

Judge Instructions & Guidelines

General Instructions

- All judges are to report to their assigned rooms at least five minutes before the time the contest round is scheduled to begin.
- Each judge's ballot is to be secured from contest official and returned immediately following each round.
- Read the instructions on the ballot.
- Do not confer with other judges.
- Judges should not interrupt the flow of debates or contests in any way. They are silent evaluators and should not reveal their decision.

Statement on Conflicts of Interest in Judging

Modified from guidelines established by the TOC LD Advisory Committee

Fair competition requires not merely the absence of impropriety but also the *appearance* of impropriety. A conflict of interest is a relationship that might reasonably be thought to bias a judge toward or against a competitor. Such relationships may themselves be quite innocent, but they could reasonably be thought to compromise a judge's impartiality.

A judge **must** recuse himself or herself from judging a student under the following conditions:

1. The judge and the student may be perceived to have a competitive or financial agreement that may bias the judge's impartial evaluation of the round. Examples include but are not limited to:

a.) The student attends a school (or a collaboration of schools) that the judge attended, coached for, or competed with.

NOTE: Two potential exceptions to this guideline would be that if a designated committee or ombudsmen felt that enough time has passed since that judge's attendance at the school to resolve concerns of impropriety. In addition, if both coaches felt comfortable with a judge that graduated from a school of one of the competitors, the tab room may allow that judge placement.

b.) The judge has a paid or unpaid coaching, consulting, or judging relationship with the student or school during the same academic year.

NOTE: Serving a tournament-hired judge does not constitute a conflict of interest.

c.) The judge has received or provided expressed or implied offers to provide future coaching, consulting, or judging to a school or student.

d.) The judge has provided exclusive pre-round preparation to a student either before or during a tournament through any method including electronically, verbally, or through the transfer of resources.

NOTE: Sharing of information does not constitute preparation but the discussion of strategies, arguments, evidence, etc would constitute preparation. If such preparation is provided during a tournament, the judge should immediately (before pairings are released) recuse himself or herself from judging the student they prepared for the rest of the tournament. If practice rounds before or during the tournament has occurred between schools that a judge is fulfilling obligations for and could potentially judge, that would be defined as preparation and all parties should consider that a conflict.

2. The judge and the student may be perceived to have a personal or social arrangement that may bias the judge's impartial evaluation of the round. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a.) The judge and the student may be perceived to have had a personal relationship that may bias the judge's impartial evaluation of the round.
- b.) The judge and the student are or have been in a familial, physical, or emotional relationship.
- c.) The judge and the student have communications of a personal nature over e-mail, telephone, or the Internet including social networking sites that goes beyond causal exchanges. For example, communications that are extensive and/or repetitive may create a conflict. Judges who socialize with the student outside of the competition arena are considered to have established a personal or social relationship with that student.

3.) The judge does not believe they are able to fairly and impartially adjudicate a competition involving a particular student for whatever reason.

A judge may **choose** to recuse himself or herself from adjudicating a student under the following conditions: (If these conditions exist, it is the affirmative duty of the judge to make such information publicly available prior to the round beginning).

- 1.) The judge shares transportation and/or lodging with the student's team on a regular basis.
 - 2.) The judge has a personal, financial, or familial relationship with the student's coach or member of the student's family.
 - 3.) The judge is an administrator of, currently employed by, or anticipates employment from a forensics related enterprise with whom a financial or advisory relationship exists or is sought with the student.
- NOTE:** While these guidelines do not prohibit lab leaders/institute staff from judging their lab students. However, if those lab leaders maintain consistent contact with those students and/or engage in personal relationships with them, they should recuse themselves from judging those specific individuals.

The expectation of competitors, judges, and coaches is to engage in the highest levels of professionalism and integrity. While the responsibility is on judges to aide transparency, the responsibility exists for coaches and student competitors as well. It is the affirmative duty of all coaches and debaters to assist efforts in transparency. No decisions will be modified as a result of disclosed information.

Judging Speech Events

Thank you for agreeing to judge a speech round. Your service is especially important as these events are designed to bring judges and debaters together in an educational, productive, and encouraging experience. This activity is designed to teach a variety of skills including analysis, synthesis, and artistic interpretation.

- If a contestant is not present when his/her number is called, the judge is to proceed to the next available speaker. When the contestant arrives, s/he should be heard next. At some district contests, students are participating in another contest scheduled for the same hour and they cannot avoid being late. For the same reason, a student may have to leave immediately after speaking.
- As students announce their titles, the judge is to write the title of the selection in the designated space on the ballot.
- If a contestant does not arrive by the end of the contest, the judge is to inquire about the absent contestant before s/he marks the ballot. Every contestant should be heard.
- After all contestants have been heard, they are to be ranked 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 (ties are not permitted) in the order of excellence. Number 1 is the best speaker.
- The judge must be sure to double check the ballot, sign it, seal it in the envelope, and return it to the ballot table.

Speech Event Time Limits

Extemporaneous Speaking (US & International)	7 minute speech with 30 second grace period Preparation time is 30 minutes
Original Oratory	10 minutes with 30 second grace period
Dramatic Interpretation	10 minutes with 30 second grace period
Humorous Interpretation	10 minutes with 30 second grace period
Duo Interpretation	10 minutes with 30 second grace period

Extemporaneous Speaking

The extemporaneous speech should not be regarded as a memory test of the material contained in any one magazine article, but rather as an original synthesis by the speaker of the current fact and opinion on the designated topic as presented by numerous sources.

The contestant therefore should be held accountable for strict adherence to the precise statement of the topic drawn and discounted severely for shifting to some other phase of the topic on which s/he might prefer to speak. The information presented should be well-chosen, pertinent, and sufficient to support the central thought of the topic.

The material should be organized according to some logical plan to produce a complete speech within the time allowed. Delivery should be free from marked defects in the mechanics of speech -- poise, quality and use of voice, enunciation, fluency, bodily expressiveness -- and should be effective in enlisting and holding the interest of the audience.

The best extemporaneous speech combines clear thinking, good speaking, and interesting presentation to establish a definite thought with respect to the subject chosen.

Do not require a contestant speaking on a controversial subject to take a personal stand on that issue. S/He may do so, or s/he may elect to present both sides of the controversy as currently set forth in the public press. Judge him/her on the effectiveness with which s/he develops the subject according to his/her own plan.

There is NO minimum qualifying time for the extemp. speech. Do not penalize a contestant for brevity unless s/he fails to cover adequately the subject s/he has chosen. Maximum time is seven minutes. Impose no penalty for slight overtime, but do so if in your judgment it is excessive.

Time: The time limit in both extemporaneous speaking events shall be 7 minutes with a 30 second "grace period". If the judges in the round agree that the student has gone beyond the "grace period", the student may not be ranked 1st, but need not be ranked last based on time. The ranking is up to each individual judge's discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.

Original Oratory

Since the contestants delivering them have written these orations, the judges should consider thought, composition, and delivery. However, since this is a contest in speech rather than in essay writing, the emphasis should be placed on the speech phase. Thought and composition should be considered primarily in the way they are employed to make effective speaking possible.

The orator should not be expected to solve any of the great problems of the day. Rather, s/he should be expected to discuss intelligently, with a degree of originality, in an interesting manner, and with some profit to his/her audience the topic s/he has chosen. Any appropriate subject may be chosen but the orator must be truthful. Any non-factual reference, especially a personal one, MUST be so identified.

Although many orations deal with a current problem and propose a solution, the judge is expressly reminded that this is not the only acceptable form of oratory. The oration may simply alert the audience to a threatening danger, strengthen its devotion to an accepted cause, or eulogize a person. The orator should be given free choice of subject and judged solely on the effectiveness of its development and presentation.

The composition should be considered carefully for its rhetoric and diction. The use of appropriate figures of speech, similes and metaphors, balanced sentences, allusions, and other rhetorical devices to make the oration more effective should be noted especially. Use of American English should be more than correct; it should reveal a discriminating choice of words and altogether fine literary qualities. It should be especially adapted to oral presentation.

Delivery should be judged for mastery of the usual mechanics of speech -- poise, quality and use of voice, bodily expressiveness, and for the qualities of directness and sincerity which impress the oration upon the minds of the audience. An orator should not be penalized for a few seconds overtime.

No particular style of delivery is to be set up as the one correct style to which all contestants must conform. Rather, each contestant is to be judged upon the effectiveness of his/her delivery, free to choose or develop whatever style will best give him/her that effectiveness with his/her particular oration. No visual aids are permitted.

The time limit in Original Oratory is 10 minutes with a 30 second "grace period". If the judges in the round agree that the student has gone beyond the "grace period", the student may not be ranked 1st, but need not be ranked last based on time. The ranking is up to each individual judge's discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.

Interpretation

The art of interpretation is to be regarded as recreating the characters in the story presented and making them seem living and real to the audience. Presentation shall be from memory and without the use of physical objects or costume.

A selection for interpretation must be a cutting from a single literary work: one novel, or one short story, or one play, or one or more poems. Monologues are acceptable. During the presentation, contestants must name the author and the book or magazine from which the cutting was made. Adaptation may be for the purpose of transition. In Duo Interpretation each of the two performers may play one or more characters, so long as performance responsibility in the cutting remains as balanced as possible. [If the selection is prose or poetry and contains narration, either or both of the performers may present the narration.]

The selection should be judged for its appropriateness as contest material and its suitability to the particular contestant using it. The use of good literature should be noted favorably and a selection devoid of literary merit graded lowest.

This is a contest in interpretation. The contestants should be evaluated on poise, quality and use of voice, inflections, emphasis, pronunciation, enunciation, physical expression, and especially the ability to interpret characters correctly and consistently. Narrative, if included, should be vivid and animated so as to be an interesting and integral part of the story rather than just "filler" between portions of dialogue.

The final test of good interpretation is the ability to use all these factors so successfully and unobtrusively that the hearer forgets that this is a contest and in a created atmosphere is carried away to the time and place of the story being unfolded.

The time limit in Interpretation events is 10 minutes with a 30 second "grace period". If the judges in the round agree that the student has gone beyond the "grace period", the student may not be ranked 1st, but need not be ranked last based on time. The ranking is up to each individual judge's discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.

