

fact, meet it.

7. Remember, the affirmative team has the responsibility of establishing the probability that their proposal will correct the evils in the status quo. If they use the comparative, advantage approach, they need only show their plan is comparatively advantageous and does not induce significant new harms. In the criteria case they must show: that the criterion is the best one to judge the situation by and that their plan can more effectively fit it without adding new disadvantages. They will attempt to do this by the quality and quantity of evidence and the soundness of their reasoning as they defend their position.

D. Technical aspects of debate to be considered in judging:

1. There should be agreement on definition of terms as the debate progresses. The affirmative usually defines the terms, but the negative has the right to challenge the definitions if they feel the affirmative has been unfair in defining terms. Unless the definition of terms is attacked by the negative, the definitions advanced by the affirmative are assumed to be accepted.
2. The construction of the affirmative case should be done early enough in the debate for the negative to attack it. Totally new arguments for or against the proposition should not be introduced so late in the debate (such as in the rebuttal period), that the other team has no chance to deal with the arguments.
3. Arguments must be supported by reasoning and evidence. If arguments are not supported, the opposition should call attention to the fact and insist that the arguments be supported. However, if an argument is advanced and is not dealt with in any way by the opposition, it is presumed to be won by the team advancing the argument.
4. If you as a judge know that evidence is being distorted or that the debaters are being dishonest, you should penalize them accordingly. You must be very careful in handling this situation and be very sure of your information. (It is better if the opposition can point out minuses of evidence).
5. Minor infractions of the rules such as going a few seconds overtime, whispering too loudly during the debate, etc., should not unduly influence your decision. If, however, such minor infractions interfere with the major aspects of the debate, you should consider this in rendering your decision.
6. Delivery alone should not determine the winner, as the emphasis should be on the presentation of arguments. However, if the debater does not communicate clearly and effectively in a manner easily understood, you should take this into consideration. For example, some debaters employ such rapid-fire delivery as to make the presentation difficult, if not impossible, to understand.
7. Do not require either team to meet arguments or issues in your mind that are not advanced successfully by the opposition.
8. A negative system may argue for simple modifications or repairs of the present system.

E. Special considerations for cross examination:

1. During the questioning period, the questioner should:
 - a. Ask questions that are arranged in some order.
 - b. Ask questions that are relevant to the proposition, and to the speech of the debater who is being questioned.
 - c. Ask questions that can be answered; avoid trickery.
 - d. Show the significance of the opponent's answers, making clear the implications.
2. The answerer should:
 - a. Avoid filibuster; make the answers as concise as possible, but refuse to answer questions with a simple "yes" or "no" if doing so would do injustice to his case.
 - b. Admit lack of knowledge rather than attempt to cover up such lack.
 - c. Emphasize strong points in his own case at every opportunity.

F. Miscellaneous considerations:

1. Normally, the team winning the debate will have the higher total points. If this is not the case in a particular round, you should specifically indicate that you are giving a "low-point win."
2. Avoid making comments to the debaters or to the coaches which may give some indication of your decision before the results are announced.
3. The minimum score for any individual debater shall be 15 points.
4. *All requests for evidence or other materials count against either the questioning time or the preparation time (or both) of the requesting team.*



JUDGE _____

ROOM _____

Virginia High School League Policy Debate Ballot

TOURNAMENT _____ DATE _____

1. Rate all speakers using the following scale:

SUPERIOR 30 29 28 27	EXCELLENT 26 25 24 23	AVERAGE 22 21 20 19	FAIR 18 17 16 15
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------

2. Fill in decision, points and ranks and return at least white copy to Tournament Control immediately.
3. If pink and yellow copies are retained, complete and return with constructive comments as soon as possible.
4. Oral critiques are not permitted.
5. Do not reveal decision under any circumstances.

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
School _____ Team # _____	School _____ Team # _____
Position Name Points Rank	Position Name Points Rank
1st AFF. _____	1st NEG. _____
2nd AFF. _____	2nd NEG. _____

THE TEAM WINNING THIS ROUND WAS TEAM # _____ REPRESENTING THE [AFFIRMATIVE] / [NEGATIVE] SIDE.

Judge's Signature _____ School Affiliation _____

Individual Comments

Affirmative	Negative

REASONS FOR DECISION:

- FORMAT**
- First Affirmative8 minutes
 - Second Negative.....3 minutes (questions first affirmative)
 - First Negative8 minutes
 - First Affirmative3 minutes (questions first negative)
 - Second Affirmative.....8 minutes
 - First Negative3 minutes (questions second affirmative)
 - Second Negative.....8 minutes
 - Second Affirmative.....3 minutes (questions second negative)
 - First Negative5 minutes (rebuttal)
 - First Affirmative5 minutes (rebuttal)
 - Second Negative.....5 minutes (rebuttal)
 - Second Affirmative.....5 minutes (rebuttal)

State Championship Policy Debate Format

What follows is a detail of how the state championship in Policy debate will be run and a model for Regions and Super Regions.

Pairings shall be determined by the tournament director to provide the most equitable schedule possible depending on the number of participants in each group. Final decision on tournament format and pairings shall be at the discretion of the tournament director. The standard format for events with 8 or fewer teams is round robin in which all teams shall meet once.

In the event there are more than eight teams, the director shall schedule four preliminary rounds using the power pairing format below.

Power Pairing Format

1. Rounds 1 and 2 paired at random with regional constraints. (Debaters from the same region will not meet in the first two rounds if at all possible.)
2. Round 3 paired on win-loss records and speaker points (High-High). (Debaters from the same region can meet in round 3 and all subsequent rounds.)
3. Rounds 4 paired on win-loss records and speaker points (High-Low).
4. Top four debaters break to semifinal rounds.
5. Break to final round.

Explanation of Power Pairings

In the first two rounds of Policy debate, debaters will be randomly paired against other debaters from outside of their own region. Teams from the same region should not meet if at all possible. The remaining rounds will be power matched.

Round 3 is power matched using a high-high system. This means that the debaters are ordered according to win-loss record and then points (total points breaking ties between debaters that have the same number of wins) and then paired from the top with the number 1 debater meeting number 2 and number 3 debating number 4 unless the contestants have debated before or if they are from the same school. In that instance, the debater would meet the next eligible debater down the list (since Round 3 is not side constrained, the side is randomly determined for each debate).

Round 4 is power matched using a high-low system (and side constraints in even numbered rounds). The high-low system creates a bracket of debaters based on win-loss record (e.g. all of the teams with three wins would be in the same bracket). That bracket is ordered by total speaker points, and then by speaker ranks. The bracket is paired by having the top team in that bracket meet the bottom team (based on speaker points, then by speaker ranks) in that bracket. For example, if there were six debaters that had three wins, the top three-win debater (based on total speaker points) would meet the bottom three-win debater (based on total speaker points), the second would meet the fifth and the third would meet the fourth. Again, there are constraints in that two debaters that have met previously in this tournament will not meet again and debaters from the same school will not meet prior to elimination rounds. If a bracket is uneven (e.g. there are only five three-win debaters), the bracket is made even by pulling debaters from the next lower bracket (e.g. from the two-win bracket into the three-win bracket).

NOTE: High-low never means taking the top debater based on win-loss record and pairing her/him against the bottom debater based on record (e.g. an undefeated debater against a winless debater).

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

116-5-1 Lincoln-Douglas Contest Rules and Regulations- Each school entering Lincoln-Douglas debating on the regional level will be afforded the option of entering a maximum of three Lincoln-Douglas debaters, each of whom is prepared to debate both sides of the resolution.

116-5-2 Each region entering the regional meet shall qualify a maximum of four debaters to the regional meet. Each region entering the state meet shall qualify a maximum of four debaters to the state tournament. If one of the first four debaters is unable to advance to the regional or state tournament, the fifth place debater in the appropriate regional or super-regional tournament may replace the debater unable to attend. No replacements beyond fifth place shall be permitted, and each region shall be responsible for resolving ties or disputes in accordance with policies in the VHSL Debate Manual so that it advances no more than four Lincoln-Douglas debaters to state.

116-5-3 Pairings shall be determined by the tournament director to provide the most equitable schedule possible depending on the number of participants in each group. A director may choose either a round-robin format, with each team assigned a debate against each of the other teams, or five or six preliminary rounds utilizing power pairings as published in the Debate Manual, followed by a single elimination tournament pairing the top four or eight qualifiers.

116-5-4 The following format is used in Lincoln-Douglas debates: (a) Affirmative speaker presents constructive speech: six minutes. (b) Negative speaker questions the affirmative speaker: three minutes. (c) Negative speaker presents constructive speech: seven minutes. (d) Affirmative speaker questions the negative speaker: three minutes. (e) Affirmative speaker presents first rebuttal speech: four minutes. (f) Negative speaker presents rebuttal speech: six minutes. (g) Affirmative speaker presents second rebuttal speech: three minutes. (h) Each speaker shall have a total of three minutes preparation time to use during the debate.

116-5-5 The critic judge (or set of three judges at the discretion of the meet director) decides the better speaker in each debate. If three judges are used, each judge makes his/ her decision independent of the other two. Each judge's ballot is counted as a win or loss in determining the winner of the meet. In case of ties in number of wins, decision in head-to-head competition (first if it is a clean decision) and total speaker points (second) are employed to determine a winner.

116-5-6 A judge may serve throughout a meet, but it is preferable that he/she not judge the same contestant twice.

116-5-7 Judging Requirements-Each school participating in Lincoln-Douglas debate at the state meet must provide at least one qualified judge to evaluate Lincoln-Douglas competition in a group other than the one represented by the school, unless judge is provided by host. The coach may serve as the school's required judge. Penalty for violation is a fine as stated in 30-5-1.

116-5-8 Bases For Judges' Decision-Criteria used by judges in determining winners include all aspects of general effectiveness in debate. Most important of these criteria are clear and persuasive speaking, analysis of issues, persuasiveness of over-all argumentation, clarity and organization of arguments, adequacy and accuracy of evidence and consistent defense of a core value. If a judge determines that a contestant speeds, spreads, uses technical jargon, or otherwise employs Policy tactics in a manner that makes his/her argument unable to be understood by an intelligent high school student or well-informed citizen, that judge must vote against the offending contestant.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Information for Tournament Directors and Debate Judges

Lincoln-Douglas debate or L-D has its origins in the political debates of Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas in 1858 from which it takes its name. L-D is one-on-one debating as opposed to team debating. In addition, L-D debaters consider propositions of value rather than propositions of policy.

These characteristics of L-D are designed to encourage thoughtful consideration of society's values and to discourage debates which become bogged down in questions of the workability of a particular policy or its consequences (disadvantages).

In the tradition of Lincoln-Douglas, whose debates lasted three hours each, debaters are encouraged to involve their audience in the contest through the skillful use of all the tools of oral persuasion. The rate and organization of delivery should be such that a reasonable listener could follow the issues and clash of opinion without taking extensive notes (flowsheets). **Judges should consider excessive speed or unclear communication as factors in their decision.**

Debates should be rewarded for excellence in:

- Delivery. The rate and intonation of each speech should be that of an effective persuasive oration. Debaters should involve the audience in the debate through effective gestures.
- Organization. Each speech should be presented in an orderly manner, making use of effective transitions to keep the audience involved in the flow of the debate.
- Clash. The debaters should clearly clash with each other on all major points, offering a rationale for their positions and an explanation of how they differ from their opponents.
- Value Consistency. The debaters should demonstrate a knowledge of the values inherent in the proposition. Furthermore, they should each uphold a value consistent with their position in the debate.

Accordingly, judges do not need any extensive training. They need only to be certain their decisions are based upon the issues presented in the round and the effectiveness of each speaker rather than upon their personal views of the topic being debated.

The topic for L-D debate is selected by the National Forensics League and should be announced no more than one month prior to the regional deadline. This short preparation time for debaters is designed to limit the amount of evidence presented to a reasonable level and to prevent the use of prepared evidence books common in Policy debate today.

Judges Decision: Criteria used by judges in determining winners include all aspects of general effectiveness in debate. Most important of these criteria are clear and persuasive speaking, analysis of issues, persuasiveness of over-all argumentation, clarity and organization of arguments, adequacy and accuracy of evidence, and consistent defense of a core value. **The L-D winner in a given round must be the debater with the most points.** Oral critiques are not permitted.

Affirmative Constructive - 6 minutes; Cross examination by negative - 3 minutes; Negative Constructive - 7 minutes; Cross examination by affirmative - 3 minutes; Affirmative Rebuttal - 4 minutes; Negative Rebuttal - 6 minutes; Affirmative Rebuttal - 3 minutes.



Virginia High School League Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

ROUND _____ ROOM _____ DATE _____ JUDGE _____

Affirmative (code) name _____ Negative (code) name _____

INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES

In making your decision, you might ask yourself the following questions:

1. Which of the debaters persuaded you that their position was more valid?
2. Did the debaters support their position appropriately, using logical argumentation throughout, and evidence where necessary?
3. Which debater communicated more effectively?

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD	AVERAGE
Affirmative	50-49-48-47	46-45-44-43	42-41-40-39	38-37-36-35
Negative	50-49-48-47	46-45-44-43	42-41-40-39	38-37-36-35

In my opinion the better debating was done by _____
(affirmative or negative) code

Judge's Signature _____ School _____

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Case & Analysis	Case & Analysis
Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning	Support of Issues through Evidence and Reasoning
Delivery	Delivery

Reason for Decision (Oral Critiques are Not Permitted):

FORMAT

- Affirmative 6-minute constructive
- Negative 3-minute cross examination
- Negative 7-minute constructive
- Affirmative 3-minute cross examination
- Affirmative 4-minute rebuttal
- Negative 6-minute rebuttal
- Affirmative 3-minute rebuttal

State Championship Lincoln-Douglas Debate Format

What follows is a detail of how the state championship in Lincoln-Douglas debate will be run and a model for Regions and Super Regions.

Pairings shall be determined by the tournament director to provide the most equitable schedule possible depending on the number of participants in each group. Final decision on tournament format and pairings shall be at the discretion of the tournament director. The standard format for events with 8 or fewer teams is round robin in which all teams shall meet once.

In the event there are more than eight teams, the director shall schedule four preliminary rounds using the power pairing format below.

Power Pairing Format

1. Rounds 1 and 2 paired at random with regional constraints. (Debaters from the same region will not meet in the first two rounds if at all possible.)
2. Round 3 paired on win-loss records and speaker points (High-High). (Debaters from the same region can meet in round 3 and all subsequent rounds.)
3. Round 4 paired on win-loss records and speaker points (High-Low).
4. Top four debaters break to semifinal rounds.
5. Break to final round.

Explanation of Power Pairings

In the first two rounds of Lincoln-Douglas debate, debaters will be randomly paired against other debaters from outside of their own region. Teams from the same region should not meet if at all possible. The remaining rounds will be power matched.

Round 3 is power matched using a high-high system. This means that the debaters are ordered according to win-loss record and then points (total points breaking ties between debaters that have the same number of wins) and then paired from the top with the number 1 debater meeting number 2 and number 3 debating number 4 unless the contestants have debated before or if they are from the same school. In that instance, the debater would meet the next eligible debater down the list (since Round 3 is not side constrained, the side is randomly determined for each debate).

Round 4 is power matched using a high-low system (and side constraints in even numbered rounds). The high-low system creates a bracket of debaters based on win-loss record (e.g. all of the teams with three wins would be in the same bracket). That bracket is ordered by total speaker points. The bracket is paired by having the top debater in that bracket meet the bottom debater (based on speaker points) in that bracket. For example, if there were six debaters that had three wins, the top three-win debater (based on total speaker points) would meet the bottom three-win debater (based on total speaker points), the second would meet the fifth and the third would meet the fourth. Again, there are constraints in that two debaters that have met previously in this tournament will not meet again and debaters from the same school will not meet prior to elimination rounds. If a bracket is uneven (e.g. there are only five three-win debaters), the bracket is made even by pulling a debater from the next lower bracket (e.g. from the two-win bracket into the three-win bracket).

NOTE: High-low never means taking the top debater based on win-loss record and pairing her/him against the bottom debater based on record (e.g. an undefeated debater against a winless debater).

Student Congress

Information for Tournament Directors, Coaches and Students

Student Congress was added as a new debate event in 2003 in order to establish a real-world debate experience modeled after a state or national legislature, although the program is not an exact replica of the United States Congress or the Virginia House of Delegates or Virginia Senate. Student Congress was promoted as a somewhat less demanding debate format that would be an attractive introductory event for students, coaches and judges and easier to administer than other debate events. The hope is that Student Congress will build participation in debate, with the belief that once involved many students would go on to other debate events.

Preparing for Competition

1. **Six weeks out:** Interest meeting with general discussion of Student Congress topics to be provided by VHSL at least 30 days before each tournament. Different topics will be used for regional and state tournaments.
2. **Five weeks out:** Bring articles to this meeting, share them, then create resolutions.
3. **Four weeks out:** Bring resolutions and articles for discussion, write authorship speeches. Each participating student must write either a bill or resolution to be discussed. This legislation should be labeled "A." Participants may write one additional bill or resolution, labeled "B," which may be considered only after first bills/resolutions "A" from all participants in the chamber have been brought forward. Each representative/senator must electronically submit his or her bill(s) or resolution(s) at least one week in advance of the regional and state tournament(s) via the Student Congress website.
4. **Three weeks out:** Bring everything, write a likely second or third speech; create "talking points" for other topic areas.
5. **Two weeks out:** Practice delivering all speeches, followed by two minutes of question and answer.
6. **One week out:** Practice with professional attire, authorship speeches followed by questioning, negative speeches, affirmative speeches, votes and parliamentary procedure. Post legislation on website by deadline.
7. For regionals, make 30 copies of all resolutions; copy talking points for team members.

STUDENT CONGRESS RULES AND REGULATIONS

116-6-1 Student Congress Rules and Regulations-Each school entering Student Congress may send up to six representatives to the regional tournament and each region may send up to twelve senators to the state tournament. A list of topic areas will be presented at least 30 days before each tournament; students should be able to speak on all topic areas. Each participating student must write either a bill or a resolution to be discussed. This legislation should be labeled "A." Participants may write one additional bill or resolution, labeled "B," which may be considered only after first bills/resolutions "A" from all participants in the chamber have been brought forward.

Bills/resolutions must be electronically submitted at least one week in advance of the regional and state tournament(s) via the Student Congress website.

The Clerk of Congress will choose two domestic topics, two international topics, two economic topics and two statewide topics that provide a breadth and depth of topic areas without presenting an overwhelming research burden. To provide debate on a wide variety of subjects, schools are encouraged to have no more than one bill or resolution per topic area. A tournament official may scan all legislation prior to the posting deadline to eliminate duplicate legislation, nontopical legislation or inappropriate material. The tournament official will notify students and coaches of any problems or concerns, but will not edit or revise student-produced legislation. **Once the legislation has been approved, it is up to the students to determine the order of the docket. Legislation must alternate (domestic, international, economic and statewide) among the topic areas.**

Clerk's Interpretation: The docket of legislation must follow the DIEV format for the entirety of docket A legislation. After a chamber has set the docket of legislation and has started debate procedures, the chamber must follow the DIEV format for one complete DIEV cycle. After this cycle is completed, the chamber may modify the legislative order using standard procedures for altering the docket. The Super Session must also follow the DIEV format for a minimum of one cycle.

116-6-2 Each school may enter a maximum of six students to the region; each region may qualify a maximum of 12 representatives to the state final. Up to three call-ups from the regional to the state tournament are permitted. At the regional level, student competitors shall be called "representatives," and at the state tournament they shall be called "senators." There will be no difference in the rules of procedure. Regional and state tournaments in Student Congress may be held in conjunction with the regional and state tournaments in debate.

116-6-3 The number of representatives or senators participating determines whether the meet is divided into multiple chambers. In general, 24 representatives or senators per chamber is ideal, with chambers ranging in size from 15 to 30 members. If there is to be more than one chamber, schools and regions should be split equally between or among chambers. At the regional tournament, each chamber should meet between two and four sessions, as determined by the Clerk of Congress. At state, each chamber will meet in four sessions, with a fifth Super Session set for any group split between two chambers. The Super Session will include all students placing in the top half of the two split chambers. **Each school qualifying for the state tournament in a group with split chambers will provide one bill or resolution to be considered for the Super Session docket**, and that bill or resolution must be submitted electronically on the Student Congress website at least one week in advance of the state tournament. At the regional tournament, the time of each legislative session will be determined by the Clerk of Congress. At state, each session will last 90 minutes.

116-6-4 A parliamentarian will be chosen by the Clerk of Congress to preside over all sessions and will fill out an evaluation of each student. In preliminary sessions, two judges will evaluate each speaker using ballots provided by the League. In Super Sessions, three judges will be used. The judges will change for each legislative session, with no judge being used more than twice. Students will elect presiding officers for each session.

Note: Parliamentarian may not serve as both parliamentarian and judge of the same chamber.

116-6-8 Judging Requirements and Bases for Judges' Decision-Each school participating in Student Congress debate at the state meet must provide at least one qualified judge to evaluate Student Congress competition in a group other than the one represented by the school. The coach may serve as the school's required judge. Penalty for violation is a fine as stated in 30-5-1. Criteria used by judges will include all aspects of general effectiveness in debate. Most important will be clear and persuasive speaking, documentation of sources, clarity, organization and responding to previous arguments.

116-6-6 Speeches-All speeches shall have been written by the competing students during the school year in which the contest is conducted and not contain an excess of directly quoted material, nor shall the speech be a mere paraphrase taken completely from one source. The student shall acknowledge the sources of any quotations used. Penalty for a plagiarized speech is disqualification.

116-6-7 Speaker's Precedence-The presiding officer and parliamentarian will number student speeches, with the presiding officer's opening comments considered the first speech of the session. Speaker order will be determined by precedence, meaning the presiding officer will select first the representatives/senators (R/S) who have given no speeches, then R/S's who have given one speech and so on. In the event that two or more R/S's who have the same number of speeches wish to speak, the presiding officer will recognize the one who spoke least recently. Numbering speeches will facilitate determining who has precedence to speak.

116-6-9 Determining Winners-Each representative or senator may speak up to six times. His or her best two speeches will be added to the parliamentarian's score. The highest score will place first, the next highest second and so on. In the case of a tie, drop the parliamentarian's score. If scores are still tied, refer to the third best speech and continue until ties are broken. If there is a Super Session, the representative or senator's best Super Session speech scores, one from each of the three judges, are added to the parliamentarian's score. This score is then added to the preliminary score. Thus, the Super Session final score will be the sum of five scores: (1) the three Super Session judges' scores, (2) the Super Session parliamentarian's score, and (3) the preliminary score. In the case of a tie, drop the Super Session parliamentarian score. If scores are still tied, drop the preliminary parliamentarian score.

116-8-2 A student may participate in Policy, Lincoln-Douglas, Student Congress and/or Public Forum debate but may participate in only one form of debate at the regional, super-regional and state tournaments.

116-9-1 Tournament Limitations-No individual or team may participate in more than 16 tournaments during the school year, excluding VHSL regional, super-regional and state tournaments. A student who registers at and participates in a debate tournament under a name other than his/her own or under a name other than his/her bona fide school name shall be disqualified from participating in the regional, super-regional and state debate tournaments.

UNDERSTANDING LEGISLATION

A bill is an enumeration of specific provisions which, if enacted, will have the force of law. A resolution is simply a generalized statement expressing a conviction or sentiment. A resolution will generally center debate on the broad principles of the concept; a bill is more apt to delve into the merits of the specific provisions it contains. Although they are

not necessary, a resolution may have whereas clauses, but a bill never has them. The use of both bills and resolutions will add variety to congressional proceedings.

Resolutions

Simple resolutions are usually generalized statements expressing the belief of the group adopting them, and they do not have the force of law. Resolutions may be preceded by one or more whereas clauses, stating the principal reasons for adopting the resolution, but their number should be limited and may be omitted altogether.

Bills

A bill is an enumeration of specific provisions which if enacted will have the force of law. It must be definite; it must state exactly what is to be done or not to be done. A penalty must be stipulated or the law will not have force. A bill does not have whereas clauses.

OFFERING AMENDMENTS

Amendments may be brought from the floor. Amendments must be in writing using the VHSL Amendment Form and state exactly the words to be added or stricken and may be considered only upon a second (by show of hands) of 1/3 of the members PRESENT. Negative 1/3 seconds are never to be taken.

1. Amendment is written using VHSL Amendment Form.
2. Amendment is submitted to parliamentarian.
3. Presiding Officer reads amendment and determines if it is germane.
4. Parliamentarian reads amendment aloud.
5. Presiding Officer asks for a 1/3 second of the members present. If the amendment does not receive the 1/3 second, debate continues with the next appropriate speech. If the amendment receives the 1/3 second...
6. Presiding Officer asks for an authorship speech on the amendment. Preference for the amendment's authorship speech shall be based upon the number of speeches given (regular speaking precedence). The person who wrote the amendment does not automatically have the right of authorship; it becomes the property of the chamber.
7. Once the first proponency speech is given, no automatic questioning period follows. A con speech on the amendment will be in order.
8. Debate will then alternate pro and con on the amendment until the amendment is disposed of in the proper manner.

Note: Any speech on the main motion is out of order if it does not pertain to the amendment while the amendment is on the floor.

STUDENT CONGRESS CHAMBER SEATING ASSIGNMENT PROCEDURE

Prior to the competition, the Clerk will conduct a random draw to determine the chamber assignment of each competitor. The random draw will occur taking into account the number of competitors from a single school, with a name corresponding to each random entry. The Clerk will remain blind to the names of each competitor, but not to the name of the school represented by the random entry. As a result, the Clerk can assign an "entry" to a particular chamber without having knowledge of the particular student represented by the entry. All efforts will be made by the Clerk to balance the number of students from each school across multiple chambers.

At the start of the competition and once competitors report to their chambers for committee meetings, the parliamentarians will conduct a random draw to determine seating within the chamber. If this random draw results in an imbalance in the number of students from the same school seated together, then the Clerk can make necessary adjustments to balance the seating in the chamber.

OATH OF OFFICE

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter.

STUDENT CONGRESS FORMAT

- (a) Parliamentarian will call the chamber to order and determine or identify committee chairs. Each representative/senator will turn in a copy of his/her legislation to the appropriate committee chair. Committee chairs will determine the docket (the order in which legislation will be debated) by selecting one bill or resolution from each committee and proceeding until all bills or resolutions have been assigned. They will present this packet to the parliamentarian who will then post it on a chalkboard/whiteboard/easel. As the parliamentarian calls out the number or author of each piece of legislation, that student will provide one copy of his or her legislation to the parliamentarian, presiding officer, each judge and each delegate or senator in the chamber.

The parliamentarian will ask for volunteers to serve as presiding officers for the first session. Each person may give a one-minute speech (not scored) to the chamber explaining his/her qualifications and reasons for being presiding officer. The Chamber will then vote by secret ballot to select the first presiding officer. Students not elected may run again at the start of subsequent sessions. A student may not serve as a presiding officer more than once during the regional tournament and once during the state finals. The presiding officer will be evaluated by the parliamentarian **judges (July 2014)**. In preliminary sessions, the presiding officer's score will be doubled and counted as one speech given by the student. In a super session, the presiding officer's score will be tripled and counted as one speech.

- (b) The presiding officer will make a brief opening speech in which he/she sets his/her expectations. This will be the first speech of the session. This speech will be followed by a call for a main motion, then a call for a three-minute authorship speech followed by two minutes of questioning.
- (c) Call for a three-minute negative speech; time not used by the speaker may be used for questioning. The speaker has the right to refuse to answer questions.
- (d) Repeat b and c until an appropriate motion is made (motion to table or to call the previous question, etc.).
- (e) Exact precedence for speaking order and approximate precedence questioning order will be kept by the parliamentarian and the presiding officers. In the event of a conflict, the parliamentarian's tally is final.
- (f) Once action has been taken on a bill or resolution, the next legislative item on the docket may be considered.
- (g) At state, there shall be four sessions with a fifth Super Session set for any group split between two chambers. Each session will last 90 minutes.

ELECTION OF THE OUTSTANDING SENATOR

At the end of the chamber business, but before adjournment in the last session, an election will take place in each chamber to select the Outstanding Senator from among all members in the chamber.

1. The parliamentarian in each chamber will conduct the election. Senators may verbally nominate any other senator in that chamber, but not themselves.
2. The vote will be a secret ballot with each senator voting for one nominee. The parliamentarian will count the ballots to be witnessed by the judges of that session.
3. After each ballot, unless one candidate has received a majority of the votes cast, the person receiving the fewest votes shall be dropped. If the combined votes of the two lowest candidates do not equal the votes of the next lowest candidate, both shall be eliminated. If there is a tie for the lowest two or three candidates, it is recommended that a vote be taken on the tied candidates and eliminate only one candidate at a time. When one candidate received the majority vote of the chamber, the election is finished.
4. The winner will not be announced in the chamber. The parliamentarian from each chamber will communicate the name of the winner to the Clerk of Congress only, and these winners will be announced during the awards ceremony.



Virginia High School League Student Congress Speaker's Ballot



Round _____ Date _____ Group: _____ Chamber _____

Speaker's Name _____ Speaker's School _____

Length of Speech _____ Aff/Neg _____

Topic/Bill # _____ Judge's Name _____

Use one ballot for each speech. Rank each speech 12-20 (using no fractions or decimals and 20 being the highest) in each category. **Please write legibly** and comment under each area. Additional comments can be made on the reverse. Oral critiques are not permitted.

Delivery: _____ (12-20)
Is eye contact comprehensive and natural, or is the speaker reading?
Seriousness of purpose, style, poise, coherency, etc.

Originality of Thought: _____ (12-20)
Does the speech advance debate or rehash old thoughts?

Organization and Unity of Speech: _____ (12-20)
Is it organized? Does it develop? Does it ramble?

Evidence and Logical Basis for Statements _____ (12-20)
Breadth of knowledge on the subject
Cites valid sources

Overall Impact and Impression _____ (12-20)
Comments



Virginia High School League Student Congress Parliamentarian's Ballot



Round _____ Date _____ Group _____ Chamber _____

Speaker's Name _____ Speaker's School _____

Parliamentarian's Name _____

Use one ballot for each member. **Please write legibly** and score each member in each category. Please also comment under each area. Additional comments can be made on the reverse.

1A Questioning _____ (24-30)

Does the member participate in questioning, making incisive and thoughtful queries of the speaker?

AND/OR

1B Responsiveness

Does the member respond to questioning with enlightening remarks that promote understanding of the issue?

Courtesy _____ (9-17)

Does the member act in a manner that is respectful and courteous to other members of the house, the presiding officer and others who are present?

Participation _____ (9-17)

Does the member actively engage in the business of the chamber in a way that advances his/her interests?

Procedure _____ (9-17)

Does the member exhibit an understanding of the rules and procedures of the chamber, and is he/she aware of the proceedings?

Impression _____ (9-17)

Does the member create a favorable overall impression?



Virginia High School League Student Congress Presiding Officer's Ballot



Round _____ Date _____ Group _____ Chamber _____

Officer's Name _____ Officer's School _____

Judge's Name _____

Rank each presiding officer of your house 12-20 (using no fractions or decimals and 20 being the highest) in each category. **Please write legibly** and comment under each area. Additional comments can be made on the reverse.

Impression _____ (12-20)
Does the member create a positive first impression and a favorable overall impression?

Opening Remarks _____ (12-20)
Did the presiding officer's introduction provide enough information? Did the opening remarks present clear expectations? Did the presiding officer follow through on what he/she said he/she would do?

Knowledge of Parliamentary Procedure _____ (12-20)
Does the presiding officer have an understanding of parliamentary procedure? Does the presiding officer explain motions and his/her actions?

Control _____ (12-20)
Is the presiding officer fair but firm? Is he/she willing to use the gavel as needed? Does he/she rule motions dilatory or do what it takes to advance the business of the house? Did the presiding officer control the session, or did it control him/her?

Precedence _____ (12-20)
Does the presiding officer consistently and accurately keep track of affirmative and negative speeches, motions and questions, making corrections as needed?

Public Forum Debate

116-7-1 Public Forum Debate Contest Rules and Regulations—Each school entering Public Forum debate on the regional level may enter a maximum of two, two-speaker debate teams, each of which is prepared to debate both sides of the resolution.

116-7-2 Each region entering the super-regional meet may certify first, second and third place teams in each event to the regional meet. Each region entering the state meet may certify first, second and third place teams in each event to the state meet. If one of the first three Public Forum teams is unable to advance to the regional or state tournament, the fourth place Public Forum team in the appropriate region or super-regional tournament may replace the Public Forum team unable to attend. No replacements beyond fourth place shall be permitted. Each region shall be responsible for resolving ties or disputes in accordance with policies in the VHSL Debate Manual so that it advances no more than three teams to state.

116-7-3 Pairings shall be determined by the tournament director to provide the most equitable schedule possible depending on the number of participants in each group. A director may choose either a round-robin format, with each team assigned a debate against each of the other teams, or five or six preliminary rounds utilizing power pairings as published in the debate manual, followed by a single elimination tournament pairing the top four or eight qualifiers. In Public Forum debate, pro or con positions are decided by coin toss every round. The team winning the toss may choose to either go first or select a position. The opponent then has the opportunity to choose the remaining option. For example, Team A wins the coin toss and decides to go second. Team B would then have a choice of going pro or con.

116-7-4 The following format is used for Public Forum debate: (a) Speaker 1 (Team A, 1st speaker presents Constructive): four minutes. (b) Speaker 2 (Team B, 1st speaker presents Constructive): four minutes. (c) Crossfire (between speakers 1 & 2): Speaker 1 asks the first question; thereafter, either speaker may ask questions: three minutes. (d) Speaker 3 (Team A, 2nd speaker): four minutes. (e) Speaker 4 (Team B, 2nd speaker): four minutes. (f) Crossfire (between speakers 3 & 4): Speaker 3 asks the first question; thereafter, either speaker may ask questions: three minutes. (g) Speaker 1 (Team A) Summary: two minutes. (h) Speaker 2 (Team B) Summary: two minutes. (i) Grand Crossfire (all speakers): one member from Team A asks the first question; thereafter, any speaker may ask questions: three minutes. (j) Speaker 3 Final Focus: two minutes. (k) Speaker 4 Final Focus: two minutes. Each team may use up to two minutes of prep time.

116-7-5 The critic judge (or set of three judges at the discretion of the meet director) decides the better team in each debate. Note: If three judges are used, each judge makes his/her decision independent of the other two. Each judge's ballot is counted as a win or a loss in determining the winner of the meet.

116-7-6 Total wins of each team are computed to determine the teams winning the tournament or advancing to elimination rounds. In case of ties in number of wins, the decision in head-to-head competition (first if it is a clean decision), total speaker points (second) and total speaker ranking (third) are employed to determine a winner.

116-7-7 A judge may serve throughout a meet, but it is preferable that he/she not judge the same team twice.

116-7-8 Judging Requirements—Each school participating in Public Forum debate at the state meet must provide at least one qualified judge to evaluate Public Forum competition in a group other than the one represented by the school, unless judge is provided by host. Qualifications for judging Public Forum debate are guided by the notion that the activity be geared for a “person on the street” and that decisions be based upon that person's impression, not be prescribed burdens like those in Policy debate. The coach may serve as the school's required judge. Penalty for violation is a fine as stated in 30-5-1.

116-7-9 Bases for Judges' Decisions—Criteria used by judges in determining winners include all aspects of general effectiveness in debate. Most important of these criteria are clash of ideas in a persuasive manner; support of assertions through logical thinking and evidence when needed; adequate and accurate use of evidence; strong and solid argumentation; clarity of speech, organization and refutation; fairness; courtesy; professionalism, and persuasiveness of overall argumentation by both teams. Judges look for a professional and serious debate, as well as direct and forthright speaking. If a judge determines that a contestant speeds, spreads, uses technical jargon, or otherwise employs Policy tactics in a manner that makes his/her argument unable to be understood by an intelligent high school student or well-informed citizen, that judge must vote against the offending team.

116-7-10 Competing teams should strive to clash on the issues in a persuasive manner. In Public Forum debate contests, teams should strive to advocate or reject a position posed by the resolution. Penetrating analysis, clear exposition of terms and arguments and a definite evaluation and summary should be sought throughout. In general, it is better to develop two or three crucial issues rather than to mention many without developing any. Good Public Forum debaters should display logic and analysis. They should use evidence when needed with the understanding that evidence is not limited to traditional cards often associated with Policy Debate, but rather, any information that helps a judge understand a position and may include analogies, examples, anecdotes or stories. They should win their case and refute that of their opponents. They should communicate effectively, using the fundamentals of good speaking. There are no burdens on either side.

116-7-11 The role of the questioner or cross-examiner is very important. He/she should frame in advance a great many questions, but should use in any given debate only those which are relevant and those which manifestly tend to reveal the weakness of the opponents' case or to emphasize and amplify the strong points of his/her own case. The questioner should show an awareness of the pro position and should adapt his/her questions to the pro arguments. The pro should in turn shift its point of view to take account of and satisfy the con objections. The purpose of cross-examination is to bring to light weaknesses or inconsistencies in the opponents' case, preparatory to refutation in rebuttal. Such weaknesses or inconsistencies as are uncovered should be exploited. Questioners should avoid the use of trick queries and of farfetched and elaborate traps, and should not become legalistic, nor resort to hair-splitting.

116-7-12 In Public Forum, emphasis should be placed on teamwork and on the function of each speaker as a part of the team. Every effort should be made by the coach to stimulate flexibility and independence of thought. Judges look for a professional and serious debate, as well as direct and forthright speaking, informality and ease and good humor in delivery. Speakers should be prepared to establish all authorities quoted and to relate quotations to the point at issue. It is recommended that quotes are effective, but few in number.

Public Forum

Information for Tournament Directors, Coaches and Students

Public Forum was added as a new debate event beginning the 2010-11 school year in order to offer a more accessible debate format that is appealing to students and lay judges who have not found traditional debate formats useful to them. This appeal comes in the form of participants and audience members being able to understand the format without having specialized experience in debate or the fields being discussed. The hope is that Public Forum will build participation in debate, with the belief that once involved many students would participate in other debate events.

PUBLIC FORUM RULES AND REGULATIONS

116-7-1 Public Forum Debate Contest Rules and Regulations—Each school entering Public Forum debate on the regional level may enter a maximum of two, two-speaker debate teams, each of which is prepared to debate both sides of the resolution.

116-7-2 Each region entering the super-regional meet may certify first, second and third place teams in each event to the regional meet. Each region entering the state meet may certify first, second and third place teams in each event to the state meet. If one of the first three Public Forum teams is unable to advance to the regional or state tournament, the fourth place Public Forum team in the appropriate region or super-regional tournament may replace the Public Forum team unable to attend. No replacements beyond fourth place shall be permitted.

Each region shall be responsible for resolving ties or disputes in accordance with policies in the VHSL Debate Manual so that it advances no more than three teams to state.

116-7-3 Pairings shall be determined by the tournament director to provide the most equitable schedule possible depending on the number of participants in each group. A director may choose either a round-robin format, with each team assigned a debate against each of the other teams, or five or six preliminary rounds utilizing power pairings as published in the debate manual, followed by a single elimination tournament pairing the top four or eight qualifiers. In Public Forum debate, pro or con positions are decided by coin toss every round. The team winning the toss may choose to either go first or select a position. The opponent then has the opportunity to choose the remaining option. For example, Team A wins the coin toss and decides to go second. Team B would then have a choice of going pro or con.

116-7-4 The following format is used for Public Forum debate:

- (a) Speaker 1 (Team A, 1st speaker presents Constructive): four minutes.
- (b) Speaker 2 (Team B, 1st speaker presents Constructive): four minutes.
- (c) Crossfire (between speakers 1 & 2): Speaker 1 asks the first question; thereafter, either speaker may ask questions: three minutes.
- (d) Speaker 3 (Team A, 2nd speaker): four minutes.
- (e) Speaker 4 (Team B, 2nd speaker): four minutes.
- (f) Crossfire (between speakers 3 & 4): Speaker 3 asks the first question; thereafter, either speaker may ask questions: three minutes.
- (g) Speaker 1 (Team A) Summary: two minutes.
- (h) Speaker 2 (Team B) Summary: two minutes.
- (i) Grand Crossfire (all speakers): one member from Team A asks the first question; thereafter, any speaker may ask questions: three minutes.
- (j) Speaker 3 Final Focus: two minutes.
- (k) Speaker 4 Final Focus: two minutes.

Each team may use up to two minutes of prep time.

116-7-5 The critic judge (or set of three judges at the discretion of the meet director) decides the better team in each debate. Note: If three judges are used, each judge makes his/her decision independent of the other two. Each judge's ballot is counted as a win or a loss in determining the winner of the meet.

116-7-6 Total wins of each team are computed to determine the teams winning the tournament or advancing to elimination rounds. In case of ties in number of wins, the decision in head-to-head competition (first if it is a clean decision), total speaker points (second) and total speaker ranking (third) are employed to determine a winner.

116-7-7 A judge may serve throughout a meet, but it is preferable that he/she not judge the same team twice.

116-7-8 Judging Requirements-Each school participating in Public Forum debate at the state meet must provide at least one qualified judge to evaluate Public Forum competition in a group other than the one represented by the school. Qualifications for judging Public Forum debate are guided by the notion that the activity be geared for a "person on the street" and that decisions be based upon that person's impression, not be prescribed burdens like those in Policy debate. The coach may serve as the school's required judge. Penalty for violation is a fine as stated in 30-5-1.

116-7-9 Bases for Judges' Decisions-Criteria used by judges in determining winners include all aspects of general effectiveness in debate. Most important of these criteria are clash of ideas in a persuasive manner; support of assertions through logical thinking and evidence when needed; adequate and accurate use of evidence; strong and solid argumentation; clarity of speech, organization and refutation; fairness; courtesy; professionalism, and persuasiveness of overall argumentation by both teams. Judges look for a professional and serious debate, as well as direct and forthright speaking.

116-7-10 Competing teams should strive to clash on the issues in a persuasive manner. In Public Forum debate contests, teams should strive to advocate or reject a position posed by the resolution. Penetrating analysis, clear exposition of terms and arguments and a definite evaluation and summary should be sought throughout. In general, it is better to develop two or three crucial issues rather than to mention many without developing any. Good Public Forum debaters should display logic and analysis. They should use evidence when needed with the understanding that evidence is not limited to traditional cards often associated with Policy Debate, but rather, any information that helps a judge understand a position and may include analogies, examples, anecdotes or stories. They should win their case and refute that of their opponents. They should communicate effectively, using the fundamentals of good speaking. There are no burdens on either side.

116-7-11 The role of the questioner or cross-examiner is very important. He/she should frame in advance a great many questions, but should use in any given debate only those which are relevant and those which manifestly tend to reveal the weakness of the opponents' case or to emphasize and amplify the strong points of his/her own case. The questioner should show an awareness of the pro position and should adapt his/her questions to the pro arguments. The pro should in turn shift its point of view to take account of and satisfy the con objections. The purpose of cross-examination is to bring to light weaknesses or inconsistencies in the opponents' case, preparatory to refutation in rebuttal. Such weaknesses or inconsistencies as are uncovered should be exploited. Questioners should avoid the use of trick queries and of farfetched and elaborate traps, and should not become legalistic, nor resort to hair-splitting.

116-7-12 In Public Forum, emphasis should be placed on teamwork and on the function of each speaker as a part of the team. Every effort should be made by the coach to stimulate flexibility and independence of thought. Judges look for a professional and serious debate, as well as direct and forthright speaking, informality and ease and good humor in delivery. Speakers should be prepared to establish all authorities quoted and to relate quotations to the point at issue. It is recommended that quotes are effective, but few in number.

Public Forum

Information for Judges

Public Forum is a team event that supports or rejects a position posed by the monthly resolution topic. The clash of ideas must be communicated in a persuasive manner. The debate should:

- Display solid logic, lucid reasoning and depth of analysis
- Utilize evidence without being driven by it
- Present a clash of ideas by countering/refuting arguments of the opposing team (rebuttal)
- Communicate ideas with clarity, organization, eloquence and professional decorum

What to Expect

Crossfire – two previous speakers stand and ask questions in a polite, but argumentative exchange. Both speakers may question each other, however, the first question of the crossfire period is asked to the speaker who just finished.

Summary – these speeches are rebuttals that extend earlier arguments or answer opposing refutations and may incorporate new evidence but not new arguments.

Grand Crossfire – all four speakers may remain seated as they ask and answer questions. The first question is asked by the team that had the first summary to the team which had the last summary. After that, any debater may question or answer.

Final Focus – this will be a restatement of why the judge should vote pro or con using the speaker's most compelling arguments. No new arguments are accepted at this time.

Evaluation

Judges should evaluate teams on the quality of arguments made, not on their own personal beliefs, and not on issues they think a particular side *should* have argued. Quality and well-explained arguments should win over mere quantity thereof. Debaters should use quoted evidence to support their claims, and well-chosen, relevant evidence may strengthen, but not replace arguments.

Clear communication is an important consideration. Judges will discount arguments that are too fast, too garbled or too full of technical terminology that is unable to be understood by an intelligent high school student or well-informed citizen. Speakers should appeal to the widest possible audience through sound reasoning, succinct organization, credible evidence and clear delivery.

The pro should prove that the resolution is true, and the con should prove that the resolution is not true.

Write constructive, thorough comments to each debater. Give reasons why you voted for one side and state what the losing team needed to do to win.



Virginia High School League Public Forum Debate Ballot

Round _____ Room _____ Date _____ Judge _____

Scores should fall within one of these four ranges: 28-30 for **superior** debating; 25-27 for **excellent** debating; 22-24 for **average** debating; and 19-21 for **below average** debating.

PRO TEAM	CON TEAM
Code # _____ Team Points: _____	Code # _____ Team Points: _____
1 st Debater _____	1 st Debater _____
2 nd Debater _____	2 nd Debater _____
TEAM POINTS: Superior – 28-30; Excellent – 25-27; Average – 22-24; Below Average – 19-21	
The team that won this debate is _____ representing the PRO / CON (circle one). No Low Point Wins! (Code)	
Judge Signature: _____ Judge's School: _____	

Order of debate:

Speaker 1 (4 min.)	Speaker 1 Summary (2 min.)
Speaker 2 (4 min.)	Speaker 2 Summary (2 min.)
Crossfire (3 min.)	Grand Crossfire (3 min.)
Speaker 3 (4 min.)	Speaker 3 Final Focus (2 min.)
Speaker 4 (4 min.)	Speaker 4 Final Focus (2 min.)
Crossfire (3 min.)	

Preparation time: 2 minutes per team

Please note: pro/con positions are decided by coin toss every round. The team winning the toss may choose to either go first or select a position. The opponent then has the opportunity to choose the remaining option. For example, Team A wins the coin toss and decides to go second. Team B would then have the a choice of going pro or con.

COMMENTS TO DEBATERS:

REASONS FOR MY DECISION:

(Oral critiques are not permitted)