



Reviewing Rounds

CTMSDL Workshop

August 26, 2019



Normal Coaching

Coach

Student

Teach

Listen



Observe

Execute



Comment

Correct



Debate & Speech Coaching

Coach

Teach



Observe



Comment

Student

Listen



Execute



Correct



Coaching Constraints

- There is only one of you at the tournament
 - busy judging
 - one team at a time
- Practice debates are time expensive
 - lack feel of real debates
- Exercises are short on context
 - “artificial” arguments
 - lack of evolution



Judges

- Quality varies
- Students rarely remember oral feedback
- Ballot comments are limited
- Even good ballot comments:
 - are limited in content and coverage
 - don't permit discussion
 - based on the judge's perspective



Conclusions

- Most debaters:
 - don't know why (or whether) they won or lost
 - don't really know how to improve
- Debaters have to be the observers
- Coaches have to coach:
 - using the debaters' own observations
 - using the coach's observation of other rounds
- *Learning to flow well is a critical skill*



Using Flows

- Simple visual interpretation
- Using flow examples to teach important “debate theory”



Spatial Examples: Good Flow

	Chris Yang	Robert Patterson	Numan Gajpati	Suman Patil	ESU - MSPDP 2015
<p>Loved one in military capt. no ransom - death cert</p> <p>Frame: Military capt in battle</p> <p>Priority 1: get back peace</p> <p>2: prisoner exch</p> <p>3: money</p> <p>G1 Nec to protect Civilians</p> <p>G2 Not Turn Backs on sold.</p> <p>G3 No other options</p> <p>G4 Shows our loyalty</p> <p>G1 NWP gives govt power - anything incl. ransom</p> <p>G2 Put cold on front - obligation to pay back</p> <p>G3 - rescue oper. leading cause of death</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> many fail for success escape, in places recapt variable method exchange <p>G4 Shows loyalty + devotion to military</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> give sold. comfort increase interest in mil. <p>G1 } summary</p> <p>G2 }</p> <p>G3 }</p> <p>G4 }</p> <p>no rationale</p>	<p>Intro Motion Prop. Then Opp</p> <p>G1 'Nec to protect Civilians'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - best option not pay - lead to capture captives <p>G2 Risk lives if pay more</p> <p>G3 Will show lateral + [no arg in reply]</p> <p>Def Ransom - sum of \$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no some hostages Frame - pay for any <p>G1 Ransom risks other</p> <p>G2 Other alternatives</p> <p>G1 - pay worst path</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> make citizens target NWP Fr \$58M pay First source of rev. for al Qaeda Fr 2/3 of \$8 host US only \$ <p>- pay gives market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ransoms rising waste money, harm economy encourages kidnappers rather than stop cycle <p>G2 Other Prod. Alt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - refusal not disregarded - Somali pirates pay ↑ piracy, since 2013 ↓ #1's <p>{ Best Evidence }</p>	<p>Intro Opp, Frame Prop</p> <p>G1 NWP Clause</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - must trade prisoners for 1 Ref. <p>G2 - obligation to soldiers</p> <p>G3 - rescue req. don't work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Somali paid, not prisoner exchange - rescue leading cause of death <p>G4 Need to show loyalty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - attract more to military <p>G1, G2, G3</p> <p>[no restat, nothing new]</p> <p>III</p> <p>G1 - trading prisoners, not paying ransom</p> <p>G2 Agree other alt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - trade prisoners, not pay <p>Cassatium</p>	<p>Intro Motion</p> <p>G1 Nec to protect []</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - risk many more <p>G2 - any force endangers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> against anything military stands for <p>G3 - only started a few</p> <p>G4 Loyalty</p> <p>NWP - 3 danger []</p> <p>G1 WP - ransom + kidn → ransom</p> <p>G2 WP only on money not exchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - applies to any force - returning leaders - Cobent Treasury [] for weapons, kill soldiers - NWP 2010 - "Good bla us w/ money bought weapons" OGB - return leaders we \$ lose \$ lose strategy intergroup fear <p>G2 - Somalia - armed guards, survive have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - speed for rescue in Somalia - kill kidnappers - prevent travel to dangerous areas - State Dep warning - Bills to ban travel 	<p>Intro Refute Prop, Weigh</p> <p>G1 - prisoner exchange still funds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - risk rest of US <p>G2 - violating what mil stand for by aiding enemy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - refutes frame work - not just mil damage <p>G3 - shown viable options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$1 release harms us <p>G4 - loyalty vs 300 mil. pot. victims put a risk</p> <p>G1 Only reputation is framed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - all of America at risk <p>G2 Conceded this []?</p> <p>Weigh</p> <p>Immediate gratification vs Long-term harm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • soldiers + other 300M • can't take that risk 	<p>ESU - MSPDP 2015</p> <p>The US should pay ransom for hostages.</p> <p>Hackley v Rachel Carson</p> <p>Tug/Rolby []</p> <p>Intro Motion</p> <p>Frame, Themes</p> <p>Frame - Prop has right</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no specific reasons why extratropical <p>Plan Military only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - arg on \$ don't stand <p>Leaders - you give back leader</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - get back heroes • let die we fail at response <p>Hostage Swap leads to more</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fight whether we pay send ⇒ no ↑ battles - take captive more might happen • get back as not killed - not risking US citizens • only mil. battle hostages • no citizens then • not citizens here - no Opp arg relevant - military policy of "no man left behind" <p>Decision 2-1 Opp</p> <p>Decision wrong.</p> <p>Def problem</p> <p>All speakers think and/or - argument</p>



To Each His or Her Own

Cindy	Ben	Jackie	Tai	LOB (Ben)	CTMSDL 10-21-17 National Service Army/Mid vs Smith Alexandra
<p>Intro</p> <p>P1 Improve Society Patriotism Work Experience Plan \$12k/yr \$5K schd -18-28 yrs</p> <p>P1 Society - Ameri Corp } more vol } help } Peace "</p> <p>P2 Act to try diff projects, decide likes</p> <p>P3 - more confident in country • weaker pat. now • fewer in military</p> <p>Learn to be civil ser- vices, continue</p> <p>Poor get salary, add job to reduce</p> <p>Build schools/ fix roads</p> <p>Learn to work with others - help in work force</p> <p>Help economy - \$5K family in real</p> <p>Boost democracy, don't take away from</p> <p>P1 How diverse? - part of country/govt</p>	<p>Motion</p> <p>Q1 Not cost eff</p> <p>Q2 Ruin plans</p> <p>Q3 Prob. outcomes</p> <p>Prof req early commit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - take away, less time - should force talented - "alloc, sat, train, clothing, med, eat, mgmt, periodic base" <p>Disillusion w/ gov or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - programs poorly run - disc gov jobs/ prog - bad service <p>Peace Corp 17 \$pp/4K spm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - prog expand → unequal - too big to admin - danger "Columbia medical risk" - weak training T&A <p>P1 Reduce Mil to pay? - what about mil</p> <p>P1 \$50B.</p>	<p>Intro</p> <p>P1 Society</p> <p>Cost eff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Columbia - \$ ⇒ + \$4/ben" - Ameri Corp + \$3 Bn (?) to pay stud loan <p>Give Skills to Part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can find new jobs - better knowledge + productivity - help college accept pay <p>P3 More patriotic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - happier corp <p>P1 Die in battle?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not more patriotic - still for the country - honorable <p>Overall generate jobs, \$.</p>	<p>P1 Exorbitant cost</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "on costs from LOC Ameri Corp costs x 10x \$30K/week - cost of taking young out of work force • workers spend more, pay higher tax - better go into med + become doctor 	<p>Ruin plans</p> <p>Not cost eff</p> <p>Prob outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - become doctor, e.g., inventor better for country - \$30K per Prop - says gen 4x ⇒ \$120K back <p>Improve lives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not all want to do this - prefer other things that help career <p>Unfund military? Σ taking time</p>	<p>Intro</p> <p>Opp -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost Eff? pay little for work done Stops Talent? gives more experience End Plan? help make better - life changes - other problems arise <p>Other things? this way also help - vol in their field</p>



Argument Flow in Round

Speech	1 st Prop	1 st Opp	2 nd Prop	2 nd Opp	Opp R	Prop R
Prop	P1 P2 P3		P1 P2 P3	P1		Some reply to Opp
Opp		O1 O2 O3			O1 O2 O3	

Ask debaters: “What were your opponents’ contentions?”



Offense but No Defense

Ananya Balasubramanya	Caroline Kelly	Jacob Kirschbaum	Julia Knispel	Caroline Kelly	CTMS02 1-26-19 Wes/Wat vs. East Ridge Hate Speech
<p>Intro Motion TH - US HS - person/group w/o attributes - exception to prot</p> <p>P1 → violence, division P2 Violates soc. contract P3 Dehumanizes</p> <p>PL (white Sup → murder) Sikh Dylan Roof - genocide prece by HS - holocaust/Rwanda promp by HS - NYPD bias crime ↑ → HS → violence</p> <p>P2 SC - implicit, benefits • HS attacks people → hate Gov't • 892 hate groups in US • 191,000 hate crime - no HS ⇒ no crime</p> <p>P3 - deep new, psyc wound ↓ empathy • e.g. targeted violence - often viol preceded by HS • HS used to motivate - not free if minorities burdened</p>	<p>Intro Motion</p> <p>Q1 Speech safer than crime Q2 Protected 1st A Q3 lets expression</p> <p>Q1 limits to FS to protect - panic - threats ⇒ limited lead to viol</p> <p>Q2 ACLU - Gov't deny print POL forbid bullying? HS about opinion POL Op of o/hate? Hate way be opinion • denial/reg speech POL limit HS not FS? limit speech P2 → ↓ democracy - e.g. Richard Spencer ok US not Europe POL Euro not US? other countries don't ban POL Better to ban? No, not to hate crime</p>	<p>Intro No reply to Prop</p> <p>P1 - NYPD bias crime arrests. [interview] ⇒ ban HS. - HS ⇒ high BP POL Need to express? - not will hate - Charlottesville Riots P2 - sac. freedom for protection - kindergarten sticks & stones • suicide, high BP Q? Okay to allow FS if it hurts others?</p> <p>Q1 - phy viol already ban ⇒ in prison - just another restrict so no neg effect</p> <p>Q2 - going to change list - need to copy other countries</p> <p>Q3 Can express views w/o hate - controversial w/o hurt feelings</p> <p>Q3 - open society req opin 4:20</p>	<p>Intro Motion Opp - Prop</p> <p>PO New</p> <p>Q1 Peter + White Nat'l - Charlottesville vs Kapernick NFL POL still allowed? not finished • CK could wrong • PS might annoy POL CK A Libe? kept others from Hate Crime POL No Expression? - should express POL Hateful not or more peaceful? - still FS Q2 HS protected, no 1st A exception Q3 Jackson - schools ed students - need protect ind. - Ban wouldn't work Obama: not repression more speech 4:45</p>	<p>Intro Motion</p> <p>Expression - may not be able to express - 23% lead to crime</p> <p>PO1 - dang opin not exp • these are views • not nec. dangerous • not req to liste</p> <p>PO1 Stated HS always leads to violence - not so</p> <p>Protection? - not by ban - O2 limits exist • ban violence 3:00</p>	<p>Varun Kandaspe</p> <p>Intro Opp, Prop, Clash Opp - no source?</p> <p>HS → violence • ban ⇒ no division HS → no violation of social contract → could save lives.</p> <p>Ref HS currently prot? point of debate - SC will re-interpret Expression? - hurtful opinions shouldn't be good. Clash: pos. exp resurive be the never direct at desc to race or gender Const.? - point of debate</p> <p>Two Worlds Opp - divisive - at each other throat Prop - can work together - counseled by society Q?</p>

Take Over



Thin Defense on Both Sides

Grace Flynn	Lillian Morrison	AS Junja	Khobe Isaac	Zoe Oric	CRMSOL Eastcott, Westfield & Torrington Colonize Mars
<p>Intro Motion</p> <p>"end of all our exploring" TSE</p> <p>TH - PPP w/ NASA</p> <p>Col - working settlement</p> <p>Then - Progress of Hum</p> <p>Modeling given choices, go</p> <p><u>P1</u> Advantech</p> <p><u>P2</u> Ensure survival explore</p> <p><u>P3</u> Desire fulfilled to expand</p> <p><u>P1</u> - e.g. Moon \Rightarrow CAT Scan</p> <p>- e.g. smoke detector</p> <p>- e.g. water filter</p> <p>\Rightarrow life changing, not invented / inv. late</p> <p>\Rightarrow Mars same, amazing insu</p> <p><u>P2</u> Must "self-sust city"</p> <p>- GW, overpop, pollul</p> <p>\Rightarrow Mars alt.</p> <p>- Asteroids, Supernova, C&RB</p> <p>\Rightarrow wipe out</p> <p><u>P3</u> - Moon brought us together</p> <p>• proud to be American</p> <p>- Europe col West crops, animals, plants</p> <p>• beneficial part</p> <p>[who says won't be again]</p>	<p>Intro Motion</p> <p><u>P1</u> - have reasons to do this</p> <p><u>P3</u> - if people die won't feel so good</p> <p>Plan - invest in protecting Earth</p> <p>- don't ruin/pollute world e.g. conserve water, reduce fast poll, global warming</p> <p>\Rightarrow fresh start</p> <p><u>O1</u> Speed up death of Earth</p> <p>- Mars takes away resour</p> <p>- many things wrong now</p> <p><u>PO1</u> Safe alt? agree, but that is f: x Earth</p> <p>- don't know Mars works \Rightarrow wastes res.</p> <p><u>O2</u> Mars has bad health</p> <p>- exercise or love/hate</p> <p><u>PO1</u> def</p> <p>- harmful rad \Rightarrow brain damage</p> <p><u>PO1</u> def</p> <p>dead 52klyr</p> <p>lost 72klyr</p> <p><u>PO1</u> DY Acolo will focus to solve problems.</p> <p>- caused by UV, need to fix CO₂ poll to fix</p> <p><u>O3</u> Fix problems here</p> <p>- poll etc</p>	<p>Intro Prop then Opp.</p> <p><u>P1</u>, <u>P2</u>, <u>P3</u></p> <p><u>P1</u> - CAT Scan - comp counts to careem</p> <p>\Rightarrow med tech.</p> <p>- smoke detector</p> <p><u>P2</u> no refutation</p> <p>\rightarrow many existential threat</p> <p>"asteroids, viruses, volcano"</p> <p><u>P3</u> We went to the moon</p> <p><u>PO1</u> Really if '00's die?</p> <p>- when we accomplish will outweigh cost</p> <p><u>PO1</u> Disease on Mars? - free us to find a cure</p> <p><u>P2</u> Plan not feasible</p> <p>- funding</p> <p>- many exist, not under control: overpop, gw, asteroid</p> <p>4100</p> <p><u>P1</u> - reasons not same as people</p> <p><u>P3</u> / <u>PO1</u> - accomplish goal outweigh impact</p> <p><u>O1</u> 5000</p> <p><u>O3</u> cross</p> <p><u>O2</u> - space suits frozen food</p>	<p>Intro</p> <p><u>P1</u> - failed colonize before e.g. Vikings</p> <p>\Rightarrow highly likely fail Mars</p> <p>- Mars may not be possible</p> <p><u>PO1</u> def</p> <p><u>PO1</u> Success too? yes cause</p> <p><u>PO1</u> denied</p> <p>- \$7.85 Bn for mission</p> <p>\Rightarrow take money for Earth</p> <p><u>PO1</u> PPP? - is Gov't fund.</p> <p><u>O2</u> - radiation, gravity</p> <p><u>PO1</u> ref</p> <p>- 3yrs gain on rays</p> <p>\Rightarrow big unknowns</p> <p>- disease kills how fast if no cure quick</p> <p><u>O3</u> Carlin "America waste"</p> <p>- many pollution problems</p> <p>- Mars is something we don't really need</p> <p>"Earth easier than Mars"</p>	<p>Intro Prop then Opp.</p> <p><u>P2</u> Same who ruined Earth will ruin Mars</p> <p>- gravity problems, water</p> <p>- space suits? frozen food?</p> <p>how energy able?</p> <p>\Rightarrow so (feeling) uncertainty</p> <p>- no water, no nutrients in soil</p> <p><u>P1</u>! Reasons - they said we don't know</p> <p>- so danger</p> <p><u>P2</u> send to die not save</p> <p>Salvation is on Earth</p> <p>- fix so we can survive</p> <p><u>P3</u> No pride if colonists die</p> <p>- Mars hit by asteroid</p> <p>- risk 100's lifers for something we don't know works</p> <p><u>O1</u>, <u>O2</u>, <u>O3</u></p> <p>Ethics</p>	<p>Westfield & Torrington Colonize Mars</p> <p>Abbi Artha</p> <p>"More than human imagination."</p> <p>Intro</p> <p>Earth problems?</p> <p>- easier to start over than fix Earth</p> <p>Harm Mars?</p> <p>- learned from mistakes e.g. 2k glob warm</p> <p>Health?</p> <p>"given ability"</p> <p>• should we.</p> <p>2nd Opp didn't refute</p> <p> terraforming will make Mars Earth-like</p> <p>- know enough</p> <p>- take a chance</p> <p>Mars risk?</p> <p>- one survives.</p> <p>Opp - no longer leading stake, no back up</p> <p>Prop - gained immense knowledge</p> <p>- inspired citizenry</p> <p>which side better advances HR?</p> <p>- know</p> <p>- ec.</p> <p>- patriotism.</p> <p>argument</p>



Argument Flow in Round

Speech	1 st Prop	1 st Opp	2 nd Prop	2 nd Opp	Opp R	Prop R
Prop	Def Model P1 P2 P3	P1 P2	P1 P2 P3		P1 P2 P3	Good summary <i>but</i> <i>needed</i> <i>rebuttal!</i>
Opp		Plan O1 O2 O3	Plan O1 O2	O1 O2 O3	O1,O2, O3	

- Time sequence of 2nd Prop was: P2, P3, Opp Plan, P1, P3. O1 and O2 are mentioned at the 5 minute mark in grace period.
- 1st Opp and 2nd Opp each answer 4 POIs!



THW colonize Mars.

Proposition

- Definitions
 - TH = Public/Private Partnership w/NASA
 - Colony—working settlement
- Theme—progress
- Model—given ability, we should go to Mars

- P1: Advance knowledge
- P2: Ensure survival of the human race
- P3: Fulfill desire to expand and explore

Opposition

- Plan: invest in protecting/fixing Earth

- O1: Mars project will speed up death of Earth
- O2: Mars has bad health effects
- O3: Most prefer to fix Earth before going to Mars



Questions

- Does Prop have a plan?
- Does the definition of “TH” add anything?
- What is a “Theme”? Should Opp contest it?
- Is the “Model” valid?
- Do the Prop contentions:
 - flow from the motion?
 - unique to the motion?
- Is the Opp “Plan” a counterplan? Necessary? Wise?
- Do the Opp contentions respect/attack the Gov case?
- Assume each side wins all their own contentions, who wins the round?



THW provide a minimum annual income to all citizens.

- Definitions
 - TH = Nigeria
 - Plan: provide a UBI similar to Namibia
- P1: Citizens have a right to a decent standard of living
- P2: MAI provides wide economic benefits
- P3: MAI provides tangible social benefits



THS tariffs on China

Proposition

- TH = US
- Value: best for US
- P1: Increases US GDP
 - More produced in US
 - Better quality/safety
- P2: Prevent or delay Chinese hegemony
 - China is export driven
 - Less sold to US
 - Move factories out of China

Opposition

- O1: Tariffs are self-destructive for US
 - Harms world trade
 - Increases prices in US
 - Invites retaliation
- O2: Limits access to critical raw materials
 - Rare earths



THS tariffs on China

- TH = China
- Value: long-term benefit to China
- P1: Strengthens China's int'l standing
 - US disregards treaties and int'l law
 - China seen as leader
- P2: Strengthens China's economy in the long run
 - 1. Conflict with US inevitable
 - Forces China to be self-reliant in technology
 - Forces China to develop other trading partners
 - 2. Provides domestic political cover
 - Chinese economy is unbalanced and needs changes
 - US is convenient scape goat for pain of adjustment
- P3: Weakens the US
 - Tariff implementation lead nations to question US leadership
 - Tariffs primary cost is to US businesses and consumers

On Opp this is a turn of the previous Prop second contention!



Other Exercises with a Flow

- Trace one contention through each speech
- Match Prop and Opp contentions
 - adapting Opp case structure
- “Redo” speeches
 - later Constructives
 - especially Rebuttals
- Identify “missing” POIs



Thoughts on Flowing

- Can be learned/taught
 - requires a discipline and practice
- Requires modeling
 - coach should flow the same way
 - judges should be encouraged to flow
- Requires a formal post-tournament review
- *Have the team discuss and agree on a single format?*



My Flowing Preferences

- Handwritten, not on a laptop
 - ink, not pencil
- Spiral bound notebook or pad
 - good writing surface
 - easy to hold, speak from
 - artist paper doesn't bleed through
- Six-column format
- *Office Lens* or similar program for document capture



Alternatives

- If loose sheets:
 - have a clipboard to hold during round
 - have a folder to store post-round
 - if more than one piece of paper, work out exactly how
- If laptop/tablet:
 - pick a program
 - design a format and establish conventions



Flowing Details

- “All debaters flow all speeches”
 - 1st Prop can be from a separate page
 - Opp case of 1st Opp can be from a separate page
- *But*
 - *teammates flow these speakers!*
- Speaker’s own column holds outline
 - Fill in as you flow



After the Tournament

- Teams regroup and outline all rounds
 - document or spreadsheet template, shared drive?
 - “readable, reasonable summary”
 - Coach outlines judged/observed rounds
 - including the final round
- Each team makes a list of observations
 - about specific rounds
 - about the topic in general
 - anything else interesting
- *3 team members, one round each!*
 - plus the final
 - each edits the other’s work
- Spend a practice going over these as a team or in small groups



Withhold Ballots?

- Reward for effort put into review
- More accurate self-reflection
- Remove judge quality as a variable
- Learn to trust one's own judgement
- Lean to compare one's own judgement to that of another



Questions and comments?