|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard/Objective:**  **T**he **s**tudent **w**ill **b**e **a**ble **t**o discriminate among various judging philosophies **i**n **o**rder **t**o curate a panel of judges that reflects adaptability and their own personal debate philosophy.  **CS.4.DIV.3: Adapt to opponents, audience, and judge**   * Paradigms * Content warnings * Sensitivity * Microagressions | **Level:**  Beginner  **Intermediate**  **Advanced** |
| **Timeframe:**  **3 90-min classes**  (block scheduling) |

**Judge Philosophies and Adaptation**

**Part 1 – Essential Elements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Essential Question** | How does knowledge of judges’ preferences influence argumentation and performance? |
| **Supporting Question 1** | What conclusions can be drawn about a judge’s voting thresholds based on their philosophy? |
| **Supporting Question 2** | What ideas and information are most important to express in a judging philosophy? |
| **Supporting Question 3** | How can collaborative practice refine a personal philosophy and influence performance? |

**Rationale –** Knowing how to select relevant information from judge philosophies is a critical aspect of completing preferences for competitions, but more importantly, engages students in reflective practice in which they are able to better their approaches to argumentation and performance. The purpose of this lesson is to identify key components of judge philosophies in an effort to compose and refine their own debate philosophies as both competitors and eventual judges. At the conclusion of this lesson students will apply their knowledge to the selection of a dream team panel of judges, demonstrating their adaptability and highlighting key components of their own personal debate philosophies.

**Part 2 –** **The Lesson**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Supporting Question 1**  How does knowledge of judges’ preferences influence argumentation and performance? | The instructor will **model** for students how to access judge philosophies from <https://judgephilosophies.wikispaces.com/> or [tabroom.com](http://tabroom.com/). The instructor will describe to students the common components of and language for judge philosophies, and guide a discussion on the differences between judges’ preferences. The instructor will review with students (**APK – access prior knowledge**) the importance of thorough and thoughtful readings of philosophies to best inform MJP selections for competition. The instructor will explain the various ways (**N – new information**) judge adaptation impacts performance, and help students mediate how much—if any—adaptation is appropriate for various judging scenarios.  **Activity—**  1) Students will be instructed to select five (5) judging philosophies from one of the resources above, consulting the judges list from an upcoming tournament for guidance.  2) Students will read the philosophies thoroughly and mark up each with comments and questions. After reading, students will complete the “Philosophy Inventory” (**PAGE NUMBER**) worksheet independently.  3) With pod mates (four members), students will share their adaptation strategies from their inventories in informal discussion, focusing on how particular preferences might influence their argumentation and performance. Students should complete a discussion summary. |
| **Supporting Question 2**  What conclusions can be drawn about a judge’s voting thresholds based on their philosophy? | Through **guided practice**, students will compose their own judge philosophies. They will be asked to consider their voting thresholds for specific arguments, reviewing the components and language from SQ 1.  **Guiding Questions**:  1) In what order would your argument preferences appear and why?  2) What language can you use to indicate various predispositions to readers?  3) What information is lacking from philosophies you have read that would be beneficial to a debater?  4) How can you write your philosophy so as to not discourage certain argumentation (unless you absolutely will not ‘vote’ for a position) but to be clear about your preferences?  5) Should you include a speaker point range?  **Activity—**  Students will contemplate and compose their own thoughts about debate, organizing their thoughts into judge philosophies. Completed philosophies should be uploaded to Google Classroom to make them available to classmates (Rubric provided on PAGE NUMBER).  **Homework—**  Students will review classmates’ judge philosophies on Google Classroom to participate in SQ 3 activity. |
| **Supporting Question 3**  How can collaborative practice refine a personal philosophy and influence performance? | Students will **collaborate** by participating in the “Judges’ Lounge” activity.  **Activity—**  1) Students will briefly review classmates’ judge philosophies for the activity.  2) Using the “Judges’ Lounge” activity sheet (PAGE NUMBER), students will move about the room communicating with their classmates about their preferences. The objective is to find judges with whom you have preference commonalities and differences. Students will use the “Find Someone Who” strategy to complete the activity: “If you were a judge at a tournament and walked in to the judges’ lounge, who would you ‘sit’ with?”  3) Students will complete the activity with a written reflection on how their philosophies could be refined after collaboration with those with similar and different preferences. Students may adjust written philosophies as needed. |

**Part 3 – Assessment**

|  |
| --- |
| Students will demonstrate understanding of the importance of judges’ preferences by responding to the following prompt (PAGE NUMBER):  **PROMPT:** Curate a ‘dream team’ panel of three judges that reflects your personal philosophy, debate style, and ability to adapt. Responses should provide the judges’ names and a detailed rationale for each selection, while considering specific aspects of your argumentation and performance to which your panel will be receptive.  **Rubric:** (PAGE NUMBER) |

**Part 4 – Resources**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Terms and Resources** | Threshold |
| <https://judgephilosophies.wikispaces.com/> | Clipping |
| [www.tabroom.com](http://www.tabroom.com) | Cheap shots |
| Truth v. Tech | Paperless rules/prep time |
| Respect | Speaker points |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Resources for Extension** | <https://hsimpact.wordpress.com/2014/10/13/judge-philosophy-guidelines/> |

**Part 5 – Reflection**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Class Period \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /25

**Philosophy Inventory (SQ1)**

Select five judges from the judges’ list for an upcoming tournament you or your squad is attending. Read their judge philosophies on either [www.tabroom.com](http://www.tabroom.com) or <https://judgephilosophies.wikispaces.com> and complete the following inventory on EACH judge.

|  |
| --- |
| Judge’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rounds \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  How does this judge evaluate framework v. critical arguments?  What notable **thresholds** does this judge indicate that they have?  Does this judge indicate if they are **tech or truth**?  How does this judge evaluate **theory**?  Are there any notable comments from this judge that might impact how you debate for them?  How do you predict your arguments would be received/evaluated by this judge?  What would be your adaptation strategy for this judge?  What standard rating would you give this judge at this upcoming tournament? Provide explanation that considers the overall judging pool and team list for this competition.  RATING: \_\_\_\_\_ (1-5 and S) |

|  |
| --- |
| Judge’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rounds \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  How does this judge evaluate framework v. critical arguments?  What notable **thresholds** does this judge indicate that they have?  Does this judge indicate if they are **tech or truth**?  How does this judge evaluate **theory**?  Are there any notable comments from this judge that might impact how you debate for them?  How do you predict your arguments would be received/evaluated by this judge?  What would be your adaptation strategy for this judge?  What standard rating would you give this judge at this upcoming tournament? Provide explanation that considers the overall judging pool and team list for this competition.  RATING: \_\_\_\_\_ (1-5 and S) |

|  |
| --- |
| Judge’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rounds \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  How does this judge evaluate framework v. critical arguments?  What notable **thresholds** does this judge indicate that they have?  Does this judge indicate if they are **tech or truth**?  How does this judge evaluate **theory**?  Are there any notable comments from this judge that might impact how you debate for them?  How do you predict your arguments would be received/evaluated by this judge?  What would be your adaptation strategy for this judge?  What standard rating would you give this judge at this upcoming tournament? Provide explanation that considers the overall judging pool and team list for this competition.  RATING: \_\_\_\_\_ (1-5 and S) |

|  |
| --- |
| Judge’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rounds \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  How does this judge evaluate framework v. critical arguments?  What notable **thresholds** does this judge indicate that they have?  Does this judge indicate if they are **tech or truth**?  How does this judge evaluate **theory**?  Are there any notable comments from this judge that might impact how you debate for them?  How do you predict your arguments would be received/evaluated by this judge?  What would be your adaptation strategy for this judge?  What standard rating would you give this judge at this upcoming tournament? Provide explanation that considers the overall judging pool and team list for this competition.  RATING: \_\_\_\_\_ (1-5 and S) |

|  |
| --- |
| Judge’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rounds \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  How does this judge evaluate framework v. critical arguments?  What notable **thresholds** does this judge indicate that they have?  Does this judge indicate if they are **tech or truth**?  How does this judge evaluate **theory**?  Are there any notable comments from this judge that might impact how you debate for them?  How do you predict your arguments would be received/evaluated by this judge?  What would be your adaptation strategy for this judge?  What standard rating would you give this judge at this upcoming tournament? Provide explanation that considers the overall judging pool and team list for this competition.  RATING: \_\_\_\_\_ (1-5 and S) |

**Write Your Own Judge Philosophy Activity (SQ2) Rubric**

**Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Class Period \_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PP** |  | **Exemplary (5)** | **Proficient (4)** | **Emerging (3)** | **PE** |
| **5** | **Organization** | Skillfully and logically organizes argument preferences and information so that readers can easily understand the philosophy. Proper formatting is present (use of headers, appropriate font, paragraph length is sensible). | Sufficiently organizes argument preferences and information so that readers can understand the philosophy, though lacking in some clarity. Proper formatting is present (use of headers, appropriate font, paragraph length is sensible). | Argument preferences and information are presented but lacks coherent flow. Formatting is inconsistent and does not aid comprehension. |  |
| **5** | **Content** | Thoughtfully and thoroughly relates important information about each argument area, provides examples or other aids to help reader comprehension. Robust discussion of voting thresholds is present. | Sufficiently develops information about each argument area. Discusses voting thresholds but does not address interactions of arguments. | Limited and/or inconsistent content development. Does not sufficiently address each argument area and does not provide consistent thresholds. |  |
| **5** | **Diction and Tone** | Consistently uses precise and varied language. Content is clear and tone is appropriate. | Sufficiently uses precise and varied language. Content is sufficiently clear and tone is appropriate. | Language is not elevated and unclear. Content is superficial and tone is inconsistent. |  |

**Total\_\_\_\_\_**

**Judge’s Lounge—Find Someone Who (SQ3)**

Directions: Imagine you are judging at a debate tournament. You have a round off and head to the judges’ lounge to grab a snack. Who do you sit with? After reading your classmates’ judges philosophies, move about the room and complete the Find Someone Who (FSW) boxes by communicating with your classmates about the information in their philosophies. Write their name and indicate whether you agree or disagree with their predisposition. \*\*Not all of these will be readily knowable from your classmates’ philosophies; you must seek and ask.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FSW does not vote for affs without a plan text | FSW dislikes topicality | FSW takes prep for flashing | FSW is a traditional judge (Stock Issues) | FSW does not like Ks but “will vote for them” |
| FSW likes performance debate | FSW is tech over truth | FSW is truth over truth | FSW highly prioritizes respectability | FSW will not vote for critical arguments |
| FSW hates framework | FSW likes politics DAs | FSW gives low speaker points | FSW has a high threshold for theory | FSW errs neg on theory |
| FSW favorite argument is CPs | FSW prioritizes “do what you do best” | FSW is ok with K tricks | FSW leans neg on PICS | FSW prioritizes ROB arguments |
| FSW believes that fairness is an impact | FSW does not like agent counterplans | FSW lists debate teams the enjoy | FSW likes security and cap, but not Baudrilliard | FSW thinks that fiat solves the link |

Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Class Period \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /30

**Judge Philosophies and Adaptation Written Formal Assessment**

Curate a ‘dream team’ panel of three judges that reflects your personal philosophy, debate style, and ability to adapt. Responses should provide the judges’ names and a detailed rationale for each selection, while considering specific aspects of your argumentation and performance to which your panel will be receptive.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PP** |  | **Exemplary (10)** | **Proficient (7)** | **Emerging (5)** | **PE** |
| **10** | **Organization** | Skillfully and logically organizes thoughts and information. | Sufficiently and logically organizes thoughts and information. | Little to no organization of thoughts and information. |  |
| **10** | **Content** | Judges panel reflects the argument style of the debater superiorly. Thoughtfully and thoroughly rationalizes each selection. | Judges panel reflects the argument style of the debater sufficiently. Debater provides rationale for each selection satisfactorily. | Judges panel is not coherent with argument style of the debater, and  limited and/or inconsistent rationale provided for each judge selection. |  |
| **10** | **Style and Tone** | Consistently uses precise and varied language. Content is clear and tone is appropriate. | Sufficiently uses precise and varied language. Content is sufficiently clear and tone is appropriate. | Language is not elevated and unclear. Content is superficial and tone is inconsistent. |  |

**Total \_\_\_\_\_**