SCOPE

This document describes the standards, or rules, of Christian Communicators of America (CCA) regarding policy debate. As standards, they are not just recommendations or suggestions but are principles or rules the participants are expected to maintain and follow.

PHILOSOPHY

Participation

The required minimum age for participation in team policy debate is 14 effective on January first of the competition year. The student should be mature enough and have the necessary skills to participate in a high school level activity. When high school level students debate with other students at the same level, rather than high school level students debating junior high-level students, the competition is naturally improved. A better personal learning experience and higher level of competition is created as *"iron sharpens iron."*

Upper high school level competitors increase the level of competition because of their knowledge, skills, and reasoning ability. When students begin participating at a youthful age, they often stop competing after a couple of years--before their abilities reach full maturity. When older students stop competing, the level of competition drops to the skill level of those participating - junior high or early high school. A higher level of competition will be more challenging to upper high school level students and keep them debating longer. In addition, if the participant is hopeful for a debate or leadership scholarship, it is desirable on the part of the college that students participate in their junior and senior years of high school.

Purpose of academic policy debate

CCA believes that academic policy debate should be a practical educational experience that primarily is glorifying to God while reflecting the stylistic and analytical skills that are typically associated with common public forums (e.g., church, courts, congress, classroom, civic gatherings, etc.).

While these skills are transferable, it must be understood that academic debate is by nature technical. Direct refutation is not only expected, but necessary. Debaters must compare various positions. Nevertheless, because these skills are both transferable and a reflection of our character, the direct refutation inherent to academic policy debate can and should be done with meekness, humility, and consideration for the opponent, without sacrificing the strength of the argument.

Policy debate is not a pursuit of the "truth" or of the "perfect policy" in an ideal sense, but rather, it is a forum that has been developed for the training of minds in the art of argumentation.

The skills acquired from participation in academic policy debate are transferable to other communication venues. The demeanor displayed in the competitive arena is not only a reflection of current character, but also habits developed and exercised in the debate forum are likely to be transferred to other forums. Accordingly, in the CCA debate program, emphasis is placed on courteous behavior, while simultaneously emphasizing appropriate confrontation.

Nature of communication

In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle wrote about persuasion. He claimed there **are** three ways to persuade: logos, ethos, and pathos (i.e., appeal based on logic, appeal based on the character of the speaker, and appeal based on the emotions of the audience). He said that rhetoric is useful because things that are just and true have a natural tendency to prevail over their opposites. Plato, his teacher, described rhetoric as the "habit of a bold and ready wit."

It is impossible to have logical discussions if there is no agreement on the meanings of words, or if the participants are dishonest with their terminology. Socrates, in Plato's *Phaedo*, stated succinctly, "To use words wrongly and indefinitely is not merely an error in itself, it also creates evil in the soul." Similarly, Jesus instructed believers to have their yes be yes, and their no be no. (See Matthew 5:37)

Persuasion employs many methods – it is not dependent upon logic and reason alone. Plato argued against rhetoric as being dangerous – and if used incorrectly, it is. (See Proverbs 18:21)

It is not CCA's goal to teach actors who can delude the public by tickling the ear (see 2 Timothy 4:3 and Plato's charge against the sophists in *Gorgias*). The goal is to train minds in the art of argumentation based upon logic and reason. Logic and reason, when combined with eloquence, invigorates content. It is the goal of CCA to reward civil, comprehensible presentation.

Analysis, explanation, and appeals to common sense are considered appropriate argumentative strategies; however, statements that are not developed, applied, and supported are no more than mere assertions.

Ethics

CCA strives to maintain standards of ethical, responsible, humane, and communicative argumentation.

With respect to general behavioral constraints, participants and coaches are reminded that CCA views debate as a formal event whose ultimate end is to glorify God. Conduct and attire should reflect respect for other participants, the debate activity, and the mission of CCA.

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).

For debate to be fun and educational, everyone needs to participate according to the rules, specifically the rules of ethics. Ethical violations in the round include but are not limited to falsification or misuse of evidence, vulgar language, slander, deception, tag teaming with a partner or audience members, disrespectful behavior while someone is speaking, and splitting the negative.

An ethical violation, by definition, is a serious infraction of CCA principles. Ethical violations should be infrequent events. When they are observed, charges of such violations are to be brought, with discretion and humility, to the attention of the Tournament Director (not the judge) by the offended participant (not a parent or coach). Of course, judges and coaches are not precluded from raising ethical concerns with the Tournament Director.

Not every behavioral infraction constitutes an ethical violation. Moreover, not every complaint needs to be made to the attention of the Tournament Director. For example, if a coach or parent sees a participant behaving inappropriately, they are encouraged to speak directly to the coach or parent of the participant who made the infraction so that corrections can be made quietly and swiftly. However, if the behavioral infraction is a serious or repeated offense in which the offending individual does not respond positively to a coach or parental complaint, such infraction should be made known to the Tournament Director.

Comprehensible Presentation

There are three parts to a comprehensible presentation.

1. The presentation must be made in a logical manner, which includes succinct statements of the argument, clear organization, and a logical progression of the argument.
2. The presentation should be both trustworthy and delivered in a manner that supports its trustworthy nature, which includes the attire and confidence of the presenter.
3. The presenter should consider these aspects as parts of a comprehensible delivery: vocal volume; word usage; variety in contrast, rate, pitch, rhythm; word emphasis, gestures, facial expressions, and appropriate pauses.

Speed and Spread

This technique involves a debater to speak **faster than 160 words per minute** and is prohibited. This is not comprehensible presentation and is seen as unethical because it attempts to gain an advantage by overwhelming the opposition rather than by sound reasoning. The goal of CCA debate is conversational style communication.

Attire

To show respect for the activity, opponents, and judges, professional business attire is required. Complete information regarding professional business attire (or "tournament attire") requirements is included in the CCA Code of Conduct. Competitors must remain in CCA required tournament attire for the entirety of a tournament event.

Understanding the Resolution

The purpose of the resolution is twofold: to facilitate training in the art of argumentation by limiting the scope of discussion within the round, and to expose students to timeless issues regarding public policy. To facilitate in-depth argumentation without an undue burden of research, and due to the age of the students, the permissible positions of the Affirmative Team are severely limited.

STANDARDS

Tournament Director Authority

The Tournament Director shall have complete discretionary power to determine the appropriate penalty for any violations of these standards.

Ethics Violations

If there has been an ethical violation by a participant or audience member in the round, participants shall bring this to the attention of the Tournament Director, not the judge, after the round.

Judging Dichotomy

Judges will actively address ethical violations and bring such violations to the attention of the Tournament Director. Judges must decide the winner of the round using the four stock issues of topicality, significance, inherency, and solvency. The Affirmative Team must win all four stock issues to win the round. The Negative Team need to win only one stock issue to win the round.

The win shall be given to either the Affirmative Team or the Negative Team, except if the winning team is given a loss for committing an ethical violation. In such cases, a double loss shall be given. Only in this instance can a double loss be awarded.

Speakers shall be given speaker points in each of the following criteria – one (1) being low and four (4) being high.

- Argumentation
- Communication
- Cross-examination

- Justification
- Organization

The points given for each of the categories shall be totaled. The speakers shall be 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.

Tournament Registration Eligibility

An eligible student must be between the ages of 14 and 18 as of January 1 of the tournament season. A debate team consist of two eligible students. A student may compete in speech and debate events at a maximum of four (4) tournaments per competitive season. Attendance at tournaments other than these four is prohibited even as a non-competing, unregistered observer.

Stock Issues

A. Topicality

Topicality refers to the Affirmative plan's state of conformity to the debate resolution. A plan is topical if it justifies the full resolution as a direct result of planks in a plan that implements the resolution. Topicality is a protection for the Negative Team and should not be challenged frivolously or unnecessarily.

Topicality must be brought up in the first negative constructive speech if it is to be considered in the round. If the issue of Topicality is raised, the judge must vote on it after the cross-examination period following the second negative constructive. If the judge decides that the Affirmative case is not topical, the round ends and the negative team wins the round. If the judge determines that the Affirmative case is topical, no further topicality arguments are permitted in that round.

Participants are reminded that the stock issues, topicality included, serve as an analytical contrivance, or set of criteria, which judges utilize to assist them in determining whether they will vote for the Affirmative Team or the Negative Team. While a plan may be judged not topical in one debate round, the very same plan might easily be judged topical in the next round.

This is a direct result of the fact that academic policy debate is not a pursuit of "perfect policy." Policy debate is a means by which debaters are trained in analysis and argumentation. While there are separate ways to approach topicality, students should follow this general pattern when addressing this stock issue:

- The Negative Team must present their topicality argument in the first negative constructive speech and ask for a topicality ruling at the end of the cross examination following the second negative constructive speech.

- The Negative Team should articulate how, in their understanding, the affirmative plan is non-topical. The Negative Team must explain that the affirmative is not topical for one or more of three reasons outlined below.
- The Negative Team should explain why they believe the affirmative plan should be ruled not topical. This step consists of relating to why the Negative's definitions or understanding should be accepted instead of the Affirmative Team's position. The best and most common way to argue that one definition is superior to another is to present criteria for a good definition and then argue that your definition realizes these criteria better than your opponent's definition.

Acceptable Criteria to Prove a Satisfactory Definition: (not all of these will always apply)

- Prove your definition is officially stipulated as the correct one for this resolution.
- Prove your definition is grammatically correct.
- Prove your definition is derived from the appropriate field.
- Prove your definition is based on common usage.
- Prove your definition is consistent with policy maker's usage.
- Prove your definition meets the original understanding of the framers of the resolution (only applies when the resolution is accompanied with an addendum or letter of intent.).
- Prove your definition provides a clear distinction between what is legitimately included and what is legitimately excluded by the definition.
- Prove your definition provides a fair division of ground.

The following are three reasons an affirmative case is to be judged not topical**:**

1. The Negative Team may argue that the affirmative case does not meet the resolution as defined by the Affirmative Team itself. This circumstance rarely presents itself, as most teams are careful to choose definitions that match their plan or tailor their plan to match their definitions.
2. The Negative Team may argue that the affirmative case does not meet the resolution as the Negative Team has defined it. This is, by far, the most ordinary form of topicality press, and it relies upon different definitions of words like substantial, significant, policy, and other keywords found in the resolution itself.
3. The Negative Team may argue that the mandates of the affirmative case do not meet the resolution as either the Negative Team or the Affirmative Team has defined it. This press is typically referred to as "*effects topicality*." This challenge occurs when an Affirmative Team's case changes a policy other than the one specified in the resolution, but the effect of that change is in the topic area of the resolution. Effects topicality alleges that the Affirmative Team is not topical in its direct mandate or intent but only arguably arrives at

alleviating harms typically associated with the topic through a variety of internal links.

B. Inherency

Inherency argues the relationship between the status quo and the probability of future harm or inability of the status quo to fully meet a specific goal. The affirmative team must prove that each significant harm or unachieved goal that it identifies is built into the essential nature of the status quo such as through legal structures or societal attitudes, and that the needs identified by the affirmative can only be met by adopting the affirmative case.

C. Significance

Significance refers to the degree of importance or impact attached to an issue. The affirmative must prove that the essential elements of the case are quantitatively and/or qualitatively important.

D. Solvency

Solvency refers to the ability of a plan to work. The Affirmative Team must prove that the plan is viable and will solve or significantly reduce the harms that have been identified; or, when running a Comparative Advantage case, that the claimed advantages will come about.

Affirmative Case Structure

Only the following case structures are permitted: Needs Analysis Affirmative and Comparative Advantages Analysis Affirmative. Other case structures are prohibited.

Debaters select the **Needs Analysis Affirmative** when they believe that a significant inherent need (or harm) exists in the status quo that can best be solved by adopting the plan advanced by the Affirmative Team to provide significant advantages.

- Needs Analysis Affirmative, consisting at least of:
    - Harm (s)
    - Plan
        - Agency
        - Mandate(s)
        - Enforcement
        - Funding and Staffing
        - Addendum (optional)
    - Advantage(s)

Debaters select the **Comparative Advantages Analysis Affirmative** by accepting significant goals of the status quo and arguing that the affirmative plan is a better way of attaining these goals to produce greater advantages than the status quo.

- Comparative Advantages Analysis Affirmative, consisting at least of:
    - Goals of the status quo*
    - Plan
        - Agency
        - Mandate(s)
        - Enforcement
        - Funding and Staffing
        - Addendum (optional)
    - Advantage(s) by comparison.

    * In this case structure, there must be an identifiable relationship between the goals accepted by the Affirmative Team and the resolution as justified by the planks in the plan that implement the resolution. The Affirmative Team must select goals that are from the specific policy being reformed. Goals that identify broad ideological ideals that are not associated with the specific policy being reformed are not significant and are prohibited. **The CCA Comparative Advantages Case Structure FAQ** provides additional guidance on standards for this case structure.

Blending the key elements of the permitted case structures outlined above is prohibited. Examples of prohibited blending of key case elements would be:

- Adding a Goal(s) of the Status Quo to a Needs Analysis Case
- Adding Harms to a Comparative Advantage Case

Furthermore, teams should clearly declare the case structure they are using in the 1AC or be prepared to identify the case structure upon cross-examination.

Extra Topicality

The Affirmative Team may have some provisions in its plan that are not specifically enumerated in the resolution but provide for a reasonable implementation of its proposal. These provisions are typically described as "extra topical." Affirmative advantages may not be drawn from extra topical mandates. Advantages drawn from extra topical mandates are not a result of adopting the resolution, not likely to be unique to the resolution, and therefore should be rejected as a reason for adopting the affirmative plan.

Prima Facie

If the Affirmative Team has not presented a prima facie case in the 1AC, the Negative Team must challenge this in the 1NC. The failure to have a prima facie case is a failure to fulfill the four stock issues and a failure to overcome negative presumption in the first affirmative

speech. An incomplete case does not satisfy the prima facie requirement. A prima facie ruling is not announced to the debaters and is reserved for the ballot by awarding one or more of the stock issues to the Negative Team. Judges are instructed not to stop a round but allow it to finish before making a prima facie decision.

Affirmative Plans

An affirmative plan should include the following planks:

Plank 1 – Mandates

In most debates, this is the essence of the plan. In this plank, the Affirmative Team specifies the mandates given to the agency that administers the plan. The Affirmative Team must specify exactly what it requires the agency to do. Any new legislation needed to conduct the Affirmative Team's plan will be included in this plank.

Plank 2 – Agency

In this plank, the Affirmative Team specifies who will be responsible for adopting and administering its plan. This may include identifying who will enact the plan and/or who will do the work on the plan. The Affirmative Team must provide the essential details of the agency that will put its plan into effect.

> ***Caution***: Advantages may not be drawn from extra topical mandates; they may only be drawn from the action specified in the resolution.

Plank 3 – Enforcement

In this plank, the affirmative specifies how the plan will be enforced. In the need and inherency issues the affirmative has given reasons why people may resist its plan. Now the affirmative plan must provide a means of making people behave the way it wants them to. The affirmative may find it necessary to provide fines, prison terms, or other forms of coercion or incentives to make people act in the way necessary for their plan to work. In some circumstances, the affirmative may be able to demonstrate that, under the new conditions created by its plan, people will act in the desired way because it is now in their self-interest to do so. Most often enforcement will be through "normal means," which is to say that it is not specified by the plan, but simply uses the existing law enforcement mechanisms of the status quo.

Plank 4 – Funding and Staffing

In this plank, the Affirmative Team specifies how it will get the funding and staffing it needs to conduct its mandates. These actions usually occur through "normal means" unless the mandates require a substantial change in the funding and staffing of the resolutional actor, typically the US Federal Government.

Plank 5 – Addendum

In this concluding plank, the Affirmative Team can add further provisions as may be necessary to complete the implementation of its plan. This plank is quite often unnecessary.

Negative Case Structure

- Splitting the negative is prohibited.
- Counter Plans and Minor Repairs are prohibited.
- Kritics are prohibited (see glossary for definition.)
- Purchased cases are prohibited.

Evidence

To achieve the educational aspects of research within the debate activity, it is essential that the students perform their own research. Purchased evidence and cases are prohibited.

The following general standards apply to the use of evidence:

- Evidence shall be provided with a citation of source, author, and date of publication. Additional evidence from the same source may be referred to "as previously cited."
- The use of purchased evidence, such as case outlines, source books, prepared argument briefs, subject summaries with citations, or any other research not completed by the team members themselves is prohibited.
- Participants take full responsibility for the accuracy of the evidence they cite.
- ***The use of the Bible quoted as evidence is prohibited in the round.***

Ellipsing of evidence is permitted. Ellipsing is to leave out with ellipses or to strike out unnecessary verbiage. This is permitted so long as it does not change the original meaning of the quotation. Students should be able to verify the context of ellipsed evidence in the event of a challenge at the discretion of the Tournament Director. At a minimum, students are expected to be able to provide a full citation to the original source.

The opposing team may review evidence. Students may ask for, and should receive, a copy of the evidence used in the round upon request. As this is a protection against intentional falsification for both teams and not a substitute for flowing or research, evidence should not be challenged and reviewed frivolously or unnecessarily. A request to review multiple pieces of evidence without sufficient cause is considered pilfering of research and is prohibited. Negative teams are also prohibited from requesting a copy of the complete Affirmative Case.

- A request to review evidence should be made in a speech, or cross-examination, after the opposition's speech in which that evidence was cited.

- Evidence should be submitted only at the end of a speech or cross examination and can only be reviewed by the requesting team during that team's preparation time. The evidence must be immediately returned to its owner prior to the subsequent speech.
- If a competitor believes evidence has been misused, misquoted, or falsified, as with all ethics charges, that individual should bring this to the attention of the Tournament Director. Intentional falsification of evidence is a serious violation which warrants disqualification from competition at the Tournament Director's discretion.
- At any time, the judge may request, and should receive, evidence from either team. However, such a request should be reserved for extreme situations such as a charge of falsification or misuse of evidence. The judge is encouraged not to interrupt the timed flow of the round if possible.

Evidence Sharing

Evidence sharing is permitted between members of the same club prior to the tournament or with a novice team that does not have the benefit of a club. Evidence sharing at any point during tournament hours (those hours when competitors are required to be in tournament attire) is in effect a form of tag teaming and is prohibited.

Case Information Sharing

During tournament hours, information obtained from a debate round shall remain confidential to the competitors who participated in that round and their designated coach(es).

Competitors may confidentially discuss and analyze a round with their coach(es) for educational and coaching purposes. However, information obtained from that round shall not be communicated, directly or indirectly, to any other competitor, coach, parent, judge, spectator, or tournament attendee who did not participate in that round.

Prohibited information includes, but is not limited to:

• Evidence and source citations

• Case flows

• Harms, needs, goals, advantages, or disadvantages

• Plan mandates and details

• Argument strategies, responses, rebuttals, and cross-examination content

• Any other information that would provide a competitive advantage against a team during the current tournament

This restriction applies only during tournament hours, defined as those hours when competitors are required to be in tournament attire. Discussion of rounds and case information outside tournament hours is permitted.

Penalties for violation of this rule will be the Tournament Director's discretion ranging from reprimand to forfeiture of the round by the team(s) engaging in the above practice.

Fiat Power

Fiat power is the convention in academic policy debate that, for the sake of argument, participants may assume the implementation of their policy. This allows debaters to focus on the question of whether a policy should be adopted and avoid the irrelevant arguments about whether the policy would (or will) be adopted. However, the political fallout or natural consequences of enacting the affirmative plan may be subject to debate.

In addition:

- The affirmative may not fiat that advantages will flow from the plan; advantages must be proven.
- The affirmative may not fiat attitudes. For example, the affirmative may not fiat that the public will love and comply with the plan.
- Fiat is not a magic wand; it may not be used to make a plan work.

Fiat power is defined in the CCA Debate Glossary as follows: "The affirmative's authority, as defined by the resolution, to implement its plan." The central issue here is the phrase "as defined by the resolution." The resolution will identify the agent of reform. This is typically the United States Federal Government. Fiat power does not extend to the state and local governments beyond the Federal Government's current ability to adopt rules that bind the lower levels of government. It also does not extend to federal, state, or local courts as they are not the bodies that reform federal policy. Fiat does not extend to foreign countries or organizations unless they are specifically identified as agents of change within the resolution.

In The Round

First Affirmative Constructive (1AC)

- First affirmative speaker presents this speech.
- Eight minutes in length.
- Must present a prima facie case.
- Use of a scripted case is permitted.
- A copy of the case shall not be given to the judge.
- A copy of the case shall not be given to the Negative Team.

Cross-examination

- Second negative speaker is the questioner.
- First affirmative speaker is the respondent.
- Three minutes in length.

First Negative Constructive (1NC)

- First negative speaker presents this speech.
- Eight minutes in length.
- Topicality must be raised in this speech, otherwise it is waived.
- All negative on-case arguments shall be made in this speech.

- Any portions of the affirmative case not addressed in this speech are conceded by the negative.

Cross-examination

- First affirmative speaker is the questioner.
- First negative speaker is the respondent.
- Three minutes in length.

Second Affirmative Constructive (2AC)

- Second affirmative speaker presents this speech.
- Eight minutes in length.
- Any portions of the negative argument not addressed in this speech are conceded by the affirmative.

Cross-examination

- First negative speaker is the questioner.
- Second affirmative speaker is the respondent.
- Three minutes in length.

Second Negative Constructive (2NC)

- Second Negative speaker presents this speech.
- Eight minutes in length.
- If topicality is an issue, it should be addressed again in this speech.
- Any portions of the affirmative argument not addressed in this speech are conceded by the negative.

Cross-examination

- Second affirmative speaker is the questioner.
- Second negative speaker is the respondent.
- Three minutes in length.
- When a Negative Team requests a topicality ruling in the 1st Negative Constructive Speech, it shall be given by the judge at the conclusion of this segment.

First Negative Rebuttal (1NR)

- First negative speaker gives this speech.
- Five minutes in length.
- New arguments shall not be introduced, but additional evidence to support existing arguments is permitted.

First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)

- First affirmative speaker gives this speech.
- Five minutes in length.
- New arguments shall not be introduced, but additional evidence to support existing arguments is permitted.

Second Negative Rebuttal (2NR)

- Second negative speaker gives this speech.
- Five minutes in length.
- New arguments shall not be introduced, but additional evidence to support existing arguments is permitted.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR)

- Second affirmative speaker gives this speech.
- Five minutes in length.
- New arguments shall not be introduced.

Preparation Time

- Five minutes per team.
- The team that is speaking next is charged with the prep time.
-
- Prep time may not be used prior to cross-examination.

Oral Judging Critique

- No longer than ten minutes in length.
- The judge must not reveal the decision. A topicality ruling is an exception to this rule.

Special Debate Terminology

Unless otherwise addressed in these standards, special terminology common in various forms of academic debate theory and practice have no official meaning or weight within the context of these standards. Students shall refrain from claiming otherwise. The basis for judging voting decisions in the debate round will be in accordance with the stock issues of topicality, significance, inherency, and solvency. Examples of such terms could include but are not limited to "Negative Philosophy," "Resolutional Analysis," or "Affirmative Philosophy." Such terms and phrases are at most helpful rhetorical devices used to explain the stock issues; they are not independent standards for judging a round.

Cross Examination

The purpose of cross-examination is to ask and answer questions, not to make statements. Debaters will face the judge during the cross-examination period. Polite conduct is required. Occasionally, a debater may be asked a question that could hurt their case. CCA's position is that it is better to answer the question than to dance around it. As a practical matter, not answering a question gives the appearance of uncertainty and a lack of self-confidence. Ethically, if the debater is not careful, it can also be a form of lying.

Splitting The Negative

Splitting the negative is prohibited (see Glossary for definition). However, a division of labor is allowed. A division of labor between the negative speakers is when the 1NC focuses primarily on refuting some of the affirmative arguments using logic, evidence, and reasoning, while minimally addressing all other arguments raised by the affirmative (which means the substance of each negative response is clear to the affirmative, and the judge, even if a complete argument is not presented); those arguments not addressed at all are dropped and conceded to the opposing team. The 2NC then focuses on refuting the remaining arguments using logic, evidence, and reasoning, but again, still addresses all on-case arguments. The 2NC is permitted to raise additional off-case arguments, but it is unethical for the Negative Team to hide the substance of their on-case arguments from the Affirmative Team until after the 1NC.

Speaker Point Criteria

Below are descriptions of each of the speaker point categories. In each round, speakers will be given points in each of the categories listed below. Additional guidance on how judges are to score speaker points is provided in the **CCA Individual Speaker Point Guide.**

1. Organization

Strategic Organization

Putting a speech together in such a way as to achieve a certain result with a particular audience.

A well-organized speech has an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. It uses main points, transitions, signposts, internal previews (a statement in the body of the speech that lets the audience know what the speaker is going to discuss next), and internal summaries (a statement in the body of the speech that summarizes the speaker's preceding point or points) which will enable the listener to understand the thesis and its development in the speech.

Organization utilizes harmony, unity, correlation, arrangement, and classification. Each speech should be systematic and methodical.

2. Argumentation

Refutation and Rebuttal

Challenging the opponents' points by showing flaws or weaknesses in their arguments and overcoming the opponents' arguments and re-explaining or rebuilding one's own arguments.

A well-argued presentation includes tearing down an opponent's case by refuting their evidence with stronger, more credible, and current evidence; and challenging the opponent's reasoning with stronger, clearer, and more logical reasoning by using direct refutation, by linking arguments, and by showing the significance of arguments.

Argumentation includes appeal, explanation, illustrations, evidence, and logic.

3. Cross examination

Cross-examination Format

One member of the opposing team stands side-by-side with his opponent and directly questions the opponent about the case.

An effective cross-examination will employ assertive, thoughtful, pertinent questions and responses. The ability to think and respond spontaneously without much preparation time is an important facet of cross-examination.

Types of Questions

- *Question of Fact*: A question about the truth or falsity of an assertion.
- *Question of Value*: A question about the worth, rightness, or morality of an idea or action.
- *Question of Policy:* A question about whether a specific course of action should or should not be taken.
- *Question of Clarification:* A question about a specific assertion made in the speech. E.g., "When you said ___, did you mean to include ____?" or "Does you mandate to repeal ___ include the repeal of ____?"

Cross-examinations provide the opportunity to investigate, clarify, interrogate, and question.

4. Justification

Justification

The basic issue in a speech which deals with the questions of policy: Is there a fundamental problem or need that requires a change from current policy? Is this problem widespread and is it significant enough to require change? A speech designed to change or reinforce the beliefs or actions of the audience.

A well-justified speech will present evidence and reasoning in a winsome manner by using Aristotle's theory of the Available Means of Persuasion: logos (logical appeal), pathos (emotional appeal), and ethos (the speaker's character or likeability).

Justification applies reason, defense, explanation, influence, and plausibility.

5. Communication

Conversational Quality

Communicating in a fashion that sounds spontaneous and genuine no matter how many times a speech has been rehearsed.

One facet of a well-communicated speech is the use of vocal technique. Verbal technique includes changes in a speaker's rate, pitch, and volume, which give the voice variety and expressiveness. In addition, effective verbal communication is characterized by proper pronunciation and enunciation. The second facet of communication is the use of non-verbal communication. This communication occurs because of appearance, posture, gestures, eye contact, facial expressions, and other non-linguistic factors.

Communication is meaningful delivery which includes description, expression, reception, summary, information, accessibility, and conversational tone.

Timing

The competitors shall do all timing. Each team must provide two count-down timers, one for speaking and one for tracking preparation time. Verbal and non-verbal time signals from judges, team members, or spectators are prohibited.

Before a team takes prep time, they must inform the judge. For example, "The Negative Team is now taking prep time." When ready, the team then announces how much prep time remains. For example, "The Negative Team stopping prep time with 3 minutes remaining." Participants should set timers to count down from 5:00 to simply start and stop the timer and avoid any appearance of adding to their time.

Participants will time the oral critique by setting the timer for 10 minutes. When the judge and participants hear the time piece ring, everyone will know the oral critique time is finished.

Oral Critique

Oral critiques by judges are permitted, at their discretion, to facilitate learning. Judges may offer comments on a variety of areas related to the round. Since judges are not to reveal or imply anything relative to their decision, caution should be exercised to not assume the judge's decision based on what is said.

Even if participants disagree with the judge's assessment, they will respectfully and graciously listen as that judge has voluntarily given of his/her time to serve to the best of his/her ability. Participants may share the content of each judge's critique with their parents and coaches.

Just as the judge sits quietly while the debaters present during the round, in the oral critique the debaters sit quietly while the judge presents. Judges are instructed not to ask or answer questions once the round is complete.

Electronics

Competitors shall be prohibited from having radios, cell phones, computers, pads, PDAs, pagers, programmable watches, programmable calculators, et cetera, in the round. The use of non-programmable calculators for basic computations is allowed for use during the round.