

SIXTEEN-WEEK POLICY DEBATE CURRICULUM

Designed for classroom teachers who offer
introduction to policy debating as a regular
class.

By

Alfred C. Snider
University of Vermont

Alfred@Snider.name

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

GUIDELINES FOR THE SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

ADAPT IT

To your own teaching style and the needs and habits of your students. Do more of what works and change what doesn't work.

VARIETY

It is good to mix media - video, discussion, a short talk given by you, them speaking, a debate. It keeps everybody interested.

DISCUSSION AND FEEDBACK

This is where you really teach, mostly through explanation and repetition.

IN THEIR OWN WORDS

Make them explain things back to you in their own words. This is the best test for understanding.

EXAMPLES

Are the key to teaching debate. Give argument, debate, and real world examples of the application of ideas you are discussing.

ALWAYS SAY SOMETHING POSITIVE

Students will listen to and accept criticism if you also put in something positive. Always be positive about improvement.

DEBATES

Everyone debates in front of the class. Keep the debates short. Encourage them to prepare especially for their class debates. Try and use the focus of each class debate to teach.

BUILD ON PREVIOUS MATERIALS

Build on things done in previous weeks, build on things done that week, use the connectedness of debating to keep them involved.

EVIDENCE SAMPLES – USE THE TOPIC YOU ARE DEBATING

Provide evidence samples that will contain evidence that fits the activity outlined, evidence that says the opposite of what is called for, and evidence which is simply irrelevant. This shows if they can tell the difference.

MOVE TO REAL ARGUMENTS FROM REAL DEBATES SOON

This curriculum provides basic materials in the beginning, but as your students start debating at tournaments and they meet real opponents, change your focus as soon as you can to what your opponents say and do. Use class time to prepare to win at tournaments.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER ONE

UNIT TITLE: WELCOME TO DEBATE

GOALS:

- INTRODUCE STUDENTS TO THE BASIC COMPONENTS OF DEBATE: OPPOSITION, ARGUMENT, DEVELOPMENT, REBUTTAL
- HAVE STUDENTS WATCH A SAMPLE DEBATE ON THE TOPIC THEY WILL BE DEBATING.
- HAVE STUDENTS GIVE A SHORT, SPONTANEOUS SPEECH AGREEING WITH OR DISAGREEING WITH A STATEMENT.
- HAVE STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN A PUBLIC ASSEMBLY TO DISCUSS SOME ISSUE OF INTEREST TO THEM.

RESOURCES:

- VHS TAPE: PART 1 OF 15 30 MINUTES
- VHS TAPE OF A MINI-DEBATE 40 MINUTES
- CODE OF THE DEBATER: pp. 1-13

DAY 1 DISCUSS BASIC COMPONENTS OF THE DEBATE SITUATION

DAY 2 HAVE STUDENTS GIVE SHORT, SPONTANEOUS SPEECHES AGREEING OR DISAGREEING WITH A STATEMENT

DAY 3 VIDEOTAPE: PART 1 WALK THROUGH OF A DEBATE FOLLOWED BY DISCUSSION

DAY 4 VIDEOTAPE OF SAMPLE DEBATE ON THE TOPIC THEY WILL BE DEBATING

DAY 5 PUBLIC ASSEMBLY MEETING TO DISCUSS SOME ISSUES OF INTEREST.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ONE WELCOME TO DEBATE

DAY 1 DISCUSS BASIC COMPONENTS OF THE DEBATE SITUATION

ASK STUDENTS IF THEY HAVE EVER SEEN A DEBATE - LIVE, ON TELEVISION, ETC. IF THEY HAVE NO EXAMPLES YOU GIVE ONE - POLITICAL, TV TALK SHOW.

ASK STUDENTS WHAT MAKES A DEBATE DIFFERENT FROM NORMAL COMMUNICATION. ITEMS INCLUDE:

- ESTABLISHED TOPIC
- DIFFERENCE OF OPINION
- MAKING POINTS, ANSWERING POINTS
- THE PRESENCE OF AN AUDIENCE WHICH IS THE OBJECT OF PERSUASION
- THE NECESSITY TO DEVELOP THE POSITION PRESENTED
- THE NECESSITY TO RESPOND TO ARGUMENTS BY THE OTHER SIDE

IF DEBATE HAS ARGUMENTS IN IT, ASK STUDENTS WHAT AN ARGUMENT IS. THE POINT IS TO SHOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN ARGUMENT AND A CLAIM -- A CLAIM JUST SAYS SOMETHING IS SO, BUT AN ARGUMENT ATTEMPTS TO PROVE WHY SOMETHING IS SO.

ASK STUDENTS ABOUT EXAMPLES FROM EVERYDAY LIFE WHERE PEOPLE USE ARGUMENTS AGAINST EACH OTHER:

- IN BUSINESS
- IN SCHOOL DISCIPLINE MATTERS
- IN PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS (ALLOWANCE, HOURS, CAR, ETC.)

ASK STUDENTS ABOUT AN ISSUE THEY WOULD LIKE TO SEE DEBATED -- SOMETHING THAT MATTERS TO THEM. EXAMPLES FROM THE TOPIC, OR YOU MIGHT INCLUDE LOCKER SEARCHES AT SCHOOL, DRUG TESTING IN THE WORKPLACE, LIE DETECTOR TESTS FOR SUSPECTED CRIMINALS,

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, ETC.
EXAMPLES FROM EVERYDAY LIFE MIGHT INCLUDE FIRING A
SPORTS MANAGER OR TRADING A PLAYER, MAKING HIGH
SCHOOL VOLUNTARY, THE BEST MUSIC STAR OR BAND, ETC.

PICK A TOPIC AND TELL STUDENTS THEY WILL GIVE A SHORT
SPEECH THE NEXT DAY IN SUPPORT OF OR AGAINST A TOPIC
CHOSEN.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ONE WELCOME TO DEBATE

DAY 2 HAVE STUDENTS GIVE SHORT, SPONTANEOUS SPEECHES AGREEING OR DISAGREEING WITH A STATEMENT

HAVE THEM RISE AT THEIR SEATS OR COME TO THE FRONT OF THE ROOM, WHICHEVER YOU THINK IS BEST AND MOST COMFORTABLE. DO MAKE SURE TO MAKE THEM STAND.

TELL STUDENTS THEY WILL CAST BALLOTS AT THE END FOR WHO DID THE BEST JOB.

THE IDEA IS TO GET THEM SPEAKING. IT DOESN'T MATTER HOW LONG THEY TALK OR, REALLY, WHAT THEY SAY, AS LONG AS THEY SPEAK.

CALL ON STUDENTS TO SPEAK. DON'T BE AFRAID TO JOIN IN AND GIVE A SPEECH YOURSELF IF THEY FALTER, AND IF YOU DO GIVE ONE THAT YOU THINK WILL LEAN THE OPPOSITE WAY THAT MOST OF THE STUDENTS ARE LEANING. THIS MIGHT ENCOURAGE THEM TO SPEAK AND DISAGREE WITH YOU, WHICH IS FINE.

ALLOW SOME STUDENTS TO SPEAK TWICE IF THEY WANT TO.

ENCOURAGE STUDENTS TO RESPOND TO WHAT OTHERS HAVE SAID IN THEIR SPEECHES.

HAVE STUDENTS WRITE ON A PIECE OF PAPER WHO DID THE BEST JOB AND WHY AND TURN IT IN TO YOU. ANNOUNCE THE TOP THREE FINISHERS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ONE WELCOME TO DEBATE

DAY 3 VIDEOTAPE: PART 1 WALK THROUGH OF A DEBATE
FOLLOWED BY DISCUSSION

GIVE STUDENTS THE BASIC OUTLINE OF A DEBATE,
FOLLOWING PAGE.

HAVE STUDENTS WATCH THE 30-MINUTE VIDEO MAPPING OUT
A DEBATE. MAKE FUN OF THE BALDING BOZO ON THE TAPE.

DISCUSS THE TAPE AFTERWARDS:

- ANSWER QUESTIONS ABOUT THE TAPE
- ASK QUESTIONS: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AFFIRMATIVE AND
NEGATIVE, NATURE OF CROSS-EXAMINATION, ROLE OF THE
JUDGE/CRITIC/AUDIENCE, HOW SHOULD PARTNERS WORK
TOGETHER, ETC.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

OUTLINE OF A DEBATE

Many of the words identified in **bold** will be concepts you will need to learn more about as you get deeper into debating. There is a glossary of terms at the end of this book.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE SPEECH (1AC)

8 minutes

Establishes affirmatives advocacy of resolution.

There is a problem that could be solved - **SIGNIFICANCE, HARM, ADVANTAGE**

The status quo isn't going to solve this problem without change - **INHERENCY**

Here is our specific proposal of what ought to be done - **PLAN**

Our plan will solve the problem/harm - **SOLVENCY**

8 minutes

Defend aff positions, attack negative positions, and last chance to introduce new issues for aff.

Argue that the disadvantages are really reasons to vote affirmative. **TURNS.**

Argue that the counterplan and the affirmative plan can co-exist. **PERMUTATIONS.**

FIRST NEGATIVE SPEAKER CROSS EXAMINES 2AC

3 minutes

SECOND NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE SPEECH (2NC)

8 minutes

Attack aff positions, defend negative positions, last chance to introduce new issues for the neg.

2NC and 1NR should cover different issues. **DIVISION OF LABOR.**

SECOND NEGATIVE SPEAKER CROSS EXAMINES 1AC

3 minutes

• Ask question to help you understand their arguments.

GET INFORMATION

• Ask questions to set up your arguments to come. USE ANSWERS AGAINST THEM LATER

• Show the judge what a wonderful person you are. ACT LIKE A POLITE, FRIENDLY PERSON.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKER CROSS EXAMINES 2NC

3 minutes

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL (1NR)

4 minutes

Attack aff positions, defend neg positions. **DIVISION OF LABOR.**

FIRST NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE SPEECH (1NC)

8 minutes

Attacks affirmative and begins laying out additional issues negative

Make arguments against the specifics of the aff case. **CASE ARGUMENTS.**

Argue that if the plan is adopted bad things will happen. **DISADVANTAGES.**

Argue that the fundamental assumptions of the affirmative are flawed/incorrect. **CRITIQUE.**

Argue that the plan is not a representation of the topic. **TOPICALITY.**

Argue that there would be a better alternative to the plan. **COUNTERPLAN**

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL (1AR)

4 minutes

Answer all neg issues, defend aff positions.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL (2NR)

4 minutes

Select winning issues and sell them to critic. **WEIGH THE ISSUES.**

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL (2AR)

4 minutes

Select winning issues and sell them to critic. **WEIGH THE ISSUES.**

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKER CROSS EXAMINES 1NC

3 minutes

Teams are given a total of 5-10 minutes prep time to use before their speeches. It is different at different tournaments.

Shake Hands. See if the judge has any comments.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE SPEECH (2AC)

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ONE WELCOME TO DEBATE

DAY 4 VIDEOTAPE OF SAMPLE DEBATE

WATCH THE 40 MINUTE VHS TAPE OF THE SAMPLE DEBATE.

AFTER THE DEBATE, HAVE A DISCUSSION:

- WHO DID YOU LIKE THE BEST IN THE DEBATE?
- WHAT DIDN'T YOU LIKE ABOUT THE DEBATE?
- WHAT WOULD YOU HAVE DONE BETTER?
- WHAT WAS THE WORST ARGUMENT IN THE DEBATE?
- WHAT WAS THE BEST ARGUMENT IN THE DEBATE?

HAVE STUDENTS VOTE FOR THE TAM THEY THOUGHT WON BY RAISING THEIR HANDS.

ANNOUNCE THE TOPIC YOU HAVE SELECTED FOR THE PUBLIC ASSEMBLY DEBATE TO FOLLOW THE NEXT DAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ONE WELCOME TO DEBATE

DAY 5 PUBLIC ASSEMBLY MEETING TO DISCUSS SOME ISSUES OF INTEREST.

HAVE A PUBLIC ASSEMBLY DEBATE

This is a chance for new debaters to begin thinking about the topic and get some public speaking experience in as well. We have suggested an issue for you to use, but you can come up with one on your own as well.

TELL THEM -- "This exercise is modeled after the old-fashioned Vermont town meeting. We will be discussing a topical issue. Feel free to raise your hand and be called on to make a short speech in support or in opposition to the motion we will be considering. Simply raise your hand, be recognized, come to the front of the room, introduce yourself, and say what you wish."

Go on as long as you want within sensible limits, encourage everyone to speak, but if some want to watch without speaking that's fine.

As the exercise goes on, feel free to stand up and agree or disagree with something another speaker has said. You can appoint a student as the chair, to call on people, or the teacher can do that ... or the teacher can just be another member of the assembly and give a speech.

THE ISSUE: Many schools are now allowing administrators to search lockers and student belongings whenever they wish to combat school discipline problems as well as drug and alcohol at school.

THE MOTION: This assembly believes that high school administrators should be allowed to search student lockers, backpacks, etc. whenever they feel they need to. The need to keep order in school and stop drug and alcohol use outweighs student privacy rights.

CAUTION: YOU MAY HAVE TO GIVE A SPEECH IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION MORE THAN ONCE IF STUDENTS ALL DISAGREE WITH IT. DON'T WORRY ABOUT THAT -- ARGUING AGAINST THE TEACHER CAN BE A WAY OF INVOLVING THEM AND EMPOWERING THEM. LET THEM KNOW YOU DO THIS BECAUSE THERE IS ALWAYS MORE THAN ONE SIDE TO EVERY ISSUE, AND WE NEED TO LOOK AT ALL SIDES IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUE

HAVE STUDENTS WRITE ON A PIECE OF PAPER WHO DID THE BEST JOB AND WHY AND TURN IT IN TO YOU. ANNOUNCE THE TOP THREE FINISHERS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER TWO

UNIT TITLE: THE STOCK ISSUES

GOALS:

- FAMILIARIZE STUDENTS WITH THE BASIC STOCK ISSUES WHICH EXIST IN POLICY DEBATING
- ENABLE STUDENTS TO BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY THESE ISSUES IN A SAMPLE AFFIRMATIVE CASE.
- ENABLE STUDENTS TO BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY THESE ISSUES IN A NEGATIVE STRATEGY

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE: PART 2 OF 15

STOCK ISSUES HANDOUT (ATTACHED)

DAY 1 VHS TAPE PART TWO STOCK ISSUES IN DEBATE AND DISCUSSION.

DAY 2 IDENTIFICATION OF STOCK ISSUES IN AN AFFIRMATIVE ESSAY AND DISCUSSION

DAY 3 IDENTIFICATION OF STOCK ISSUES IN A NEGATIVE ESSAY AND DISCUSSION

DAY 4 HOW STOCK ISSUES BECOME VOTING ISSUES

DAY 5 A SIMPLE STOCK ISSUES DEBATE

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TWO

DAY 1 VHS TAPE PART 2 OF 15 STOCK ISSUES IN DEBATE AND DISCUSSION.

WATCH THE 30 MINUTE VIDEO ABOUT STOCK ISSUES.

IN A DISCUSSION ASK THEM WHAT THE STOCK ISSUES ARE AND HOW THEY WOULD BE INVOLVED IN A POLICY DISCUSSION LIKE LOWERING THE DRINKING AGE TO 18 FROM 21.

- WHY WOULD WE WANT TO DO SUCH A THING?
- HOW WOULD WE DO IT?
- WILL IT WORK TO SOLVE THE REASON WHY WE WANT TO DO IT?
- WHAT BAD THINGS MIGHT HAPPEN BECAUSE OF IT?
- IS THERE ANOTHER APPROACH WHICH MIGHT WORK BETTER?

HAND OUT THE BRIEF AFFIRMATIVE ESSAY THE STUDENTS WILL BE READING FOR TOMORROW.

ASSIGN THE DEBATE FOR FRIDAY. GIVE PARTICIPATING STUDENTS THE MINI-EVIDENCE SETS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

MINI EVIDENCE SET FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

MINI EVIDENCE SET FOR THE NEGATIVE

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

AFFIRMATIVE ESSAY INSERTED

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

STOCK ISSUES IN POLICY DEBATE

THE RESOLUTION/TOPIC:

The resolution is what the debate is "about." It is the role of the affirmative team to support/advocate/prove the resolution. Policy: resolution calls for some action. Negatives often argue that the affirmative is not a good representation of the resolution. (See TOPICALITY)

THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE:

In the 1AC the affirmative presents their "case" for the resolution. It is usually a prepared speech which is clearly organized. It can be organized in a number of different ways, but usually involves the following "stock issues."

PROPOSAL/PLAN: Identification of policies to be changed and an explanation of how they would work.

SOLVENCY/WORKABILITY: An explanation of how this proposal would create a desirable situation.

ADVANTAGE/SIGNIFICANCE: An explanation of the beneficial outcome of this proposal and a descriptions of the dimensions of these benefits.

INHERENCY: Reasons why this problem persists and is "inherent" in the status quo. Sometimes....

NEGATIVE CASE ATTACKS:

The negative will attempt to disprove the affirmative case. Usually this occurs in 1NC, although it is not necessarily so. The negative disputes affirmative claims in their case and shows how it is failing in one or more of the steps it needs to prove. Examples: there is no problem, your proposal won't solve the problem, the status quo is a better approach to the problem.

TOPICALITY:

The negative may offer an argument that the affirmative case is not a good representation of the topic, thus the affirmative must lose the debate because they have failed to "affirm." Usually, the negative will do the following.

DEFINE: some word or phrase in the resolution, usually using some outside source to verify the definition.

VIOLATION: explain how the affirmative does not meet this interpretation, how they "violate" the definition.

STANDARDS: explain how if there are conflicting definitions (affirmative definition and negative definition) the negative definition is preferable.

VOTING ISSUE: explain how if the affirmative loses this argument, they will lose the debate (or be punished in some other way).

NEGATIVE OBJECTIONS TO THE AFFIRMATIVE:

These arguments are presented and constructed by the negative, and are offered as reasons why the affirmative case should be rejected, independent of the success of case attacks. There are a number of types. Do not let different names fool you!

DISADVANTAGE: Usually on policy and quasi-policy topics. The negative argues that if we do what the affirmative proposes, it will cause some bad thing to happen. Usually, a disadvantage will be a chain of reasoning explaining how the affirmative causes some "disadvantageous" situation to be created. The disadvantage is sort of like a story the negative is telling: it begins with an explanation of what the affirmative is doing, then explaining how this caused something to happen (LINKS), and then explaining how this leads to a tragic ending (IMPACTS). Some disadvantages require several steps, and those between the original link story and the impact are called INTERNAL LINKS.

CRITIQUE/KRITIK: The negative argues that some fundamental assumption or behavior of the affirmative is fallacious and thus the affirmative presentation must be rejected.

NEGATIVE COUNTER-PLANS:

The affirmative will advocate a "plan" they are willing to defend. Likewise, negative teams may wish to advocate a "plan" they are willing to defend or the status quo. These are different based on the topic.

STATUS QUO: The negative advocates things the way they are now and contends that if we changed as the affirmative wants things would be worse.

COUNTERPLAN: The negative advocates a non-topical reasonable alternative which they feel would be superior to the affirmative proposal. Note the components:

- it may not be a topical action (that is what the affirmative is supposed to do, not the negative),
- it must be a reasonable alternative to the affirmative (you would want to choose the counterplan instead of the affirmative plan, as opposed to just doing both), and
- it has to be shown as an on balance superior alternative.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TWO

DAY 2 IDENTIFICATION OF STOCK ISSUES IN AN AFFIRMATIVE ESSAY AND DISCUSSION

HAVE THE STUDENTS READ A VERY SHORT ESSAY ON THE DEBATE TOPIC WHICH LEANS AFFIRMATIVE AND HAVE THEM IDENTIFY THE VARIOUS COMPONENTS ONE WOULD LIKE IN A POLICY DEBATE CASE:

- A PROBLEM WHICH EXISTS (SIGNIFICANCE)
- THE CAUSE OF THE PROBLEM, WHY IT PERSISTS (INHERENCY)
- WHAT WE SHOULD DO ABOUT IT (PLAN)
- CLAIMS THAT THE PLAN WILL REDUCE THE PROBLEM (SOLVENCY)

IF TIME REMAINS HAVE THE STUDENTS COME UP WITH ARGUMENTS AGAINST WHAT THE ESSAY IS CLAIMING, AND IDENTIFY WHAT CATEGORY THEY WOULD BE IN:

- CASE ATTACK AGAINST AFFIRMATIVE SIGNIFICANCE
- CASE ATTACK AGAINST AFFIRMATIVE SOLVENCY
- DISADVANTAGE TO THE PROPOSAL
- COUNTERPLAN TO THE PROPOSAL - DO SOMETHING ELSE

HAND OUT THE NEGATIVE ESSAY FOR THE NEXT DAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

NEGATIVE ESSAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TWO

DAY 3 IDENTIFICATION OF STOCK ISSUES IN A NEGATIVE ESSAY AND DISCUSSION

HAVE THE STUDENTS READ A VERY SHORT ESSAY ON THE DEBATE TOPIC WHICH LEANS NEGATIVE AND HAVE THEM IDENTIFY THE VARIOUS COMPONENTS

- CASE ATTACK AGAINST AFFIRMATIVE SIGNIFICANCE
- CASE ATTACK AGAINST AFFIRMATIVE SOLVENCY
- DISADVANTAGE TO THE PROPOSAL
- COUNTERPLAN TO THE PROPOSAL - DO SOMETHING ELSE

IF TIME REMAINS HAVE THE STUDENTS COME UP WITH ARGUMENTS AGAINST WHAT THE ESSAY IS CLAIMING, AND IDENTIFY WHAT CATEGORY THEY WOULD BE IN.

HAVE THE STUDENTS CONSIDER WHICH ESSAY THEY THOUGHT WAS BEST AND WHY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

WEEK TWO

DAY 4 HOW STOCK ISSUES BECOME VOTING ISSUES

IF YOU DO NOT WANT TO USE THE TOPIC HERE, YOU CAN USE THE TOPIC: I SHOULD ENLIST IN THE MILITARY AFTER HIGH SCHOOL INSTEAD OF GOING TO COLLEGE.

HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT WHY THESE STOCK ISSUES ARE IMPORTANT. USING THE HANDOUT ON STOCK ISSUES, GO THROUGH THEM ONE AT A TIME AND ASK THE QUESTION:

- IF THE AFFIRMATIVE TEAM FAILS TO PROVE X (SIGNIFICANCE, INHERENCY, SOLVENCY), WHY WOULD THEY LOSE THE DEBATE?
- IF THE NEGATIVE TEAM PROVES Y (DISADVANTAGE, COUNTERPLAN, CRITIQUE, TOPICALITY), WHY WOULD THEY WIN THE DEBATE?

INDICATE TO STUDENTS THAT OFTEN ONE SIDE WINS ONE STOCK ISSUE AND THE OTHER SIDE ANOTHER STOCK ISSUE, AND SO THEY HAVE TO BE WEIGHED AGAINST ONE ANOTHER. EXAMPLES:

- NEGATIVE MAY WIN A DISADVANTAGE BUT AFFIRMATIVE MAY WIN CASE, SO THEY HAVE TO BE COMPARED.
- AFFIRMATIVE MAY NOT SOLVE VERY MUCH OF THE PROBLEM, BUT THERE IS NO REASON NOT TO ADOPT THE PLAN (NO DISADVANTAGE).
- THERE ISN'T MUCH OF A HARM, BUT THE AFFIRMATIVE DOES SOLVE IT, SO IT HAS TO BE WEIGHED AGAINST A DISADVANTAGE, AND EVEN A SMALL ONE MIGHT OUTWEIGH IT.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

WEEK TWO

DAY 5 A SIMPLE STOCK ISSUES DEBATE

USE A TOPIC OF INTEREST TO THEM OR USE A CASE FROM THE TOPIC.

HAVE A VERY SIMPLE DEBATE:

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE DEBATE FOCUS ON THE STOCK ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE, INHERENCY, AND SOLVENCY.

HAVE EVERYONE IN THE CLASS FOLLOW THE DEBATE. HAVE THEM MAKE COMMENTS AFTER THE DEBATE. HAVE THEM FILL OUT A BALLOT STATING WHO WON AND WHY. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER THREE

UNIT TITLE: ORGANIZATION & NOTES

GOALS:

- TEACH STUDENTS BASIC CONCEPTS OF ARGUMENT ORGANIZATION
- TEACH STUDENTS HOW TO FORMAT THEIR NOTES TO PROPERLY FOLLOW A DEBATE.
- TEACH STUDENTS HOW TO USE ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS TO IMPROVE NOTE TAKING
- HAVE STUDENTS PRACTICE NOTE-TAKING TO EMPHASIZE ABBREVIATION AND SYMBOL USE
- HAVE STUDENTS PRACTICE NOTE-TAKING OF THE MINI-DEBATE

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE: PART 3 OF 15 FLOWING

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 75-78 &125

DAY 1 VHS TAPE PART 3 OF 15 FLOWING AND DISCUSSION

DAY 2 TAKING NOTES AND READING THEM BACK

DAY 3 TAKING NOTES WITH FOCUS ON ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

DAY 4 FLOW THE SAMPLE MINI-DEBATE ON VHS TAPE, TURN IN FLOWS

DAY 5 A SIMPLE CLASS DEBATE FOR PEOPLE TO FLOW.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THREE

DAY 1 VHS TAPE PART 3 OF 15 FLOWING AND DISCUSSION

WATCH VHS TAPE PART 3 OF 15 (30 MINUTES)

HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT NOTE TAKING:

- WHAT ARE PROBLEMS YOU FACE IN TAKING CLASS NOTES?
- HOW IS TAKING NOTES IN A DEBATE DIFFERENT?
- WHY IS IT HARD TO DEBATE WITHOUT GOOD NOTES?
- SHOULD YOU SPEAK FROM THE TOP OF YOUR HEAD OR FROM YOUR NOTES?
- DO YOU USE ABBREVIATIONS OR SYMBOLS IN TAKING NOTES NOW? WHAT ARE THEY?
- MOST FAVORITE AND LEAST FAVORITE TYPES OF PENS.

ANNOUNCE THE DEBATE PARTICIPANTS FOR FRIDAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THREE

DAY 2 TAKING NOTES AND READING THEM BACK

HAVE STUDENTS GET PAPER AND PEN READY, THEY WILL NOT NEED TO USE COLUMNS.

HAVE STUDENTS TAKING TURNS READING PIECES OF EVIDENCE FROM THE SAMPLE SHEET ATTACHED. GO FROM THE EASY (A) TO THE DIFFICULT (B). THEN THE EVIDENCE WHICH DOES NOT MATCH THE TAG (C).

AFTER EACH STUDENT READS THE EVIDENCE, HAVE SOMEONE ELSE IN CLASS REPEAT WHAT THEY HAVE FOR NOTES. SEE IF ANYONE ELSE HAS MORE DETAIL.

POINT OUT TO THEM THAT YOU DO NOT COPY DOWN THE MATERIAL WORD FOR WORD, INSTEAD YOU TRY AND COPY DOWN THE IDEA, THE POINT, THE ARGUMENT BEING MADE.

POINT OUT TO THEM THAT THE SOURCE OF THE EVIDENCE IS IMPORTANT AS WELL. ENCOURAGE THEM TO COPY THAT DOWN. ASK THEM WHY THE SOURCE MIGHT BE IMPORTANT?

ASK THEM WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE EVIDENCE FROM CATEGORY C? POINT OUT THAT OFTEN DEBATERS WILL USE EVIDENCE WHICH DOES NOT NECESSARILY SUPPORT THEIR POINT, AND ONLY GOOD LISTENING AND GOOD NOTES CAN CATCH THEM.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THREE

DAY 3 TAKING NOTES WITH FOCUS ON ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

GO OVER THE COMMON LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS IN THE TEXT. HAVE THEM EACH COPY THE LIST ONTO A PIECE OF PAPER.

TALK ABOUT HOW TO MAKE ABBREVIATIONS -- USE ONLY THE CRITICAL LETTERS AND LEAVE THE VOWELS OUT.

INSTRUCT STUDENTS TO USE ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE IN TAKING THEIR NOTES DURING THIS EXERCISE.

HAVE A STUDENT READ THE SAMPLE EVIDENCE PIECE BY PIECE. AFTER EACH PIECE ASK SOMEONE IN THE CLASS TO READ BACK HAT THEY HAVE ONLY AS SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS, AND ASK OTHERS IF THEY CAN UNDERSTAND IT.

TALK ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF LISTENING FOR IDEAS AND CONCEPTS, NOT JUST TAKING A TRANSCRIPTION. IN DEBATE WE NEED TO ANSWER THE IDEAS.

GIVE SPECIAL RECOGNITION TO STUDENTS WHO CREATE NEW SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE FOR ABBREVIATION AND SYMBOL WORK

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THREE

DAY 4 FLOW THE SAMPLE MINI-DEBATE ON VHS TAPE, TURN IN FLOWS

HAVE STUDENTS PREPARE FLOW SHEETS FOR WATCHING A DEBATE -- SEVEN COLUMNS, SEVERAL SHEETS.

WATCH THE SAME DEBATE ON VHS TAPE, HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE. CAUTION THEM NOT TO GIVE UP, TO KEEP ON TRYING, AND TO USE ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS. TRY TO GET STUDENTS TO PUT THE ANSWERS TO ARGUMENTS NEXT TO THE ORIGINAL ARGUMENTS ON THE FLOW.

WALK ROUND THE CLASS LOOKING AT THEIR FLOWS, GIVE POSITIVE FEEDBACK, HELP THOSE HAVING TROUBLE.

COLLECT THE FLOWS FOR EXAMINATION.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THREE

DAY 5 A SIMPLE CLASS DEBATE FOR PEOPLE TO FLOW.

USE A CASE FROM THE TOPIC. YOU CAN USE THE SAME SAMPLE EVIDENCE FROM BEFORE.

HAVE A VERY SIMPLE DEBATE:

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE CLASS FLOW THE DEBATE.

AFTER THE DEBATE HAVE THE CLASS TALK ABOUT WHO WAS THE EASIEST TO FLOW AND WHY.

ASK STUDENTS WHO THINK THEY HAVE A GOOD FLOW TO TURN IT IN TO YOU. COLLECT THEM AND THEN ANNOUNCE WHO DID THE BEST JOB AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER FOUR

UNIT TITLE: EVIDENCE AND PROOF

GOALS:

- TEACH THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF EVIDENCE IN A DEBATE SETTING
- TEACH THE WAYS IN WHICH EVIDENCE CAN BE CHALLENGED AND CRITICIZED.
- SHOW STUDENTS HOW TO FIND EVIDENCE IN A SAMPLE ARTICLE.
- GIVE STUDENTS PRACTICE IN CRITICIZING SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 4 OF 15

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 82-94

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 4 OF 15 EVIDENCE AND DISCUSSION OF EVIDENCE IN REAL LIFE.

DAY 2 READING A SAMPLE ARTICLE AND FINDING EVIDENCE.

DAY 3 CRITICIZING SAMPLE PIECES OF EVIDENCE.

DAY 4 FORMAT AND CITATION FOR PRODUCING EVIDENCE

DAY 5 A SIMPLE DEBATE USING SOME EVIDENCE

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOUR EVIDENCE AND PROOF

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 4 OF 15 EVIDENCE AND DISCUSSION OF EVIDENCE IN REAL LIFE.

WATCH THE VHS VIDEO, 30 MINUTES.

DISCUSS THE ROLE THAT EVIDENCE PLAYS -- IT "PROVES" OR SUPPORTS SOMETHING.

ASK STUDENTS TO GIVE EXAMPLES FROM REAL LIFE OF HOW EVIDENCE IS USED TO PROVE OR SUPPORT:

- CLAIMS THAT YOU NEED SPECIAL PRIVILEGES OR ALLOWANCE INCREASE FROM PARENTS.
- PROVING YOU ARE INNOCENT WHEN FALSELY ACCUSED OF SOMETHING.
- CLAIMS THAT ONE SPORTS STAR IS BETTER THAN ANOTHER.
- CONVINCING SOMEONE THEY SHOULD GO TO THE DANCE WITH YOU.

ANNOUNCE THE DEBATERS FOR FRIDAY. GIVE THEM SAMPLE EVIDENCE FOR THE DEBATE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOUR EVIDENCE AND PROOF

DAY 2 READING A SAMPLE ARTICLE AND FINDING EVIDENCE.

HAVE STUDENTS READ A SHORT SAMPLE ARTICLE ON THE TOPIC IN CLASS AND HAVE THEM BRACKET THE PASSAGES THEY THINK THEY COULD USE AS EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT AN ARGUMENT IN A DEBATE.

GO THROUGH THE ARTICLE PARAGRAPH BY PARAGRAPH AND HAVE STUDENTS INDICATE WHICH PASSAGES THEY WOULD USE AND WHICH ARGUMENTS THEY WOULD SUPPORT.

FOCUS ON HELPING STUDENTS DEVELOP GOOD TAG-LINES OR TITLES FOR THEIR ARGUMENTS AS SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS KEEP THE ARTICLE FOR USE LATER.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE DISCOVERY ARTICLE

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOUR EVIDENCE AND PROOF

DAY 3 CRITICIZING SAMPLE PIECES OF EVIDENCE.

REVIEW WITH THE CLASS WAYS IN WHICH EVIDENCE CAN BE CRITICIZED, SEE ATTACHED PAGE.

DISTRIBUTE A PAGE OF EVIDENCE TO BE CRITICIZED. MAKE SURE THEY KNOW THIS IS JUST SAMPLE EVIDENCE AND NOT REAL EVIDENCE. SAMPLE EVIDENCE PAGE ATTACHED.

GO THROUGH THE EVIDENCE PIECE BY PIECE. HAVE SOMEONE READ IT AND THEN ASK THE CLASS TO INDICT THAT EVIDENCE. SAMPLE EVIDENCE PAGE WITH KEY TO ERRORS ATTACHED.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

INDICT EVIDENCE

Evidence is the support upon which many arguments rest. It is essential for the negative team to undermine this evidentiary support by addressing major inadequacies in affirmative evidence. Here are some simple techniques which should be kept in mind.

1. Matching the evidence with the claim. Often the claim which the affirmative uses the evidence to support is much broader and stronger than the actual wording of the evidence. Negative speakers should be monitoring the actual words of affirmative evidence as closely as possible, and then launch challenges against important pieces of evidence which seem particularly vulnerable or important.

2. Strength of evidence. Probability is a continuum which begins at "absolutely will not happen" and runs to "absolutely will happen." Few ideas exist at either of these ends of the spectrum, and most fall somewhere in the middle range. The qualifiers contained within the evidence are essential to analyze and identify. Once again, the challenge serves as the appropriate mechanism for dealing with this situation.

3. Recency and its relevance. In general, we might say that recent evidence is better than less recent evidence, all else being equal. However, recency is very important in some evidence and not in other evidence depending on to what it refers. Competing evidence about the yearning humans have to be loved and respected would not be decided based on one piece being 6 months more recent. However, competing evidence about Algeria's intention to acquire nuclear weapons may be decided based on recency, especially if the situation has recently changed. Lack of recency on the part of affirmative evidence should be pointed out and criticized only if events are likely to have changed since the evidence first appeared. In this case recency can be important, but it is not an ironclad standard for refuting evidence.

4. Source qualification. The reason we use evidence in a debate is to back up our arguments with expert fact and opinion. High school and college students are not subject experts on the topics about which they debate, thus they attempt to quote subject experts to bolster their claims. Disturbingly, fewer and fewer debaters recognize this essential characteristic of evidence and read the name and the date but not the qualifications. One could hardly claim that the day on which something is said is more important than who said it, yet debaters put the date in over the qualification. Negative teams should demand source qualifications while at the same time reading qualifications for their own sources. A quick and easy standard can be established that without qualification evidence fails its argumentative role and then asking that the critic opt for qualified negative evidence over unqualified affirmative evidence in any instance where there are sources in conflict.

5. Source bias. Often those who write about important topics are fervent believers in a specific approach to the controversy. As well, some sources have direct vested interests in making certain statements ("US foreign policy is promoting peace," says the US Secretary of State; or, "My new invention will replace the current gasoline engine," says Wallace Minto, inventor). Everyone who has an opinion is not a biased source, and some source bias is rarely grounds for rejecting the evidence entirely, but serious source bias should be pointed out and the strength of that evidence should be reduced.

6. Source conclusion. Many scholarly sources tend to evaluate controversies thoroughly, dealing with all of the relevant issues on both sides. Often these sources get quoted as making statements to support affirmative conclusions which they did not make at the end of their own analysis. This brings the use of that evidence for affirmative conclusions into question. While the evidence is not discounted 100% (since the original author did think it was a relevant issue) its support for a conclusion the opposite of the author's should be substantially reduced.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE TO BE CRITICIZED

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE TO BE CRITICIZED
WITH ERROR KEY

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOUR EVIDENCE AND PROOF

DAY 4 FORMAT AND CITATION FOR PRODUCING EVIDENCE

REVIEW WITH STUDENTS HOW TO CITE AND TAG EVIDENCE

TO CITE EVIDENCE:

Evidence should always have full and complete citations. Just as articles should footnote their sources, debaters should make it possible for others to identify where evidence comes from. This includes the following:

- a. The author
- b. The author's qualifications
- c. The publication
- d. The date of the publication
- e. The page number of the original quotation.

Unacceptable:

Wade 99 or New York Times 99 or Senate Hearings 99

Acceptable:

Melissa Wade, Adjunct Education Professor, Emory U, Fall 1999, Journal of Debate Love, "Why debaters make better lovers," p. 23

TO TAG EVIDENCE:

Make sure the tag is a clear and full statement, including

- a. A subject
- b. An object
- c. A verb
- d. Some indication of why the argument is true

HAVE THE STUDENTS TAG AND CITE THE SAMPLE EVIDENCE THEY BRACKETED EARLIER IN THE WEEK. HAVE THEM CUT OUT THE TAG-CITE AND EVIDENCE AND TAPE THE EVIDENCE ITSELF TO THE TAG-CITE. NOW THEY HAVE PRODUCED EVIDENCE THEY CAN USE IN A DEBATE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOUR EVIDENCE AND PROOF

DAY 5 A SIMPLE DEBATE AND FOCUS ON EVIDENCE

USE A CASE FROM THE TOPIC.

HAVE A VERY SIMPLE DEBATE:

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS WHO USED EVIDENCE, WHO INDICTED EVIDENCE, AND WHO DEFENDED EVIDENCE THE BEST.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER FIVE

UNIT TITLE: AFFIRMING

GOALS:

- TEACH STUDENTS THE BASIC COMPONENTS OF AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE.
- GIVE STUDENTS EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING IDEAS BEHIND AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE THEY ARE INTERESTED IN.
- GIVE STUDENTS EXPERIENCE IN MANIPULATING EVIDENCE TO BUILD AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE.
- ENGAGE STUDENTS IN A DISCUSSION OF HOW TO STRATEGICALLY PICK AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 5 OF 15 AFFIRMATIVE PART ONE
CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 15-20, 48, 50-51

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 5 OF 15 AFFIRMATIVE PART ONE AND DISCUSSION.

DAY 2 BUILDING AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE CONCEPTUALLY AND STYLISTICALLY

DAY 3 BUILDING AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE OUT OF A SAMPLE EVIDENCE SET.

DAY 4 DISCUSSION ABOUT PICKING AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

DAY 5 A SIMPLE DEBATE WITH FOCUS ON AN AFFIRMATIVE APPROACH

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIVE AFFIRMING

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 5 OF 15 AFFIRMATIVE PART ONE AND DISCUSSION.

WATCH VHS TAPE 5 OF 15 ON THE AFFIRMATIVE.

DISCUSS THE MATERIAL WITH THE STUDENTS:

- WHAT ARE THE MAJOR POINTS THE AFFIRMATIVE MUST COVER?
- WHAT SHOULD THE PLAN CONTAIN?
- HOW CAN THE AFFIRMATIVE MAKE THEIR PROPOSAL SEEM MORE REALISTIC?
- HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO EXPLAIN THE IMPORTANT CONCEPTS TO THE JUDGE-AUDIENCE?
- HOW WOULD YOU USE THESE IDEAS IN AN EVERYDAY LIFE ARGUMENT FOR CHANGE? EXAMPLES: SLEEP OVERS, STAYING OUT LATE, ALLOWING YOU TO BORROW THE CAR, ETC.

ANNOUNCE THE DEBATERS AND THE TOPIC FOR THE FRIDAY DEBATE.

DISTRIBUTE THE SAMPLE ARTICLE ON THE TOPIC.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE ARTICLE ON THE TOPIC

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIVE AFFIRMING

DAY 2 BUILDING AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE CONCEPTUALLY AND STYLISTICALLY

BACKGROUND: SAMPLE ARTICLE.

LEAD A DISCUSSION IN CLASS ABOUT DESIGNING AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

HAVE THE CLASS OUTLINE WHAT THE MAJOR CONTENTIONS WOULD BE, WHAT THE PLAN WOULD DO. HAVE A MAJOR CONTENTION FOR EACH OF THE STOCK ISSUES YOU NEED TO COVER.

TALK ABOUT HOW TO MAKE THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE SEEM MORE APPEALING:

- WHAT KINDS OF WORD CHOICES SHOULD YOU USE TO MAKE IT SEEM MORE IMPORTANT AND PERSUASIVE?
- WHAT KINDS OF EVIDENCE WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE TO INCLUDE IN YOUR FIRST SPEECH?

DISTRIBUTE SAMPLE EVIDENCE SET FOR NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE SET FOR TOPIC AFFIRMATIVE

SEE EARLIER EVIDENCE SET

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE SET FOR TOPIC
NEGATIVE

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIVE AFFIRMING

DAY 3 BUILDING AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE OUT OF A SAMPLE EVIDENCE SET.

HAVE STUDENTS EXAMINE A SAMPLE EVIDENCE SET ON THE TOPIC.

USING THIS, THEY SHOULD CREATE AN OUTLINE FOR A BRIEF FIRST AFFIRMATIVE SPEECH. THEY SHOULD WRITE OUT:

- INTRODUCTION
- CONTENTIONS - INDICATING WHICH EVIDENCE GOES WHERE (EACH PIECE OF EVIDENCE HAS A NUMBER)
- PLAN
- CONCLUSION STATEMENT

HAVE STUDENTS PRESENT TO CLASS OR HAND IN THE PAPER WITH THE INTRODUCTION, CONTENTIONS, PLAN, AND CONCLUSION ON IT. IN PRESENTING IT THERE IS NO NEED TO READ THE EVIDENCE, JUST INDICATE WHICH PIECE OF EVIDENCE IS USED WHERE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIVE AFFIRMING

DAY 4 DISCUSSION ABOUT PICKING AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE TOPIC WHICH COULD BE AFFIRMATIVE CASES.

DEVELOP A LIST OF AREAS IN WHICH THERE ARE PROBLEMS

AFTER A DECENT LIST IS DEVELOPED, GO THROUGH AND EVALUATE EACH ONE:

- IS THERE REALLY A BIG PROBLEM HERE?
- IS IT GOING TO BE SOLVED IF WE LEAVE IT ALONE?
- IS THERE A WAY TO SOLVE THIS PROBLEM? WHAT IS IT?
- WILL THE SOLUTION ACTUALLY REDUCE THE PROBLEM?
- ARE THERE MAJOR ARGUMENTS AGAINST THIS IDEA?

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIVE AFFIRMING

DAY 5 A SIMPLE DEBATE WITH FOCUS ON AN AFFIRMATIVE APPROACH

HAVE THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE BE ABOUT THE TOPIC USING THE SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

HAVE A VERY SIMPLE DEBATE:

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER SIX

UNIT TITLE: NEGATING THE CASE

GOALS:

- LEARN ABOUT HOW TO ATTACK AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE BY USING EVIDENCED AND LOGICAL ARGUMENTS
- LEARN ABOUT HOW ATTACK ON THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE CAN INFLUENCE THE DECISION IN THE DEBATE.
- LEARN HOW TO MINIMIZE PROBLEMS AND CALL INTO DOUBT THE ABILITY OF THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS SPECIFIED.
- GIVE SHORT ANALYTICAL SPEECHES ATTACKING AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 13 OF 15

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 21-29.

DAY 1 WATCH VHS TAPE 13 OF 15 ABOUT HOW TO ATTACK AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE, WITH DISCUSSION.

DAY 2 ANALYSIS OF A SAMPLE AFFIRMATIVE CASE AND DISCUSSION OF HOW TO ATTACK IT.

DAY 3 SHORT SPEECHES ATTACKING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

DAY 4 SHORT SPEECHES ATTACKING THE SOLVENCY OF THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE WITH FOCUS ON ATTACKING THE CASE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SIX NEGATING THE CASE

DAY 1 WATCH VHS TAPE 13 OF 15 ABOUT HOW TO ATTACK AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE, WITH DISCUSSION.

WATCH VHS TAPE 13 OF 15 ATTACKING THE CASE.

HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT WAYS TO ATTACK:

- HOW DO YOU MAKE SOMETHING LOOK SMALL?
- HOW DO YOU MAKE SOMETHING SEEM UNIMPORTANT?
- HOW DO YOU SHOW A PROPOSAL WON'T WORK?
- IF PEOPLE DON'T LIKE A PROPOSAL HOW CAN THEY GET AROUND IT?

ASSIGN THE DEBATE AND FOCUS FOR FRIDAY.

DISTRIBUTE THE SAMPLE FIRST AFFIRMATIVE SPEECH.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SIX NEGATING THE CASE

DAY 2 ANALYSIS OF A SAMPLE AFFIRMATIVE CASE AND DISCUSSION OF HOW TO ATTACK IT.

TALK ABOUT ORGANIZATION OF CASE ATTACKS -- YOU INDICATE AN AFFIRMATIVE POINT AND THEN LAUNCH ARGUMENTS AGAINST IT, NUMBERING THEM 1-2-3, ETC.

LOOK AT THE SAMPLE AFFIRMATIVE CASE POINT BY POINT AND TALK ABOUT HOW IT MIGHT BE ATTACKED. TELL STUDENTS THEY WILL BE MAKING SPEECHES ON THIS LATER.

DISTRIBUTE SAMPLE NEGATIVE EVIDENCE AT THE END OF CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE AFFIRMATIVE CASE

CONSULT WDI FILES

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SIX NEGATING THE CASE

DAY 3 SHORT SPEECHES ATTACKING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

LOOK AT THE SIGNIFICANCE CONTENTION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE. GIVE STUDENTS A FEW MINUTES TO WRITE DOWN SOME ATTACKS AGAINST THE SIGNIFICANCE PORTION.

HAVE STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES ATTACKING THAT PORTION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

MAKE SURE THAT STUDENTS:

- NUMBER THEIR ARGUMENTS
- SIGNPOST THEIR ARGUMENTS (SAY WHAT THEY ARE ANSWERING)
- USE A MIXTURE OF EVIDENCED AND NON-EVIDENCED ARGUMENTS.

HAVE STUDENTS NAME WHO THEY THOUGHT DID THE BEST JOB. ALSO HAVE THEM INDICATE WHO IMPROVED THE MOST FROM THE LAST SPEECH.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

WEEK SIX NEGATING THE CASE

DAY 4 SHORT SPEECHES ATTACKING THE SOLVENCY OF THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

LOOK AT THE SOLVENCY CONTENTION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE. GIVE STUDENTS A FEW MINUTES TO WRITE DOWN SOME ATTACKS AGAINST THE SOLVENCY PORTION.

HAVE STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES ATTACKING THAT PORTION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

MAKE SURE THAT STUDENTS:

- NUMBER THEIR ARGUMENTS
- SIGNPOST THEIR ARGUMENTS (SAY WHAT THEY ARE ANSWERING)
- USE A MIXTURE OF EVIDENCED AND NON-EVIDENCED ARGUMENTS.

HAVE STUDENTS NAME WHO THEY THOUGHT DID THE BEST JOB. ALSO HAVE THEM INDICATE WHO IMPROVED THE MOST FROM THE LAST SPEECH.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

WEEK SIX NEGATING THE CASE

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE WITH FOCUS ON ATTACKING THE CASE.

HAVE THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE AND THE NEGATIVE ATTACK USE THE SAMPLE EVIDENCE. HAVE THE DEBATE FOCUS ON THE CASE ITSELF.

HAVE A VERY SIMPLE DEBATE:

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER SEVEN

UNIT TITLE: NEGATING THE PLAN

GOALS:

- LEARN ABOUT THE FUNCTION AND COMPONENTS OF A NEGATIVE DISADVANTAGE ARGUMENT.
- LEARN ABOUT HOW TO ANSWER A NEGATIVE DISADVANTAGE.
- EXPERIENCE ORGANIZING A DISADVANTAGE FROM A SET OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.
- GIVE A SPEECH ANSWERING A DISADVANTAGE.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 7 OF 15

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 30-33, 52-53, 54

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 7 OF 15 ABOUT DISADVANTAGES AND DISCUSSION.

DAY 2 BUILD A CONCEPTUAL DISADVANTAGE TOGETHER AS A GROUP

DAY 3 HAVE STUDENTS BUILD A DISADVANTAGE FROM A SET OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

DAY 4 HAVE STUDENTS GIVE A SHORT SPEECH ANSWERING THE DISADVANTAGE BUILT ON DAY 3.

DAY 5 A SHORT DEBATE FOCUSING ON DISADVANTAGES

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SEVEN NEGATING THE PLAN

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 7 OF 15 ABOUT DISADVANTAGES AND DISCUSSION.

WATCH VHS TAPE 7 OF 15 ABOUT DISADVANTAGES.

LEAD THE CLASS IN A DISCUSSION OF DISADVANTAGE TERMINOLOGY:

- WHAT IS A LINK?
- WHAT IS A BRINK?
- WHAT IS AN IMPACT?
- WHAT IS UNIQUENESS?

IF YOUR FAMILY WANTED TO SEND YOU TO A MILITARY SCHOOL IN ALASKA, COULD YOU THINK OF ANY DISADVANTAGES TO THAT PLAN?

ANNOUNCE THE DEBATE AND FOCUS FOR FRIDAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SEVEN NEGATING THE PLAN

DAY 2 BUILD A CONCEPTUAL DISADVANTAGE TOGETHER AS A GROUP

ASSUME THAT THE AFFIRMATIVE WANTS TO [USE SAMPLE PLAN FROM THE TOPIC].

WORK WITH THE CLASS TO DEVELOP A DISADVANTAGE AGAINST THIS PROPOSAL.

- DEVELOP A THESIS FOR THE DISADVANTAGE
- OUTLINE THE DISADVANTAGE - A-B-C-D
- MAKE SURE THAT THERE IS A MAJOR SUBPOINT FOR LINK, UNIQUENESS, IMPACT, ETC.
- TALK ABOUT POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO THIS DISADVANTAGE

WARN STUDENTS THAT THIS ARGUMENT WILL BE THE FOCUS OF ACTIVITY LATER IN THE WEEK -- SO PAY ATTENTION TO SAVE TIME LATER.

DISTRIBUTE SAMPLE EVIDENCE ON THIS DISADVANTAGE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SEVEN NEGATING THE PLAN

DAY 3 HAVE STUDENTS BUILD A DISADVANTAGE FROM A SET OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

HAVE STUDENTS REVIEW THE SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

HAVE STUDENTS USE THE EVIDENCE AND THE OUTLINE FROM THE DAY BEFORE TO CONSTRICT A DISADVANTAGE. THEY SHOULD COMPOSE A THESIS STATEMENT, MAJOR SUBPOINTS (A-B-C, ETC.), AND INDICATE WHICH PIECES OF EVIDENCE THEY WOULD PUT WHERE.

INVITE STUDENTS TO READ THEIR COMPLETED DISADVANTAGE, INCLUDING EVIDENCE, TO THE CLASS.

COMMENT ON EACH ONE WITH THE CLASS:

- IS THE THESIS STATEMENT CLEAR?
- ARE ALL THE NEEDED COMPONENTS OF A DISADVANTAGE THERE?
- ARE THE SUBPOINTS LABELED CLEARLY AND PROPERLY?
- ARE THE SUBPOINTS IN THE CORRECT ORDER?
- CAN THE IMPACT OF THE DISADVANTAGE BE STATED MORE POWERFULLY?

HAVE THE CLASS SELECT WHICH ONE THEY LIKE BEST.

DISTRIBUTE THE LIST OF HOW TO ANSWER A DISADVANTAGE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

HOW TO ANSWER A DISADVANTAGE:

Every disadvantage is like a chain of reasoning. It starts with the link and ends with the impact. Like any chain, it is only as strong as its weakest link. You only need to break the chain at one critical point to defeat the disadvantage.

- Disprove link to your plan. (NO LINK or LINK TAKE-OUT)

The link take-out states that the affirmative plan doesn't actually cause the problem the disad presents.

- Disprove impact. (NO IMPACT or IMPACT TAKE-OUT)

The impact take-out states that the problem the disad presents is not serious or harmful.

- Disprove internal link. (NO INTERNAL LINK or INTERNAL LINK TAKE-OUT)

Some needed logical step is missing or false. Explain this, and make sure to show that this step is critical to the entire disadvantage argument.

- Link turn: no, our policy solves this problem. (Not to be used with impact turn)

The link turn states that when the affirmative plan happens, the problem the disad presents is avoided. This often means that when the affirmative plan happens the exact opposite of the problem happens.

- Impact turn: no, that thing we cause is not bad, it is actually good. (Not to be used with link turn)

The impact turn states that the problem the disad presents is actually a good thing.

- Not intrinsic: other forces will intervene to stop the impact from taking place.

In our above example, you could argue that people want both Chinese and Art so much they will lengthen the school day.

- Applies to policy system/plan of opponents as much as it does to you, so irrelevant.

The disadvantage may also apply to the counterplan of the negative, making it irrelevant for determining which to adopt. If the counterplan would have the states require Chinese, both teams would have a policy which would cut Art.

- No brink: there is not enough of a link to push us over into impact X.

We are now standing well back away from the cliff, so the push they identify (LINK) will not push us over the edge.

- Not unique: will happen/should have happened anyway because of X .

The non-unique argument states that the problem the disad presents will happen anyway in the status quo. If it were to happen anyway, it doesn't matter if the affirmative plan causes the problem or not.

- Case outweighs: bigger, sooner, etc.

If the impact of the disadvantage is smaller than the advantage of the plan, then even if the disadvantage were true you would still adopt the plan.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SEVEN NEGATING THE PLAN

DAY 4 HAVE STUDENTS GIVE A SHORT SPEECH ANSWERING THE DISADVANTAGE BUILT ON DAY 3.

REVIEW THE LIST OF WAYS TO ANSWER A DISADVANTAGE.

GIVE STUDENTS A FEW MINUTES TO LOOK AT THE DISADVANTAGE FROM DAY THREE AND COME UP WITH AT LEAST FOUR ANSWERS.

HAVE STUDENTS GIVE VERY BRIEF SPEECHES ANSWERING THE DISADVANTAGE.

COMMENT ALONG WITH CLASS:

- MAKE SURE THEY NUMBER THEIR ANSWERS, 1-2-3, ETC.
- MAKE SURE THEY USE DIFFERENT KINDS OF WAYS TO ANSWER.
- MAKE SURE THE ANSWERS ARE EASY TO FLOW.
- MAKE SURE THE ANSWERS DO NOT CONTRADICT ONE ANOTHER.

HAVE SOMEONE KEEP A LIST OF ALL THE DIFFERENT ANSWERS, AND SEE HOW MANY YOU GOT. THE MORE THE BETTER.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SEVEN NEGATING THE PLAN

DAY 5 A SHORT DEBATE FOCUSING ON DISADVANTAGES

IN THIS DEBATE USE A CASE FROM THE TOPIC. HAVE THE NEGATIVE USE THE DISADVANTAGE YOU HAVE BEEN WORKING ON.

HAVE A VERY SIMPLE DEBATE:

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER EIGHT

UNIT TITLE: NEGATING WITH CRITIQUES & COUNTERPLANS

GOALS:

- LEARN ABOUT THE FUNCTION AND BASIC COMPONENTS OF CRITIQUES.
- ANALYZE A CRITIQUE USED BY OPPOSING TEAMS.
- LEARN ABOUT THE FUNCTION AND BASIC COMPONENTS OF COUNTERPLANS.
- ANALYZE A COUNTERPLAN USED BY OPPOSING TEAMS.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 8 OF 15

VHS TAPE 9 OF 15

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 34-36

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 37-41

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 8 OF 15 COUNTERPLANS WITH DISCUSSION

DAY 2 ANALYSIS OF A COUNTERPLAN USED BY AN OPPOSING TEAM

DAY 3 VHS TAPE 9 OF 15 CRITIQUES WITH DISCUSSION

DAY 4 ANALYSIS OF A CRITIQUE USED BY AN OPPOSING TEAM

DAY 5 A SHORT DEBATE WITH A FOCUS ON A COUNTERPLAN OR A CRITIQUE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK EIGHT NEGATING THE AFFIRMATIVE WITH CRITIQUES & COUNTERPLANS

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 8 OF 15 COUNTERPLANS WITH DISCUSSION

WATCH VHS TAPE 8 OF 15 COUNTERPLANS.

DISCUSSION - EXPLORE THE ISSUE OF COMPETITION - WHEN DO TWO CHOICES REALLY COMPETE?

- EXAMPLE: AFFIRMATIVE PLAN - JOIN THE ARMY
- EXAMPLE: COUNTERPLAN - STAY IN SCHOOL

DO WE REALLY NEED TO CHOOSE BETWEEN THESE TWO? ARE THERE WAYS WE COULD DO BOTH (AND IF E CAN DO BOTH, THE COUNTERPLAN IS NOT A REASON TO REJECT THE PLAN)?

- JOIN THE ARMY AND GO TO SCHOOL IN THE ARMY.
- JOIN THE ARMY AND GO BACK TO SCHOOL AFTER YOUR SERVICE IS OVER.
- JOIN NOW BUT DEFER UNTIL AFTER SCHOOL.
- JOIN NATIONAL GUARD FOR SUMMER AND WEEKENDS BUT STAY IN SCHOOL.
- GO TO A MILITARY SCHOOL WHICH PREPARES YOU FOR THE ARMY.

WHICH OF THESE SEEMS BETTER?

DISTRIBUTE COUNTERPLAN ANSWER SHEET.

ANNOUNCE DEBATERS AND FOCUS FOR FRIDAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

Answering Counterplans

Counterplans must meet certain burdens in order to beat the Affirmative plan, therefore it is the job of the affirmative to show how the counterplan does not meet these burdens. Affirmative answers should expose the flaws in the counterplan and show why it is a bad idea.

Affirmative answers can be found while looking at different parts of the counterplan.

- **The counterplan is topical.**

The affirmative should make sure the counterplan is non-topical. If the counterplan is topical, it should not be accepted, because only the affirmative gets to defend the resolution. The negative has everything else to choose from.

- **The counterplan is not competitive.**

Affirmatives should argue that the counterplan is not competitive with the affirmative plan. If we do not have to choose between the plan and the counterplan, then it IS NOT A REASON TO VOTE AGAINST THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE. In order to do this, affirmative teams have three choices.

A. Prove it is not mutually exclusive. We CAN do both at the same time.

B. Prove it is not net beneficial. We SHOULD do both at the same time.

C. Offer permutations: Permutations are an affirmative's special weapon against counterplans. Permutations are arguments that prove the entire plan can be combined with parts of the counterplan in order to gain the advantages of the counterplan without rejecting the plan.

REMEMBER TO USE THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF PERMUTATIONS LISTED ABOVE.

- **Solvency**

Affirmatives can argue that the counterplan does not solve. The affirmative should look to see if the counterplan solves the affirmative advantage, the advantages of the counterplan, and avoids the disadvantages.

- **Disadvantages**

Counterplans, like affirmative plans, can have disadvantages. The affirmative should argue that if the counterplan is done something bad will happen that wouldn't otherwise happen if the affirmative plan is done.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK EIGHT NEGATING THE AFFIRMATIVE WITH CRITIQUES & COUNTERPLANS

DAY 2 ANALYSIS OF A COUNTERPLAN USED BY AN OPPOSING TEAM

USE A SAMPLE COUNTERPLAN FROM FROM AN INSTITUTE.

OR, BETTER YET, USE A COUNTERPLAN WHICH ONE OF YOUR OPPOSING SCHOOLS USES.

GO MOVER IT IN CLASS, AND ASK STUDENTS TO EXPLAIN WHAT THEY THINK EACH POINT MEANS.

TOGETHER ANALYZE HOW YOU MIGHT GO ABOUT ANSWERING THIS COUNTERPLAN.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK EIGHT NEGATING THE AFFIRMATIVE WITH CRITIQUES & COUNTERPLANS

DAY 3 VHS TAPE 9 OF 15 CRITIQUES WITH DISCUSSION

WATCH VHS TAPE 9 OF 15 ON CRITIQUES.

HAVE DISCUSSION ABOUT CRITIQUES:

- HOW IS A CRITIQUE DIFFERENT FROM A DISADVANTAGE?
- WHAT ARE THE TYPES OF CRITIQUES?
- WHAT WOULD BE SOME CRITIQUES OF MAJOR TOPICAL CONCEPTS.

DISTRIBUTE THE CRITIQUE ANSWER SHEET.

DISTRIBUTE A SAMPLE CRITIQUE FROM THE CD-ROM.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

Answering Critiques

While critiques are a valuable negative argument, they are also vulnerable to some general affirmative answers. The following arguments are suggestions that require more substantive development from you as you research and debate critiques during the academic year.

- **Debate the specific critique.** There are many answers to critiques that merely require research like any other negative argument. Remember that philosophers and rhetorical critics get into arguments with each other just like legislators and policy analysts do. The general rule is: for every group of scholars who support the ideas behind the critique, there is a different group of scholars who think the ideas in the critique are terrible. If you find out that a certain critique is being run, research it just like you would any other argument in order to find those scholars who disagree with it.
- **Use cross-ex time to ask about the critique.** You can't debate what you don't understand, and critiques can be very difficult to understand. Often, evidence in critiques uses academic jargon and obscure words. Don't be intimidated. If the other team can't explain what these words mean, the judge won't be willing to vote for them. If they CAN explain them, then you will be able to understand them, too. Ask how the plan links to the critique and what implications the critique has in the round. Don't let the other team avoid these questions.
- **Don't forget to use your own brain!** Once you understand what the critique says, you can answer it with arguments that make sense to you. Also, remember that the evidence in the 1AC is designed to answer objections to the case. Use that evidence creatively.
- **Utilize your specific affirmative answers.** Many of the implications of the critique are very generalized, but the affirmative can point to specific evidence to prove both their harms and their solvency. Thus, general indictments might not be as persuasive as the specific proofs offered by the affirmative.
- **Debate the uniqueness of the critique.** Negative critique debaters try to avoid the uniqueness debate and argue that it is irrelevant. However, the implications of the critique frequently occur at the margins of incremental impact. In other words, the critique often talks about harms that are already occurring all around us. The affirmative should stress that if the affirmative advantage is intact, the marginal increase in disadvantage beyond the present system does not merit rejection.
- **Argue that there is no alternative.** If the affirmative harm is substantial, the plan is largely solvent, and the critique has uniqueness problems, press the negative to defend what their alternative to the plan and the present system will be. If there is no alternative, then it makes uniqueness arguments against the critique that much more valuable.
- **Attack the alternative.** If the negative offers alternatives to the plan and the present system, then the affirmative can argue that the alternative is a bad idea.
- **Make the negative defend the idea of critiques.** Many members of the debate community have accepted the idea of critiquing assumptions as acceptable. However, many others do not believe that philosophical and rhetorical ideas have any place in policy debate. Make the negative explain why we should consider these kinds of arguments if the goal of debate is to train students to study policy issues like legislators and political analysts do.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE CRITIQUE

SEE CD-ROM. TRY THE CRITIQUE OF WORK IN THE EMPLOYMENT NEGATIVE SECTION, AS STUDENTS OFTEN ENJOY THIS ISSUE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK EIGHT NEGATING THE AFFIRMATIVE WITH CRITIQUES & COUNTERPLANS

DAY 4 ANALYSIS OF A CRITIQUE USED BY AN OPPOSING TEAM

EXAMINE THE SAMPLE CRITIQUE OR, BETTER YET, ONE USED BY AN OPPOSING SCHOOL.

GO THROUGH IT STEP BY STEP, HAVE STUDENTS READ EACH PART OF IT OUT LOUD, AND THEN EXPLAIN WHAT THEY THINK IT MEANS IN THEIR OWN WORDS.

DEVELOP A LIST OF ANSWERS FOR THIS CRITIQUE. WRITE THEM ON THE BOARD. TELL STUDENTS TO KEEP THIS LIST WITH THEIR DEBATE MATERIALS BECAUSE THEY MAY NEED IT IN A DEBATE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK EIGHT NEGATING THE AFFIRMATIVE WITH CRITIQUES & COUNTERPLANS

DAY 5 A SHORT DEBATE WITH A FOCUS ON A COUNTERPLAN OR A CRITIQUE.

HAVE THE DEBATE FOCUS ON EITHER A COUNTERPLAN OR A CRITIQUE. TRY AND USE AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE YOU ARE USING IN COMPETITION, BUT KEEP IT SHORT.

HAVE A VERY SIMPLE DEBATE:

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER NINE

UNIT TITLE: CROSS EXAMINATION

GOALS:

- TEACH STUDENTS THE BASIC TECHNIQUES OF ASKING QUESTIONS EFFECTIVELY IN CROSS EXAMINATION.
- TEACH STUDENTS THE BASIC TECHNIQUES OF ANSWERING QUESTIONS EFFECTIVELY IN CROSS EXAMINATION.
- ALLOW STUDENTS TO EXPERIENCE CROSS EXAMINATION SITUATIONS IN CLASS.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 10 OF 15

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 80-81.

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 10 OF 15 CROSS EXAMINATION AND DISCUSSION.

DAY 2 BAD CROSS EXAMINATION TECHNIQUES EXERCISE.

DAY 3 ANSWERING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR OWN AFFIRMATIVE EXERCISE.

DAY 4 ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF ONE OF YOUR OPPONENTS EXERCISE.

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE FEATURING EXPANDED CROSS EXAMINATION PERIODS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NINE CROSS EXAMINATION

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 10 OF 15 CROSS EXAMINATION AND DISCUSSION.

WATCH VHS TAPE 10 OF 15 CROSS EXAMINATION.

DISCUSS INFORMATION FROM THE TAPE:

- WHAT ARE THE GOALS OF CROSS EXAMINATION?
- WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO BE POLITE?
- CAN COMPETITION AND DISAGREEMENT MAKE YOU LOSE YOUR COOL?
- HOW CAN YOU PREPARE QUESTIONS FOR CROSS EXAMINATION?

ANNOUNCE DEBATERS AND FOCUS FOR FRIDAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NINE CROSS EXAMINATION

DAY 2 BAD CROSS EXAMINATION TECHNIQUES EXERCISE.

HAVE STUDENTS VOLUNTEER TO ENGAGE IN CROSS EXAMINATION IN PAIRS. ASSUME THAT THE PERSON BEING QUESTIONED HAS GIVEN THE FIRST AFFIRMATIVE SPEECH YOUR TEAM USES.

EACH PAIR OF STUDENTS SHOULD MODEL APPROPRIATE AND INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIORS (WITHIN LIMITS).

- FOR THE FIRST PAIR, HAVE THE QUESTIONER DO THINGS THE WRONG WAY AND THE ANSWERER DO THINGS THE RIGHT WAY.
- SWITCH RIGHT AND WRONG AFTER THAT.
- GIVE EACH PAIR THREE MINUTES.
- AFTER EACH PAIR HAVE THE CLASS COMMENT (AND YOU CAN COMMENT AS WELL) ON WHETHER THEY WERE REALLY DOING THINGS RIGHT OR WRONG.
- COMMENT ON WHETHER THE PERSON DOING THE "RIGHT" THINGS TOOK ADVANTAGE OF THE MISTAKES OF THE OTHER.

HAVE THE STUDENTS VOTE ON BEST PAIR ON A PIECE OF PAPER. ANNOUNCE IT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

WEEK NINE CROSS EXAMINATION

DAY 3 ANSWERING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR OWN AFFIRMATIVE EXERCISE.

ASSUME YOU ARE USING THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF YOUR OWN TEAM, SOMETHING EVERYONE IS FAMILIAR WITH.

HAVE STUDENTS VOLUNTEER TO BE CROSS EXAMINED BY THE CLASS FOR THREE QUESTIONS EACH.

TAKE QUESTIONS FROM THE CLASS FOR THE VOLUNTEER. AFTER EACH ANSWER DISCUSS WHETHER THAT WAS A GOOD ANSWER OR HOW IT COULD BE BETTER.

GET AS MANY PEOPLE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AS POSSIBLE.

AT THE END DISCUSS THE LESSONS OF THE EXERCISE:

- HOW TO ANSWER QUESTIONS MORE EFFECTIVELY
- HOW TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR CASE MORE EFFECTIVELY.

HAVE THE STUDENTS VOTE ON BEST ANSWERER ON A PIECE OF PAPER. ANNOUNCE IT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

DISTRIBUTE AN OUTLINE OF AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE RUN BY AN OPPOSING SCHOOL.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NINE CROSS EXAMINATION

DAY 4 ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF ONE OF YOUR OPPONENTS EXERCISE.

THIS CAN BE DEMANDING OF THE TEACHER BUT THE STUDENTS WILL LOVE IT.

USING THE DISTRIBUTED OUTLINE OF A CASE USED BY AN OPPOSING SCHOOL, THE TEACHER SERVES AS THE ANSWERER AND THE CLASS RAISES THEIR HANDS AND ASKS QUESTIONS AS IF THE TEACHER WAS DEFENDING THAT AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

WARNING TO TEACHER - MAKE SURE TO FOLLOW THE ANSWERING GUIDELINES.

AFTER A WHILE OF THIS, STOP AND WRITE ON THE BOARD THE BEST QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT THIS AFFIRMATIVE CASE. TELL THE STUDENTS TO KEEP THIS LIST FOR WHEN THEY DEBATE THAT CASE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NINE CROSS EXAMINATION

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE FEATURING EXPANDED CROSS EXAMINATION PERIODS.

HAVE A DEBATE WITH CONSTRUCTIVES, NO REBUTTALS, AND EXPANDED CROSS EXAMINATION.

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 5 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 5 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 5 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 5 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS WHAT WENT WELL AND WHAT DID NOT GO WELL. CONSTRUCT A LIST ON THE BOARD OF DOS AND DON'TS BASED ON THIS DEBATE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER TEN

UNIT TITLE: SPEAKING WITH POWER

GOALS:

- TEACH STUDENTS ABOUT BASIC EFFECTIVE SPEECH DELIVERY TECHNIQUES.
- ACQUAINT STUDENTS WITH THE VARIETY OF SPEAKING DRILLS AVAILABLE.
- ANALYZE STUDENT SPEAKING PATTERNS OF EACH STUDENT.
- STUDENTS WILL GIVE SHORT SPEECHES TO ILLUSTRATE THE TECHNIQUES THEY NEED TO IMPROVE.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 14 OF 15 EFFECTIVE SPEAKING.

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 65-66, 71-74.

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 14 OF 15 EFFECTIVE SPEAKING AND DISCUSSION

DAY 2 REVIEW OF SPEAKING DRILLS FOR DIFFERENT NEEDS.

DAY 3 STUDENT SPEECH SAMPLES FOR DIAGNOSIS.

DAY 4 DO DRILLS AS A CLASS AS CALLED FOR BY DIAGNOSIS.

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE WITH SPEAKING PATTERNS DESIGNED TO DEMONSTRATE IMPROVEMENT IN DIAGNOSED AREAS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TEN SPEAKING WITH POWER

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 14 OF 15 EFFECTIVE SPEAKING AND DISCUSSION

WATCH VHS TAPE 14 OF 15 EFFECTIVE SPEAKING.

FOLLOW WITH DISCUSSION:

- WHO DO YOU THINK IS A GOOD PUBLIC SPEAKER?
- DO THEY DO THE THINGS TALKED ABOUT ON THE TAPE?
- WHO IS A BAD PUBLIC SPEAKER? WHY?
- RATE YOURSELF AS A PUBLIC SPEAKER

MENTION TO THE CLASS THAT LEADERSHIP STUDIES DEMONSTRATE THAT THOSE WHO SPEAK WELL ARE MOST OFTEN IDENTIFIED AS LEADERS. YOU NEED THIS SKILL TO AVOID BEING CONSIDERED A FLUNKIE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TEN SPEAKING WITH POWER

DAY 2 REVIEW OF SPEAKING DRILLS FOR DIFFERENT NEEDS.

MAKE SURE EACH STUDENT HAS SOMETHING TO READ FROM, HOPEFULLY SOME EVIDENCE ON THE TOPIC.

REVIEW THE VARIOUS SPEAKING DRILLS FOUND ON pp. 71-74.

EXPLAIN EACH DRILL AND WHAT IT IS TRYING TO ACCOMPLISH. THEN HAVE THE STUDENTS DO THAT DRILL AS A GROUP FOR 1-2 MINUTES.

WHILE THEY ARE TALKING WALK AROUND THE CLASS AND SAY THINGS LIKE "LOUDER," "COME ON, YOU CAN DO BETTER," ETC. THEY SEEM TO LIKE THAT. BE FRIENDLY ABOUT IT.

ASKS STUDENTS WHICH ONES THEY LIKED BEST AND WHICH ONES THEY LIKED LEAST.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TEN SPEAKING WITH POWER

DAY 3 STUDENT SPEECH SAMPLES FOR DIAGNOSIS.

EACH STUDENT GIVES A ONE MINUTE SPEECH, A COMBINATION OF THEIR OWN IDEAS AND READING SOME EVIDENCE. AFTER EACH SPEECH THE TEACHER (AND OTHERS) CAN GIVE COMMENTS ON WHAT THEY NEED TO IMPROVE.

AFTER AREAS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT HAVE BEEN FOUND AND ALL STUDENTS HAVE SPOKEN, SELECT DRILLS (OR INVENT DRILLS) WHICH DEAL WITH THE AREAS THAT NEED TO BE IMPROVED.

THEN, HAVE THE TEACHER GIVE A ONE MINUTE SPEECH AND THE STUDENTS CAN GIVE SUGGESTIONS FOR HER/HIM.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TEN SPEAKING WITH POWER

DAY 4 DO DRILLS AS A CLASS AS CALLED FOR BY DIAGNOSIS.

IDENTIFY WHICH STUDENTS NEED TO DO WHICH DRILLS.

HAVE A SIMILAR GROUP DO THEIR DRILL (OR COMBINATION OF DRILLS) ALL AT ONCE FOR 4-5 MINUTES WHILE THE OTHER STUDENTS WATCH AND LISTEN. AFTER EACH GROUP SPEAKS HAVE OBSERVING STUDENTS GIVE COMMENTS. MAKE SURE TO GIVE SOME POSITIVE COMMENTS WHEN NEEDED.

WITH ANY EXTRA TIME AVAILABLE HAVE STUDENTS DO SOME GENERAL CLARITY DRILLS.

EXPLAIN THAT JUST LIKE IN SPORTS TRAINING REPETITION AND PRACTICE IS ESSENTIAL -- SPEAKING IS A SKILL.

As Cecilia Graves says, speaking drills are like preparing for a marathon -- you don't just practice once or twice and then run a marathon. You have to train every day, even after you won a marathon, because there is always another race to run, another opponent to defeat.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TEN SPEAKING WITH POWER

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE WITH SPEAKING PATTERNS DESIGNED TO DEMONSTRATE IMPROVEMENT IN DIAGNOSED AREAS.

HAVE EACH STUDENT IDENTIFY FOR THE CLASS THE DELIVERY AREAS THEY ARE WORKING ON. THEN, HAVE A DEBATE AND ENCOURAGE EACH SPEAKER TO IMPROVE IN THEIR AREAS.

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE ESPECIALLY DELIVERY.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER (BASED ON ARGUMENTS, NOT DELIVERY) ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER ELEVEN

UNIT TITLE: ANALYSIS OF YOUR OPPONENTS

GOALS:

- ANALYZE AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF OPPOSING SCHOOL.
- ANALYZE DISADVANTAGE OF OPPOSING SCHOOL.
- STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES AGAINST ANALYZED POSITIONS.

RESOURCES:

CODE OF THE DEBATER p. 97

DAY 1 REVIEW AND ANALYZE AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF OPPOSING SCHOOL.

DAY 2 STUDENTS GIVE SPEECHES AGAINST THE ANALYZED AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

DAY 3 REVIEW AND ANALYZE A DISADVANTAGE USED BY OPPOSING SCHOOL.

DAY 4 STUDENTS GIVE SPEECHES AGAINST THE ANALYZED DISADVANTAGE.

DAY FIVE SHORT DEBATE FEATURING THE DISADVANTAGE ANALYZED.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ELEVEN ANALYSIS OF YOUR OPPONENTS

DAY 1 REVIEW AND ANALYZE AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF OPPOSING SCHOOL.

SUPPLY STUDENTS WITH A COPY OR OUTLINE OF AN AFFIRMATIVE CASE USED BY AN OPPOSING SCHOOL.

HAVE STUDENTS READ EACH SECTION. HAVE THAT STUDENT THEN EXPLAIN WHAT THAT SECTION MEANS IN THEIR OWN WORDS.

AFTER EACH SECTION HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT WEAKNESSES AND POSSIBLE ARGUMENTS.

AFTER THE CASE IS FINISHED, CONSTRUCT A LIST OF ARGUMENTS WHICH CAN BE USED AGAINST THAT CASE.

ASSIGN STUDENTS DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CASE (SIGNIFICANCE, SOLVENCY, DISADVANTAGE AGAINST IT, CRITIQUE AGAINST IT, TOPICALITY AGAINST IT, COUNTERPLAN AGAINST IT, ETC,) TO SPEAK ABOUT ON THE FOLLOWING DAY.

ANNOUNCE DEBATERS AND FOCUS FOR DEBATE ON FRIDAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ELEVEN ANALYSIS OF YOUR OPPONENTS

DAY 2 STUDENTS GIVE SPEECHES AGAINST THE ANALYZED AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

HAVE STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES AGAINST THEIR ASSIGNED PORTION OF THAT CASE. ENCOURAGE THEM TO USE EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS.

CRITIQUE ORGANIZATION, DELIVERY, AND ARGUMENT AFTER EACH ONE. ALWAYS SAY SOMETHING POSITIVE.

HAVE ALL OTHER STUDENTS FLOW THE SPEECHES AND KEEP THOSE NOTES, BECAUSE IN ALL PROBABILITY THEY WILL BE DEBATING THIS CASE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ELEVEN ANALYSIS OF YOUR OPPONENTS

DAY 3 REVIEW AND ANALYZE A DISADVANTAGE USED BY OPPOSING SCHOOL.

SUPPLY STUDENTS WITH A COPY OR OUTLINE OF A DISADVANTAGE USED BY AN OPPOSING SCHOOL AGAINST YOU.

HAVE STUDENTS READ EACH SECTION. HAVE THAT STUDENT THEN EXPLAIN WHAT THAT SECTION MEANS IN THEIR OWN WORDS.

HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT WEAKNESSES AND POSSIBLE ARGUMENTS.

CONSTRUCT A LIST OF ARGUMENTS WHICH CAN BE USED AGAINST THAT DISADVANTAGE.

ASSIGN STUDENTS TO DELIVER ANSWERS TO THIS DISADVANTAGE ON THE FOLLOWING DAY.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ELEVEN ANALYSIS OF YOUR OPPONENTS

DAY 4 STUDENTS GIVE SPEECHES AGAINST THE ANALYZED DISADVANTAGE.

HAVE EACH STUDENT GIVE A SHORT SPEECH (LESS THAN THREE MINUTES) ANSWERING THE DISADVANTAGE.

KEEP A LIST OF ANSWERS ON THE BOARD, ADD NEW ONES AS THEY COME UP. HAVE STUDENTS COPY THIS LIST OF ANSWERS DOWN, AS THEY WILL IN ALL PROBABILITY BE FACING THIS DISADVANTAGE.

DISCUSS WITH THE CLASS WHICH ARE THE BEST ANSWERS AND HOW TO PHRASE THEM. HAVE STUDENTS SHARE EVIDENCE THEY HAVE FOUND TO ANSWER THAT ARGUMENT.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK ELEVEN ANALYSIS OF YOUR OPPONENTS

DAY FIVE SHORT DEBATE FEATURING THE DISADVANTAGE ANALYZED.

HAVE A DEBATE WHICH FOCUSES ON THE DISADVANTAGE YOU HAVE ANALYZED.

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE ESPECIALLY THE DISADVANTAGE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER TWELVE

UNIT TITLE: BUILDING MAJOR ARGUMENTS

GOALS:

- TEACH STUDENTS BASIC ORGANIZATIONAL TECHNIQUES FOR CONSTRUCTING ARGUMENTS.
- GIVE STUDENTS EXPERIENCE IN ORGANIZING A TOPICALITY ARGUMENT.
- GIVE STUDENTS EXPERIENCE IN ORGANIZING A DISADVANTAGE.
- GIVE STUDENTS EXPERIENCE IN ORGANIZING A CRITIQUE.

RESOURCES:

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 95-96, 126.

DAY 1 REVIEW OF BASIC ORGANIZATIONAL TECHNIQUES AND ARGUMENT COMPONENTS FOR TOPICALITY, DISADVANTAGE, AND CRITIQUE.

DAY 2 STUDENTS BUILD TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS OUT OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

DAY 3 STUDENTS BUILD A DISADVANTAGE OUT OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

DAY 4 STUDENTS BUILD A CRITIQUE OUT OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TWELVE BUILDING MAJOR ARGUMENTS

DAY 1 REVIEW OF BASIC ORGANIZATIONAL TECHNIQUES AND ARGUMENT COMPONENTS FOR TOPICALITY, DISADVANTAGE, AND CRITIQUE.

DO NOT FEAR REPETITION -- IT IS GOOD AND LEADS TO LEARNING AND RETENTION.

DISTRIBUTE ORGANIZATION CHECKLIST

REVIEW BASIC ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES FOUND IN THE TEXT.

REVIEW THE COMPONENTS OF: TOPICALITY, DISADVANTAGE, AND CRITIQUE ARGUMENTS.

DISTRIBUTE SAMPLE EVIDENCE FOR TOPICALITY.

ANNOUNCE DEBATERS AND FOCUS FOR FRIDAY DEBATE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

ORGANIZATION

Excellent ideas can be sabotaged by poor organization. Likewise, average ideas can be enhanced and successful if properly organized.

One of the most important goals a debater has is to be able to present material in a way that makes logical sense, relates ideas to each other in meaningful ways, and allows the judge to connect your responses to the arguments they are answering. Unless your ideas work together well and unless the judge writes your answers to the opposition's arguments down next to the arguments they apply to, victory will be difficult.

LEARN TO BUILD AN OUTLINE

When you build arguments and advocacy positions in a debate it is important to remember basic outlining techniques. MAJOR POINTS: Divide your ideas up under major headings. These major headings might represent major argumentative burdens such as stock issues. Make sure that the major points are distinct from one another. If an idea is unavoidable and vital in coming to the conclusion you want, it should be included as a major point. Put major points in the proper chronological order: causes before effects, background before conclusions, etc. The statement of the major point should be something which all of the points arrayed under it are relevant to.

SUBORDINATION: Within each major point you can array all of the specific points which support the major idea. Some of these will naturally group together into further subgroups. This sorting of ideas is critical to debate success and to becoming a critical thinker. Ideas can be sorted by: distinct idea or concept, general or specific nature, different steps in a logical process, etc.

NOTATION: Outlines (and debate arguments) have letter and number alternations so that one level of substructure can be differentiated from another. Major points are often expressed with roman numerals (I, II, III, IV, etc.), subtopics of major points are letters (A, B, C, D, etc.), and particulars about subtopics are numbers (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.). It takes two particular ideas to begin a subdivision of any point, or else the single subdivision would be the more general point. You need a B to justify an A, and a 2 to justify a 1.

- I. Major point that you are making
 - A. Subtopic in support of I.
 - B. Another subtopic in support of I.
 - 1. Specific point about B.
 - 2. Another specific point about B.
- II. Another major point you are making.
 - A. Subtopic in support of II.
 - B. Another subtopic in support of II.

STRUCTURE BEYOND THE OUTLINE

In critiquing arguments by others, or in applying certain issues to positions taken by the other team, it is essential to organize smaller groups of arguments. For example, if the affirmative case has stated that X is harmful, the negative will need to organize responses to this concept. Here are two distinct ways to organize such response.

LIST OF REASONS -- USE NUMBERS: Often debaters will provide a list of independent reasons why something is or is not true. If the affirmative claims that X is harmful, the negative could come up with 1, 2, 3, and 4 independent arguments why this is not true. Each of these would be a separate idea, not a repeat of a previous idea. Thus, opponents would have to answer each of these separately.

CHAIN OF REASONING - USE LETTERS: Often arguments are more complex than one idea, and involve several steps. These can be thought of as chains of reasoning. Thus, a debater would say that A is true, and B is true, and therefore this leads to conclusion C. Like any chain, it is only as strong as its weakest link. Thus, opponents would only have to break the chain at one point.

WHY DO THIS: It is very important to be able to tell the difference between a situation where arguments in a list are independent and where there is a chain of reasoning. If you organize arguments this way you will always be able to tell the difference easily.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE FOR TOPICALITY

SEE TOPICALITY SECTION IN THE CD-ROM FOR DEFINITIONS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TWELVE BUILDING MAJOR ARGUMENTS

DAY 2 STUDENTS BUILD TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS OUT OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

REVIEW COMPONENTS OF A TOPICALITY ARGUMENT.

HAVE STUDENTS TAKE THE SAMPLE TOPICALITY EVIDENCE AND BUILD THEIR OWN TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS. REMIND THEM TO BE COMPLETE BUT KEEP IT SHORT.

HAVE STUDENTS READ THEM TO THE CLASS ONE BY ONE. COMMENT ON THEM AS THEY READ THEM.

SUGGEST CHANGES:

- WORDING
- WHICH DEFINITIONS ARE USED
- HOW RHETORICAL COMPONENTS LIKE REASONS TO PREFER AND VOTING ISSUE ARE HANDLED.

DISTRIBUTE SAMPLE EVIDENCE FOR DISADVANTAGE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE FOR DISADVANTAGE

TAKE EVIDENCE FROM A DISADVANTAGE ON THE CD-ROM

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TWELVE BUILDING MAJOR ARGUMENTS

DAY 3 STUDENTS BUILD A DISADVANTAGE OUT OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

REVIEW COMPONENTS OF A DISADVANTAGE.

HAVE STUDENTS TAKE THE SAMPLE DISADVANTAGE EVIDENCE AND BUILD THEIR OWN DISADVANTAGE. REMIND THEM TO BE COMPLETE BUT KEEP IT SHORT.

HAVE STUDENTS READ THEM TO THE CLASS ONE BY ONE. COMMENT ON THEM AS THEY READ THEM.

SUGGEST CHANGES:

- WORDING
- WHICH EVIDENCE IS USED
- HOW ALL NEEDED COMPONENTS ARE REPRESENTED.

DISTRIBUTE SAMPLE EVIDENCE FOR CRITIQUE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

SAMPLE EVIDENCE FOR CRITIQUE

SEE EVIDENCE FROM WORK CRITIQUE ON CD-ROM, IN
EMPLOYMENT NEGATIVE SECTION.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TWELVE BUILDING MAJOR ARGUMENTS

DAY 4 STUDENTS BUILD A CRITIQUE OUT OF SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

REVIEW COMPONENTS OF A CRITIQUE.

HAVE STUDENTS TAKE THE SAMPLE CRITIQUE EVIDENCE AND BUILD THEIR OWN CRITIQUE. REMIND THEM TO BE COMPLETE BUT KEEP IT SHORT.

HAVE STUDENTS READ THEM TO THE CLASS ONE BY ONE. COMMENT ON THEM AS THEY READ THEM.

SUGGEST CHANGES:

- WORDING
- WHICH EVIDENCE IS USED
- HOW ALL NEEDED COMPONENTS ARE REPRESENTED.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK TWELVE BUILDING MAJOR ARGUMENTS

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE

HAVE A DEBATE WHICH ON AT LEAST ONE OF THE ARGUMENTS BUILT THIS WEEK

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE ESPECIALLY THE TARGET ARGUMENT.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER THIRTEEN

UNIT TITLE: DEBATING TOPICALITY

GOALS:

- TEACH STUDENTS THE BASIC COMPONENTS OF A TOPICALITY ARGUMENT.
- TEACH STUDENTS THE BASIC TECHNIQUES OF ANSWERING A TOPICALITY ARGUMENT.
- ANALYSIS OF TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS AS APPLIED TO THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE USED BY STUDENTS.
- ANALYSIS OF TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS AS APPLIED TO THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF AN OPPOSING SCHOOL.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 6 OF 15 TOPICALITY
CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 42-46

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 6 OF 15 TOPICALITY WITH DISCUSSION

DAY 2 STUDENTS BUILD TOPICALITY ARGUMENT AGAINST AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF AN OPPOSING SCHOOL USING SAMPLE EVIDENCE.

DAY 3 STUDENTS ANALYZE ALL OF THE TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS POSSIBLE AGAINST THEIR AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

DAY 4 STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES ANSWERING TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS AGAINST THEIR AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE FEATURING TOPICALITY ARGUMENTATION.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THIRTEEN DEBATING TOPICALITY

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 6 OF 15 TOPICALITY WITH DISCUSSION

WATCH VHS TAPE 6 OF 15 ON TOPICALITY (30 MINUTES)

HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT TOPICALITY, INCLUDING:

- HAVE YOU EVER CHANGED THE DEFINITION OF A WORD TO TRY AND GET OUT OF SOMETHING? (I WASN'T SLEEPING, I WAS JUST RESTING MY EYES.)
- IDENTIFY AREAS WHERE DEFINITIONS ARE REALLY IMPORTANT - CONTRACTS, LAW ENFORCEMENT, ETC.
- DO WORDS HAVE ONE MEANING OR MANY MEANINGS?
- WHO DECIDES WHAT WORDS MEAN?

DISTRIBUTE PLAN OF OPPOSING TEAM WHICH SEEMS TO HAVE TOPICALITY PROBLEMS.

ANNOUNCE DEBATERS AND FOCUS OF DEBATE FOR FRIDAY

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THIRTEEN DEBATING TOPICALITY

DAY 2 STUDENTS BUILD TOPICALITY ARGUMENT AGAINST AFFIRMATIVE CASE OF AN OPPOSING SCHOOL USING SAMPLE EVIDENCE

REVIEW TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS - COMPONENTS AND IDEAS.

HAVE SOME DICTIONARIES HANDY.

HAVE SOMEONE READ THE PLAN OF THE OPPOSING TEAM.

GO THROUGH THE RESOLUTION WORD FOR WORD AND SEE IF YOU CAN IDENTIFY WORDS OR PHRASES THIS PLAN DOES NOT MEET.

PICK THE BEST VIOLATION WRITE IT TOGETHER.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THIRTEEN DEBATING TOPICALITY

DAY 3 STUDENTS ANALYZE ALL OF THE TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS POSSIBLE AGAINST THEIR AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

DISTRIBUTE A COPY OF THE PLAN USED BY YOUR SCHOOL.

DISTRIBUTE LIST OF AFFIRMATIVE DEFINITIONS OF IMPORTANT TERMS.

GO THROUGH THE RESOLUTION WORD FOR WORD AND SEE IF YOU CAN IDENTIFY WORDS OR PHRASES THIS PLAN DOES NOT MEET.

MAKE A LIST OF ALL THE IMPORTANT WORDS AND HOW YOU PLAN MEETS THOSE WORDS. FIND A DEFINITION WHICH WORKS WITH YOUR ARGUMENT.

DISTRIBUTE LIST OF AFFIRMATIVE TOPICALITY ANSWERS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

Affirmative Topicality Tips

1. Write your plan with an eye to topicality. When you write your affirmative case, you make a series of strategic decisions. Most of these revolve around solving the problem your case identifies. Usually, you try to find the policy that solves the problem the best. Similarly, you should look for a policy that seems to be a clear example of the resolution. Does the plan sound like it takes the kind of action required by the resolution? Write the plan using as many of the words in the resolution as possible.

2. Research the words of the resolution. The negative will research various definitions of the important words in the resolution. The affirmative should do the same thing. Look for definitions that clearly include the kind of action taken by the plan. Failing that, look for the broadest possible definitions.

3. Research "contextual" evidence. Most people believe the function of topicality is to provide a reasonable limit on the number of cases the affirmative can run. If you can find evidence that talks about your policy and the words of the resolution in the same sentence or paragraph, you can read that evidence against topicality violations to make your case sound reasonable.

4. Remember: Advantages don't make you topical. Topicality focuses on what the PLAN does. The fact that your advantages talk about the same things as the resolution is largely irrelevant. Make sure your PLAN is topical.

5. Prepare your topicality answers ahead of time. Anticipate the kinds of topicality arguments the negative is likely to run against you and write out answers and counter-definitions before the tournament.

Common Answers to Topicality

1. Counter-definitions. The negative will read a definition of one of the words in the

resolution that makes your plan sound non-topical. It is your job to answer that definition with a "counter-definition": a different definition of the same word that makes your plan sound topical. Once you read a counter-definition, make sure to make additional arguments about why your definition is better than the negative definition.

2. Contextual evidence. Reading evidence from the topic literature that links your plan with the words of the resolution can help make your plan sound reasonable.

3. The "We Meet" answer. Read the negative's definition. Most of the time it isn't as exclusive as they say it is. Try to think of reasons your plan actually "meets" their definition. In other words, think of reasons why the negative's definition actually describes the plan, instead of excluding it.

4. Things that check abuse. Negatives will try to argue that the plan is abusive; they will say that, if the judge allows the plan to be topical, hundreds of other plans will also become topical. This is "abusive" because it puts too much of a burden on the negative to research those hundreds of new plans. The affirmative often argues that other things "check" or prevent this abuse:

A) Literature checks. The affirmative should argue that their plan is reasonable because it is based on evidence found in the topic literature. In other words, the affirmative argues that the judge should not worry too much about topicality because the affirmative case generally concerns itself with the same issues as the resolution.

B) Other words check. The resolution is composed of many different words. The affirmative often argues that, since the plan has to be an example of ALL the different words in the resolution, then violating a single word is not such a big deal. If the plan meets all the words in the resolution except one, for example, then it is still talking about the same general things as the resolution.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

C) Solvency checks. The affirmative has to prove that its plan solves the problem identified by the case. On topicality, the affirmative often argues that its definitions could not really add hundreds of new plans to the topic because most of those new plans would not solve any significant problem.

5. Counter-standards. The negative assumes that The judge must use certain standards to decide the issue of topicality. The affirmative should think of its own standards. The most common affirmative counter-standard is "reasonability," also known as "debatability." The affirmative argues that, as long as the plan is reasonable, the judge should ignore topicality. The affirmative must provide reasons why its plan is reasonable. These reasons might include things like "if the negative has evidence against the case-if the negative can fairly DEBATE the case-then the plan is reasonably topical. The bottom line of reasonability is that it urges the judge not to choose between' two competing definitions. Instead The judge is urged to decide whether or not the plan unfairly harms the negative in the round.

6. Reasons why topicality is NOT a voting issue. Most debater are taught that topicality is an absolute voting issue, which

means that the negative can win the entire round just by winning topicality. Not everyone agrees that this is true, however. Here are some common reasons affirmatives give why the judge should not consider topicality:

A) Language is indeterminate. Is there such thing as "the best" definition? Ultimately, the words we use to describe things are not precise. Using an earlier example, what is "a reasonable hour" for a teenager to get home at night? There is no precise answer to this question. Because language is imprecise (or "indeterminate"), many affirmatives argue that it is unfair to base a decision in a round on competing definitions. Besides, meaning is not found in words but in people.

B) Topicality silences important voices. In many cases, important ideas are not heard by policy-makers because they come from people who have unpopular opinions. Policy-makers avoid listening to these important ideas by using obscure rules and procedures. Some affirmatives argue that topicality is just another meaningless procedure which prevents important ideas from being debated. Evidence describing the importance of the plan is helpful in making this claim.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

AFFIRMATIVE DEFINITIONS OF IMPORTANT TERMS

SEE TOPIC DEFINITIONS ON CD-ROM.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THIRTEEN DEBATING TOPICALITY

DAY 4 STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES ANSWERING TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS AGAINST THEIR AFFIRMATIVE CASE.

ASSIGN WORDS IN THE RESOLUTION TO STUDENTS, HAVE THEM PREPARE TO ANSWER A TOPICALITY VIOLATION ON THAT WORD.

GO WORD BY WORD AND HAVE STUDENTS GIVE A ONE MINUTE ANSWER TO A TOPICALITY VIOLATION ON THAT WORD.

MAKE COMMENTS:

- MAKE SURE THEY ARE USING AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFINITION.
- MAKE SURE THEY ARE ARGUING THAT THE NEGATIVE DEFINITION IS BAD.
- MAKE SURE THEY ARE PROVING THAT THEY MEET EVEN THE NEGATIVE'S BAD DEFINITION.
- MAKE SURE THEY ARE GIVING REASONS WHY THE AFFIRMATIVE INTERPRETATION IS BEST.

KEEP A LIST ON THE BOARD OF THE BEST ANSWERS AND HAVE STUDENTS COPY THEM DOWN -- THESE ARE ANSWERS TO TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS WHICH CAN BE MADE AGAINST THEIR CASE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK THIRTEEN DEBATING TOPICALITY

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE FEATURING TOPICALITY ARGUMENTATION.

HAVE A DEBATE WHICH FOCUSES ON TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS. THE NEGATIVE MIGHT PRESENT SEVERAL OF THEM.

1AC = 3 MINUTES
CX = 2 MINUTES
1NC = 3 MINUTES
CX = 2 MINUTES
2AC = 3 MINUTES
CX = 2 MINUTES
2NC = 3 MINUTES
CX = 2 MINUTES
1NR = 2 MINUTES
1AR = 2 MINUTES
2NR = 2 MINUTES
2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE ESPECIALLY THE TARGET ARGUMENT.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER FOURTEEN

UNIT TITLE: DECIDING WHO WINS

GOALS:

- TEACH STUDENTS ABOUT BASIC DECISION FORMULAS APPLICABLE TO REAL LIFE SITUATIONS.
- TEACH STUDENTS ABOUT BASIC DECISION FORMULAS APPLICABLE TO ACADEMIC DEBATE.
- HAVE STUDENTS RENDER DECISIONS ON A SAMPLE DEBATE.

RESOURCES:

VHS TAPE 11 OF 15 DECISION MAKING.

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 57-60, 106-107.

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 11 OF 15 DECISION MAKING WITH DISCUSSION.

DAY 2 REVIEW OF DECISION MODELS FROM THE TEXT.

DAY 3 ANALYSIS OF DEBATE DECISION SITUATIONS.

DAY 4 STUDENTS WATCH, FLOW, AND JUDGE SAMPLE MINI-DEBATE.

DAY 5 STUDENTS EXPLAIN THEIR DECISIONS FROM SAMPLE MINI-DEBATE AND ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOURTEEN DECIDING WHO WINS

DAY 1 VHS TAPE 11 OF 15 DECISION MAKING WITH DISCUSSION.

WATCH VHS TAPE 11 OF 15 DECISION MAKING

DISCUSSION:

- ARE ELEMENTS OTHER THAN THE ARGUMENTS IMPORTANT IN THE DECISION?
- WHAT ROLE DOES BIAS OR PREVIOUS BELIEVE PLAY IN THE DECISION?
- IS IT POSSIBLE FOR PEOPLE TO BE TOTALLY OBJECTIVE?
- HOW DOES COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS WORK IN EVERYDAY LIFE?

DISTRIBUTE COPIES OF TUNA'S EQUATION AND AUNT BLUEBELL'S SCALES.

NO DEBATE THIS WEEK!

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

TUNA'S EQUATION

S = AFF SIGNIFICANCE ESTABLISHED

I = DEGREE TO WHICH STATUS QUO CANNOT SOLVE

V = AFF SOLVENCY ESTABLISHED

D = RISK OF DISADVANTAGE UNIQUE TO AFF

CCP = COMPETITIVE COUNTERPLAN ADVANTAGE

$$[S(I)V] > D = \text{AFF}$$

$$[S(I)V] < D = \text{NEG}$$

$$[S(I)V] > D + \text{CCP} = \text{AFF}$$

$$[S(I)V] < D + \text{CCP} = \text{NEG}$$

If S = 10,000 lives, I = .8, V = .5 & D = 5,000 lives, who wins?

AUNT BLUEBELL'S SCALES

Rounded rectangles represent policy position advocated.

Sharp rectangles represent impact established.

Circles represent arguments modifying impacts.

A+ = added to affirmative, A- = subtracted from affirmative

N+ = added to negative, N- = subtracted from negative

SEE PAGE IN CODE OF THE DEBATER.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOURTEEN DECIDING WHO WINS

DAY 2 REVIEW OF DECISION MODELS FROM THE TEXT.

REVIEW AND DISCUS TUNA'S EQUATION.

- ILLUSTRATE COMPARISON OF ADVANTAGE TO DISADVANTAGE.
- CHANGE NUMBER VARIABLES AND SEE HOW THE DECISION CHANGES.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS AUNT BLUEBELL'S SCALES

- NOTICE THE NEED FOR OFFENSIVE (+) ARGUMENTS AS WELL AS DEFENSIVE (-) ARGUMENTS.
- NOTICE THE ROLE OF THE POLICY SYSTEM OF THE NEGATIVE, AS STATUS QUO OR COUNTERPLAN.
- INSERT VARIABLES AND SAMPLE ARGUMENTS AND SEE HOW THE DECISION GOES.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOURTEEN DECIDING WHO WINS

DAY 3 ANALYSIS OF DEBATE DECISION SITUATIONS.

FOR THE CLASS, MAP OUT SEVERAL DIFFICULT DEBATE SCENARIOS AND ASK THEM HOW THEY WOULD VOTE.

(UNDER DEVELOPMENT)

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOURTEEN DECIDING WHO WINS

DAY 4 STUDENTS WATCH, FLOW, AND JUDGE SAMPLE MINI-DEBATE.

WATCH THE SAMPLE MINI-DEBATE. HAVE ALL THE STUDENTS FLOW IT AND THEN WRITE A BALLOT EXPLAINING WHY THEY VOTED FOR ONE TEAM OR THE OTHER. THE BALLOT WILL BE USED IN THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FOURTEEN DECIDING WHO WINS

DAY 5 STUDENTS EXPLAIN THEIR DECISIONS FROM SAMPLE MINI-DEBATE AND ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM CLASS.

CALL ON STUDENTS TO READ THEIR BALLOT ONE BY ONE. HAVE OTHER STUDENTS AS QUESTIONS OF THE JUDGE.

TALLY UP THE FINAL DECISION.

SEE IF THE DECISION IS DIFFERENT THAN IT WAS IN WEEK TWO.

HAVE THE STUDENTS SELECT THE JUDGE WITH THE BEST BALLOT.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER FIFTEEN

UNIT TITLE: DEVELOPING A STRATEGY

GOALS:

- LEARN THE BASIC CONCEPTS OF NEGATIVE STRATEGY.
- LEARN THE BASIC CONCEPTS OF AFFIRMATIVE STRATEGY.
- LEARN THE BASIC CONCEPTS OF REBUTTAL STRATEGY.
- ANALYZE AN OPPOSING AFFIRMATIVE CASE AND DEVELOP A STRATEGY AGAINST IT.
- DEVELOP ARGUMENT “PACKAGES” WHICH WORK TOGETHER.

RESOURCES:

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 79, 98-99, 108, 109-111

DAY 1 HOW TO DEBATE AS A TEAM AND WORK TOGETHER

DAY 2 DISCUSS REBUTTAL STRATEGIES FOR AFFIRMATIVE AND NEGATIVE.

DAY 3 REVIEW SPECIFIC NEEDS FOR DIFFERENT REBUTTALS

DAY 4 DEVELOP ARGUMENT PACKAGES FROM AVAILABLE NEGATIVE POSITIONS.

DAY 5 STUDENTS PRESENT STRATEGIES AGAINST VARIOUS SORTS OF CASES.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIFTEEN DEVELOPING A STRATEGY

DAY 1 HOW TO DEBATE AS A TEAM AND WORK TOGETHER

DISTRIBUTE DEBATING AS A TEAM HAND OUT

GO THROUGH THE DEBATING AS A TEAM CHECKLIST AND COMMENT ON THEM. ASK WHO HAS DONE ANY OF THESE.

GIVE TEAMS CLASS TIME TO WORK TOGETHER ON SOME OF THESE ISSUES.

ANNOUNCE DEBATE FOR THIS WEEK.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

DEBATING AS A TEAM

You don't debate by yourself, you debate as a team. Good teamwork prepares you to succeed in debate and to succeed in life. Here is some simple advice on how you and your partner should prepare to debate together.

PARTNERSHIPS:

- Decide on Speaker positions. Don't be afraid to share the 2's, making one person the expert on the negative and the other expert on the affirmative.
- Make agreements between yourselves:
 - How much work you want to do on debate. How committed are you?
 - Which tournaments will you attend together?
 - Division of labor -- who is going to do what? Negotiable as you go along.
 - Schedule time to work together on arguments and files.
- Get what you need: folders, tubs, expandos. At least folders and a box AND A STOPWATCH.

AFFIRMATIVE:

- Prep the 1AC. Insert rhetoric, time it, cut and rearrange. Make it yours.
- Prep topicality responses and answers to the disads you would run against your case.
- File all of the evidence. Try to know where stuff is. Have an index to use.
- Make sure you have answers to all of our negative arguments filed separately. Often when you receive evidence from institutes, handbooks, etc. the answers to the negative arguments will also be included. Pull these answers out and put them with your affirmative materials.

NEGATIVE:

- Make sure you have the arguments which are available to you. Compare with other teams, trade, cooperate, and try to increase the number of different negative approaches you have.
- Have a separate section for all of your shells. Make them easy to get and use.
- Folderize or expandoize all of the extensions for the negative arguments. Find the best 8-10 pieces of evidence to extend each of your major negative arguments. Create folders for negative arguments you have against different cases. Often when you receive evidence from institutes, handbooks, etc. the negative answers to the affirmative cases you are not using will also be included. Pull these answers and put them in your negative materials, each in a folder with the case name on it.
- Make a separate topicality file for the negative.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIFTEEN DEVELOPING A STRATEGY

DAY 2 DISCUSS REBUTTAL STRATEGIES FOR AFFIRMATIVE
AND NEGATIVE.

DISTRIBUTE REBUTTAL STRATEGY SHEET.

DISCUSS REBUTTAL STRATEGY SHEET.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

REBUTTALS

Most debaters, coaches, and judges would agree that rebuttals are the most difficult and yet the most important parts of the debate. Not only is there less time within each speech, but each debater has to sort through all of the issues to determine which ones are the most important ones! What a debater does or does not do in rebuttals will decide who wins the debate. Very few debaters (especially beginners) can hope to extend everything that happened in the constructive speeches. Debaters don't have to do that and just because a team may have dropped a point or an argument is not an automatic reason to vote against that team. What matters is the type of argument that is extended or dropped in rebuttals-this will determine the winner of the round.

Think about these four issues when rebuttals happen:

1. Which arguments have more weight at the end of the round?
2. Which outcomes (disads, counterplans) are more likely given lots of internal links?
3. What about time frame-what happens first?
4. What about the quality of evidence?

Here are some other helpful hints:

1. Avoid repetition. Don't just repeat your constructive arguments. Beat the other team's arguments and tell the judge why your arguments are better.
2. Avoid passing ships. Don't avoid what the other team said. You must clash directly with their responses.
3. Avoid reading evidence only. You must be explaining and telling the judge why these issues win the debate.
4. Avoid rereading evidence that has already been read in constructives. You can make reference to it by referring to it, but don't re-read it.
5. Avoid "lumping and dumping." Don't try to go for everything. You can't make 12 responses to each argument in a few minutes.
 - Be organized. Don't jump from issue to issue at random. Be specific and logical about winning issues.
 - Don't be a blabbering motormouth. Speak quickly but not beyond your ability. If you speak too fast, you will stumble and not get through as much.
 - Don't whine to the judge about fairness or what the other team might have done that you think is unethical. Make responses and beat them.
9. Don't make new arguments. You can read new evidence but you can't run new disadvantages or topicality responses. You are limiting to extending the positions laid out in the constructive speeches.
10. Use signposting . Make sure the judge knows where you are on the flowsheet. This is not the time to lose the judge on the flow.
11. Use issue packages. Organize your arguments into issue packages. Choose arguments which you want to win. Don't go for everything. Extend those arguments that you need to win.
12. Cross-apply arguments. If you dropped an argument in a prior speech that you think was important don't act like your losing. Cross-apply arguments you made somewhere else in the debate to answer it.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIFTEEN DEVELOPING A STRATEGY

DAY 3 REVIEW SPECIFIC NEEDS FOR DIFFERENT REBUTTALS

SEPARATE CLASS INTO FOUR GROUPS BASED ON THEIR REBUTTAL POSITIONS.

SUPPLY EACH GROUP WITH THE SUGGESTION SHEET FOR THEIR REBUTTAL POSITION. HAVE THEM REVIEW AND DISCUSS THESE ITEMS PLUS THEIR PERSONAL EXPERIENCES.

1NR p. 84 (ALSO ON 2NC INSTRUCTION)

1AR p. 85

2NR p. 57

2AR p. 60

AFTER ABOUT 30 MINUTES HAVE EACH GROUP PRESENT A LIST OF THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS TO REMEMBER ABOUT THAT REBUTTAL

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIFTEEN DEVELOPING A STRATEGY

DAY 4 DEVELOP ARGUMENT PACKAGES FROM AVAILABLE NEGATIVE POSITIONS.

COMPILE A LIST OF NEGATIVE POSITIONS AND MAJOR ARGUMENTS WHICH YOUR SCHOOL HAS.

GO THROUGH THE LIST AND CROSS CHECK IT TO SEE WHICH POSITIONS CONTRADICT.

CREATE A FINAL LIST WHICH EXPLAINS WHAT ARGUMENTS AND POSITIONS CAN BE USED WITH WHAT OTHER POSITIONS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK FIFTEEN DEVELOPING A STRATEGY

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK NUMBER SIXTEEN

UNIT TITLE: JUDGE AND AUDIENCE ADAPTATION

GOALS:

- TEACH STUDENTS ABOUT VARIETIES OF JUDGES AND AUDIENCES.
- TEACH STUDENTS ABOUT HOW TO ADAPT TO DIFFERENT TYPES OF JUDGES AND AUDIENCES.
- STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES TO DIFFERENT TYPES OF JUDGES AND AUDIENCES.
- FOCUS ON ADAPTING TO A GENERAL PUBLIC AUDIENCE.

RESOURCES:

CODE OF THE DEBATER pp. 100-102, 104.

DAY 1 DISCUSSION OF DIFFERENT JUDGE AND AUDIENCE TYPES.

DAY 2 DISCUSSION OF HOW TO ADAPT TO DIFFERENT JUDGE AND AUDIENCE TYPES.

DAY 3 STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES TO ONE JUDGE-AUDIENCE TYPE.

DAY 4 STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES TO ANOTHER JUDGE-AUDIENCE TYPE.

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE AIMED AT GENERAL PUBLIC AUDIENCE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SIXTEEN JUDGE AND AUDIENCE ADAPTATION

DAY 1 DISCUSSION OF DIFFERENT JUDGE AND AUDIENCE TYPES.

DISTRIBUTE JUDGE TYPE SHEET

DISCUSS THE THREE TYPES OF JUDGES.

HAVE STUDENTS IDENTIFY JUDGES THEY HAVE HAD WHO WOULD FIT INTO THESE CATEGORIES.

ANNOUNCE DEBATERS AND FOCUS FOR FRIDAY DEBATE.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

ADAPTING TO JUDGES AND AUDIENCES

The essence of audience analysis involves making judgments about the audience and then trying to understand them. See your message as they would see it, not as you perceive it. Evaluate your ideas and strategies based on their perspective, not yours.

ALWAYS ADAPT TO THE ROLE OF JUDGE/CRITIC

Always make judgments about your judge(s) using basic audience analysis concepts:

- Well informed, generally informed, poorly informed about an idea.
- Highly motivated, moderately motivated, poorly motivated.
- Agrees, no opinion, disagrees with an idea.

Realize that a judge is always:

- Another person listening. They know less about your spoken argument than you do, even if they understand the issue better.
- Watching the entire debate. Watching you before the round, before you speak, working with your partner, etc.
- Comparing you with your opponents. If they do something irritating, make sure not to. Be strong where they are weak. Make the choice clear between you.
- Expecting a dignified and tasteful performance. Be professional and there for a reason. Don't be silly, irreverent, or too chummy with the judge or opponents. Be task oriented.
- Interested in the debate, not your ego. Sell the issues in the debate, make them your focus, not your desire to win.
- A lot like you. If you didn't get a card or a tag line or the thesis of a disadvantage, the judge probably did not either.
- A sender of non-verbal signals. These can tell you what they like, what they don't like, and whether they are lost or not.
- Aware that some of your arguments are better than others, and the same goes for your opponents. Don't claim to "win everything," make a real and credible call on how things are going.
- Correct. It is your job to please them, not the other way around.

PERCEIVED ROLE TYPES FOR JUDGES

This is a simplistic way to categorize judges. However, it does help understand some of the variables. The type is set by the role the judge sees herself in. All judges deserve our respect and our effort to adapt to what it is they are looking for. Being able to adapt to different audiences will help you all throughout your life.

TYPE A - JUDGE OF ACADEMIC DEBATE CONTEST

This is the judge we prepare you for. The judge is open minded about debate, works hard during the round, wants to make an unbiased decision, has decent knowledge of the topic and debate procedures.

TYPE B - EDUCATOR COACH OF LEARNING DEBATES

All judges are there to educate, but Type A does it through making a good decision. This judge wants to "teach you" something and you had better be ready to learn. This judge is generally an older or more traditional teacher who also coaches debate. They may have not judged in a while or at your level. Make them think they have something to teach you and you can win.

TYPE C - ESTEEMED JUDGE OF ENTERTAINING DEBATES

All judges like to be entertained in the round, but Type C expects you to put on a show that they will enjoy, and thus call it a "good debate." This is often a lay judge ("Here's a ballot, go judge a debate"), or a judge who is disenchanted with the current form of debate, or someone who hasn't judged in a LONG time, or

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

someone who is burnt out as a debate coach and just wants to get through the judging obligation. Make the round enjoyable and make yourself look articulate and you can win.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SIXTEEN JUDGE AND AUDIENCE ADAPTATION

DAY 2 DISCUSSION OF HOW TO ADAPT TO DIFFERENT JUDGE AND AUDIENCE TYPES.

DISTRIBUTE JUDGE ADAPTATION TIPS.

REVIEW JUDGE ADAPTATION TIPS.

HAVE STUDENTS DISCUSS THEIR ABILITY TO ADAPT TO DIFFERENT JUDGES THEY HAVE HAD IN THESE CATEGORIES.

TELL STUDENTS TO PREPARE A SHORT DEBATE SPEECH FOR JUDGE TYPE B FOR NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

JUDGE ADAPTATION TIPS

TYPE B ADAPTATIONS

Delivery:

1. Slower than usual. Pace your delivery based on their flow and non-verbals.
2. Speak in more complete sentences, fewer fragmentary tag lines.
3. Give summaries about major arguments (case contentions, disadvantages, etc.) as you finish with them.
4. Better sign posting for pages of the flow, pause before moving to another major point.
5. Watch carefully for non-verbals of agreement/disagreement or understanding/misunderstanding.

Content:

1. Give a thesis statement before presenting a major argument in order to create context.
2. Avoid debate jargon. Explain debate concepts in words everyone would understand (link turn becomes "we solve that problem," while permutation becomes "you don't have to vote against us to gain the advantages of the counterplan.").
3. Give reasons for theoretical requirements ... explain why a non-competitive counterplan is "not a reason to vote against our case." Don't just say "reject the counterplan because it is not competitive."
4. Emphasize the line-by-line argument less than with Type A.
5. Use fewer arguments and issues, develop them more completely.
6. Use internal summaries. As you exit an issue, explain why you win it and why it is important.
7. Use external summaries. Summarize and weigh the issues in the debate carefully, leaving time to explain their interaction.
8. Assume the judge accepts the current American conventional wisdom and work from there.
9. Use less evidence than with Type A and explain it more.

TYPE C ADAPTATIONS

Delivery:

1. Everything for Type B but more so.
2. Speak slower, be more colorful, be more complete.
3. Develop a finite number of themes and apply them liberally to arguments in the debate.
4. Focus on major points only, not on flow specific arguments, although you must not be perceived as ignoring issues.
5. Try and create a personal relationship with the judge -- that you and the judge understand what is going on and the other team does not.

Content:

1. Everything for Type B but more so.
2. Focus on major concepts and ideas. Make an extra effort to explain HOW an argument or idea works.
3. Assume the current American conventional wisdom and stay there.
4. Explain all theory issues as being "logically required" and then explain why. On competition, for example, say that "Since you do not have to choose between the counterplan and our plan, it is not a reason to reject our affirmative case."
5. Use fewer pieces of evidence, emphasize qualifications, focus on reasons given inside the evidence.
6. No jargon at all. Replace it with real words.
7. Realize that the judge will not so much vote on the issues as decide who should win and then sort the issues out based on that. The overall impression is essential.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SIXTEEN JUDGE AND AUDIENCE ADAPTATION

DAY 3 STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES TO ONE JUDGE-
AUDIENCE TYPE. - TYPE B

EACH STUDENT SHOULD GIVE SHORT DEBATE SPEECH
AIMED AT A TYPE B JUDGE.

GIVE FEEDBACK TO EACH SPEAKER. POINT OUT OVER-
ADAPTATION.

TELL STUDENTS TO PREPARE A SHORT DEBATE SPEECH FOR
JUDGE TYPE C FOR NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SIXTEEN JUDGE AND AUDIENCE ADAPTATION

DAY 4 STUDENTS GIVE SHORT SPEECHES TO ANOTHER JUDGE-AUDIENCE TYPE. - TYPE C

EACH STUDENT SHOULD GIVE SHORT DEBATE SPEECH AIMED AT A TYPE C JUDGE.

GIVE FEEDBACK TO EACH SPEAKER. POINT OUT OVER-ADAPTATION.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>

WEEK SIXTEEN JUDGE AND AUDIENCE ADAPTATION

DAY 5 SHORT DEBATE AIMED AT GENERAL PUBLIC AUDIENCE.

1AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2AC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

2NC = 3 MINUTES

CX = 2 MINUTES

1NR = 2 MINUTES

1AR = 2 MINUTES

2NR = 2 MINUTES

2AR = 2 MINUTES

HAVE THE STUDENTS DISCUSS THE DEBATE.

HOW WOULD PARENTS AND RELATIVES LIKE SUCH A DEBATE?
THAT IS THE STANDARD TO USE.

HAVE THE STUDENTS FLOW THE DEBATE AND VOTE FOR THE
WINNER ON A WRITTEN BALLOT. ANNOUNCE THE WINNER AT
THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CLASS.

SIXTEEN WEEK DEBATE CURRICULUM

Alfred C. Snider, University of Vermont, Alfred@snider.name, <http://debate.uvm.edu/>