

NCFL POLICY DEBATE JUDGES INSTRUCTION SHEET 2019

Thank you for taking the time today to judge this event. It is our hope that both the students and judges find it to be mutually beneficial.

Policy debate involves two-person teams, one affirmative and one negative, who will be debating this year's resolution: **Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States.**

Round Format

There are four 8-minute constructive speeches, beginning with the 1AC and alternating sides. Each constructive is followed by a 3-minute cross-examination period. Then there are four 5-minute rebuttals, beginning with the 1NR and alternating sides. Prep time is 5 minutes per team.

Decisions

At the end of the debate, you must choose a winning team. All rounds will have at least 3 judges, but **YOU MAY NOT CONFER WITH THE OTHER JUDGES.**

In a debate event, this should be based on the persuasiveness of the arguments advanced at the end of the debate according to what the debaters said, not what you believe or think to be correct, and not solely on the quality of their speaking styles.

According to NCFL Bylaws, "Judges are prohibited from reading any materials presented in any speech unless falsification is suspected by the opponent and the original source in question is available in the round." Thus, decisions and points should be entered soon after the end of the debate. You may enter additional comments up until the end of the tournament.

YOU ARE NOT TO DISCLOSE YOUR DECISION to other debaters, coaches, or judges.

Points and Ranks

You must rank the students from 1 to 4, 1 being the being the best, 4 the least best. Ties in rank are not allowed.

You must give speaker points to each debater. Ties in points are allowed, as are low-point wins.

Please use the following scale, even if it is not your normal scale, to ensure a fair ranking of teams when elimination round participants are determined:

<p>29.5-30: I wish I could frame your speeches; your strategic decision-making belongs in a textbook</p> <p>29.1-29.4: you left no doubt about who won and are better than most debaters at this tournament</p> <p>28.8-29.0: you were effective and strategic, and made only minor mistakes</p> <p>28.3-28.7: you mainly did the right thing, but made some small errors</p> <p>27.8-28.2: you made strategic errors or drops, left something to be desired</p> <p>27.3-27.7: you missed things, were hard to follow, and need improvement</p> <p>27.0-27.2: you advanced little in the debate or cost your team the round</p> <p>26.0-26.9: you are not ready for this division/tournament</p> <p>Below 26: you were offensive, ignorant, rude, or tried to cheat (MUST come to tab)</p>

Event Structure and Common Practices

First Affirmative constructive presents the affirmative case and plan. Within the case, the affirmative will identify an inherent problem, the problem is significant and they will offer a plan that solves this problem and what advantages are accrued as a result of the affirmative solvency.

The second negative cross-examines the first affirmative.

First Negative constructive will make arguments, both in theory and in substance, against the affirmative case. The typical but not exclusive negative arguments are:

- Topicality- a negative argument that claims the affirmative is violating a word(s) in the resolution
- Disadvantage- by voting affirmative, certain bad things are going to happen
- Critique- this is an argument that may indict the resolution as a whole, the language of the opposing team, or the performance of the opposing team.
- Counterplan- The negative may offer an alternative proposal to the affirmative plan
- Case arguments- these are arguments against the affirmative's inherency, significance, and/or solvency

The affirmative cross-examines the first negative

Second affirmative constructive answers these negative arguments, extends their arguments from the 1ac, and may further elaborate on any position.

The negative cross-examines the second affirmative.

Second negative constructive answers some of the affirmative answers, extends their arguments from the 1nc, and may further elaborate on any position.

The affirmative cross-examines the second negative speaker.

At this point, the rebuttals begin, with the negative first. The first negative rebuttal is considered an extension of the second negative constructive. No new arguments may be introduced into the debate in the rebuttals, but new evidence is allowed if it extends an existing argument.

Here is a quick guide for the speaker order:

1ac 8min
(3min cx)
1nc 8min
(3 min cx)
2ac 8min
(3 min cx)
2nc 8min
(3min cx)
1nr 5min
1ar 5min
2nr 5min
2ar 5min