

Judges' Scorecard/Rubric

Courtesy HGHS Debate Team

Presenter	Speech	Time	Minimum Requirements	Strong Points	Weak Points	Examples (links)
Aff	Affirmative Constructive (Aff Case)	6 min.	-value and criterion -contentions (subpoints are helpful) -analysis -linking arguments back to the value and criterion	-claims are warranted and impacted (why it's true and why it matters) -logical and consistent -eye contact (not just staring at paper)	-no core philosophy/only example-based -non-resolutional arguments (e.g. refers to U.S. only when resolution implies any democracy) -non-unique harms/benefits (could happen on either side) -does not use full time allotted	My value is individual welfare, supported by my criterion of a healthful lifestyle. Contention 1: healthy eating Subpoint A: Dairy products are good Claim: Cheese is good. Warrant: It has nutrients Impact: It's important that cheese is good, because its nutrients contribute to overall bodily health
Neg	Cross-Examination (CX)	3 min.	Neg asks Aff questions	Neg gets Aff to make concessions, admissions of fact, clarifies definitions	Neg asks for too much clarification and not enough probing questions; little relevancy; does not use all time	Hypothetical situation relevant to the resolution that makes a point "Do you agree that..."
Prep time (for Neg)						
Neg	Negative Constructive and Rebuttal (Neg C/R)	7 min.	-value and criterion -contentions (subpoints are helpful) -analysis -linking arguments back to the value and criterion	-see AC -time usage: split about evenly between reading NC and rebutting Aff -uses concessions from CX in rebuttal	Rebuttals are not warranted/impacted, no CX admissions used, poor time usage	Sample rebuttal point: Cheese is good for you, but can be fattening if you eat too much, which is detrimental to health.
Aff	Cross-Examination (CX)	3 min.	Aff asks Neg questions	Aff gets Neg to make concessions/admissions, etc.	(see CX above)	
Prep time (for Aff)						

Judges' Scorecard/Rubric

Courtesy HGHS Debate Team

Aff	First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)	4 min.	Aff attacks Neg's case and responds to Neg's rebuttals of the AC; Aff defends own case	Aff doesn't drop own case or Neg's responses; Aff may group subpoints by similar arguments to save time; calls and impacts drops	-Aff runs out of time and misses the chance to respond to attacks on AC (upholding own case) or rebut opponent's case -does not impact drops	Moderation in eating is implied.... So, cheese is still good, because it has nutrients like calcium and some fat, which is necessary for healthy cell membranes....
Prep time (for Neg)						
Neg	Second Negative Rebuttal (2NR)	6 min.	Neg responds to Aff's 1AR, may call drops, and crystallizes	"goes down the flow" and refutes Aff/upholds Neg -voters are linked back to value/criterion	-does not crystallize	
Prep time (for Aff)						
Aff	Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR)	3 min.	Crystallization (may <i>succinctly</i> address values/some of the flow)	(see above) "ties everything together into one neat package" for the judge to vote on	-spends too much time arguing all over the flow and/or -does not crystallize	I win __ point because.. Make __ a voting issue

"Winners"

-reductio ad absurdum

--showing internal inconsistency in opponent's arguments (e.g. violates or can't achieve his/her value)

-My case trumps my opponent's because...

-opponent admitted vital concession in CX and I referred to this in my rebuttal and would like to make it a voting issue

-opponent dropped __ subpoint/part of my case, and this is important because it means he/she agrees with me, ergo I win

-opponent dropped my analysis of the value structure OR did not address the values, ergo my value (and case) take precedence

-opponent's case has harms that do not happen on my side (note: non-unique harms are a wash)