

## ***CCofSE Policy Debate Rules and Standards***

### **PHILOSOPHY**

Academic policy debate is not a pursuit of the “truth” or of the “perfect policy” in an ideal sense, but rather a forum useful to train minds in the art of argumentation. Debaters must learn to address both sides of an issue, requiring them to come to an understanding of an opponent’s perspective. To succeed in competition, they will need to learn to explain, interpret, apply, analyze, synthesize, solve problems, and communicate information effectively to a judge. Good clash over contrasting viewpoints on policy issues is encouraged. Direct refutation is expected and necessary. However, as Christian communicators, we are first and foremost to glorify God. Accordingly, in CCofSE, emphasis is placed on humility, courtesy, and Christ-like behavior.

### **GENERAL STANDARDS**

#### ***Ethics***

Conduct and attire should reflect respect for other participants, the debate activity itself, and the mission of CCofSE. Participants are encouraged to err on the side of caution, to do everything decently and in order (1 Corinthians 14:40, 1 Corinthians 16:14), and to avoid even the appearance of wrongdoing (1 Thessalonians 5:22).

#### ***Violations***

Concerns about violations of the Policy Debate Rules and Standards should be handled according to the guidelines specified in the CCofSE Code of Conduct. The tournament director will have the final say in determining any action that may be required.

### **THE ROUND**

#### ***Team Structure***

A team consists of two people who are between the ages of **12 and 18** as of October 1 of the competition year. At the request of a coach, and with the approval of the Steering committee, age requirement exceptions may be made.

#### ***Round structure***

A round of team policy debate consists of eight speeches. In the first four constructive speeches debaters will lay out their most important arguments and build their cases. In the last four rebuttal speeches, debaters are expected to extend and rebut arguments that have already been made in the constructive speeches, but may not make new arguments.

In a Policy Debate, the order and timing of speeches is as follows:

- First Affirmative Constructive (1AC) - 8 minutes
- Cross-Examination (C/X or Cross-Ex) - 3 minutes
- First Negative Constructive (1NC) - 8 minutes
- Cross-Examination - 3 minutes

Second Affirmative Constructive (2AC) - 8 minutes  
Cross-Examination- 3 minutes  
Second Negative Constructive (2NC) - 8 minutes  
Cross-Examination- 3 minutes  
First Negative Rebuttal (1NR) - 5 minutes  
First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR) - 5 minutes  
Second Negative Rebuttal (2NR) - 5 minutes  
Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR) - 5 minutes

Each team is given 5 minutes of preparation time (also known as prep time), which they may use before any of their speeches.

### **Affirmative Case Structure**

*The following are suggested case structures for CCofSE Policy cases:*

- *Needs Analysis Affirmative (Plan meets need)*
- *Comparative Advantage Affirmative*
- *Goals Criteria Affirmative*

*Alternative Justification Affirmative Cases (AJAC cases) are not allowed. (see glossary)*

*Teams should clearly identify the case structure they are using in the 1AC, or be prepared to do so upon cross-examination.*

*All Affirmative cases must be prima facia.*

### **Negative Case Structure**

- *A Topicality challenge, if any, should be presented in the first Negative Constructive speech.*
- *Use of the Emory Switch is discouraged.*
- *Counterplans are allowed, but should be non-topical. In other words, a Counterplan should not fulfill the resolution (as defined by the Affirmative). A Counterplan should demonstrate that a reasonable alternative plan would be better policy than either the status quo or the Affirmative plan. Counterplans should be presented in the first Negative Constructive speech.*
- *Minor Repairs are allowed. Minor Repairs, by definition, cannot be topical, because they require the use of structures and/or precedents already within the status quo. A Minor Repair is not the same as a Counterplan, so there should be no policy changes, or changes of agency, etc..*
- *Splitting the Negative Block is allowed, but new arguments are prohibited in the rebuttal speeches.*

## **ARGUMENTATION**

Arguments are to be supported by evidence or logic, not simply a debater's opinion, no matter how eloquently and persuasively the point is argued. Tag-teaming with a partner or audience member is prohibited.

## **EVIDENCE**

1) Team Policy Debate makes use of a wide variety of support to defend and clarify arguments, which may include (but is not limited to) logic, definitions, quotations, facts, examples, applications, analogies, cited material and other relevant information.

2) Evidence (a subset of support) is the oral verbatim reading of quoted text as well as an accompanying citation from a particular source that is publicly available.

a) Evidence must be physically present, on paper, in the debate room.

b) A written source citation must include:

i) Author (if available).

ii) Publication name.

iii) Complete date (if an internet source does not include a publication date, then the date of the last website update and the date accessed should be included).

iv) URL (if available).

v) Page number, if from a printed source.

vi) The citation is located directly above or below the quoted text.

c) Evidence must be read verbatim from the first word of the sentence to the ending punctuation without redaction or addition.

i) Information in parentheses may only be orally omitted when it does not change the meaning of the quotation.

ii) Information in parentheses must remain within the printed quotation.

d) Evidence may not be pieced together from non-contiguous sections of an article. If using two or more sections of an article, each new section from the same source must be cited as a new piece of evidence or made orally distinct from the previous section (e.g. "later in the article").

e) Ellipses may not be added by the debater, but may be included if part of the original material.

f) Evidence presented by a debater must be consistent with the intent of the source piece.

g) Evidence must be made available if requested by the other team or the judge, as the team presenting the evidence has the burden of validating that evidence if challenged.

h) Judicial Review—if the judge desires to review any written materials, this request must wait until the round is over, and must be at the initiative and direction of the judge.

i) Review may only include written materials that were orally presented by the debaters during the round.

ii) Debaters may not extend or explain arguments during the review.

i) Debaters may not attempt to provide the judge with written materials before, during, or after the round. Debaters are free to refer orally to the judge's right of evidence review, both in speeches and in cross-examination.

j) When evaluating the round, the judge is free to disregard any evidence presented which is found to be deficient in any aspects described above.

k) Debaters are responsible for all information presented in the round. Fabrication of information is strictly prohibited.

3) Debaters may not display "props" to the judge at any point in the round. A "prop" is defined as an object that substitutes an oral communication with a visual depiction

### ***Rebuttals***

Rebuttals are to be used to respond to the opponent's lines of argument and to extend arguments made in constructive speeches. No new lines of argument may be presented in rebuttals. New lines of argument are those that are not clarifications or responses made to arguments presented in the constructive speeches, but those that are completely new and unrelated to previous argumentation. New evidence to extend or clarify constructive arguments is permitted in rebuttals.

### ***Dropped arguments***

An argument is considered dropped if opponents do not respond to it in their next speech. There is no penalty for dropped arguments, but once dropped an argument should not be picked up later in the debate unless the opposing team continues the discussion.

### ***Timing***

All timing shall be done by the competitors. Each team should provide two countdown timepieces, one of which is to be used to keep track of prep time.

Speech times for Team Policy Debate are as follows:

8-3-8-3-8-3-8-3-5-5-5-5

Each team receives five (5) minutes prep time.

Prep time may not be used immediately before a cross-examination.

### ***Electronics***

Debaters may not use electronic devices other than timepieces in a round. Recording or videotaping of any or all of a round is allowed only with the permission of all debaters involved.

## **JUDGING PARADIGM**

***Criteria***

Competitors will be evaluated on their analysis, use of evidence, and ability to effectively and persuasively organize, deliver, and refute arguments. All speeches should be pleasant, comprehensible, and persuasive in tone. Rapid-fire delivery, commonly called "speed and spread delivery," is considered antithetical to the purpose and intent of this event and is not allowed.

***Voting Issues***

The stock issues, or voting issues – topicality, significance, inherency, and solvency – shall be the basis of the voting decision for policy debate rounds. The affirmative team must win all four stock issues in order to win the round. The negative team need win only one stock issue to win the round.

Disadvantages are also a voting issue, and will fall under either solvency or significance at the discretion of the judge.

A win shall be given to either the affirmative or the negative team, except in the event a winning team is given a loss for committing an ethical violation. In such cases, a double loss shall be given. Only in this instance is the round given a double loss.

### ***Speaker Points***

Speakers shall be given speaker points in each of the following areas - one (1) being weak, and five (5) being strong.

- Argumentation/refutation
- Cross-examination
- Delivery
- Evidence/logic
- Organization
- Persuasiveness

The points given for each of the categories shall be totaled, and the speakers ranked based upon these totals. The speaker with the highest total points shall be ranked first; the speaker with the second highest total shall be ranked second, and so on. Ties in speaker ranks are prohibited and shall be broken at the judge's discretion.

### ***Oral Judging Critique***

CCofSE sees tremendous educational value in an oral critique by the judge immediately following the round.

- Critiques should be no longer than five minutes in length.
- The judge must not reveal the decision to the debaters.



•