DANEIS Beginning of the Round (with Straight Resolutions)

When the debaters, Judge, and Speaker are all in the room, the Judge or the Speaker should flip a coin, asking one of the debaters chosen at random to "call" it. The team that wins the coin flip may choose *either* the resolution *or* the side, whichever it prefers. Before it is required to pick one of these options, the winning team is entitled to hear and see the resolutions offered for the round. Therefore, as soon as the coin flip is completed, the Judge or the Speaker opens the envelope containing the resolutions for the round, reads them aloud to everyone, and then shows them to the side that won the coin flip. The team that won the coin flip now declares whether it will choose side or resolution. The team that lost the coin toss receives whichever of these items the winning team does not choose. Whichever team has the privilege of choosing side may wait until the other team has selected the resolution for the debate before declaring their preferred side. Thus, the team choosing the resolution does so first. The other team then chooses either side "Government" or side "Opposition," whichever side it prefers.

The Government team now has two minutes in which to propose its definitions for a key term or two in the resolution. Both teams remain in the room during this two minute period with the Judge and the Speaker. The Government is not required to outline its case in this two-minute definitions period. Since the resolutions for the debate are *straight* resolutions, the resolutions have been written to make them debatable *as worded*. Any proposed definition for a term, therefore, should only be for clarification on the meaning of the term in the context of the debate, NOT for redefining the resolution as a whole. The purpose of having straight resolutions is to avoid situations where the Government tries to "squirrel" the debate by redefining the resolution broadly to argue about something that they have prepared as a "canned" case. Proposing a proper clarification for a key term would be merely to propose, for example, that the word *government* refers to the federal government, or (alternatively) that the word *government* refers not to the federal government but rather to all state governments, or (alternatively) the word *government* refers to governments wherever you find them.

If the Opposition and the Judge find that the definitions constitute a debatable resolution, *i.e.* one which is not tautological, truistic, or overly narrow, both teams begin their 10 minute preparation period. If either the Opposition or the Judge questions the debatability of the definitions, the Judge should first attempt to negotiate a mutually acceptable compromise. If this effort fails, the Judge should dispatch the Speaker immediately to find the Tournament Director, who will adjudicate.

Here is an example. Suppose the resolution selected for debate is "This House regrets bombing Libya". The terms here are pretty straightforward. "This House" is taken to mean the people in the room, and should be left as such. "Libya" should be defined as the North African country of Libya, and "bombing" as the NATO airstrikes on that country. The only tricky part is "regrets", which should probably be left undefined or, preferably, be given a loose definition. That allows the debate to go in multiple directions and factor in moral, strategic, and other questions. So defining the word *regrets* as "holds to be a mistake", or "would not have, with hindsight, carried out" works well, but "believes did not accomplish its objectives" is probably overly narrow and confining. With that in mind, as long as the terms are reasonable the Opposition cannot object just because they would prefer something else, but if the terms change the nature or crux of the debate, then they should be changed.

Once there is agreement on definitions, the Government prepares outside the room for 10 minutes. When preparation time has expired, the Government returns to the room and the Speaker calls the House to order so that the debate can begin.

DANEIS Brief Overview - Rules of Parliamentary Debate with POIs

1) The debate will be presided over by Mr. or Madam Speaker.

2) The Government team (the side in favor) shall sit on the right hand side of the Speaker. The Opposition (the side against) shall sit on the left.

3) The speaking order will be as follows: the Prime Minister, followed by the Member of the Opposition, then the Minister of the Crown (second Government speaker) who is followed by the Leader of the Opposition (second Opposition speaker). Finally, the Prime Minister concludes the debate by delivering the Government's rebuttal.

4) Maximum speaking times are 5 minutes for the Prime Minister's first speech, 8 minutes for the Member of the Opposition's speech, 8 minutes for the Minister of the Crown's speech, and 8 minutes for the Leader of the Opposition's speech (the last 3 of which are for rebuttal). Finally, the Prime Minister closes the debate with a 3 minute rebuttal speech. There are no minimum times for speeches. A grace period of 30 seconds is allowed for all speeches, except the Prime Minister's rebuttal.

5) During the rebuttal speeches (i.e. the last 3 minutes of the Leader of the Opposition's speech and the entire 3 minutes of the Prime Minister's closing speech), members (debaters) may not bring up any new arguments or new evidence, except in direct refutation of material which has already been presented.

6) All remarks must be addressed to the Speaker of the House and not to anyone else. e.g. say "Mr. Speaker" not "Mr. Speaker, honorable judges". The member must address Mr. Speaker in his/her first sentence.

7) Other members of the House (the individual debaters) should be referred to by their title, specifically "the Prime Minister" or "the Minister of the Crown" on the Government side, and "the Member of the Opposition" or "the Leader of the Opposition" on the side of the Opposition. Such members of the House may also be referred to as The Honorable Member" or "The Honorable Gentleman" or "The Honorable Lady". They may be referred to as he or she but never as "you".

8) Members will speak only when called upon by the Speaker, except for Points of Information.

9) When the other side is speaking, members may raise Points of Information by standing and silently catching the attention of the member speaking, or by standing and saying, "On a Point of Information" if he/she wishes.

10) When a Point of Information is raised, a member may *accept* it by saying "Accepted" or "Yes please" or "Go ahead" or "I'll take your point", *reject* it by saying "no thank you" or "declined", or *defer* it by saying "not now" or "in a moment" and taking it later.

11) After a Point of Information is accepted, the member offering the point should speak for no more than 15 seconds, briefly framing and asking a question which supports his case.

12) Once the question is asked, the member offering it should take his seat, and the member who has accepted the Point of Information should provide a brief response, rebuttal, or answer before continuing with his case.

13) Points of information should not be offered during the first minute of any speech, the final minute of the Member of the Opposition and Minister of the Crown's speeches, the final three minutes of the Leader of the Opposition's speech, and the entirety of the Prime Minister's final speech. The clock continues to run throughout the debate.

14) The Government members may introduce a plan for implementing the resolution if they wish to, but they are not required to do so. If they do propose a plan, they must introduce it during the Prime Minister's speech.

15) If, and only if, the Government introduces a plan, the Opposition may introduce a counterplan, but it is not required to do so. A counterplan is an alternative method of implementing the resolution which is significantly different from the Government plan and is demonstrably better than the Government plan. If the Opposition wants to introduce a counterplan, they must introduce it during the address of their first speaker.

16) Props (e.g. drawings, models) may not be used, and courtesy must be shown to all other members at all times. As with all DANEIS tournaments, it is strictly understood that teams may ***not*** consult any reference materials of any kind (electronic or otherwise) during their preparation time or during the actual debate. Parliamentary debating is extemporaneous debating.

DANEIS POIs Explained

DANEIS will not be using Points of Order, Points of Personal Privilege, or Heckling in parliamentary debates this year. Instead, the only form of parliamentary interruption that will be allowed is a Point of Information (POI).

When, how, and by whom are POIs offered and then either accepted or declined?

Either member of the team that is not speaking may offer a Point of Information at any time in the permitted period. To do so, he/she will stand and say "On a Point of Information" if he/she wishes (or simply stand and wait). He/she will say no more at this time, but remain standing. The person who is giving his/her speech is free to accept or decline the Point of Information. Whichever may be the case, he/she would normally complete his/her current sentence before revealing the decision. If he/she wishes not to accept it, he/she may say "No thank you", or "Declined", or may indicate with a suitably polite gesture that the person offering the Point of Information should sit down. If he/she wishes to accept it, then this should be indicated with words such as "Accepted" or "Yes please" or "Go ahead."

What is the procedure for "protected time" during speeches?

"Protected time" is simply time when POIs are not allowed. Here's how it works by order of speaker.

PM: The first minute of the PM's opening (main) speech is protected time
-table rap at end of minute 1, indicates protected time is suspended for the remainder of the PM's speech

MO: The first & last minute of the MO's speech is protected time.
-table rap at end of minute 1, indicates protected time is temporarily suspended
-table rap at end of minute 7, indicates protected time kicks in again for final minute of the MO's speech

MC: The first & last minute of the MC's speech is protected time.
-table rap at end of minute 1, indicates protected time is temporarily suspended
-table rap at end of minute 7, indicates protected time kicks in again for the final minute of the MC's speech

LO: The first minute & last three minutes of the LO's speech is protected time.
-table rap at end of minute 1, indicates protected time is temporarily suspended
-table rap at end of minute 5, indicates protected time kicks in again for the final 3 minutes of the LO's speech

PM: The entire 3-minute closing speech of the PM is protected time.
-no table rap, therefore, is needed

How do I evaluate the use/non-use of POIs in judging a round?

Here are some guidelines:

*A POI may contain a preface, but must end with one, and only one, question.

*A POI should be fairly compact--certainly no more than 15 seconds.

*A good POI will have clarity, relevance, and strategic value.

*A POI raised cannot require a yes or no answer, but a response to a POI of "Yes" or "No" can be appropriate.

*A speaker is not required to immediately respond to a POI. He/she may defer it by saying, "Just one moment..." or "I will take your point in a moment..." or something similar, and finish his/her statement before responding.

*To an accepted POI, speakers are required to respond to the POI but not necessarily to give a direct answer to the question as framed.

*The questioner is not entitled to an immediate follow-up question once a response is given, as this could unreasonably interrupt the flow of the speech of the person holding the floor.

*The raising of POIs in rapid succession--a "barrage"--is to be avoided.

*Debaters are encouraged to raise multiple POIs over the course of the debate, and each speaker is expected to take at least one POI, provided that multiple POIs are offered.

*There is no allowance for the time required by a POI. The clock continues to run.

*A POI offered just before "protected time" kicks in again is still valid, and can be accepted within protected time.

*As the effective use of POIs is integral to the debate, the judge, in deciding the debate and awarding speaker points, may take into consideration the number of POIs raised, the number taken, the quality of points raised, and the content of responses.

The bottom line is this: Without getting too bogged down in the picayune application of technical rules (since this will take some getting used to by both judges and debaters) the main thing to consider is whether the questioner clashed effectively, or whether the responder was able to effectively respond to, or neutralize, his opponent's POI. POIs are about thinking on your feet and injecting life and spontaneity into the debate.

DANEIS Speaker-Timekeeper Script

Parliamentary Debating – with POIs

When the debaters are properly seated (Government to your right, Opposition to your left, facing each other) and the judge has taken his/her place (opposite and facing you, say: "I call the House to order. I call upon the Prime Minister to open the case for the Government."

[The Prime Minister speaks for up to five minutes. You should bang the table after the **first** minute, and then give her/him (and each of the other debaters) time signals indicating how much time is left. At thirty seconds, you should show the number 30 on your hands, and at 15 seconds you should wind your arm down like a clock. When the final 15 seconds have passed, you should stand up. When the Speaker sits down, you should record the time elapsed during the speech. This is standard procedure and should be repeated for all speakers.

When the Prime Minister finishes speaking, you say "We thank the Prime Minister for her/his remarks, and call upon the Member of the Opposition to open the case for the Opposition."

[Member of Opposition speaks for up to eight minutes. You should show hand signals and bang the table after the **first** and **seventh** minute.]

Speaker: "We thank the Member of the Opposition for his/her remarks, and call upon the Minister of the Crown to continue the case for the Government."

[Minister of Crown speaks for up to eight minutes. You should show hand signals and bang the table after the **first** and **seventh** minute.]

Speaker: "We thank the Minister of the Crown for his/her remarks, and call upon the Leader of the Opposition to conclude the case for the Opposition.

[Leader of Opposition speaks for up to eight minutes. You should show hand signals and bang the table after the **first** and **fifth** minute.]

Speaker; "We thank the Leader of the Opposition for his/her remarks, and call upon the Prime Minister to conclude the case for the Government, reminding her/him that she/he has three minutes in which to do so, and may introduce no new evidence or lines of argument."

[Prime Minister speaks for up to three minutes. You should show hand signals.]

Speaker; "We thank the Prime Minister for his/her remarks, and we declare this House adjourned.

Does the judge, Mr./Mrs./Ms./Miss._____, wish to make any comments?"
(As the judge is filling out his/her score sheet, let the judge know the time for each speech. After comments, if any, and after the judge has finished filling out the scoresheet, collect the scoresheet and take it to the entrance of the Tab Room. You should wait at the door while someone in the Tab Room checks your scoresheet. If a problem is identified, you will need to take the scoresheet back to the judge immediately to fix it and then bring it back to the Tab Room for a recheck. You and the judge should begin proceedings for the next round as soon as all of the debaters have arrived.)

Note: The judge will expect you to read the script at the appropriate times and keep track of the speaking time (giving appropriate raps on the table and appropriate time signals). See the sheet entitled "Beginning the Round" for how the judge should conduct the coin toss, choice of resolution, choice of side, etc.

DANEIS Parliamentary Debate Scoring Guide

70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95+
Serious flaws	Some flaws	Average/Good	Very Good	Outstanding	Goin' to Worlds!

95+ This person is among the very best debaters you will ever see and must receive an award today. This lawyer will not only get you acquitted of murder even when the State has mountains of rock-solid evidence against you, (s)he will successfully sue the State for harassing you.

90-94 An outstanding performance on every level. Should be in the running for an award today. This lawyer will probably get you acquitted.

85-89 An accomplished debater. This person may have a few minor flaws in his/her case, but all in all this is a very, very strong performance. This lawyer will get you 4 years in a minimum-security prison that has a full-service gym and free premium cable channels.

80-84 An average performance. This debater does well in all areas, but may also have a few logic flaws, a few missed opportunities in refutation, some hiccups in delivery, some weak evidence. This lawyer will plead your case down to manslaughter; you're facing eight-and-a-third to twenty-five.

75-79 A flawed performance. This debater is likely short on time or is very repetitive. (S)he is not well-organized, has serious logic flaws, minimal evidence, and vague refutations. This debater is unsure on his/her feet and is not a particularly smooth speaker. The jury finds you guilty.

70-74 A weak performance. Probably significantly under time, with little development of the case. Scant evidence and refutation. Unexplained leaps in logic. Halting, fidgety, delivery that fails to connect to the listener. This lawyer might get you convicted of murder even if you were demonstrably out of the country at the time of the crime.

Individual categories:

W	NI	F	G	VG	E
Weak	Needs Improvement	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent

Organization: Does the debater have a clear flow from point to point? Are the points properly sign-posted? Is there a unifying theme, or a stated common value/first principle at play?

Analysis: How thoroughly does the debater understand this issue? Is the case superficial, or does it delve deeply into nuances and complications? Does the debater see all sides of the issue?

Logic: Is the debater making observations and arguments that make sense given the topic and evidence on the table? Is the debater making unfounded or unexplained claims? Are the thought links present?

Evidence: Is the debater bolstering and illustrating his/her points with specific details that support his/her contentions? Is the rhetoric grounded in facts? Is the evidence being used related to the argument being presented? Is the debater's "spin" on that evidence, clever and convincing?

Refutation: Has the debater attacked the points of his/her opponent with logic and evidence? Has the debater successfully used what his/her opponent has said against him/her? Is the refutation vague, or specific, going point-by-point?

Delivery: How well does the debater command an audience? Does (s)he speak clearly and loudly? How is his/her eye contact and stance? Does (s)he connect with listeners? Does (s)he follow the rules of the House?

DANEIS Parliamentary Debate Scoring Sheet

Resolution:_____

Round (circle): 1 2 3 Level (circle): Novice Advanced

Government Code:_____

PM:_____ **MC:**_____

	Organ.	Analysis	Logic	Evidence	Refutation	Delivery	**Total**	Rank in Room
Prime Minister								
Minister of the Crown								

PM Comments: MC Comments:

Team Total:_____

Opposition Code:_____

MO:_____ **LO:**_____

	Organ.	Analysis	Logic	Evidence	Refutation	Delivery	**Total**	Rank in Room
Member of the Opp.								
Leader of the Opp.								

MO Comments: LO Comments:

Team Total:_____

I award this debate to the (circle): Government Opposition

Reasons for decision:_____

Judge's Name:_____ Code:_____