

Abstract: There are important benefits to integrating non-forensics faculty into assisting with the instruction and training of intercollegiate parliamentary debaters. These benefits may also spill over into individual events in a limited way. Parliamentary debate, if done well, requires that debaters have a broad based education covering many diverse disciplines, especially philosophy, history and political science, and of course a familiarity with current national and international events. Enlisting the aid of non-forensics professors from various departments to provide occasional mini-lectures on diverse topics can help improve this broad-based education. Additionally, there are other unique benefits to encouraging non-forensics faculty members to share ownership of this interdisciplinary academic activity. The model proposed and discussed is the Forensics Fellows program being implemented at Point Loma Nazarene Colleg, in San Diego, California.

**FORENSICS FELLOWS:
INTEGRATING FACULTY PARTICIPATION INTO
INTERCOLLEGIATE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE PROGRAMS**

Lewis E. Rutledge
Director of Forensics
Point Loma Nazarene College, San Diego, CA

Overview

Parliamentary debate is probably the fastest growing activity in intercollegiate forensics over the past few years. It is a popular alternative to other forms of intercollegiate debate for many reasons. One of its primary appeals is its public or audience centered focus, designed to appeal to most any audience, regardless of their debate background or subject matter expertise. This form of public debate focuses more on the substance of the issues debated and less on the meta-debate elements such as format, rules, debate theory and/or jargon.

More traditional homes of intercollegiate debate have evolved, at least at their more experienced levels of participation, into more specialized forms of communication that require a greater awareness of the technical aspects of advanced debate theory and specific knowledge of the jargon and theoretical constructs of both debate in general and the specific topic area being debated. CEDA and NDT debate currently debate the same resolution all year. This prolonged period of analysis of one topic allows and encourages a much deeper and more comprehensive research effort over a specific field of study. Without such specific knowledge it can be very difficult to follow the more competitive of these debates as an audience member, participant, critic, or coach. Further complicating the task of following these forms of debate for untrained listeners is the extremely rapid rate of delivery that is common in the more experienced levels of CEDA or NDT debate. Many novices find it too difficult to overcome these entry barriers within the more traditional forms of debate that focus on one or two topics the whole year.

Many believe there are less severe entry barriers to successful participation in parliamentary debate, which emphasizes eloquence over speed, and generalized argumentation over specific knowledge based arguments, and a universal audience focus over relying upon the technical expertise of the listeners. Additionally, by not designating one central resolution for the entire season in parliamentary debate there is less pressure on debaters to spend extensive hours in the library becoming a subject matter expert on the designated topic. The above points are not an attempt to argue for the superiority of one form over another, merely to evaluate the apparent appeal of parliamentary debate over the more traditional forms of intercollegiate debate. In short, parliamentary debate seems to provide an environment where participants can compete on a more level playing field despite inherent differences in program's size, resources, experience of coach, experience of students, etc.

The Problems

Having suggested various reasons why parliamentary debate may have fewer entry barriers for programs and individual debaters alike, it is important to clarify that there are still some significant problems associated with starting or running a parliamentary debate program. These problems can be subdivided into difficulties specifically relating to

parliamentary debate, and larger issues common to directing most intercollegiate forensics programs.

First, to effectively train successful parliamentary debate teams seemingly requires a broad base of knowledge over a tremendous breadth of topic areas, primarily current events, philosophy and political science, but also drawing heavily from history, economics, psychology and other disciplines as well. This requirement may intimidate some away from actively participating in this activity, at both the student and coach level. At least with knowing that there is one main topic area (as in CEDA or NDT debate), there is a chance to prepare on many, if not most, of the main debatable areas for the year. It can be very intimidating to know that in any given parliamentary tournament you will be debating, or judging, from six to 10 or more completely different topic areas, with just 15 minutes to gather your thoughts after hearing the motion, before delivering the first speech.

One strategy may be to just recruit bright, well-educated and informed students that have already obtained encyclopedic knowledge of all matters of potential importance, and teach them to debate. While such students should never be turned away, it would be horribly limiting to only cater to these rare students, when debate can be such a wonderful mind expanding tool for so many others as well. Another alternative is to simply teach debate skills and recommend that students become well read, knowing what a hit or miss proposition this might be for developing an awareness on any given subject. The probable result of such an approach would be many uninformed debaters trying to build opposing arguments from collective ignorance and calling it a debate. This too would be inadvisable. Uninformed debate can be worse than no debate at all. It simply compounds ignorance. This type of debate is probably the reason many have not embraced parliamentary debate thus far. While it is a difficult problem to overcome, there are other possibilities. One is to recruit a diverse pool of debaters from many different majors and have them share their expertise with others through discussions, mini-lessons, prepared briefs, etc. This is helpful, but it should be supplemented by inviting your colleagues that teach in other departments to share their collective wisdom as well. That is what the Forensics Fellows program attempts to do. This will be developed in greater detail later.

The Forensics Fellows may also help a few other problems that traditionally plague forensics programs and directors. For example, forensics programs may have grown too isolated from the rest of the campus communities. Trying to balance extremely hectic travel, administrative and practice schedules with normal teaching loads often limit forensics directors interaction in the more traditional avenues of faculty interaction, such as faculty meetings, committees, retreats, conferences, etc. Forensics' extensive extracurricular responsibilities can also erode professors' opportunities to conduct academic research and publish their findings, thus reducing their opportunities for academic advancement within some institutions. These extremely long hours combined with a lack of institutional recognition and advancement can contribute to rapid burnout, which costs our colleges some of our most talented forensics educators.

The isolated nature of the forensics programs can conceivably contribute to tensions with other faculty members in various ways. For example, if all another faculty member knows about forensics is that several of the debaters keep missing tests or activities scheduled on Fridays, a certain level of resentment may occur. It may appear as if these students are being allowed to miss important academic assignments just to travel to other schools. Likewise, some faculty members that coach forensics may have to miss committee meetings or department meetings due to tournament conflicts, or have reduced office hours during the week, which may not seem fair to colleagues unfamiliar with the long hours spent on forensics over the weekends. The ever-present budget conflicts may also create resentment from some faculty members that may not realize how expensive it is to run a competitive forensics program. Even if none of the other problems occur, there is significantly less opportunity for forensics faculty members to network with other faculty members due to the long hours required by forensics. All of these areas of resentment, or missed networking opportunities, can ultimately impact the advancement opportunities of the faculty member and/or the administrative support for the program as a whole.

The Proposed Solution

At the risk of making claims that sound like they are better suited for an infomercial, the Forensics Fellows, or similar approaches, can help to

solve many of the previously cited problems. Forensics Fellows is a program designed to integrate faculty assistance with intercollegiate forensics programs, primarily in parliamentary debate but potentially also in individual events. Through inviting faculty members that may have had no former association with forensics to commit to one mini-lecture a semester, or year, with the speech and debate team, the problem of expertise is spread out to many other subject matter experts. For example economics professors could discuss pros and cons of free market capitalism, or communism. Political scientists could cover third party politics, or campaign finance reform, or term limits. International relations professors could discuss China's most favored nation status, the United States' role in the United Nations, or the future of the European Common Market. Such contributions should help to combat the collective ignorance issue stemming from the lack of one central, well-researched, year-long topic.

This enhanced interaction between the faculty and the speech and debate team will also offer an increased awareness to the Forensics Fellows of the academic excellence associated with the activity. They will soon realize that rather than merely attempting to miss academic work, our students are really engaging in an intensive form of higher learning with some of the sharpest minds from the best colleges throughout the country. Through encouraging this broader sense of ownership over the school's forensics program, speech and debate can receive the best possible form of public relations. Once others see the amount of work that is invested in debate and the benefits to the students, they should become allies for a quality forensics program. A supportive faculty can help solidify a forensics program by recruiting quality students out of their classes, working closely with the team members on missed assignments, and in various other ways such as through supporting faculty endorsements on budget and/or scholarship committees, etc.

Additionally, with a greater awareness of the amount of time and effort it takes to direct a quality program there should be greater support for the faculty members involved. This support could effect promotion and tenure decisions, class release time, and facility allocation or additional staffing questions. Faculty members that show a greater interest in the activity may even be invited to attend an occasional tournament to see first hand the long hours and the contagious excitement for learning that are now part of

the tournament experience. Forensics Fellows may even provide a good lay judging pool of bright, educated, neutral critics that could be very helpful when hosting a parliamentary debate tournament. They can be trained how to be an effective critic by listening to squad debates throughout the year.

Method

Attached to this paper is an informational handout prepared for the Point Loma Nazarene College (PLNC) pilot program entitled "Forensics Fellows: A Cooperative Effort Between the PLNC Faculty and Forensics." The handout contains some important information for non-forensics faculty including an explanation of the purpose or vision of the program, a section briefly explaining the fundamentals of parliamentary debate, a discussion of some topics commonly debated and how students prepare, and a section on how specifically the faculty can help. Also included in the package is a set of rules for the most recent NPDA Championship Tournament, and several sets of sample resolutions. Finally, there is a questionnaire asking for basic contact information from those interested and a series of questions designed to solicit what areas the fellows would like to teach. The questionnaire also has room for suggestions regarding other ideas for speech topics or favorite works of literature to interpret, designed to aid coaching individual events.

Invitations can be extended to one or two of the forensics fellows to prepare a presentation once a week or once every several weeks on a pre-selected topic of general interest. It may help to review the content of the presentation prior to the session. The presentation will take place at the regularly scheduled meeting time for the debate team. Eventually, you may consider inviting members of debate classes to these sessions as well. Students should be encouraged to arrive early and practice active listening skills. Strong note taking skills should also be encouraged, concentrating on noting not only the bigger underlying concepts, but also the major proponents, chief opponents, important dates, supporting or contradicting current or historical events, etc. The presentation can vary based on the needs of the specific program.

One model might have the guest lecturer speaking for 30-40 minutes covering both sides of a controversial issue. While handouts are not

necessary, the attached informational package contains a sample brief format that suggests one possible way of outlining the information. Tips for further reading, such as breakthrough or seminal works for each side would be helpful. Or, you may want to invite one guest lecturer to share the pro arguments on a particular issue and another to posit the con arguments. Regardless of the model employed, questions and/or interaction should be encouraged, but care should be taken to arrive at a style of interaction comfortable to the guest speaker. A round table discussion of the central issues and ramifications and potential approaches to take in a debate can be a valuable follow up to the presentation. Following the discussion, time permitting, it might even be a good idea to have a debate or break into groups for multiple debates on the issue discussed. The guest lecturer can either stay and critique the debate, or if time does not allow may be excused prior to the debate. You may wish to assign a given debater to brief one or two sides of the presentation to provide some central record that the entire team could refer to in future weeks or months.

Several items should be noted here. First, be very careful not to try to overwork a particular Forensic Fellow. Try to evenly spread out the speaking assignments even if one's areas are more often discussed in tournaments. You do not want to risk burning out your colleagues. You also don't want to ignore or shun the assistance of others that may have volunteered. Second, be sure to coach your students how to react positively to the guest lecturers. They should be polite, encouraging and affirming. Let the students know that not all professors are comfortable with being challenged on everything they say. Also alert the lecturers that they may expect from the debaters some more direct involvement and interaction with the ideas than they might normally encounter in class. Reassure the guest that this is a positive sign of the students engaging with the ideas, not a sign of disrespect. Remind them that good debaters want to know both sides of an issue and may play devil's advocate to explore or experiment with various ideas, which they may or may not personally favor. Finally, it is also important to be clear on time expectations and to try to honor those times. Finally, a follow up thank you card or small inexpensive gift item might not be a bad idea. While you may be used to volunteering long hours above class requirements for this activity, your colleagues may not be. Let them know how appreciated their time is. One possibility is hosting a thank you lunch or dinner each semester or year

where the guest lecturers, or Forensics Fellows, are invited along with the team members.

Discussion of Benefits

This program was just initiated at PLNC late last year following the end of the competitive season, with the intention of implementing it this upcoming year. The program was advertised on the campus E Mail listserv. Following a very positive response rate, about 20% of the faculty committed to help this program, an informational lunch was provided. Forensics Fellows and speech team members both were invited and had a chance to interact over lunch. Following the meal the informational package was discussed. The feedback was very positive from faculty and students alike. The completed questionnaires showed a wide diversity of interest areas. The group was mostly self-selected. Due to the large number of political science and history related topics encountered, a special effort was made to see that all members of the History and Political Science Department were aware of the program. It also helped that a number of the students on the team were history or political science majors, and are often the top students in their classes. Approximately 80% of the history and political science professors volunteered. The student team members may be the best recruiters of their favorite professors on campus.

It is too early to discuss the relative success or failure of this particular program so far. It is hoped that by presenting the idea in this forum others might experiment with some variation of this proposal and in the coming years results can be assessed and compared. The response on our campus even at this early stage has been very positive. Even administrators such as the Vice President of Student Development and the Registrar have volunteered. The potential rewards to the activity as a whole are large. Some of those benefits include but are not limited to:

1. Better understanding by debaters of many diverse topic areas taught by experts in their respective fields.
2. Stronger arguments and better debates due to this increased knowledge base.

3. Stronger interaction between students and professors, benefiting both students and professors.
4. Improved faculty awareness of forensics' high academic merit.
5. A wider debate recruitment net for the top students in each department.
6. Better faculty cooperation when debaters must miss an occasional class.
7. Greater faculty and administrative awareness of effort required to direct forensics.
8. Increased support for forensics faculty in advancement, tenure, release time, etc.
9. Creation of a potential judging pool for hosting parliamentary debates on campus.
10. A positive environment for supporting forensics with adequate budgetary and/or scholarship support.
11. Better integration of forensics with other campus faculty and activities.
12. Less burnout of forensics directors due to increased job satisfaction.
13. Fewer forensics programs being lost due to burn out and loss of directors.
14. Non-debate critics provide a nice check against debaters abusing argumentation theory or jargon without adequate explanation or support.
15. Individual events programs can gain strong recommendations for topics for platform speeches, and/or good suggestions for great literature to interpret that may not be well known in forensics circles.

The potential harms from such a program mostly center around the potential of poor management techniques in implementing the proposal. It is important to carefully plan out each step. Be sure to solicit adequate feedback from lecturers and students alike and be ready to make changes if necessary.

Conclusion

The Forensics Fellows program is only one of many different possible ways to help integrate non-forensics faculty into assisting with the forensics team. There are obviously many others. You may wish to begin with a much smaller scale effort and reach out to just one or two other professors that may be interested. One of the benefits of the larger scale approach is that your colleagues may see themselves as just one of many volunteering to help. Many hands make light work. Or, they might fear that if they are being contacted individually that you might expect them to do significantly more.

On the other hand, some schools may find that this program provides a natural springboard to an even larger campus or community wide forum for public debates on matters of interest to the public at large. Not only would these events advance public debate and educate your students, they hold the potential for providing a unique fund-raising possibility for your forensics team. There are programs that find they can raise several thousand dollars a year through hosting public debates on issues of community interest, then charging a nominal entry fee and/or selling advertising for programs.

The real goal is to encourage directors of forensics to bridge the gulf and invite colleagues to share in the excitement of teaching through this unique tool. If handled well, everyone should benefit. Your colleagues get to share material that is important to them with bright, inquisitive students that are clearly going beyond classroom expectations. The students gain from the wealth of knowledge that they might not normally be able to access. You are able to bring other perspectives into training sessions, which is very important in critical thinking exercises. The program as a whole also benefits from sharing the ownership with the rest of the faculty. Parliamentary debate is a unique activity that embodies many of the best aspects of a college, empowering bright, articulate students

engaging in the critical inquiry of interdisciplinary issues. It is time that we allow others to share in this excitement.

Appendix A – Sample Forensics Fellows Packet

Forensics Fellows:

A cooperative effort between the PLNC Faculty and Forensics In support of Parliamentary Debate and Individual Events Speaking

1997-98 PLNC FORENSICS FELLOWS AN OVERVIEW:

Thank you for your interest in assisting with the PLNC Parliamentary Debate team by becoming involved in the Forensics Fellows. The purpose of this organization is to allow the student members of the Point Loma intercollegiate debate team to interact with faculty and staff from various departments and benefit from your years of study and expertise in various topics that may lend themselves to future debates. This will primarily benefit the students of course, but it is hoped that you too will benefit from interacting with some of our students outside the confines of the classroom. These speech team members are some of our best and brightest students representing all majors and they regularly commit many hours to compete for the school and to improve their public speaking and critical thinking skills. Many will be headed to various graduate programs when they leave us. Your investment of a few hours in their lives may provide them not only with meaningful subject matter content for future debate rounds, but more importantly with a role model of a caring faculty member. They can see your enthusiasm for your area of interest and catch the excitement of continuing their education beyond just a B.A. or a B.S.

WHAT IS PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE?

Parliamentary Debate is a new and exciting form of intercollegiate debate that stresses both critical thinking and public speaking skills. This audience-centered form of debate rewards well-read, well-spoken competitors that can think quickly on their feet. There are two person teams that represent either the Government or the Opposition in any given round, roughly based on the British Parliament. The contestants only learn of the topic to be debated 15 minutes before the first speech. There is no preparation time between speeches either. As one speaker sits down, the next rises and contests the earlier speaker's arguments.

This particular debate format is intended to be highly interactive. The speakers may engage one another in direct questioning throughout the Constructive speeches (except for during the first and last minute when arguments are being set up or summarized). The judge, or the Speaker of the House, may also be drawn into rule on points of order. For example, if a speaker lodges a new argument in a rebuttal speech, which is against the rules, the opposing team may object to the judge which will be asked to rule immediately. Finally, the audience, or "Members of Parliament," are encouraged to interact through applause at points of agreement. Mild heckling is even encouraged, such as someone saying "shame" quietly if a speaker says something particularly objectionable, such a sexist, bigoted or hurtful remark.

The mechanics are fairly simple. Each speaker has one Constructive speech wherein arguments are posited that support one's own side and/or attacks the opponent's side. Each team has one Rebuttal speech to summarize the key voting issues and reasons why they feel the critic should support their particular side. The order and times of speeches are listed below:

Prime Minister's Constructive	7 minutes
Leader of the Opposition's Constructive	8 minutes
Member of the Government's Constructive	8 minutes
Member of the Opposition's Constructive	8 minutes
Leader of the Opposition's Rebuttal	4 minutes
Prime Minister's Rebuttal	5 minutes

WHAT TOPICS ARE DEBATED?

There is a vast array of potential topics to be debated. They vary from tournament to tournament. Each round has a separate resolution, which is usually completely unrelated to other round's resolutions. There are, however, some guiding principles. Tournament hosts are encouraged to prepare resolutions that focus on controversial, debatable issues regarding current events, politics, or philosophy. Typically students rely on well-known current or historical situations as beginning points for their arguments.

A list of just some of the many potential topics is attached to the back of this paper. For example, one resolution may be "This House Believes That: Violent action to overthrow oppression is legitimate." The Government may choose to focus on one or more examples to illustrate the legitimacy of such a course from various perspectives. They may choose to cite America's revolution from Great Britain to support revolution from bad governments, instead they may wish to isolate the Government's right to take stringent, violent action to liberate its citizen's--such as the Peruvian forces just accomplished against the rebel siege in Peru, or Israel's raid on Entebbe. Hopefully, the Opposition will not only be able to address the specifics of the Government's case and argue the merits suggested therein, they should also be able to bring up similar counter examples to show why and when violence was either not needed or used, and/or where it misfired. In response to the American Revolution, the Opposition might point out that Canada and Australia more peacefully accomplished liberation from Britain and their cultures seem to be far less plagued by rampant violence today perhaps as a result. Likewise, for every successful Peruvian release or Israeli counter terrorist raid, you must look to the more predictable Waco tragedy and/or continuing cycle of violent backlash in the Middle East. And with your help most of our students will also be able to intelligently discuss social contract theory.

HOW CAN OUR STUDENTS PREPARE FOR THIS WIDE A VARIETY OF TOPICS?

They are encouraged to be well-read in current events by keeping up with at least one daily newspaper and one of the news magazines each week for issues. We also subscribe to magazines with an international focus such as *The Economist*, or *The World Press Review*. Additionally, they are encouraged to read as much as possible in Philosophy, History, and Political Science, and to enroll in these courses whenever possible either as a part of their major or for their electives. But even with this, there is no way that they can possibly cover everything in sufficient depth. That is where you come in.

HOW CAN THE PLNC FACULTY HELP?

By allowing our students to glean from areas that you are already well versed in they can greatly expand their knowledge base. These areas of interest need not be limited to just what you teach. Many of you keep abreast of many areas of study that would greatly help our students prepare a broad background of familiarity with important topics or potential illustrations. In short, we are seeking to broaden and deepen these students' education.

Aside from just the debate implications, certain students may want to explore particular topics in greater depth. We also compete in Individual Events, a competitive category which includes student prepared platform speeches, such as Informative or Persuasive speeches, that last from 8 to 10 minutes and are based on much deeper research and study. Additionally, many of the events are of an interpretive nature. They ask the students to interpret good literature, again using cuttings of 8 to 10 minutes in length. Most of our students have not encountered nearly as much great literature as you have. If you can recall some very powerful drama, or poetry, or prose that you found compelling, chances are it could lend itself to a strong performance piece.

HMMM? BUT HOW MUCH TIME WILL THIS TAKE?

We know and appreciate how busy you are and don't want to add to the many other commitments you already have. It would be a great help if we could just know that you would be available or try to make yourself available once or twice a semester or year to meet with the team for perhaps an hour to discuss a topic or topics with which you are already familiar. There may also be an occasional informational lunch or group meeting with the Forensics Fellows as a whole. But that would be optional and more to give us a chance to say thank you for your support and let the students interact with you in a less formal setting. Sometimes these opportunities to interact casually with students over a meal mean more to them than anything else. Those are some of the times I remember most fondly from my undergraduate days.

Realistically we are suggesting that each person plan on the equivalent of one lecture per semester, of approximately 40 minutes to be followed by a round table type exchange of ideas and strategies. It may take a few hours more or less to prepare your notes for this session. Chances are it would not take too long though.

WHAT SPECIFICALLY ARE YOU LOOKING FOR?

The particular format is very much open to suggestion. This project is brand new and I know of no current model to follow, which frees us up considerably. However, what I am envisioning is about an hour with the students learning what you would like to share with them. This would ideally be a blend of lecture and discussion.

You and I could meet earlier and discuss an appropriate topic scope and some sample resolutions that we may expect to encounter at tournaments. What is particularly helpful is if we can see competing interests covered in a particular session. For example, if we could have a speaker cover both the pros and cons of Capitalism, or Democracy, or Communism, or the Insanity Plea in one setting that would be great. Another idea might be to invite several professors at the same time to discuss similar areas and generate some real dialectical discussion. Some form of handouts would be very helpful as well. I've attached a few examples of various briefs the students prepared for last year.¹ As you can see, we have not yet arrived at any particular format and are open to suggestions. A short reading list of some of the major works or most influential thinkers in any given area would also be very helpful.

WHAT CAN I DO NOW TO HELP OUT?

To help organize this project I need to know topic areas in which you are most interested. Knowing your scheduling constraints will also help. The attached questionnaire will help provide some basic informational data and allows you to identify areas of interest or expertise. Please be as general or specific as you wish. I will try to organize a series of sessions (probably only two a month to begin with) to address commonly

¹ Editor's Note: Student briefs have been omitted at the author's request. Persons implementing this program could include materials prepared by their students.

encountered topic areas. Based on your responses and your availability, we will prepare a schedule of lecture sessions. Due to the number of professors interested, we will try to plan for the entire year without overtaxing anyone. It may be that we ask you if you can share what you know in an area other than what you listed, because it seems as if it might be related to your interest area. Please feel free to bow out of such a request if it is not convenient, interesting to you, or time effective. We would also like your permission to circulate the list of Forensics Fellows to our students who might pick your brains with regard to other speech ideas.

Thanks so much for your help and support.

Appendix B – NPDA Rules

1997 NPDA Championship Tournament Rules

The purpose of these rules is to define goals and procedures of the debates so that, to the extent possible, everyone will enter the debates with a shared set of expectations. These rules are designed to apply to the goals and procedures of debate rather than the substance. They are framed in ways that attempt to allow many degrees of freedom in regard to debaters creativity. These rules are essentially the ones that will be used at the Championship Tournament but may be slightly revised. In any revisions are made, competitors will have final draft of the rules one month prior to the tournament.

RULES OF ELIGIBILITY

1. Debater Eligibility.

Eligibility to participate in the NPDA championship tournament is governed by the by-laws of the NPDA.

2. Judge Eligibility

2A. Each judge will have completed his or her bachelor's degree or will be an intelligent and well-read lay person hired by the tournament director.

2B. No one will be assigned to judge any team if he or she has had any official association with the team's school or with either member of the team during the previous four years. No one will be assigned to judge any person he or she has coached in the past.

2C. Each team will have the opportunity to strike a limited number of judges. The specific number of strikes (between five and ten) will be determined by the tournament director based on the size of the judging pool.

2D. At any time after the first round of competition, any team may present cause to the tournament committee why they should not be heard

by a particular judge. Such petitions will be accepted only in very serious cases including, but not limited to, verbal, physical, or sexual assaults or threats, occurring during the NPDA tournament.

2E. All judges should be available for assignment through the octafinals. Judges whose teams do not qualify for the octafinals may, if they wish, be excused after octafinals. All other judges must be available through the final round.

3. Sanctions

In the case of serious violations of these Rules, debaters or judges may be withdrawn from the tournament by a 2/3 vote of the Tournament Committee.

RULES OF DEBATING AND JUDGING

1. Resolutions

1A. A different resolution for each round will be presented to the debaters fifteen minutes prior to the beginning of each debate.

1B. The topic of each round will be about current affairs or philosophy. The resolutions will be general enough that a well-educated college student can debate them. They may be phrased in literal or metaphorical language.

2. Objective of the debate

The government team must affirm, and the opposition must oppose the resolution. The government must make and defend a sufficient case for the resolution. If, at the end of the debate, the judge believes that the government has successfully defended the resolution, they will be declared the winner; otherwise the opposition will be declared the winner.

3. Before the debate

The government team, if they wish, may use the room assigned for debate for their preparation. If the government team uses the debating room for

preparation, both the judge and the opposition must vacate the room until the time for the debate to begin.

4. During the debate

4A. Except for notes made during preparation time, no prepared materials or resources for the debater's use in the round may be brought into the debating chambers.

4B. Debaters may refer to any information which is within the realm of knowledge of liberally educated and informed citizens. If they believe some cited information to be too specific, debaters may request that their opponent explain specific information with which they are unfamiliar.

4C. Format of the debate

Prime Minister Constructive	7 minutes
Leader of Opposition Constructive	8 minutes
Member of Government Constructive	8 minutes
Member of Opposition Constructive	8 minutes
Leader of Opposition Rebuttal	4 minutes
Prime Minister Rebuttal	5 minutes

4D. Constructive and Rebuttal Speeches

Introduction of new arguments is appropriate during all constructive speeches. However, debaters may not introduce new arguments in rebuttal speeches except that the Prime Minister may introduce new arguments in his or her rebuttal to refute arguments that were first raised in the Member of Opposition Constructive. New examples, analysis, analogies, etc. which support previously introduced arguments are permitted in rebuttal speeches.

4E. Points of Information

A debater may request a point of information--either verbally or by rising--at any time after the first minute and before the last minute of any constructive speech. The debater holding the floor has the discretion to accept or refuse points of information. If accepted, the debater requesting

the point of information has a maximum of fifteen seconds to make a statement or ask a question. The speaking time of the debater with the floor continues during the point of information.

4F. Points of Order

If at anytime during the debate, a debater believes that his or her opponent has violated one of these Rules of Debating and Judging, he or she may address the Speaker of the House with a point of order. Once recognized by the Speaker of the House, the debater must state, but may not argue for, the point of order. At the discretion of the Speaker of the House, the accused may briefly respond to the point of order. The Speaker of the House will then rule immediately on the point of order in one of three ways: point well taken, point not well taken, or point taken under consideration. The time used to state and address a point of order will not be deducted from the speaking time of the debater with the floor.

A point of order is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor violations. Debaters may be penalized for raising spurious points of order.

4G. Points of Personal Privilege

At any time during the debate, a debater may rise to a point of personal privilege when he or she believes that an opponent has personally insulted one of the debaters, has made an offensive or tasteless comment, or has grievously misconstrued another's words or arguments. The Speaker will then rule on whether or not the comments were acceptable. The time used to state and address a point of personal privilege will not be deducted from the speaking time of the debater with the floor.

Like a point of order, a point of personal privilege is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor transgressions. Debaters may be penalized for raising spurious points of personal privilege.

5. After the debate

5A. After the Prime Minister Rebuttal, the Speaker of the House will dismiss the teams, complete the ballot and return it to the tournament

director. The judges should not give oral comments before the ballot is completed and returned to the tournament director.

5B. After returning the ballot, the judge may, at his or her discretion, give brief constructive comments to the debaters. Judges should refrain from announcing the decision. After these comments, debaters and coaches will refrain from seeking further information about the debate from the judge.

5C. Debaters or coaches will refrain from requesting that judges reveal decisions. Debaters or coaches who harass judges for information may be withdrawn from the tournament on a two-thirds vote of the Tournament Committee.

Appendix C – Sample Topics

**Parliamentary Debate Resolutions
The Sunset Cliffs Classic Invitational
Point Loma Nazarene College
January 31-February 2, 1997**

Round 1: This House Believes (THB) that justice is blind.
Round 2: THB that television corrupts the mind.
Round 3: THB that America neglects her young.
Round 4: THB that it is better to give than to receive.
Round 5: THB that dogs make better pets than do cats.
Round 6: THB that embracing Ebonics is a recipe for failure.
Octofinals: THB that gender equality is a myth.
Quarterfinals: THB that the ends do not justify the means.
Semifinals: TH would support the impeachment of Boris Yeltsin.
Finals: THB that the inmates are running the asylum.

**Parliamentary Debate Resolutions
The Pacific Southwest Collegiate Forensics Association
Spring 1997 Championships Tournament
Los Angeles Valley College
February 28- March 2, 1997**

Round 1: This house would (THW) ban genetic cloning.
Round 2: THB computers are the answer.
Round 3: THB spaceship earth is crashing.
Round 4: THB that patriotism is misguided.
Round 5: TH would not worship at the temple of sport.
Round 6: THW exterminate capital punishment.
Octofinals (Open Div.): THB special interests have ruined democracy.
Octofinals (Novice Div.): THB advertising degrades the quality of life.
Quarterfinals: THB that reality is just a linguistic construction.
Semifinals: THB that crime pays.
Finals: THB that we have sold our souls for financial gain.

**Parliamentary Debate Resolutions
The Regis University Invitational
Regis University
Posted to the parli-I 11/12/96 by Marcus Paroske**

Round 1: TH supports an across the board tax cut.
Round 2: THB the poverty of the third world is the fault of the first world.
Round 3: TH rejects the American way of life.
Round 4: THB the truth is out there.
Round 5: THB the blood of Bosnia has stained American hands.
Round 6: THB competition is over emphasized in the United States.
Quarterfinals: THB negative political advertising is significantly detrimental to the democratic process.
Semifinals: THB privacy protections have become too extreme in the United States.
Finals: The system of justice, in this House, should be retributive, not distributive.

Appendix D – Forensics Fellow Member Questionnaire

1997-98 PLNC FORENSICS FELLOWS

MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME: _____

DEPARTMENT: _____

OFFICE PHONE: _____

E MAIL ADDRESS: _____

MAJOR AREAS OF INSTRUCTION (TOPICS OR CLASSES TAUGHT):

OTHER AREAS OF INTEREST AND STUDY:

ANTICIPATED SCHEDULING CONSTRAINTS:

Please list times when you absolutely can not meet due to standing obligations such as class times, standard group meeting times, etc. We are primarily looking at weekdays (except Fridays) from 3:00 to 8:00 from which we will select potential meeting times. Remember, to keep from abusing your time you will probably only be asked to help at one session per semester.

Mondays Tuesdays Wednesdays Thursdays

In addition to parliamentary debate, our speech team participates in the following individual events:

INTERPRETATION SPEECHES

- Dramatic Interpretation
- Prose Interpretation
- Poetry Interpretation
- Duo Dramatic Interpretation

PLATFORM SPEECHES

- Persuasion
- Informative
- Speech to Entertain
- Rhetorical Criticism

LIMITED PREP SPEECHES

- Impromptu Speaking
- Extemporaneous Speaking

PLATFORM SPEECH IDEAS:

This next section is a chance to list any ideas you may have for innovative yet significant topic ideas or titles in literature that would make a compelling speech or story. We have little control over the limited preparation topics and the studying and research for Parliamentary Debate will greatly assist us in these events. There are however many topics from your disciplines or areas of study that might make great topics for student researched and written platform speeches. These topic areas should probably not be the overdone ideas like Capital Punishment, Gun Control, or abortion. The more cutting edge, unique, and current the better. It should also be socially significant. Please list any such topic ideas that come to mind here:

INTERPRETATION SELECTION IDEAS:

This section is asking you to think back on great (use your own slant on what great might be) or enjoyable works of literature. Can you remember the author and title of a particularly compelling piece of poetry, prose or drama that you have read or seen or heard lately or even from long ago? If it moved you chances are others will be moved by it also if it is interpreted well. What are your favorites? Our students are always looking for good ideas of powerful (or subtly powerful) literary selections. Any ideas you have would be appreciated. We will compile an idea file and add to it as people remember others. Please feel free to drop me a note if you think of others later. Thanks so much.