The Great Debate Public Forum Training Coach’s Packet

This packet has been developed for you, debate coaches, to help you teach your students the skills of debate. This packet is free to use, but please do not distribute it without express permission.

Public Forum debate is the style of debate most similar to the debates your students will see on television. The focus is communication with all kinds of audiences. The topics change every month to give your students the chance to learn about many different areas of disagreement in our world today.

If you are interested in learning more about Public Forum Debate, you should check out the new edition of our debate book: The Great Debate; A Handbook for Policy Debate & Public Forum Debate. The book contains significantly more information than we can fit into our videos and is a must read for anyone serious about coaching students to become great debaters or those who want to improve their own debate skills too. Purchase a copy today at www.greatdebate.net

Be sure to keep up with the latest Great Debate videos on youtube (www.youtube.com/mygreatdebate), like us on facebook, and follow us on twitter for daily links to articles relating to numerous high school debate topics (www.twitter.com/mygreatdebate).

And let us know if you have any feedback on these materials, the videos, or any other resources we offer. Best of luck to you as you work with your students this year and beyond.

Keep in touch with us online: www.greatdebate.net
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Debate 101 – An introduction to argumentation and debate

What is Debate?
Debate is the practice of comparing & contrasting ideas.

The goal of authentic debate is to search for truth.

How does debate work?

- Resolution
  - The resolution is the focus of the debate round
  - The resolution tells us what we are talking about for a debate round

- Two sides of the debate
  - Affirmative
    - The affirmative team is required to affirm the resolution.
  - Negative
    - The negative team is required to negate/reject the resolution.

Pieces of a COMPLETE Argument:
- Each argument makes a statement of a possible truth
- Each argument is supported
- Each argument explains why it is important

These pieces all have names in debate:
- Statement of truth = Claim
- Support for the statement = Warrant
- Importance, why it matters = Impact

Debate isn’t just making your own argument, you have to respond to opposing arguments.
INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE

Debate is the _practice_ of _comparing_ & _contrasting_ ideas.

The goal of authentic debate is to _search_ for _truth_.

Different debate Styles:

- Policy Debate – evidence focused debate on pros/cons of a particular policy
  - i.e. change space exploration policy in the United States
- Value Debate – philosophy and value focused debate on the pros/cons of a particular value or worldview
  - i.e. liberty is more important than security
- Public Forum Debate – communication focused debate on the pros/cons of a particular position of fact or policy
  - i.e. Wikileaks threatens US National security

All debates focus on the Resolution

- In Public Forum the sides of the debate are Pro and Con
- **Pro** argues for the resolution (affirmative in Policy and Value debate)
- **Con** argues against the resolution (negative in Policy and Value debate)

- Resolutions in Public Forum change monthly
Public Forum Debate is a team event
- Teams of 2
- Different speeches and roles, but one voice

Goals of the Debate
- Solid logic, reasoning, and analysis
- Use evidence to support, not dictate, arguments
- Clash ideas between the pro and con teams
- Clearly communicate to any audience

Unique Features of Public Forum
- Coin flip for sides
- Short speeches
  - Entire round is 37 minutes including all prep time
  - Longest speech is 4 minutes
  - Shortest speech is 1-2 minutes
- Crossfire
  - Both sides ask and answer questions – at the same time!
What is An Argument???

Write out your arguments for or against this statement:
“Scholars should not have a dress code at SciAcademy”

Why do we think a statement is true?

- It _corresponds_ with our experience
- An _expert_ supports it
- Someone we _Trust_ says it

Pieces of a COMPLETE Argument:

- Each argument makes a statement of a possible __truth__
- Each argument is __supported__
- Each argument explains why it is __important__

These pieces all have names in debate:

- Statement of truth = __Claim__
- Support for the statement = __Warrant__
- Importance, why it matters = __Impact__

How can an argument be supported? We use __Evidence__

Evidence is the __Warrant__ and we can get evidence from lots of places

- __Analytical__ warrants – logical reasons
- __Empirical__ warrants – statistics and examples from the real world
- __Psychological__ warrants – how people tend to act

Evidence we use:

- Facts
- Analogies
- Anecdotes
- Studies
- Reports
- Stories
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Debate Rounds & Speaker Responsibilities

A Public Forum debate round consists of _8_ speeches and _3_ crossfires.

Pro and Con flip for sides (and sometimes for speaking order)
{we’ll assume pro speaks first}

Format of a debate round where Pro argues first:

- First Pro Constructive (1PC) - _4_ Minutes
- First Con Constructive (1CC) - _4_ Minutes
- Crossfire between both first speakers (CF) – _3_ Minutes
- Second Pro Constructive (2PC) - _4_ Minutes
- Second Con Constructive (2CC) - _4_ Minutes
- Crossfire between both second speakers (CF) - _3_ Minutes
- Pro Summary (PS) - _2_ Minutes
- Con Summary (CS) - _2_ Minutes
- Grand Crossfire between all 4 debaters (CF) - _3_ Minutes
- Pro Final Focus (PFF) - _1-2_ Minutes
- Con Final Focus (CFF) - _1-2_ Minutes
- Preparation Time – 2 minutes per team
- {33 Minutes Total}

Goals of each speech

- First Constructive – Tell your side of the story
- Second Constructive – Repair your story, poke holes in their story
- Crossfire – Ask and answer questions about your arguments
- Summary – Focus on the key disagreements and why you are winning those
- Final Focus – Give two or three reasons your side of the resolution should prevail
Constructive: Building the case

1PC
Present case to uphold the resolution

1CC
Present case rejecting the resolution

2PC
Respond to attacks on pro case, refute con case

2CC
Respond to attacks on con case, refute pro case

Summary & Final Focus: Selling the case

PS
Summarize the key issues of disagreement

CS
Summarize the key issues of disagreement

PFF
Explain why pro should win the debate

CFF
Explain why con should win the debate
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Understanding What We’re Debating: The Resolution

Resolved: The abuse of illegal drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

What would we need to logically prove or know to affirm or negate this resolution?

There are 5 keys to understanding and proving the resolution:

- Definitions of the _words_ in the resolution
- _Type_ of resolution
- _Context_ of the resolution
- Actor and _Action_ of the resolution
- _Evaluative_ term of the resolution

**Define Terms:**

- Abuse
- Treated
- Illegal Drugs
- Public Health
- Criminal Justice

**Two Categories of Resolutions** we will typically face:

- _Comparative_: Examine _both_ ideas and compare _benefits_
- _Absolute_: Uphold a _general principle_ and prove it is most often _correct_

**Context**

Limits the debate to a _specific_ place or situation

- “When in conflict”
- “In the United States”
- “Abuse” of drugs

**Actor**

Who is having this _debate_?

**Evaluative Terms**

The _Key_ question where _debate_ is focused

Discussion: What would we need to logically prove to affirm or negate the resolution?
Public Forum Case Structure

The First Constructive Speech for both sides include a pre-written case

- The first constructive speech is only 4 minutes long
- Public Forum requires communication, so speed must be moderate

Goals of the Case

- Grab your audience’s attention
- Clarify any potential confusion
- Identify strong reasons your position should be accepted
- Summarize with a compelling conclusion

Attention-Getter

- Why should we care about this topic?
- Why should we like your position?
- Can your arguments make a difference in the world?
- Set the stage in your favor

Clarification

- What is the resolution?
- What is this debate about?
- Clarify definitions of key terms
- Provide your team’s thesis – what does voting for you mean?
- Preview your main arguments
Contentions

- **Two or Three Contentions**, each independently supporting your overall position
- **Structure**
  - Tag (“Buying and Selling organs cheapens human life”)
  - **Claim** – The argument you are making
    - “Allowing the sale of human organs puts a price people’s worth”
  - **Warrant** – Support for the argument you are making
    - “Ethics Professor Smith states that human life can’t be valued, but buying an organ to save a life will put a pricetag on staying alive, thus undermining the invaluable nature of humans.”
  - **Impact** – Why does your argument matter and justify your side of the resolution?
    - “When human life is only as valuable as the price of an organ, human life becomes no more valuable than any other commodity and the market determines who is valuable enough to be allowed to live.”
- Should contain one or two quotations
- Argue in general for your position

Conclusion

- Reprise the main contentions
- Tie back to the attention-grabber
- One more chance to persuade
Outline

1. Attention-Getter
   a. No one wakes up in the morning and thinks, why I would love to go hear 33 minutes of speeches and arguments on a random topic. In fact, even people who love debate are prone to become glossy-eyed at the end of a long debate tournament. The attention step is your chance to wake your audience from their slumber and motivate the next 33 minutes of their day. The attention-getter should not tell your audience why the topic is relevant and worth considering, but it should give the listener the opportunity to identify with your side of the round.
   b. How to: The attention step may include a story, a famous quotation, or some citation to an expert in the topic’s field. Quoting someone who says the problem with today’s world is the lack of today’s resolution is a great way to get your audience’s attention and bring them into your camp all at the same time.

2. Clarification
   a. Now that you have your audience’s attention, what are you going to spend the next 200 or so seconds talking about? First, you’ll want to let them know what the focus of the debate will be: the resolution. Then you’ll want to clarify what this resolution is asking you to do, define any terms which may cause confusion or be contentious, and identify what positions you will be taking in the round.
   b. The resolution should be quoted exactly. Say “we support the resolution ‘Resolved that ...’” or “we oppose the resolution ‘Resolved that ...’”
   c. Tell the judge what the resolution is about – this may mean providing a very brief background or identifying the key disagreements on the issue so the judge is aware of the world on both sides of the resolution.
   d. Define terms that might be confusing or might be used by your opponent to make your arguments beyond the resolution.
   e. Your thesis should be a simple statement that ties your contentions together in support of the resolution (or in opposition)
   f. Finally, preview your two or three contentions, just using the tags so everyone knows where you are going.

3. Contentions
   a. This is the meat of your case. You want to give the audience a reason to support you. Your audience is listening for you to give them clear reasons in favor of (or opposed to) the resolution. Each contention should independently point out the correctness or the benefit of a ballot in your favor. Each contention should contain 3 parts – a claim, warrant, and impact – just as all good arguments should.
   b. The claim is a brief statement made which will need to be proven. For example, the argument “Gun control laws increase crime” is simply a claim. Good debaters will carefully word claims to make them easy for a judge to write down. This is called a “flow tag” and simply means using word economy to limit the number of words used to summarize the argument.
c. The claim is supported with evidence, called a warrant. The warrant is some kind of expert or other credible individual stating an argument in line with the claim. For example, a quotation from the Department of Justice noting that in states with the most strict gun control laws the rates of violent crime are highest could be used to support the claim.

d. Finally, an argument needs more than a claim and warrant to be successful. The impact asks the all important “so what?” question. Let’s assume the claim and warrant are correct and gun control laws do increase crime. If this is true, why should anyone care and further, why should this matter in the debate at hand? The impact answers both of these questions. The impact notes that more lives will be saved without strict gun laws than with those laws. Saving lives, as it is often the stated goal of gun laws, ought to weigh in our minds when deciding whether to have the gun laws in the first place and in this hypothetical argument should prevail.

e. Every case should have at least 2 and no more than 3 contentions. A contention can contain more than 1 claim, warrant, or impact, but be mindful of time constraints.

4. Conclusion

a. Briefly remind your audience of your main contentions, your thesis, and finish your speech by tying everything back to your opening attention grabber. This is your last chance to make the first impression – don’t waste it!
Research Basics

What is evidence?
- Evidence is published **support** of an argument
- Evidence helps **persuade** the audience

Why is good evidence important?
- Gives **credibility** to your words

Finding Evidence
- Research – Find information that supports your positions

**Research Steps**

1. Brainstorm key words from the resolution
   - What do you **already** know
   - What words are unclear to you?
   - What do you need more information?
2. Begin answering your questions
   - Find definitions
   - Begin looking for information to educate yourself
3. Dig deeper
   - Read articles
   - Find good **quotations**
   - Use that article to point you to other good articles and good quotations

Using Google
- Search individual terms (drug abuse)
- Search multiple words (illegal drug abuse and public health)
- Search using quotation marks (“criminal justice” and “illegal drugs”)
Refutation

When the other debater says something you have 3 choices:
1. **Accept**
2. **Reject**
3. **Ignore** = acceptance

[The best choice is obviously to oppose your opponent, so how do we do that?]

2 Different types of attacks

**Weigh:** Compare claims
- Evidence
  - Empirics against theoretical arguments
  - Counter evidence with **better** evidence
- Logical missteps (wrong assumptions)
- Missing warrants
- Not **Comparative** – not show why the resolution is better on that side
- Show insignificance of opposition

**Turn:** Concede part but show how **impact** supports you
- **Link** turn – different cause
- **Impact** turn – different outcome

**Turns** are stronger than **weighing**

**Argument package:** Multiple attacks together

**Method of attack:** **3-point refutation**
- What are we talking about?
  - **Tag**
- What do I say?
  - **Respond**
- Why does it matter?
  - **Impact**
Responding to Attacks

After your argument is attacked, how do you respond?

1. **Repeating** original argument
2. **Ignore** the attack and talk about something else
3. **Respond** to the attack

Responding is the only option
- Respond to the opponent’s argument – **Refutation**
- Strengthen your original point - **Extend**

2 Steps

**Refute**
- Use the same refutation types and techniques we already know
  - Show holes in their attack
  - Fill your weaknesses exposed by their attack

**Extend**
- **Add** to the point you already made
  - Evidence
  - Analysis
  - Implications
  - Impact

**Pattern for Response**
- Address responses from opponent
- **Extend** claims and warrants of your argument
- **Impact**
Flowing...so you know where you’re going!

Ignoring arguments = conceding argument

- How do you remember everything said in a round?
- How do you make sure you address everything?

Flowing

- The debater’s note-taking method
- Short-hand notes for each argument
- Logical order to keep the round organized

How to Flow

- Supplies:
  - 2 different color pens
  - Notepaper (legal pad, blank paper, etc.)
- Method:
  - Step 1:
    - Divide 2 pages into 5 sections
    - Divide 1 page into 4 sections
  - Step 2:
    - Take notes for each speech
    - Connect responses to the original argument
    - Watch the argument “flow” through the round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>1AR</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>2AR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sky is blue</td>
<td>Sky is gray</td>
<td>Gray skies</td>
<td>Background is</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>require blue</td>
<td>not how we define color</td>
<td>background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>background</td>
<td>always shows through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Not always A</td>
<td>A more often than not</td>
<td>A only sometimes</td>
<td>A wins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What to Flow:

- **Vital Information**
  - Tag
  - Evidence (source)
  - Where it “flows”
- **Valuable Information**
  - Impacts
  - Evidence (summary)
  - Missing links

Tips

- Learn your own **shorthand**
  - {≠; <; >; USFG (US Federal Government); HR (Human Rights); not}
- Write **small**
- Write **legibly**
- Practice, practice, practice!
**CrossFire! - This isn’t your typical Cross-Ex**

I. What is Crossfire?
   a. 3 minute Q&A session between 2 or all 4 debaters
   b. When?
      i. After the 2nd and 4th Constructive speeches
      ii. After the Summary speeches
   c. Both debaters ask and answer questions
   d. Stand – may sit during grand crossfire

II. Purpose of crossfire
   - **Clarification** – if you missed something or want to be sure they really said something
   - **Identify Weakness** – Identify and exploit holes in their logic and arguments
   - **Defend** your position – by clarifying and expanding your arguments
   - **Attack** weakness – expose contradictions, identify inconsistencies
   - **Gaining Credibility** – judges evaluate you based on your Crossfire
     - Are your questions thought out?
     - Are you polite, sharing your time, not interrupting?
     - Do you have strong responses to probing questions?

III. Special Features of Crossfire (vis-à-vis cross examination)
   - Both sides asking questions
   - Both sides answering questions
   - Both sides taking turns
   - Both sides on offense and defense (basketball not baseball)
   - Both sides always communicating

IV. Goals when asking questions
   - **Plan** ahead – what are the two or three weaknesses you want exposed?
   - **Precise** – short questions are better
   - **Polite**, but firm – Ask your question, then allow your opponent to do the same
V. Goals when answering questions

Concise response – don’t admit more than asked, don’t waste time with long answers
Calm response – even if your opponent asks irrelevant questions
Champion your side – find opportunities to highlight the strength of your case

VI. Coming up with good questions

Set up arguments you have already prepared – what dilemma do you want to expose?
Don’t ask open-ended questions
If something sounds too good to be true, it is, so ask about it!

VII. The Grand Crossfire

All 4 debaters – cooperation and teamwork even more important
Allow everyone to participate
Don’t interrupt your partner – come up with a signal
No Team questioning – one partner should ask each question
Question selection even more important – even fewer questions to ask and answer
Politely Persuade – only 1 more minute left to advance your side in the round
Question/Answer Selection:
Ensure the question still matters to the debate (flow the Summary Speeches)
Focus on key disagreements that win you the round
Tie their questions to your key winning arguments

• For more information see helpful web resources:
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Two Heads are Better than One

Many forms of debate require you to work with a partner – Public Forum is no different. There are pros and cons to having a partner, but if you’re going to be a good PF debater, you’ll need to work seamlessly with your partner!

• Keep one another accountable
• Lighten the workload
• Different communication styles, strengths/weaknesses

Partners allow you to bounce ideas off each other before, during, and after the round. They also have different abilities to persuade which will help you win more rounds!

• Who is covering what issues (defense, attack, question types)
• Who is "good cop" and who is "bad cop"
• Technical v. speaking
• Salesperson should speak second - Details person speaks first

These decisions are pre-round decisions. Try the two positions and see which one you both feel more comfortable taking. Also, see how your different order impacts the way your opponents debate.

• Pre-Round - Good communication must begin before the round
• Prep time - limited, make sure you’re on the same page
• During round - Nonverbal, encouraging, coordinate crossfire
• Post round - Review what went well, what can be improved

Be careful how you communicate with the judge when your partner is speaking!! Easy to distract the judge or tell the judge your partner’s argument is bad, keep flowing all the time!

• What are your strengths? Compliment strengths
• Big ideas person & detail person
• Researcher and argument developer
• Speaker and thinker

Work with your coach, parents, or teachers to identify your own strengths and weaknesses. Your best friend may not be your best debate partner – opposites often attract votes from the judge.

Not all teams have these “labels” but many great teams will take on similar complimentary characteristics.
Argumentation & Voting Issues

Pieces of a COMPLETE Argument:
- Statement of truth = __Claim__
- Support for the statement = __Warrant__
- Importance, why it matters = __Impact__

Rounds are full of arguments going back and forth – one side says “A,” the opponent says “Not A, but B.” We use the flow (debate note taking) to keep track of the arguments and make sure we address everything.

Method of attack: 3-point refutation

- What are we talking about?
  - Tag
- What do I say?
  - Respond
- Why does it matter?
  - Impact

Method of defense: 3-point refutation

Refute
- Use the 3-point refutation
  - Show holes in their attack
  - Fill your weaknesses exposed by their attack

Extend Your Argument
- Add to the point you already made
  - Evidence
  - Analysis
  - Implications
  - Always Impact
Voting Issues

In the final focus, both teams have 1 or 2 minutes to wrap up their arguments and try to convince the judge they won the round. Rather than repeating the arguments that have taken up the first 30 minutes of the round, the Final Focus should focus the audience on the key reasons to cast a ballot for one side or another.

Questions to answer:

- Why do you win?
- What are your strongest points?
- What arguments does the judge/audience seem to like?
- Where was the real conflict in this round? Did you win it?

How to Present Voting Issues:

- Rule of 3 – pick no more than 3 winners
- Identify the key conflict(s)
- Weigh both sides (showing why you win)
- Impact, impact, impact

Debate rounds are not won by what is said in the final speech. However, a poor final speech can certainly turn the table against you in a close round. Focusing on the key voting issues and ignoring the petty issues of the round will go a long way toward helping the judge know on what basis their decision ought to rest.
So What?

Winning with Impacts

Every debate is full of arguments – good and bad

Good debaters make good arguments

| Claim (or assertion) | Warrant (evidence) | Impact (commentary) |

Great debaters identify which arguments are important and win those arguments

Identifying important arguments

- Does this argument answer the resolution?
- Does this argument hurt my side?
- If the judge agrees with this point, can they still vote for me?
Winning important arguments

- Roadmap
  - Where did we come from?
  - Where are we now?
  - Where are we going?

- 3-point refutation
  - They said (What are we talking about?)
  - I say (What is my response?)
  - Impact (Why does my response matter and why do I win?)

- Always Impact
  - How did you win this particular point?
  - What role does this point play in the resolution?
  - Why your winning points matter? (compare with other points)
  - Why should the judge vote for you?
First Speech Strategies

Tell a story:
- This will engage your audience
- This will highlight the problem
- This will frame the debate

Who's talking here?
- Write the case in the speaker's voice
- Make the case fit the presenter
- Content, tone, density, all must reflect the speaker

Unique Structures
- Judges are expecting Basic Structures
  - Policy – Plan-meets-needs
  - LD – value, criterion, 3 contentions
  - Public Forum – 3 independent contentions
- Cute points typically result in losses
- What are the 3 reasons to use a special structure?
- Clarity trumps cuteness

Strategy
- Bump (point out interesting, but non-debatable things)
- Set (set up opponent to make bad arguments and yourself to make strong ones)
- Spike (reject strong opposing arguments in 1st speech)

Final Pointers:
• Choose a case that sets YOU up for success
• Clarity is more important than creativity
• Lay out a positive story up front
HOMEWORK
Homework for Debate Class 1 – write 2 arguments either for or against the resolution

Resolved: The abuse of illegal drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.

Argument for the(circle one): PRO CON

Claim:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Warrant(s):

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Impact:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Argument for the(circle one): PRO CON

Claim:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Warrant(s):

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Impact:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________
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Refutation Homework

Instructions: Make list of 5 arguments in support of the resolution, and refute them; Make list of 5 arguments opposing the resolution and refute them.

Name:
Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument Supporting Resolution</th>
<th>Refutation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument Against Resolution</td>
<td>Refutation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Support</td>
<td>→ Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Support</td>
<td>→ Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Support</td>
<td>→ Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Support</td>
<td>→ Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
<td>- Tag &amp; Signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
<td>- Respond/Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
<td>→ Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Support</td>
<td>→ Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
<td>→ Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
<td>- Impact &amp; Weigh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debate Team Weekend Homework

Catch up on any lessons you have missed: youtube.com/mygreatdebate (Basic Public Forum Training)

Read the topic overviews if you haven’t already

Outline the 3 contentions you want to use on the pro

• .
• .
• .

Outline the 3 contentions you want to use on the con

• .
• .
• .
Case Revision Homework

Instructions: Read the pro case you have been given. Select one contention you wish to replace, and write a replacement contention using the structure below.

Your New Pro Contention:

1. 
   a. 
      Tag: 
      Warrant: 
      Impact: 

   b. 
      Tag: 
      Warrant: 
      Impact: 

Instructions: Read the con case you have been given. Select one contention you wish to replace, and write a replacement contention using the structure below.

Your New Con Contention:

1. 
   a. 
      Tag: 
      Warrant: 
      Impact: 

   b. 
      Tag: 
      Warrant: 
      Impact:
In-Class Exercises
**Fun Debates!!**

Resolution: “M&M’s are better than Reese’s Pieces”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fun Debates!!

Resolution: “Rewarding scholars for good behavior is better than punishing bad behavior”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quiz 1 – Public Forum Basics

Name:

1. What are the two sides of a public forum debate called?

2. How many minutes is each constructive speech?

3. In public forum debate, what is the period of questions and answers called?

4. The Final Focus speech says why you should win. How many reasons should the speaker give?

5. How many minutes is each summary speech?

6. How long does each crossfire last?

7. What is the focus of the debate?
Refutation Do Now:

Resolved: In the United States, juveniles charged with violent felonies ought to be treated as adults in the criminal justice system.

Write down your top 5 arguments for and against the resolution, explain your reasons.

Affirmative:
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

Negative:
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5.
Crossfire

Do Now:

Instructions: Read our current pro and con cases. List at least 5 questions you have about the pro case and 5 questions you have about the con case.

Pro:
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Con:
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
Syllabus for Introduction to Public Forum Debate

Debate Team,

I hope you all had a wonderful Mardi Gras and enjoyed your time off. Now that we’re back in school, we’re going to turn to a new debate style: Public Forum Debate. You’ll learn a lot about this new style and we’ll end the semester with a showcase for your fellow students and may even be able to perform for our parents too!

Below is our syllabus for the remaining classes. I am assuming you are attending class on Monday & Wednesday or Tuesday & Thursday. If you are attending different days, let’s talk so you can be sure not to miss any of the material.

I will be posting videos of each lecture on youtube. That way, even if you aren’t at school you will be able to make up the lesson and keep up with the rest of the team. The videos will be available at www.youtube.com/mygreatdebate.

We’ll vote on the topic for our debates the first 2 days of class and I’ll make a video summary of that topic for you to watch as we prepare for the debates the remainder of the semester.

The homework assignments listed are not simply suggestions – you need to complete these assignments before the next class. Public Forum debate is partner debate meaning you are not only letting yourself down if you fail to complete an assignment, but you are letting your partner down too. The checkbox next to each assignment is for you to check when you have completed the homework. Keep this syllabus and be sure to keep the checkboxes updated so you know what homework you are missing. If you have any questions about an assignment, please speak with me or send me an email.

Finally, if you have any questions or concerns throughout the rest of the semester, please let me know. I’m looking forward to working with you all as we learn a new debate style and prepare to showcase our debate skills to our fellow scholars, teachers, and parents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic of Class</th>
<th>Homework Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar</td>
<td>Introduction to Public Forum Debate</td>
<td>Email Mr. Wolfson: <a href="mailto:jwolfson@sciacademy.org">jwolfson@sciacademy.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Get ahead on your non-debate work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Mar</td>
<td>Introduction to Public Forum Debate</td>
<td>Email Mr. Wolfson: <a href="mailto:jwolfson@sciacademy.org">jwolfson@sciacademy.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Get ahead on your non-debate work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Weekend</td>
<td>Watch Video of Topic Introduction</td>
<td>Watch video posted at <a href="http://www.greatdebate.net">www.greatdebate.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write down 3 reasons you agree and disagree with the resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Mar</td>
<td>Public Forum Rounds, debater responsibilities</td>
<td>Find, read, and summarize 2 articles that discuss the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Mar</td>
<td>GEE - No Debate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Mar</td>
<td>Case Construction – how to write a case</td>
<td>Outline the case you would like to run on the “Pro” side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Mar</td>
<td>Public Forum Rounds, debater responsibilities</td>
<td>Find, read, and summarize 2 articles that discuss the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar</td>
<td>Crossfire is not CrossX</td>
<td>Outline the case you would like to run on the “Con” side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Mar</td>
<td>Case Construction – how to write a case</td>
<td>Outline the case you would like to run on the “Pro” side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Mar</td>
<td>Research day [Find evidence for and against 1 argument in your “pro” case and 1 argument in your “con” case]</td>
<td>Find evidence for and against 1 more argument in your “Pro” case and 1 more argument in your “Con” case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Mar</td>
<td>Crossfire is not CrossX</td>
<td>Outline the case you would like to run on the “Con” side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr</td>
<td>Mini Debate (Constructives only, no evidence)</td>
<td>What contentions was the weakest in your case? Write 2 arguments to reply to the refutation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Apr</td>
<td>Research day [Find evidence for and against 1 argument in your “pro” case and 1 argument in your “con” case]</td>
<td>Find evidence for and against 1 argument in your “Pro” case and 1 argument in your “Con” case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr</td>
<td>Research day [Find evidence to support your weakest contention]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Apr</td>
<td>Mini Debate (Constructives only, no evidence)</td>
<td>What contentions was the weakest in your case? Write 2 arguments to reply to the refutation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 Apr</td>
<td>GEE - No Debate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Apr</td>
<td>Working with a partner</td>
<td>Discuss with your partner the arguments you would like to run, outline this “updated” case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Apr</td>
<td>Working with a partner</td>
<td>Discuss with your partner the arguments you would like to run, outline this “updated” case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Apr</td>
<td><strong>AFTER SCHOOL PRACTICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Apr</td>
<td>Argumentation &amp; Voting Issues</td>
<td>What is the best voting issue you have for your pro and con cases? Write a paragraph explaining why this is your best voter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Argumentation &amp; Voting Issues</td>
<td>What is the best voting issue you have for your pro and con cases? Write a paragraph explaining why this is your best voter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete your team cases. Email them to Mr. Wolfson by the 27th of April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-May</td>
<td>Speech Day – work on delivery</td>
<td>Read your new cases 3 times each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-May</td>
<td>AFTER SCHOOL PRACTICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-May</td>
<td>Speech Day – work on delivery</td>
<td>Read your new cases 3 times each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-May</td>
<td>Debate Rounds</td>
<td>What contentions was the weakest in your case? Write 2 arguments to reply to the refutation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-May</td>
<td>No Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-May</td>
<td>Debate Rounds</td>
<td>What contentions was the weakest in your case? Write 2 arguments to reply to the refutation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-May</td>
<td>AFTER SCHOOL PRACTICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Refutation/Responding to Attacks</td>
<td>Between you and your partner, Write 3-point refutation against each contention in both pro and con cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-May</td>
<td>Refutation/Responding to Attacks</td>
<td>Between you and your partner, Write 3-point refutation against each contention in both pro and con cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-May</td>
<td>Strategy in Public Forum</td>
<td>Between you and your partner, write a paragraph explaining your top 2 voting issues for both pro and con cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-May</td>
<td>Strategy in Public Forum</td>
<td>Between you and your partner, write a paragraph explaining your top 2 voting issues for both pro and con cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-May</td>
<td>AFTER SCHOOL PRACTICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-May</td>
<td>Preparation for the showcase!</td>
<td>Find, read, and summarize 3 recent (in the last 2 weeks) articles that discuss the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-May</td>
<td>Preparation for the showcase!</td>
<td>Find, read, and summarize 3 recent (in the last 2 weeks) articles that discuss the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May</td>
<td>Debate Rounds</td>
<td>Find, read, and summarize 3 recent (in the last 2 weeks) articles that discuss the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-May</td>
<td>Debate Rounds</td>
<td>Find, read, and summarize 3 recent (in the last 2 weeks) articles that discuss the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-May</td>
<td>Debate Rounds</td>
<td>Read your new cases 10 times each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-May</td>
<td>Debate Rounds</td>
<td>Read your new cases 10 times each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-May</td>
<td>Public Forum Showcase!</td>
<td>(Date is Tentative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>