



## LCC Policy Debate Rules and Standards

### PHILOSOPHY

Academic policy debate is not a pursuit of the “truth” or of the “perfect policy” in an ideal sense, but rather a forum useful to train minds in the art of argumentation. Direct refutation is expected and necessary. Good clash over contrasting viewpoints on policy issues is encouraged. However, as Christian communicators, we are first and foremost to glorify God. Accordingly, in LCC, emphasis is placed on humility and courteous behavior.

### STANDARDS

Conduct and attire should reflect respect for other participants, the debate activity, and the mission of LCC. Participants are encouraged to err on the side of caution, to do everything decently and in order (1 Corinthians 14:40, 1 Corinthians 16:14), and to avoid even the appearance of wrongdoing (1 Thessalonians 5:22). Violations in the round include, but are not limited to, inappropriate attire, disrespectful behavior, falsification or misuse of evidence, or tag-teaming with a partner or audience member.

Concerns about a violation of LCC debate standards should be brought to the attention of the Tournament Director, not the judge, immediately following the round. The Tournament Director shall have complete discretionary power to determine an appropriate penalty for any violation of the LCC standards.

### JUDGING PARADIGM

- ***Voting Issues***

The stock issues (topicality, significance, inherency, solvency), or voting issues, shall be the basis of the voting decision for the debate round. Disadvantages are also a voting issue, and will fall under either solvency or significance at the discretion of the judge.

The affirmative team must win all four stock issues in order to win the round. The negative team need win only one stock issue to win the round. Arguments from both teams are to be supported by evidence or logic, not simply a debater’s opinion, no matter how eloquently and persuasively the point is argued.

A win shall be given to either the affirmative or the negative team, except in the event a winning team is given a loss for committing an ethical violation. In such cases, a double loss shall be given. Only in this instance is the round given a double loss. Ethical violations are discussed in the tournament director handbook and the club manual.

- ***Dropped arguments***

An argument is considered dropped if it is not carried through two consecutive speeches. When an argument is dropped, the opponent wins on that particular issue.

- ***Speaker Points***

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

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

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

## **Oral Judging Critique**

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

- Critiques should be no longer than five minutes in length.
- The judge must not reveal the decision to the debaters.
- Guidelines may be found on the ballot and protocol sheet.

## **THE ROUND**

Competitors will be evaluated on their analysis, use of evidence, and ability to effectively and persuasively organize, deliver, and refute arguments. All speeches should be pleasant, comprehensible, and persuasive in tone. *Rapid-fire delivery, commonly called "speed and spread delivery", is considered antithetical to the purpose and intent of this event.*

### ***Team Structure***

In Lincoln-Douglas Policy debate, a team consists of one person who is between the ages of 13 and 18. In Team Policy debate, a team consists of two people who are between the ages of 13 and 18.

At the request of a parent, and with the approval of the coach, age requirement exceptions may be made. Advice on exceptions may be obtained through the LCC club leader liaison.

## ***Affirmative Case Structure***

The following are the recommended case structures for all LCC Policy cases:

- Needs Analysis Affirmative
- Comparative Advantage Affirmative
- Goals Criteria Affirmative
- Stock Issues Affirmative

At the request of a coach, other case structures may be allowed. Advice on exceptions may be obtained through the LCC club leader liaison.

All Affirmative cases must be prima facia.

## ***Negative Case Structure***

- Counterplans are allowed, but must be non-topical. In other words, a counterplan must not fulfill the resolution (as defined by the affirmative). A counterplan should demonstrate that a reasonable alternative plan would be better policy than either the status quo or the affirmative plan.
- Minor repairs are allowed. Minor repairs, by definition, cannot be topical, because they require the use of structures and/or precedents already with the status quo. A minor repair is not the same as a counterplan, so there should be no policy changes, or changes of agency, etc..
- Critics are prohibited.
- In Team Policy debate, a topicality challenge, if any, must be presented in the Negative Constructive speech (first speech -1NC).
- In L-D Policy debate, a topicality challenge, if any must be presented in the Negative Constructive speech (first speech -1NC).

## ***Rebuttals***

Rebuttals are to be used to respond to the opponent's lines of argument and to extend arguments made in constructive speeches. New evidence to extend or clarify constructive arguments is permitted in rebuttals.

No new lines of argument may be presented in rebuttals. By new lines of argument, we mean those, which are not clarifications or responses made to arguments presented in the constructive speeches, but those, which are completely new and unrelated to previous argumentation.

## ***Evidence***

The following general standards apply to the use of evidence:

- All evidence must be from a published source available to the public, and verifiable at the tournament.
- Evidence should be accurately and directly quoted with proper respect to the context of the original source.
- Evidence shall be provided with a citation of source, author's name and credentials, and date of publication. Additional evidence from the same source may be referred to "as previously cited".
- Participants take full responsibility for the accuracy of the evidence they cite.
- The use of the Bible quoted as evidence is prohibited in the round.
- Students may ask for, and should receive upon request, a copy of the evidence used in the round by the opposing team. Evidence should be reviewed by the requesting team during that team's prep time, and immediately returned to its owner.
- A judge may request evidence from either team after the round, and should receive it.
- If a competitor believes evidence has been misused, misquoted, or falsified, as with all ethics charges, that individual should bring this to the attention of the Tournament Director.

## **Timing**

The competitors, according to the guidelines laid out in the self-timing protocol, shall do their own timing. Each competitor should provide a timepiece that counts down to an audible sound. Two separate timepieces may be used, one of which keeps track of prep time and the other for timing speeches.

Speech times for Team Policy Debate are as follows: 8-3-8-3-8-3-8-3-5-5-5-5

Speech times for L-D Policy Debate are as follows: 6-3-7-3-5-6-3

Each team or LD competitor receives four (4) minutes prep time.

## **Electronics**

Competitors may not use laptop computers in a round.

Recording or videotaping of any or all of a round may only be done with the permission of all debaters involved. Recordings should honor that permission granted by using discretion so as not to disturb the comfort level of the debaters or to hinder the round.