



AUCKLAND SCHOOLS DEBATING

Proudly sponsored by Russell McVeagh

TEACHER ADJUDICATOR SEMINAR 2012

ADJUDICATING IS A REQUIREMENT FOR ALL JUNIOR & SENIOR OPEN COACHES

- If you coach one team, you will be rostered to adjudicate at least two debates during the year. If you coach two teams, you will be asked to adjudicate at least four debates. You will not be asked to adjudicate more than three debates per team you coach.
- If, for any reason, you are not able to fulfil your adjudication responsibilities, you must arrange for another teacher within your school to adjudicate for you. If there is no-one to adjudicate the debate you are rostered for, your team will lose that round by default.
- Adjudicating will make you a better coach!

PURPOSE OF THIS SEMINAR

- Provide the basics so you are comfortable adjudicating Junior & Senior Open debates.
- To answer your questions.

THE COMMITTEE IS HERE TO HELP

The Committee appreciates the time commitment that teachers put in to debating, and particularly in to adjudicating. ASD could not be run without you.

If you have any questions throughout the competition, the ASD website contains all the information about the competition: <http://aucklandschoolsdebating.org.nz> or you can email the committee at info@aucklandschoolsdebating.org.nz

The grade convenors for 2012 are:

Junior Open: Corinne Marti
Senior Open: Jessica Storey

The debates in 2012 will take place at the following schools:

Junior Open	
West	Rutherford College
Central	Epsom Girls Grammar
North	Westlake Girls High School
East	Howick College
South	Tangaroa College

Senior Open	
West	Avondale College
Central	Mt Roskill Grammar
North	Westlake Boys High School
East	St Kentigern College
South	King's College



AUCKLAND SCHOOLS DEBATING

Proudly sponsored by Russell McVeagh

THE FUNCTIONS OF AN ADJUDICATOR

There are three primary functions of an adjudicator:

- Controlling the debate
- Determining the winner
- Delivering the adjudication

(a) **Controlling The Debate**

The two most important qualities of a good adjudicator are **confidence** and **control**. The students, other teachers, and parents, will look to you to lead the process for the debate, and expect that you know what is going on.

Before the debate

Know the rules!

- (i) The order of speakers (First affirmative, first negative, second affirmative, second negative, third affirmative, third negative, negative reply, affirmative reply) Third speakers can not give the reply
- (ii) The timing of speeches (Junior Open = 5 minute speeches, with 2.5 minute replies; Senior open = 6 minute speeches with 3 minute replies). A warning bell is given one minute before the end of the speech.
- (iii) Points of Information – only in Senior Open by agreement from both teams during preliminary rounds and they are mandatory during the final rounds.

A full copy of the rules is available on the ASD website:
<http://aucklandschoolsdebating.org.nz/competition/rules/>

Make sure you arrive at the debate room on time.

Make sure that you have a mark sheet (the host school convenor will provide you with one); note paper and a pen!

Before the debate commences, fill out the mechanical details on the mark sheet. Please ensure that the full names of all debaters are recorded legibly and are correctly spelt, and that the school and team number is completed (e.g St Kents 2).

Check to see if you have a timekeeper and chairperson. The chairperson is traditionally from the affirming school, and the time keeper the negating school, though there are no rigid rules around this. If there is no-one to fulfil these duties, then take it upon yourself to be the chairperson, and if necessary, the timekeeper too.



AUCKLAND SCHOOLS DEBATING

Proudly sponsored by Russell McVeagh

During the debate

You control the pace of the debate. Indicate to the chairperson when you are ready for each speaker to take the floor.

The following conduct is not permitted during a debate:

- (iv) Audience/coach participation: hand signals to count down the time is permissible. Offering advice of what to say in the next speech, or being critical of the opposition is not.
- (v) Personal attacks by speakers.
- (vi) Swearing, racism, or other inappropriate language.
- (vii) Heckling.
- (viii) Extreme facial expressions, sniggers, snorting, and the like
- (ix) Loud talking between the speakers during a speech is not permissible

Use your discretion in how you handle any inappropriate behaviour. Usually a reminder in between speeches is sufficient. If the noise between speakers during a speech is too loud, a simple "sssshhh" or calling "order" is likely to be enough.

After the debate

After delivering your adjudication, be available for individual feedback if the students would like it. There is no need to stay for more than an extra 5 or so minutes for this.

Return the completed mark sheet to the Host School Coordinator.

Complaints/Breaches of the rules

If a complaint arises or there is a concern that the rules may have been breached, always continue with the debate.

Inform the Host School Convenor of the circumstances giving rise to the complaint as soon as possible. The Committee will then determine what the best course of action is (e.g. whether the result should stand or what, if any, sanction is appropriate).

(b) Determining the winner

There are no draws in debating. You must determine a winner.

The basic question to ask yourself at the end of the debate is:

Which team has been the most convincing?

Which team has fulfilled their role the best?

At the end of the debate, has the affirmative fulfilled their role? Has the negative team? This may go some way to determining the winner of the debate.



AUCKLAND SCHOOLS DEBATING

Proudly sponsored by Russell McVeagh

There are generally two types of debates:

- Model/change debate
- Judgement debate

Model/status quo/change debate

This is a debate in which the moot requires the affirmative team to argue for the status quo.

Eg: This house would ban beauty pageants
This house would make blood donation compulsory

An affirmative team should:

- Identify what the status quo is
- Identify a problem with the status quo which necessitates a change
- Identify what the change to the status quo is going to be
- Discuss how that change is going to be effected
- Discuss how the change to the status quo is a good thing, and addresses the problem with the status quo

The negative team should:

- Attack the primary planks of the affirmative team's case:
- Deny that the problem asserted by the affirmative team exists
- Point out problems with the proposed change
- Point out problems with the mechanics for effecting the change
- Point out if the proposed change does not address the problem asserted by the affirmative team, or if it will create alternative problems
- An affirmative team may also: argue substantively in favour of the status quo; argue that there is a better solution to the problem than what the affirmative team has pointed out.

The negative team does not have to do each and every one of these. For example, it may not be reasonable for a negative team to deny the problem identified by the affirmative.

Judgement debate

This is a debate in which the moot requires the teams to make an evaluative decision, often between two alternatives.

Eg: This house believes co-ed schools are better than single sex schools
This house believes that reality TV has done more harm than good

A good affirmative team will:

- Be clear in their method of evaluation, setting "criteria" or parameters against which they will make their judgement
- Provide sound analysis and reasoning to support that judgment



AUCKLAND SCHOOLS DEBATING

Proudly sponsored by Russell McVeagh

A good negative team will:

- Consider and offer alternative or additional criteria or parameters
- Provide sound analysis in support of their case

Substantive argument and rebuttal

It is important that both the affirmative and negative engage in substantive argument and rebuttal. Rebuttal is certainly not just for the negating team.

In terms of substantive matter – most credit should be given to the material that is well explained early in the debate (by either the first or second speakers). The third speaker for the affirmative should offer a small amount of new material, but this should not be critical to the affirmative team's case.

The third negative speaker should not introduce any new material. Similarly, substantive new material should not be introduced in the leader's replies. Any new material introduced by third negative or leader's replies should not be given much credit at all.

Evidence & analysis

You will be the best judge of what is convincing within the context of any debate.

Evidence and analysis is a must! Assertions and statements which are not explained or supported are not likely to win debates. Unexplained lists are seldom convincing.

Evidence should be relevant. The more recent the better.

What is unconvincing (but unfortunately commonly used):

- Reliance on obscure statistics (unable to be verified or challenged; for every statistic there is a counter statistic)
- Personal anecdotes and hypothetical situations
- Role plays/metaphors
- References to movies/television/Shakespeare
- Outdated examples

What not to do

- Do NOT add up the marks of individual speakers in order to determine the winner
- There are generally no knock out arguments
- The team with the best speaker does not always win the debate
- Do NOT decide the debate on the basis of the leaders reply
- Do not predetermine the result of the debate
- Do not be persuaded by which team:
 - Has the better reputation
 - Is better dressed
 - Uses bigger words
 - Spoke for the longest



AUCKLAND SCHOOLS DEBATING

Proudly sponsored by Russell McVeagh

(c) Delivering the adjudication

Marksheet

Fill out the mark sheet completely before you give your oral adjudication.

Make sure:

- You have entered the winner – the name of the team and the side they debated
- The total scores reflect the result you have arrived at
- The speakers scores reflect their comparative ranking
- What you say in your oral adjudication is reflective of the marks you have awarded

ASD uses a band of 60-80 to ensure consistency. You **must** stick within this range:

- 60 is worst ever, 70 is average, 80 is best ever
- The total mark is most important (arrive at your total mark for each speaker first and then work backwards)
- Margin of win:
 - <3 represents a close debate
 - 3<5 represents a close but clear debate
 - 5<10 represents a clear debate
 - >10 represents a “walk over”
- Ranking of speakers
- Half marks are fine

Oral Adjudication

- Take a few minutes at the conclusion of the debate to prepare your oral adjudication – jot down a few notes in the order you wish to discuss them
- Be clear, concise and persuasive
- Focus on the main points of the debate that were critical in determining the winner. This can usually be distilled to three main issues in the debate.
- You do not need to address every point that was raised in the debate. Your adjudication does not need to take any longer than 5 minutes.
- Be constructive in your adjudication, even if one team has clearly won.
- Focus on the team, rather than individuals. Individual feedback can be given after you have delivered the adjudication if teams wish to stay for that.
- Comment on what was done particularly well in the debate, as well as offering observations of what could be improved upon in later debates.
- Teams are more likely to listen to your feedback if you do not announce the result until the end of your adjudication.