

★ **AMERICA 250 FLORIDA** ★

In Extemporaneous Debate (EXD), students compete in a one-on-one format with limited prep time to prepare for the topic they are to debate. Students present arguments and engage in rebuttals; however, unlike other common debate events, students debate a different topic each round. They are given 30 minutes to prepare for the round. The use of evidence is permitted, but not a focal point due to the limited time available to prepare a case for the round. As with most debate events, students do not “choose their side;” instead they are assigned a side.

RULES

Participants must follow a conversational pace when speaking in order for their opponent and the judge to assess their statements. “Spreading” (excessively fast speech) is not permitted.

FORMAT

Extemporaneous debates follow a structured format with defined speaking roles and time limits.

TOPIC SELECTION

Participants are given a resolution (topic) related to current events, politics, economics, civics or government.

PREPARATION TIME

Participants are given 30 minutes to prepare their case after receiving the topic. During this preparation time, they can research, gather information and organize their thoughts.

EVIDENCE AND CITATIONS

Participants should support their arguments with relevant evidence, statistics, examples and quotations from credible sources. They should provide citations for their evidence to demonstrate credibility and allow for fact-checking; however, due to limited preparation, evidence is not the primary focus.

NOTES

Participants are permitted to use notes and/or electronic devices in both preparation and during the round for Extemporaneous Debate.

JUDGING CRITERIA

Judges typically evaluate participants based on factors such as content, organization, delivery, rebuttal skills and overall persuasiveness. They may also consider factors like creativity, depth of analysis and responsiveness to the topic.

FAIRNESS AND SPORTSMANSHIP

Participants should maintain a respectful and sportsmanlike demeanor throughout the debate. They should avoid personal attacks, logical fallacies and other forms of misconduct. Students should directly address/face the judge and not their opponent.

SPEAKING TIMES

Proposition Constructive: 2 minutes

Cross-Examination of Proposition: 1 minutes

Opposition Constructive: 2 minutes

Cross-Examination of Opposition: 1 minutes

Mandatory Prep Time: 1 minute

Proposition Rebuttal: 2 minutes

Opposition Rebuttal: 2 minutes

Mandatory Prep Time: 1 minute

Proposition Rebuttal: 2 minutes

Opposition Rebuttal: 2 minutes

EXTEMPORANEOUS DEBATE

JUDGES QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

JUDGING AND EVALUATION

CLARITY

The debaters should give the judge sufficient background information and be clear with their language, so the judge is able to understand the issue at hand, as well as the student's response to that issue. This also serves the purpose of demonstrating the speaker understands the topic.

TOPICALITY

The debaters should give a focused case for or against the resolution. It should contain arguments, analysis and interpretation. All arguments should be related to the topic for that debate.

ACCURACY

A variety of evidence should be used to support the debaters' arguments. If the evidence is from a published source, then it should be properly cited orally. If the evidence is quoted, then the original author's name should be provided.

DELIVERY

The debate should be delivered using the appropriate tone. Hand gestures should also be used to convey additional meaning and emphasis; however, they should not distract from the speech itself. The delivery should enhance the speech without subtracting from its meaning.

CLASH

The debaters should have a clash of ideas. In addition to presenting their case, they must also directly respond to the arguments made by their opponent and counter rebuttals made.

Speaker Points (1-5)	1 POOR	2 BELOW AVERAGE	3 AVERAGE	4 ABOVE AVERAGE	5 EXCELLENT
Performance	Very nervous, unclear speech, frequent pauses, lack of eye contact.	Some nervousness, inconsistent clarity, occasional pauses, limited eye contact.	Confident delivery, clear speech, minimal pauses, adequate eye contact.	Very confident delivery, articulate speech, few pauses, strong eye contact.	Extremely confident, compelling delivery, fluent speech, no pauses, strong and engaging eye contact.
Organization	Very disorganized, unclear structure, difficult to follow.	Somewhat disorganized, weak structure, challenging to follow at times.	Generally organized, logical structure, mostly easy to follow.	Well-organized, clear structure, easy to follow.	Exceptionally well-organized, flawless structure, effortless to follow.
Evidence	Little to no relevant evidence provided, unsupported claims.	Limited relevant evidence, some unsupported claims.	Adequate relevant evidence, mostly supported claims.	Strong relevant evidence, well-supported claims.	Abundant, highly relevant evidence, all claims well-supported.
Argumentation	Weak arguments, significant logical flaws, easily refuted. No rebuttal to opponent's claims.	Some weak arguments, inconsistencies to logic. Limited rebuttal to opponent's claims.	Generally sound arguments, minor inconsistencies. Some quality rebuttals, but some opponent's claims left unexamined.	Strong arguments, logical coherence. Opponent's claims addressed.	Compelling arguments, flawless logic, very difficult to refute. All opponent's claims addressed, examined and persuasively countered.
Questioning	Ineffective questioning, little engagement with opponents.	Limited effectiveness in questioning, minimal engagement.	Adequate questioning, some engagement with opponents.	Effective questioning, good engagement with opponents.	Highly effective questioning, deep engagement with opponents, adept at exposing weaknesses.
Conduct	Very disrespectful, inappropriate behavior.	Somewhat disrespectful, occasional inappropriate behavior.	Generally respectful, minor instances of inappropriate behavior.	Respectful conduct throughout.	Exemplary conduct, respectful at all times, sets a positive tone.

RULES

A LEGISLATIVE SESSION CONSISTS OF:

- A recommended minimum of 90 minutes and maximum of 120 minutes.
- Election of a presiding officer: Students may nominate themselves or another competitor as presiding officer for the chamber.
- Nominated students for a presiding officer must be selected by a majority vote of the student chamber. If there is not a majority, the candidate with the fewest votes is removed from the running and voting occurs again until a candidate receives a majority.
- The presiding officer selection process is capped at a maximum of 15 minutes.
- Presiding officers will receive a gavel at the start of the round.

AUTHORSHIP

The presiding officer must recognize the author of the legislation. If the author is not present in the chamber, the presiding officer will call for a sponsor.

BILL AND RESOLUTION SUBMISSION

Participants may submit bills and resolutions for consideration in the legislative debate no later than 28 days prior to the tournament. Submissions must adhere to the specified format and be relevant to current issues.

LEGISLATIVE PACKET

A packet of bills and resolutions is created by the tournament organizer, approved by FCDI and provided to participants at least 10 days prior to the tournament. The packet may include a mix of student-created and pre-selected legislation.

DOCKET SELECTION

A docket of bills and resolutions is determined by the chamber.

SPEAKER ORDER

The presiding officer (P.O.) must recognize speakers based on precedence and recency. If multiple competitors seek recognition, the PO should prioritize the one who has spoken the fewest times (precedence). If they have spoken an equal number of times, the PO should then recognize the competitor who spoke least recently (recency).

SPEECH TIMING

Each speaker is allotted up to three minutes to deliver their speech. Gavel signals indicate when there is one minute, 30 seconds and zero seconds remaining. Speeches are given a 10-second grace period. The presiding officer should halt the speech after 3:10. Legislation authorship/sponsor speeches and the first negative speech are followed by a two-minute cross-examination period. Alternating affirmative/negative speeches followed by up to one minute questioning period per chamber member. No more than two minutes of total questions per speech.

SPEECH STRUCTURE

Speakers should adhere to a structured format for their speeches, including an introduction, main points or arguments and a conclusion. Speeches should be well-organized and coherent, with clear transitions between ideas.

DECORUM AND CONDUCT

Participants must conduct themselves in a respectful and professional manner throughout the debate. Personal attacks, disruptive behavior or disrespectful language are not tolerated.

DEBATE ETIQUETTE

Speakers should address the chair or presiding officer when delivering speeches to the full chamber. All remarks should follow parliamentary procedure and adhere to established rules of order. Interruptions, side conversations, and out-of-turn remarks are discouraged and should be avoided.

EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENTATION

Speakers should support their arguments with relevant evidence, statistics and examples. Debaters are encouraged to research and prepare well-supported arguments to strengthen their positions.

JUDGING CRITERIA

Judges evaluate participants based on criteria such as content, delivery, organization, responsiveness to questions and overall effectiveness in advocating for their positions. Scores are assigned based on the quality of performance relative to these criteria. Students should seek to advance the debate with new ideas, not just repeating what previous speakers have said.

RULES

QUESTIONING PERIODS

Following each speech, there is a designated period for questioning by other participants, known as the questioning period. Speakers may yield their remaining time for questions, allowing for additional discussion and clarification. ALL NOVICE rounds and rounds with more than 14 members in the chamber must utilize indirect questioning.

ELECTRONIC DEVICES

Legislative debate participants may use electronic devices and internet but are not permitted to message anyone inside or outside the chamber. Students may have non-electronic visual aids.

JUDGING AND EVALUATION

EVALUATION

If a student asks a question, they should not be scored for that question; however, the judge should take note that the student may be setting the stage for a future speech. Handling and asking of questions should be considered when ranking students overall in the chamber.

Each time that a student is recognized to make a speech, you should fill out a speaker ballot for that student.

Judges should keep track of all student participation in the chamber in order to accurately rank students. This includes speeches, questions and motions.

Students are ranked at the end of the session holistically based upon quality and quantity of speeches given, motions made that advanced chamber business, professionalism, presence, and quality of questions and responses.

While not a strict judging criteria, students should have clash. They should rebut each other's points instead of just speaking without including other's points.

Scoring: 1-6 = (Nothing below a 3 for Novice). If you think a student deserves <3, please speak directly to your coach. See rubric

NOTES ABOUT SCORING LEGISLATIVE DEBATE

Score each competitor's speech for and against the legislation/resolution using the 1-6 scoring range found on the drop down ballot for that competitor. You will also find a space for comments that help explain your 1-6 scoring choice.

At the conclusion of the round, use every competitor's speech scores primarily, and their overall performance secondarily to rank every competitor in the room. If there are 12 competitors in the room, each will be assigned a rank—no ties for rank.

Your final responsibility for a legislative chamber will be to note how each student performs in regard to questioning, participation in parliamentary disputes, interaction with other students and general decorum.

PRESIDING OFFICER (P.O.)

Among the first things done in a legislative session is the election of a Presiding Officer. This person will be scored differently than the other competitors. The Presiding Officer will recognize students to speak and question the current speakers, as well as recognize any of the various motions passed.

Judges should allow both the student legislative debaters in the chamber and the Presiding Officer to correct breaches of rules or parliamentary procedure. If students fail to do so, judges may step in to point out breach of procedure. The judge will also be called upon to score the Presiding Officer; when doing so, they are to be scored separately from the other students. Instead the judge should evaluate them based on the following criteria.

- Did the P.O. recognize speakers in a fair and consistent manner?
- Did the P.O. utilize Parliamentary Procedure correctly, and in a manner that allowed the chamber to run smoothly?
- Did the P.O. maintain control of the chamber, without resorting to tyrannical or autocratic means?
- Did the P.O. conduct themselves with decorum and dignity?
- As the P.O. does not actually give a traditional "speech," a common strategy is to award a speech score for every hour of presiding.
- The P.O. should be ranked among competitors.

JUDGING AND EVALUATION

Legislative Debate Rubric

Speaker Points (2-6)	2, 2.5 pts DEVELOPING Level of Mastery	3, 3.5 pts LOW Level of Mastery	4, 4.5 pts FAIR Level of Mastery	5, 5.5 pts GOOD Level of Mastery	6 pts EXCELLENT Level of Mastery
<i>Vocal Performance of content: Rate, volume, intonation, emphasis, enunciation, pronunciation</i>	Speaker's rate/volume/enunciation interfered with audience understanding.	Speaker's vocal performance interfered with understanding over 1/2 of the total speaking time.	Speaker's vocal performance at times (1/3 or less) interfered with understanding.	Speaker's vocal performance bolstered understanding and interest. Confident in speaking.	Speaker's vocal performance expertly supported the message. Delivery was clear, compelling, and professional.
<i>Physical Performance: Eye contact, facial expressions, gestures, posture, purposeful movement</i>	Speaker's physical performance interfered with understanding. Speaker provided minimal eye contact and lacked appropriate expressiveness.	Speaker's physical performance occasionally interfered with understanding. Speaker lacked consistent eye contact, gestures/movement.	Speaker's physical performance showed no major errors but lacked proficiency throughout. Some attempt at purposeful movement.	Speaker's physical performance added to the overall understanding of the topic. Gestures and purposeful movement aided understanding.	Eye contact, facial expressiveness, gestures, and movement all demonstrated confidence and skill.
<i>Speech Organization: Structure was clear and easy to follow. Intro, main points, and conclusion clearly established.</i>	Lacked basic structure: introduction, body, transitions, and conclusion. Hard to follow along.	Introduction, body, and conclusion were attempted; some organizational elements were missing.	Introduction with hook and preview used. Clearer transitions between main points and use of review would be helpful.	Organizational elements were clear. Intro included hook and preview. Basic transitions used. Conclusion summarized nicely.	Speech was expertly organized with clear transitions. Conclusion provided a perfect sense of closure.
<i>Speech Content and Analysis: Support for main ideas include a variety of supporting structures (e.g., data, expert opinions, etc.).</i>	Support for main points needs development. Sources not cited clearly or correctly. Topic analysis too broad or incomplete.	Some support provided for each main point. More and varied support as well as outside sources needed. Topic analysis limited.	One or more points was supported, but varying types of support and/or a greater variety of quality sources would add interest and credibility. Topic analysis ok.	Each point was supported with ample and varying types of evidence. Sources clearly cited. Topic analysis was adequate but not novel.	All points well-supported and prior speakers referenced. Abundant, quality evidence cited. Topic analysis was highly creative.
Overall: Contribution to the advancement of the debate/and to the success of the chamber.	No speeches given. No questions asked. Decorum issues (distracted, disengaged, etc.)	The speech(es) given were redundant or off topic. Questions asked did no elucidate.	The speeches given included some new and helpful information for the chamber to consider. Questions were somewhat helpful in clarifying.	The speeches given advanced the discussion by bringing up important considerations. Questions were pointed and relevant.	The speeches given were extremely helpful in identifying strengths and weaknesses. Pointed questions were relevant and critical.

P.O. Rubric

Speaker Points (2-6)	2 WEAK - MEDIOCRE	3 - 4 GOOD	5 - 6 EXCELLENT - SUPERIOR
<i>Parliamentary Procedure</i>	The P.O.'s knowledge of parliamentary procedure is lacking, and he/she shows negligible effort to correct errors and/or consult written rules. Minimizes opportunities for others to debate by failing to adhere to time specified in a recess motion.	The P.O. demonstrates competency in procedure, but makes mistakes in determining the results of motions and votes, etc.	The P.O. has command of parliamentary procedure (motions) and uses this to run a fair and efficient chamber, seldom consulting written rules and ruling immediately on whether motions pass or fail. Keeps chamber running smoothly.
<i>Recognition</i>	Frequent errors are made in speaker recognition. Students in the chamber rise to a point of order to correct erroneous speaker recognition made by the P.O. The P.O. is slow in recognizing speakers and questioners. There are fewer than 10 speeches per hour in the chamber.	Presiding preferences are not clearly explained. Speaker recognition is somewhat inconsistent or biased. The P.O. is successful in achieving 10 speeches per hour in the chamber.	The P.O. is consistent in recognition distributing speeches throughout the room based on precedence. The P.O. recognizes speakers and questions in a timely manner to maximize participation. Achieving 12 or more speeches per hour is a sign of excellence.
<i>Control</i>	The environment in the chamber does not foster participation. Allows students to abuse parliamentary procedure in place of debating legislation. Encourages frequent recesses.	Guides the chamber to remain focused on debating legislation. At times, students on the chamber floor appear to be more in control of the chamber than the P.O. during the session. Sometimes is unsure of how to rule on motions or business.	The P.O. is respected and trusted by his/her peers. Establishes a businesslike environment that fosters maximum participation in the chamber. Rules on motions and business without interjecting himself/herself into the issue.
<i>Demeanor</i>	The P.O. uses their position for their own personal advantage as opposed to operating in the best interest of the chamber as a whole.	Overall, the P.O. creates a professional atmosphere although there are times where the atmosphere is less than totally professional.	The P.O. fosters a respectful, professional, and collegial atmosphere. Addresses all members respectfully.
<i>Communication</i>	Communication between the P.O. and chamber is confusing or counterproductive. Communication from the P.O. (excessive or lack of) prevents maximum participation from members of the chamber.	The P.O. occasionally takes excessive time when explaining rulings or doesn't explain rulings clearly.	The P.O. dynamically displays a command and relates well to the chamber through his/her vocal and physical presence. Word choice is economical and eloquent. Rulings are concisely explained.

RULES

PROHIBITED CONTENT

Profanity, sexual content, glorification of violence or drug use is strictly prohibited. Violations of this rule will result in a point deduction and may result in disqualification from the tournament. Judges should inform the tournament director about inappropriate content and NOT discuss directly with student.

PREPARATION TIME

- Judge(s) in each IMP room will be provided with an envelope with printed prompts for the round.
- The speaking order is listed on your Speechwire ballot. The name on the top goes first, and so on.
- All members of the round should enter the room simultaneously.
- The speaker will draw three prompts, read them silently, choose one and read it aloud. Then, return the other two face down.
- The official timer begins now. Students have seven minutes and 30 seconds grace to prepare AND deliver a speech about the prompt. While there is no minimum prep time or speaking time, competitors who can limit themselves to two-minutes of preparation and deliver a five minute speech are seen as successful. Prep plus delivery of speech cannot exceed 7:30.
- Students can write notes to prepare but can only bring a 3" X 5" notecard up to speak. All preparation should be completed without the use of electronics or outside notes / paper. All judges will be issued enough notecards that each competitor will have one provided when it's their turn.

TIME REQUIREMENTS

Participants are given seven minutes total to prepare and present their speech. Each participant may receive a 30-second grace period if they go longer than seven minutes. Students that prep and speak for longer than 7:30 minutes will not be ranked first. Students who do not speak for at least two minutes will not be ranked first.

NOTES

Using a script or notes is allowed during preparation; however, students may only use a notecard throughout their speech.

CONTENT ORIGINALITY

While speakers have limited time to prepare, their speeches need to contain original content created on the spot. Speakers should avoid memorized or rehearsed material.

RELEVANCE

Competitors should keep their speech focused and relevant to the prompt provided, avoiding tangents or introducing unrelated topics that detract from the central theme.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Speakers may be evaluated based on criteria such as organization, clarity, relevance, creativity and overall effectiveness in responding to the impromptu prompt.

JUDGING AND EVALUATION

Judges will BOTH RANK and SCORE competitors. There should be only "high point" wins. If one speaker earned a 98 and another speaker a 96, the competitor with the higher score must be ranked higher. There may be NO TIES in RANK, but it's okay to have tied scores out of 100. As a card is permitted with this version of impromptu speaking, use of the card may play into scoring, but there is NO penalty for its use. The card should not be used as a prop.

IMPROMPTU SPEAKING

JUDGES QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

JUDGING AND EVALUATION

CONTENT

___ Ideas relatable ___ Ideas original/Creative ___ Pathos/Entertainment ___ Cogent and easy to follow

Organizationally (intro, body, conclusion) ___ Points are explained, supported and sourced

___ Signposting /transitions used

DELIVERY ___ Rate ___ Volume ___ Emphasis and timing ___ Physical expression

___ Word choice enhances message ___ Enunciation ___ Energy/emotion ___ Purposeful movement

___ Pronunciation ___ Eye contact

*Reminder–We never make judgments based on a speaker’s ideology, background or appearance. Use the checklist to help you stay as “unbiased” as possible. If a speaker says something that makes you uncomfortable, it’s important to be specific in your ballot comments and tactfully explain why you’re uncomfortable.

Do NOT share any oral feedback or decision with the speakers whilst at the competition.

Speaker Points	10 - 11 DEVELOPING Level of Mastery	12 - 13 LOW Level of Mastery	14 - 15 FAIR Level of Mastery	16 - 17 GOOD Level of Mastery	18 - 20 EXCELLENT Level of Mastery
Vocal Performance of content: Rate, volume, intonation, emphasis	Speaker’s rate/volume/ enunciation interfered with audience understanding. Speaker’s emphasis/ intonation conflicted with the message.	Speaker’s vocal performance interfered with understanding over 1/2 of the total speaking time.	Speaker’s vocal performance at times (1/3 or less) detracted from the delivery of the message.	Speaker’s vocal performance helped bolster the audience’s understanding and interest. No distracting vocal issues. Confident in speaking.	Speaker’s vocal performance expertly supported the message. Delivery was clear, compelling, and professional throughout.
Physical Performance: Eye contact, facial expressions, gestures, posture, purposeful movement	Speaker’s physicality interfered with performance. Speaker’s eye contact (or lack of), gestures and/or movement distracted from the performance.	Speaker’s physicality occasionally interfered with overall performance. Some issues with gestures, eye contact, facial expressions, or movement were distracting.	Speaker’s physical performance showed no major errors but lacked proficiency throughout.	Speaker’s physical performance only included a few errors and overall enhanced the performance. Good use of eye contact, gestures, facial expressions, and purposeful movement were observed.	Speaker’s physical performance expertly demonstrated public speaking skill. Excellent use of eye contact, facial expressions, gestures, and movement demonstrated confidence.
Speech Organization was clear, easy to follow, and connected logically to the prompt. Intro, main points, and conclusion were clearly established. Thematic transitions were provided.	Lacked organization— ideas were difficult to follow. Lacked preview of points and/or review. Few transitions or unclear transitions from point to point. The speech only loosely connected to the prompt.	Organization was at times unclear. Transitions were inconsistent. Some repetition or oversight of ideas. A weak link to the prompt was provided.	Overall organization was easy to follow. Transitions used. Some repetition or oversight of ideas. Speech connected to the prompt.	Organization was easy to follow. Intro included a hook and reference to prompt. Points were previewed. Main points clear, and transitions were used. Conclusion provided a sense of closure. Connection to the prompt was adequate.	Organization was perfect. Intro included hook, reference to prompt, preview of points and then thematic transitions from point to point. Conclusion referenced hook and provided closure. Approach to prompt was creative.
Speech Content Choices: clarity, creativity, support, and appropriateness	Main ideas were not linked to prompt. Main ideas lacked development. Content was inappropriate.	Main ideas were loosely linked to the prompt and to one another. Main ideas needed development. Some repetition or oversight made detracted from the speech.	Main ideas addressed prompt in a basic way. Some support for each point was provided. Content was appropriate.	Interesting approach to prompt. Main ideas were well-supported. Examples were clear and helped audience understand.	Highly creative approach to prompt. Each main point was closely linked to the prompt and to each other. Support was well-developed and interesting.
Use of time and overall performance and decorum as speaker and audience member (e.g., active listening and applauding)	Student spoke for less than 60 seconds and/or student’s behavior (as audience member or speaker) was unsportsmanlike.	Student spoke for less than 90 seconds. Overall performance indicated lack of confidence and/or understanding.	Student spoke for less than two minutes. Overall performance indicated a lack of confidence and/or understanding.	Student spoke for at least three minutes and demonstrated confidence, understanding, and relatability.	Student used less than two minutes of prep, spoke for at least four minutes, and demonstrated confidence and professionalism.