

Contemporary Policy Debate

Information for Directors and Debate Judges

Form of Debate: Cross Examination Plan. (Adapted from the Oregon Plan)

1.	First Affirmative	8 minutes	
2.	Second Negative	3 minutes	(Questions first affirmative speaker)
3.	First Negative	8 minutes	
4.	First Affirmative	3 minutes	(Questions first negative speaker)
5.	Second Affirmative	8 minutes	
6.	First Negative	3 minutes	(Questions second affirmative speaker)
7.	Second Negative	8 minutes	
8.	Second Affirmative	3 minutes	(Questions second negative speaker)
9.	First Negative	5 minutes	(Presents rebuttal speech)
10.	First Affirmative	5 minutes	(Presents rebuttal speech)
11.	Second Negative	5 minutes	(Presents rebuttal speech)
12.	Second Affirmative	5 minutes	(Presents rebuttal speech)

Procedures:

1. You will hear one or more debates as scheduled by the meet director and announced by the chairman.
2. Select an advantageous seat and review the ballot. (Judges sit apart)
3. Be sure timekeeper is ready when the debate starts.
4. After each debate:
 - a. Rank each debater in order of excellence (1st for best, 2nd for next best, etc.)
 - b. Pick the winning team
5. After each debate, assign either mentally or in writing a numerical score for each team and comment briefly. A written critique is required.
6. Turn in ballot to chairman of meet.

Suggestions for Judging:

- A. Your decision should be based on which team did the better job of debating and not on your personal opinions or convictions. The debaters are debating each other, not the judge. Be objective as you listen to the debate and evaluate the techniques being employed. There is no place in debate judging for subjective evaluation.
- B. Try to determine which team establishes the greater probability for its position. The debate should be centered on the significance of the problem based on an analysis of the causes and the desirability and practicality of proposed solutions as supported by evidence and reasoning.
- C. The following outline will help you judge the debate. This is a general prospectus of what should happen:
 1. The affirmative will state the proposition and define terms. They will then usually explain the nature of the problem and trace the causes, citing evils in the present situation (the status quo). They will show how their proposed changes will correct the situation and will usually mention certain advantages that will probably come about if their proposal is accepted.
 2. The negative will usually defend the status quo and attack the arguments for a change being advanced by the affirmative. They may do this by pointing out that there is no need for a change and that any change would be worse than the present. They may argue that there is no problem or that the problem is presently being solved by changes already in progress. Negative may also offer a counter plan.
 3. If the negative team uses a counter-plan, they must prove that this proposal is based on a legitimate interpretation of the proposition and that it will solve the problem in a better way than the plan advanced by the affirmative.
 4. There will usually be several main contentions or major arguments that are of such importance that you can determine who wins the debate by deciding which team won these major arguments.
 5. The affirmative may also contend that unique, significant, comparative advantages over present system will accrue from their plan. Then they do not have to argue a need or evil.