INSTRUCTION MANUAL

YOUTH LEADING DEBATE

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE
DECEMBER 2018

Overview

Youth Leading Debate (YLD) is a competitive dialogue and debate program for politically active young people. This program introduces participants to debate through interactive training camps and supports them in developing practical political leadership skills. The materials in this resource are designed to familiarize young people with the rules of policy debate, increase their ability to develop policy reform proposals and prepare them to display their skills in debate competitions.

The program materials in this manual should be adapted as appropriate to the cultural context and specific needs of the participants, recognizing their identity (gender, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and other characteristics), location, experience and other personal circumstances. Use this manual in combination with the YLD Program Manual, which provides guidance for implementing a youth debate program and organizing youth debate tournaments. Each participant should receive a copy of this manual.

Pt 1: Instruction Manual
The instruction manual is a technical reference for the program instructors and participants. It is a compilation of resources and tools developed by global youth debate organizations, debate instructors or coaches and debate clubs. The manual also incorporates different styles of debate such as policy debate, public forum, and parliamentary debate. While the concepts in this manual reflect varying levels of complexity, an experienced debate instructor will be necessary to guide the participants through the materials and expand their knowledge throughout the program.

Pt 2: Program Curriculum
The program curriculum contains ten modules that introduce competitive policy debate. The curriculum contains step-by-step instructions for program facilitators and seeks to connect debate and political participation. Each module contains learning goals, lessons with links to worksheets, and activities that directly correspond with sections of the instruction manual. Refer to the YLD Program Manual for additional guidance on conducting a debate instruction "bootcamp".

Table of Contents

PART I: Instruction Manual

Democracy and Debate
Public debate over local and national policy issues is the foundation of democracy and a key aspect of the basic human right to freedom of expression. Debate on controversial topics generates opposing viewpoints and creates a marketplace of diverse ideas for citizens to consider. Encouraging and supporting debate thus promotes a culture of healthy public discourse. When individuals think critically about what can be done to improve society and how to express their opinions on issues, they hone the skills necessary to participate in civic and political life. Debate helps citizens become active participants in the decision-making process on issues that affect their lives and communities. Those who participate in debate and discussions on government policies are more likely to vote and participate in civic organizations and political campaigns. As debaters learn to look beyond emotional appeals and hold elected leaders to a higher standard, they become more likely to demand increased evidence-based policymaking, transparency, and fairness in electoral processes. When more citizens participate in debate and embrace these norms, political leaders are obligated to respond.

Benefits of Competitive Debate

Engaging in competitive debate allows participants to cultivate and sharpen important skills for use in many aspects of daily life. These skills include critical thinking, listening, research, information processing, creative thinking, communication, self-confidence, interpersonal skills, and teamwork. Debate also involves decision-making, and our lives are filled with decisions, some simple and relatively unimportant and others that are more complex. Participating in debate helps participants develop a better understanding of perspectives on both sides of the complex decisions that have a wide-reaching impact on society. The requirement to "switch sides" allows debaters to explore an opposing viewpoint, helping to minimize political polarization and build empathy. Since debates often revolve around topics of local or national importance, participants deepen their knowledge of the evidence and research involved in the process of preparing for a debate. While debate skills prepare participants for many career paths, they provide particularly good training for activism and political participation. Debate helps participants develop persuasion skills and challenges them to refine their advocacy for different audiences while providing them with an intellectually challenging laboratory to test their ideas. The goal of debate is not only to help participants better understand their opponent and their motivations but to improve the level of discourse, paving the way for the productive exchange of ideas and increased collaboration.

What is Policy Debate?
The purpose of this manual is to teach young people about competitive debate, with a focus on policy debate. Policy debate helps answer questions of change and typically calls for policy change. Policy debate takes the form of a competition during which teams of two advocate for (Affirmative Team) and against (Negative Team) a resolution. A single

debate team is composed of two people and one round of competition involves two teams challenging each other. One or more judges who observe the debate determine the winner of the round. The judge might be a teacher, debate coach, community member or public official. The team that wins the majority of rounds wins the debate competition. The following sections introduce the elements of a debate and the preparation necessary to participate in a debate competition.

Elements of a Debate

Debates take many shapes and forms, but they all have common elements:

Constructive Speeches →	Debaters describe their initial proposal idea
Rebuttal Speeches →	Debaters take turns defending their proposals
Cross-Examination →	Debaters use this time to question the opposing team
Preparation Time →	Debaters use this time to arrange their thoughts for rebuttals
Flowing →	Debaters take notes on what the opposing team is saying
Judging →	One or more judges determine the winner

Debate Match

The table below outlines the speech order, speech times and questioning periods for the debate competition. Each team receives 5 minutes of preparation time to use during the debate. This time can be split up and used at different times throughout the debate or all at once. There is guidance for using this time in the subchapter: Using Prep Time.

Opening Speeches			
1	1st Speaker	Affirmative Constructive	6 Minutes
2	1st Speaker	Negative Constructive	6 Minutes
		Cross-Examination	3 Minutes
Rebuttal Speeches			
3	2nd Speaker	Affirmative Constructive	6 Minutes
4	2nd Speaker	Negative Constructive	6 Minutes
		Cross-Examination	3 minutes
5	1st Speaker	Negative Rebuttal	4 minutes
6	1st Speaker	Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Closing Speeches			
7	2nd Speaker	Negative Rebuttal	4 minutes
8	2nd Speaker	Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes

PHASES OF A DEBATE

There are **3** phases of each debate: **Opening**, **Rebuttal,** and **Closing**.

Phase 1: Opening Speeches
In the first two speeches of the debate, the debater outlines their argument with evidence. These speeches are designed for each team to introduce their stance on the issue.

1

2

1st Affirmative Constructive (1AC)	1st Negative Constructive (1NC)
This speech is also referred to as the "Affirmative Case." This is when the first team presents an argument for a specific policy change. This is the *only* speech in a debate that can be prewritten. It should be well thought out, researched, well-delivered and use the entire allotted time.	This speech details several arguments against the "Affirmative Case". This speech is designed to introduce several reasons why the Affirmative's proposed policy is not a good idea. The Negative should aim to understand whether the Affirmative has credible research and what arguments will be effective against their case.

Phase 2: Rebuttal Speeches
Debaters use the **four speeches in the middle** of the debate to discuss the details of their case and compare the quality of their evidence to the evidence of the other team.

   For example: Whose resources are more qualified? Whose evidence is more recent?
Debaters should point these details out to the judge as reasons why their claims should be preferred over their opponent. This is an opportunity to point out arguments the opponents have not answered.

3

4

2nd Affirmative Constructive (2AC)	2nd Negative Constructive (2NC)
This is the 2nd speech given by the affirmative and has two roles. **First**, it should add details to the argument. **Second**, it should begin to respond to the Negative's arguments.	This is the 2nd speech given by the negative. The 2NC and the 1NR are similar speeches given by 2 different people. *Example: if the Negative's position is that the Affirmative proposal is too expensive and will hurt the environment, then the 2nd Negative Constructive (2NC) should focus on the question of cost and the 1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR) should talk about the environmental consequences.*

5	6
1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR)	1st Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)
This is 3rd speech given by the negative. It is the Negative's opportunity to go into additional detail about the arguments. While the Affirmative gets to speak first and last, the Negative gets to speak for a long period in the middle of the debate. The Negative should use this time to expand on their arguments and evidence.	This is the 3rd speech given by the affirmative. This is often considered the hardest speech because there is only a short amount of time to respond to the Negative arguments. Prioritizing what is important and speaking quickly and concisely is critical, as is having a strong foundation from 1AC and 2AC.

Phase 3: Closing Speeches

At the end of the debate, each team has an opportunity to deliver a closing statement.

7	8
2nd Negative Rebuttal (2NR)	2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR)
This speech should reiterate the main points of the argument and how it evolved throughout the debate. There should be no new arguments introduced. This is the last opportunity to convince the judge which team to vote for, and many judges base their decisions on what is said in the closing speech.	

CROSS-EXAMINATION

Cross-Examination is the 'question and answer' period during the competition and provides an opportunity to do three things:
1. Clarify certain aspects of the opponent's case.
2. Expose weaknesses in the opponent's case.
3. Build one's own case.

While one person from each team is asking and answering questions, the other person on the team should be preparing for their speech or taking notes.

Asking Questions in Cross-Examination
➔ Choose questions that help clarify the other team's arguments. If a debater understands the details of their opponent's arguments, they can formulate responses that are more effective.
➔ If the other team is not directly answering the questions, it is acceptable to interject and request that the specific questions be answered.
➔ Questioning the other team's evidence is a good strategy. It may prove that the other team's argument is lacking.

Answering Questions in Cross-Examination
➔ Consider what the other team is asking, and answer only answer clear, direct questions.
➔ Cross-Examination can be an opportunity for debaters to continue to advocate for their position, but be aware that the other team is trying to discredit any claims made during this period.
➔ Refer to the team's evidence whenever possible.

USING PREP TIME

Preparation time allows teams to take a breath, talk with their partner and prepare their speeches during the debate. Each team receives the same amount of prep time during a debate and can use this time whenever they choose.

Prep time: Affirmative
➔ Taking some prep time before the 2AC is a good strategy. This is the last time for the Affirmative to introduce new evidence in a debate.
➔ Taking some prep time before the 1AR is also important. The debater needs to respond to many Negative speeches in a short amount of time.
➔ Prep time before the 2AR is probably least important, though the debater may want to save at least a few seconds to gather their thoughts.

Prep time: Negative
➔ Taking prep time before the 2NC is a good strategy. If the 2NC and 1NR are weak, the Negative has likely lost the debate.
➔ Do not take prep before the 1NR—the debater has their partner's speech, the 2NC prep time, and 3 minutes of cross-examination to prepare, so this should be one of the best speeches in the round without the extra time.
➔ Saving time before the 2NR is important. Since the Negative will not speak last, making a strong closing statement is important.

TAKING NOTES "FLOWING"

Debates are complex intellectual exchanges with many components. Even in simple rounds, there are often 20 or 30 claims that are binge addressed, and failure to answer an opponent's argument can be an easy way to lose a debate. Keeping the team's notes organized helps ensure that debaters are not missing anything. The method of note taking or "flowing," is a system for organizing and following the details of the debate. Flowing involves keeping a record of the course of each argument. While there is a standardized method for flowing, people tend to develop their own variations.

Here are some basic steps to get started:
1. Divide a sheet of paper into seven columns. Each column represents one speech in the debate. There are eight speeches in the debate, but the back-to-back Negative speeches are considered 1 speech divided between two people.

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC/1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR

2. Flowing is a visual record of which arguments have been beaten, which arguments are still being contested and which arguments have flowed through the round without being refuted.
3. Use flowing to record opponents' arguments and evidence so the team knows what needs to be refuted.
4. The flow sheets should be used to guide the debater's speech and respond to the other team's arguments, pointing out what they did and did not answer and adding additional evidence as necessary.
5. Continue taking notes through the end of the debate. A teammate might miss an important point and need it for the last speech, or the other team might make an important argument, which the debater will need to know for the next round.

Flowing Tips:
➔ Practice!
➔ If a debater falls behind while taking notes, they should take a deep breath and start again.
➔ The column format will make it clear what arguments the other team has answered and which arguments have not been addressed.
➔ Use as many sheets of paper as necessary and leave space between each argument. If a debater makes an argument and the opposing team has five reasons why that debater team is wrong, space is needed to write each argument.
➔ Using abbreviations, images and arrows can be helpful. The opposing team will speak faster than the other team can write, so the focus is on capturing the ideas, not specific words.

JUDGEMENT—WHO WINS?

In a competitive debate, a formal judge will decide which team wins and which team loses. A judge can be one person, multiple people or include audience participation. The judge's decision is based on a single question:

Is the Affirmative's proposal a good idea?

Judges are persuaded by debaters who develop comprehensive, detailed arguments AND answer the arguments made by their opponents. When an opponent makes a point against an argument, the debater must explain to the judge why that point is not valid. In addition, the debater must answer the arguments their opponents make. The debater must help the judge understand why, given all the different arguments in the debate, their side should win.

At the end of the debate, judges will give what is called an "oral critique" — they will discuss what the teams did well and how they can improve. One of the teams may think the judge made the wrong decision — but debate is about more than winning or losing. It is about learning to effectively express and defend a perspective on a topic of real importance and engaging in a productive exchange with others on the issue.

TOPIC AND RESOLUTION

The topics chosen for the debate competitions are issues of national significance that require a public policy response. The topic is then formulated into a resolution or a statement. This resolution divides the topic between the Affirmative: The team that is arguing in favor of the resolution, and the Negative: the team that is arguing against the resolution.

Example Topic: Environment
Example Resolution: The federal government should increase regulations requiring industries to substantially decrease the production of environmental pollutants.

Introduction to Argumentation

An effective argument influences listeners to change or affirm their stance on a policy issue. Developing an effective argument must include a variety of tactics, including persuasion techniques, in addition to evidence and reasoning. Argumentation is the process of developing, discussing and evaluating these arguments.

ETHOS, PATHOS, AND LOGOS

The Greek philosopher Aristotle outlined three fundamental ways to persuade people: Ethics, Emotion and Logic. These three categories are still used to explain persuasion. The example below will help explain each persuasion technique.

Example: Proposal: The government should implement a tax on pollution to create a healthier environment.

Ethos: Ethics

Ethos is the Greek word for ethics or character. Ethos focuses on the debaters' trustworthiness, dependability or preparedness and appeals to the audiences' standards of behavior or beliefs about what is and is not acceptable for them.

Example: We have an obligation to protect other species and the planet for our children and future generations.

Pathos: Emotion

Pathos is the Greek word that means both experience and suffering. Pathos in debate focuses on convincing the audience with emotion. Powerful stories can evoke empathy, and terrifying narratives can encourage feelings of fear or anger and a desire to correct perceived wrongs.

Example: Pollution causes animals to suffocate and die, birds to be covered with tar and unable to fly, and disease for our nation's children.

Logos: Logic

Logos is the Greek word for logic. Arguments using logos focus on the message and appeal to authority or credibility by offering expertise, research, or data to support arguments.

Example: X amount of pollution is a systemic risk to our ecosystem, suppressing ecotourism and sustainability, and causing Y amount of children to get sick.

The most effective debaters use a blend of all three techniques to support their arguments.

Blended: X amount of pollution is a systemic risk to our entire ecosystem, causing Y amount of children to become sick each year and X amount of animals to die. We have an obligation to protect our children and save the ecosystem for future generations.

AFFIRMATION, REASONING, AND EVIDENCE

1) **Affirmation: Claim or Argument**

2) **Supporting Evidence: Data**

3) **Reasoning: Rules or principles that explain the connection between the claim & data**

Developing an argument in debate is making claims based on logical reasoning and proof. There are **two main parts** to an argument in debate: the <u>Affirmation</u> and the <u>Supporting Evidence</u>. The debater must also explain the validity of the claim **and** the connection between the Affirmation and Supporting Evidence. This is called the <u>Reasoning</u>. Listed below are three examples:

Example 1
Affirmation: Team Blue will win the soccer game against Team Red. *Evidence: Historically Team Blue has won most soccer games against Team Red.* *Reasoning: If Team Blue usually wins, it is probable that Team Blue will win the game.*

➔ The *Affirmation* is the argument that Team Blue will win the soccer game.
➔ The *Evidence* is the fact that historically, Team Blue has won.
➔ The *Reasoning* states the principle or widely held belief that winning historically can predict winning in the future.

Example 2
Affirmation: Team Blue will win the soccer game against Team Red. *Evidence: Team Blue has faster players than Team Red.* *Reasoning: Speedy players help win soccer games.*

➔ The *Affirmation* is the argument Team Blue will win the game.
➔ The *Evidence* includes factual information about the speed of the players on Team Blue in comparison to the speed of players on Team Red.
➔ The *Reasoning* states the principle or widely held belief that a player's speed contributes to the outcome of the game.

Example 3
Affirmation: The death penalty should be abolished. *Evidence: Innocent people are mistakenly killed by the death penalty.* *Reasoning: The criminal justice system makes errors that cannot be remedied once*

people are killed.

- ➔ The *Affirmation* is the assertion that the death penalty should be abolished.
- ➔ The *Evidence* is the fact that innocent people are killed.
- ➔ The *Reasoning* states that any policy resulting in innocent people being wrongfully killed should be ended.

The more evidence and reasoning an affirmation has, the stronger the argument will be. Evidence is not always a proven fact and can take other forms, such as an expert opinion. Using research will help debaters gather a variety of evidence to prove the validity of their argument.

Countering an Argument
The team arguing the Negative will develop counter arguments to refute the Affirmative's argument or claim. There are two options for countering an argument.

1) Option 1: Challenge the Evidence

Example 1
Affirmation: Team Blue will win the soccer game against Team Red.   *Evidence: Historically Team Blue has won most soccer games against Team Red.*   *Reasoning: If Team Blue usually wins, it is probable that Team Red will win the game.*
Challenge the Evidence: Team Red has also won a number of games against Team Blue, although this was not stated in the argument.

Example 2
Affirmation: Team Blue will win the soccer game against Team Red.   *Evidence: Team Blue has faster players than Team Red.*   *Reasoning: Speedy players help win soccer games.*
Challenge the Evidence: Based on most recent evidence, Team Red is actually faster than Team Blue

Example 3
Affirmation: The death penalty should be abolished.   *Evidence: Innocent people are mistakenly killed by the death penalty.*

Reasoning: The criminal justice system makes errors that cannot be remedied once people are killed.
Challenge the Evidence: There has not been an innocent person executed under the death penalty in the last 7 years.

2) <u>Option 2: Challenge the Reasoning</u>

Example 1
Affirmation: Team Blue will win the soccer game against Team Red. *Evidence: Historically Team Blue has won most soccer games against Team Red.* *Reasoning: If Team Blue usually wins, it is probable that Team Red will win the game.*
Challenge the Evidence: Team Red has also won a number of games against Team Blue, although this was not stated in the argument.
Challenge the Reasoning: The team arguing the Negative could point out that history does not always affect future games. Players may become injured or leave the team, the team's strategy may have changed, the team may have a different coach, etc.

Example 2
Affirmation: Team Blue will win the soccer game against Team Red. *Evidence: Team Blue has faster players than Team Red.* *Reasoning: Speedy players help win soccer games.*
Challenge the Evidence: Based on most recent evidence, Team Red is actually faster than Team Blue.
Challenge the Reasoning: The team arguing the Negative could say a faster team does not always win. The Negative could find examples of games that were won by the slower team or point out disadvantages to speedy players. The Negative could also say other factors such as shooting ability, experience, practice time and coaching might be more important factors in winning than speed.

Example 3
Affirmation: The death penalty should be abolished. *Evidence: Innocent people are mistakenly killed by the death penalty.* *Reasoning: The criminal justice system makes errors that cannot be remedied once*

people are killed.
Challenge the Evidence: There has not been an innocent person executed under the death penalty in the last 7 years.
Challenge the Reasoning: The team arguing the Negative could state that the death of a few innocent people is not a sufficient reason to ban the death penalty. For example, innocent people die in traffic accidents, but that does not mean driving should be banned.

Guide for Exploring the Topic

Debaters do more than make claims; they must back up their arguments with "proof" designed to persuade the judge. To debate a topic, a debater should know enough to form an opinion, but they must also research a wide array of views pertaining to the topic beyond their personal stance. Once debating begins, a team will need an abundance of research and evidence to support the claims in their case.

Most evidence for debate comes from library or internet research. Evidence might also come from a debaters own experience, common knowledge, or a story that someone shared. When using this type of evidence, it is important to use additional data to provide context.

Example: If a debater knows someone that is a migrant, tell a story about their personal experience, then explain that there are X thousands of people experiencing similar problems associated with migration throughout the country.

THE QUALITIES OF "GOOD" EVIDENCE

Debaters often rely on published evidence to prove their arguments. Debaters must have the ability to determine the quality and believability of evidence, or they risk losing debates because they failed to realize the evidence was faulty. Debaters should find sources that have concrete evidence, not just claims. Evidence that has reasoning is more persuasive and credible.

Suppose the team wants to prove that Candidate X will win an election and they find a quote that says, "Candidate X will be elected because he is supported by unions." Politicians who are supported by unions have a better chance of winning. That claim is stronger than if it said, "Candidate X will win."

→ **Recent:** Find recent evidence. The more up-to-date the evidence is the stronger and more accurate it will be.

→ **Source Authority:** Find evidence from qualified sources. Qualifications refer to the credentials or experience of the author of the evidence.

➔ **Source Neutrality:** Find evidence from unbiased sources. Some sources might have questionable credibility because they are "biased." A "biased" source is one with a motivation that could override its interest in being truthful. Example, a politician might be more concerned about the political impacts of their campaign than about telling the truth.

➔ **Citations:** When good evidence is found, the debater should make sure the quality of the evidence is made clear to the opponent and to the judge. There should be a complete citation before the team can use the evidence in a debate round. Citations include:
  a. **Who is being quoted or referenced?** This should be a person's full name, and if relevant, professional title and place of business.
     i. Example, "Former representative in the United Nations,"
     ii. "Jose Villa, business owner"
     iii. "Minister Rodriguez, Department of Transportation"
  b. **When was it published?** The date gives the judge and the opposing team a reference point.

RESEARCH

When the teams begin gathering research, it is helpful to know what arguments the team wants to support. These ideas can often come from brainstorming sessions. As the team thinks of ideas for arguments, write them down and save them for review once the research begins. Outstanding research requires effort; it takes time to find high-quality evidence, so plan ahead. Thoroughness is crucial, and can prove decisive in winning or losing. When finding good evidence, bookmark the website or write down the part of the library where it was found. As each debater gains more experience with research, they will develop personal shortcuts and strategies for using their time efficiently. Once debaters become more experienced with debate rounds, they will learn which evidence is most helpful for winning the debate.

Where to Look for Research
Library: The library might be a useful source for finding materials. Books are useful resources for obtaining strong evidence, as well as reference documents, journals, magazines and paper copies of newspapers. Many debaters prefer digital sources and ignore the library, passing up many high-quality sources in the process.
  ➔ If the process for finding research is unfamiliar, ask the librarians for help.

The Internet: Most debate research is conducted using the internet.
  ➔ A common internet-based research strategy is to use a search engine such as Google. Using a basic or advanced search can help with finding relevant websites, newspaper articles and reports.
  ➔ Google Scholar is also a useful resource for finding articles or academic journals, although sometimes a subscription is needed to access them.

Evaluating the Internet

The internet is a fantastic resource for debate research. There are also many potential risks to internet research, since almost anyone can publish materials online.

- ➔ Evaluating internet sources must be done on a case-by-case basis.
- ➔ Websites can be judged on factors of authority, accuracy, objectivity and the date.
  - a. Does the site provide references and footnotes?
  - b. Do the claims made conform to prior knowledge?
  - c. Are there other authors making the similar claims?
  - d. Does the website treat alternative ideas fairly and thoroughly?
  - e. Has the website been recently updated?

Disinformation & Information Integrity

Disinformation campaigns purposefully use false information to mislead the audience. While many research organizations, think tanks and other groups produce legitimate research that may support a specific point-of-view, disinformation goes beyond partisan-leaning research to distort facts.

Carefully consider the following when evaluating a news source:

1. Where does it come from?
   a. Is this a reputable source, or is it a personal blog or partisan media?
2. Who is the author, and what are their qualifications?
3. What is the author's point of view?
   a. Who benefits from the viewpoint represented in the article?
   b. Is there a motivation that might cause the author to misrepresent the truth?
4. Is information widely verified by other news sources?
5. Does the article contain logical pieces of information to support its' claims, or does it attempt to appeal to emotions instead of logic?
6. Is the source written properly?
   a. Does it include citations and references to other sources?
   b. Does the article use proper diction, grammar, and formal sentence structure, or does it include irregularities such as writing in ALL CAPS or low-quality photographs?

Original Research

- ➔ Once the debaters receive the topic for the debates, they must take time to talk with people in their community and conduct original research.
- ➔ Remember to talk with a wide array of people, not just those with who have different opinions.
- ➔ Original research can be a powerful supplement to existing research and data.

Writing an Affirmative Case

Policy Debate goes beyond theoretical ideas of what people could do in an ideal world to focus on concrete actions that people can take now. When participants are arguing for the Affirmative, they are responsible for advocating for a certain policy change. This team is more likely to win if participants include more details and structure within the proposal.

Example Topic: Environment
Example Resolution: The federal government should increase regulations requiring industries to substantially decrease the production of environmental pollutants.

The 1st Affirmative speech (1AC) should lay out the Affirmative case. There are four necessary components.

1. **Identify the Problem**: Why hasn't the problem been fixed?
   Example: Pollution has not been reduced because some believe prevention measures would slow down the industrial economy and lead to job loss.

2. **Identify a Plan of Action**: What will be done about the problem?
   Example: The government should impose regulations on industries and require companies to hire environmental emissions experts to increase industry-wide innovation and enforce regulations. The government would also require companies to provide technical training for a percentage of their current employees to lessen potential job loss.

3. **Identify the Why:** What are the most persuasive reasons to take action? Be sure to consider the long-term consequences, not just the immediate benefits.
   Example: Increased regulations would result in overall economic growth; more jobs in engineering, manufacturing, construction, materials, operation, and maintenance; prevent hundreds of thousands of pollution-related infections and deaths; and reduce damage to crops and timber.

4. **Describe How the Plan Will Work:**
   Example: Research shows that in the long term, any initial economic costs of environmental pollutant regulation are negligible, as a cleaner environment result in significantly healthier communities and overall higher living standards for generations to come.

IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM

When advocating for policy change, debaters should establish why they think action is necessary. It is especially important is to identify why change has not happened already.

Example: If environmental pollution has steadily decreased over the last five years due to company-initiated actions, it would be inadvisable to argue that all companies hire an emissions expert.

There are two ways to identify a problem:
1. **Structural:** This barrier to change is financial, legal, or otherwise exists in the material world.

   Example: Most companies do not have the economic resources to switch to clean power initiatives.

2. **Attitudinal**: This is a barrier based on human behavior—people are unwilling to change.

   Example: Government officials do not believe traditional energy methods are harmful to the environment, and worry that increased regulations will hurt national economic growth.

When writing the Affirmative case, debaters should find evidence documenting why the team's plan has not already happened and identify the barriers to action. The team should have some evidence for the 1AC, and a few secondary sources available to use later in the debate if the other team challenges them on this point.

PLAN OF ACTION

Policy debate is about specific policy solutions. We can agree on many topics with relative ease—discrimination is bad, murder should be decreased, etc. If a specific plan of action is suggested to combat discrimination or murder, it becomes much easier to have a debate about these issues. The method for solving the problem can be debated fairly. The Affirmative must offer a specific policy proposal to solve a problem that falls under the resolution. The Affirmative does not need to fix every problem under the resolution, but the team must suggest an action that addresses part of the resolution.

Example Resolution: "The government should increase regulations requiring industries to substantially decrease the production of environmental pollutants."

- A plan of action that states, *"The government should act to reduce environmental pollution levels"* is too simple and does not include enough detail. It is not enforceable or actionable, and it is hard for the Negative to respond.

- A plan of action that states, *"The government should implement and enforce an anti-pollution campaign to regulate the production of environmental pollutants by deploying inspector squads to coal-fired power plants, steel mills and other businesses to enforce a 15% reduction in air pollution within six months"* is specific. While it does not address pollution everywhere, is a strong step in the right direction.

The team arguing the Affirmative is not expected to write an entire piece of legislation, but they should specific and careful when writing their advocacy statement. Once the

Affirmative reads their plan of action, they must remain consistent. The Affirmative should not defend actions that do not have presented evidence.

WHY TAKE ACTION?

When debating, the Affirmative must identify a proposed action, however, stating an action and how it works is not enough to encourage the judge or audience to agree. Similar to advocating for a political candidate or social change agenda, there are outcomes of the action the debaters would like to see happen. Detailing the outcomes helps persuade the judge to agree with the Affirmative's case.

The benefits of the planned action can either be positive outcomes, such as more money, more jobs, enhanced rights, etc. or an absence of Negative consequences, such as less discrimination, less pollution, less violence, etc. Evidence and research will be required to support the arguments, usually at least one piece of evidence to answer each of these questions:

1. **What is the current outcome?**
   Example: Coal-fired power plants, steel mills and automobiles, among other industries, cause severe environmental pollution by emitting ozone-depleting gases and particles that destroy the environment and result in many fatal health concerns.

2. **What is the cause and effect of the proposed action?**
   Example: Strict environmental regulations on power plants, steel mills and automobiles would reduce pollution levels in our country.

3. **Why is this outcome beneficial?**
   Example: Pollution causes disease, damages the ecosystem and hurts the economy. Environmental regulations spark innovation in clean technologies and discourage research and development in conventional polluting technologies.

The team arguing the Affirmative should have additional evidence supporting each of these claims, and be able to speak confidently about the implications of the case.

Consider explaining the comparisons using the following criteria:
   → **Timeframe**: When will the plan's benefits happen? Sooner is better than later.
   Example: New regulations will change the landscape of environmental pollution immediately, resulting in new jobs in environmental technology and services, cleaner air and water, and healthier communities.

   → **Magnitude**: How large are the benefits? Measure in whatever unit is most persuasive—lives or dollars saved are common considerations.
   Example: Environmental regulations save the economy billions by preventing the Negative health effects associated with pollution. Air and water pollution cause

many illnesses, such as respiratory diseases, cancers, heart attacks, infections, poisonings, etc., that cost billions each year to treat.

➔ **Probability**: How likely are the plan's benefits to happen?
Example: If regulations are imposed and environmental pollution is decreased within six months, the environmental, economic, and health benefits will follow shortly thereafter.

➔ **Reversibility**: Can the problem be reversed?
Example: The hazardous impact of pollution causes permanent environmental damage and health consequences, but environmental regulations will result in healthier and more productive citizens who live longer.

HOW WILL THE PLAN WORK?

The team arguing the Affirmative must show that there is a problem and prove that they have an effective solution that improves the current situation. Strong evidence to support the proposal is very important. Researchers from think tanks, academia and elsewhere write policy briefs and argue for different public policy proposals, which can be reliable sources for evidence.

Think about these basic questions about regarding the proposed action:
➔ Who will execute the plan?
➔ How much will it cost?
➔ Why will it work?
➔ Will the plan be as effective as the plan claims?
➔ Are there other implementation questions to consider?

Example: Companies are required to hire an accredited environmental emissions expert who can help reduce their environmental pollution and conform to regulations imposed by impartial inspectors.
OR
Example: Strongly polluted sites should be cleaned up through national environmental programs and bioremediation.

If this is part of the plan, the team must identify:
➔ Who is going to pay for the environmental expert, federal inspectors, or the in-site cleanup?
➔ How much money will this cost companies and the federal government?
➔ Where is the money coming from? (Taxes, existing fund trade-off, etc.)
➔ Will environment emissions experts and federal inspectors decrease the company's Negative environmental impact? OR Will the mandate to clean up a polluted site change the use of the land in the future?

Debating the Affirmative

1AC: Presenting the Case

The 1st Affirmative Constructive (1AC) is always the first speech in the debate. It is the initial opportunity for the Affirmative to present and defend their proposed action and associated arguments. The 1AC should be strategically designed to emphasize the Affirmative's strongest arguments. The 1AC is written before the debate. The entire outline of the Case and Plan (see sample on page 11) should be presented at this time. Typically the Affirmative should place their best evidence in their 1AC. "Best" in this case might mean the longest, most qualified and most recent evidence with the strongest warrants. Adjustments to the 1AC are important. After the 1AC has been used in competition, evaluate the evidence selection. Is there evidence in the current 1AC that was seldom use in the rounds? If so, consider taking it out of the speech. Is there evidence that is always read in the 2AC? If so, consider adding those cards.

2AC: Second Affirmative Constructive

The 2nd Affirmative Constructive (2AC) speech should clarify the team's proposal and respond to any arguments made in the 1st Negative Construction (1NC). Most of the arguments the Negative will make against the Affirmative's case can be anticipated, and therefore should be prepared before the competition. The Affirmative should brainstorm answers to the arguments they expect to hear against their proposal. These prepared answers should include logical arguments and evidence. The 2AC should diversify the types of answers that are made against each argument. Do not focus on only one or two specific types of arguments, but instead present a wide variety. Designing strong response strategies is just as important as the 1st Affirmative Case construction. The 1AC evidence will be the strongest evidence in the Affirmative file. The 2AC should reference this evidence, both the substance of the reasoning in the evidence, as well as the quality of the sources. If the Affirmative has written a strong case, the 2AC should have to read very little new evidence to prove their case.

1AR: The First Affirmative Rebuttal

The First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR) must cover all of the arguments extended by the team arguing the Negative in both the 2NC and the 1NR. The timing of this is difficult, since the 1AR is only 4 minutes long and the Negative speeches in the middle are 10 consecutive minutes. The 1AR must be selective and efficient.

Tips for writing the first affirmative rebuttal:
- ➔ The 1AR should have a strategy in mind for allocating speech time.
  Example: if one-third of the Negative's time was spent extending a disadvantage to the proposal, approximately one-third of the 1AR should be spent answering.
- ➔ The 1AR should use their partner's 2AC as a reference point for their speech. The 1AC evidence and analysis can also be used as well.
- ➔ It is very important that the 1AR not repeat arguments or waste time.

➔ The 1AR must respond directly to the Negative's arguments. It is not enough to simply repeat 2AC answers. Consider "what arguments the Negative made that would make the strongest impression on the judge?"
➔ Reminder: explain and expand on the Affirmative arguments.

2AR: The Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR)

The Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR) is the closing speech. The 2AR must be strong because it is the final speech judges will hear.

Tips for writing the closing speech:
➔ This speech must summarize the entire proposal and strategy. Fully explain the Affirmative Case and its comparative advantage over the Negative policy.
➔ The 2AR must assess which arguments are necessary to win the debate and determine what arguments the Affirmative can afford to lose.
➔ The closing speech should aim to win the most impressive argument decisively and early on in the speech.
➔ In addition to summarizing, the 2AR must also address the arguments extended by the last Negative speaker.
➔ Frame the speech so the arguments won seem more important than the arguments that were lost.
➔ The 2AR should be selective. As the last speech, the 2AR has the freedom not to worry about what comes afterwards.

Writing the Negative Case

ON CASE ARGUMENTS

On case arguments aim to discredit the content of the Affirmative case and focus directly on the various elements of the case. This will consist of counter-claims, which contradict or otherwise weaken the Affirmative claims. If the Negative persuades the judge that the plan is pointless or that it makes the situation worse, there is no reason to vote Affirmative. Even if the Negative only wins some of their arguments, any disadvantage they prove is enough to encourage the judge vote Negative.

1. **Minimizing the Harm:** Make evidenced arguments that deny the importance of the harm.
   Example: If the Affirmative claims to reduce pollution, the Negative might read evidence suggesting that pollution levels are already relatively low or in decline.

2. **Denying Causality:** Deny their claims—the Affirmative does not do what the team says it will do.
   Example: If the Affirmative claims to reduce pollution levels by imposing government regulations, propose that the Affirmative argument will not actually impact pollution levels because the initiative will not receive enough political support to be successful.

3. **Turn the Harm into a Positive:** Suggest that the harm is not a harm at all.
   Example: If the Affirmative claims that pollution harms the environment, argue that pollution is a necessary byproduct of economic growth and industries that cause pollution create necessary products and employ many people across the country.

4. **Turning Causality:** Argue that the Affirmative's plan will do the opposite of what it intends.
   Example: If the Affirmative claims to minimize pollution, argue that the Affirmative actually makes pollution more likely or worse.

5. **Inevitability**: Some problems cannot be solved. The Negative may read evidence to suggest that the issue cannot be solved by any means, including the Affirmative's proposed plan.

6. **It Will Not Work**: Perhaps the most common Negative case strategy is an argument that the plan will fail. This argument should be accompanied by extensive evidence that specifically discredits the plan.

OFF CASE ARGUMENTS

Off case arguments focus on the efficacy of the Affirmative case and consist of evidence that the Affirmative plan will have negative repercussions, even to the point of global disaster. The Negative off case may also propose an alternative means of solving the harms that is preferable to the consequences of adopting the Affirmative plan.

Disadvantages

The heart of any argument is that the proposal will lead to positive change. Therefore, one of the best claims for the Negative is that the proposal will have negative consequences. In debate, we call this kind of argument a disadvantage. Disadvantages are some of the easiest arguments to prove to the judges.

> *Example: Why shouldn't the federal government implement an anti-pollution campaign to impose regulations on environmental pollutants?*
> > ➔ *The government does not have the funds available to finance this initiative.*
> > ➔ *This initiative will result in widespread job loss.*

Types of Disadvantages

There are an infinite number of ways to argue that a change will cause a negative outcome. Here are several types of disadvantages debaters commonly use when arguing against changes in government policy.

- **Economic Costs:** Government programs cost money to create and enforce. These expenses may interfere with the government's ability to fund other important programs. Large costs may also damage the national economy by affecting overall government spending and budgetary priorities.

- **Political Trade-offs**: Leaders who make changes that are unpopular with political parties or their own supporters may lose the influence they need to carry out other important policy changes. Conversely, the plan may increase the popularity of dangerous leaders, allowing them to pursue negative, though unrelated policy changes.

- **Unexpected Consequences**: Sometimes actions taken in one area have profound unexpected consequences. The plan may lead to a chain of disastrous causes and effects unrelated to the original action.

Disadvantages must also be "unique" to the Affirmative plan. This burden means that the drawback occurs ONLY when the plan is passed, and that it will not occur in the present system.

> *Example: If someone said that the proposed plan would not decrease global warming, the Affirmative would have to prove that global warming will not increase or that the plan will make a meaningful change in the severity of global*

warming. This is because some level of global warming is already underway and the plan may not reduce global warming immediately.

Disadvantages must have a large impact – one that is greater than the advantage the Affirmative wins in the debate. The Negative has to prove that the negative consequences of adopting the plan would outweigh the benefits; otherwise, there is no adequate reason to reject the plan. Use the same criteria from the Affirmative plan to explain the Negative team's outcomes:

➔ **Timeframe**: When will the plan's benefits happen? Sooner is better than later.
  Example: New regulations will change the landscape of the job market immediately, as increased restrictions will cause those working in current industries to lose their jobs.

➔ **Magnitude**: How big are the benefits? Benefits can be measured in whatever unit is most persuasive—lives or dollars saved are common considerations.
  Example: Environmental regulations are among the most expensive federal regulations and will cost the economy billions of dollars. Business would be negatively impacted by additional environmental regulations, which would reduce their ability to maintain job stability.

➔ **Probability**: How likely will the plan's benefits happen?
  Example: Environmental regulations will take years to implement and place increased costs, burdens and delays on manufacturers, threaten international competition and make it nearly impossible to grow the job market. In this context, the benefits will never materialize.

➔ **Reversibility**: Can the problem be reversed, or ended later?
  Example: The economic stagnation resulting from environmental regulations would reverse recent gains and have a devastating impact on local communities. Often, the payback period on green capital investments can take too long.

Counter-Proposals
In some cases, the team arguing the Negative can propose a policy alternative of their own. The ability to come up with a unique plan for change is a powerful tool for the Negative. After all, the Affirmative is limited to plans that are examples of what is called for in the topic or resolution. The Negative has no such restrictions.

Counterplans or counter proposals must:
1. Have a specific text outlining their plan of action.

2. Have specific evidence and arguments for their plan.

3. Be mutually exclusive with the Affirmative. Mutual exclusion prevents simultaneous access to shared resources. If one teams proposes an idea, and the other team proposes a different idea, that does not mean that either idea is wrong unless the two ideas are in conflict.

   Example: If one team proposes that the government invest in "green farming" and the other team proposes that the government invest in controlling methane gas leaks, then a conflict has been established: which plan is a better use of the government's limited resources?

4. Lastly, the plan must provide net benefits. A net benefit is any reason that proves that the Affirmative plan does not work, but simultaneously proves that the Negative plan is the better plan.

   Example: The Affirmative proposes that we fix global warming by shifting to wind turbines as our primary source of energy, and the Negative proposes we shift to solar panels. Both proposals will transition the country away from fossil fuels and reduce the carbon footprint. How should the judge decide which is better?
   a. The team arguing the Negative can make internal arguments—which proposal is more effective, efficient, etc.
   b. The team arguing the Negative can also make external arguments—wind turbines might kill birds, but solar panels will not.

Debating the Negative

1NC: The First Negative Constructive

The First Negative Constructive speech (1NC) lays the foundation for the Negative strategy in the debate. In this speech, the Negative outlines every major argument that is part of their strategy. The main job of the 1NC is to present all of the Negative points against the Affirmative case. The 1NC should build a solid Negative policy to defend, whether it is a defense of the status quo or a counterplan. The 1NC should avoid repetitive arguments. Repeating arguments makes it easy for the Affirmative to refute the Negative's claim. This is true for both On Case and Off Case arguments.

2NC: Second Negative Constructive & 1NR: First Negative Rebuttal

The Second Negative Constructive speech (2NC) is one of the most important Negative speeches in the debate. The 2NC typically expands and explains two or three of the arguments that were presented in the 1NC, while the 1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR) handles one or two of the other arguments.

Tips:
- *Start with an Overview; explain the thesis of the argument before explaining the details and responses to the Affirmative.*
- *Compare and Contrast; Compare the advantages and disadvantages of the plan and any potential counterplan.*
- *The goal of these speeches is to create multiple viable ways for the Negative to win the debate—multiple reasons the Affirmative proposal is not a feasible idea. Focus only on the arguments that are most effective.*

2NR: The Second Negative Rebuttal

The second Negative Rebuttal (2NR) must tie together the entire Negative strategy, discuss each part with detail and leave a favorable impression on the judges and the audience. This speech must also respond to any arguments from the 1AR.

Tips:
- Do not try to win every argument. The debaters only need one reason why the Affirmative proposal is flawed, and they should focus on the strongest idea.
- Be opportunistic. Address the arguments that were made in the first Affirmative Rebuttal and focus on the weakest arguments.
- Attempt to anticipate the 2nd Affirmative Rebuttal. Know what arguments they are likely to make, and preempt them.

Debating the Evidence
One team may introduce a piece of evidence but the opposing team does not have prepared answers. A debater can invalidate the other team's evidence without having expert testimony by using the arguments below.

1. Anecdotal evidence:
If the Affirmative mentions one isolated example, make the claim that this is anecdotal evidence, and a policy or proposal should not be based on a single example.

2. Assertions:
If the Affirmative makes a claim without providing any supporting evidence or reasoning, this is an assertion, not a proven argument. Point this out to the judge, as an unsupported claim.

3. Warrantless Evidence:
If the Affirmative reads evidence that states the conclusion of the author without the reasons and evidence to support that conclusion, it is impossible to tell if the claim is true. This is a poor use of evidence and should be noted to the judge. Debaters making this argument will often say that there is "no evidence" for the claim. This simply means that the author of the source does not explain the link between the assumptions and the conclusions.

4. Biased Sources:
Sometimes bias can be revealed about an author based on their job, their affiliations, or the manner in which the other team states their case. Identifying biased sources will hurt the credibility of evidence.

5. Dates:
On rapidly changing issues, the date of the evidence is important. If the Affirmative reads evidence that says the economy is on the brink of collapse or a war is coming, the date the evidence matters. If one team's evidence is more recent than their opponents, they can make this argument to the judges.

6. Vague References:
Often different authors will use the same word to refer to different situations. The word "disaster" coming from a politician might be entirely different from a natural "disaster".

7. No Causality:
Sometimes evidence will refer to correlations between events, but this assertion does not mean that one causes the other. The existence of variables in the same place does not guarantee that there IS causation between any of these problems and the result.

8. The "does it make sense?" test:

Sometimes highly qualified experts make arguments that are obviously flawed. Disprove the logical connections in the evidence, or provide counterexamples from personal experience or personal knowledge.

Public Speaking

Debates are about communication. What a debater says is the most important factor when deciding which team wins. However, debate is a persuasive activity and a strong delivery transforms the content of a speech. Combining substance and style will create powerful, convincing speeches. In debate, the practice and preparation enhances the performance and delivery. If a debater knows their message, believe in its truthfulness, and delivers the message in a manner that is comfortable, they will become an effective advocate and a persuasive public speaker.

Voice
➔ Volume: Speak up! If the judge and the audience cannot hear the speech, they cannot be persuaded.
➔ Speed: If the talking speed is increased, the judge is able to hear more content, however, if the delivery is too fast, the audience won't be able to comprehend what the debater is saying.
➔ Variation: Maintaining one speed and volume is not engaging. Emphasize key points by increasing volume, slowing down, pausing, or a using a combination.

Eye Contact
➔ Be sure to maintain eye contact. The speech will be more convincing if the audience senses that they are being addressed directly.
➔ When speaking, a debater should make eye contact throughout the room.
➔ Always remember that whenever a debater is speaking, they are speaking to someone.

Body Language
➔ Debaters should stand up straight and communicate both their strength of character and the self-confidence in the message.
➔ Eliminate movements such as shifting weight, swaying from side to side, bouncing up and down, or pacing back and forth.
➔ For a public speaker, the best gestures are those that connect to the message being delivered.

Choice of Language
➔ Using the appropriate language helps a debater convince the judge.
➔ Using formal language could help convey seriousness, while informal language could increase relatability. Debaters must choose their words carefully.
➔ The use of name-calling and insults will not convince the audience or judge and that language is not in the spirit of debating.
➔ Using metaphors can be a powerful way to make complex ideas relatable.
➔ Repeating key points can help emphasize them.
➔ Listing points in groups of three is a tool to help the audience remember what was said.

→ Humor can be a useful tool to boost an audience's engagement and view of a situation.
- Make sure to avoid controversial or insulting humor.
- Less is more; humor is often best at the beginning or end of a speech.

TOP 10 THINGS NOT TO DO IN DEBATE

1. Do not commit academic dishonesty. Evidence exists to support every argument. Do not manipulate evidence to fit the argument.

2. Do not make your opponent the object of the debate. For example, do not comment on your opponent's physical appearance or use personal information about them to prove a point. Keep the arguments about the proposed ideas.

3. Do not interrupt an opponent while they are speaking. Everyone deserves a chance to be heard.

4. Do not hide your sources. If another team asks to see your evidence, show it to them.

5. Do not argue with the judge. It is the team's job to persuade the judge with their speeches.

6. Do not participate in debate without being well prepared.

7. Do not keep unorganized files. If a debater has a great quote from an expert but cannot find it, then it is not useful.

8. Do not be nervous. There are no consequences to losing. Debaters compete to develop their skills and meet other debaters who are also passionate about policy reform.

9. Do not give up. Regardless of the winner, each team will learn something from the process.

10. Do not be serious 100% of the time. If you make a mistake, be patient with yourself. Debate is an intellectual space to share and test innovative ideas; use this space to have fun and encourage each other.

Glossary

Affirmative Team: the side that argues in support of the resolution.

Argument: an opinion supported by evidence

Argumentation: a technique that uses evidence and reasoning to support claims.

Attitudinal Barrier: mindsets that block certain policies or laws. Political leaders, court justices, interest groups, and the public all have the power to keep policies from existing.

Claim: a controversial statement that a debater supports or refutes with evidence and reasoning.

Constructive Speech: a speech that presents a debater's basic arguments for or against the resolution.

Cross Examination: the period during a debate when a member of one team asks questions of an opposing team member to gain additional information about their arguments and positions.

Ethos: this is the Greek word for ethics or character and focuses on demonstrating the debaters' trustworthiness, dependability or preparedness.

Evidence: information used to support a claim.

Flowing: Taking notes during a debate competition.

Judge: refers to the individual(s) responsible for determining the winner of a debate round.

Logos: this is the Greek word for logic and focuses on the message and appeal to authority or credibility by offering expertise, research, or data to support arguments.

Negative Team: the side that argues against the resolution.

On-case Argument: arguments that directly respond to the affirmative's case.

Off-case Argument: negative arguments that, while not directly responding to the affirmative's case, are offered as significant reasons for rejecting the case or plan.

Pathos: this is the Greek word that means both experience and suffering and during a debate it focuses on convincing the audience with emotion.

Policy Debate: a form of debate that centers on government policy reform.

Preparation Time: the amount of time given to each team to prepare for their speeches. Prep time may be taken at any time in any interval.

Reasoning: using analysis to connect the evidence to the claim.

Rebuttal Speeches: Speeches in debate that challenge and defend arguments introduces in constructive speeches.

Refutation: the process of attacking an opponent's arguments.

Resolution: the topic being debated.

Structural Barrier: laws, Supreme Court decisions, and executive branch policies that keep a new policy from existing.

PART II: Program Curriculum

The curriculum consists of ten modules that introduce competitive debate. The design of each module helps the participants make the most of their preparation and contain learning goals, lessons, and activities that correspond with sections of the instruction manual. The curriculum is participant-centered and incorporates young people's diverse needs as learners, their experiences as activists, and their efforts and ideas for influencing policy reform.

The curriculum can be covered over the course of three to four days as part of a debate "bootcamp". This allows for a significant amount of the content to be introduced over a short period. The curriculum is also adaptable and the modules can be expanded or repeated to meet the participant's diverse needs. The pace of the program and regularity of the learning sessions should be determined in collaboration with the participants and local partners. Program instructors should make adjustments and add learning activities based on their own experience and expertise. Program instructors should also connect the content of the modules to participant's political activism and the realities of the political landscape. It is expected that participants will continue their preparation and practice for the competitions beyond the debate instruction sessions.

Curriculum Learning Outcomes
- Participants will expand their critical thinking skills.
- Participants will develop argumentation skills.
- Participants will improve their research skills and practice critically analyzing sources of information.
- Participants will develop oratory and active listening skills as a participant and critic.
- Participant will develop interpersonal skills through collaboration with and constructive
  evaluation of their peers.
- Participants will learn to develop policy recommendations and develop advocacy skills.

Debate Curriculum

# Introduction	Time: 1 hr.

1) **Opening Remarks**
   a) Provide a program overview and an overview of the bootcamp.
      i) If the curriculum will be implemented over the course of several weeks or months, discuss the best days to meet and provide all participants with a schedule.
   b) Introduce staff and program instructors.
   c) Discuss learning goals and have all participants discuss their program expectations.
2) **Pre-Assessment**
   a) All participants should receive a questionnaire to assess their debate knowledge prior to the start of the instruction camp.
3) **Team Building Exercise**
   a) Start with an activity that helps the participants and staff get to know each other and begin building group cohesiveness.

# Closing	Time: 1.5 hrs.

Closing Activity
Gather participants as a group and lead them through a reflection exercise that begins with reviewing the details of the camp and transitions toward critical thinking, problem solving, and creating a plan: What?/So What?/Now What?
1) **What**: use facts to describe what happened during the bootcamp and with whom. What was the substance of the group interaction?
2) **So what**: shift from describing the bootcamp experience to discussing the meaning of the experience for participants. This includes their feelings, any lessons learned and why they feel that way.
3) **Now what**: connect their experience to the bigger picture. How will participants apply the lessons learned and insights gained to new situations, including setting future goals and creating an action plan.

Closing Remarks
Provide information about follow-up trainings or practice sessions and tournaments.

MODULE 1: Getting Started	Time: 1.5 hrs.
– Introduction to competitive policy debate **– Connecting the benefits of debate to civic engagement and political participation**	
Introductory Questions – What do you know about debate? – Have you participated in debate before? If so, what type of debate?	
Video: Candidate Debate & Discussion – Show participants a video of a candidate debate – Following the video, have participants discuss their thoughts **Guiding Questions:** What do you think the speakers did right? Wrong? How did the speakers interact with and respond to each other?	
Civics and Debate – Discuss the connection between debate, civic engagement, and political participation **Guiding Questions:** – What is your cause or motivation for participating? (school, community, politics, social issue) – Have you faced barriers when attempting to participate? If so, what are they? How do you face those challenges? – Which local and/or national issues are important to you?	Manual p. 5
What is Policy Debate – Discuss the elements and phases of a debate competition	Manual p. 6–11

MODULE 2: Public Speaking	Time: 1.5 – 2 hrs. Manual p. 35

– Practice speaking under pressure, integrating verbal and nonverbal skills
– Practice persuasive speaking and speaking on unfamiliar issues

ACTIVITY: Filling the Space
1) Have participants get into small groups (3–5).
2) Give the participants a resolution.
   a) *Example: Young people should/should not be in elected positions with power to make decisions.*
3) Instruct one people in each group to speak for 30 seconds continuously without using filler words, without repeating themselves, or using other verbal crutches.

Round Two
4) Repeat the same process with the next participant in the group and extend the speaking time by 30 seconds. Assign participants a different topic.
5) Instruct participants to begin summarizing their points if they run out of things to say.

Round Three
6) Repeat the process and increase the speaking time by 30 seconds for each round until participants reach 2 minutes and 30 seconds.
7) When participants reach 2 minutes and 30 seconds speaking time, give participants 30 additional seconds of preparation time before speaking. They should use the 30 seconds to prepare three main points.
8) Once everyone in the group has a chance to speak for 2 minutes and 30 seconds with preparation time, end the activity.

Post–Activity
9) Discuss the activity and give participants an opportunity to ask questions.

ACTIVITY: 4 Corners
This activity will help participants become more comfortable sharing and defending their opinion in public.
1) Label four corners of the room: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
2) Have participants brainstorm a list of debate resolutions.
   a) *Example: "Corruption should be punishable by the death penalty".*
3) Instruct participants to walk to one of the corners after they hear the resolution. Undecided participants will stay in the middle.
4) Allow each corner 30 seconds to discuss why they chose their corner.
5) Alternating from agree to disagree, have each group volunteer one person to explain why they chose their position.

Round II
6) Participants try to convince other participants to move to their corner. The facilitator also encourages participants to move from one corner to another if they change their position.

7) Each debate ends when each group has a chance to speak and there are no undecided participants in the middle of the room.

MODULE 3: Demonstration Debate	Time: 2 hrs. Manual p. 5

– Participants become familiar with debate components, speech order, cross-examination and note taking

Demonstration Debate
This is a sample debate between experienced debaters. The debaters will discuss their strategy and write their speeches beforehand, including a few mistakes for the purpose of discussion after the debate. Have a facilitator take notes (flow) on an overhead projector and, if possible, videotape the demonstration for future use. Encourage participants to ask questions and take notes based on the points they think are important.

Post-Debate
1) Have the participants vote for the winner.
2) The facilitator then declares the winner as the official judge.
3) The facilitator reviews the notes on the projector and explains how they chose the winning team.
4) Discuss how the participants voted. Encourage participants to be as honest as possible.

Guiding Questions:
- What encouraged them to choose the winner (body language, language choice, tone of voice, content of speech etc.)?
- What guidelines should determine the winner?

Flowing
During the demonstration debate, each participant will practice flowing (note taking).
- Divide a sheet of paper into seven columns.
- Each column represents 1 speech in the debate.
- There are 8 speeches in the debate, but the back-to-back Negative speeches are considered 1 speech divided between two people.

MODULE 4: Cross-Examination	**Time: 30 min** **Manual p. 9**

– Participants learn to use questioning periods to clarify certain aspects of the opponent's case, expose weaknesses in the opponent's case, and build their own case.

Activity: [WUDL Cross Examination Strategy Activity](#)
- Participants will prepare a set of cross-examination questions and write the aim of the questions and the anticipated response to each question.
- Working with a partner, participants will test their questions to see if their opponent responds as they expect.

MODULE 5: Affirmation, Reasoning & Evidence	Time: 2 hrs. Manual p. 13

– Overview of different methods of persuasion
– Introduction to building arguments
– Introduction to refutation and rebuttal

Ethos, Pathos and Logos

Introduce different methods of persuasion and ask volunteers to explain or demonstrate each persuasion technique from their own understanding.

Activity: Persuasion

1) Ask one participant to take on the role of someone in a position of power (Example: Mayor). The person in the position of power has money that can be used to fund a project.
2) Participants will get into small groups and brainstorm a proposal for the mayor.
3) One person from each group will present their idea.
4) The mayor will then decide which person convinced them to fund their project.
5) Use this activity to introduce Affirmation, Reasoning, and Evidence.

MODULE 6: Affirmative Case Preparation	Time: 4 hrs. Manual p. 20

– Introduction to case writing and evidence incorporation

1) Participants get into pairs and review the section <u>Writing an Affirmative Case</u> in the manual.
2) Participants then use the **Public Policy Worksheet** as a guide construct the 1st draft of all four parts of the case with supporting evidence.
3) Facilitators review cases and provide feedback.

Activity: NAUDL Line by Line Challenge
This activity introduces basic argumentation skills. In this activity, participants practice line-by-line refutation. At the end of the round, each speaker of the 4-member group completes a rebuttal speech using the technique: Repeat, Refute and Resume.

Activity: NAUDL Introduction to Clash
This activity introduces clash and direct refutation skills. It is helpful as an introduction to the lesson about clash or rebuttal. Participants give short opposing speeches in front of the group and the facilitator points out where the arguments clashed and where they did not.

MODULE 7: Exploring the Topic	Time: 1 hr. Manual p. 17

- Participants learn the value of research for debate
- Participants receive examples of inaccurate sources vs reputable sources
- Participants brainstorm as a group and begin thinking strategically about the topic

1) Discuss the qualities of good evidence:
   a) Publish Date
   b) Source Authority
   c) Source Neutrality
   d) Citations
2) Discuss where to find research:
   a) Evaluating online sources of information
3) Discuss original research
   a) Gathering evidence from others through stories

Activity: Identifying Evidence
1) Separate participants into small groups (3-4) and give each group an article that relates to the topic.
2) Participants will read the article, mark sections that can be used as evidence. Participants then decide how each piece of evidence should be used during a debate.

Topic Discussion
1) Discuss the resolution.
   a) What are the keywords and why is it written this way?
   b) Is the topic debatable? Why or why not?
2) Create lists of arguments for and against the resolution using poster board or whiteboards.

MODULE 8: Impact Calculus	Time: 1 hr. Manual p. 23
– Participants learn about impact calculus, which is a type of argumentation that compares the impact of the cases presented by both teams.	
Use the manual to discuss the following: 1) Timeframe 2) Magnitude 3) Probability 4) Reversibility	
Activity: Impact Spar SPAR Debating is an exercise for cultivating and maintaining interest in debate.	

MODULE 9: Negative Case Preparation	Time: 2 hrs. Manual p. 27-29

- Participants learn about on-case arguments
- Participants learn about off case arguments: disadvantages and counter proposals

On-Case Arguments

On-case arguments aim to discredit the content of the Affirmative's policy proposal and focus directly on the various elements of the proposal.

Use the manual to discuss the strategies below:
1) Minimizing Harm
2) Denying Causality
3) Turn the Harm into a Positive
4) Turning Causality
5) Inevitability
6) The Plan Won't Work

Off Case Arguments

Off-case arguments focus on the efficacy of the Affirmative proposal and consist of evidence that the Affirmative plan will have negative repercussions, even to the point of global disaster. The Negative off case may also propose an alternative means of solving the harms that is preferable to the consequences of adopting the Affirmative plan.

Use the manual to discuss the strategies below:
1) Disadvantages
   a) Economic
   b) Political Trade-offs
   c) Unexpected Consequences
   d) Review timeframe, probability, magnitude, and reversibility
2) Counterplans or Counter Proposals

MODULE 10: Practice Debate	Time: 2 hrs. Manual p. 7–12
– Participants practice a full round of debate	
– Review the manual for the components and phases of a full round of debate – During each practice debate, partner a participant with a facilitator to serve as judges – Always allow time for feedback and discussion at the end of the round	

Acknowledgements

The National Democratic Institute is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, nongovernmental organization working to support and strengthen democratic institutions worldwide through citizen participation, openness and accountability in government. Since its founding in 1983, NDI and its local partners have worked to support and strengthen democratic institutions and practices by strengthening political parties, civic organizations and parliaments, safeguarding elections, and promoting citizen participation, openness and accountability in government. NDI's multinational approach reinforces the message that while there is no single democratic model, certain core principles are shared by all democracies. For more information about NDI, please visit ndi.org.

National Democratic Institute
455 Massachusetts Ave, NW – 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
www.ndi.org