

Idaho High School Activities Association

John Billetz, Executive Director Julie Hammons, Assistant Director

Tel: (208)375-7027 Fax: (208)322-5505

8011 Ustick Rd. Boise, ID 83704

E-mail: admin@idhsaa.org

2009-2010

DEBATE

JUDGING MANUAL

2010 State Debate

March 12-13 Vallivue High School

Host: Heather Luff

Manager: Staci Hoseley

Idaho High School Activities Association

**2009-2010
Debate Judging Manual**

Introduction

As a debate judge, you are a very important part of an educational program designed to develop life skills of critical thinking, effective communication, and leadership. Judges must strive to meet high standards of ethical behavior and knowledge of subject.

This guide is intended to serve as a judging resource and also to provide information about debate competition, especially district and state tournaments.

Table of Contents

2009-2010 Rules	
Debate Rules Changes	1
General Speech Arts Rules for Judges	2
Debate Rules for Judges	3-4
Responsibilities and Ethics of Judging	5
Judging a Debate	6
Policy Debate	7
Lincoln-Douglas Debate	8
Public Forum Debate	9
How to Flow a Policy Debate	10
How to Flow a Lincoln-Douglas Debate	10
Debate Terms	11
Philosophy Form for Policy Debate	12
Philosophy Form for Lincoln-Douglas Debate	13
Remuneration Form / W-9	14

Debate Rules Changes 2009-2010

1. State Debate Tournament Format, #2: No round will be scheduled to begin later than 9:00 pm on the first day.

Idaho High School Activities Association 2009-2010 General Speech Arts Rules for Judges

Note: The following rules are those which most pertain to judges. For a complete list of drama rules, refer to the current IHSAA Rules and Regulations Manual.

2009-2010 State Tournaments

Drama	December 4-5	Bonneville High School	(Dist Completion – November 21)
Debate	March 12-13	Vallivue High School	(Dist Completion – February 27)
Speech	April 16-17	Century High School	(Dist Completion – April 3)

Judges

1. **Age:** Speech arts judges shall have been graduated from high school for at least twenty months.
2. **Certification:** Judges shall register, pay a required fee, watch the online certification clinic and score 80% on a written test every year.
3. **Pay Scale:** At district and state drama, certified judges will be paid \$10.00 per round, non-certified judges will be paid \$5.00 per round. The IHSAA will only pay certified judges at state.

State Tournament Judging Requirements

1. *Drama & Speech:* Each school must bring one "hired" judge in addition to the coach. *Debate:* Each school must bring one "hired" judge for every 7 students, or fraction thereof.
2. Certified judges will be assigned before non-certified judges if possible.
3. Novice judges must attend a non-certifying rules clinic at the state tournament site.

Tournament Inquiry Procedure

1. Concerns regarding possible rules violations by coaches or competitors during state tournaments must be submitted in writing to the tournament manager. The complaint will be reviewed and, if necessary, a grievance committee will be convened to consider the inquiry and determine dispensation.
2. A contestant who is found to have violated general rules or specific rules of an event may be disqualified by the tournament management.

2009-2010 Debate Rules for Judges

Note: The following rules are those which most pertain to judges. For a complete list of debate rules, refer to the current IHSAA Rules and Regulations Manual

POLICY DEBATE

Policy debate, also known as team debate, is a series of contention-quote-analysis organized argumentation between two teams of two members each. The debate is like a trial, but an idea or proposal is being tried rather than a person. There are two sides to a debate - affirmative which attempts to show something is wrong with the present system (status quo) and thus a change is needed, and negative which usually takes the position that the present system is acceptable, that no problem exists to an extent that warrants or justifies a change. It is the obligation of the affirmative to debate the topic and offer reasonable solutions. The negative usually argues that the status quo is proven to be workable and that a minor change may be all that is needed. (Negative may use a counter plan.)

Time Limits for Policy Debate

8 minutes	constructive speeches	5 minutes	rebuttal
3 minutes	cross-examination	5 minutes	down time

2009-2010 Policy Debate Topic

Poverty

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States.

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

1. Lincoln-Douglas debate is a “one-on-one” argumentation where the debaters attempt to convince the judge of the acceptability of their side of a proposition of value. A proposition of value is a statement about the qualities we assign to a given object as something we are favorable toward, or the opposite, as something we are not favorable toward. Value resolutions take several forms:
 - a. Moral value resolutions - state that something is good or bad in an ethical sense.
 - b. Artistic value resolutions - state that something is pleasing or displeasing to our senses.
 - c. Political value resolutions - state preferences in political philosophies.Some Lincoln-Douglas debate propositions are worded to offer two conflicting values while some L-D propositions regard the acceptability of a single value.
2. Format: Each speaker in the debate has an equal amount of time to persuade the judge.
3. Duties of the Speakers
 - a. The Affirmative speaker is required to uphold an analysis of the value(s) implied in the resolution.
 - b. The Negative speaker may choose:
 1. To uphold a countervailing analysis of the value(s) implied in the resolution OR
 2. To offer a straight refutation of the Affirmative position OR
 3. To offer a combination of counter analysis and refutation.
 - c. Both speakers bear the burden of clash in rebuttal speeches; that is, each must speak to his/her opponent’s position in the debate.

Time Limits for Lincoln-Douglas Debate

6 minutes	affirmative constructive speeches
3 minutes	cross-examination by negative
7 minutes	negative constructive speeches
3 minutes	cross-examination by affirmative
4 minutes	affirmative rebuttal
6 minutes	negative rebuttal
3 minutes	affirmative rebuttal
3 minutes	down time

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Topics

1. The district Lincoln-Douglas topic is published in the December issue of the NFL Rostrum.
2. The state Lincoln-Douglas topic is published in the February issue of the NFL Rostrum.
3. The state L-D topic shall not be debated nor observed at any tournament prior to the state tournament.

IDAHO DEBATE CODE

The purpose of this code is to clarify rules and format for interscholastic debate. The code is specifically applied to the district and state debate tournaments, but may also serve as a guide for the invitational season. Violations of Debate Code Rules 1-12 could result in loss of the ballot or disqualification: Violations of Rules 13-14 are not subject to loss of the ballot or disqualification.

1. There shall be no scouting by a coach, judge, or contestant in order to obtain advance information of an opponent’s case. There shall be no heckling, distractions or flowing of the debate by observers. Observers shall be affiliated with one of the participating teams or obtain permission from the tournament manager.
2. It is illegal to falsify evidence. Any evidence used in a debate must be available for inspection by the judge or the opposition. A judge may examine evidence only if the issue of falsification occurs during the round.
3. A five-minute preparation time is allotted for each policy team to be used at their discretion, except during speeches. A three-minute preparation time is allotted each L-D debater. The timekeeper, designated by the judge, will keep track of this time.
4. The first aff. must define the terms of the proposition either literally or operationally. The first neg. may either accept or reject the definition of terms. Any topicality arguments must be initiated in the first negative constructive speech.
5. The affirmative must present the plan, or a reasonable outline, during the first affirmative constructive speech.
6. In a counter plan case, or where a specific minor repair is advanced by the negative, the negative must present the proposal during the first negative constructive speech. The negative must not implement the resolution advanced by the affirmative.

7. In cross-examination:
 - a. The questioner controls the time, and may interrupt the witness to request shorter answers or indicate that the answer given is sufficient.
 - b. Each speaker on a team must ask questions. The team may determine the order in which each team member asks questions.
 - c. Where appropriate, the witness may clarify his or her answer. The witness must answer any legitimate question to which an answer can be given.
 - d. The witness shall not ask questions of the questioner except for the purpose of clarification.
 - e. The witness must answer without consultation, aid or instruction from his/her colleague.
 - f. Only the person being examined or the examiner may speak.
8. During cross examination, constructive and rebuttal speeches, the speaker's partner may not verbally assist or interrupt.
9. The judge is ultimately responsible for times in the round. Debaters are responsible for timing their speeches and staying within the allotted times. A road map is included in the speakers allotted time.
10. New issues shall not be advanced in rebuttal speeches; however, additional evidence and extensions on previous arguments are appropriate.
11. Evidence must be identified by author, title, date of publication and page number. Subsequent reference can be abbreviated.
12. Permission to record a debate must be obtained from all coaches and debaters involved.
13. Contestants shall receive no outside assistance once the round has begun.
14. Laptops are allowed in debate.

Grounds for Disqualification

1. Falsification of evidence
2. Failure to produce evidence upon request
3. Switching code numbers, divisions or partners
4. Scouting or receiving advance information of an opponent's case at the tournament.

Grounds for Forfeiture of Round

An entry will forfeit a round for failure to appear within ten minutes of the scheduled time, unless the delay is caused by the tournament itself. A forfeit will result in a loss, a rank of 7, and 0 speaker points.

Appropriate Debating

A signed Principal Approval Statement must be submitted to both district and state tournament managers to acknowledge that:

- a. All argumentation advanced by debaters from the school will meet the standards of conduct of that school,
- b. All constructive speeches, rebuttals, cross examinations (both questions and answers) will be appropriate in both language and action for use in public performance by high school students. The use of profane, vulgar, harassing or discriminatory language and/or action is inappropriate.

Judging Guidelines

1. State debate judges shall file policy and L-D philosophy statements that will be posted for examination.
2. One policy debate constitutes a judging round. Two LD debates constitute a judging round.
3. A judge should not judge a contestant more than once.
4. Each school will be provided with a copy of their ballot.
5. The ballot is the official decision of the judge.
6. Judges are not obligated to "defend a ballot" or answer a coach's questions regarding a ballot decision.
7. Oral critiques are not given at state debate.
8. Judges do not disqualify contestants. Rule violations shall be reported to the tournament manager.

Observers at State Debate

1. Scouting: Violators will be disqualified.
 - a. No L-D contestant shall observe another contestant at any point during the tournament.
 - b. No Policy contestant shall observe an opponent or receive advance information about an opponent's case from a coach, judge, or other contestant.
2. Observers: All rounds at state debate are open. Exceptions: a) LD competitors shall not observe LD rounds until they are eliminated from the tournament.
 - b) Anyone having a bye or forfeit shall not observe rounds during their bye/forfeit time.
3. Observers' Affiliation: Observers must be affiliated with one of the participating entries unless prior written permission has been granted by the tournament manager.
4. Observers' Behavior: There shall be no heckling, distractions or flowing of a debate by observers.

Idaho High School Activities Association

RESPONSIBILITIES AND ETHICS IN JUDGING DEBATE

Professionalism

1. Be professional in appearance and actions.
2. Bring judging materials including timer, paper, writing implements, and judging manual.
3. Arrive on time and attend scheduled pre-tournament meetings.
4. Review rules and judging procedures prior to each tournament.

Assignments

1. Avoid judging students you know personally (especially those from your school). If you are assigned to judge someone you have judged previously in the tournament or someone you know, notify tournament management immediately.
2. Do not trade ballots with other judges.
3. Be available and ready to accept new judging assignments when necessary.

When you enter the contest room

1. Control the room setting – be aware of observers
2. Review competition procedures (see “ground rules” for debaters).
3. Check codes – but do not ask speakers where they are from.
4. Review your judge paradigm.

Judging

1. Listen – pay attention - take notes
2. Do not interrupt a speaker to ask questions or make comments.
3. **At district and state debate, you must judge according to the Idaho Debate Code.**
4. Render a fair and objective decision of each contestant. Avoid favoritism and keep personal preference (including style and subject) out of the judging decision.
5. Fill out the ballot with all required information.
6. Do not disclose your decision or give oral critiques.
7. Return ballots to the tournament desk promptly and wait for ballot to be checked. Do not keep ballots during a following round or leave the tournament with a ballot.
8. Report rules infractions to tournament officials and make appropriate notations on the ballot.
9. **In Policy Debate, if a violation of the Idaho Debate Code impacts your decision, come to the tabulation room before filling out the ballot.**

When you have questions

1. Take good notes.
2. After all presentations are complete, bring questions / concerns to the tournament desk.

Idaho High School Activities Association

JUDGING A DEBATE

Decorum

The judge is the highest authority in the room and it is his/her responsibility to assure that proper decorum is followed. Announce the following contestant “**ground rules**” prior to the first round:

- No one may enter or leave the room after the debate has begun.
- Be courteous and respectful towards your competitors. Spectators guilty of rude or distracting behavior will be required to leave.
- Time signals may be given only by the judge (or designee). (Review / illustrate time signals).
- Only the judge is permitted to flow the debate.
- Oral critiques will not be given.

The Flow

Note taking by the judge is not only desirable, but also critical. It eliminates an element of passivity which exists in the relationship between the judge and debaters. Taking notes actively involves the judge in the debater's performance and provides feedback to the debaters. Debaters use the judge's note taking activity as a cue to what is important and what may be irrelevant. However, it is also important to give your full attention to the debate. It is not fair to the debater to speak to the top of the judge's head throughout the debate.

Notes are also important to help remember the debate. A judge who has listened to 60 minutes of debating needs notes in order to formulate a decision and justify that decision. The competitors should never have to wonder why a particular decision was made.

The Decision

By state rule, you must follow the Idaho Debate Code at district and state tournaments.

Factors that influence a decision must be issues of the debaters. The judge is not part of the debate, and must remain objective and impartial! Remember, debaters have no choice about which side of a topic they must uphold. Decisions must not be made on the basis of the judge's personal convictions regarding the topic or the style in which it was debated.

Do not disclose any decision or answer a coach's questions prior to the release of ballots. Judges are not obligated to "defend a ballot" to a coach or debater.

The Ballot

Once a decision has been reached, it must be recorded on the ballot. Be certain to provide all information requested. Seemingly unimportant information often is necessary for tournament administration in cases of tie-breaking, power-matching, or determining speaker awards.

Ballots that are filled out completely also help competitors get a better picture of their performance. A conscientious judge will never turn in a ballot without comments that provide specific, constructive critique. Generalizations are worthless. If a debater does something wrong, say so, but always suggest how to correct that problem in a positive and sincere manner.

POLICY DEBATE

Policy debate, also known as team debate, is a series of contention-quote-analysis organized argumentation between two teams of two members to each team. The debate is very much like a trial in which an idea or proposal is being tried rather than a person.

There are two sides to a debate:

1. affirmative which attempts to show something is wrong with the present system (status quo) and thus a change is needed
2. negative which usually takes the position that the present system is acceptable, that no problem exists to an extent that warrants or justifies a change. It is the obligation of the affirmative to debate the topic and offer reasonable solutions. The negative usually (negative *may* consider use of a counter plan) argues that the status quo is proven to be workable and that a minor change may be all that is needed.

Affirmative Teams

The affirmative teams will use one of two general approaches. Traditional Needs or Comparative Advantages. In either approach, four elements must be demonstrated to the judge's satisfaction to prove the case:

1. Justification - there is either a need or an advantage
2. Flaw in status quo - inherency or uniqueness
3. Plan meets justification for change
4. Plan is workable and free from major disadvantages

It is the obligation of the affirmative to debate the topic and offer reasonable solutions. Abusive affirmative interpretations should not be allowed, but original argumentation and original thinking are not to be discouraged.

Topicality is a voting issue.

Traditional Needs Approach

1. There is a problem or need with the plan - termed harm and significance.
2. Inherency - the status quo cannot presently deal with the need.
3. Introduced plan meets need or solves the problem.
4. Introduced plan is workable and free from major disadvantages.

Comparative Advantages Approach

1. There is an advantage to implement change. There is a benefit and significance.
2. Uniqueness - the advantage is unique to the change that cannot be achieved by status quo.
3. Introduced plan increases advantage.
4. Introduced plan is workable and free from major disadvantages.

Negative Teams

The negative usually argues that the status quo is proven to be workable and may only need a minor change to be perfect. Remember, the negative needs to win only one stock issue.

General Approaches

1. The negative will offer clash to the affirmative's position with evidence and reasoning.
2. Strategies may include defense of the status quo.
3. Straight refutation
4. Recognize minor repairs are needed and offer counterplan.
5. Kritik:: Recognizing problematic philosophic assumptions
6. Questioning Topicality

Time Limits: Policy Debate

- 8 minutes: constructive speeches
- 3 minutes: cross-examination
- 5 minutes: rebuttal
- 5 minutes: down time

Who Wins the Policy Debate?

In policy debate the affirmative has the burden of proof. The affirmative should prove a need for change. The negative has presumption. At the end of the round the judge should consider whether or not the negative presented "reasonable doubt" regarding the affirmative proposal. Did the affirmative "prove" a legitimate need for change? The negative may present reasonable doubt by winning stock issues, by weighing advantages versus disadvantages, through risk analysis of the affirmative plan, and/or overall persuasiveness or credibility of the arguments. Depending on the judge's philosophy or paradigm (stock issues, policy making, communication, tabu la rasa, etc.) different decision making philosophies may be implemented. Regardless of the philosophy chosen, the bottom line in making the decision should ultimately fall to burden of proof and presumption.

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

1. Lincoln-Douglas debate is a "one-on-one" argumentation where the debaters attempt to convince the judge of the acceptability of their side of a proposition of value. A proposition of value is a statement about the qualities we assign to a given object (etc.) as something we are favorable toward, or the opposite, as something we are not favorable toward. Value resolutions take several forms:
 - a. Moral value resolutions - state that something is good or bad in an **ethical** sense.
 - b. Artistic value resolutions - state that something is pleasing or displeasing to our **senses**.
 - c. Political value resolutions - state **preferences** in political philosophies.
2. Some Lincoln-Douglas debate propositions are worded to offer two conflicting values: i.e. "Preservation of environment should take precedence over resource development." Some Lincoln-Douglas propositions regard the acceptability of a single value: i.e. "Plea bargaining is an acceptable method of administering justice."
3. There are no stock issues in L-D, and there is no plan for change; rather, L-D is debated on value resolutions. One may see the value or benefits to be gained from both sides.. The position of the two sides are implicit in the resolution. The resolution will indicate that one thing is better than another. (example: Liberty is more important than safety.)

Duties of the Speakers

1. The Affirmative speaker is required to uphold an analysis of the value(s) implied in the resolution.
2. The Negative speaker may choose:
 - a. To uphold a countervailing analysis of the value(s) implied in the resolution OR
 - b. To offer a straight refutation of the Affirmative position OR
 - c. To offer a combination of counter analysis and refutation.
3. Both speakers bear the burden of clash in rebuttal speeches, that is, each must speak to his/her opponent's position in the debate.

Format

1. Each speaker in the debate has an equal amount of time to persuade the judge. Two Lincoln-Douglas debates constitute one round of judging.
2. Time Limits
 - 6 minutes, affirmative constructive speech
 - 3 minutes, cross-examination by negative
 - 7 minutes, negative constructive speech
 - 3 minutes, cross-examination by affirmative
 - 4 minutes, affirmative rebuttal
 - 6 minutes, negative rebuttal
 - 3 minutes, affirmative rebuttal
 - 3 minutes, down time

Who Wins the Lincoln-Douglas Debate?

Value debating is more subjective (feelings) than policy debating which is more objective (factual), however, L-D debaters must still substantiate arguments with evidence. In L-D, the debater who defended his/her position on the value topic more effectively will win the debate. Consider logic, reasoning, and evidence most heavily - presentation and "ethos" secondary.

(Ethos is the disposition, character or attitude peculiar to a specific people, culture, or group that distinguishes it from other peoples or groups; fundamental values, spirit, or mores.)

Idaho High School Activities Association

Public Forum Debate

(adopted from the NFL)

Public Forum Debate is audience friendly debate that focuses on advocacy of a position derived from the issues presented in the resolution, not a prescribed set of burdens. A Public Forum Debate round begins with a flip of a coin between the competing teams to determine sides and speaker position. Public Forum tests skills in argumentation, cross-examination, and refutation.

1. Topics: Specific topics for district and state tournaments will be published in the *Rostrum* and at www.nflonline.org.

2. Procedure: Prior to EVERY round and in the presence of the judge(s), a coin is tossed by one team and called by the other team. The team that wins the flip may choose one of two options: EITHER the **SIDE** of the topic they wish to defend (pro or con) OR the **SPEAKING POSITION** they wish to have (begin the debate or end the debate). The remaining option (SIDE OR SPEAKING POSITION) is the choice of the team that loses the flip. Once speaking positions and sides have been determined, the debate can begin. Each speaker shall have four minutes for constructive argument, alternating between pro and con. (Please keep in mind that the debate may begin with a con speech.) Following the first two constructive speeches, the two debaters who have just given speeches will stand and participate in a three-minute "crossfire". [In "crossfire" both debaters "hold the floor"] However, the first question must be asked by the speaker who spoke first. After that question, either debater may question and/or answer at will.] At the end of the first "crossfire", the four-minute constructive arguments are continued by the students yet to speak. At the conclusion of the last two constructive arguments, another three-minute "crossfire" takes place between the two debaters who just spoke using the crossfire procedure discussed above. Following the four constructive speeches and two "crossfire" segments, the 1st speakers for each team will each give a 2-minute summary continuing established alternation. The summary speeches should include the arguments his or her team is winning and refuting of arguments if it is losing. At the conclusion of the summary speeches, all four debaters will remain seated and participate in a three-minute "Grand Crossfire" in which all four debaters are allowed to cross-examine one another. The first question must be asked by the speaker who gave the first summary speech. At the conclusion of the "Grand Crossfire", the second speakers will each give a 1-minute "Final Focus" speech. The "Final Focus" is a persuasive final restatement of why a team has won the debate.

Public Forum Timing Schedule

First Speaker - Team A = 4 Minutes

First Speaker - Team B = 4 Minutes

Crossfire = 3 Minutes

Second Speaker - Team A = 4 Minutes

Second Speaker - Team B = 4 Minutes

Crossfire = 3 Minutes

Summary - First Speaker - Team A = 2 Minutes

Summary - First Speaker - Team B = 2 Minutes

Grand Crossfire = 3 Minutes

Final Focus - Second Speaker - Team A = 1 Minute

Final Focus - Second Speaker - Team B = 1 Minute

Prep Time (per team) = 2 Minutes

3. Plans/Counterplans: In Public Forum Debate, a plan or counterplan is defined by the NFL as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Neither the pro or con side is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan; rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.

HOW TO FLOW A POLICY DEBATE

Remember, all debate speeches are a series of contention-quote-analysis chains. The first Negative specializes in refuting the Affirmative case. The Second Negative specializes in attacking the Affirmative plan. Each speaker in a debate has certain duties.

						Closing Arguments	
1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
Aff Philo- sophy	Neg Philo- sophy		Attack Plan I Solvency 1. 2. 3.		Answer Plan Attacks of 2NC	Summary Case Responses (Plan not needed)	Summary Plan Responses
Propo- sition Plan 1. 2. 3. 4.	Attack Case 1. 2. 3. 4.	Rebuild Case 1. 2. 3. 4	Dis.Ads 1. 2.	Attack (case) Again		Summary Plan Attacks	Summary Case (need for plan)
8 min 3 min cx	8 min 3 cx	8 min 3 cx	8 min 3 cx	5	5	5	4 times for speeches

In the case of a tie, the debate goes to the negative. The judge must enforce down time and give reasonable and accurate signals during cross-examinations and during speeches.

HOW TO FLOW A LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

Aff Con	Neg Con	Aff Rebuttal	Neg Rebuttal	Aff Rebuttal
Definitions Criteria	Neg Attacks	Answer Neg Attacks	Continue Attacks on Aff Analysis	Final Defense
Contentions	Definitions Criteria	Attacks	Rebuild the Neg	Continue Attacks
	Contentions		Summary	Summary

DEBATE TERMS

1. ANALYSIS - Explanation of a quote and how it proves a contention.
2. BRIEF - A series of responses, and the evidence to back up the responses, against a possible attack or contention, or an opponent.
3. BURDEN OF PROOF - The burden of proof to present a prima facie case supporting the debate resolution is on the affirmative.
4. BURDEN OF PROVING - The obligation of any speaker to prove an argument which the speaker generates. He who asserts, must prove.
5. CASE - Why the affirmative proposes the plan.
6. CASESIDE ISSUES - This term incorporates topicality, significance and inherency and establishes the reasons why the resolution should be implemented. Generally, caseside issues are addressed by the first affirmative and first negative constructive speakers.
7. COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE - A type of affirmative case which shows that the resolution will have significant and unique advantages over the status quo.
8. CONSTRUCTIVES - First four speeches where arguments from constructives are further constructed.
9. COUNTERPLAN - A negative case approach which admits that the present system should be changed, but which advocates an alternate plan. The counterplan must be non topical. It cannot enact the resolution. It must be competitive with the affirmative plan. It must be presented by the first negative constructive speaker.
10. DISADVANTAGES - This argument is based on the possibility that we can enact the resolution and solve the problem, but in doing so, we introduce problems more serious than those we intended to solve. The Affirmative must demonstrate that the evils of the disadvantages are outweighed by the benefits of the resolution.
11. EXTRA TOPICALITY - Used to describe the state of nonconformity to the debate resolution. If needs are solved or advantages gained as a direct result of some plank of the plan which does not implement the resolution, the term is applied.
12. FIAT - An assumed power to put a proposal into effect. Fiat is related to the word "should" in the resolution and means that the plan ought to be implemented. It cannot be the basis of any arguments regarding workability, advantages or disadvantages.
13. FLOW - Keeping track of key points of a debate by making notes.
14. INHERENCY - The causal relationship between the absence of the resolution and the continuation of the problem cited. It generates the questions of why the problem will continue if we fail to affirm the resolution. The focus is why we must affirm the resolution in order to be able to solve the problem.
15. PLAN - What the affirmative proposes to do.
16. PLANSIDE ISSUES - This term incorporates solvency and disadvantage arguments and establishes the consequences of implementation of the resolution. Traditionally, these issues are addressed by the second affirmative and second negative speakers.
17. PRESUMPTION - The assumption that conditions and policies should remain as they are. The present system is presumed to be adequate until or unless the affirmative establishes that a change in the system is necessary or would be advantageous.
18. PRIMA FACIE - A case which, "at first look", appears reasonable and prudent. A prima facie case must include a specific plan to implement the resolution as well as justification for the implementation.
19. QUOTE - A statement from an expert.
20. SIGNIFICANCE - Arguments center on whether the need or advantage is compelling. Does the present system have a serious inadequacy which generates a serious problem?
21. SOLVENCY - This argument is based upon the ability of the affirmative to demonstrate that the implementation of the resolution will solve the problem. The plan must indicate results on which solving the problem depends.
22. STATUS QUO - The present system as it exists today. That which would be changed by the affirmative plan.
23. TABULA RASA - Before experience; A need to begin from the start; A clean slate.
24. TOPICALITY - Arguments center on whether the action advocated by the affirmative matches the action referred to in the resolution.

Idaho High School Activities Association
Judge's Philosophy – Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Judge's Name _____

Date _____

1. My experience with Lincoln-Douglas (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> coach of team	<input type="checkbox"/> L-D debater in high school
<input type="checkbox"/> frequently judge L-D	<input type="checkbox"/> L-D debater in college
<input type="checkbox"/> no L-D experience	<input type="checkbox"/> other (please describe)

2. number of years experience in L-D debate

3. Circle your attitudes concerning the following Lincoln-Douglas practices:
 - a. Rate of Delivery

slow	1	2	3	4	5	rapid
------	---	---	---	---	---	-------
 - b. Persuasive Communication

least important	1	2	3	4	5	most important
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------
 - c. L-D Theory Arguments

unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	acceptable
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	------------
 - d. Value Premise/Core Value

unnecessary	1	2	3	4	5	mandatory
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----------
 - e. Use of Example

optional	1	2	3	4	5	decisive
----------	---	---	---	---	---	----------
 - f. Use of Evidence

little	1	2	3	4	5	much
--------	---	---	---	---	---	------
 - g. Resolving Substantive Issues

least important	1	2	3	4	5	most important
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------
 - 2 Burden of Clash

unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	decisive
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------
 - i. Approach to Resolution

philosophic concept	1	2	3	4	5	pragmatic application
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----------------------
 - j. Focusing on a few key issues is more important than clashing with each specific point

agree	1	2	3	4	5	disagree
-------	---	---	---	---	---	----------
 - k. Rebuttals

crystallize	1	2	3	4	5	line by line
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	--------------

Housekeeping – State Tournaments

JUDGE’S REMUNERATION FORM

1. After each round, fill out the form, initial, and give to ballot desk with your completed ballots. The official will also initial the form and return it to you.
2. After your final judging assignment, sign the form and turn it in to the ballot desk. The official will also sign it and return the yellow copy for your records

SAMPLE FORM

Certified judges receive \$10 per round; Non-certified judges will not be paid by the IHSAA. This form must be turned in at completion of tournament & a W-9 must be on file with the Idaho High School Activities Association before payment of fees can be made.

<u>Round</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Event/Category</u>	<u>Initials</u>	
			<u>Judge</u>	<u>Ballot Desk</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total Number of Rounds Judged:			_____	_____

Judge's Signature: _____

Ballot Desk Official's Signature: _____

IRS FORM W-9

The Internal Revenue Service requires that the IHSAA must have on file a Form W-9 for each judge or paid official at all State events. We must receive the completed form before payment can be made.

The W-9 form must be filed only once. If you have previously submitted a W-9 to our office and your address has not changed, please disregard this notice. If you have not submitted a W-9 or if your address has changed, please return the completed form to the ballot table before you leave the tournament.