follows:
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Aff Constructive (1AC): 8 minutes
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Neg Constructive (1NC): 8 minutes
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff Constructive (2AC): 8 minutes
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg Constructive (2NC): 8 minutes
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Neg Rebuttal (1NR): 5 minutes
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Aff Rebuttal (1AR): 5 minutes
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg Rebuttal (2NR): 5 minutes
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff Rebuttal (2AR): 5 minutes
- ❖ The Constructives are for **building** the arguments; Rebuttals are for extending the **analysis**. Completely new arguments should not be brought up in the Rebuttals.



# Parliamentary Overview (Part 1)

---

- ❖ Parli is a debate about current event resolutions. **Debaters receive a new resolution every round**, and only have 20 minutes to prepare for the topic before their round.
- ❖ The judge will need to send the debaters the resolution 20 minutes before their round. Parli judges will be sent special instructions on how to view the Parli resolutions (the resolutions must be kept secret from the debaters so no one has an unfair advantage).
- ❖ About 38 minutes long.
- ❖ Debaters do NOT have prep time between speeches
- ❖ Two teams of two: Government (supporting the resolution) and Opposition (against the resolution)
- ❖ Evidence can and will be used, but it will not be as in-depth as in TP due to the lack of research time. Debaters should emphasize good logic and reasoning.
- ❖ Resolutions come in 4 types: **fact** (arguing about the truth of a statement), **value** (arguing about which value is more important), **policy** (arguing that a particular policy should or should not be taken), or **scenario** (arguing about what should be done given a hypothetical situation). Debaters may disagree in the round about the type of resolution they are debating.

# Parliamentary Overview (Part 2)

- ❖ Debaters do NOT have designated cross examination time.
- ❖ They may instead interrupt their opponents any time between the first and last minute of any constructive speech to ask a “point of information” (POI). POIs are only permitted in rebuttals if the teams say they will accept questions during rebuttals, but it is customary to not accept questions in rebuttals.
- ❖ In Ziggy, debaters who wish to ask a question should unmute themselves and say “Question.”
- ❖ The speaker’s time does NOT stop when they are being asked a question.
- ❖ It is customary to accept 2 to 3 questions per constructive speech, but debaters do **not** have to answer questions. Judges are free to give more or less speaker points based on debaters’ choice to answer or not to answer questions.
- ❖ Debaters can also raise "Points of Order," if they believe the other team is bringing up a new argument in a rebuttal speech. Debaters must unmute, say "Point of Order," wait for the speaker to **pause their timer**, and then the debater claiming a new argument may BRIEFLY explain why they think the argument is new.
- ❖ After explaining the new argument, the debater who is giving the speech may briefly explain why they think the argument is not new, or can admit that it is a new argument.
- ❖ The judge may EITHER tell the debaters whether they think it’s a new argument or not on the spot, OR they may simply say “I will take it into consideration,” and can evaluate it later when filling out the ballot. **The judge is the one who will ultimately decide if/how to factor in the Point of Order.**
- ❖ After the judge responds, the debater will unpause their timer and resume their speech.

# Sample Parli Resolutions

---

- ❖ **Fact:** Legislative obstructionism is better at achieving the goals of democracy than legislative compromise
- ❖ **Value:** This House believes that isolation is better than involvement
- ❖ **Policy:** The United States Federal Government should implement universal healthcare
- ❖ **Scenario:** Superheroes like the Avengers exist.  
Resolved: The government should regulate superheroes.

# Parli Structure

---

- ❖ There is NO PREP TIME during the round. They only have 20 minutes before the round when they are first given the resolution.
  - ❖ Government and Opposition are abbreviated as “Gov” and “Opp”
- ❖ The pattern of speeches is as follows:
  - Prime Minister Constructive (PMC): 7 min
  - Leader of Opp. Constructive (LOC): 7 min
  - Member of Gov. Constructive (MGC): 7 min
  - Member of Opp. Constructive (MOC): 7 min
  - Leader of Opp. Rebuttal (LOR): 5 min
  - Prime Minister Rebuttal (PMR): 5 min
- ❖ The Constructives are for **building** the arguments; Rebuttals are for extending the **analysis**. Completely new arguments should not be brought up in the Rebuttals.
- ❖ Each parli round will be unique and different, so judge the round primarily on logic and argumentation, and less on the style or structure of the case.

# Part 3 of 4: Judging Tips

# How to Judge, Part 1

---

- ❖ Listen carefully to what each debater says and **take good notes** to help you reflect back on the arguments
- ❖ Do NOT ask the debater what their record is or how experienced they are before submitting your ballot.
- ❖ **Set your own opinions aside.** If a debater says something you personally disagree with, that should not affect your decision. **Only** weigh the argument based on: (1) how well it was argued and (2) whether the other side responded well or at all. **Your personal opinions are not factors for who wins or loses.**
- ❖ If a debater makes a claim that has a significant bearing on the round, and you have doubts about the claim, BUT their opponents never refute or challenge the claim, let the claim stand. It's the debaters' job, not yours, to refute the arguments.

# How to Judge, Part 2

---

- ❖ The team who wins doesn't always have highest speaker points (although they certainly can). The win and loss should be awarded based on the quality of arguments, the quality of responses, and how well each team is able to convince you that their side is true based on good reasoning.
- ❖ **Fill out your ballot within 48 hours**, and when you're ready to submit it, click "Finalize." It will automatically send the ballot to the debaters and to Ziggy. Don't click Finalize until your ballot is finished.

# Writing the Ballot

---

- ❖ Use the speaker boxes to make suggestions to debaters on things they did well and things they need to improve - **listing several positive comments** encourages them, and **listing several things they could work** on (i.e., eliminating fillers, slowing down, using more vocal variety) strengthens them as a speaker.
- ❖ **Make sure to encourage the positive aspects of the performance while providing specific, helpful critique** (“do A instead of B” as opposed to “don’t do B”)
- ❖ In your Reason for Decision, consider which *specific* argument(s) persuaded you to vote the way you did, and list those for the debaters.
- ❖ If you have personal thoughts or suggestions about the arguments, feel free to include them on the ballot. However, make sure you *decide* the win based **only on the issues argued by the debaters.**



# S P E A K E R P O I N T S

Category	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Persuasiveness</b>	Poor speaker who neglects logic and believability in their argumentation.	Fair speaker with roughly equal amounts of clarity and confusion.	Average speaker with arguments you can follow and understand.	Speaker with more persuasive-than-average arguments. Well constructed, easily understood points.	Speaker with strongly compelling arguments.
<b>Organization</b>	Highly disorganized speaker whose points lack cohesion and are difficult to flow.	Speeches have some structure but overall lack connection between points.	Average organization. Most arguments/points follow a general or rough outline or roadmap.	Good organization of arguments and evidence/support that helps add clarity to the round.	Highly organized speaker whose points are easy to flow and are clearly labeled/tagged throughout the entire round.
<b>Delivery</b>	Displays a significant lack of confidence, has several distracting habits or mannerisms and/or is condescending, arrogant or abrasive.	Fair speaker with moments of confidence, but may also ramble, end speeches early, or is somewhat abrasive.	A good speaker who speaks clearly and articulately, although not with full confidence. Generally well-mannered.	Above average speaker who is confident, easy to listen to, and free from distracting habits. Well-mannered and courteous.	Highly polished speaker whose voice, volume, and vocabulary greatly enhance each speech. Highly respectful of opponent and others .
<b>Support</b>	Little or no evidence/support used to back up arguments, or evidence/support used is irrelevant and/or not explained or analyzed.	Some arguments have evidence/logical support, but most do not; evidence/support is not often impacted or is often read without analysis/explanation.	Most arguments are supported by adequate evidence and/or logic, while some arguments lack or have irrelevant support.	Consistent use of relevant evidence/examples and logic to support the major points in the round. Evidence/logic is usually explained well.	Every argument has quality, relevant evidence/examples and/or logical support. Speaker explains the reasoning behind each piece of support.
<b>Cross-Examination</b>	Unprepared to ask and/or answer questions; <u>and/or</u> extremely rude during cross-examination.	Asked confusing questions, gave vague and/or unconvincing answers, and/or was somewhat rude during cross-examination.	Asks reasonable questions and gave effective answers. May be slightly pushy or unaware toward opponent.	Asked probing, thoughtful questions and gave compelling, well-reasoned answers. Generally, very courteous.	Asked excellent questions that exposed or weakened the opponent's arguments. Utilized admissions in subsequent speeches. Answered arguments persuasively and without rambling. Always very courteous.
<b>Refutation</b>	Consistently inadequately addressing the points made by the opponent (either by failing to respond at all, or by mischaracterizing points.	Limited ability to identify and respond to opponent's arguments; responds okay some arguments responded to well while others responded to poorly.	Responds to most of opponent's actual points with rational, reasonable arguments.	Quickly and accurately makes sense of the opponent's major arguments and consistently responds with solid argumentation.	Exceptionally skilled in identifying the core/root issue of the opponent's arguments and presents quality, persuasive rebuttals to every argument.

# Part 4 of 4: Final Tips

# Evidence Requests

---

- ❖ If either team uses a piece of evidence that you have questions about or would like to see, they must either send you the piece of evidence in the chat with the other team, or they must email you the evidence and they must CC the other team.
- ❖ You may **NOT** ask to see the complete case of any team.
- ❖ You should **NOT** ask for evidence in Parli because of the limited prep time they have as they won't have fully prepared briefs like in TP or LD.

# Verbal Feedback

- ❖ Verbal feedback is allowed, and is recommended if you want to give feedback. However, do not feel obligated to give verbal feedback if you'd prefer to only write notes on the ballot.
- ❖ It helps to have records of feedback, so please write your most important comments on the ballot, even if you explain them in verbal feedback.
- ❖ **Do not tell the debaters who won during verbal feedback.** After verbal feedback is complete, please review your notes before deciding on a winner.

# Thank You!

---

- ❖ We appreciate your willingness to help train students to communicate well and to compete from a Christian ethical perspective.
- ❖ If you or your student have questions or want to view the official rules, please visit our Rules page (go to [www.ziggyonlinedebate.us](http://www.ziggyonlinedebate.us) and click the Rules button at the top of the page).
- ❖ Your feedback and comments are welcome and appreciated. Please direct any inquiries to Isaac Sommers at [ziggyonlinedebate@gmail.com](mailto:ziggyonlinedebate@gmail.com).