

Tournament Package
YorkU Women's High School Tournament 2019

York University
4700 Keele Street
Toronto ON
M3J 1P3
yorkuniversitydebate@gmail.com



YORK
UNIVERSITÉ
UNIVERSITY



Schedule:

Friday (February 22nd, 2019)	
3:30 - 5:00 PM	Registration
5:00 - 5:30 PM	Introductions and Briefings
5:30 - 6:45 PM	Round 1
6:45 - 7:30 PM	Dinner
7:30 - 8:45 PM	Round 2
Saturday (February 23rd, 2019)	
8:30 – 9:30 AM	Check In & Breakfast
9:30 – 11:15 AM	Round 3
11:15 – 1:00 PM	Round 4
1:00 – 1:45 PM	Lunch
1:45 – 3:30 PM	Round 5 (Hidden Quarters)
3:30 – 5:15 PM	Semi-Finals & Novice Finals
5:15 – 7:00 PM	Finals
7:00 – 8:00 PM	Awards

*Note: the junior finals will be held conditional on the number of junior team entries in the tournament

British Parliamentary Style Guide

Debaters are told the motion and their positions in the debate fifteen minutes before the start of the round and have that time to prepare.

At the end of a debate, judges rank the teams from 1st to 4th and also assign individual scores to the speakers.

While teams on the same side of the motion are arguing for the same thing, it is important to note that they are also competing against one another for position, and while they cannot contradict each other, they must have unique stances and arguments in the round, and they should not prepare together or share any information.

Speakers and Roles

Government	Opposition
Opening	
<p>Prime Minister (PM) Define the resolution Models the round Introduce the government case</p>	<p>Leader of the Opposition (LO) Introduce the opposition case Refutes the PM's points If there is going to challenges on the definition or model, the LO must mention it in their speech</p>
<p>Deputy Prime Minister (DPM) Continues opening government's case Refutes the LO's points Rebuilds the PM's points</p>	<p>Deputy Leader of the Opposition (DLO) Continues opening opposition's case Refutes the DPM's points Rebuilds the LO's points</p>
Closing	
<p>Member of the Government (MG) Extends the government's case (material brought up must be different than the material opening brought up) Refutes the DLO's points</p>	<p>Member of the Opposition (MO) Extends the opposition's case (material brought up must be different than the material opening brought up) Refutes the MG's points</p>
<p>Government Whip (GW) Summarizes the debate (themes) Refutes what the opposition has said throughout the round No new content may be introduced</p>	<p>Opposition Whip (OW) Summarizes the debate (themes) Refutes what the government has said throughout the round No new content may be introduced</p>

Points of Information

Points of information (POIs) are an opportunity for people on the opposing side of a debate to challenge a debater to deal with a particular issue or question during the middle four minutes of his or her speech, i.e. not during the first or last 30 seconds (protected time). POIs do not have to take the form of a question and they should last no more than ten seconds in duration.

POIs are required at this tournament, and debaters should try offer them throughout the debate. Speakers can decline POIs; however, all speakers are expected to take a minimum of one POI during their speech, and should be penalized for failing to do so.

Points of clarification may be offered during the Prime Minister's speech, in order to clarify any questions opposition teams might have about the model. Points of clarification should be announced as such by the person giving them, and it is considered bad form for the PM not to accept them. Neither POIs nor POCs can be offered by teams on the same side of a debate (ie, 2nd proposition cannot offer them to 1st proposition, or vice versa).

Structure and Style

It's important that all debaters, regardless of their position, strive to make the structure of their speeches clear and straightforward. There's no “right” way to structure a speech so long as the structure makes sense and is easy to follow— putting the model last in a PM speech isn't bad because you need a particular structure, but rather, because it means it's not clear what you're debating about until the end of your speech. In general, it's best to explain each of your arguments separately and make sure the transitions between your arguments are clear, because otherwise it's hard to follow the logic of each argument. Similarly, it's a good idea to separate your constructive argumentation from your refutation, or to point out very clearly where you're mixing and matching.

Speaking style, like structure, is a way to present your arguments more effectively. Style includes a lot of things: how you use body language and hand gestures, where you choose to alternate the pitch, rhythm, volume, or speed of your voice, whether you use casual or formal language, or humour, and more—this is nowhere near an exhaustive list. Style is a means by which debaters try to emphasize the important parts of their speeches and convey their arguments in the most persuasive and engaging way possible. If your argument is logical and coherent, but you sound like you don't believe it, you're not likely to win over your judges, so pay attention to your presentation.

BP Scoring Range

65 - 69 (below average, rare): This speech was poor. Stylistically it was weak and from the perspective of matter brought very little if anything to the round. Most debaters who receive this score will not have filled their time. There was an honest attempt made to debate, but it was generally ineffective and lacked any real structure. Scores in the higher end of this range will show some attempt to deal with the issues and the actual topic, but was still a poor speech. Judges must prepare to justify any score lower than 68.

70 - 74 (average): This speech was below average. Although the debater may have filled most of their time, there were significant gaps in both style and logic that detracted from the speech. While the debater had an understanding of the issues in the round, he/she did not do a great job addressing them. This debater likely did not offer any points of information, or answer or deal with any effectively.

75 - 79 (slightly above average): This speech was above average. The debater was competent and generally managed to identify the major issues in the debate, both in constructive arguments and in refutation. He/she presented sufficient matter that was generally well organized. Stylistically he/she was not brilliant but at least easy to listen to, and he/she at least offered or answered some points of information. The debater will likely have filled time, and generally did all they were supposed to do.

80 - 84 (very good, rare): This speech was generally very good. A score of 80% is the benchmark for someone who did everything they were supposed to, and did it very well. The debater filled all of their time, offered good points of information and answered them effectively, constructed relevant arguments in a logical and organized manner, refuted all arguments adequately, was stylistically excellent and/or had interesting and thought-provoking analysis. This debater did what they were called on to do and it was generally a polished speech.

85 – 90 (very rare): This speech was outstanding. The debater had excellent style and charisma, and brilliant analysis. He/She brought up arguments that were insightful, creative, relevant and well developed. This debater offered excellent points of information, and answered any that were asked confidently and effectively. All arguments were refuted systematically and thoroughly. Judges must be prepared to justify this score.