

# Judging Guidelines

OSDU 2025

Thank you for volunteering your time to judge! Please read through the following instructions and guidelines, and let one of the tournament organizers know if you have any questions.

- 1) **Ballot.** In many tournaments, you will receive an online Ballot. However, if you do not, you can print up a judging ballot from our website. Because the CP and BP formats of debating, there are different ballots for each of these debates. At the top of the ballot, you need to write your name, the name of the debaters, the team's name, the debate round, the individual score and the team score.
- 2) **Scoring.** Each debater receives a score out of 100. The numbers for each team member are added up out of 200 to determine the winner of the debate. Although individual debaters can have the same score, the team score must be different—*there must be a clear winner*. The individual scores out of 100 are *holistic*, and typically the average score for a debater is 75%. *In the CP format, you simply need to determine whether the Opposition or the Proposition team won the round. However, in the BP format, you need to rank all 4 teams from best to worst. In other words, the best team of two, and not the best side, will win the round.*
- 3) **Judgment.** The winning team should be the team that you believe argued a better case. Your task is to identify the key issues in the round and determine which team was more successful in moving their case forward. Please put aside any particular **bias** you may have at the beginning of the debate. Your task is to give every debater a fair chance to argue his/her case.
- 4) **Debate Roles.** Each debater in the round has distinct responsibilities, which are outlined in the CNDF guide. As a judge, you are listening to hear whether the debater properly fulfill the expectations of the role. Needless to say, no debater should have an automatic scoring advantage or disadvantage because of the role.
- 5) **Oral Comments.** At some tournaments, there is *open adjudication*, which means that the judges are allowed to offer oral comments to the debaters at the end of the debate without revealing who won. However, most tournaments have closed adjudication, and some have partially opened adjudication, which means that the judges can offer comments on the early rounds only. In this tournament, **Rounds 1 and 2 are OPEN**, which means that you can comment for **no more than 10 minutes** on the strengths and weaknesses of each debater, but you **CANNOT tell the debaters their scores**. However, before you comment, **please complete and send your Ballot**. **Rounds 3 and 4 are CLOSED adjudication**, which means that no comments are given at all.
- 6) **Conferral Judging.** In those debates where there is more than one judge, the judges can discuss their results among themselves after the debaters have left the room. After discussing the round, send **ONE Ballot only** to the Tabs officer.

7) **Decorum.** A judge should expect a high level of proper conduct from the debaters, which means that a debater should not swear, insult or intimidate another debater. If you observe such behavior, please notify the tournament director or CA (Chief Adjudicator).

## Scoring Range

Canadian National Debate Format (CNDF)  
British Parliamentary Style (BP)

---

In many tournaments, the average score is 75 – 77%. Do NOT give a score greater than 90% or less than 70% unless the debater's speech is short by several minutes. When hearing the debate, consider the following six categories:

- |                 |                 |                                    |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| 1) Organization | 3) Reasoning    | 5) Clash (Refutation and Rebuttal) |
| 2) Evidence     | 4) Presentation | 6) Listening and POIs              |
- 

70-75%	The <b>structure</b> of the debate is not well organized The <b>evidence</b> is not profound and insightful. The relation of the <b>evidence</b> to a claim is often unclear The student's <b>voice</b> is often monotone; some words are unclear The student does not <b>clash</b> in the rebuttal or refutation. The <b>POIs</b> are mostly irrelevant or not insightful
75 - 80%	The <b>structure</b> of the debate is well organized The <b>evidence</b> is sometimes profound and insightful. The relation of the <b>evidence</b> to a claim is often clear The student's <b>voice</b> is sometimes monotone, but the words are clear The student creates some <b>clash</b> in the rebuttal or refutation. The <b>POIs</b> are often relevant and insightful
80-85%	The <b>structure</b> of the debate is very well organized The <b>evidence</b> is frequently profound and insightful. The relation of the <b>evidence</b> to a claim is always clear The student's <b>voice</b> shows good inflection, but the words are clear The student effectively <b>clashes</b> in the rebuttal or refutation. The <b>POIs</b> are notably relevant and insightful
85 - 90%	The <b>structure</b> of the debate is extremely well organized The <b>evidence</b> is always insightful and often profound. The relation of the <b>evidence</b> to a claim is clever The student's <b>voice</b> shows a wide range of inflection—very engaging The student cleverly <b>clashes</b> in the rebuttal or refutation. The <b>POIs</b> are extremely relevant and insightful

