### Practices- Ideas

#### Tidwell- Require 2 practices per week students are competing. ½ tournament grade

Practices TWF- 2 hours each day - we do a lot of full debates, novices always Drills/alternative things with varsity kids.

#### Shephard- doesn’t require practices- has 90 minute blocks 5 days per week

 Optional- daily- a coach is there.

 \*Cutting evidence

 \*Watch novices

#### Heath- rounds and speech redos, research

 \*2 days a week- required

#### Silverman- require 1 2 days per week- different time

 \*practice debates/performance/strategy

#### Ligenfelter- no planned practice- as needed

## Alternatives To Full Practice Debates (Tidwell)

### Argument From Opposing Evidence

#### Give the debater a position (1AC, T, DA, CP, or K)

#### Give the student 3-5 minutes (or overnight if class assignment) to read the evidence and make arguments based on ONLY that evidence. They may NOT access any other files.

#### Student must give a speech lasting no longer than 3 minutes to make their answers.

#### 2 points for defensive and 5 points for offensive arguments.

### Debating Chuck

**DIRECTIONS:**

**Pre-flow your 1AC. Then follow the directions for each type of round.**

**Slow Round Version-**

**1. Case Side- Roll the dice for every subpoint on the Solvency and EITHER Harm or**

 **Advantage. 2. Off Case- roll 2 off case positions 3. Take 4 minutes to prep a 2AC**

**Fast Round Version:**

**1. Roll an on case argument for every place there is a 1AC solvency card**

**2. Roll 4 Off- Case Arguments (K version- roll one K position from the list**

**3. Take 4 minutes to prep the 2AC**

**ON CASE ARGUMENTS:**

**3 Chuck answers the argument badly w/o evidence or warrant**

**4 Chuck makes an analytical argument that you’ve never heard before**

**5 Chuck claims with some weak evidence, that your plan already exists**

**6 Chuck runs an argument with evidence that’s better than your 1AC evidence**

**7 Chuck attacks the argument with a really good argument without any evidence**

**8 Chuck drops the argument**

**9 Chuck says that your evidence is biased**

**10 Chuck claims that your evidence is made up, and the judge looks concerned**

**11. Chuck babbles something incoherent and the judge nods in agreement**

**12 Chuck says hello to the judge before the round starts and they talk about the great times**

 **that they had at camp last summer, and the judge says- “you’ve got this in the bag”**

**13. Chuck Says you don’t provide funding, and that you should lose because of that.**

**14. Chuck runs Corruption as a solvency block.**

**15. Chuck drops the argument**

**16. Chuck says that the argument doesn’t make any sense**

**17. Chuck has evidence from yesterday that says your plan was put into place last week**

**18. Chuck has evidence from your solvency author that says your plan won’t work.**

**OFF CASE ARGUMENTS:**

**2 Chuck runs no off case here**

**3 Chuck runs a China CP with Relations DA**

**4 Chuck runs no off case here**

**5 Chuck runs an Aid Tradeoff DA**

**6 Chuck runs an America First argument**

**7 Chuck runs China DA**

**8 Chuck runs Corruption**

**9 Chuck run Topicality- plan is not health assistance**

**10 Chuck runs Topicality- you don’t increase**

**11 Chuck runs Aid Dependency**

**12 Chuck runs a one card solvency turn that he calls a Racism DA**

**KRITIKS FOR K VERSION OF FAST ROUND:**

**1. Compassion Fatigue**

**2. Disaster Pornography**

**3. BioPower**

**4. Statism**

**5. Cultural Hegemony/Imperialsm**

**6. Feminist International Relations**

### Mini-Chuck- Topicality

**Topicality Chuck- Coach picks an AFF. You are NEG, and you pick a T. Chuck is the 2AC, and he answers the T by rolling the amount of times listed in each section. You get 2 minutes to prep your answers, and you get 3 minutes to answer.**

**We Meets: (2 Rolls)**

**1. We meet because our aff is in every camp list.**

**2. We meet because the solvency proves that we do.**

**3. We meet because the definition is by our solvency author**

**4. We meet.**

**5. No answer.**

**6. We don’t understand the argument- it probably confuses you, too!**

**Counter Interpretation: (1 roll)**

**1. No CI**

**2. They read a definition that includes the aff, by a dictionary**

**3. They read a definition that includes the aff, by an expert in the field**

**4. They read a definition that has nothing to do with the T argument**

**5. They read a definition that supports your argument**

**6. They read a definition that comes from a blog**

**7. Why are we debating about definitions, anyway?**

**8. Our aff is topical. We get to define!**

**9. Neg’s definition is terrible. We don’t have to counter interpret**

**10. We don’t understand the definition- it’s dumb.**

**11. No CI**

**12. They read a definition about a different word in the topic.**

**Counter Standards: (4 Rolls)**

1. **BRIGHT LINE: Definition draws a clear line between aff and neg ground.**
2. **FAIR LIMTS: The definition most fairly divides aff and neg ground.**
3. **FIELD EXPERT / FIELD CONTEXT: The definition is important because it comes from an expert on the topic.**
4. **GRAMMATICAL CORRECTNESS: The definition fits the grammatical construction of the resolution.**
5. **FRAMER’S INTENT: The definition is superior because it fits the intent of the writers of the resolution.**
6. **PRECISION: The definition is better because it is more precise.**
7. **LITERATURE CHECKS ABUSE: Any case specific neg proves that the aff is reasonable.**
8. **DICTIONARY DEFINITIONS ARE GOOD / BAD: The definition comes from a dictionary which, depending on the analysis and evidence is either good or bad.**
9. **REASONABILITY: The definition is reasonable, and that is enough.**
10. **COMMON USAGE: The definition is the most common understanding of the word.**
11. **QUALITY OF DEBATE: The definition (or violation) improves or preserves the quality of the debate process.**
12. **EDUCATION: The definition improves or protects the educational value of the round.**
13. **EACH WORD HAS MEANING: The definition preserves the unique meaning of the word.**
14. **RESOLUTIONAL CONTEXT: Definition works best within the context**

**of the rest of the resolution / also known as “whole res”**

**Voters: (1 Roll)**

**1. No answers**

**2. Don’t vote unless we are 100% non-topical**

**3. We provide Fairness and Education**

**4. Topicality is an imperialist argument that entrenches racism**

**5. Gee- We’re topical.**

**6. We came to talk about Latin America, and they’re just debating definitions.**

### Mini-Chuck: Disadvantages

**Coach picks an AFF. You are NEG, and you pick a DA. Chuck is the 2AC, and he answers the DA by rolling the amount of times listed in each section. You get 2 minutes to prep your answers, and you get 3 minutes to answer.**

**Uniqueness: 2 Rolls**

**1. NU: We have lots of foreign policy with other countries, nothing’s happened yet.**

**2. NU: The President makes people and countries mad all the time. No impacts have happened.**

**3. NU: The federal government spends money constantly, and no impacts**

**4. They read a uniqueness answer that is better than your uniqueness, and it’s from this morning.**

**5 . NU: World War II proves.**

**6. NU: The President is a whack job, this will never happen.**

**7. NU: Congress is broken- nothing will change**

**8. Fiat gets us out of the DA**

**9. They read a uniqueness answer that is really bad. It’s massively overtagged.**

**10. Plan is better than the DA**

**11. They read a really good uniqueness answer from 1985.**

**12. Why are we talking about \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_? The topic is about Latin America!**

**Link: 3 Rolls**

**1. They make an analytical turn that makes no sense.**

**2. We don’t make this happen.**

**3. They read a turn that actually makes them link more.**

**4. They read a turn that is better, and newer than your link.**

**5. They read a turn that is better than our link, but it’s from 1994.**

**6. They read the tag for 3 link turns, but don’t read any evidence.**

**7. They read a turn that is worse than your link, but it’s from yesterday.**

**8. This is dumb.**

**9. This can’t happen. We’re Americans!**

**10. No link- the plan existed before, and this didn’t happen**

**11. No link**

**12. The negative argument is confusing, and you probably are confused to, so it just doesn’t matter.**

**Internal/Impact Answers: 3 Rolls**

**1. They read evidence that your terminal impact is impossible, but it’s from a blogger**

**2. They read evidence that your terminal impact is unlikely, and it’s a really good source. From 1994.**

**3. They read evidence that your terminal impact is unlikely, and it’s a really good source. This summer.**

**4. Your impact is dumb. There is no way doing plan will result in the impact.**

**5. No internal- there is no way to get from their link to the final impact.**

**6. Impact Turn: The impact is good. It cleans up the planet!**

**7. Case outweighs**

**8. We turned this at the link level, so it’s an advantage for us.**

**9. We’d never let this happen. We’re Americans!**

**10. No answer**

**11. They make a really good analytical takeout.**

**12. This is counter-intuitive.**

### Infinite 1AC CX

#### The 1A from a team reads their 1AC to the class/group. At the end, the rest of the class cross-examines the team until there are no questions remaining. Both Affirmative students may answer.

### Mini-1 Position Debates

#### The focus here is to work on development of positions and answers through a debate without doing a full policy round.

####  1AC is shared with everyone. It is NOT read out loud.

####  Neg gets 3 minutes to choose/prep 1 position (Solvency block, T, DA, CP, or K), and they get no more than 3 minutes to present it.

####  Aff gets 2 minutes to prep 2AC answers. 2AC the SAME AMOUNT of time used by the 1NC.

####  Neg gets 2 minutes to prep the 2NC/1NR (one speech). They get up to 4 minutes to answer/extend.

####  1AR gets 1 minute of prep, and ½ the time used by the 2NC/1NR to answer.

####  2NR gets 1 minute of prep, and the SAME time as the 1AR.

####  2AR gets 1 minute of prep, and the SAME time as the 2NR.

### Speech Redos

#### Have students choose a speech document from a tournament or practice debate. Give them an appropriate amount of time to prep a new and improved version of that speech. The student MUST prepare an updated speech doc and pre-flow the speech. Make them redo the speech for you.

### Trial By Trolley

#### Use this game as a classroom activity!

### Targeted Answering- Offensive Focus

#### Directions: Give students a DA, T, CP, or K Shell/1NC. Give them 2 minutes (or overnight for homework)to make answers to the argument. They get 3 minutes to answer the argument. Each DEFENSIVE Argument is worth 2 points, and each OFFENSIVE argument is worth 5 points. I usually make it a 30 point grade for a class assignment.