

Adjudication Decision Sheet

Debate Information

Grade	Round	Topic	Affirmative Team	Negative Team

Decision

Winner: Aff / Neg

Issue	Arguments Responses Analysis		Winner & Summary
	<i>Aff</i>		<i>Neg</i>

General Feedback

	Feedback	Explanation Implementation Examples
1		
2		
3		

This decision sheet should be considered an additional tool to regular notetaking.

Behaviour & Safety

Ensuring the safety & enjoyment of debaters, spectators and adjudicators is the most important part of any debate. Adjudicators should be positive and welcoming throughout their adjudication & personal feedback. If you feel unsafe, please contact the venue coordinator, QDU Program Manager on (07) 3870 0680 or admin@qdu.org.au and/or emergency services (000). In all cases where emergency services are called, the Program Manager must also be alerted when safe to do so.

General Structure of Adjudication:

- 1) Welcome, congratulations & signposting.
- 2) Announce the winner.
- 3) Explanation & analysis of your decision.
- 4) General feedback.
- 5) Invite teams for personal feedback after the adjudication.

Oral Adjudications (OA's) should be similar in length to the designated speech times for the grade debating (e.g. 6 min for Grade 9). Avoid OAs beyond this time length.

Decision:

- A winner must be decided, a tie can never be awarded.
- The winner should be based upon overall persuasiveness, NO single event should be the basis of a decision. Issues should be used to guide your decision. Generally, the team that has won the most issues wins the debate.

Issues:

- Issues should be the largest questions/clashes within the debate. Issues can be framed and engaged with in multiple ways:
 - 1) *Stakeholders (e.g. Which side makes [insert stakeholder] better off?)*
 - 2) *Outcomes (who gets better..., did this actually make an impact..., whose outcomes were more important?)*
 - 3) *Is [insert contentious topic] a good thing? (e.g. Is the right to choose a good thing?)*
 - 4) *Principle clashes (e.g. Right to privacy vs the right to safety)*
- Within each issue, you should contrast the material provided by either side
- For the decision sheet, it is suggested that you only fill out issues once it is clear what the largest clashes are within the debate.

Arguments | Responses | Analysis:

- Should be a brief overview of the points, ideas & rebuttal provided from both teams within each issue.
- Credit material from each speech, ensuring debaters feel heard.
- Your analysis should be done alongside the presentation of ideas within the issue, and should outline key differences between the teams:
 - o Depth & explanation of reasoning, responsiveness/rebuttal, consistency & clarity, organisation of ideas, number of ideas presented, stakeholder analyses, impacting (why we should care) and more...
 - o Never base your decision on what the teams should have said/ideal arguments (this is for feedback), your *justification should be based upon what was said in the debate.*
- *Always justify your reasoning, never make assertions within your adjudication.*

Winner & Summary:

- Announce the winner of the issue.
- Distil your analysis to 1-2 points of difference between the teams, to make clear to debaters who won & why

General feedback

- Never single out any one debater in general feedback.
- Provide a mixture of positive & constructive feedback & tailor your feedback to the debater's experience.
- Avoid feedback specific to your preferences – prioritise feedback that the average person would give.

Explanation | Implementation | Examples

- Be specific in your explanation – explain HOW debaters could execute on the feedback provided through tangible strategies (e.g. practise your speech in front of a mirror).
- Provide examples & analogies, especially for younger students or students new to debating.
- Explain WHY debaters should follow your feedback.

If you have any questions about the contents of this guide, please contact adjudicators@qdu.org.au.

For a more in-depth guide, please visit: <https://qdu.talentslms.com/>