

Checklist for Judging BP Debates

Judging a BP debate involves assessing both how well the debaters fulfill the duties of their positions (1 prop, 2 opp etc.), and the quality of the arguments and refutation. This checklist is meant to help you evaluate how well they fulfilled their roles. If the answers to any of these questions is no, that should result in a lower score and, possibly, placing.

1st Prop team:

Has the 1st speaker presented a clear and reasonable definition with, if appropriate, a good model?

Has each speaker supported their case with convincing reasons? Normally each speaker would present 1 to 3 reasons, but the key is quality not quantity.

1st Opp team

Have they attacked the Proposition case, and dealt with the arguments presented?

Has each speaker supported their case with convincing reasons? Normally each speaker would present 1 to 3 reasons, but the key is quality not quantity.

For the second speaker, have they defended their partner's points where appropriate?

2nd Prop Team

Did they avoid "knifing" the other team on their side?

Has the 3rd speaker on the proposition presented a clear extension?

Has the 4th speaker (the Whip) summarized the debate from the point of view of the proposition, and shown why their side has won the debate?

Has the 4th speaker avoided adding new arguments?

2nd Opp Team

Did they avoid "knifing" the other team on their side?

Has the 3rd speaker on the opposition presented a clear extension?

Has the 4th speaker (the Whip) summarized the debate from the point of view of the opposition, and shown why their side has won the debate?

Has the 4th speaker avoided adding new arguments?

General (everyone)

Did everyone, other than the 1st prop speaker, deal with the arguments presented in the speech immediately before theirs? Did they also deal with key issues in the case presented by the other side?

Did they offer POI's (a rough guide would be for each debater to offer 2 per opposing speech)? Did they accept at least 1 and no more than 2, assuming enough were offered?

Did the second teams on each side avoid "knifing" (contradicting or disagreeing with) the first team on their side?