

Chapter A3 – Debate Rules

This chapter addresses the framework, standards, and requirements for CCNW Team Policy Debate. It is intended to cover issues related to what occurs within the debate round.

Unless otherwise stated, the information set forth in this section shall be understood, accepted, and followed as mandatory rules or standards. The intent of CCNW is to use standardized debate theory and protocol as a central part of the educational environment. CCNW expects all participants to pursue mastery of the principles and practices set forth herein.

While CCNW understands that debate theory is debatable in other leagues, debate theory or debate protocol is not debatable in CCNW. CCNW debates should be about the substance of the issues and not about the relative merits of various debate theories. All comments and recommendations about theory or protocol should be directed to the CCNW Board, not the subject of argumentation during a debate round.

Chapter Contents

A3.1 Team Structure	1
A3.2 Case Structure.....	2
A3.3 Debate Round Structure.....	5
A3.4 Timing the Round	9
A3.5 Win-Loss Decision Criteria: The Stock Issues	10
A3.6 Speaker Evaluation Criteria	16
A3.7 Other In-Round Debate Rules	19

Team Structure

I. General

The debate shall be conducted between two debate teams with two people on each team. One team shall be designated as the Affirmative Team. The other team shall be designated as the Negative Team.

The speakers on each team shall be designated as the #1, or 1st speaker and the #2 or 2nd speaker. These designations shall apply throughout the debate round.

The combination of team assignment (Affirmative or Negative) and speaker designation (#1 or #2) specify the role of each debater for a given debate round.

- 1A = 1st Affirmative Speaker
- 2A = 2nd Affirmative Speaker
- 1N = 1st Negative Speaker
- 2N = 2nd Negative Speaker

These designations correlate directly to the names of the speeches presented in Section A3.4, Debate Round Structure. Speakers must give those speeches indicated by the designated speech name. Exchanging speeches with a partner, or in any way altering the explicit relationship between debater designation and speech order is prohibited.

II. The Affirmative Team

The Affirmative Team is assigned the task of affirming the Resolution. This means their goal is to demonstrate to the judge that the Resolution, which calls for a change or reform in current U.S. Federal Government policy, should be adopted.

III. The Negative Team

The task of the Negative Team is to oppose the Affirmative Team's efforts. This may generally be done in one of two ways. First, the Negative Team may attempt to convince the judge that there is insufficient reason to change or reform the policy in question. Second, they may attempt to convince the judge that the particular plan proposed by the Affirmative Team will not work sufficiently well to merit adoption. Either the plan will fail to create the desired benefits, or it will cause adverse unintended consequences that negate any possible benefits arising from the plan.

A3.2 Case Structure

I. Purpose of the Case Structure

The "Case" is the complete package of argumentation and supporting information presented by the Affirmative Team. CCNW dictates the type of content and order of presentation that all Affirmative Teams must use when presenting their case. The use of a standardized case structure facilitates the efficient exchange of information and ideas, thus enhances the likelihood of good debate.

II. Case Structure Elements

The following describes the content to be incorporated into the various elements of the case.

Prima Facie. The Affirmative Team must present a prima facie case in the 1AC. That means that they must present sufficient information in each required part of the case structure to be clear as to their intent.

In satisfactorily presenting all required elements of a case, the Affirmative Team fixes the positions that they will be arguing throughout the debate round. They must hold these positions for the duration of the round, arguing and defending them to the best of their ability. They may not alter or shift their position in an attempt to overcome arguments presented by the Negative Team.

When the Affirmative Team presents a Prima Facie case, it is assumed that it holds all four Stock Issues. To win the Round, the Negative Team must present argumentation that overcomes the Affirmative position on at least one of the Stock Issues. Thus, when the Affirmative Team presents a Prima Facie case, any Stock Issue not contested by the Negative Team is won by the Affirmative Team.

When the Affirmative Team fails to present a Prima Facie case it has failed to show one or more essential reason for adopting the Affirmative Plan. When this happens, the Affirmative Team should lose the Round. The appropriate procedure is for the Negative to challenge Prima Facie in the INC, identifying the missing elements and asking the judge to vote for the Negative Team because the Affirmative case was not Prima Facie. The arguments for and against the case being Prima Facie may be made throughout the Round. The decision is to be made after the Round during the normal ballot process. The judge should award those Stock Issues to the Negative Team that were affected by the Prima Facie failure.

A. Definitions

For a legitimate debate to occur, both sides must be using a common vocabulary. When a particular term is used, both teams need to know what it means, both for their team and to their opponents. The Definitions section of the case structure is provided for the Affirmative Team to present the meanings they want to apply to key terms that relate to issues they expect to be debated in the round.

In their response the Negative Team may dispute any definition presented by the Affirmative Team. If they do so, and agreement on a common understanding isn't reached by the teams, the judge will have to decide which team better justified their definition. In addition to contesting Affirmative Team definitions, the Negative Team may introduce definitions of their own if they believe it will aid in the presentation of their arguments.

B. Harms of the Status Quo

These are often labeled the “Harms” for brevity. For the Affirmative Team to justify the need for change, they must demonstrate that the existing policy causes a problem that is bad enough to warrant incurring the risk of change. It is not generally good practice to make a policy change simply for the sake of change.

C. Plan

This is the specific proposal for the changes the Affirmative Team wants to implement. The plan has a number of different elements that, taken together, provide the ability to demonstrate an adequate overall address to the full range of potential policy making concerns.

Fiat Power. Fiat power provides the Affirmative Team the ability to assume their plan will be adopted. The debate then can center on the merits of the plan rather than on its political viability (“It will never happen because of the party currently in power.”). Fiat power only extends to the act of passing the plan, not to controlling consequences. Fiat power extends only to the entity (Agency) with the authority to make policy. It does not extend to dictating what happens with other, non-policy making parts of the government (courts).

1. Mandates.

Mandates are the key part of the Plan. They specify the policy changes the Affirmative Team wants to implement. There must be at least one Topical Mandate for the case to be Topical. (See below for a discussion of the Stock Issue of Topicality).

2. Agency.

The entity that has the authority to enact the proposed policy change. Since CCNW debates are always about U.S. Federal Government policy, the Agency must be the appropriate part of the U.S. Federal Government. In many cases the Agency will be Congress and the President who have the authority to enact laws. In some cases, depending on the policy in question, the policy change may be enacted at a lower governmental level, such as Department (Agriculture, Energy, Interior, etc.).

3. Enforcement.

This is the means by which the Affirmative Team intends to ensure that their Mandates will be implemented and enforced as intended. It is not assumed that just because a policy is enacted that, without proper enforcement, it will be obeyed.

4. Funding.

Not all Affirmative Plans need money to be implemented. However, when a Plan is proposed that requires governmental expenditures to work, the Affirmative must provide adequate funds through this part of the Plan.

5. Addendum.

The concluding plank of the affirmative team's plan which adds further provisions that may be necessary to complete the plan's implementation. For example, it might provide for the repeal of conflicting legislation, indicate the intent of the plan, and provide other details that could help make the plan comprehensive and understandable.

In addition, the Addendum may be used by the Affirmative Team to reserve the right to expand upon their plan in future speeches. This use does not give them the right to substantively change or add to their plan. It does give them the right to further explain details embodied in the original plan, but not explained in depth due to time constraints.

D. Advantages

These are the benefits the Affirmative Team expects to achieve with the adoption of their Plan. They are intended to provide the judge with a clear picture of the way things should be, in contrast to the way they are in the status quo.

The Affirmative Team may only derive legitimate Advantages from the implementation of Topical Mandates. When weighing Advantages, the judge must determine whether or not the Mandate giving rise to the Advantage in question is Topical, and set aside any benefits arising from non-Topical Mandates.

III. Supplemental Information

It is common for Affirmative Teams to build into the presentation of their case certain introductory comments, or transitional phrases that aid in making the speech interesting or move smoothly from one subject to the next. The use of these elements that do not strictly fall within the allowable case structure is acceptable. However, the Affirmative Team may not, through the use of such supplemental elements change any of the requirements of the debate round, or place any additional burden on the Negative Team.

An example of one type of supplemental information sometimes used by some Affirmative Teams in other debate leagues is the “Resolutional Analysis” or “Affirmative Philosophy”. This is generally presented after the definitions and is used to try to describe key aspects of what the Affirmative Team believes good policy should look like. To ensure the focus of the debate remains on the Stock Issues, the use of a “Resolutional Analysis”, “Affirmative Philosophy”, or similar elements is prohibited in CCNW debate. Should one be presented by an Affirmative Team, the judge shall ignore it completely in deciding the case, instruct the team to remove it before their next Affirmative Round, and notify the Event Director.

IV. Allowable Case Structure

CCNW allows only one case structure as presented below. No other case structures are permitted. Use of any case structure other than the Needs Analysis will result in the loss of the round by the Affirmative Team.

A. Needs Analysis

1. Definitions (Optional)
2. Harms (No limit on number of Harms.)
 - a) Harm 1 (May have main point and multiple sub-points.)
 - b) Harm 2 (May have main point and multiple sub-points.)
3. Plan (in any order)
 - a) Mandates
 - b) Agency
 - c) Funding
 - d) Enforcement
 - e) Addendum
4. IV. Advantages (No limit on number of Advantages.)
 - a) Advantage 1 (Main Point)
 - b) Advantage 2 (Main Point)

A3.3 Debate Round Structure

I. Purpose of the Round Structure

The round structure, including the order of speeches, the time allowed for each speech, and other requirements has been developed to create a fair and reasonable framework in which to conduct the debate. Round structure requirements must be strictly followed.

II. Speech Order and Times

The following is the required order of speeches and the time allotted for each. An explanation of each type of speech, and what is and is not permitted with each type is provided below. CX is used to abbreviate a cross-examination.

1AC	1 st Affirmative Constructive.....	8 minutes
CX	Cross Examination of the 1A by the 2N	3 minutes
1NC	1 st Negative Constructive	8 minutes
CX	Cross Examination of the 1N by the 1A	3 minutes

2AC	2 nd Affirmative Constructive.....	8 minutes
CX	Cross Examination of the 2A by the 1N	3 minutes
2NC	2 nd Negative Constructive	8 minutes
CX	Cross Examination of the 2N by the 2A	3 minutes
1NR	1 st Negative Rebuttal	5 minutes
1AR	1 st Affirmative Rebuttal.....	5 minutes
2NR	2 nd Negative Rebuttal	5 minutes
2AR	2 nd Affirmative Rebuttal.....	5 minutes

III. Constructives

These speeches are used to construct the Affirmative and Negative positions. In general, new issues and ideas may be introduced throughout the Constructives, provided that the responsibilities set forth are fulfilled.

The Affirmative Team is prohibited from providing a copy of the 1AC to the Judge, even when the Judge requests a copy. The 1AC is typically the only completely pre-written speech during the debate round. It is typically considered an advantage to the Affirmative Team for the Judge to have a copy of the 1AC as a reference during the Round since there isn't a comparable summary of the Negative position. Furthermore, debate is intended to be based on effective oral communication, and allowing written communication could be detrimental to developing the desired oral communication skills.

The Negative Team must respond in the 1NC with substantive argumentation to each point presented by the Affirmative Team that the Negative Team intends to challenge. Any substantive point of the 1AC not addressed by the 1NC is considered dropped and conceded by the Negative Team. (See below for additional discussion of dropped arguments.) Splitting the Negative is specifically prohibited. (See the Glossary in this Manual for the CCNW definition of Splitting the Negative.)

If the Negative Team wants to challenge the Topicality of the Affirmative case, it must declare its intent and set forth the reasons why it considers the case to not be Topical in the 1NC. Then, if after the response in the 2AC, the Negative Team still believes the case to not be Topical and it desires the judge to issue a decision concerning Topicality, the 2N must specifically request a Topicality ruling from the judge after the cross-examination by the 2A, and before the 2N sits down. Once the 2N is seated the Constructives are over and Topicality may no longer be argued.

If the Negative Team wishes to claim that the Affirmative Plan will create Disadvantages, the 1NC must state the intent to present disadvantages, must identify the number of disadvantages to be presented, and provide a brief 1-2 sentence summary of the substance of each disadvantage. If the 1NC fulfills this responsibility, the 2NC may more fully develop these disadvantages. Disadvantages not announced by the 1NC must not be considered by the judge in his decision regarding the winner of the round.

IV. Cross-Examination

Cross-examination is provided in the structure to allow the opposing team an opportunity to question the speaker regarding his speech in particular and his case in general.

A. Purpose of Cross-Examination

There are typically three uses for Cross-examination. However, Cross-examination is not necessarily limited to just these uses.

1. Fill in missing information.
2. Clarify unclear issues or information.
3. Seek admissions from the speaker regarding weaknesses in his position. While such questions may be difficult and awkward for the respondent, they are a legitimate part of the debate protocol.

B. Protocol for Cross-Examination

1. Debater Roles in Cross-Examination

The debaters are to fill specified roles during Cross-examination. The Cross-examiner (the debater from the team opposing the debater who just finished his speech) is to exclusively ask questions. The debater who just finished speaking is to exclusively answer questions. Cross-examination is not a dialogue. It is a question and answer session.

The true audience for the debaters is the judge, not the opposing debater. Thus, debaters are to look at the judge when they are asking or answering questions. They are not to look at each other.

2. Courtesy During Cross-Examination

Team policy debate is a competitive activity. Cross-examination is part of that competition. Therefore, debaters may pursue aggressive lines of questioning in order to efficiently and effectively obtain the information they desire. Because of this, debaters should be prepared for aggressive questioning from opponents during Cross-examination.

At the same time, CCNW debaters are brothers and sisters in Christ seeking to develop skills to be used in his service. Therefore, all CCNW debaters should be careful to conduct themselves with attitudes of charity and grace suitable to their Christian characters.

3. Control of Cross-Examination

The Cross-examiner is in control of Cross-examination. He has the right to ask any reasonable question and expect a reasonable answer.

When the Cross-examiner has received what he considers to be a sufficient and satisfactory answer, he has the right to direct the respondent to quit answering. The proper protocol for this is for the Cross-examiner to say "Thank you." Upon hearing "Thank you" the respondent should stop speaking and get prepared for the next question.

Failure of the respondent to respect the “Thank you” from the Cross-examiner is a failure of Cross-examination protocol and should be reflected in the respondent’s speaker score for “Cross-Examination”

The Cross-examiner should not abuse his control of Cross-examination. Bullying or badgering the respondent by repeated abrupt cutting off of replies should not occur. Doing so may be reflected in the Cross-examiner’s speaker score for “Cross-Examination”.

V. Rebuttals

Rebuttals are distinguished from Constructives by the fact that no new arguments (new issues or new ideas) may be presented by either team in the rebuttals. All points made during Rebuttals must be related to an issue or an idea that was introduced into the debate during the Constructives. New evidence or a new way of explaining a point is acceptable in a Rebuttal, as long as the underlying issue or idea was presented in a Constructive.

Any new argument, issue, or idea presented in a Rebuttal must be disregarded by the judge and not factored into the judge’s decision in any way. While it is permissible, and often occurs, for a team to draw attention to a new argument raised by their opponents, it is not necessary that they do so. The judge can, and should, disregard any new arguments presented in a Rebuttal regardless of whether or not they are prompted to do so by the debaters.

At the same time, the judge should carefully refer to his own notes and memory whenever a debater claims his opponent has presented a new argument in a Rebuttal. It is possible that the debater making such a claim, under the stress of the round, missed the point when it was originally made in a Constructive and thus incorrectly believes it is only now being made for the first time.

VI. Preparation (Prep) Time

Each team is allowed a total of 5 minutes of preparation time during the round. They may request to use this time prior to any of their speeches. Prep time may be used in any amount before any speech until the total 5 minutes has been used. Once the allotted 5 minutes has been used by a given team, that team may not have any additional preparation time and must immediately go to the podium to speak when it is their turn.

Under certain conditions debaters may ask for information from the opposing team for their use during prep time. The Negative Team may request a copy of the 1AC for their use during prep time prior to the 1NC. The 1N should return the 1AC prior to starting the 1NC. It is not permissible for the 1N to use the written 1AC during his speech.

In addition, the team preparing for the next speech may request copies of evidence previously presented by their opponent during the round. The request should be as clear and explicit as possible, and the opposing team should provide the requested evidence as promptly as possible. The speaker should return the evidence prior to his speech. He should not retain it, and if inadvertently retained should not use the printed evidence directly.

A3.4 Timing the Round

I. Timer Responsibility

Each CCNW Work Day, Round Robin, or Tournament debate round must have a designated person, other than the debaters and the judge, responsible for keeping track of speech time and preparation time. The timer must meet CCNW requirements for age and any other criteria established by CCNW for timers.

II. Time Signals

The timer must carefully track time and keep the debaters apprised of the passage of time as described below.

A. Time Signals for Specific Parts of the Round

1. Constructives. Time remaining at 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 minutes, 30 seconds, and each of the last 10 seconds.
2. Cross-Examination. Time remaining at 2 and 1 minutes, 30 seconds, and each of the last 10 seconds.
3. Rebuttals. Time remaining at 3, 2 and 1 minutes, 30 seconds, and each of the last 10 seconds.
4. Saying “Time”. When the allotted time for a speech is finished the timer must say “Time” in a clear voice, loud enough for all debaters and the judge to hear.
5. Preparation (Prep) Time.

The team preparing to speak must notify the timer that they are using prep time. If they wish to be notified regularly, such as at 30-second intervals, of the passage of time, they must make this request of the timer. If this request is made, the time must verbally report the passage of time as requested. When the team preparing to speak is ready they are to notify the timer to stop prep time.

When requested by the Team using prep time, the timer shall notify the team how much prep time they used and the total amount of time they have remaining for the rest of that round.

III. Exceeding Time Limits

Time limits must be adhered to strictly for all speeches and for preparation time.

A speaker, whether giving a speech or speaking during Cross-examination, must stop speaking as soon as practical after “Time” is called. They may finish their current sentence, as long as they bring it to an immediate conclusion. Anything over about 5-seconds should be considered an unacceptable overrun of speech limits.

The judge may impose two consequences for speakers who exceed time limits. The first consequence is to ignore any information presented after time is called. The second consequence is to factor the failure to adhere to time limits into the speaker evaluation by lowering the score for “Organization” by at least one point, and possibly more if the violation is either repeated or of a significantly long duration.

A3.5 Win-Loss Decision Criteria: The Stock Issues

I. Purpose and Use of the Stock Issues

The Stock Issues are the sole criteria for determining the winner of the debate round, unless Ethical issues arise. Taken together, when understood and used properly, the Stock Issues constitute a full justification for accepting or rejecting the proposition embodied by the Resolution.

II. Basis for Evaluating the Stock Issues

A. In-Round Argumentation Only. No Personal Bias.

A debate round is a contest of argumentation between the two teams debating. The only information the judge is allowed to use to determine the winner is that which is presented by the debaters during the round. For all intents and purposes, if something is not specifically stated by a debater during the debate round, that information does not exist and can't be used by the judge.

B. Weighing Evidence

A key aspect of good argumentation is the support of important claims or statements with facts or reasoned conclusions by qualified experts. This is particularly important in debates between high school students who are not usually recognized as experts on the topics they are debating. When, as is often the case, the positions presented by the two debate teams are at odds with each other, the quality, timeliness, and applicability of supporting evidence should carry significant weight in determining which position to accept.

The judge may know of other, better information that would lead to a different conclusion if it were introduced into the debate round. In such cases the judge must take special care to disregard all such personal knowledge and rely solely on the evidence presented in the round by the debaters.

1. **Quality.** The quality of evidence is largely tied to the level of expertise, authority, and resulting respect attributed to the source.

It is important that the particular authority or expertise of a source be relevant to the particular point being presented. It may well be that an individual is the world's foremost expert in a particular subject, such as nuclear physics. However, the prestige and name recognition gained from such prominence should not be allowed to result in attributing credibility to such an expert outside of his acknowledged field or fields.

2. **Timeliness.** Timeliness can be very important. In some cases it can be a determining factor. Such may be the case for a variety of studies where a newer study provides more current and relevant information.

However, more recent is not always better. "Old" evidence may be perfectly appropriate to represent particular facts or circumstances. And, newer studies are not always better than older ones.

Judges need to be careful when assessing the dates of evidence and the appropriate weights to be given to newer vs. older information.

3. **Applicability.** The weight or importance given to evidence presented in the round should include an assessment of how directly that evidence relates to the point under consideration.

Some evidence may not seem particularly relevant at first. In such cases it is the debater's responsibility to provide the logical connection between the evidence cited and the point the debater is trying to make. Here again, the judge should not apply prior knowledge or bias, but judge the applicability of evidence based on what the debaters argue in the round.

4. **Common Knowledge and Logic.** The basic expectation in CCNW debate is that debaters will back up all of their important statements with credible evidence from appropriate sources. A debate judge deciding a point of argumentation on the basis of an unsupported opinion or assertion of a high school age student may be either giving that student more credit than appropriate, or accepting statements based on knowledge other than what has been presented in the round.

However, with all that said, there are instances where it may be reasonable and appropriate for a judge to accept and consider statements made by a debater that are not backed up by a specific document read in the debate round. There are many basic facts that are considered common knowledge that may be reasonable to introduce into a debate round without specific documentation. CCNW does not intend to attempt to define what might or might not be considered common knowledge, but rather leaves it to the discretion of the judge.

The bottom line is that a debater need not have documentary evidence backing every single statement, if a particular statement is reasonably considered common knowledge. Well-explained and logically applied common knowledge can win important points in a debate round.

C. Dropped Arguments

1. **Defined and Explained.** When a debater fails to directly and substantively respond to an argument presented by his opponent in the speech immediately prior to his, he is said to have dropped that argument. The concern about dropped arguments centers on the short, tightly constrained format of a debate round. When a debater fails to respond to his opponent's arguments at the first opportunity to do so, he denies his opponent the chance to engage in a meaningful debate over the issue. In the most extreme case, both teams could hide key positions to the end of the round. In such a circumstance the debate would devolve into opposing platform speeches (much like modern political debates). Dropping arguments, intentionally or not, is not acceptable in CCNW debate and may be subject to significant consequences.
2. The normal consequence of a debater dropping an argument is for that drop to be assessed as a concession of the point to the opposing team. The silence (failure to present a counter argument) is viewed as being in agreement.

Once an argument is dropped, it may not be picked up again by the team that dropped it.

Dropping an argument does not necessarily mean a team will lose the debate round. The team dropping a point loses that point. It depends on the importance of that particular point on how it affects any particular stock issue and ultimately the win/loss decision for the round.

3. Repetitive Arguments (Drops with No Impact). Under some circumstances both teams will fall into a pattern of simply repeating what they (or their partner) said in an earlier speech. There is no new argumentation being presented by either side. Under these circumstances there should not be any particular merit or value assigned to being the last to simply repeat a point. If this occurs, the judge may, and should, evaluate the arguments presented by each team and award credit as appropriate rather than viewing this as a drop and scoring it as such.

III. Topicality

The discussion of Topicality in this section is limited to the basics as they relate to evaluating Topicality as a Stock Issue within a debate Round. Other sections of this Manual address CCNW intent and philosophy with regard to Topicality.

As a Stock Issue, Topicality looks at whether or not the case presented by the Affirmative Team falls within the boundaries of topics intended for debate. If the case is not Topical, there is no basis for a debate. Topicality is to be evaluated in conjunction with the Resolitional Intent Letter. This letter, issued by CCNW, explains on a point-by-point basis what the Affirmative Team must do, and clearly demonstrate to the judge they are doing, in order to be Topical.

The key to whether or not a case is Topical is found in the Mandates. If one mandate is Topical, making a reform or change to the policy area specified by the Resolution, the case is Topical.

If the Negative Team believes the Affirmative case to not be Topical (there are no Topical mandates), they must present substantive arguments for their position in the 1NC.

If Topicality is challenged, it is the responsibility of the Affirmative Team to rebut the Topicality challenge in the 2AC. The Affirmative Team's belief that their case is Topical does not guarantee that it is Topical.

If after the arguments presented in the 2AC, the Negative Team still believes the Affirmative case is not Topical, they should use the 2NC to further argue their position. If the Negative Team wants the judge to rule the Affirmative case not-Topical, they must specifically request a Topicality ruling after the cross-examination following the 2NC. If the 2NC speaker sits down without specifically requesting a Topicality ruling, the case is considered Topical (marked for the Affirmative on the ballot) and the round continues into Rebuttals to continue the debate over the Policy Stock Issues.

Dealing with "Substantial(ly)" or "Significant(ly)" in the wording of the Resolution. Each Resolution requires that the policy change be substantial or significant. There are two closely related reasons for this practice:

- Ensure the case is important enough to be worthy of attention, and
- Ensure the case is not so obscure and trivial that it is unlikely to be researched by a typical Negative Team.

An attack on the case not being Substantial (or Significant as appropriate) is normally the weakest of all Topicality attacks and should be approached with skepticism. If the Affirmative Team appears to be legitimately attempting to address an important issue, and can reasonably explain how their case is Substantial (or Significant), they should win this part of a Topicality challenge. However, if the case is built on an issue that is truly minor and unimportant, then attack on it for its not being Substantial (or Significant) can be legitimate, and the basis for a Negative win.

Extra-Topicality occurs when the Affirmative Team presents one or more Topical Mandates (making the case Topical), and then includes one or more Mandates that are not Topical. Extra-Topical mandates may be included to address housekeeping details as appropriate. However, the Affirmative Team may not be credited with any Advantages (any reason to vote for the case) arising from Extra-Topical Mandates. Disadvantages may be tied to Extra-Topical mandates, so an Affirmative Team risks Disadvantages without the possibility of Advantages when they include Extra-Topical Mandates.

IV. Policy Stock Issues

A. Significance

Significance looks at whether there is justification for change. Policies should not be changed unless there is a compelling reason. In some cases the compelling reason is something bad that is occurring today, or it may be a problem of a desirable improvement that is being hindered.

When arguing that a particular issue is Significant, the Affirmative Team will normally present information on the number of people affected, the seriousness of the impact, the impacts to social concerns or societal traditions, or the moral ramifications. In simple terms, for the Judge to award the Stock Issue of Significance to the Affirmative Team, the Judge should, based on the arguments in the Round, see the situation something along the lines of “This is very important. Something really needs to be done.” If the Judge is ambivalent or unconvinced of the seriousness or importance of the issue, then the Stock Issue of Significance should be awarded to the Negative Team.

B. Inherency

Inherency looks at the probability that the justification for change (see Significance) will continue to exist at some future time. If the justification will cease without Affirmative action, Affirmative action is unnecessary and should be rejected.

When arguing that a particular issue is Inherent, the Affirmative Team will normally present information on forces in the Status Quo that are acting to prevent the desired change. They may try to demonstrate that the problem exists and show that it is likely to continue to exist. They may show that there is a system or structure in place that acts to maintain the status quo. Or they may try to show that societal attitudes are involved in the continuation of current conditions. In simple terms, for the Judge to award the Stock Issue of Inherency to the Affirmative Team, the Judge should, based on the arguments in the Round, see the situation something along the lines of “If some sort of definite action is not adopted, things are going to stay just like they are.” If the Negative Team demonstrates that the objective of the Affirmative Team will occur without the actions proposed by the Affirmative Team, the Judge should award the Stock Issue of Inherency to the Negative Team.

It is not uncommon for Negative Teams to not make any Inherency argument during a round, and they may not even mention it. When this occurs, as noted in the discussion of Prima Facie above, if the Case was Prima Facie, the Affirmative Team wins Inherency, even if it does not explicitly present arguments in support of Inherency.

C. Solvency

Solvency looks at whether or not the Affirmative Plan can reasonably be expected to create the benefits claimed by the Affirmative Plan, and do so without creating new problems that offset any gains that might be achieved.

Normally the focus of the debate over the Stock Issue of Solvency should be on the Mandates. The Resolution looks for a change in a particular area of policy, and that change must be found in the Mandates. To win the Stock Issue of Solvency the Affirmative Team must demonstrate that their Mandates will produce the Advantages they claim.

While not generally central to debate, the other planks of the plan (Agency, Funding, Enforcement) can become key to the debate, and can be the basis for the Affirmative Team failing to win Solvency. These planks ensure that the debaters remain tied to the real world workings of the government as they consider policy ideas.

1. Agency (see Case Structures, Section A3.2 above for a definition). A failure to specify the proper Agency would result in an inability for the Plan to be adopted (Fiat power can't force a government entity to operate outside its legitimate sphere of authority.) Where there is no Plan, there is no Solvency.
2. Funding. This is funding for the activities or items required by the Mandates. (This is not funding for legislative activity.) Not all Affirmative Plans require the expenditure of funds. However, to ensure the full scope of impact of a Plan is evaluated, where funds are required, the Affirmative team should be required to adequately address funding for their plan.

When funding is necessary, the Affirmative Team should have a sound understanding of how much money they will need, and be able to satisfactorily explain the rationale behind their estimated costs. In the presentation of the Plan in the 1AC, the Affirmative Team must briefly present an outline of their handling of funding. If funding is not contested by the Negative Team, it need not be further addressed during the round. If funding is challenged, then it should be debated like any other issue.

There are three common methods an Affirmative Team may use to fund their Plan: Funds generated by the Mandates, Funds transferred from other existing programs, or "Normal Means". Normal Means states that funding will be appropriated through the normal legislative budgetary process.

Regardless of the method used to fund a plan, the costs are a legitimate point of attack by the Negative Team. If attacked, the judge must decide whether or not the Affirmative Team refuted the Negative's arguments and reasonably justified the expenditure.

In addition, it is not permissible for the Affirmative Team to be given any sort of benefit or credit for the source chosen to fund their plan. For example, it is conceivable that the Affirmative Team could choose to terminate a particularly unpopular program that is completely unrelated to the topic covered by the Resolution to generate funds. While no Advantage can be gained in the debate round for ending such a program, the Affirmative Team can be subject to Disadvantages for that action.

3. **Enforcement.** This is the entity that will be responsible for ensuring the Plan is implemented as intended. This is commonly some part of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would typically be given the task of enforcing new environmental regulations.

Just like failing to have enough traffic officers often results in more cars speeding, an Affirmative Team not having proper or adequate enforcement in the Plan may be subject to an attack saying the desired benefits will not happen because the Plan will not be properly carried into effect.

D. Disadvantages (Judged Under Solvency)

Actions taken by the Affirmative Team with their Plan may give rise to undesirable unintended consequences, which are labeled Disadvantages for debate purposes. If effectively argued by the Negative Team, Disadvantages can be a legitimate reason to reject the Affirmative Plan by voting for the Negative Team on the Stock Issue of Solvency.

1. **Burden of Proof.** One of the fundamental principles of debate is that “He who asserts must prove.” Since the Negative Team is asserting that certain Disadvantages will occur, the Negative Team carries the burden of proof.

There are four parts to proving a Disadvantage: Link, Brink, Uniqueness and Impact. It is not essential for the debaters to use these terms, but it is generally beneficial that they do so as it makes it easier for the judge to evaluate their argumentation.

Link. This is showing the connection between a specific action in the Affirmative Plan and the Disadvantage.

Brink. This is a demonstration of the susceptibility of the status quo to the action having a significant impact. If you push someone standing in the middle of a field, they may stumble but serious harm may not be caused. If you push that same person while they are standing on the edge of a cliff, they may fall off and be badly hurt or killed.

Uniqueness. If the problems embodied in the Disadvantage already exist, and the action in the Affirmative Plan will not cause a significant increase in those problems, then the Disadvantage is not unique, the status quo will not be worse off after the Affirmative Plan than before. Thus, the Negative Team must show that the Disadvantage is bringing about a new problem, or a significant increase to an existing one.

Impact. To say something is a problem does not mean that it is a problem, or that it is bad enough to want to avoid it. The Negative Team must explain who is being hurt and how, and demonstrate that this impact is a sufficient reason to reject the Affirmative Team's Plan.

2. Introducing Disadvantages.

Except as provided below, for the Negative Team to have Disadvantages considered, the 1NC must present a sufficient overview of each disadvantage that allows the Affirmative Team the opportunity to substantively respond in the 2AC.

Not presenting Disadvantages until the 2NC results in the Affirmative Team being unable to respond until the Rebuttals, which leaves insufficient time for the Affirmative Team to both respond to the Disadvantages as well as cover all other necessary points. Disadvantages satisfactorily introduced by the 1NC may be further developed by the Negative Team in subsequent speeches.

A very limited exception to the above rule may be allowed in cases where information provided by the 2AC either clarifies some point to the extent that the sense or meaning is substantively changed, or new information comes to light such that a particular Disadvantage that was not previously evident becomes apparent. While the Negative Team may argue this exception applies whenever they believe appropriate, it is solely up to the discretion of the Judge as to whether to consider a new Disadvantage presented by the 2NC or to completely disregard such as a violation of the basic rule presented above.

3. Presentation of Disadvantages

Disadvantages are not generally part of the argumentation in opposition to the points presented in the Affirmative Case. For example, they do not argue that Harms are not Significant or Inherent. Neither do they argue that the Plan will not Solve. Thus, Disadvantages are said to be "Off Case" arguments. As such, the recommended format is for the 1NC to introduce any Disadvantages after having responded to all parts in the Affirmative Case. This arrangement results in Disadvantages being set off as separate, independent issues to be assessed on their individual merits.

It is not mandatory that Disadvantages be handled in this way, but strongly encouraged as the best approach for effective argumentation.

A3.6 Speaker Evaluation Criteria

I. Purposes of Speaker Evaluations

"A debate round is a contest of argumentation between the two teams debating." This statement is quoted from above in the introductory remarks about the Stock Issues. It is repeated here to reiterate the fact that argumentation is the foremost element of debate, and that presentation, while important, is secondary. CCNW debate is to be a substance over style activity. With that in view, the speaker evaluations are to be used for three primary purposes: tiebreaking for team placement, feedback for speaker improvement, and speaker awards.

Tiebreaking for Team Placement. The first criteria for ranking teams is their win-loss record. Speaker scores, both points and ranks may be used as part of the tiebreaking criteria to distinguish between teams with identical win-loss records. The exact formula for tiebreaking is addressed separately in the portion of the CCNW Manual for conducting events.

Feedback for Speaker Improvement. Each of the speaker scoring categories evaluates a separate aspect of the speaker’s contribution to the debate round. By scoring, or grading, each speaker’s efforts in each of these areas on the ballot, and providing the debaters copies of the ballots at the end of the event, the debaters can find out which areas of their presentation are successful, and which areas are weak and in need of improvement. Comments on the speaker scores are encouraged to help clarify the basis for the scores given.

Speaker Awards. In line with the goal of focusing on argumentation over presentation, team awards are given precedence over speaker awards. However, the development of proficiency with presentation and overall speaking ability is considered a valuable and worthwhile goal, and providing speaker awards separately from the team awards is done to encourage and reward those who achieve the highest proficiency in their speaking.

II. Scoring Basis for Assigning Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks

The basic guideline for assigning speaker points is that scores should be assigned consistent with grades in a challenging, upper level high school course. Each speaker should be scored in each category. While comparisons between debaters are unavoidable, the intent is that points are assigned objectively. If all students excel, they may all receive a grade of ‘A’ (5 points). If all students struggle they may all receive a grade of ‘D’ (2 points). Points should be assigned with competent, experienced debaters as the standard.

It is not necessary that the team that wins the debate round receive the higher speaker points. Certain categories, such as Argumentation and Evidence may tend to correlate more with winning or losing than categories such as Cross-Examination or Communication. However, again, the Judge should evaluate each speaker directly on his merits in each category.

Grade	Score	Comments
A	5	Exceptional performance in all respects. Little or no room for improvement. (Great Job.)
B	4	Good, solid performance in most if not all elements of the category. Weaknesses or errors where noted are small and do not significantly detract from the performance. (Very Good.)
C	3	Average, middle-of-the-road performance. The debater is generally competent and effective, but also has noticeable room to improve. (OK to Good.)
D	2	Distinct weaknesses noted in many aspects. These weaknesses result in errors or detriments to the effectiveness of the debater. (Weak. Definitely needs improvement.)
F	1	Poor performance. Weaknesses or errors are so noticeable or significant that the debater’s effectiveness is completely or nearly completely compromised. May also be used to correct a debater for unacceptable behavior. (Poor to Very Poor.)

Speaker Ranks are assigned strictly on the basis of total speaker points. The speaker with the highest point total is the highest ranked speaker (#1 speaker). The speaker with the least total points is the lowest ranked speaker (#4 speaker). If two speakers end up with the same number of total points, the judge must break the tie and assign one speaker the higher rank and the other speaker the lower rank.

Example #1:

1A (20 points), 2A (18 points), 1N (16 points), 2N (21 points)

#1 Rank = 2N, #2 Rank = 1A, #3 Rank = 2A, #4 Rank = 1N

Example #2:

1A (20 points), 2A (19 points), 1N (14 points), 2N (20 points)

#1 Rank = 2N, #2 Rank = 1A, #3 Rank = 2A, #4 Rank = 1N

Example #3:

1A (12 points), 2A (16 points), 1N (13 points), 2N (14 points)

#1 Rank = 2A, #2 Rank = 2N, #3 Rank = 2A, #4 Rank = 1N

III. Scoring Specific Speaker Categories

A. Argumentation

Argumentation involves the construction of sound, well reasoned and well supported arguments for your position and the effective refutation and rebuttal of your opponents position. The focus of Argumentation is the Claim, or the point under dispute. For a Claim to be accepted it should be solidly based on a foundation of reliable facts. The relevance and importance of these facts should be clearly and logically explained. Good refutation involves demonstrating that one position is superior based on stronger, more credible and current evidence; and/or demonstrating stronger, clearer, and more logical reasoning.

B. Evidence

The criteria for evidence is the same as used in evaluating evidence for the Stock Issue decisions discussed above: Quality, Timeliness, and Applicability. Because good evidence is critical to supporting a position, the expectation is that evidence will be presented for each key point. It is important that the debater convey the relevance and value of each item of evidence to the point being made.

C. Organization

Organization is putting a speech together that has an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. It uses main points, transitions, signposts, internal previews, and internal summaries that enable you to understand the thesis and its development in the speech. It should be systematic and methodical.

D. Communication

Communication is the use of verbal and non-verbal technique. Verbal technique includes changes in a speaker's rate, pitch, and volume that gives the voice variety and expressiveness and is characterized by proper pronunciation and enunciation. The second facet of communication is the use of non-verbal communication. This communication occurs as a result of appearance, posture, gestures, eye contact, facial expressions, and other non-linguistic factors. Good communication will have a conversational tone and make sense to the average listener.

E. Cross-Examination

Cross-examination will employ assertive, thoughtful, pertinent questions and responses using the ability to think and respond spontaneously without much preparation time. Participants should not avoid questions but answer courteously. It provides the opportunity to investigate, clarify, interrogate, and question.

A3.7 Other In-Round Debate Rules

I. General Intent: Limit CCNW Debate to the Fundamentals.

The intent of CCNW debate is to restrict the activity to core fundamentals under the belief that a smaller number of key skills well learned is preferable to many poorly understood concepts. Therefore, certain practices found in other debate leagues are prohibited. It is considered an Ethical Violation to undertake any practice listed in this section and may, at the discretion of the Tournament Director result in loss of the round and possibly additional sanctions that could include ejection from the event and suspension from the league.

II. Counterplans & Minor Repairs Prohibited

Counterplans and Minor Repairs (which fall under counterplan theory) are Negative Strategies that propose alternate, and potentially superior means of attaining the results sought by the Affirmative Team. These do not lend themselves to a simple, straightforward application of the Stock Issues, or at least tend to confuse the application of the Stock Issues. To ensure consistent and straightforward application of the Stock Issues, Counterplans and Minor Repairs are prohibited.

III. Speed and Spread Prohibited

Speed and Spread is a technique that works on the idea of dropped arguments. By speaking at extremely high speeds a team can present a very large number of arguments, each of which carries a burden of rebuttal for the opposing team. For each argument dropped, the team using the Speed technique claims a point in their favor. In general, this tends to push the debaters to try to put more arguments into the round, to the sacrifice of the development of well reasoned, high quality argumentation. Furthermore, the communication of debaters practicing extreme speed can become unintelligible to the average community judge. Since it is the goal of CCNW to train debaters in quality argumentation that is readily comprehensible to normal citizens, Speed and Spread is prohibited. Debaters may not speak at an average rate of more than 180 words per minute.

IV. Kritiks Prohibited

Kritiks (pronounced “critiques”) are a Negative strategy that purport to be an assessment of ideas or issues underlying the Affirmative Case. The argument is that if the underlying philosophy is bad, then the results or consequences arising from the Case must be accordingly rejected. With a Kritik the discussion moves from an evaluation of the Stock Issues (the need for change, the likelihood of successful change) to a philosophical or psychological assessment of often largely unrelated issues. To ensure consistent and straightforward application of the Stock Issues, Kritiks are prohibited.

V. Visual Aids Prohibited

CCNW debate is intended to be based on oral argumentation. All information is to be communicated by speaking, or tone and gesture that complement the speaking. The use of visual aids of any sort, such as graphs, charts, or pictures, is prohibited.

VI. Use of Computers and Other Electronic Devices Prohibited

CCNW prohibits the use of computers or other similar electronic devices for all debate related activities at any time from the time of arrival at the event to the conclusion of the last round of the event. For all 2-day tournament this prohibition includes the period from the evening of the 1st day to the morning of the 2nd day.

No computers or similar electronic devices may be present during the debate round at any time or for any reason. This includes flowing, accessing data on the local storage device, researching, and/or communicating with anyone either locally or remotely.

No computers or similar electronic devices may be used at any time during a debate event for conducting research, whether using a local storage device, or by accessing any type of network or the internet.

Since use of computers and similar electronic devices for any type of debate related activity is prohibited at CCNW debate events, CCNW strongly encourages debaters to leave such devices at home during CCNW debate events. This will eliminate the temptation to use them if they are available, and eliminate any possibility of raising questions about what use is being made of the computer even when the use is allowed.

VII. Evidence Requests by the Judge

When both teams are contesting the facts of a particular piece of evidence, the Judge may request to see that particular piece of evidence to determine which team is more correctly understanding and communicating the information contained in that evidence. The Judge should not request to see evidence from either team if it has not been challenged with regard to the facts that it contains during the Round.

The Judge should not request to see evidence just to gain a better understanding of that evidence. It is the debater's responsibility to communicate the substance of evidence to the Judge. If the Judge asks to see evidence from one team that has not been contested as discussed above, the opposing team may object and cite this rule as the basis for the Judge not seeing the evidence.

The Judge should only request to see evidence at the conclusion of the Round.