

POLICY DEBATE ACTIVITIES

Directors must be familiar with sections of General Policy, which are applicable to the Policy Debate section.

PARTICIPANT DEFINITIONS

TEAM

A policy debate team consists of two debaters who debate both the affirmative and negative sides of the resolution. A team that cannot provide the necessary number of debaters will forfeit its debate.

ROUND OF DEBATE

A round of debate is a time slot during which a school unit will have two debates. In a switch side round or at the state debate tournament, a two-person team will have one debate per round.

SUBSTITUTIONS

A school may bring as many debaters above the minimum requirement as it desires to a tournament. The use of any particular debater or combination of debaters in a particular round is the decision of the Director of Debate at the school. It is possible for a debater to switch from the affirmative team to the negative team of the school during the course of a tournament. Once a round of debate has begun, however, the composition of the team must remain intact.

DEBATE RESOLUTION

The official topic area for policy debate in high schools throughout the United States is chosen each year using a process coordinated by the National Federation of State High School Associations. All member directors are encouraged to vote during the topic selection process.

Particular debate resolutions may involve subject matter that may be sensitive to certain local school district concerns. On several occasions, the MIFA Forensic Council has considered limitations on certain topic areas; however, it is the philosophy of the Forensic Council that the nature of the debate process provides the best system to consider restrictions on the scope of a topic. In addition, to intercede in the selection of subject matter for a particular debate topic would limit the jurisdiction of local school districts in the determination of appropriate subject matter for students. Accordingly, the MIFA has no official statewide policy to place content limitations on a particular debate resolution.

CROSS EXAMINATION DEBATE

The MIFA uses cross-examination for its policy debate tournaments.

In the cross-examination debate format each debater is responsible for two cross-examinations, one cross-examination as the questioner and one cross-examination as the respondent. Both debaters must stand for questioning during cross-examination. When both cross-examinations for a particular school are done by the same person, serving either as the questioner or the respondent for any portion of the examination period, the school that has only one person doing both cross-examinations will forfeit the round of debate.

First affirmative constructive speech	8 minutes
Cross-examination of first affirmative by either negative speaker	3 minutes
First negative constructive speech	8 minutes
Cross-examination of first negative by either affirmative speaker	3 minutes
Second affirmative constructive speech	8 minutes

Cross-examination of second affirmative by other negative speaker	3 minutes
Second negative constructive speech	8 minutes
Cross-examination of second negative by the other affirmative speaker	3 minutes
First negative rebuttal	5 minutes
First affirmative rebuttal	5 minutes
Second negative rebuttal	5 minutes
Second affirmative rebuttal	5 minutes

A debater may waive his or her cross-examination period. If a debater plans to waive his or her examination period, the individual must notify the judge to ensure accurate timing procedures. The waiver of cross-examination time does not allow the three-minute period to become additional preparation or presentation time for the team that exercises the waiver.

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR DEBATE

CHANGE IN SPEAKING ORDER

Teams are permitted to switch speaking order in the rebuttal speeches as long as the switching team notifies the other team and the judge(s). Failure of notification before the debate will result in a forfeiture loss for the team switching speaking order.

USE OF VISUAL MATERIALS

If a chart or similar material is used by either team, it must be left before the audience and must be available for reference by either team.

PROMPTING

The oral direction or prompting of a speaker's presentation by his or her partner during any speech or cross-examination is prohibited. The intent of the prompting rule is to prohibit any exchange of information that will substantively alter or direct a speaker's argument, questions, or answers. Prompting may be either verbal or written, which does include the exchange of notes during a constructive or rebuttal speech or the cross-examination period by either the team of the questioner or the team of the respondent. Because there may be practices, which might be justifiably interpreted as prompting, the debater is advised to exercise caution regarding inappropriate intrusions into the debate process.

JUDGING PRACTICES

Improper behavior by a contestant during a round may be disciplined at the discretion of the judge. Penalties could include oral and/or written criticism, the assignment of lower speaker points and speaker ranks, and/or forfeiture of the round of debate by the school, which commits the violation.

Judge behavior during a debate should be exemplary. All ballots must be turned in to the tabulation room at least 15 minutes prior to the start of the next posted time for a round. If the ballot has been submitted to the tabulation room and if fifteen or more minutes remain before the start of the next round, it may be appropriate for a judge to provide an oral critique.

EVIDENCE

1. Evidence read in a round of debate must include the name of the author, or source if there is no author, and complete date of the publication. It is unnecessary to introduce the author of a piece of evidence if the person is a staff writer. Also, the full citation for a piece of evidence including author qualifications, source, and page number(s) of the quotation must be included with the evidence, but does not necessarily have to be read in the round. For Internet materials

and/or other non-print resources, the appropriate URL (Uniform Resource Locator) information and the title of the article or an appropriate descriptor should be included on the specific piece of evidence, but it does not have to be read in the round. "Previously qualified" may be used if a source is mentioned for a second time.

2. The judge must disregard evidence that is read in a round of debate if the lack of a citation is challenged by the opponent. Thus, it is the responsibility of the opposition to note to the judge the failure of a debater to provide a proper citation. When the opposition exercises its evidential challenge, it is the responsibility of the judge to disregard the piece or pieces of evidence that lack the appropriate citations in evaluating an argument. A team whose lack of proper citation has been questioned by an opponent may respond to the challenge in a subsequent speech. The judge must then determine if the response is appropriate for the inquiry and decide if the response is adequate to merit consideration of the body of the evidence.

3. Other forms of evidential challenges must include a rationale, such as a question of the authenticity or the reliability of the content of a piece of evidence.

4. The reading of evidence by judges following the conclusion of a round of debate is limited to specific pieces of evidence that have been challenged within the context of the round of debate. Both debate teams should remain in the room to verify that the judge(s) is reading the appropriate piece(s) of evidence. Both teams should review the specific piece(s) of evidence and any copies of original material that would help verify the accuracy and authenticity of the evidence in question prior to the presentation of the card(s) to the judge(s). Providing the judge(s) with additional evidence or evidence other than the specific piece(s) of evidence subject to challenge will result in the forfeiture of one round of debate by the offending team. Judges requesting additional evidence are subject to sanctions, including the forfeiture of a round of debate by their team(s), removal from the tournament, nonpayment, and other actions as may be appropriate on the basis of available information to the Tournament Director.

5. Evidence read in a round of debate that is subject to a challenge for its potential distortion, fabrication, or other violation of the guidelines for the use of evidence should be given to the Tournament Director by the participating team or teams to facilitate an investigation of the material. To be considered by the MIFA for purposes of implementing a sanction against the offending individual or team, the petitioning team, through its director of debate, must provide a written summary of the evidential distortion, and a copy of the original article that contains the piece of evidence in question. The individual or team that is alleged to have violated one of the guidelines for use of evidence in a round of debate will then have five days to respond in writing through its director of debate to the particular allegations. The MIFA Forensic Council or its representative will then consider the issue with the option of implementing sanctions which may include the forfeiture of a round of debate, the rescinding of awards, and/or specific sanctions against the individual debater(s), director(s), and/or school(s), such as the expulsion of the individual, director, or school from future MIFA events.

RECORDS/BALLOTS OF A DEBATE

All rounds of debate are open to all participants, administrators, and/or visitors. Anyone participating in, or listening to a round of debate may take notes.

Either team may audiotape a particular round of debate. The MIFA may tape the final round debate in each school classification at the State Debate Tournament and may tape the final round of the Novice Debate Tournament.

The MIFA uses a debate ballot that requires the judge to provide each debater with points (including half points) ranging from 6-30 per speaker and ranks of 1-4. In addition, each judge

must provide participants with constructive comments and explanations of arguments that are important in the decision of the particular debate. The ballot will allow the team that wins the debate to receive fewer total points than the loser of the debate, providing the judge writes a specific reason(s) for the point disparity and if the judge checks a specific box on the ballot to acknowledge awareness of the discrepancy.

TIMING IN DEBATE

SEVEN MINUTE PREPARATION TIME RULE.

Each debating team will be allowed a maximum of seven minutes preparation time. This time may be distributed at the debaters' discretion. Judges must keep track of and announce the amount of preparation time remaining. When the seven minutes of preparation time have expired for a team, any additional time thereafter will be subtracted from the next speech of the violating team(s).

Timing intervals of the total seven minute preparation period will begin at the conclusion of each previous speech or cross-examination and will terminate with the first utterance of the next speaker or examiner. Two general exceptions to this interpretation are 1) when the speaker is delayed in beginning a presentation by the previous speaker and 2) when the judge is completing comments on the ballot. Timekeepers should keep a running total of accumulated team time.

TIMING PROCEDURES

Regardless of who times the round, the judge will be responsible for establishing a process to provide an official timing record for all speeches, cross-examination, and preparation times. Options include verbal or visual systems for timing.

All speeches will be timed beginning with the first words of the debater; however, a judge may permit a reasonably short road map prior to timing. In cross-examination, questions asked just prior to the conclusion of the examiner's time should not be answered by the respondent, if the answer would occur in overtime.

Should a debater disagree with the accuracy of the timing and/or the status of remaining preparation time, the debater must immediately request a ruling by the judge in the matter immediately.

DEBATE JUDGE CERTIFICATION

The Michigan Interscholastic Forensic Association requires policy debate judges for the State Debate Tournament and the Novice Final Tournaments to be a high school graduate, submit an ethics statement, and an online paradigm, and/or update their previously submitted paradigm no later than 1 week prior to a state tournament.

Individuals meeting requirements of debate judge certification remain subject to review. Complaints regarding a particular ballot of an individual must be submitted in writing to the MIFA with the appropriate documentation, including a copy of the ballot in question.

Violations of the ethics statement will result in the preclusion of the specific individual from assignments as a judge. Revocation of debate judge certification is subject to annual review. All complaints must be postmarked within five (5) calendar days of the alleged infraction. Upon receipt of three (3) or more complaints regarding a given judge during a certification period, the qualifications of the particular judge will be reviewed by the Forensic Council. Potential options for action by the review committee include the dismissal of the allegations, or other appropriate sanctions. In the review process, the rights of due process and all appeal procedures of the MIFA are applicable.

VARSITY STATE POLICY DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Schools will register for the Varsity State Policy Debate Tournament by the deadline using online registration. All schools will debate within their school classification A, B, C/D. Schools may, however, petition up from their reported school class size when registering for the tournament.

All schools will participate in preliminary rounds and be eligible for elimination rounds. The number of elimination rounds will be determined by the actual number of school participants in each school classification using the following ratio: if a class has 1-6 teams they, will have only a final elimination round. If there are 7-14 schools, they will have both a semifinal and final elimination round. If there are 15-31 schools, they will have a quarterfinal, semifinal, and final elimination round.

Each Varsity State Debate Tournament within the three classifications will be built to maximize fair and equitable distribution of the seeds across the schematic. In no circumstance will there be more than 6 preliminary rounds in any classification. The number of preliminary rounds will be determined by the number of participants in each class.

EXPENSES

State Tournament expenses are divided equally among the participating schools.

LATE FOR ROUND RULE

In cases of forfeiture where violations of the Fifteen Minute Rule occur, the Tournament Director shall assign an average of total points to the winning team in the forfeiture round with the team that forfeits receiving a loss and no speaker points. The ranks for the speakers on the losing team should total seven. If more than one (1) round is missed, the school is automatically eliminated from consideration for further advancement.

TOURNAMENT FORMAT

At all levels of the State Debate Tournament, all rounds must be conducted in the cross-examination style of debating. Each school will debate the same number of rounds as other schools in its division; however, only one team (either affirmative or negative dependent on the schematic) per school will debate in a particular round.

STATE DEBATE TOURNAMENT STAFF

The Executive Director will assign a tournament committee with representation of each of the school classifications to aid in the running of the tournament and tabulation.

STATE DEBATE TOURNAMENT COMMITTEES

All directors of participating debate teams are encouraged to participate in virtual seeding committee meetings in their respective school classification. A State Debate Tournament Committee of no more than seven (7) members shall be selected for each school classification or division in the varsity state final debate tournament. Each Debate Tournament Committee will be selected by nominating ballot and a final ballot process conducted by the State Office. The Debate Tournament Committees will meet virtually prior to the tournament to recommend to the Executive Director pairing procedures for their individual tournaments, which are not in conflict with Speech Activities.

STATE DEBATE TOURNAMENT STRUCTURE

The number of preliminary rounds at the Varsity State Debate Tournament will be determined by the number of teams in each particular class. The minimum number of rounds will be either round robin/or 4 and the maximum will be 6. The tournament will be tabbed by computer using TRPC or a comparable program.

In the Varsity Debate State Tournament, when the number of participating teams is uneven a "bye round" may be held. A "bye round" is a round of debate conducted at a special time, involving two (2) schools that have received "byes" from participation in some other scheduled round. The purpose of a "bye round" is to guarantee that all schools participate in an equal number of debates.

Preliminary round configuration will be predicted on recommendations of the Executive Director and the tournament committees within the construct of the TRPC program. Should a committee recommend a balanced schedule, such a schedule can be input manually into the computer tabulation system based on a balancing algorithm. A balanced schematic will be created with no greater than +/-3 balance based on committee seeding. Efforts will be made to assure that number is as low as possible.

The Tournament Director will publish the appropriate schematic one half hour prior to the start of the first round of that particular tournament. Should a tournament select a completely pre-scheduled tournament based on seeding, the entire schedule will be released prior to the start of the tournament. Should the Tournament Committee request a power-paired schedule, then, as much as can be accurately released should be released at that time.

Before the end of the next round of debates, the Tournament Director will publish the previous round's results. These results will be made available to coaches and judges within the confines of the tabulation or coach and judge hospitality room. The intent of publishing to the coach/judge room only is to NOT reveal this information to debaters, leaving the decision of whether to tell the debaters of the results to the discretion of the coach.

STATE DEBATE JUDGES

There will be one (1) certified judge in each preliminary round of debate, three (3) certified judges in each elimination round. Judges for all preliminary and elimination rounds will be placed by mutual preference. Coaches will rate each judge in the tournament on a preference system and those preferences will be input into the computer. Coaches will be offered a second preference sheet for elimination rounds, which must be submitted to the tab room by the beginning of the last preliminary round of competition.

Each school is responsible for providing one (1) MIFA certified judge, who is the Director of Debate, or the MIFA certified Assistant Director of Debate. In the circumstance that a school lacks a certified judge, the MIFA will hire a judge from a pool of certified judges paid for by the school needing a judge.

There will be a mandatory meeting of judges prior to the start of debates in each school classification. A member of the MIFA Debate Committee will conduct the meeting. Judges may not disclose round decisions to students.

For the final round in each school classification, the directors of the participating schools will initially select a panel of three judges for each debate. Directors of debate at schools participating in the final round may be exempt from judging. The director must request the exemption from the Tournament Director.

Judges must be available to judge throughout the elimination rounds. Following the start of the semifinal round of debate, unassigned judges may be withdrawn from the master judge list with the approval of the Tournament Director.

The Tournament Director will withhold payment to hired judges until all ballots are submitted. In

addition, the Tournament Director shall withhold results packets of those schools whose coach judges have not completed and submitted all copies of the ballots.

If a judge is tardy (arriving 15 or more minutes after the scheduled start of a round) for a judging assignment, the individual will be assessed a fine unless advance notification is provided to the Tournament Director and unusual circumstances exist. In addition, if a director judge is tardy for a judging assignment, the Tournament Director may forfeit one or more rounds of debate involving his or her team at the tournament.

STATE DEBATE ELIMINATION ROUNDS

Teams will qualify for the elimination rounds based on the following order of criteria: (1) total number of ballots, (2) total speaker points, and (3) total speaker ranks.

1. In the elimination rounds, teams will be paired against each other so that the number one (1) ranking team in the quarterfinals will meet the number eight (8) ranking team, the number two (2) ranking team will meet the number seven (7) ranking team, the number three (3) ranking team will meet the number six (6) ranking team and the number four (4) ranking team will meet the number five (5) ranking team. The same principle will be followed in the event that the first elimination round is a semifinal round or a final round.

2. Schools that have met in preliminary rounds of the State Debate Tournament will switch sides. If the two schools have not met, the sides will be decided by the flip of a coin.

STATE DEBATE AWARDS

Schools participating only in the preliminary rounds of the State Debate Tournament will receive appropriate team awards. Any team qualifying for the elimination rounds will receive appropriate trophies.

NOVICE DEBATE

First year debaters can compete in a special division for first year debaters. For MIFA tournaments, a novice debater is a student who has participated in no more than five judged interscholastic debates or institute debates, involving a maximum of two tournaments, prior to September 1 of each given debate year. The Michigan Interscholastic Forensic Association administers one State Final Novice Debate Tournament.

All school classifications are intermixed for the State Final Novice Debate Tournament. All rounds must be conducted in the cross-examination style of debating. Each school will debate the same number of preliminary rounds as other schools; however, only one team (either affirmative or negative dependent on the schematic) per school will debate in a particular round.

NOVICE DEBATE TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

Schools may substitute individual debater(s) within the unit prior to the start of any particular round during the tournament. Once a round of debate has begun, however, the composition of the team must remain intact.

The Novice Final Debate Tournament will include the appropriate number of preliminary and elimination rounds for the number of participants to a maximum of 5 preliminary rounds and 3 elimination rounds of cross-examination debate. The first two preliminary rounds will follow a randomly computer generated schematic while the last preliminary rounds will be power matched.

Schools will qualify for the elimination rounds on the following order criteria: (1) total number of ballots, (2) total speaker points, and (3) total speaker ranks. In the elimination rounds, schools will be paired against each other in the same way as the Varsity State Debate Tournament's

elimination rounds.

The Director of Debate or the MIFA certified Assistant Director of Debate at each of the participating schools or a hired MIFA certified judge will judge all preliminary rounds. The elimination rounds will use three-person panels. All preliminary and elimination rounds will be judged using the mutual preference system described in the Varsity section. Judges must be available to judge throughout the elimination rounds.

GENERAL NOVICE PROCEDURES

AWARDS

Any team qualifying for the elimination rounds will receive appropriate trophies. The first place school is the recipient of the Kent W. Leach Trophy traveling award which recognizes the top novice debate program in Michigan. The name of the school and the Director of Debate at the school is engraved on the traveling trophy on an annual basis.

FEES

All schools will pay a registration fee to the Michigan Interscholastic Forensic Association to cover the expenses of the tournament.

JUDGES

Each participating school is responsible for providing one (1) MIFA certified judge, who is the Director of Debate or MIFA certified Assistant Director of Debate. In the circumstance that a school lacks a certified judge, the MIFA will hire a judge from a pool of certified judges paid for by the school needing a judge.

Judges may not disclose decisions in preliminary rounds. Elimination round judges will indicate the decision of the panel to the participants following the conclusion of the round. The results of the elimination rounds will also be announced at a public assembly.

ZIEGELMUELLER AWARD

The Ziegelmueller Award recognizes outstanding performance by a school in MIFA policy debate activities. Traveling trophies, awarded on an annual basis, honor schools in various divisions for achievements in academic debate. The recipient of the top award in each division or school classification receives a permanent trophy in addition to maintaining possession of the traveling trophy until the next State Debate Tournament.

The Ziegelmueller Award, named after George Ziegelmueller, the distinguished director of debate at Wayne State University, uses participation in the MIFA Novice State Debate Tournament and the MIFA State Championship Debate Tournament to determine school recipients. Each participant in a round of debate at one of the MIFA tournaments receives six points for each win and three points for each loss, whether in a preliminary or an elimination round regardless of whether panels render a "split" decision or not.