Overall goal is to divide the total number of units ABOVE the rated judge by the total number of rounds in the pool

1. Calcluate the total number of rounds in the pool
2. For each judge, calculate the number of rounds of judging with an ordinal rank GREATER than the judge plus 1. Note that ties are OK.
3. Divide the number in step 2 by the number in step 1, multiply by 100, 1-2 decimal place(s). Debateresults showed 2 decimal places, 1 is probably more appropriate. CAT2 shows 1 decimal place.

Sample: Imagine there are 142 rounds of judging in the overall judge pool, and these are the 10 most highly-ranked judges for Team X. Note that two judges received an ordinal rank of 3.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Judge | Units | Ordinal rating | Cumulative units | Round-weighted ordinal percentile (equation and number) |
| Palmer | 3 | 1 | 1 (0+1) | 0/142=0.7% |
| Bruschke | 8 | 2 | 4 (3+1) | 4/142=2.8% |
| Edwards | 2 | 3 | 12 | 12/142=8.5% |
| Larson | 4 | 3 | 12 | 12/142=8.5% |
| Tinkers | 3 | 5 | 17 | 17/142=12.0% |
| Evers | 5 | 6 | 21 | 21/142=14.8% |
| Chance | 1 | 7 | 26 | 26/142=18.3% |
| Mays | 8 | 8 | 27 | 27/142=19.0% |
| Mantle | 4 | 9 | 35 | 35/142=24.6% |
| Aaron | 8 | 10 | 39 | 39/142=27.5% |

Here’s a link: <http://commweb.fullerton.edu/jbruschke/web/OrdPrefInstructions.aspx>

Screen shot of old debateresults.com entry screen (clicking on VIEW INFO launches a page with their judge philosophy and complete judging record. I can make the record pages, another post-sept-1 idea).

