|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Teacher’s Name:** | **Unit Name:**  **Public Forum, Lincoln-Douglas, Policy Debate** |
| **Lesson Title**  **Analysis of Judging Style and Adapting to the Judge’s Philosophy** | **Indicate which:**  Beginner Intermediate Advanced |
| **Focus Skill:** Analyzing the judges’ philosophy and applying that information in round. | **Time Frame:**  **120-180 minutes** |

**PART 1—ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Essential Question** | **What elements should be considered when analyzing the judge in a round to most effectively communicate with that judge?** |
| **Objective 1** | Students will understand how to identify and adapt to multiple judge styles. |
| **Objective 2** | Students will understand how to adjust and adapt to multiple judge styles. |
| **Objective 3** | Students will learn how to analyze and use judge’s comments on ballots or from critiques to improve their overall debate skills. |

**Overview of Lesson** *(General summary of what will be covered)***:**

|  |
| --- |
| This lesson will explore how potential judges approach a debate round. This lesson helps the student debater become familiar with the principles of judge adaptation, and provides the student debater with some strategic points of successful adaptation. Judge adaptation is nothing more than determining what motivates the judge and speaking with him or her about that motivation. Although the student will encounter an infinite number of judging preferences or paradigms, there are some general categories that allow for better prediction of preferences.  Investigation, attention, and review are just a few of the skills which judge evaluation demands, and which you will teach in this unit. |

**PART 2—THE LESSON**

**Detailed Step-by-Step Lesson** *(be sure to include time allocation information)***:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Session #** | **Time** | **Details of the Lesson** |
|  | (20-30 minutes) | ***What type of judges will be deciding the results?***  Explain to students: Debate success, as in all speaking events, is related to the degree to which you can speak to the audience. If you can establish audience rapport, you will be successful in persuading the audience. Judge adaptation is nothing more than determining what motivates the judge and speaking with him or her about that motivation. There are some general categories that allow for better prediction of preferences.  [NOTE: It is a good idea to have the students establish a folder in which they will keep their notes in this unit, their practice analysis using their own cases and filmed debates, and a review of their ballots of the year. This folder may also contain a short evaluation of the repeat judges they encounter and how they might adapt to their preferences and all of their ballots. As students go throughout the year, they will be able to refer to their notes and analysis of judges to better prepare for their debate.]  Discussion: As you move through the three types of judges, ask the students to engage by hypothesizing how these judges might factor a victory or loss. Experienced debaters may want to begin blaming judge background as a reason they lose. Try to keep this out of the conversation; when students take the conversation to this, it often works to remind students that it is best to focus the discussion on what we can control and change in order to get the judge’s vote the next time.  **Three types of judges**  ***Volunteer community judges*** (Individuals from the community or parents who have various amounts of judging experience--from very little to years)  At your league tournaments, you will be judged by a large number of parent and community judges recruited by the coaches to help with judging. The general philosophy behind this practice is that debaters should be able to persuade a wide variety of individuals. These judges have many life experiences and become good, solid judges as they listen to many debates and increase their knowledge of the format. Having a good reputation with these judges works to your advantage. Knowing that a judge likes a slower, more persuasive, philosophical approach will allow you to adjust accordingly and give that individual what he or she wants to see. Knowing that a judge makes their career in the field of the debate topic (medicine, law, education, etc.) allows you to frame the debate in more subtle and personal terms. Do not underestimate a parent judge! Many of these judges have a coach at home (one of your competitors) who is teaching them to flow and listen to specific arguments on the topic at hand.  ***Former debaters*** (most often college students)  If a judge appears to be of college age, it is a good bet that he or she is probably a past contestant. Therefore, you can expect that the judge has a good grasp of the “event” of Lincoln-Douglas. He or she probably has enough understanding of the event that you can move a little faster in your presentation and assume that the judge understands the meaning of some of the jargon and “stock” issues of Lincoln-Douglas. You can also assume that they have an understanding of the rules, speaker burdens and procedural breaches, which allows you to spend quality time structuring your arguments and attacking the opponent’s case. This allows for more direct clash, which past debaters seem to appreciate once they become judges. A bit of caution is necessary if the college judge was/is a team debater. They tend to reject many philosophical arguments in favor of more pragmatic evidence and warrants. They also tend to see debate as a “game” and may consider arguments and procedural conflicts off the flow as a reflection of what they would have done in the round.  ***Teachers or coaches*** (some from other schools)  Over the course of the year many debate coaches will judge you or your teammates. It is to your advantage to get to know these coaches. As you debate certain individuals, note what arguments are prevalent in their cases and note their school. If you have a judge in a later round who is from that opponent’s school, use some of the arguments from that opponent’s case. Because many coaches assist debaters in writing cases, the arguments a debater uses are often representative of what the coach (and now, your judge) finds believable. Introducing these same arguments will not require the normal, extensive explanations required to convince the judge of their merit. |
|  | (20-30 minutes) | Activity: The NSDA has a plethora of LD debates available online. Choose one on a topic your students will have easy access to. At first you may wish to use recorded speeches like these so that you can be in charge of stopping and starting the debate where you need to, without spoiling the arguments and eschewing the prep time. At this point you want students, using the lecture/discussion on the three types of judges, to begin the process of analyzing judge impact on the round.  1. Have the students get out their folders and refer to their lecture notes.  2. Review the three judge types and the anticipated reactions they may have to the debate.  3. Play the first speech and the first cross examination ONLY.  4. Have the students take some specific notes on what the first speech has said and how it might impact the decision of each judge type.  5. Discuss the outcomes OR encourage pair/share answering these questions:  ***What type of judge might like this AC approach?***  ***What impact has the cross examination had (if any) on the potential of the case as it moves forward?*** |
|  | (20-30 minutes) | 1. Review findings from first speech viewed.  2. Play the second speech and the cross examination ONLY.  3. Have the students take some specific notes on what the first speech has said and how it might impact the decision of each judge type.  4. Discuss the outcomes OR encourage pair/share answering these questions:  ***What type of judge might like this AC approach?***  ***What impact has the cross examination had (if any) on the potential of the case as it moves forward?*** |
|  | (20-30 minutes) | ***How will a judge’s experience and political thought influence the result?***  To this point we have discussed the different sources of judges in student debates. Community judges, parents, college debaters, former high school debaters, coaches and teachers may bring very different approaches to the ballot. Other factors we will want to consider will include their life experiences, the manner in which they approach arguments and the political leanings – conservative to liberal. To some degree, every judge is the exact same; they just want the best arguments to be made in any given debate. Regardless of the school of thought, or paradigm, they subscribe to, most judges want to see arguments compared and weighed which interact with one another.  1. Have the students get out their folders and refer to their lecture notes. There is something to add today!  2. As you move through the material, ask the students to engage by hypothesizing how these judges might factor a victory or loss. The purpose here is to have students break away from stereotypes. Some young judges are extremely conservative, while some community judges can be very liberal and, because of experience or lack thereof, will allow a great deal of latitude in the debate.  **Lay versus experienced Judges**  Judges with no debate or judging experience are known as lay judges. They usually have their judges’ instructions nearby, ask procedural questions, and take few, if any, notes. When encountering a lay judge, remember to keep the rate of delivery slower, to explain thoroughly without becoming condescending, to make connections between your arguments and your opponent’s and to make fewer arguments. Do not assume that because a judge has no actual debate or judging experience that the judge is not knowledgeable about the topic. Attorneys and other professionals are often recruited as lay judges.  **Conservative versus Liberal Philosophies**  Because much of what a Lincoln-Douglas debater says is related to political topics, it is important that you realize a judge may not share your political orientation. Whether a judge knows it or not, personal beliefs influence the way one perceives and ultimately accepts or rejects arguments. Although the ideal judge is a “blank slate” (Tabula Raza) upon entering the round, you cannot assume that *any* judge is capable of setting aside all they know and believe for a high school debate round. Nobody can divorce themselves from the context of a given debate round completely; thus, it’s your job to make sure that you have all the factors that you can control going in your favor.  3. Pair/Share a short small group discussion:  ***How will experience and conservative/liberal philosophies impact the ballot in all three groups of judges?*** |
|  | (20-30 minutes) | ***How do I learn a judge’s philosophy?***  What you coach your debaters to do in this area is largely up to your preference. You must say something because, left to their own devices, problems occur. Student/judge interaction is always an important issue to talk about prior to it happening.  1. ***The judge’s paradigm question:*** It is quite popular to have the judges speak to the debaters before the round begins. You can advise your debaters to ask for this to occur. Be careful that they do not offend the judge. The question phrased as, “Is there anything I can do to make the debate clearer for you today?” or “ What are you hoping to see in today’s debate?” is better than “Have you ever judged before?” or “Are you just a parent judge?” Even asking “What is your judging paradigm?” or “What is the calculus of your decision today?” might confuse a lay judge and offend a judge who already is feeling insecure. So, tell your debaters what you want them to say/ask. This is a good time for a team/class discussion. As part of this, you may want to have an older student chime in with advice from the trenches as well.  2. ***Observing the flow style*** as everyone gets ready for the round will also help. Tell students to watch what the judges does to prepare: multiple pieces of paper, multiple pens, etc. as this will give clues as to the type of notes the judge will take – one page flow, multi-page flow, or no flow at all. At this point, it would also be good to point out to students that throughout the round, they should watch how the judge takes notes. If the judge stops writing notes, chances are, the debaters need to slow the speed of their speech so that the judge can take notes.  3. ***Judging philosophy online:*** Some tournaments ask judges to write a judging philosophy and respond to questions about their experience. If these are available, take advantage of them! These will often ask questions about speed of speeches, role of value and criterion, use of evidence, basis for decision making, etc.  4. Today’s lesson should be full of discussion and impacts, along with much sharing by experienced debaters. Don’t overlook fresh ideas that young debaters may come up with as well! |
|  | (20-30 minutes) | ***How does a debater adjust to a judge’s preferred debate style?***  The most important thing about judge adaptation is that adaptation is not an end, but a process. Adaptation skills come from being able to recognize and adjust to clues. Judge adaptation is simply learning what environmental clues signal the presence of certain judging philosophies. Student debaters do not abandon a prepared case or adapt in an extreme manner. As the topic progresses, the student debater will develop a number of constructive arguments that appeal to different judges. Some adapting may be about language choices used in refutation and final voting issues.  LD Judge Adaptation Handout: Review the handout with students. Be sure students are making connections between what is on the handout and what is in the notes they’ve taken throughout this lesson. Engage students in short discussions as you move through the material. |

**PART 3—ASSESSMENT EVIDENCE**

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Task, Product, or Other Key Evidence of Learning** *(How will students demonstrate a level of proficiency for this skill?)*   * Student performance and product will be tied to the improvement and clarity of their Affirmative Constructive (AC) and their Negative Constructive (NC) and rebuttal speeches to offer a deeper understanding of adapting to different potential judges including: Community, Student, and Coach/Teacher. * Students should be able to recognize and build a glossary of language that adapts to judges with varying degrees of experience. This glossary should be ongoing and become a permanent part of their Judges/Ballots Folder. * Students should be able to explain how judges in their league are trained and what judges are looking for on the ballot and be able to respond to those requirements. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Key criteria to measure Performance Task(s) or Key Evidence:**  *Examples: Rubric, Checklist, etc***.**  **Checklist** -   * Lecture/Discussion – Three types of judges, lay vs experienced and conservative vs liberal * Lecture/Discussion – How do I learn the judges’ philosophy? * Lecture/Discussion notes – The 9 steps in judge evaluation * Listening/Quickwrite – “AC + cross examination – *Who is being pitched?”* * Listening/Quickwrite – “NC, rebuttal and cross examination – *Who is being pitched?”*   **Rubric -**   * My Ballots to date – evaluation and future goals |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment Strategies** *(Identify Informal/Formal Strategies)***:**  **Informal** – Teacher observation of participation and effort in discussion  Teacher observation of pair/share in small groups  **Formal** – Collection and rubric evaluation of judges’ ballots and future goals of student |

**Plans for after this lesson/competency is complete (How will you extend, enrich?):**

|  |
| --- |
| **Enrich and extend the lesson ideas:**  1. Copy and pass out a blank league ballot to each student. Discuss the rubric and how each judging style might approach each area of evaluation. Class discussion or pair/share.  2. Watch the rest of the debate round and announce the winner of the debate. What type of judge do you think made this decision? Even if you do not know, it is a good exercise for students to ponder the result in a “backward design.”  3. Have the students review their ballots throughout the year. Make a list of positive and negative comments. Identify comments that are consistent across judges. Develop a plan to work on the areas needing improvement.  4. Some questions for discussion:   * What does the judge’s choice to use the ballot to flow the debate tell me about this judge? * Is there a correlation between the judge’s instructions and the ballot and your comments? * Is there a better rubric to use to decide the winner of the debate? Submit it to the league! * Does judge analysis impact how I prepare for league tournaments and how I need to adapt for prep for invitationals? State? Nationals?   5. One of the best ways for debaters to improve is through extensive oral critiques. They provide immediate feedback regarding their strengths and weaknesses. Many tournaments do not allow oral critiques, but some of the experienced debaters on your team may have experienced them. After this unit, have a team discussion on the merits of this practice and why it might not be allowed in some venues. |

**Key Resources Used: Websites, books, film clips, etc.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Names of Resource(s):** | **Access to Resource(s) if available:** |
| Roberts, Josh. “Debate Ethos: Becoming the Michael Jordan of Debate” | [www.speechanddebate.org](http://www.speechanddebate.org) |
| Roberts, Josh. “Perfecting the Crossover: Bringing Policy Arguments Into LD” | [www.speechanddebate.org](http://www.speechanddebate.org) |
| Wiese, Jeffery and Stan Lewis, Lincoln-Douglas Debate – Values in Conflict, second edition | Topeka, KS, Clark Publishing Company, 2000 |

**Key Resources for Exploration: Websites, books, film clips, etc.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Names of Resource(s):** | **Access to Resource(s) if available:** |
| LD Rounds from National Tournaments | [www.speechanddebate.org](http://www.speechanddebate.org) |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reflections/Review for Future:**

|  |
| --- |
| Debate is an activity full of fallible beings subject to the tendencies inherent in human nature. It’s about much more than the individual arguments students make throughout a round or a tournament. There are many very good judges who are willing to listen to arguments when they’re implemented and framed correctly. The obligation, then, is on the debater to explain these arguments in such a way as to appeal to the preferences of the judge, which takes strategy and finesse and practice.  As students build their cases, continue to have them reflect on what they have control of in round. They cannot choose their judge and they should be building ways that they can appeal to a wide variety of judges who will sit in front of them. Review their ballots with them and continue to have them learn to listen. |