

MIFA DEBATE EVENTS

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

The MIFA offers three styles of debate: legislative, policy and public forum.

LEGISLATIVE DEBATE PROCEDURES

OVERVIEW

Legislative Debate is individual debate in a large group setting. Debaters research and write pieces of national-oriented legislation. At a tournament, debaters speak on the legislation using parliamentary procedure as found in Robert's Rules of Order, most recent edition.

DIVISIONS

Debaters compete in one of two divisions: Novice or Varsity. The Novice Division is open only to debaters in their first year of high school debate. The Varsity Division is open to high school debaters without restriction. Each school may bring a maximum of ten (10) students in each division. ~~In order to be eligible for the State Tournament, a Debater must have participated in at least five legislative sessions at either weekend tournaments or a MIFA-recognized Legislative Debate League during the current academic year.~~

LEGISLATION

Participating schools are required to submit at least one piece of legislation for legislative action at each tournament. The tournament director shall confirm receipt of legislation.

Legislation format: All legislation must be on one (1) page, using a traditional twelve (12) point font and double spacing. Each line should be numbered. Legislation may be in the format of either a bill or a resolution. Components ~~for the~~ of a bill include a statement of the policy, a definition of key terms in the policy, the date of implementation, the government agency responsible for the administration of the bill, the mechanisms for enforcement or compliance and funding issues. Components of a resolution include a series of reasons for a specific recommendation. The reasons for the resolution are captured in a series of "Whereas" statements accompanied by a "Therefore" statement. The resolution should contain a clear statement of the appropriate action. Bills and Resolutions must be national in scope and impact. Sample bills and resolutions are available for viewing on the MIFA website.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Speeches introducing legislation are allotted up to three (3) minutes, followed by two (2) minutes of questioning by other delegates. If the author of the legislation is not present, a student from the same school shall have the privilege of recognition (called sponsorship). If the author or a member of the school is not present in the chamber, then a speech of sponsorship may be offered by any student in the chamber. This speech of introduction must be followed by two (2) minutes of questions.

The first negative speech of up to three (3) minutes, must be followed by two (2) minutes of questions.

Following the first two (2) speeches on legislation, the Presiding Officer will alternately recognize affirmative and negative speakers, who will address the chamber for up to three (3) minutes, followed by one (1) minute of

questioning by other delegates. The chamber may move to suspend rules and extend this cross-examination time, however this is to be discouraged.

If no one wishes to oppose the preceding speaker, the Presiding Officer will recognize a motion to suspend the rules and have a second speaker upholding the same side. After this second same-side Director must be familiar with sections of General Policy, which are applicable to the Debate section. speech, the debate returns to the opposing side.

When no one seeks the floor for debate, the Presiding Officer asks the chamber if they are “ready for the question,” at which point, if there is no objection, voting may commence on the legislation itself. There is no “minimum cycle” rule. The chamber may decide to move the previous question, at the completion of any cycle of affirmative and negative speeches.

Voting

Votes of record shall be done by standing, or by show of hands. Other votes may be done by voice. There are three (3) votes of record: open an amendment, close debate, and vote on the legislation. Opening an amendment requires a vote of one-third in favor; closing debate (“move to previous question”) requires two-thirds in favor; legislation is passed by majority vote.

At the conclusion of the vote, the Presiding Officer shall announce the results.

Amendments

Amendments must be presented to the Presiding Officer in writing with specific references to lines and clauses that change, using the provided form. This must be done in advance of moving to amend.

The parliamentarian will recommend whether the amendment is “germane” that is it upholds the original intent of the legislation – otherwise it is considered “dilatatory.” The title of the legislation may be changed as an amendment. In the absence of a parliamentarian, the Presiding Officer shall rule on whether the amendment is germane.

A legislator may move to amend between floor speeches. Once that motion is made, the Presiding Officer will read the proposed amendment aloud and call for a second.

Amendments are considered neutral and do not constitute an affirmative or negative speech on the original legislation. If there are no speakers on the amendment the previous question is moved. The chamber may vote on a proposed amendment without debating it.

JUDGE ROLES

Only those judges who are at least three (3) or more years beyond (post) high school graduation, with experience in legislative debate are eligible to judge at the Varsity Super Session of the State Tournament. Judges who are at least one year or more beyond high school graduation with experience in legislative debate are eligible to judge the Novice Super Session at the State Tournament.

JUDGE EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Judges evaluate each legislator on the MIFA Speaker Ballot. Judges also evaluate the performance of the Presiding Officer, using the MIFA Presiding Officer Ballot.

Speakers

Legislator evaluations should consider the substantive participation of each individual including the Delivery, Organization, Reasoning, Evidence, Clash and Overall Impact. Delivery. The speaker should present remarks displaying serious purpose in poise, vocabulary, and voice. The style is natural, with variety in vocals as appropriate.

- > **Delivery.** The speaker should present remarks displaying serious purpose in poise, vocabulary, and voice. The style is natural, with variety in vocals as appropriate.
- > **Organization.** The speaker should structure remarks with clear introductions, development and conclusion. The point of view is carried throughout.
- > **Reasoning.** The speaker should advance the debate with reasoning skills and analysis. The speaker should avoid rehashing previous or engaging in abusive arguments. Superior speeches link the speaker's position to broader issues of significance.
- > **Evidence.** The speaker should provide evidence in support of the argument using multiple pieces of pertinent evidence of high quality or authority. A well-reasoned argument must be supported by appeals to data outside the speaker's direct experience.
- > **Clash.** The speaker should address opposing arguments and objections while advocating why his or her view should prevail. The speaker engages other arguments directly with analysis, counters with superior evidence, and advances new arguments. Sponsorship speeches should anticipate potential objections.

In addition, the judge should consider the overall contribution to the debate as a whole, including his or her answers to questions in cross-examination, questions to other speakers; motions and other chamber activity, and his or her overall professionalism.

Presiding Officer

Presiding Officer evaluations will include application of rules of parliamentary procedure, advancement of debate and leadership.

Parliamentary Procedure.

- > **The Presiding Officer** (P.O.) should have a command of parliamentary procedure. The P.O. should demonstrate a mastery of the Rules of Order, enforce those rules, resolve conflicts, preserve the integrity of the chamber, and apply rules even-handedly.
- > **Advancement of Debate.** The P.O. should keep the chamber on track, by minimizing redundant comments; promoting speech on both sides of each issue, encouraging differing view, and cultivating constructive discourse.
- < **Leadership.** The P.O. displays professionalism, and relates well to the chamber through his/her vocal and physical presence. Word choice is economical and eloquent. The P.O. should ensure that all members of the chamber have equal opportunity to speak and participate. Presiding preferences are clearly explained at the beginning of the session and executed consistently.

Rank Determination

Each judge will rank the top ten legislators in order of preference. Numeric totals must reflect ranks. The order must follow numeric totals (i.e., a legislator with a score of 27 must be ranked lower than a legislator with a

score of 29). The Presiding Officer is eligible to be ranked with the speakers. No one is to be assigned a rank higher than eleven (11) regardless of point value.

Parliamentarian Roles

The Parliamentarian assists the Presiding Officer with any questions regarding Presiding Officer guidelines or Parliamentary Procedure. A Parliamentarian can be any coach or qualified judge without any students participating in the round. Parliamentarians must be used with all Novice rounds, and with semi- or final-rounds for Varsity.

Presiding Officer Duties & Guidelines

At the State Tournament, each chamber will have one (1) Presiding Officer (PO) per session. Candidates for Presiding Officer will be nominated from the floor. There may be more than one candidate for Presiding Officer from the same school. A competitor may only act as a presiding officer in one round of competition at the state tournament.

A director must indicate those students who are certified to serve as Presiding Officers on their registration forms. The Tournament Director will assign qualified Presiding Officers to each chamber.

Role

The Presiding Officer should treat Speakers equally; all members of the chamber should have a chance to participate. As the session nears the end of the time limits, the Presiding Officer should encourage non-speakers to participate. The Presiding Officer is also responsible to the question. As long as the minority is talking (and not rehashing), the debate should continue. By manner and leadership, the Presiding Officer should actively maintain decorum in the chamber.

Recency

When more than one speaker seeks the floor, the Presiding Officer shall observe the following model of recency for recognition: First recognize students who have not spoken during the session; Next recognize students who have spoken fewer times; Then recognize students who spoke earlier (least recently) During any session, recency should not reset, to ensure that all students in a chamber have an equal opportunity to speak and receive evaluation from scorers. When a new session begins, recency will be reset along with a new seating chart, and an election of a Presiding Officer. Before precedence is established, the Presiding Officer should explain his/her recognition process and it must be fair, consistent and justifiable.

Chamber Management

The Presiding Officer fairly and equitably recognizes members to ask questions following each speech. The Presiding Officer starts timing questioning periods when s/he has recognized the first questioner, and keeps the clock running continuously until the time has lapsed. Speakers are encouraged to ask brief questions, and may only ask one (1) question at a time (two-part, multiple-part questions are not allowed since they monopolize time and disallow others to ask their questions.

Electronics Policy

Computers, cell phones, music players, and games are not to be used in the chamber during a session. Traditional timing devices are permitted. A student will be warned upon first violation; upon the second violation, the student shall be disqualified.

PRE-TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

Submitting Legislation

The tournament director may reject legislation deemed inappropriate because of content, inflammatory language choice, or incorrect formatting. If the tournament director rules the proposed legislative item of a school unacceptable, the director should provide a rationale for the decision. If the bill or resolution is rejected, the school must provide an alternative item to participate.

Chamber Parameters

The number of on-time entries will determine the number of chambers. The size of each chamber shall be no smaller than fourteen (14) and should be no greater than twenty (20); should it be necessary to exceed this limit sufficient time must be added to the session length to accommodate the extra students. Final determination of size of each chamber is at the discretion of the Tournament Director. With two (2) or more chambers, the number of participants in each chamber should be equal or nearly equal.

Session Length

Each session shall allot a minimum of six (6) minutes for each student in the chamber. Each session will have a minimum of ninety (90) minutes of debate time to a maximum of one hundred and twenty minutes (120) of debate time. For each student over twenty (20), ten (10) minutes shall be added to session length.

When there is more than one (1) session, a minimum ten (10) minute recess must be held between sessions.

Regardless of the number of legislative sessions, prior to start of the initial session, fifteen (15) minutes shall be allotted for Preliminary Business (e.g., seating chart review, judge introduction, election of Presiding Officer). This time cannot be included in the total time allotted for debate.

In legislative Super Sessions a maximum of four (4) bills/resolutions must be prepared for use. The legislative proposals for the Super Session must be new items.

Docket

The official(s) responsible for the administration of each tournament will determine the order of deliberation for the bills. The tournament directors may either mandate the order, or use a random process for the event.

Super Session bills will be identified in the docket. The tournament director will conduct a random draw prior to the opening student meeting to determine the order in which the bills will be debated in the preliminary sessions.

STATE TOURNAMENT SPECIFICS

Fees

See current fee structure at <http://www.themifa.org> and additional specifics on fees in General Policies.

Registration

A school shall submit its registration and legislation for the State Tournament to the MIFA office no later than three (3) weeks prior to the date of the Tournament. Registration shall include names of the students participating, the names of those certified to serve as Presiding Officers, and the school's proposed piece of legislation. On the day of the tournament, the school shall also provide a MIFA-provided photo release form for each participating student.

Structure and Schematics

The State Tournament will be divided into Novice and Varsity Divisions. Each school may bring a maximum of ten (10) students in each division.

For the State Championship Legislative Debate Tournaments with one (1) or two (2) chambers, will have two preliminary sessions advancing to one Super Session. If there are more than two (2) chambers there will be two preliminary sessions, a Semi Final and a Super Session.

Legislation

Participating schools must submit one (1) appropriate bill or resolution for legislative action at least thirty (30) days prior to the tournament. The Tournament Director may supplement the docket with legislation from the National Speech and Debate Association as needed. The ~~Legislative Debate~~ Tournament Committee and the Executive Director shall use a blind selection process to evaluate and select the legislation for the Tournament. The four (4) top-ranking bills shall be assigned to the Super Session. All legislation for the State Tournament will be sent to participating schools and posted on the MIFA website twenty-three (23) days prior to the tournament. It is the responsibility of each school to duplicate copies of the legislation for each of its participants.

State Tournament Legislative Sessions will have four (4) bills each. Each bill must be from a different school and the bills will be assigned to the preliminary sessions randomly by the tournament director.

Judges

There will be two (2) judges per preliminary session. A Super Session will have three (3) judges.

For the State Legislative Debate Tournament, each school will provide one judge for each division in which it has contestants.

Awards

The top ten (10) legislators in the Varsity and Novice division Super Session will receive awards. The placement will be determined by summing the ranks of each judge with a composite rank for the participant scoring. If there is a tie, the scores of the judges will be the next standard for the determination of placements. If a tie remains after the application of judge scoring, the tie will be broken by tabulating the number of first speaker rankings on the ballots of the participants. The individual with the greatest number of first place rankings would be ranked higher in the final placements.

Each participant in the State Final Legislative Debate will receive a certificate. All Super Session participants will receive a pin. The Presiding Officer in any semi- final or Super Session will also receive a gavel.

A final award presented at the State Tournament will be the Best Bill Award. This award will be voted on by the coaches of the participating schools. Bills will be ranked based on the quality of their construction, their originality and the clash that they produce. The author of the Best Bill will receive a trophy.

MIFA TEAM DEBATE ACTIVITIES

Both forms of team debate follow general procedures for debate and for their individual tournaments.

GENERAL TEAM DEBATE DEFINITIONS AND PROCEDURES

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

SUBSTITUTIONS A school may bring as many debaters above the minimum requirement as it desires to a MIFA 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. Once a round of debate has begun, however, the composition of the team must remain intact.

DEBATE RESOLUTIONS The official topic area for PD (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. The official topic area for PF (public forum debate) is coordinated through the National High School Speech and Debate Honor Society. The MIFA will post all current resolutions on the TEAM DEBATE section of the website when they are published.

NOVICE For MIFA tournaments, a novice debater is a student who has participated in no more than five judged interscholastic high school debates or institute debates, involving a maximum of two tournaments, prior to September 1 of each given debate year. For a team to participate in a State Novice Tournament, both students must meet the definition of novice debater. No middle school experience shall apply to deny a student of novice status.

USE OF VISUAL MATERIALS If a team uses charts or similar materials, they must be easily seen by the audience and judge, and must be available for reference by either team.

TIMING IN DEBATE

1. 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 or cross fire, and preparation times.
2. 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.
3. In cross-examination or cross fire, questions asked just prior to the conclusion of cross examination or cross fire time should not be answered by the respondent, if the answer would occur in overtime.
4. 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 round. Judges have complete jurisdiction over matters of timing.
5. Each team will be allowed the appropriate 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 preparation time has expired for a team, any additional time thereafter will be subtracted from the next speech of the debater on the team without remaining preparation time.

EVIDENCE USED IN ROUNDS OF DEBATE

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 on 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. 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 the round of debate by the offending team.

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.

PAPERLESS DEBATE REGULATIONS

1. Computers or other electronic devices may not be used to exchange ~~receive~~ information except among competitors and judges in the round ~~from any source (coaches or assistants included) inside or outside the room of competition~~. Internet access, use of email, instant messaging, or other means of exchanging ~~receiving~~ information between competitors ~~from sources are prohibited~~ is allowed during the round. By choosing to use computers in the round, debaters are consenting to give tournament officials the right to check contestant computers to determine outside consultation. Debaters who do not wish to consent should not use computers in the round.

2. Evidence may be printed in the round or produced electronically, but must be provided, upon request, in a format readable by the opposing team and/or the judge.

3. All exchanges of evidence should take place within current speech or prep time parameters.

4. Contestants choosing to use computers and related equipment accept the risk of equipment failure. Judges and/or contest directors will give no additional consideration (beyond that provided to debaters using paper files).

5. Contestants electing to use computers are responsible for providing their own computers, batteries, extension cords and all other necessary accessories. Tournament hosts will not be responsible for providing computers, printers, software, paper, or extension cords for contestants.
6. Contestants found to have violated the paperless debate rules will be sanctioned by the tournament director based on the severity of the violation. Penalties range from forfeiting rounds to being disqualified from the tournament.

GENERAL POLICY DEBATE PROCEDURES

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 delivered 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
Preparation time per school unit or team.....	8 minutes

A debater may waive his or her cross-examination period.. 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.

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) before the debate begins. Failure of notification before the debate will result in a forfeiture loss for the team switching speaking order.

~~PROMPTING 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.~~

PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE PROCEDURES

The MIFA uses the National Speech and Debate Honor Society’s format for Public Forum debate.

First Speaker -- Team A	4 Minutes
First Speaker -- Team B.....	4 Minutes
Crossfire (1st question by speaker A1).....	3 Minutes
Second Speaker -- Team A	4 Minutes
Second Speaker -- Team B	4 Minutes
Crossfire (first question by A2)	3 Minutes
Summary -- First Speaker -- Team A.....	2 Minutes
Summary -- First Speaker -- Team B.....	2 Minutes
Grand Crossfire (1st question from Team A).....	3 Minutes
Final Focus -- Second Speaker -- Team A	2 Minutes
Final Focus -- Second Speaker -- Team B.....	2 Minutes
Preparation Time per school unit or team.....	2 Minutes

COIN FLIP

Prior to EVERY round and in the presence of the judge(s), a coin is tossed by one team and called by the other team. The team that wins the flip may choose one of two options: EITHER the SIDE of the topic they wish to defend (pro or con) OR the SPEAKING POSITION they wish to have (begin the debate or end the debate). The remaining option (SIDE OR SPEAKING POSITION) is the choice of the team that loses the flip. Once speaking positions and sides has been determined, the debate begins (the con team may lead, depending on the coin flip results).

PLANS AND COUNTERPLANS In Public Forum Debate, unlike in Policy Debate, neither the pro nor con side is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan; rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions, but no plans or counterplans, per se.

PROMPTING

Oral prompting, except time signals, either by the speaker's colleague or by any other person while the debater has the floor, is discouraged though not prohibited and may be penalized by some judges. Debaters may, however, refer to their notes and materials and may consult with their teammate while they do not have the floor and during the Grand Crossfire.

BALLOTS

The MIFA uses a ballot, which requires the judge to provide each team with points ranging from 20-30. In addition, each judge must provide participants with constructive comments, and explanations of arguments that are important to the decision in the “Reasons for Decision” section.

GENERAL TEAM DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

BALLOTS AND ORAL CRITIQUES All MIFA tournament judges must turn in a ballot to the tab room indicating a “reason for decision” and appropriate ranks and/or points. ~~The MIFA prohibits judges from disclosing decisions in all but the elimination rounds of a tournament,~~ but Judges may disclose and offer constructive, and professional comments at the conclusion of a round as long as the ballot has been completed and submitted to the tab room and fifteen (15) or more minutes remain before the start of the next round.

TABULATING LATE FOR ROUND RULE In cases of forfeiture because of a violation of the LATE FOR ROUND RULE has occurred (MIFA General Policy p. 8), the Tournament Director shall assign an average of total points to the winning team in the forfeit round with the team that forfeits receiving a loss and no points.

STATE TOURNAMENT GENERAL PROCEDURES

1. The Executive Director will assign a tournament committee to aid in the running of the tournament and tabulation.
2. Expenses of each state tournament are divided equally among the participating schools, proportionate to each school's number of teams entered.
3. Schools will register for all State Debate Tournaments online by the deadline posted on the website. Schools wishing to enter a State Debate Tournament after the deadline will not be admitted.
4. The number of preliminary rounds in a State Debate Tournament will be determined by the number of schools entered in the tournament (In varsity policy debate each division has its own tournament so number of schools will be specific to each tournament.). The minimum number of rounds will either be round robin/or 4, 5, or 6.
5. When the number of participating schools (or in the event of multiple entries per school, the number of participating teams) is uneven, a bye round may be held. A bye round is a debate conducted at a special time, involving only the schools that have been unscheduled in previous rounds in order to assure that all schools participate in an equal number of preliminary debates.
6. All schools that participate in preliminary rounds will be eligible for elimination rounds. The number of elimination rounds will be determined by the actual number of schools (not necessarily the number of teams) participating in the tournament. If a tournament has 1-6 schools, they will only have a final round. With 7-14 schools they will have a semifinal and a final round. If there are 15-31 schools they will have a quarterfinal, semifinal and final round.
7. In the elimination rounds, teams will be paired against each other so that the number 1 ranking team in the quarterfinals will meet the number 8 ranking team, the number 2 ranking team will meet the number 7 ranking team, the number 3 ranked team will meet the number 6 ranked team, and the number 4 ranked team will meet the number 5 ranked team. The same principle will be followed in the event that the first elimination rounds is a semifinal round or a final round.
8. 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 tab room or the coach/judge hospitality room. The intent of publishing to the coach/judges only is to not reveal the information to debaters, leaving the decision of whether to tell the debaters of the results to the discretion of the coach.

POLICY DEBATE TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

POLICY DEBATE BALLOTS 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.

POLICY DEBATE JUDGING PROCEDURES

1. The Michigan Interscholastic Forensic Association requires policy debate judges for its State Debate 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 one (1) week prior to a state debate tournament and to have judged at least eight rounds on the current topic.
2. 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.
 3. Judge behavior during a debate should reflect the highest standards of educational professionalism. Individuals meeting requirements of debate judge certification remain subject to review. Complaints regarding a particular ballot or behavior of an individual judge must be submitted in writing to the MIFA with the appropriate documentation, including a copy of the ballot.
 4. 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.
 5. There will be two (2) certified judges in each preliminary round of the State Varsity Policy Debate tournament, and three (3) certified judges in each elimination round. There will be one (1) certified judge in each preliminary round of the State Novice Policy Debate Tournament and 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.
 6. 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.
 7. There will be a mandatory meeting of judges prior to the start of debates at each Policy Debate State Tournament. A member of the MIFA Debate Committee will conduct the meeting.
 - ~~8. Judges may not disclose round decisions to students.~~
 9. Directors of debate at schools participating in the final round of a state debate tournament, when there are multiple rounds occurring at the same time, may be exempt from judging. The director must request the exemption from the Tournament Director.
 10. 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.
 11. 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.
 12. If a judge is tardy (arriving fifteen (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 (1) or more rounds of debate involving the director's team at the tournament.

STATE VARSITY POLICY DEBATE TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

1. Each State Varsity Debate Tournament will be divided into two individual tournaments. The Tier 1 state tournament is comprised of schools that participate in league debates and no more than two (2) invitational

tournaments, and the Tier 2 state debate tournament is comprised of schools which participate in more than two (2) invitational tournaments, regardless of league participation. Schematics for each tournament will be built to maximize fair and equitable distribution of the seeds.

2. All directors of participating debate teams are encouraged to participate in the Debate Tournament Committee's virtual seeding meeting which must be held at least 10 days prior to the tournament. The purpose of the meeting is to recommend to the Executive Director pairing procedures for the individual tournaments.

3. Member schools will be allowed to enter only one (1) two-person team at the State Varsity Policy Debate Tournament.

4. 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.

STATE NOVICE POLICY DEBATE TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

1. The MIFA administers a tournament for first year, Novice, competitors only.

2. All school classifications are intermixed for the State Novice Policy Debate Tournament. All rounds must be conducted in the cross-examination style of debating,

3. Member schools will be allowed to enter either one (1) or two (2) two-person teams at the State Novice Policy Debate Tournament. Only one (1) of these teams from a school can advance into the elimination rounds. Schools may utilize unlimited substitution of individual debater(s) within the unit(s) 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. Teams from the same school shall not be paired against each other.

4. The State Novice Policy Debate Tournament will include the appropriate number of preliminary and elimination rounds for the number of school participants to a maximum of five (5) preliminary rounds and three (3) elimination rounds of cross-examination debate. The first two (2) preliminary rounds will follow a randomly generated schematic while the last preliminary rounds will be power matched.

QUALIFICATION FOR STATE POLICY DEBATE ELIMINATION ROUNDS

Schools will qualify for the elimination rounds based on the following order of criteria: (1) the top team's total number of ballots, (2) the top team's total speaker points and (3) the top team's total speaker ranks. Only one (1) team per school may advance to elimination rounds. Composition of that team is at the discretion of the school's coach. All students who participated in preliminary rounds from that school are eligible. Schools that have met in preliminary rounds of the State Debate Tournament will switch sides. If the two (2) schools have not met, the sides will be decided by the flip of a coin.

STATE POLICY DEBATE AWARDS

1. All teams qualifying for the elimination rounds of a State Policy Debate Tournament will receive appropriate trophies. Participant certificates are available online for download.

2. The first place school in the State Novice Policy Debate Tournament will be awarded the Kent W. Leach Trophy, a traveling award which recognizes the top first year program in Michigan and will maintain possession of it until the next State Novice Policy Debate Tournament.

PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

JUDGING PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE

1. The Michigan Interscholastic Forensic Association requires Public Forum debate judges for its State Debate Tournaments to be a high school graduate.
2. 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/or forfeiture of the round of debate by the school, which commits the violation.
3. There will be one (1) judge in each preliminary round of a State Public Forum Debate Tournament and three (3) judges in each elimination round.
4. Each school is responsible for providing one (1) judge at a State Public Forum Debate Tournament for every two (2) teams (four students). Citizen or lay judges are encouraged. In the circumstance that a school lacks a judge, the MIFA will hire a judge paid for by the school needing a judge.
5. There will be a mandatory meeting of judges prior to the start of debates at each State Public Forum Debate Tournament. A member of the MIFA Team Debate Committee will conduct the meeting.
- ~~6. Judges may not disclose round decisions to students.~~
7. 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.
8. 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 judges have not completed and submitted all ballots.
9. If a judge is tardy (arriving fifteen (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 school's judge is tardy for a judging assignment, the Tournament Director may forfeit one (1) or more rounds of debate involving the school at the tournament.

STATE PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

1. The MIFA administers a tournament for first year, Novice competitors only, as well as a Varsity Debate Public Forum tournament.
2. All school classifications are intermixed for the Public Forum State Tournaments.
3. Member schools will be allowed to enter an unlimited number of two (2) person teams at any of the State Public Forum Debate Tournaments.
4. State Public Forum Debate Tournaments will include the appropriate number of preliminary and elimination rounds for the number of school participants to a maximum of six (6) preliminary rounds and three (3) elimination rounds. The first two (2) preliminary rounds will follow a randomly generated schematic while the last preliminary rounds will be power matched.

QUALIFICATION FOR STATE PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE ELIMINATION ROUNDS

Schools will qualify for the elimination rounds based on the following order of criteria: (1) the top team's total number of ballots and (2) the top team's total speaker points. Only one (1) team per school may advance to elimination rounds. Composition of that team is at the discretion of the school's coach. All students who participated in preliminary rounds from that school are eligible.

STATE PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE TOURNAMENT AWARDS

1. All teams qualifying for the elimination rounds of a State Public Forum Debate Tournament will receive appropriate trophies. Participant certificates are available online for download for all participants.

DEBATE SWEEPSTAKES AWARD

MIFA distributes the Ziegelmueller Award at the State Debate Varsity Tournaments. Named after George Ziegelmueller, the distinguished former director of debate at Wayne State University, the award recognizes outstanding performance by a school in MIFA throughout the debate styles. Traveling trophies are awarded on an annual basis to honor schools in Class A and Classes B/C/D. The school recipients shall maintain possession of the award until the next State Debate Varsity Tournaments.

Points are awarded as follows: Team debate (policy and public forum)= 6 points for a win, 3 points for a loss, 4.5 points for a preliminary split decision with two judge ballots, and 6 points for a win and 3 points for a loss, regardless of a split decision in each elimination round.

Points are accumulated in both novice and varsity of both team debate styles, however, if multiple entries are allowed in any of the team debate divisions, the best overall unit for a school will count toward the prelims (not the entire school entry), while elimination rounds will be assigned same as single school entry points.

In individual debate (legislative), each school may earn points for their 5 best students by division (varsity and novice). In all rounds, regardless of number of judges, each judge assigns 0.5 of a point per student for participation in the round. If the judge scores the student with a rank of 1-10, the student received a second 0.5 point from that judge for that round. Additionally, the top the scorers in a division also receive the following: 3rd place gets 1 additional point, 2nd place gets 2 additional points and 1st place gets 3 additional points.

All scores are added together by school to determine the winners of the debate sweepstakes awards.

The Ziegelmueller Award is presented at the Varsity Debate State Tournament.

INSERT LEGISLATIVE DEBATE SCORE SHEET (one page PDF)

Standards for Judging

Overview

Each speech is judged in five categories, with each category ranked on a scale of one to five. While each category has its distinctive failings, at their best the categories are self-reinforcing. The five categories break down to issues of presentation (Delivery, Organization), content (Reasoning, Evidence), and debate (Clash).

Scoring

Scoring should begin at the midpoint, "Average." and grade outward from there.

- 1 Poor, used for only the most outrageous or substantive violations (similar to the 75 in IE events), or where some dimension is absent (e.g. Clash)
- 2 Fair. The speech suffered from one or more significant defects.
- 3 Starting Point (Average). Students speak competently.
- 4 Good. Student speaks well. Some weaknesses are still present with the case.
- 5 Excellent. The student shows mastery in the given area. Makes the case in a compelling fashion.

DELIVERY – The speaker should present remarks displaying serious purpose in poise, vocabulary, and voice. Expansion & Commentary. Delivery encompasses both physical manner and use of voice. The speaker engages the audience physically by stance, poise, eye contact, and gesture. The speaker should speak naturally, with confidence and without affectation. Qualities of voice, diction, pace, and vocal variety all matter here. Word choice demonstrates a seriousness of purpose and avoids colloquialisms or casual aspects of speech. (You know what I mean?)

- 1 – Generally for only the most casual presentations. Or those speeches where the student demonstrably appears not to be engaged. A (1) here should be explained in Comments.
- 2 – Some substantial or significant failures in vocal delivery or in manner of presentation.
- 3 – Student demonstrates competence in delivery. Speaks appropriately with
- 4 – Student speaks with confidence, broadly professional, some vocal mannerisms (e.g. speed, diction) may remain.
- 5 – Speaker is polished in delivery and poise, professional. The style is natural, with variety in vocals as appropriate..

ORGANIZATION – The speaker should present remarks with a clear structure and point of view. Expansion & Commentary. Remarks should be easy to follow and not ramble. A clear structure should include introduction, body and conclusion, and where appropriate, internal signposts. The speaker should present a clear point of view around which the speech is developed.

- 1- Exhibits no discernible organization or point of view. The speech rambles.
- 2- One or more part of the speech is missing. Conclusion or introduction may be perfunctory in character.
- 3- Point of view is presented; major sections present.
- 4- Speaker presents point of view, signposts internal argument.
- 5- Well rounded in structure, with clear introductions, development and conclusion. The point of view is carried throughout.

REASONING – The speaker should advance the debate with reasoning skills, without rehashing previous or engaging in abusive arguments. Expansion & Commentary. Where Organization focuses on the structure of the speech, Reasoning considers the content of what is said. Does the speaker provide a logical basis for statements? The speaker should link the speech to preceding speeches or to the bill itself. Reasoning develops the implications of its point of view, and explains the significance to the debate. The speaker may add

new information, provide analysis of opposing views, or open or add to consideration of a stock issue. Note: in Legislative Debate, Constitutionality functions analogously to Topicality in Policy Debate. At its most severe, failure in Reasoning would include resort to emotional or personal appeals, ad hominem attacks; less severe forms include failure to link to ongoing debate and rehashing previous arguments.

- 1- An abusive speech. Speaker employs ad hominem attacks; states categorical approval or disapproval without support.
- 2- Speaker appeals to personal experience, appeals to emotional truth or moral truth as self-evident. Often rehashes.
- 3- Speaker provides reasons for position. May link to the broader topic of the bill, if not the bill itself.
- 4- Speaker provides reasons for position, links them to previous points in debate.
- 5- Speaker links position to broader issues of significance; points relate in a unified view.

EVIDENCE – The speaker should provide evidence in support of the argument. Expansion & Commentary A well-reasoned argument must be supported by appeals to data outside the speaker’s direct experience. A good speaker will draw on a breadth of material to support his or her position. Evidence is rated more favorably by quality of sources, the correspondence of the evidence with the argumentative point, as well as quantity. Evidence may include may appeal to philosophy (e.g. Free Enterprise) foundational truths (e.g. US Constitution, Federalism), court cases, legislative histories, scientific papers, monographs, as well as reports and analysis from the press. Evidence should be presented in debate form, giving author (authority), source, date.

- 1-- No outside evidence presented. Speaker relies on personal experience or anecdote.
- 2-- Evidence presented minimally supports case; may come from contested or biased sources.
- 3-- Provides at least one piece of evidence pertinent to the point, drawn from press reports and analyses.
- 4-- Provides multiple pieces of pertinent evidence. Quality may be mixed
- 5-- Provides multiple pieces of pertinent evidence or high quality or authority.

INSERT

>LEGISLATIVE DEBATE SPEAKER BALLOT (one page PDF)

> Presiding Officer BALlot (one page PDF)

> Legislative Debate - seating chart

> Policy Debate - ballot

> Public Forum - ballot