

Team Policy Debate

Team Policy Debate is also known as CX Debate. A team of two debaters on each side debates a question of policy change. The affirmative team proposes a change in policy that fits within the assigned resolution, and the negative team presents potential problems with the specific policy change. A single debate round takes approximately 75 minutes.

Timing

Debaters will be responsible for timing their own speeches, cross-examinations, and preparation time. Judges can track speech types on the provided flow sheet.

Judge Responsibilities

1. It is a judge's responsibility to consider the round in an unbiased way to make a fair decision based on argumentation presented. A judge should make their decision based only on evidence and arguments presented in the round rather than the judge's previous knowledge of the topic. The judge's role is to determine whether the affirmative team has adequately defended the resolution against the negative team's arguments.
2. A judge should maintain a bias-free ruling by refraining from discussing the round or their decision with any debaters or fellow judges until after the tournament has ended.
3. Upon conclusion of the round, the judge should promptly exit the competition room and complete their ballot elsewhere such as in the judge room so that the competitors and staff may quickly transition to the next event.
4. If a judge wishes to review a piece of evidence, they should wait until after the round and ask a staff member who will get the physical evidence from the debater. This will allow the judge to maintain a bias-free ruling of the round.
5. Debaters may not interact with the judge directly unless their timer is on. The only exception is to briefly introduce their name and position and ask for the experience or judging philosophy before the round and thank the judge after the round is over.

Team Policy Debate Flow Sheet



2023-2024 Team Policy Resolution

The United States Federal Government should significantly reform its public health or healthcare policy.

Constructive Speech (1AC) 1st Affirmative Speaker 8 minutes	CX 2N 3min	Constructive Speech (1NC) 1st Negative Speaker 8 minutes	CX 1A 3min	Constructive Speech (2AC) 2nd Affirmative Speaker 8 minutes	CX 1N 3min	Constructive Speech (2NC) 2nd Negative Speaker 8 minutes	CX 2A 3min

Team Policy Debate Flow Sheet



2023-2024 Team Policy Resolution

The United States Federal Government should significantly reform its public health or healthcare policy.

Rebuttal Speech (1NR) 1st Negative Speaker 5 minutes	Rebuttal Speech (1AR) 1st Affirmative Speaker 5 minutes	Rebuttal Speech (2NR) 2nd Negative Speaker 5 minutes	Rebuttal Speech (2AR) 2nd Affirmative Speaker 5 minutes

Team Policy Debate Ballot



2023-2024 Team Policy Resolution The United States Federal Government should significantly reform its public health or healthcare policy.	Affirmative:	
	Negative :	
	Judge :	
	Round :	Room:

<u>Winning Team</u>	
Affirmative	Negative

Speaker Points

1st Affirmative Speaker :	Rank
<i>Score 1-5 (1=unacceptable, 2=fair, 3= good, 4=excellent, 5=superior)</i>	
Constructive Speech	
Cross-Examination	
Rebuttal Speech	
Evidence	
Organization	
Delivery	
Total Speaker Points	

Speaker Feedback

1st Negative Speaker :	Rank
<i>Score 1-5 (1=unacceptable, 2=fair, 3= good, 4=excellent, 5=superior)</i>	
Constructive Speech	
Cross-Examination	
Rebuttal Speech	
Evidence	
Organization	
Delivery	
Total Speaker Points	

Speaker Feedback

Please see the reverse side for the remainder of the ballot.

2023-2024 Team Policy Resolution

The United States Federal Government should significantly reform its public health or healthcare policy.

Speaker Points (continued)

2nd Affirmative Speaker :	Rank
<i>Score 1-5 (1=unacceptable, 2=fair, 3= good, 4=excellent, 5=superior)</i>	
Constructive Speech	
Cross-Examination	
Rebuttal Speech	
Evidence	
Organization	
Delivery	
Total Speaker Points	

Speaker Feedback

2nd Negative Speaker :	Rank
<i>Score 1-5 (1=unacceptable, 2=fair, 3= good, 4=excellent, 5=superior)</i>	
Constructive Speech	
Cross-Examination	
Rebuttal Speech	
Evidence	
Organization	
Delivery	
Total Speaker Points	

Speaker Feedback

Reason for Decision

Debate Speaker Points Rubric

ASDA Core Values of Conversational, Collaborative, Congenial should be evident in all events	1 Unacceptable <i>Well below expectations of ASDA competitors</i>	2 Fair <i>Growth necessary to successfully compete with others in this room</i>	3 Good <i>Prepared, competent competitor compared to others in this room</i>	4 Excellent <i>Top Half of Room. Polished, well-spoken competitor compared to others in this room</i>	5 Superior <i>Exceeding other competitors in this room in preparation, polish and presentation</i>
Constructive Speech <i>Debater provides a compelling speech affirming or negating the resolution</i>	Lack of preparation, attitude of disregard for opponent and judge	Lack of understanding, little convincing argumentation	Understanding of the issues, adequately convincing argumentation	Deep research, clear and compelling argumentation	Comprehensive research, mature and persuasive argumentation
Cross-Examination <i>Debater asks questions to clarify the round</i>	Aggressive time manipulation or belittling of opponent	Inability to comprehend the issues or formulate clarifying questions	Inquiries and responses that show knowledge of the issues	Skill in asking and answering questions that enhance the round	Strong use of questions and answers to strengthen position and weaken opposing view
Rebuttal Speech <i>Debater refutes earlier argumentation and strengthens position</i>	Misrepresentation of evidence, introduction of new argumentation, or use of other unkind and unfair tactics	Inability to understand the issues or deliver reasonable rebuttal speeches	Adequate understanding of the issues and some refutation of earlier arguments	Refutation of earlier arguments, clarification of misunderstandings, strengthening of position	Compelling ability to refute arguments, simplify the round, and convincingly clarify position
Evidence <i>Debater uses evidence in the form of advocacy, examples or logic to support claims</i>	Misuse of evidence through ignorance or willful manipulation or misapplication of advocacy, examples, or logic	Lack of advocacy, irrelevant examples, illogical arguments, or incorrect citations	Appropriate amount of advocacy, examples or basic logic	Excellent use of relevant advocacy, helpful examples, and clear logical connections that show depth of research	Superior use of extensive advocacy, enriching examples, or advanced logic that shows comprehensive research
Organization <i>Debater organizes speeches so that ideas flow logically</i>	Weak and hard to follow organization	Some organization of arguments around a thesis, somewhat logical presentation	Organizational techniques that add meaning to the round	Organization that helps the judge understand the arguments and the flow from speech to speech	Organization that simplifies the round and flows logically from the constructive speech to the final conclusion
Delivery <i>Debater uses speech and body language to uphold ASDA values</i>	Poor delivery that is disrespectful, aggressive, unkind or inappropriate	Discomfort on stage, awkward speech or body language	Comfort on stage, polite speech and body language	Stage presence that shows kindness and respect to the opponent and judge	Ability to build a relationship with the judge and opponent