

Virginia High School League
1642 State Farm Blvd.
Charlottesville, VA 22911
434-977-8475 / 434-977-5943 (fax) / www.vhsl.org.

VHSL DEBATE MANUAL

Updated October 2009



DEBATE MANUAL

REVISED: **October 2009**

CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS HIGHLIGHTED PER THIS EXAMPLE

Virginia High School League, Inc.

1642 State Farm Boulevard / Charlottesville, VA 22911 | 434-977-8475 / 434-977-5943 (fax)

www.vhsl.org / email: lgiles@vhsl.org or scondoulis@vhsl.org

Ken Tilley, Executive Director
Lisa Giles, Assistant Director
Sharon Condoulis, Program Assistant

This official publication of the Virginia High School League has been prepared as an aid to high school debate, drama and forensic coaches; lay judges; festival/tournament directors; and persons who work closely with interscholastic speech and drama programs.

The general purpose of the League's speech and drama programs is to stimulate interest and participation in those activities among Virginia high school students. This purpose is best served when a large number of schools and students engage in the programs. Through debate, drama and forensic activities at the school level, young people are provided a means of furthering their cultural and educational development.

Rules and guidelines contained in this manual have been established by the VHSL Debate, Drama and Forensic Advisory Committee with approval of the League's Executive Committee. These policies are designed to ensure an equitable setting in which to conduct competitive activities and improve one's level of achievement.

Coaches, participants, judges, event administrators and observers are expected to adhere to the regulations and procedures described herein. They are also expected to apply the principles of good sportsmanship which, according to *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* is defined as, "Conduct becoming to a competitor, involving honest rivalry and graceful acceptance of results." VHSL sportsmanship rules as stated in the Handbook apply to academic activities just as they do to athletic activities. The procedure for addressing sportsmanship concerns is printed on the reverse.

Besides containing all rules for speech and theatre events, this manual includes sample rating forms, judge's ballots and useful information so participants understand how events are administered and evaluated. Entry forms for district and regional competitions have been incorporated into the Principal's Workbook and are available under the appropriate activity on the League website (www.vhsl.org). State entry forms are also posted on the website and are also distributed by regional directors to coaches of students qualifying for that level.

Persons receiving this manual are urged to read it carefully and retain it for reference purposes. If you have any questions or need additional assistance, please contact us at the League office.

We appreciate your continued support of debate, drama and forensic activities, and we welcome your suggestions for its improvement.

Ken Tilley
Executive Director

Lisa Giles
Assistant Director for Speech Activities

ABOUT THE VHSL

When members of the Washington and Jefferson Literary Societies at the University of Virginia decided in the fall of 1913 to organize a debating league among the secondary schools of the state, they could not have comprehended how their small project would develop, expand and grow into what is now the Virginia High School League.

Twenty schools took part in that first state event. By the fall of 1914 one hundred schools were enrolled in the Virginia High School Literary League. Its program was expanded during 1914-15 to include a contest in oral reading. And in conjunction with the University's General Athletic Association, statewide competition began in baseball, basketball and track. Other sports and activities soon followed. Dramatic activities have been an integral part of the VHSL since the first One-Act Play competition in 1931-32.

Membership in the League increased so rapidly that the Extension Division of the University of Virginia, and later the Division of Continuing Education, had to be assigned greater responsibility for the conduct of League affairs.

By 1926, the League realized that, in the interest of democracy, the legislative responsibilities of the League should be vested in representatives of member high schools. All activities were coordinated under one organization. Control of the composite program was charged to a body of principals known as the Legislative Council, assisted by a smaller Executive Committee.

In March 1946, the League was reorganized as the first step in a significant postwar program. Its name was changed from "The Virginia High School Literary and Athletic League" to "Virginia High School League" to suggest a wider field of League interests. Finally, in 1995, legislative control was transferred from the Legislative Council to the Executive Committee.

For equalization of opportunities sponsored by the League, each school is classified according to its enrollment into either Group A, Group AA or Group AAA. Each group is subdivided into four regions, each of which consists of three or four districts with an average of seven schools per district. Today the League membership consists of 305 schools, nearly all of the accredited three- and four-year public high schools in the state.

More than 165,000 students participate each year in VHSL athletic programs. The League conducts state championships in 27 different sports — 13 for boys and 14 for girls — ranging from football and field hockey to gymnastics and golf. An additional 25,000 students take part in VHSL academic programs. Besides debate, drama and forensics, these include creative writing, scholastic publications and Scholastic Bowl.

Besides its sponsorship of individual and team activities for students, the League seeks to improve officiating and coaching by organizing and training more than 5,000 game officials, conducting rules clinics, providing information and materials and working closely with related organizations at the state and national levels. VHSL and the Virginia Association of Speech and Debate Coaches co-sponsor a speech, debate and theatre conference for coaches in early fall.

Through coordinated group action, the League has flourished. Thousands of men and women working with millions of boys and girls have provided wholesome, diverse activities that enhance the academic mission of schools. These activities provide valuable lessons that enrich an individual's high school experiences. They prepare students to lead more productive lives. They contribute to a unity of purpose within a team, a school, a community and the entire commonwealth. They help the League accomplish its main objective — service to Virginia's youth.

Debate, Drama and Forensic Eligibility Requirements

In order to represent their school in interscholastic activities, students:

- 1 (BONA FIDE STUDENT RULE)** must be a regular bona fide student in good standing of the school they represent.
- 2 (GRADE RULE)** must be enrolled in the last four years of high school (eighth-grade students may participate in non-athletic events for one year only while in the eighth grade without affecting their subsequent eligibility).
- 3 (ENROLLMENT RULE)** must have enrolled in the school they represent not later than the fifteenth day of the current semester.
- 4 (SCHOLARSHIP RULE)** must have passed at least five credit subjects the previous semester and must be currently enrolled in and remain continuously enrolled in not fewer than five credit subjects. The equivalent requirement on the 4X4 block plan is three and three.
- 5 (AGE RULE)** must not have reached their nineteenth birthday on or before the first day of August of the current school year.
- 6 (TRANSFER RULE)** must have been in residence at their present high school, or at a middle school from which the high school receives its students, during the last full semester unless they are transferring from a school with a corresponding move on the part of their parents into the attendance zone served by their present school unless they are entering the ninth grade for the first time.
- 7 (SEMESTER RULE)** must not, after entering the ninth grade for the first time, have been enrolled in or have been eligible for enrollment in high school more than eight consecutive semesters.
- 8 (MELS REQUIRED FOR ACTIVITIES PARTICIPANTS)** must be listed by their school on an MEL (Master Eligibility List, VHSL Form No. 3) for VHSL activities of debate, drama, forensics, academic and creative writing competition.

STUDENTS, you must earn the privilege to participate in interscholastic activities by meeting not only the above-listed standards, but also all other requirements set by your school and your League. The standards listed on this page represent only a summary of all VHSL rules and regulations. You should check with your principal or activities director if you have any question regarding your eligibility or if you are in doubt about the effect an activity may have on your eligibility. By meeting the intent and spirit of League standards you will prevent your team, your school and your League from being penalized.

Coaches, please note the following League rules that apply to you.

PRINCIPAL'S RESPONSIBILITY RULE—Final authority and ultimate responsibility in all matters pertaining to interscholastic activities of each school, both athletic and nonathletic, shall be vested in the principal, who acts under authority granted by the division superintendent of schools.

The principal shall exercise control over all interscholastic contests in which his/her school engages. It is his/her responsibility, as well as that of his/her coaches, faculty members and all representatives of the school, to practice the highest principles of sportsmanship in all interscholastic relationships with visiting coaches and official representatives, contest officials, visiting contestants and the general public, as well as to inculcate a sportsmanlike attitude toward visitors on the part of his/her school and community.

COACHES RULE—All coaches and sponsors of League activities, both athletic and nonathletic, shall be certified teachers regularly employed by the school board and responsible to the school principal. They shall have not less than three regular periods of classes or study hall duty per day.

Exceptions:

- (a) Students in training at institutions of higher learning.
- (b) Principals, assistant principals or other members of the school division's instructional or administrative staff with duties comparable to those of teachers carrying three regular periods of classes.
- (c) Retired Virginia teachers or administrators as approved by the division superintendent.
- (d) Persons approved for one activities season by the VHSL executive director upon written certification from the principal and the division superintendent. Approval shall be contingent upon written notification from the school principal that the non-faculty coach will be apprised of all VHSL eligibility requirements for participants and any League policies pertaining to his/her activity prior to assuming duties.
- (e) Instructional or administrative aides employed full-time within the same school division.

COMPETITION RULES VIOLATIONS AND APPEALS

In view of several different incidents that have arisen in previous competitions, coaches are reminded of the need to familiarize themselves with VHSL regulations governing conduct of competition.

Obviously, the provisions of Sections 100-117 are most important, and we call special attention to the last sentence of 110-6-1 which applies to debate and forensic contests: "Violations of any of these rules (Sections 26-33 and 110-117) render the offender liable to such disciplinary action as the appropriate district committee may impose." Rules violations at regional meets would be adjudicated by an interdistrict committee.

Other sections of the Handbook may also apply to situations which could occur during your meet. These include but are not limited to Section 20 (District Committee), Section 29 (Reporting Violations), Section 30 (Penalties), Section 31 (Rules Interpretations), Section 32 (Protests) and Section 33 (Appeals). Here are three important excerpts from those sections:

"Protests or complaints growing out of interscholastic competitions, such as those dealing with the eligibility of participants or with alleged violations of rules and regulations, shall be filed with the appropriate district chairman for adjudication or settlement by the district committee. (32-1-1 (1))

"Principals only may initiate protests. Protests shall be in writing, addressed to the district chairman or to the executive director, as the case may be, and shall contain a digest of all the facts pertinent to the case. Protests shall be delivered in person or sent by special delivery or first class mail. They shall be delivered or postmarked not later than two working days after the contest or receipt of the information on which the protest is based. The district committee shall meet promptly to consider and act upon each protest properly filed with the district chairman. (32-2-1)

"The Virginia High School League permits the correction of clerical or scoring errors in each interscholastic activity as specified in that activity's specific rule book. In those cases in which there is no rule book for an activity or in which the rule book does not specify a definite period of time for the correction of clerical or scoring errors and the results are not announced until the conclusion of the activity, clerical or scoring errors may be corrected within 60 minutes of the announced results. In debate, drama and forensics, a school which leaves the site prior to the end of the review period forfeits the right to appeal the results. No protests will be considered which are based upon the real or alleged failure of contest officials to interpret or apply game or contest rules properly, or to render

correct decisions in matters of judgment. League rules provide that officials for all League athletic contests shall be mutually agreed upon by the faculty representatives of all schools concerned. When this has been done and the contest has been started, differences of opinion which arise during the progress of the contest must be considered on the spot, and the decision of the contest official shall be final. Games may not be played "under protest" for later review by a district committee or interdistrict committee; however, the executive director shall render an interpretation to all parties involved as to the proper application of rules in cases of protests if complete facts are presented in writing to the League office. Such an interpretation will not change the outcome of the contest as the decision of a contest official is final, unless the executive director determines that the official(s) has incorrectly permitted a contest(s) to be suspended, a tie(s) to be broken or a tie(s) to stand in contradiction to the game rules adopted by the League." (32-1-1 (3))

In essence, once a contest is underway, it is in the hands of the judges (and, for administration purposes, the director). Thus, there is a very strong obligation on the part of contest judges and directors to know and follow all VHSL procedures. If problems do arise at your meet or if you think this office should be aware of incidents, please let us know. Also, if coaches have complaints, questions or a need for interpretations, they should discuss the matter immediately with their principal who can then follow League procedures in resolving the situation.

Key Dates for 2009-10

The district and regional dates listed below are deadline dates for given events. Many district and regional events are held earlier than the dates shown, so check with your principal or activities director to find out when and where your district and regional competition will be held.

	Group AAA	Group AA	Group A
<u>Debate</u>			
District	Mar. 20	Mar. 20	Mar. 20
Regional	Apr. 3	Apr. 3	Apr. 3
State	Apr. 23-24	Apr. 23-24	Apr. 23-24
<u>Theatre</u>			
District	Feb. 13	Nov. 7	Nov. 7
Regional	Feb. 27	Nov. 21	Nov. 21
State	Mar. 20	Dec. 8	Dec. 7
<u>Forensics</u>			
District	Feb. 20	Feb. 20	Feb. 20
Regional	Mar. 13	Mar. 13	Mar. 13
State	Apr. 10	Apr. 10	Apr. 10

VHSL ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES CALENDARS

The following calendars are provided to you in advance to assist in your planning your year and beyond. Please plan ahead to avoid conflicts with SATs, SOLs and other events. Keep in mind, deadline dates are just deadlines. District and regional tournaments may be scheduled prior to, but not after deadlines.

2009-10 ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES CALENDAR - ADOPTED

ACTIVITY	CLASS	DISTRICT DEADLINE	REGION DEADLINE	STATE FINAL	LOCATION
Theatre	A	11/07/09	11/21/09	12/07/09	Region I
Theatre	AA	11/07/09	11/21/09	12/08/09	Region I
Theatre	AAA	02/13/10	02/27/10	03/20/10	Dickinson
Scholastic Bowl	A/AA/AAA	01/30/10	02/13/10	02/27/10	W&M
Forensics	A/AA/AAA	02/20/10	03/13/10	04/10/10	Northwest
Debate	A/AA/AAA	03/20/10	04/03/10	04/23-04/24/10	Northern

Note: Easter is April 4. SAT dates are: October 10, November 7, December 5, January 23, March 13, May 1 and June 5

2010-11 ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES CALENDAR - ADOPTED

ACTIVITY	CLASS	DISTRICT DEADLINE	REGION DEADLINE	STATE FINAL	LOCATION
Theatre	A	11/06/10	11/20/10	12/07/10	Region B
Theatre	AA	11/06/10	11/20/10	12/06/10	Region B
Theatre	AAA	02/05/11	02/19/11	03/05/11	Eastern
Scholastic Bowl	A/AA/AAA	01/29/11	02/12/11	02/26/11	W&M
Forensics	A/AA/AAA	02/12/11	02/26/11	03/26/11	Region A
Debate	A/AA/AAA	03/19/11	04/02/11	04/15-04/16/11	Region D

Note: Easter is 04/24/11

2011-12 ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES CALENDAR - PROPOSED

ACTIVITY	CLASS	DISTRICT DEADLINE	REGION DEADLINE	STATE FINAL	LOCATION
Theatre	A	11/05/11	11/19/11	12/05/11	Region IV
Theatre	AA	11/05/11	11/19/11	12/06/11	Region IV
Theatre	AAA	02/04/12	02/18/12	03/03/12	Northern
Scholastic Bowl	A/AA/AAA	01/28/12	02/11/12	02/25/12	Central
Forensics	A/AA/AAA	02/18/12	03/03/12	03/31/12	Region I
Debate	A/AA/AAA	03/17/12	04/14/12	04/27-04/28/12	Region II

Note: Easter is 04/08/12

AAA state theatre and regional forensics deadline same day

2012-13 ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES CALENDAR - PROPOSED

ACTIVITY	CLASS	DISTRICT DEADLINE	REGION DEADLINE	STATE FINAL	LOCATION
Theatre	A	11/06/12	11/20/12	12/04/12	Region B
Theatre	AA	11/12/12	11/19/12	12/03/12	Region B
Theatre	AAA	02/23/13	03/09/13	03/23/13	Region III
Scholastic Bowl	A/AA/AAA	01/26/13	02/09/13	02/23/13	Region IV
Forensics	A/AA/AAA	03/02/13	03/16/13	04/13/13	Central
Debate	A/AA/AAA	03/23/13	04/06/13	04/26-04/27/13	Northwest

Note: Easter is 03/31/13

SPORTSMANSHIP – It’s all about respect!

Good sportsmanship is a top priority of the Virginia High School League. The manner in which your school is represented is far more important than whether your team wins or loses. Good sportsmanship is all about respect – respect for oneself, for teammates, opposing teams, coaches, judges, audience and for Debate itself.

Inappropriate behavior is easy to identify. One need ask only two questions:

1. Is the observed behavior respectful of the targeted audience?
2. Does the observed behavior reflect positively on your school?

If the answer to either question is no, then the behavior is inappropriate and must not be tolerated. Respect must be a priority at all times and in all situations.

Each participating Debate coach bears a huge responsibility for making sure that good sportsmanship is valued. Inappropriate behavior can be an embarrassment to students, coaches, judges, administrators, the community and to the VHSL.

Each participating school is expected to provide administrators and other chaperones to actively supervise its student body and fans during the festival and address inappropriate behavior if or when it occurs. Individuals who are disruptive, disrespectful, fail to comply with facility and/or VHSL procedures or otherwise behave inappropriately will be escorted from the facility.

- Debate coaches and school administrators have primary responsibility for observing their student body and fans, and for taking corrective action when their students or fans behave inappropriately. Students will react more quickly and more positively to their own teachers and administrators than they will to an unknown security guard.
- VHSL staff is not responsible for making sure your students and fans behave. That is your responsibility.
- Watching the competition is secondary to observing your group’s behavior. You are “on duty” during the tournament, and your supervision must be active. VHSL and tournament staff will assist when necessary.

EXAMPLES OF UNSPORTSMANLIKE BEHAVIOR

The following list is by no means “all inclusive,” but is provided to draw attention to behaviors occasionally witnessed at Debate tournaments. Please review this list with your student body so that they will know what is not acceptable.

- Entering a lower-level competition and not participating in subsequent competitions (if qualified) due to schedule or other conflicts that are known beforehand. In the event an individual or team knows in advance of a district, regional or state tournament that it will be unable to compete in all scheduled rounds, the individual or team should not be permitted to participate at all.
- Whispering, talking, booing, hissing, tapping or making any distracting noise or gestures during competition or awards ceremonies
- Entering/exiting during a round unless it is an emergency
- Challenging a judge’s comments or rankings
- Antagonizing, intimidating or abusing participants, tournament staff or others
- Challenging a judge’s comments or rankings
- Displays of temper, anger, boasting, use of profanity or arguing with tournament staff or judges

The behaviors above must be addressed by school coaches or administrators if/when they occur. Failure to do so is a violation of The League’s Sportsmanship Rule.

Remember, good sportsmanship is all about respect. Win with humility; lose with grace; do both with dignity.

SPORTSMANSHIP VIOLATIONS

27-13-1 SPORTSMANSHIP RULE-*Member schools are required to conduct all their relations with other schools in a spirit of good sportsmanship. Acts which are prima facie evidence of failure to abide by this rule are those which are noted below and others of a similar nature which transgress the usually accepted code for good sportsmanship. All incidents of conduct relating to either athletic or academic activities that are violations of the Sportsmanship Rule must be reported to the Virginia High School League.*

27-13-2 Failure to provide for proper control of spectators at a contest constitutes a violation of the Sportsmanship Rule. Incidents where spectators during or after the contest engage in verbal or physical altercations with players, coaches, officials or other spectators which disrupt the normal flow of a contest or endanger the safety of a player, official, coach or other spectators should be reported. Where the number of spectators is expected to be large in relation to the facilities for seating the crowd, uniformed police available for control should be provided. Whereas the provision of uniformed police is not required by this rule, it is expected that the host school shall have taken reasonable and proper steps that would be expected to assure proper control of spectators under any foreseeable conditions if uniformed police are not provided.

27-13-3 Failure of any team or competitor to stay in a contest until its normal end when the failure to do so is related to dissatisfaction with the officiating of the contest, unless the physical safety of the team or competitor would have been endangered by continuing the contest, is a violation and is to be reported.

27-13-4 Harassment of contest officials by a coach or a coach's ejection from a contest constitutes a violation of the Sportsmanship Rule. Any coach's ejection is to be reported in writing to the League office by the school whose coach is ejected with copies placed in the school's and officials' association files. Any incidents involving a spectator, coach or other school personnel or player striking or pushing an official is to be reported. A coach going on the floor or field to interrupt a contest while the ball is "alive" in protest of a decision by an official, conduct which invokes a penalty against the team because of the conduct of a coach or team member or any individual in the official party of a team, continued and visible actions on the part of a coach which will indicate to team members and/or to spectators that the coach believes the game is being improperly officiated, public demonstrations with game officials which indicate to others extreme dissatisfaction with officiating, and such related actions when exhibited in aggravated form are evidence of poor sportsmanship.

27-13-5 Failure of a school to use every means at its disposal to impress upon its faculty, student body, team members, coaching staff and officials the values of sportsmanship in the preparation for, and the conduct and management of interscholastic contests and the importance of observing published or accepted rules governing coaches, competitors or spectators relating to the conduct of competition constitutes a violation of the Sportsmanship Rule. School personnel must make every effort to ensure that substitute players and bench personnel do not enter the playing field/court during a verbal or physical altercation and that team personnel do not engage in other excessive unsportsmanlike conduct before, during or after the contest; such action is a violation of the Sportsmanship Rule and is to be reported. A school whose substitute players or bench personnel enter the playing field/court during a verbal or physical altercation, or whose team personnel engage in excessive unsportsmanlike conduct before, during or after a contest shall be subject to a fine as stated in 30-5-1.

27-13-6 Players and coaches who are ejected from a contest for unsportsmanlike conduct and are ineligible for the team's next contest must be reported to the VHSL office on the form provided in the Principal's Workbook. For engaging in fighting, biting or aggressive physical contact, a player shall be ineligible for the team's next two contests and a coach for a minimum of the team's next two contests. Coaches ejected for unsportsmanlike conduct will not be physically present or communicate in any way with the team at that next contest. The decision to eject and therefore suspend from the next game(s) may be appealed by conforming with the following procedure.

(1) The parents, guardians or coach of a suspended player or suspended coach must request in writing that the principal review the decision to eject.

(2) The principal will review the facts utilizing available and appropriate resources and decide whether to appeal the decision. The principal may terminate the appeal at this point if there is insufficient merit.

(3) If, after review of the facts, including consultation with officials, the principal concludes that the appeal is warranted, he/she shall contact the principal(s) or designee(s) of the other schools involved and present his/her case. If, after review of the facts, all principals or designees, together with the commissioner of the association responsible for officiating that game, agree that the appeal had merit and that because of an error or misapplication of the rules by the officials the ejection was not warranted, it will be sustained and the player reinstated for the next contest. If any two of the three individuals hearing the appeal agree that the appeal has merit but the other does not, the appellant may request a

review by the VHSL Executive Director or his designee, who may sustain or deny the appeal based upon review of the facts using all available and appropriate resources.

(4) If a player or coach ejection occurs at a state tournament where one or both principals and/or non-coach designee is/are not available and a VHSL-appointed sportsmanship or game committee is in place, that committee shall sustain or deny the appeal after hearing the facts from the appealing school, the appealing school's opponent, the game officials, the VHSL-appointed supervisor and event director.

Penalties: If the disqualification occurs in the final contest of the season (including playoffs and tournaments), the penalty shall carry over to the next sports season for students who are seniors in eligibility or to the next school year for underclassmen and coaches. A second violation in the same sport shall carry a minimum two-contest suspension (See 30-5-1 (15)).

(5) The decision of the principal(s) or VHSL-appointed sportsmanship or games committee shall be final.

27-13-7 Situations which must be reported to the League are listed, but not limited to those, below:

- (1) Incidents involving damage to school property, including buses or other vehicles.
- (2) Physical or verbal altercations or other unsportsmanlike conduct between players, coaches, spectators or officials.
- (3) Verbal abuse by players, coaches, or spectators directed toward opposing teams, coaches, or officials.
- (4) Public criticism of officials by coaches in news media.
- (5) Coach ejection from the game.
- (6) Player ejection from the game.

All situations which are a violation of the Sportsmanship Rule must be reported to the League. An initial report should be submitted to the League office within 24 hours with the complete official report within 5 business days. Failure to report violations will result in a fine as stated in 30-5-1.

27-13-11 Procedure: Academic Competition-Unsportsmanlike action must be reported to the League by any school or tournament official. The report should include any corroborating information or testimony available. A copy of the report complete with any supporting information shall be transmitted to the principal of the school or schools involved. Each principal concerned shall report such information or answers to the report as he/she deems appropriate to the League. Upon receipt of all reports and a review of any action taken, the League shall refer copies of all documents, including a staff recommendation as to whether the school's response is sufficient, to the school or schools involved and to the chairman of the League, who may in turn refer the matter to the Academic Sportsmanship Committee to investigate and adjudicate what appears to be a violation of this rule. The Academic Sportsmanship Committee shall review at a time and place set by the League office such available evidence as it deems necessary to reach a conclusion. The League is specifically directed to pursue any items which on the surface have implications of being sportsmanship violations. A League staff member or member of the Academic Sportsmanship Committee may be assigned the responsibility of holding personal interviews with the principal parties involved. Actions such as seeking reports and holding interviews are not to be interpreted in any way as casting reflection upon a school adhering to League regulations, but as an effort to keep all parties properly informed. Penalties up to and including suspensions of member schools may be imposed by the Executive Committee and/or the Academic Sportsmanship Committee. A copy of the Academic Sportsmanship Committee's action shall be filed with the chairman of the districts concerned.

27-13-12 Statement of Policy-Insofar as unsportsmanlike actions by players, students, schools administrators, officials, coaches, faculty members and spectators are concerned, the identified items under the Sportsmanship Rule along with the following guides will be referred to by a Sportsmanship Committee:

(1) The school whose coach behaves in a manner likely to have adverse influence on the attitudes of players or spectators may be provided with the choices of suspending its coach from representing that school in athletic or academic events for a specified period of time up to one year or to have discipline taken against the program or entire school by the League.

(2) Any student participant who in protest lays hands or attempts to lay hands on an official may be declared ineligible for all activities by the League or by his/her principal for up to one year. Any student participant who strikes an opponent, a coach or a spectator during or following an athletic or academic event may be declared ineligible by the League or his/her principal for a specified period of time up to one year depending on the seriousness of the act. The basis for this policy statement is that a member school shall not be represented by any student whose conduct reflects discredit upon his/her school.

(3) A school whose substitute team members or bench personnel enter the playing field/court during a verbal or physical altercation will be automatically subject to League discipline. Based on the severity of the incident, a program or school may be warned, placed on probation or suspended.

(4) In the case of spectators physically molesting an official, a coach or a participating player, the school may be given one of two options -- either to take legal action against the offenders or to accept discipline from the League.

(5) The school that does not lend complete cooperation in the host school's efforts to promote the spirit of the Sportsmanship Rule may be disciplined by the League.

(6) A coach or school administrator may be considered as committing unsportsmanlike actions if he/she makes degrading remarks about officials during or after a contest either on the field of play, from the bench or through any public news media; argues with officials or goes through motions indicating his/her dislike for a decision; protests the decision and actions of officials pertaining to the game during and after the contest; or detains the official on the field of play following a game to request a ruling or explanation of some phase of the game. A request for a ruling must be done in private and in a courteous manner. The coach may also be considered as committing unsportsmanlike actions if he/she makes degrading or unprofessional remarks about another school's personnel or about League representatives in the public news media. A coach's ejection from any contest is a sportsmanship violation to be reported to the League by the school whose coach is ejected with copies of the report placed in the school's and officials' association files.

(7) Sportsmanship violations in academic activities would include but are not limited to discretionary forfeits, attempts to manipulate final ranks and/or the effects of tie breaking procedures by systematically awarding low points to students ranked high, tampering with ballots completed by assigned judges, falsifying an entry or records, seeking information on upcoming debate competition without full identification and disclosure of appropriate associations, seeking access to or sharing content of Scholastic Bowl competition questions used in the current season, failing to produce a manuscript in the required form by the tournament deadline, abusively confronting tournament personnel, permitting a student to compete with the same selection used in a previous year, permitting a student to use an oratory not written by the student, coaches judging their own students, failing to give timely notice of a discretionary decision not to advance to the next level of competition, refusing to follow established competition format or guidelines, or judges acting unprofessionally in violating tournament guidelines or giving preferential treatment to one competitor. Students or coaches found in violation may be disciplined appropriately by their schools; judges may be denied payment for services or banned from future judging assignments.

(8) A school which fails to take appropriate action against participants or personnel who possess or use alcoholic beverages, controlled substances or illegal drugs at the site of a Virginia High School League, Inc., sponsored activity is subject to the discipline of the League.

27-13-13 Penalties-The following represents some explanations of degrees of League discipline which may be referred to in interpreting the Sportsmanship Rule:

(1) **Warning**-A warning may be given by the Sportsmanship Committee or by the League to an individual sport, academic activity or school for a one-year period of time. Cumulative warnings over a period of time may result in suspension or probation for the sport, academic activity or the school. It is official notice that an inexcusable, unethical or unsportsmanlike action has occurred, is a matter of record and that such an occurrence must not be repeated.

(2) **Probation**-Probation is a more severe penalty, based on the nature of the incident, a second incident within the sport or academic activity within a two-year period or cumulative warnings over a period of time within the school. A school or program on probation may not enter any play-off toward a district, regional or state championship nor may the school enter any sanctioned event.

(3) **Suspension**-A school suspended from the League may not meet in interscholastic competition of any kind with a member of the League or a school that is a member of another state associated with the National Federation of State High School Associations.

(4) **Fine**-A fine not to exceed \$300 may be levied with or without any other penalty that is imposed on the school. Failure to report sportsmanship violations will result in a fine per occurrence as stated in 30-5-1.

(5) Violations may result in forfeiture of any championships earned in addition to being placed on probation or suspension for one calendar year.

27-13-14 Appeals-A decision of the Sportsmanship Committee may be appealed in accordance with Section 33 of the *Handbook*.

VHSL ADVISORY COMMITTEE SERVES IMPORTANT ROLE

The Constitution of the Virginia High School League authorizes the Executive Committee to appoint advisory committees for the purpose of giving technical or other advice and assistance as may be necessary in conducting statewide activities programs for the benefit of high school students. Among these advisory committees is the Debate, Drama and Forensic Advisory Committee.

This advisory committee is composed of active high school coaches — two debate, two drama and two forensic coaches. It is chaired by a principal who also serves on the Executive Committee. It meets annually to develop the terms and conditions for administering state events as well as to make recommendations for improving administrative procedures governing speech and drama activities.

Members are appointed to provide (1) balanced geographical representation, (2) knowledge and experience in their specific activity and (3) representation for both large and small schools. The term of appointment is three years with staggered terms allowing for a combination of continuity and new ideas.

A member of the VHSL administrative staff works with the advisory committee in developing the scope of the committee's work and in presenting the committee's recommendations to coaches at area rules clinics and to the Executive Committee and Membership. In order for legislative changes (Handbook amendments) to be implemented, they must be approved by the Executive Committee at two of four annual meetings.

Obviously the strength of advisory committees is that they give the League's Executive Committee direct access to sentiment from the "grass roots" level. Committee members are encouraged to express their personal feelings and observations as well as ideas from their colleagues in the field. Many of their ideas are also addressed at required speech rules clinics held annually across the state. It is important to bear in mind that all decisions are ultimately based on what will best serve the interests of boys and girls from across the state participating in the League's interscholastic activities.

For the 2009-10 school year, members of the DDFAC include:

Debate, Drama and Forensic Advisory Committee

	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Term Expires</u>
Deon Garner, Warwick HS	Debate/Forensics	AAA	Jan. 2007 - Dec. 2009
Jenny Johnson, Graham HS	Forensics/Theatre	AA	Jan. 2007 - Dec. 2009
Kimberly Kemp, Massaponax HS	Theatre/Forensics	AAA	Apr. 2008 – Dec. 2010
Tina Tapp, Radford HS	Theatre/Forensics	A	Apr. 2007 - Dec. 2009
Jan Thompson, J.J. Kelly HS	Forensics/Theatre	A	Apr. 2008 – Dec. 2010
Bill Wonneberger, Turner Ashby HS	Debate	AA	Jan. 2009 – Dec. 2011
TBA			Jan. 2010 – Dec. 2012
TBA			Jan. 2010 – Dec. 2012

Ex Officio

Lisa Giles, VHSL Assistant Director

State Tournament Directors

Michael Hall (mphall@liberty.edu)

Tournament Director for contemporary policy, classic policy and Lincoln-Douglas

Tomer Vandsburger (tomer.vandsburger@gmail.com)

Clerk of Student Congress

Social Networking

FOLLOW US ON TWITTER

The VHSL is now using Twitter, a free micro-blogging service, to communicate timely, short messages to its constituents. Follow us at: www.twitter.com/vhsl_activities.

VHSL ACTIVITIES NOW HAVE FACEBOOK GROUPS

In an effort to network and build community among the VHSL activities populations the VHSL has created Facebook groups. These groups are open to coaches, students, judges and others who are linked to the activities community and are intended to be a constructive, supportive environment where coaches/students may ask questions, share coaching tips and resources, solicit VHSL tournament officials/staff, etc. within the VHSL community. Official groups are:

- VHSL Forensics
- VHSL Theatre
- VHSL Debate
- VHSL Scholastic Bowl
- VHSL Publications
- VHSL Creative Writing

The VHSL reserves the right to remove any post or user from any group. The following are guidelines for group use:

- Obscene, abusive, insulting, hateful, racist or sexually explicit language is prohibited as are defamatory comments or personal attacks. Posts that may be construed as threatening may be deleted and made available to the proper law enforcement officials.
- Commercial solicitations and/or advertisements are prohibited.
- All posts must be in English.

State Debate Site Rotation Schedule

Any region may bid to host a state-level activity and should submit a VHSL State Event Application by September 1 prior to the school year when the event would take place. Consideration will be given to how well the respective site meets the established criteria, financial aspects of the proposal, geographical balance and travel factors including but not limited to facilities requirements (space), centralized location, proximity to major highway arteries, access to hotel accommodations, access to restaurants, etc.

Bids may be submitted on a multi-year basis; in general a minimum of two years and a maximum of four could be considered. **In those cases when no bids have been received for an event or VHSL staff does not feel the bid(s) received meets minimum required standards, it would be the responsibility of the host region (as defined in the rotation for that year) to either host the tournament or make arrangements with another region to do so. That designated host region would bear the responsibility for ensuring that there is a tournament.** If the host region does not have facilities or has only sub-standard facilities, they would still bear the responsibility of making alternate arrangements.

Note: Host is not (necessarily) responsible for securing tournament personnel (tournament director, tab room staff, judges, etc.).

The following sites have been secured:

2009-10

All tournaments – Liberty University, Lynchburg

Future site responsibilities have been established by DDFAC on the following rotation schedule:

2008-09 Liberty Univ.	2013-14 Region A	2018-19 Eastern
2009-10 Liberty Univ.	2014-15 Region I	2019-20 Region C
2010-11 Region D	2015-16 Central	2020-21 Region III
2011-12 Region II	2016-17 Region B	2021-22 Northern
2012-13 Northwest	2017-18 Region IV	2022-23 Region D

2009-10 Topics

Classic and Contemporary Policy

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States.

Lincoln-Douglas

Sept./Oct.: Resolved: Public high school students in the United States ought not be required to pass standardized exit exams to graduate.

Nov./Dec.: Resolved: Public health concerns justify compulsory immunization.

Please check the VHSL website for subsequent updates.

Student Congress

Please check the VHSL website 30 days prior to each tournament.

VHSL Speech Scoring and Tie-breaking Procedures

Principals and Coaches: Handbook references for debate, drama and forensics events (101-5-1, 110-6-2, 117-7-1, 117-8-2, 117-9-2) specify that no first-, second- or third-place ties shall exist in VHSL competition and we urge you to become familiar with these sections as well as other regulations governing your activity.

Special Note: Districts and regions are expected to establish additional tie-breaking methods to be employed if a tie still exists even after the procedures below are followed. Such additional methods could include, but are not limited to, (1) a coach's ballot, (2) restage head-to-head competition and (3) coin flip or draw.

DEBATE

Ties in win-loss record will be broken on the basis of:

- a. Decision if the teams have debated and if in the event of ties involving multiple debaters there is a clear decision
- b. Total speaker points
- c. Total speaker rankings
- d. Median speaker points (drop highest and lowest)

Ties in speaker awards total points will be broken on the basis of:

- a. Total ranks
- b. Median points (drop highest and lowest)

TEAM SCORING

The system that follows will be used for the state tournament. It may be adapted to fit specific circumstances at the district or regional level as long as the system is approved by the district or region and all participating schools know in advance of the tournament how the sweepstakes will be determined.

1. Separate sweepstakes will be tabulated in Groups A, AA and AAA for three separate team championships.
2. In each group, 7 points will be awarded for the first place team or individual, 5 points for second place, 3 points for third place and 1 point for fourth place in each debate event (Classic policy, Contemporary policy, Lincoln-Douglas and Student Congress).
3. If an elimination format is used, resulting in two third places, the third- and fourth-place points will be split with each team given two points.
4. If Groups A, AA or AAA are combined in Classic or Contemporary policy debate because of low participation in one or all groups, the team finishing highest for each group will be awarded a minimum of 5 points no matter where in the field the team finishes. If, for example, Group AA teams finish first, second, third and fourth and the best Group A team finishes fifth, that team would earn 5 Group A points, but no other Group A team would be awarded points. In another example, if Group AA teams finished first and second and Group A teams finished third and fourth, the Group AA teams would earn 7 and 5 points respectively and no other Group AA team would be awarded points; the top Group A team would be given the minimum 5 points even though it finished third and the fourth place Group A team would be awarded 1 point. In the event of a tie for third by the two Group A teams, the 6 points possible would be split between them, 3 points each.
5. The sum of all points earned by teams/individuals from a given school will be the school's sweepstakes score.
6. If there is a tie for either first or second place in the school sweepstakes, the tie will be broken by counting the number of firsts, the number of seconds, etc. earned by each school until the tie is broken. A sweepstakes tie below second place will not be broken.

FORFEITS

Once the tournament is underway, the discretionary decision by any student or team not to participate in any round of scheduled competition constitutes a sportsmanship violation, a forfeit and immediate elimination of that student or team from the competition.

Important: For Tournament Directors and Judges

1. Observers

Observers are encouraged at the state tournament and there are no restrictions on a coach, student, parent, etc. sitting in on a debate involving their own or another team. Coaches, debaters and other school representatives are free to discuss strategies and opposing teams, even to ask a team what it is running. All that is fine as long as they fully identify themselves by name and are clear and accurate about their association with any and all schools they might represent. It must also be understood that following that disclosure, **the participants in a debate have no obligation to permit the visitors to remain in the room or to listen to the debate from outside the room. Those asked about cases or defenses, their own or those of another school, are under no obligation to provide the information.** A school whose coaches, student debaters or other representatives fail to provide full and accurate disclosure or who unfairly pressure other participants into providing access or information they do not want to provide may be reported for unsportsmanlike conduct and disciplined according to VHSL Rules and Regulations.

Districts and regions may choose to follow the state policy or may choose to follow a traditional policy which discourages scouting. Those guidelines read as follows:

Coaches, students and observers from participating schools are not permitted to hear any but their own team(s) unless permission is obtained from the debaters in the round. We encourage you to open all rounds to observers.

Tournament directors must make clear to all participants which guidelines are being used. **Judges are authorized to remove any observer distracting or disturbing the debaters during a round.**

2. Timekeepers

If no timekeeper is available, judge is expected to keep time. Please bring a stopwatch. THE TAB ROOM HAS NO EXTRA WATCHES!

3. Format

VHSL offers Classic and Contemporary versions of policy debate, Lincoln-Douglas debate and Student Congress. The 8-3-5 cross examination format will be used throughout the tournament for Classic and Contemporary policy debate. The judge will enforce the 8-minute preparation time rule in Classic and Contemporary; each Lincoln-Douglas speaker shall have a total of three minutes prep time. For Student Congress, please see instructions beginning on page 32.

VHSL rules will be strictly enforced in VHSL tournaments. Teams that participate in outside leagues must take care to recognize differences in rules and procedures among the leagues.

4. Decisions

Remember that these are high school students, many just getting started with debate, and keep all criticism constructive. It is essential that debaters learn how to improve their performance through both positive and negative feedback. Give an honest evaluation of the presentation, but do not demean or ridicule the person.

Announcing decisions prior to the Awards Assembly is not permitted and is grounds for withholding judging fees.

5. Strategy

The tournament director will not regulate a team's speaker position strategies or argument content.

6. Pairings (see Model Schematic on page 25)

In all four divisions of debate, **pairings shall be determined by the tournament director to provide the most equitable schedule possible depending on the number of participants in each group.** A director may choose either a round-robin format or five rounds paired at random followed by a single elimination tournament pairing the top four qualifiers. A round-robin format is preferable if it can be accommodated in eight rounds or fewer.

Round Robin: in this format, each team would be assigned a debate against each of the other teams. If that involves a debate against a team from the same school, the coach must state in advance of competition whether:

1. The teams/individuals debate as scheduled, or
2. The ballot is awarded to the team/individual designated by the coach, with average speaker points and ranks from previous rounds credited to the debaters.

When a format with elimination rounds is used, pairings in the first elimination round should match the qualifying team with the best record in qualifying rounds against the qualifying team with the poorest record in qualifying rounds, the next best versus the next poorest, etc.

The assignment of team numbers is conducted by lottery prior to the tournament.

Determining Sides

In Classic and Contemporary policy, sides are assigned by the tournament director. If there is an odd number of rounds, sides in the last round are determined by coin flip.

In Lincoln-Douglas, pairings are assigned randomly, and sides in the last round are determined by coin flip.

7. **Judges**

It is recommended that, where possible, judges be assigned so that they do not have a conflict of interest with individual competitors or the schools they represent. It is also recommended that, where possible, different judges are used at each level (district, region and state) so as to avoid judging the same debaters.

While college debaters are commonly used to judge high school debate, they should know, understand and support the unique rules of the Lincoln-Douglas and Classic formats if assigned to judge those events. Under no circumstances should high school students be used to judge VHSL tournaments.

8. **Reviewing Results**

After results are announced at the awards ceremony, give each school a copy of all judges' critiques and tabulation results. Schools must have an opportunity to check the accuracy of the results. All clerical and scoring errors must be corrected within 60 minutes of the announced results. A school that leaves the competition site before the review period is complete forfeits the right to appeal or correct results. Only one person from the school is required to stay for the review period, but that person must retain possession of any awards in the event that an error is discovered and awards have to be redistributed.

9. **Laptops**

The following policy is in effect as of March 8, 2006:

"Any student who opts to use a laptop in Policy, Lincoln-Douglas, or Student Congress debate competition must provide his or her own laptop and is not allowed connectivity to other computers, persons, or the Internet. The penalty for students found using connectivity will be immediate disqualification from the tournament and forfeiture of all rounds. Use is limited to the taking of notes and for the retrieval of evidence that the student has pre-written and stored on the laptop. Students are also responsible for their own battery and power; tournaments are not responsible for providing outlets."

At the start of the first round of every tournament (Classic Policy, Contemporary Policy, Lincoln-Douglas and Student Congress), judges should read aloud the policy as it is written and confirm that all students understand it. While students are, for the most part, on their honor to abide by the rules, judges can and should monitor students' use of the laptops, preferably sitting behind their students who are using them so that it is easy for them to see the screen. At any time, the judge may inspect the computer if a violation is suspected.

If a judge suspects a violation, (s)he should physically inspect the laptop, make note of the reasons (s)he feels there is a violation (including the type of program or application that was being used during the violation), judge and score the round without regard to the suspected violation, and submit the tabulation and critique sheets to the tab room director along with his/her protest. Final determination of disqualification will be made by the tournament director (VHSL assistant director if at state) who may consult with a rules committee after performing an investigation. If the director calls for disqualification, ranks will be adjusted accordingly and coaches will be notified immediately.

Voluntary participation in VHSL debate constitutes agreement to these rules, policies and guidelines on the part of all participants.

10. **Policy on Substitutions in Debate**

Policy debate teams advancing from the district to the regional tournament and from the regional to the state tournament are expected to remain intact. However, under unusual circumstances a school may substitute one member of a team advancing to the next tournament. Such circumstances as illness or an unexpected family

commitment may justify a substitution. A substitution will not be allowed for a debater who is aware of another commitment on the dates of the regional or state tournament at the time of entry into the district tournament.

If a substitution for one member of a debate team is necessary, the principal may contact the League office in writing and explain the circumstances giving the name of the student unable to attend the tournament and the name of that student's replacement. The decision on the substitution will be based on the information given.

If a team member is replaced for the regional tournament, he/she may not rejoin the team for the state tournament.

If qualifiers are unable to advance to the regional or state tournament, the alternate individual or team in the district or regional tournament may replace the individual or team unable to attend provided that the alternate placement is made two days in advance of the tournament (or Wednesday at 12 noon for the state tournament held on Friday/Saturday).

A discretionary drop, as opposed to an emergency drop, must be completed at least one week prior to the regional or state tournament, or it will be considered a sportsmanship violation. Tournament director and alternates must be notified immediately of the drop, and alternates must confirm participation two days in advance of the tournament (or Wednesday at 12 noon for the state tournament held on Friday/Saturday).

11. **Rules Violations**

Unless prescribed otherwise, a violation of any rule, if discovered and reported, will result in disqualification.

12. **Low Participation in Policy**

If Group A, Group AA and/or Group AAA is unable to certify at least six regional qualifiers to state in Classic and/or Contemporary policy debate, the qualifiers in the two or three groups will be combined into one state competition in Classic and/or Contemporary policy debate.

13. **Accommodations**

The VHSL is committed to providing reasonable and appropriate accommodations to students with disabilities at its academic tournaments. Any competing student requesting special accommodations must submit comprehensive, written information at least two weeks in advance of district tournament to VHSL Assistant Director. This information should include (1) specific nature of disability as diagnosed by a qualified professional, (2) specific functional limitations of student and (3) accommodation requested as recommended by diagnosing professional. VHSL may provide the accommodation recommended, or such other accommodation as it deems reasonable to address the identified functional limitation. Any accommodations provided will be with the intent to provide an equal but not advantageous opportunity for student to compete and is not intended to alter the fundamental nature of the activity.

Debate Judges: Appropriate Behavior

Because of complaints from students, coaches and tournament directors about inappropriate behavior by a few judges in VHSL competition, the following guidelines have been developed. Each judge is asked to read the guidelines and signify that he/she understands and accepts those guidelines by signing at the bottom prior to the start of competition. Pay may be withheld from any judge violating these guidelines.

1. Judges are encouraged to BRIEFLY discuss with the participants in a debate their judging philosophy or style prior to the start of match so that participants understand those factors that will determine a decision.
2. While observers are encouraged, judges should clear the room of any person either participant does not want in attendance. All observers must identify themselves and their affiliation with any team competing in the tournament so that the debaters in each session have the option of determining whether or not they want those people in the room or listening to the debate from outside the room. Likewise, judges should clear the room of any person who is causing a distraction for any of the participants or for the judge.
3. Judges are not permitted to carry on private conversations during the debate.
4. Judges should not suggest through audible sounds or body language how they are responding to a presentation in any way that would suggest coaching or critique. Judges may not disclose decisions or suggest or hint at those decisions prior to the announcement of final tournament results during the awards ceremony.
5. Judges MAY NOT waive the classical format in Classic Four-Person Debate, and a participating team may argue that the opposing team has not followed format guidelines as a factor in the decision.
6. Oral critiques may not be substituted for required written critiques. **Any oral comments following a debate must be restricted to BRIEF suggestions on how participants might have improved their performance without suggesting who won the ballot**, and no oral discussion following a debate may last longer than five minutes, and then only if there is time prior to the scheduled start of the next round.
7. Time limits for each section of a debate, including preparation time, must be enforced.
8. Use of profanity is prohibited.
9. Judges who smoke may not ask debaters for cigarettes, share a smoke break with debaters or coaches or permit a smoke break to interrupt the time schedule for a match or for the tournament.
10. **Judges may not show favoritism for or socialize with any coach or debater they may be evaluating during the tournament, specifically including private conversations that might be perceived as preferential.**
11. Since debaters will be dressed in coats and ties and professional work-world attire, judges will be expected to wear clothing acceptable in professional circles (no jeans, T-shirts, hats).
12. A judge is expected to be in the room throughout the debate. Since the cross-examination periods are an integral part of the evaluation, the judge must be present and listen closely to both questions and responses.
13. Eating by the judge or debaters during the debate is prohibited.

I have read the VHSL Guidelines and understand that violation of these guidelines may be cause for withholding pay.

Print and sign name

Contemporary Policy Debate

Information for Tournament Directors and Debate Judges

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

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

Procedures:

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

Suggestions for Judging:

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

6. The affirmative may also use a criteria case that any solution must fit and compare how their plan and the status quo do, in fact, meet it.
7. Remember, the affirmative team has the responsibility of establishing the probability that their proposal will correct the evils in the status quo. If they use the comparative, advantage approach, they need only show their plan is comparatively advantageous and does not induce significant new harms. In the criteria case they must show: that the criterion is the best one to judge the situation by and that their plan can more effectively fit it without adding new disadvantages. They will attempt to do this by the quality and quantity of evidence and the soundness of their reasoning as they defend their position.

D. Technical aspects of debate to be considered in judging:

1. There should be agreement on definition of terms as the debate progresses. The affirmative usually defines the terms, but the negative has the right to challenge the definitions if they feel the affirmative has been unfair in defining terms. Unless the definition of terms is attacked by the negative, the definitions advanced by the affirmative are assumed to be accepted.
2. The construction of the affirmative case should be done early enough in the debate for the negative to attack it. Totally new arguments for or against the proposition should not be introduced so late in the debate (such as in the rebuttal period), that the other team has no chance to deal with the arguments.
3. Arguments must be supported by reasoning and evidence. If arguments are not supported, the opposition should call attention to the fact and insist that the arguments be supported. However, if an argument is advanced and is not dealt with in any way by the opposition, it is presumed to be won by the team advancing the argument.
4. If you as a judge know that evidence is being distorted or that the debaters are being dishonest, you should penalize them accordingly. You must be very careful in handling this situation and be very sure of your information. (It is better if the opposition can point out minuses of evidence).
5. Minor infractions of the rules such as going a few seconds overtime, whispering too loudly during the debate, etc., should not unduly influence your decision. If, however, such minor infractions interfere with the major aspects of the debate, you should consider this in rendering your decision.
6. Delivery alone should not determine the winner, as the emphasis should be on the presentation of arguments. However, if the debater does not communicate clearly and effectively in a manner easily understood, you should take this into consideration. For example, some debaters employ such rapid-fire delivery as to make the presentation difficult, if not impossible, to understand.
7. You should not require either team to meet arguments or issues in your mind that are not advanced successfully by the opposition.
8. A negative system may argue for simple modifications or repairs of the present system.

E. Special considerations for cross examination:

1. During the questioning period, the questioner should:
 - a. Ask questions that are arranged in some order.
 - b. Ask questions that are relevant to the proposition, and to the speech of the debater who is being questioned.
 - c. Ask questions that can be answered; avoid trickery.
 - d. Show the significance of the opponent's answers, making clear the implications.
2. The answerer should:
 - a. Avoid filibuster; make the answers as concise as possible, but refuse to answer questions with a simple "yes" or "no" if doing so would do injustice to his case.
 - b. Admit lack of knowledge rather than attempt to cover up such lack.
 - c. Emphasize strong points in his own case at every opportunity.

F. Miscellaneous considerations:

1. Normally, the team winning the debate will have the higher total points. If this is not the case in a particular round, you should specifically indicate that you are giving a "low-point win."
2. Avoid making comments to the debaters or to the coaches which may give some indication of your decision before the results are announced.
3. The minimum score for any individual debater shall be 15 points.

ROUND _____ v _____
AFF NEG

_____ JUDGE _____

_____ ROOM _____

Virginia High School League Contemporary Policy Debate Ballot

TOURNAMENT _____ DATE _____

1. Rate all speakers using the following scale:

SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	AVERAGE	FAIR
30 29 28 27	26 25 24 23	22 21 20 19	18 17 16 15

- Fill in decision, points and ranks and return at least white copy to Tournament Control immediately.
- If pink and yellow copies are retained, complete and return with constructive comments as soon as possible.
- No oral critiques unless debate ends early.
- Do not reveal decision under any circumstances.

<p>AFFIRMATIVE _____ Team # _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">School</p> <p>Position Name Points Rank</p> <p>1st AFF. _____</p> <p>2nd AFF. _____</p>	<p>NEGATIVE _____ Team # _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">School</p> <p>Position Name Points Rank</p> <p>1st NEG. _____</p> <p>2nd NEG. _____</p>
---	--

THE TEAM WINNING THIS ROUND WAS TEAM # _____ REPRESENTING THE [AFFIRMATIVE] / [NEGATIVE] SIDE.

Judge's Signature _____ School Affiliation _____

Individual Comments

1 st Aff.	1 st Neg.
2 nd Aff.	2 nd Neg.

REASONS FOR DECISION:

Classic Policy Debate

Information for Tournament Directors and Debate Judges

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

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

Procedures:

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

Suggestions for Judging:

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

6. The affirmative may also use a criteria case that any solution must fit and compare how their plan and the status quo do, in fact, meet it.
7. Remember, the affirmative team has the responsibility of establishing the probability that their proposal will correct the evils in the status quo. If they use the comparative, advantage approach, they need only show their plan is comparatively advantageous and does not induce significant new harms. In the criteria case they must show: that the criterion is the best one to judge the situation by and that their plan can more effectively fit it without adding new disadvantages. They will attempt to do this by the quality and quantity of evidence and the soundness of their reasoning as they defend their position.

D. Technical aspects of debate to be considered in judging:

1. There should be agreement on definition of terms as the debate progresses. The affirmative usually defines the terms, but the negative has the right to challenge the definitions if they feel the affirmative has been unfair in defining terms. Unless the definition of terms is attacked by the negative, the definitions advanced by the affirmative are assumed to be accepted.
2. The construction of the affirmative case should be done early enough in the debate for the negative to attack it. Totally new arguments for or against the proposition should not be introduced so late in the debate (such as in the rebuttal period), that the other team has no chance to deal with the arguments.
3. Arguments must be supported by reasoning and evidence. If arguments are not supported, the opposition should call attention to the fact and insist that the arguments be supported. However, if an argument is advanced and is not dealt with in any way by the opposition, it is presumed to be won by the team advancing the argument.
4. If you as a judge know that evidence is being distorted or that the debaters are being dishonest, you should penalize them accordingly. You must be very careful in handling this situation and be very sure of your information. (It is better if the opposition can point out minuses of evidence).
5. Minor infractions of the rules such as going a few seconds overtime, whispering too loudly during the debate, etc., should not unduly influence your decision. If, however, such minor infractions interfere with the major aspects of the debate, you should consider this in rendering your decision.
6. Delivery alone should not determine the winner, as the emphasis should be on the presentation of arguments. However, if the debater does not communicate clearly and effectively in a manner easily understood, you should take this into consideration. For example, some debaters employ such rapid-fire delivery as to make the presentation difficult, if not impossible, to understand.
7. You should not require either team to meet arguments or issues in your mind that are not advanced successfully by the opposition.
8. A negative system may argue for simple modifications or repairs of the present system.

E. Special considerations for cross examination:

1. During the questioning period, the questioner should:
 - a. Ask questions that are arranged in some order.
 - b. Ask questions that are relevant to the proposition, and to the speech of the debater who is being questioned.
 - c. Ask questions that can be answered; avoid trickery.
 - d. Show the significance of the opponent's answers, making clear the implications.
2. The answerer should:
 - a. Avoid filibuster; make the answers as concise as possible, but refuse to answer questions with a simple "yes" or "no" if doing so would do injustice to his case.
 - b. Admit lack of knowledge rather than attempt to cover up such lack.
 - c. Emphasize strong points in his own case at every opportunity.

F. Miscellaneous considerations:

1. Normally, the team winning the debate will have the higher total points. If this is not the case in a particular round, you should specifically indicate that you are giving a "low-point win."
2. Avoid making comments to the debaters or to the coaches which may give some indication of your decision before the results are announced.
3. The minimum score for any individual debater shall be 15 points.

Evaluating *Classic Style Debates*

An Explanation for Debaters, Coaches and Judges

1. *Classic Switch-Side Debate* is NOT identical to Contemporary Policy Debate; it is a division instituted to disallow speed, clipped qualification of evidence, and massive spreads. Therefore, judges must be willing to adapt to *classical style* debating as delineated herein so that the participants are not placed at a disadvantage when they employ the *classical style* guidelines. Under NO circumstance should a judge in this division evaluate the debate based on the contemporary style used in most college debating even if participating teams are in agreement, nor should a judge express his/her dislike for *classical style* debating to the students engaged in it. There is a separate competition for Contemporary Switch-Side Debate.
2. Paramount in *classical style* debating is the diminution of speed characteristic of contemporary style debate. All speakers in *classic style* debating MUST speak at a moderate speaking rate. *Moderate speaking rate* is interpreted to mean a rate such as that employed in a courtroom when a trial lawyer gives a summation of arguments before a jury, in a classroom when an instructor delivers a lecture, in a church when a minister gives a sermon, in a TV news broadcast when an anchor disseminates the world and national news, and in everyday dialogue when two people converse with each other. In contrast, moderate speaking rate is NOT the speed used by an auctioneer in selling goods.
3. In *classical style* debate, all speakers will have the same content obligations as those embraced currently in all policy debating. The difference comes in the amount of the content. The amount of the content has to be disciplined to fit the eight-minute constructive, three-minute cross-examination, five-minute rebuttal time frame. Further, the amount of the content must be tailored to allow for persuasive speaking rather than reading rapidly from manuscripts and briefs.

PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

4. To persuade, one must have something worthwhile to say, articulate the content so that it comes across as vital and well reasoned, support contentions with logic and credible evidence, structure what is said in a clear manner, emphasize significant points and establish excellent rapport with those whom one wants to persuade. All of these qualities are expected to be embraced in *classical debating*.
5. To be persuasive, the speaker will have to talk to the judge and to the members of the opposition rather than exclusively read from manuscripts, briefs, or sheets of evidence. Notes, including a fully developed manuscript for the first affirmative speech, will be permitted but only as prompts, and a debater should not simply read to the opposing team and others in the room. Evidence cards may be read, but each piece of evidence must be read at a moderate speaking rate and with appropriate vocal expression so that the audience can grasp both the content and its significance. All acronyms will have to be defined and made clear to both the judge and to the members of the opposition.
6. Good, easy-to-follow organizational structure is paramount. The most persuasive speakers in the real world reflect in their oral presentations an organizational structure (not cluttered by far too many points and sub points) that is easy to follow as well as an organizational structure that promotes clarity, unity, and coherence; hence, these qualities will be expected *in classical style debating*.
7. Critical points will have to be emphasized using effective eye contact, good posture, appropriate tonal patterns, facial expressions, and appropriate hand gestures.
8. In *classical style debate*, the debaters will express to the judge their hope that they have persuaded him/her along their enumerated lines of argumentation instead of instructing him/her as to what points are to be drawn across the flow.
9. During formal occasions, the most effective persuasive speakers dress appropriately for those events. Debaters are expected to follow this protocol (coats and ties for gentlemen and professional work-world attire for ladies) since the speaking occasion is a formal one.

ANALYSIS

10. In *classical competition*, debaters will take the time necessary to develop breadth and depth in the analysis of their position. To achieve breadth and depth in argumentation, one must focus more on amplifying and substantiating a few vital areas of concentration rather than scattering into a myriad of directions in hopes that the opposition cannot speak fast enough to cover the projected points.

EVIDENCE

11. Sound analysis and disciplined argumentation require the support of more than one piece of evidence. Scholarly presentations in the real world never rely on one piece of evidence to establish a point. Rather, substantive evidence with logical and reasonable connections to the argument under consideration is the rule. In *classical debate*, emphasis will be placed on substantive evidence with incisive links to the contentions being proved.
12. In *classical style* debate, evidence will be expected to hold up to reasonable and logical tests. For example: Is the documentation of the evidence given in full form? Is the source reliable? This is particularly important for Internet sources, since anything can be published there and there are few controls on most sites to ensure validity. Is the source objective and free from bias? Is the evidence supported by other scholarly data? Is the evidence based on empirical studies? Is the evidence well reasoned and logical? Is the evidence timely? If the opposition can show that the evidence fails a critical test or tests, and the judge is persuaded by the opposition's stand, then the opposition may very well win that point even though they cannot produce a counter card.
13. The judge should exert care in assessing evidence and the manner in which that evidence is refuted by the opposition. If evidence is refuted convincingly by showing that it is not reasonable or logical through substantive analysis, the judge would be within his/her right to accept that line of refutation even though the debater does not offer a counter card.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

14. In *classical debate* cross-examination will be an integral part of the debate and will be considered in the win/loss a judge awards.
15. The cross-examination will be closed because the speaker who is being cross-examined should be able to defend all that he/she said during the constructive and should be capable of answering questions regarding his/her side's line of argumentation.
16. The speaking rate and delivery of the first affirmative speech should be such that during the cross-examination the second negative will not have to ask for a copy of the case and plan. In *classical debate*, members of the opposition will probably ask for some evidence cards to review but, hopefully, will never need to ask for a copy of the first speech. If a first affirmative is asked for a copy of his/her speech, it may be a signal that his/her presentation was not effective enough to be absorbed. However, requesting the speech may be a ploy to pretend the presentation was ineffective, and the judge should make an independent evaluation.
17. During the cross-examination period, a line of questioning could weaken the other side's impact of argumentation, and such weakening could weigh in the judge's decision.

OTHER CRITICAL INSTRUCTIONS

18. The judge in rendering his/her evaluation should evaluate all elements (analysis, logical reasoning, evidence, organization, refutation, persuasive speaking, effective delivery) on the ballot with utmost care giving each aspect its due weight.
19. In giving TOTAL speaker points to a debater on a 30-point scale, the judge should grant enough points in each category prescribed on the ballot so that when the points are totaled they will fall within one of these three ranges: 27-30 for **superior debating**; 23-26 for **excellent debating**; and 19-22 for **average debating**.
20. On the ballot a judge must give his/her rationale for the win/loss. In the rationale not all emphasis should be relegated to platform presence. Debaters want to know on which crucial arguments they won or lost and how either a strong or weak job of the art of persuasion may have affected the decision. Whatever the case, the judge must

stress on what significant elements of argumentation a team won or lost and why those elements were convincing or unconvincing.

21. Classical style debaters are familiar with the above instructions given to the judges. Should a debater observe and argue a violation of the classical style standards by the opposition, and the argument is well founded, the judge must give weight to the violation in the ultimate win/loss decision.
22. Negative comments to the debaters about *Classic style* are eschewed. The judge can relay his/her commentary about the style to the professional leadership of the tournament.
23. Winning a debate using the *Classic style* is not contingent solely on WHAT is said but also on HOW it is said. Reading a manuscript using rapid-speed delivery and massive spreads is discouraged. Persuasive speaking using a moderate speaking rate and all of the qualities of the art of persuasion are encouraged and rewarded.
24. The judge should exert care in assessing evidence and the manner in which that evidence is refuted by the opposition. If evidence is refuted convincingly by showing that it does not meet critical tests or it is not reasonable or logical, the judge would be within his/her right to accept that line of refutation even though the debater does not offer a counter card.
25. A line of refutation could very well begin during the cross-examination period. That is why listening to the cross-examination carefully is imperative and holds weight in the evaluation process.

Evaluating VHSL Classic Policy Debate

I have attended a clinic at which the tournament director has reviewed the instructions for Evaluating Classic Style Debates with judges.

I understand that this format is an alternative to Contemporary Policy Debate, which utilizes the speed delivery common to college debate and emphasized at many debate workshops and why it is essential that VHSL offer both policy debate formats.

I understand that the moderate speaking rate used in classic debate is similar to that used by a trial lawyer giving his/her summation before a jury, a teacher lecturing to a class, a minister giving a sermon or a TV reporter giving the news. It is not the speed of an auctioneer.

I understand that the debate structure and topic are the same as for Contemporary Policy Debate and that content is important, but that the amount of the content will necessarily be reduced so that the debater can talk to the judge and opponents and use the devices of oral persuasion.

I understand that even if the competing teams are comfortable with contemporary debate, I must enforce the format for Classic debate in classic competition.

I agree to evaluate Classic Debate according to the standards set by the Virginia High School League and understand that no round in Classic Debate may be assigned to a judge who has not signed this agreement.

Judge's name (please print) _____

Judge's signature _____

Judge's school or professional affiliation _____

Date _____

Model Schematic for Classic and Contemporary Policy Debate Competition Involving Eight Teams

(Two from each of four districts)

Pairings shall be determined by the tournament director to provide the most equitable schedule possible depending on the number of participants in each group. A director may choose either a round-robin format, with each team assigned a debate against each of the other teams, or five or six preliminary rounds utilizing power pairings, followed by a single elimination tournament pairing the top four or eight qualifiers.

The first option for a field of no more than eight teams is a round-robin tournament, pairing every team against every other team in no more than seven rounds. Some regions prefer a four- or three-round tournament. Recommended schematics follow.

FOUR ROUND SCHEMATIC

I		II		III		IV	
Aff	Neg	Aff	Neg	Aff	Neg	Aff	Neg
1a vs.	2b	2b vs.	2c	1c vs.	2a	1a vs.	1c
2a vs.	1b	1b vs.	1c	2c vs.	1a	2a vs.	2c
1c vs.	2d	2d vs.	2a	1d vs.	2b	1b vs.	1d
2c vs.	1d	1d vs.	1a	2d vs.	1b	2b vs.	2d

THREE ROUND SCHEMATIC

I		II		III	
Aff	Neg	Aff	Neg	Flip Coin For Sides	
1a vs.	2b	2b vs.	2c	1c vs.	2a
2a vs.	1b	1b vs.	1c	2c vs.	1a
1c vs.	2d	2d vs.	2a	1d vs.	2b
2c vs.	1d	1d vs.	1a	2d vs.	1b

Districts are “a,” “b,” “c,” “d” (assign randomly)

Teams are “1” (District Champion) and “2” (District Runner-up)

The schematic above is suggested guide for use in Regional competition that consists of two teams from each of four districts, or a total of eight two-person teams. In the pairings, the letters “a,” “b,” “c” and “d” represent the four districts; the “1” and “2” represent the first and second place teams, respectively, from the four districts. For example, team 1c would be the first place team from District C; team 2b would be the runner-up from District B.

The letter designations should be assigned randomly and announced just prior to the competition.

The pairings contain the following parameters.

1. The two teams from the same district do not meet in any of the four rounds of the Regional.
2. Assuming four rounds are held, each team will have two affirmative rounds and two negative rounds.
3. In the four-round format, each team will face two first-place teams and two second-place teams.
4. If only three rounds are held, each first-place team will meet one first-place team and two second-place teams; each second-place team will face one other second-place team and two district champions.
5. If only three rounds are held, in the first two rounds each team will have one affirmative and one negative round; in the third round the teams will flip a coin to determine sides.

For this schematic to work fairly, there must be at least three rounds. Four is clearly preferable. **In the event fewer than eight teams enter the Regional, certain adjustments will have to be made.** For example, if only seven teams appear, the missing team can simply be designated as a "Bye." Those scheduled to face the Bye team will simply receive a win and the average of their speaker points from other rounds. The existence of Byes always undermines the competition somewhat (especially when not everyone will face the Bye team), but since the district (a, b, c, d) designation is being determined randomly, all have an equal chance at facing a Bye team, unless of course the Bye team is from one's own district.

If six or fewer teams enter the Regional, this schematic will have to be reworked altogether. You may want to play with some schematics assuming anywhere from three to eight teams enter.

Power Pairings if the Number of Teams Competing Mandates an Elimination Format

If participation permits a round-robin tournament, with each team debating every other team in eight or fewer rounds, that is perhaps the format fairest to all teams in Classic and Contemporary Policy debate. However, if more than nine teams are participating, a round-robin format is impossible and the director should schedule five or six preliminary rounds utilizing power pairings, followed by a single elimination tournament pairing the top four or eight qualifiers (see below).

Power Pairings

If 12 or more teams participate, five preliminary rounds will be scheduled.

1. Rounds 1 and 2 paired at random. (In a combined A/AA tournament, Group A schools will be paired with Group A schools and Group AA schools with Group AA so far as possible.)
2. Round 3 paired on win-loss records and speaker points (High-High). (In a combined A/AA tournament, no distinction will be made between Group A and AA schools in considering win-loss records and speaker points.)
3. Rounds 4 and 5 paired on win-loss records and speaker points (High-Low). (In a combined A/AA tournament, no distinction will be made between Group A and AA schools in considering win-loss records and speaker points.)
4. Top eight teams break to quarterfinal rounds.
5. Break to semifinal rounds.
6. Break to final round.

If fewer than 12 teams participate, six preliminary rounds will be scheduled.

1. Rounds 1 and 2 paired at random. (In a combined A/AA tournament, Group A schools will be paired with Group A schools and Group AA schools with Group AA so far as possible.)
2. Round 3 paired on win-loss record and speaker points (High-High). (In a combined A/AA tournament, no distinction will be made between Group A and AA schools in considering win-loss records and speaker points.)
3. Rounds 4 through 6 paired on win-loss record and speaker points (High-Low). (In a combined A/AA tournament, no distinction will be made between Group A and AA schools in considering win-loss records and speaker points.)
4. Top four teams break to semifinal rounds.
5. Break to final round.

Explanation of Power Pairings

In Classic and Contemporary switch-side debate, the VHSL rules specify that the first two rounds will be randomly paired and the remaining rounds (number based on the number of teams competing in the division) will be power matched.

Round 3 is power matched high-high. This means that the teams are ordered according to win-loss record and then points (total points breaking ties between teams that have the same number of wins) and then paired from the top with the number 1 team meeting number 2 and number 3 debating number 4 unless the teams have debated before or if they are from the same school. In that instance, the team would meet the next eligible team down the list (since Round 3 is not side constrained, the side is randomly determined for each debate).

Rounds 4 and following are power matched using a high-low system (and side constraints in even numbered rounds). The high-low system creates a bracket of teams based on win-loss record (e.g. all of the teams with three wins would be in the same bracket). That bracket is ordered by total team speaker points. The bracket is paired by having the top team in that bracket meet the bottom team (based on speaker points) in that bracket. For example, if there were six teams that had three wins, the top three-win team (based on total team speaker points) would meet the bottom three-win team (based on total team speaker points), the second would meet the fifth and the third would meet the fourth. Again, there are constraints in that two teams that have met previously in this tournament will not meet again and teams from the same school will not meet prior to elimination rounds. If a bracket is uneven (e.g. there are only five three-win teams), the

bracket is made even by pulling a team from the middle (determined by total team speaker points) of the next lower bracket (e.g. from the two-win bracket into the three-win bracket).

NOTE: High-low never means taking the top team based on win-loss record and pairing it against the bottom team based on record (e.g. an undefeated team against a winless team).

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Information for Tournament Directors and Debate Judges

Lincoln-Douglas debate or L-D has its origins in the political debates of Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas in 1858 from which it takes its name and in contemporary political debates. L-D is one-on-one debating as opposed to team debating. In addition, L-D debaters consider propositions of value rather than propositions of policy.

These characteristics of L-D are designed to encourage thoughtful consideration of society's values and to discourage debates which become bogged down in questions of the workability of a particular policy or its consequences (disadvantages).

In the tradition of Lincoln-Douglas, whose debates lasted three hours each, debaters are encouraged to involve their audience in the contest through the skillful use of all the tools of oral persuasion. The rate and organization of delivery should be such that a reasonable listener could follow the issues and clash of opinion without taking extensive notes (flowsheets). Judges should consider excessive speed or unclear communication as factors in their decision.

Debates should be rewarded for excellence in:

- Delivery. The rate and intonation of each speech should be that of an effective persuasive oration. Debaters should involve the audience in the debate through effective gestures.
- Organization. Each speech should be presented in an orderly manner, making use of effective transitions to keep the audience involved in the flow of the debate.
- Clash. The debaters should clearly clash with each other on all major points, offering a rationale for their positions and an explanation of how they differ from their opponents.
- Value Consistency. The debaters should demonstrate a knowledge of the values inherent in the proposition. Furthermore, they should each uphold a value consistent with their position in the debate.

Accordingly, judges do not need any extensive training. They need only to be certain their decisions are based upon the issues presented in the round and the effectiveness of each speaker rather than upon their personal views of the topic being debated.

The topic for L-D debate is selected by the National Forensics League and should be announced no more than one month prior to the district deadline. This short preparation time for debaters is designed to limit the amount of evidence presented to a reasonable level and to prevent the use of prepared evidence books common in policy debate today.

Judges Decision: Criteria used by judges in determining winners include all aspects of general effectiveness in debate. Most important of these criteria are clear and persuasive speaking, analysis of issues, persuasiveness of over-all argumentation, clarity and organization of arguments, adequacy and accuracy of evidence, and consistent defense of a core value. **The L-D winner in a given round should be the debater with the most points.**

Affirmative Constructive - 6 minutes; Cross examination by negative - 3 minutes; Negative Constructive - 7 minutes; Cross examination by affirmative - 3 minutes; Affirmative Rebuttal - 4 minutes; Negative Rebuttal - 6 minutes; Affirmative Rebuttal - 3 minutes.

Virginia High School League Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

ROUND _____ ROOM _____ TIME _____ DATE _____ JUDGE _____

Affirmative (code) name _____ Negative (code) name _____

INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES

In making your decision, you might ask yourself the following questions:

1. Which of the debaters persuaded you that their position was more valid?
2. Did the debaters support their position appropriately, using logical argumentation throughout, and evidence where necessary?
3. Which debater communicated more effectively?

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD	AVERAGE
Affirmative	50-49-48-47	46-45-44-43	42-41-40-39	38-37-36-35
Negative	50-49-48-47	46-45-44-43	42-41-40-39	38-37-36-35

In my opinion the better debating was done by _____
(affirmative or negative) code

Judge's Signature _____ School _____

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Case & Analysis	Case & Analysis
Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning	Support of Issues through Evidence and Reasoning
Delivery	Delivery

Reason for Decision

FORMAT

- Affirmative6-minute constructive
- Negative3-minute cross examination
- Negative7-minute constructive
- Affirmative3-minute cross examination
- Affirmative4-minute rebuttal
- Negative6-minute rebuttal
- Affirmative3-minute rebuttal

Suggested Lincoln-Douglas Debate Schedule Procedures

Schools are permitted to enter three students at the district level, and four students advance from district to region and from region to state.

If the number of entries at the district, region or state competition permits a round-robin tournament pairing every participant with every other participant in no more than eight rounds, the round-robin format used in the past may be continued, using the pairings format printed for Switch-Side debate.

If the number of entries at the district, region or state competition prohibits a full round-robin tournament within eight rounds, the tournament director may plan five rounds with pairings at random, followed by a single elimination tournament pairings the top eight qualifiers.

Drops for **emergency** reasons must be accepted whenever they occur; however, **the tournament director and the school whose student would be the alternate must be notified immediately of a discretionary drop; where the decision is a matter of choice, at least one week prior to the beginning of competition or it will be considered a sportsmanship violation.**

In the event that a district or regional qualifier to the regional or state tournament drops, the alternate who finished next in the same district or region may advance, but such changes must be made two days in advance of the tournament (or Wednesday at 12 noon for the state tournament held on Friday/Saturday).

How the State Lincoln-Douglas Debate Tournament will be run

Pairings shall be determined by the tournament director to provide the most equitable schedule possible depending on the number of participants in each group. A director may choose either a round-robin format, with each team assigned a debate against each of the other teams, or five or six preliminary rounds utilizing power pairings, followed by a single elimination tournament pairing the top four or eight qualifiers.

If participation permits a round-robin tournament, with each team debating every other team in eight or fewer rounds, that is perhaps the format fairest to all debaters in Lincoln-Douglas debate. However, if more than nine debaters are participating, a round-robin format is impossible and the director should schedule five or six preliminary rounds utilizing power pairings, followed by a single elimination tournament pairing the top four or eight qualifiers (see below).

Power Pairings

If 16 debaters participate, five preliminary rounds will be scheduled.

1. Rounds 1 and 2 paired at random with regional constraints. (Debaters from the same region will not meet in the first two rounds if at all possible.)
2. Round 3 paired on win-loss records and speaker points (High-High). (Debaters from the same region can meet in round 3 and all subsequent rounds.)
3. Rounds 4 and 5 paired on win-loss records and speaker points (High-Low).
4. Top eight debaters break to quarterfinal rounds.
5. Break to semifinal rounds.
6. Break to final round.

If fewer than 16 debaters participate, six preliminary rounds will be scheduled.

1. Rounds 1 and 2 paired at random. (Debaters from the same region will not meet in the first two rounds if at all possible)
2. Round 3 paired on win-loss record and speaker points (High-High). (Debaters from the same region can meet in round 3 and all subsequent rounds.)
3. Rounds 4 through 6 paired on win-loss record and speaker points (High-Low).
4. Top four debaters break to semifinal rounds.
5. Break to final round.

Explanation of Power Pairings

In the first two rounds of Lincoln-Douglas debate, debaters will be randomly paired against other debaters from outside of their own region. Teams from the same region should not meet if at all possible. The remaining rounds (number based on the number of debaters competing in the division) will be power matched.

Round 3 is power matched high-high. This means that the debaters are ordered according to win-loss record and then points (total points breaking ties between debaters that have the same number of wins) and then paired from the top with the number 1 debater meeting number 2 and number 3 debating number 4 unless the contestants have debated before or if they are from the same school. In that instance, the debater would meet the next eligible debater down the list (since Round 3 is not side constrained, the side is randomly determined for each debate).

Rounds 4 and following are power matched using a high-low system (and side constraints in even numbered rounds). The high-low system creates a bracket of debaters based on win-loss record (e.g. all of the teams with three wins would be in the same bracket). That bracket is ordered by total speaker points. The bracket is paired by having the top debater in that bracket meet the bottom debater (based on speaker points) in that bracket. For example, if there were six debaters that had three wins, the top three-win debater (based on total speaker points) would meet the bottom three-win debater (based on total speaker points), the second would meet the fifth and the third would meet the fourth. Again, there are constraints in that two debaters that have met previously in this tournament will not meet again and debaters from the same school will not meet prior to elimination rounds. If a bracket is uneven (e.g. there are only five three-win debaters), the bracket is made even by pulling a debater from the middle (determined by total speaker points) of the next lower bracket (e.g. from the two-win bracket into the three-win bracket).

NOTE: High-low never means taking the top debater based on win-loss record and pairing her/him against the bottom debater based on record (e.g. an undefeated debater against a winless debater).

How District Lincoln-Douglas Debate Tournaments will be run

This part is tricky since there are not the same number of schools in each district. For example, the Southeastern District in AAA has 8 schools. The Virginia Beach District has 10 schools. Assuming no district is larger than 10 schools, the number of debaters competing at districts would range as high as 30. Debaters from the same school will not have to debate each other (the same rules in place for this at State should apply -- debate or coach decides).

1-9 Debaters

If there are fewer than 10 debaters, the district should hold a round robin tournament in which every debater debates each other and the top 4 qualify for regionals. The fifth place debater will be the alternate.

10 or more Debaters

The field should be broken into even groups and a round robin format should be used within the group. Then the top debaters will compete in a single-elimination bracket to determine the 4 qualifiers. The non-qualifier with the best prelim record should be designated the alternate.

Examples of how to set up the prelim groups follow. Debaters from the school should be evenly distributed among the groups. For example, if there are 2 groups, 2 debaters from a school will be in one group and one in the other. If there are 3 groups, 1 debater from a school will be in each group. If there are 4 or more groups, there should be no more than one debater from a school in a given group.

10 debaters: Divide the field into 2 groups of five. Each debater will have four debates and one Bye.

11 debaters: Divide the field into 1 group of five and 1 group of six. This means that one group will have 4 debates and 1 Bye and the other group will have 5 debates.

12 debaters: Divide the field into 2 groups of six or 3 groups of four. Hold the appropriate number of debates to conduct a round robin within each group.

13 debaters: Divide the field into 2 groups of four and one group of five.

14 debaters: Divide the field into 2 groups of five and one group of four.

15 debaters: Divide the field into 3 groups of five.

16 debaters: Divide the field into 4 groups of four.

17 debaters: Divide the field into 2 groups of six and 1 group of five.

18 debaters: Divide the field into 3 groups of six.

19 debaters: Divide the field into 3 groups of five and 1 group of four.

20 debaters: Divide the field into 4 groups of five.

- 21 debaters:** Divide the field into 3 groups of five and 1 group of six.
- 22 debaters:** Divide the field into 2 groups of five and 2 groups of six.
- 23 debaters:** Divide the field into 3 groups of six and 1 group of five.
- 24 debaters:** Divide the field into 4 groups of six.
- 25 debaters:** Divide the field into 5 groups of five.
- 26 debaters:** Divide the field into 4 groups of five and 1 group of six.
- 27 debaters:** Divide the field into 3 groups of five and 2 groups of six.
- 28 debaters:** Divide the field into 3 groups of six and 2 groups of five.
- 29 debaters:** Divide the field into 4 groups of six and 1 group of five.
- 30 debaters:** Divide the field into 5 groups of six.

Student Congress

Information for Tournament Directors, Coaches and Students

Student Congress was added as a new debate event in 2003 in order to establish a real-world debate experience modeled after a state or national legislature, although the program is not an exact replica of the United States Congress or the Virginia House of Delegates or Virginia Senate. Student Congress was promoted as a somewhat less demanding debate format that would be an attractive introductory event for students, coaches and judges and easier to administer than other debate events. The hope is that Student Congress will build participation in debate, with the belief that once involved many students would go on to other debate events.

Preparing for Competition

1. **Six weeks out:** Interest meeting with general discussion of Student Congress topics to be provided by VHSL at least 30 days before each tournament. Different topics will be used for regional and state tournaments.
2. **Five weeks out:** Bring articles to this meeting, share them, then create resolutions.
3. **Four weeks out:** Bring resolutions and articles for discussion, write authorship speeches. Each participating student must write either a bill or resolution to be discussed. This legislation should be labeled "A." Participants may write one additional bill or resolution, labeled "B," which may be considered only after first bills/resolutions "A" from all participants in the chamber have been brought forward. Each representative/senator must electronically submit his or her bill(s) or resolution(s) at least one week in advance of the regional and state tournament(s) via the Student Congress website.
4. **Three weeks out:** Bring everything, write a likely second or third speech; create "talking points" for other topic areas.
5. **Two weeks out:** Practice delivering all speeches, followed by two minutes of question and answer.
6. **One week out:** Practice with professional attire, authorship speeches followed by questioning, negative speeches, affirmative speeches, votes and parliamentary procedure. Post legislation on website by deadline.
7. For regionals, make 30 copies of all resolutions; copy talking points for team members.

STUDENT CONGRESS RULES AND REGULATIONS

117-9-1 Student Congress Rules and Regulations-Each school entering Student Congress may send up to six representatives to the regional tournament and each region may send up to twelve senators to the state tournament. A list of topic areas will be presented at least 30 days before each tournament; students should be able to speak on all topic areas. Each participating student must write either a bill or a resolution to be discussed. This legislation should be labeled "A." Participants may write one additional bill or resolution, labeled "B," which may be considered only after first bills/resolutions "A" from all participants in the chamber have been brought forward.

Each representative/senator must electronically submit his or her bill(s) or resolution(s) at least one week in advance of the regional and state tournament(s) via the Student Congress website.

The Clerk of Congress will choose two domestic topics, two international topics, two economic topics and two statewide topics that provide a breadth and depth of topic areas without presenting an overwhelming research burden. To provide debate on a wide variety of subjects, schools are encouraged to have no more than one bill or resolution per topic area. A tournament official may scan all legislation prior to the posting deadline to eliminate duplicate legislation, nontopical legislation or inappropriate material. The tournament official will notify students and coaches of any problems or concerns, but will not edit or revise student-produced legislation. **Once the legislation has been approved, it is up to the students to determine the order of the docket. Legislation must alternate (domestic, international, economic and statewide) among the topic areas.**

117-9-2 Each school may enter a maximum of six students to the region; each region may qualify a maximum of 12 representatives to the state final. Up to three call-ups from the regional to the state tournament are permitted. At the regional level, student competitors shall be called "representatives," and at the state tournament they shall be called "senators." There will be no difference in the rules of procedure. Regional and state tournaments in Student Congress may be held in conjunction with the regional and state tournaments in debate.

117-9-3 The number of representatives or senators participating determines whether the meet is divided into multiple chambers. In general, 24 representatives or senators per chamber is ideal, with chambers ranging in size from 15 to 30 members. If there is to be more than one chamber, schools and regions should be split equally between or among chambers. At the regional tournament, each chamber should meet between two and four sessions, as determined by the Clerk of Congress. At state, each chamber will meet in four sessions, with a fifth Super Session set for any group split

between two chambers. The Super Session will include all students placing in the top half of the two split chambers. **Each school qualifying for the state tournament in a group with split chambers will provide one bill or resolution to be considered for the Super Session docket**, and that bill or resolution must be submitted electronically on the Student Congress website at least one week in advance of the state tournament. At the regional tournament, the time of each legislative session will be determined by the Clerk of Congress. At state, each session will last 90 minutes.

117-9-4 A parliamentarian will be chosen by the Clerk of Congress to preside over all sessions and will fill out an evaluation of each student. Two judges will evaluate each speaker using ballots provided by the League. The judges will change for each legislative session, with no judge being used more than twice. Students will elect presiding officers for each session.

Note: Parliamentarian may not serve as both parliamentarian and judge of the same chamber.

117-9-5 Judging Requirements and Bases for Judges' Decision-Each school participating in Student Congress debate at the state meet must provide at least one qualified judge to evaluate Student Congress competition in a group other than the one represented by the school. The coach may serve as the school's required judge. Penalty for violation is a fine as stated in 30-5-1. Criteria used by judges will include all aspects of general effectiveness in debate. Most important will be clear and persuasive speaking, documentation of sources, clarity, organization and responding to previous arguments.

All speeches shall have been written by the competing students during the school year in which the contest is conducted and not contain an excess of directly quoted material, nor shall the speech be a mere paraphrase taken completely from one source. The student shall acknowledge the sources of any quotations used. Penalty for a plagiarized speech is disqualification.

117-9-6 Speaker's Precedence-The presiding officer and parliamentarian will number student speeches, with the presiding officer's opening comments considered the first speech of the session. Speaker order will be determined by precedence, meaning the presiding officer will select first the representatives/senators (R/S) who have given no speeches, then R/S's who have given one speech and so on. In the event that two or more R/S's who have the same number of speeches wish to speak, the presiding officer will recognize the one who spoke least recently. Numbering speeches will facilitate determining who has precedence to speak.

117-9-7 Determining Winners-Each representative or senator may speak up to six times. His or her best two speeches will be added to the parliamentarian's score. The highest score will place first, the next highest second and so on. In the case of a tie, drop the parliamentarian's score. If scores are still tied, refer to the third best speech and continue until ties are broken. If there is a Super Session, the representative or senator's best Super Session speech scores, one from each of the three judges, are added to the parliamentarian's score. This score is then added to the preliminary score. Thus, the Super Session final score will be the sum of five scores: (1) the three Super Session judges' scores, (2) the Super Session parliamentarian's score, and (3) the preliminary score. In the case of a tie, drop the Super Session parliamentarian score. If scores are still tied, drop the preliminary parliamentarian score.

117-10-2 A student may participate in Classic, Contemporary, Lincoln-Douglas and/or Student Congress debate but may participate in only one form of debate at the district, regional and state tournaments.

117-11-1 Tournament Limitations-No individual or team may participate in more than 16 tournaments during the school year, excluding VHSL district, regional and state tournaments. A student who registers at and participates in a debate tournament under a name other than his/her own or under a name other than his/her bona fide school name shall be disqualified from participating in the district, regional and state debate tournaments.

STUDENT CONGRESS CHAMBER SEATING ASSIGNMENT PROCEDURE

Clerk of Congress will create a seating chart for all chambers where random numbers represent students. On tournament day during school registration and prior to competition, each coach representing a school involved in Student Congress will perform a blind draw of a number to represent each of his/her students participating in the Student Congress. The number drawn shall correspond to the seating chart to determine chamber and seating assignments.

Should the random draw result in a disproportionately large number of students from the same school within the same chamber, Clerk of Congress may adjust chamber assignments to achieve a fair balance.

STUDENT CONGRESS FORMAT

- (a) Parliamentarian will call the chamber to order and determine or identify committee chairs. Each representative/senator will turn in a copy of his/her legislation to the appropriate committee chair. Committee chairs will determine the docket (the order in which legislation will be debated) by selecting one bill or resolution from each committee and proceeding until all bills or resolutions have been assigned. They will present this packet to the parliamentarian who will then post it on a chalkboard/whiteboard/easel. As the parliamentarian calls out the number or author of each piece of legislation, that student will provide one copy of his or her legislation to the parliamentarian, presiding officer, each judge and each delegate or senator in the chamber.

The parliamentarian will ask for volunteers to serve as presiding officers for the first session. Each person may give a one-minute speech (not scored) to the chamber explaining his/her qualifications and reasons for being presiding officer. The Chamber will then vote by secret ballot to select the first presiding officer. Students not elected may run again at the start of subsequent sessions. A student may not serve as a presiding officer more than once during the regional tournament and once during the state finals. The presiding officer will be evaluated by the parliamentarian. In preliminary sessions, the presiding officer's score will be doubled and counted as one speech given by the student. In a super session, the presiding officer's score will be tripled and counted as one speech.

- (b) The presiding officer will make a brief opening speech in which he/she sets his/her expectations. This will be the first speech of the session. This speech will be followed by a call for a main motion, then a call for a three-minute authorship speech followed by two minutes of questioning.
- (c) Call for a three-minute negative speech; time not used by the speaker may be used for questioning. The speaker has the right to refuse to answer questions.
- (d) Repeat b and c until an appropriate motion is made (motion to table or to call the previous question, etc.).
- (e) Exact precedence for speaking order and approximate precedence questioning order will be kept by the parliamentarian and the presiding officers. In the event of a conflict, the parliamentarian's tally is final.
- (f) Once action has been taken on a bill or resolution, the next legislative item on the docket may be considered.
- (g) At state, there shall be four sessions with a fifth Super Session set for any group split between two chambers. Each session will last 90 minutes.

ELECTION OF THE OUTSTANDING SENATOR

At the end of the chamber business, but before adjournment in the last session, an election will take place in each chamber to select the Outstanding Senator from among all members in the chamber.

1. The parliamentarian in each chamber will conduct the election. Senators may verbally nominate any other senator in that chamber, but not themselves.
2. The vote will be a secret ballot with each senator voting for one nominee. The parliamentarian will count the ballots to be witnessed by the judges of that session.
3. After each ballot, unless one candidate has received a majority of the votes cast, the person receiving the fewest votes shall be dropped. If the combined votes of the two lowest candidates do not equal the votes of the next lowest candidate, both shall be eliminated. If there is a tie for the lowest two or three candidates, it is recommended that a vote be taken on the tied candidates and eliminate only one candidate at a time. When one candidate received the majority vote of the chamber, the election is finished.
4. The winner will not be announced in the chamber. The parliamentarian from each chamber will communicate the name of the winner to the Clerk of Congress only, and these winners will be announced during the awards ceremony.



Virginia High School League Student Congress Speaker's Ballot



Round _____ Date _____ Division (circle one): A / AA / AAA Chamber _____

Speaker's Name _____ Speaker's School _____

Length of Speech _____ Aff/Neg _____

Topic/Bill # _____ Judge's Name _____

Use one ballot for each speech. Rank each speech 12-20 (using no fractions or decimals and 20 being the highest) in each category. **Please write legibly** and comment under each area. Additional comments can be made on the reverse.

Delivery: _____ (12-20)

Is eye contact comprehensive and natural, or is the speaker reading?
Seriousness of purpose, style, poise, coherency, etc.

Originality of Thought: _____ (12-20)

Does the speech advance debate or rehash old thoughts?

Organization and Unity of Speech: _____ (12-20)

Is it organized? Does it develop? Does it ramble?

Evidence and Logical Basis for Statements _____ (12-20)

Breadth of knowledge on the subject
Number of citations and/or sources _____

Overall Impact and Impression _____ (12-20)

Comments



Virginia High School League Student Congress Parliamentarian's Ballot



Round _____ Date _____ Division (circle one): A / AA / AAA Chamber _____

Speaker's Name _____ Speaker's School _____

Parliamentarian's Name _____

Use one ballot for each member. **Please write legibly** and score each member in each category. Please also comment under each area. Additional comments can be made on the reverse.

1A Questioning _____ (24-30)
Does the member participate in questioning, making incisive and thoughtful queries of the speaker?

AND/OR

1B Responsiveness
Does the member respond to questioning with enlightening remarks that promote understanding of the issue?

Courtesy _____ (9-17)
Does the member act in a manner that is respectful and courteous to other members of the house, the presiding officer and others who are present?

Participation _____ (9-17)
Does the member actively engage in the business of the chamber in a way that advances his/her interests?

Procedure _____ (9-17)
Does the member exhibit an understanding of the rules and procedures of the chamber, and is he/she aware of the proceedings?

Impression _____ (9-17)
Does the member create a favorable overall impression?



Virginia High School League Student Congress Presiding Officer's Ballot



Round _____ Date _____ Division (circle one): A / AA / AAA Chamber _____

Officer's Name _____ Officer's School _____

Parli's Name _____

Rank each presiding officer of your house 12-20 (using no fractions or decimals and 20 being the highest) in each category. **Please write legibly** and comment under each area. Additional comments can be made on the reverse.

Impression _____ (12-20)
Does the member create a positive first impression and a favorable overall impression?

Opening Remarks _____ (12-20)
Did the presiding officer's introduction provide enough information? Did the opening remarks present clear expectations? Did the presiding officer follow through on what he/she said he/she would do?

Knowledge of Parliamentary Procedure _____ (12-20)
Does the presiding officer have an understanding of parliamentary procedure? Does the presiding officer explain motions and his/her actions?

Control _____ (12-20)
Is the presiding officer fair but firm? Is he/she willing to use the gavel as needed? Does he/she rule motions dilatory or do what it takes to advance the business of the house? Did the presiding officer control the session, or did it control him/her?

Precedence _____ (12-20)
Does the presiding officer consistently and accurately keep track of affirmative and negative speeches, motions and questions, making corrections as needed?

VHSL Preferred Debate Judges Listing

* denotes those who are also qualified Student Congress Parliamentarians

202 Area Code

Benjamin Wetmore, 6034 Richmond Highway, Apt. 321, Alexandria, VA 22304, 202-329-8932,
debate@benwetmore.com

276 Area Code

Dr. William Phelps, III, 21264 Battle Hill Drive, Bristol, VA 24202, 276-642-5334, bphelps@wcs.k12.va.us
Phyllis Shackett, 403 Ferndale Drive, Collinsville, VA 24078
Brady Surles, Southwest Virginia Community College, Richlands, VA 24641
Richard L. Watson, Virginia High School, Long Crescent Drive, Bristol, VA 24201

301 Area Code

Dr. Blanton Croft, Hagerstown Comm. College, 17706 Garden Spot Drive, Hagerstown, MD 21740, 301-393-2511 (h)

304 Area Code

Skip Crane, Route 4, Box 519A or P.O. Box 3611, Bluefield, WV 24701, 304-589-5711, tomskip2@hotmail.com

423 Area Code

Richard L. Marshall, 1025 Sormount Court, Kingsport, TN 37660, 423-246-1741
Dr. Robert Rainwater, 610 Georgia Avenue, Bristol, TN 37620
Sandra Sanders, 780 Hamilton Road D-6, Blountville, TN 37617

434 Area Code

Barbara BogaRosh, 101 Overlook Drive, Charlottesville, VA 22903
Carolyn Meier, P. O. Box 2434, Charlottesville, VA 22902, 434-971-1169 (home)
H. C. Rand, 305 Grandview Drive, Amherst, VA 24521
Mona D. Rudder, 1096 Ivy Place, Forest, VA 24551, 434-525-6586
***Allibeth Simpson**, Sweetbriar College, asimpson11@sbc.edu
Joyce Sweet, Lafoon Realty, Inc., 720 Oak Street, Farmville, VA 23901, 434-392-6191 (work), 434-983-7614 (home)
Dana Tickle, dtickle@bedford.k12.va.us, 434-525-2674

540 Area Code

Dr. Roy A. Ball, Clinch Valley College, P.O. Box 16, Wise, VA 24293
Kate Blackman, 4068 Rose Bud Court, Edinburg, VA 22824, 540-560-2747, kdblackman@shenandoah.k12.va.us
Jody Brown, Ferrum College, P.O. Box 1000, Ferrum, VA 24088, 540-365-4354, jbrown@ferrum.edu
Steve Bull, P. O. Box 169, Riner, VA 24149, 540-382-3110
Ben Cameron, 305 PAB, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061
Jonathan Cohodas, 1641 Lancing Drive #274, Salem, VA 24153, 540-375-6458
J. Philip Cornett, P. O. Box 838, Culpeper, VA 22701, 540-825-6444
Donald Cox, 1220 N. Augusta Street, Apt. C, Staunton, VA 24401
Bonnie Elosser, Box 3038, Wise, VA 24293
Shea Finrock, 911 Colley Block Road, Strasburg, VA 22657, sheaf76@yahoo.com
Richard Follett, Skyline HS, 151 Skyline Vista Drive, Front Royal, VA 22630, 540-631-0366, ext. 31147 (work),
540-465-2976 (home) rfollett@wcps.k12.va.us
***R.J. Green**, greenrj@jmu.edu
Rick Juarez, Route 1, Box 194-1A, Broadway, VA 22815
Raymond Kohl, 2110 North Fourth Street, Wytheville, VA 23482, rekohl@wytheco.org
***Jeremy Lawson**, lawsonjq@jmu.edu
Joel Lock, 206 Raven Road, Stephens City, VA 22655, jlock2@gmu.edu
Terri Lock, 206 Raven Road, Stephens City, VA 22655, lockt@frederick.k12.va.us
Theresa Manchey, 116 Royal Avenue, Strasburg, VA 22657
Caroline Muelenaer, cmuel07@vt.edu
Arch Painter, 506 Carroll Drive, Stephens City, VA 22655, 540-869-4901, archpainter@earthlink.net
Richard Peake, Clinch Valley College, College Avenue, Wise, VA 24293
H. Alan Pickrell, 223 King Street, Abingdon, VA 24210, 540-628-6004 (home), pickrell@preferred.com
Dr. Melinda Robinett, Director of Special Education, Wythe County Schools, Route 3, Box 255, Max Meadows, VA
24360, 540-228-5411
Dr. Roger Soenksen, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA 22807

Tracy Sonafelt, Harrisonburg HS, 395 South High Street, Harrisonburg, VA 22801
Arthur Sperry, 1510 Valley Mill Road, Apt. 2, Winchester, VA 22601
Dana Tickle, Jefferson Forest HS, dtickle@bedford.k12.va.us
Shawn Tickle, stickle@bedford.k12.va.us, 540-297-7151
Kevin Weekley, 315A Reynolds Street, Blacksburg, VA 24060, 540-961-4842 (home), 540-231-2801 (work)
Marla L. Weitzman, P. O. Box 2861, Wise, VA 24293, 540-796-9168

571 Area Code

*Lynne Damaty, Potomac Falls HS, lynne.damaty@loudoun.k12.va.us
*Cheryl Gusman, Dominion HS, sheryl.gusman@loudoun.k12.va.us

703 Area Code

Warren Decker, Dept. of Communication, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030
Bruce Gregg, Randolph-Macon Academy, bagregg@rma.edu
Adelle C. Gunn, 3402 Glen Carlyn Drive, Falls Church, VA 22041, 703-931-8597, agunn@acps.k12.va.us
Wade W. Gunn, 3402 Glen Carlyn Drive, Falls Church, VA 22041, 703-931-8597, wwgunn@msn.com
Pat Hagy, West Springfield HS, plhagy50@yahoo.com
Martha Lee, Woodson HS, (h) 703-354-1615, (w) 703-503-4727 x 2, martha.lee2@fcps.edu
*Melissa Mustard, Thomas Edison HS, melissa.mustard@fcps.edu
*Colston Reid, creid1@gmu.edu
Eric Trumbull, Division of Communication, Woodbridge Campus, NVCC, 15200 Neabsco Mills Road, Woodbridge, VA 22191-4099, 703-878-5667, 703-670-8433 (fax)

757 Area Code

*Virginia Anderson, gingergavel@cox.net
Mary Lou Ferguson, Poquoson HS, 757-868-7123, mferguso@phs.poquoson.k12.va.us.
Deon Garner, 1313 Thomas Street, Hampton, VA 23669, 757-660-8752, deon.garner@nn.k12.va.us.
*Justin Giroux, Warwick HS, Justin.giroux@nn.k12.va.us
Jim Godfrey, First Colonial HS, jbgodfre@vbschools.com
Fran Hassencahl, Dept. of Speech Communications, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529
Andrew Jackson, Princess Anne HS, andrew.jackson@vbschools.com
Mat Krmpotich, mat123@cox.net
R. Brigham Lampert, Jamestown High School, 3751 John Tyler Highway, Williamsburg, VA 23185, 757-259-3600
Elizabeth Milne, 527 E. Waters Edge, Newport News, VA 23606, 757-595-1975
Brenda Osvold, Tabb HS, bosvold@ycsd.york.va.us
J. Michael Ponder, 812 Clay Street, Franklin, VA 23841
Stephanie Rayfield, Deep Creek HS, rayfiske@cps.k12.va.us
Ron Richards, Broad Run HS, rrichar1@loudoun.k12.va.us
*Marcy Swanson, Grafton HS, mswanson@ycsd.york.va.us
Keith Webb, keith.webb@nn.k12.va.us
Ryan Welborn, Poquoson HS, 757-868-7123, rwelborn@phs.poquoson.k12.va.us.

804 Area Code

Katie Albrecht, University of Richmond, kalbrech@richmond.edu
Ashley Alexander, University of Richmond, aa5nz@richmond.edu
William Ballard, Jr., Atlee High School, 9414 Atlee Station Road, Mechanicsville, VA 23116, 804-730-3395
Paul Beard, University of Richmond, pbeard@richmond.edu
Amy Berlin, 913 Granite Avenue, Richmond, VA 23226, 804-285-9765, hubbird1@aol.com
C. R. Burcham, Sr., 1510 Professor Court, Richmond, VA 23228, 804-262-3132
Grant Christensen, University of Richmond, gc4im@richmond.edu
Donna E. Coghill, 1709 Avondale Avenue, Richmond, VA 23227, 804-515-9495
Sarah Cornet, Speech Communication, University of Richmond, VA 23173
Annette D. Fiddler, P. O. Box 802, Warsaw, VA 22572, 804-333-4589
Eric Jensen, P. O. Box 8707, Richmond, VA 23226
Drina Connors Kay, 3907 Timber Ridge Road, Midlothian, VA 23112, 804-744-1710, drinakay@aol.com
*Brian Krohn, University of Richmond, brian.krohn@richmond.edu
Kevin D. Kuswa, Director of Debating, Department of Rhetoric & Communication Studies, University of Richmond, VA 23173, 804-289-8269, 804-287-6496 (fax), kkuswa@richmond.edu
David E. Majewski, 51 Crater Woods Court, Petersburg, VA 23805, 804-862-6122
David Manley, University of Virginia, 804-295-9040
Fiona McCarthy, University of Richmond, fm8uc@richmond.edu

Joe McMenamin, jmcmenamin@mcguirewoods.com

Angela S. Pickels, 3325 A Cutshaw Avenue, Richmond, VA 23230

Stephen Raybould, 501 Argyle Terrace, Richmond, VA 23225, 804-421-9668, slraybould@attbi.com

Chase Rowan, University of Richmond, cr3pc@richmond.edu

Anne Saldutti, University of Richmond, asaldutt@richmond.edu

Philip Semsch, 26 Clover Court, Montross, VA 22520

Ted Sheckels, Dept. of English, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, VA 23005

Brent Sullivan, University of Richmond, bsulliva@richmond.edu

Joseph Leo Swonk, Rappahannock Community College, Box 318, Warsaw, VA 22572

Glen Turner, 2112 Riverside Drive, C4, Richmond, VA 23225

2009-10 DIRECTORY OF DISTRICT AND REGIONAL EVENTS DEBATE

Outlined below is a digest of district and region sponsored events as reported by tournament directors or district and regional chairmen. Where information is incomplete, no information has been relayed to the VHSL.

DEBATE			
EVENT	DATE	LOCATION	DIRECTOR & CONTACT
Eastern Region			
Beach District			
Eastern District			
Peninsula District			
Southeastern District	Mar. 19-20	Great Bridge	Bowman Garrett, garrebst@cps.k12.va.us
Central Region			
Capital District			
Central District			
Colonial District			
Dominion District			
Northern Region	Mar. 20	Westfield	Terri Towle, TKTowle@fcps.edu
Concorde District	Feb. 25	Westfield	Terri Towle, ktowle@fcps.edu
Liberty District	Feb. 27	Lake Braddock	Dave Hembach, dave.hembach@loudoun.k12.va.us
National District	Feb. 5	Hayfield	Steve Kewer, Stephen.kewer@fcps.edu
Patriot District	Feb. 27	Lake Braddock	Mark Martino, mark.martino@fcps.edu
Northwest Region			
Cardinal District			
Cedar Run District			
Commonwealth District		North Stafford	Margaret Lowry, mlowry@staffordschools.net
Western Valley District			
Region I			
Battlefield District			
Bay Rivers District			
Southside District			
Region II			
Dulles District			
Evergreen District			
Jefferson District			
Northwestern District			
Region III	March 27	Fort Defiance	Dan Tratnack, detratnack@augusta.k12.va.us
Blue Ridge District			
Massanutten District			
Seminole District			
Southern Valley District	March 9	Fort Defiance	Dan Tratnack, detratnack@augusta.k12.va.us
Region IV Festival	Apr. 3	Blacksburg	Bradley Kraft, bkraft@mcps.org
Piedmont District			
River Ridge District	Mar. 13	Blacksburg	Bradley Kraft, bkraft@mcps.org
Southwest District			
Region A			
Eastern Shore District			
Northern Neck District			
Tidewater District			
Tri-Rivers District			
Region B			
Bull Run District			
Dogwood District			
James River District			
Shenandoah District			
Region C			
Hogoheegee District			
Mountain Empire District			
Pioneer District			
Three Rivers District			
Region D			
Black Diamond District			
Clinch Mountain District			
Cumberland District			
Lonesome Pine District			

Last updated October 26, 2009