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**To the Club Debating Coordinator.**

* **As the Rotary Club Debating Coordinator (RCDC)** you are the only contact between Rotary and your debating team(s). The District debating chairman does not have any contact with individual teams, their schools or the coaches
* **Club Coordinator’s Package.** This letter is part of the Club Coordinator’s Package which is usually supplied by email. You need to ensure that the coach of each team that you are sponsoring has a copy of the complete package. The relevant documents are listed on the face-sheet of the package.
* **The draw.** The last page of the package will be the draw (when it is finalised). See below for completion dates for each round and the topics.
* **Administration and Rules.** Part of the package is the ‘*Administration and Rules*’ document. All coordinators need to familiarise themselves with the contents of this document as it will provide the answer to most questions that arise. If not, please contact the district chairman, whose details appear at the foot of the package cover sheet and below.
* **Adjudicators.** As soon as possible you need to produce or acquire a list of suitable adjudicators because it is part of your role to provide adjudicators for each debate, (except the final held in conjunction with the Rotary District Conference). The previous RCDC in your club will be able to provide a list of names and contact details. Failing that, you will need to use your own initiative to compile your own list. Some possibilities include members of debating groups or public speaking clubs such as Rostrum and Toastmasters, coaches of debating in other schools, prominent citizens etc. It is important to note that debating is not public speaking, and that it has a special set of protocols. Because of this you need to ensure than the adjudicators you choose are familiar with debating as distinct from public speaking. The coach of your own school may be able to suggest suitable adjudicators.  
  There is an excellent publication called *Taking the Initiative:* [*A Guide to Debating and Public Speaking*](https://www.artsunit.nsw.edu.au/sites/default/files/Taking_the_Initiative.pdf)produced by the NSW Education Department that can be downloaded from <https://www.artsunit.nsw.edu.au/sites/default/files/Lloyd%20Cameron/2014%20Taking%20the%20Initiative.pdf> In some cases it would be wise to suggest to some potential adjudicators that they read that publication. There is also a concise summary attached to the adjudication sheets.
* **Rounds 1 to 3**

Round One – to be completed by 24 June (end of Term 2 in Vic)

***“That a second language should be compulsory in schools”***

Round Two – to be completed by 16 Sep (end of Term 3 in Vic)

***“That the media worship the wrong heroes”***

Round Three – to be completed by 18 November 2015

***“That private schools create divisions in society”***

* **Feedback and queries**. The debating committee is happy to receive feedback about the debating competition. Please be assured that we will deal with any issues that arise as quickly as possible.
* **Thank you** for undertaking the role of debating coordinator for your club. If you plan ahead you will find that it is not a difficult task, but one that is very satisfying.

Regards,

Nigel Liggins,

District Debating Chair.

Administration and Rules.

1. Teams, competitors and draw

1.1 A debating team entering the Ian Murphy Memorial Debating Competition will represent both the Secondary School attended by the team members and the sponsoring Rotary Club

1.2 A team will consist of three students, who must be enrolled school students at the time of each debate.

1.3 There is no restriction upon the number of teams a Club may nominate, but in the event of there are too many nominations for the competition in any particular year, clubs nominating more than one may be required to reduce this to one (by organising a preliminary debate between their nominated teams?)

1.4 In order to minimize travel, the teams in the competition may be divided into ‘East’ and ‘West’ or North and South and the draw will be done in two halves. The final will thus be between the winners of each half.

2. Schedule for the competition

2.1 The competition will be conducted as a ‘knock-out’ draw amongst the teams nominated by the Clubs.

2.2 The competition will commence as soon as is practical after Conference (March/April) in each year and will conclude with the Grand Final at Conference in the following year. The semi-finals will be held as soon as possible after school commences in February with the absolute deadline being three clear weeks before Conference.

2.3 Deadlines for all other rounds will be nominated by the District Debating Chairman, and Clubs are required to adhere to these, or seek an extension from the Chairman. In the event that deadlines are exceeded and no extension is granted, the Chairman may declare a forfeit on behalf of one of the Clubs in that round, or he may declare both Clubs to have forfeited, in which case the Club which would have debated the winner of that round will effectively receive a bye in the following round.

2.4 Forfeit in the final. If a team reaches the final and then forfeits, the team beaten by that team in the semi-finals will take the place of the forfeiting team. If this is not possible, the District Debating Chairman will make arrangements for another team to participate in the final, having regard for paragraph 1.4 above. The objective of this rule is to ensure that there is a debate at the District conference.

3. Arranging each debate

3.1 The Club sponsoring the ‘top’ team in each round is considered to be the ‘host’ club. It is the responsibility of the host club to initiate arrangements for each debate.

3.2 Venues for each debate will be arranged by mutual consent of the two Clubs. In cases where Clubs are far apart, they are encouraged to find a Club at some intermediate location, which is prepared to host the Debate.

If problems arise, the District Debating Chairman should be advised without delay so that matters may be resolved with minimum disruption to the rest of the draw.

3.3 As a general principle, sponsoring Clubs should provide transport for team members and their coach especially when travelling away from home.

Which team has the affirmative argument?

3.4 On the draw, the team occurring first, or above in each round (i.e. the ‘top’ team), will have the affirmative, except in the semi-finals and final. In those two cases, the District Debating Chairman will make a draw, and the outcome will be notified with the topics.

It is the responsibility of each Club’s debating coordinator to liaise with his counterpart in the opposing Club and with the Coach of the debating team for each Debate to ensure that there is no ambiguity concerning which team has the affirmative and which team has the negative.

It reflects very badly upon Rotary’s organisational skills if two teams arrive, both having prepared the same side of the debate.

4. Conduct of each Debate

4.1 A lectern should be provided and the teams will sit at either side of it, with the affirmative team on the right when facing the audience. Each table should be large enough to allow notes and reference material to be accommodated. A jug of water and three glasses should also be provided for each team.

4.2 At the commencement of the Debate, the Chairman will announce the topic, the two teams and who will take the affirmative and the negative.

4.3 As each speaker comes to the lectern, the Chairman will introduce him/her, which side they represent and whether they are first, second or third speaker.

Microphones

4.4 If there is a microphone, the Chairman should adjust it for each speaker. As a general principle, microphones and public address systems should be avoided unless acoustics or other factors render them necessary. This is because many experienced debaters prefer not to have their movements restricted by a microphone.

Notwithstanding the above, microphones will always be necessary at the Grand Final because of the large audience.

Props

4.5 The only material, which may be used in the debate, are notes, dictionaries, documents and other references such as newspaper cuttings, etc, which are to be tabled. No other props are permitted.

Timing in the debates.

4.6 All three debaters on each side will speak for FOUR minutes.

4.7 In fairness to all, the Chairman should ensure that a roughly equal interval be allowed between debaters, and that this interval should be at least one and a half minutes. This is to allow adequate and equal opportunity for teams to prepare rebuttal.

4.8 Timekeepers will give a loud SINGLE warning bell at THREE minutes and TWO BELLS at FOUR minutes. These should be struck firmly and immediately damped so that the speaker and the adjudicators have no difficulty in hearing them, while at the same time providing a minimum of disruption to the speaker’s delivery.

4.9 Time-keepers should prepare a report for the adjudicators showing the speaking time of each speaker.

This is particularly important in the case of debaters who finish short, since the adjudicators will not usually be aware of how much they were short.

Notification of result

4.10 It is the responsibility of the club sponsoring the winning team in each debate to inform the District Debating Chairman of the result without delay.

5. Administration

5.1 It is the responsibility of the District Debating Coordinator to prepare a package of material each year covering the organisation, rules and conduct of the competition. The package will be titled ‘Club Coordinator’s Package’

5.2 When the package is received each sponsor Club must supply a copy of the package and the draw (received separately) to the school or whoever is responsible for coaching the debating team at the earliest possible time, so that they are aware of all aspects of the competition and can plan accordingly.

Costs

5.3 Host clubs are expected to pay the meal costs of the three team members, their coach and two adjudicators.

Visiting clubs are expected to pay the same, but for only one adjudicator. Parents and supporters are normally expected to pay their own costs.

5.4 In cases where a third Club is hosting the debate, both visiting Clubs are expected to pay their respective costs as above so that the third club does not incur any costs.

6. Adjudication

6.1 It is desirable to have three adjudicators for each debate, with two arranged by the host club and one by the visiting club. If three cannot be arranged, it is permissible (but undesirable) to use a single adjudicator.

6.2 This ruling may be varied only by mutual consent of the two Clubs so that, for example, the ‘home’ Club may be required to provide all adjudicators.

6.3 Where at all possible, adjudicators should be found with the least possible connection with either the sponsor Club or the team. They should certainly not be staff members from the debaters’ school or members of either sponsor club, or their families.

6.4 In the case of a result where there is not a unanimous decision amongst the adjudicators, the result will NOT be decided by the summation of their scores.

In such cases, a decision will be reached either by further discussion so that the decision becomes unanimous or if that cannot be reached, then by a majority decision by the adjudicators.

6.5 Adjudicators are to mark independently of each other, and should sit apart from each other during the debate so that they cannot see each other’s marking sheets.

In order for this process to function successfully, even numbers of adjudicators should be avoided, and the Chairman must ensure that the adjudicators are fully aware that the result may not be determined by a simple summation of their scores.

Marking sheets

6.6 Copies of the marking sheets are enclosed with the Club Coordinator’s Package. These replace all previous marking sheets. Each adjudicator will be provided with a set of marking sheets and in order to maintain consistency of scores, it is desirable that only those sheets be used.

Updates to the Rules.

PP Jim Maden

April 1991

Revised: Gordon Ferguson

August 2000 (Section 3.5)

Revised: Bill Whitehead

May 2008 (Sections 1.3, 3.6 and 5.1)

Sequence altered and headings added

April 2014. Ela Tually.

Paragraphs 1.1, 1.4 and 2.4 added

February 2015. Geoff Tually.

Electronic Version 2016.

**Conducting a Debate**.

The Club Debating Coordinator needs to consider the following:

1. The tables should be arranged thus:

Negative

Affirmative

Lectern

Audience

1. The debate should be conducted either before or after the meal.
2. If the meal is to precede the debate try to have the debaters and the adjudicators fed first.
3. Each adjudicator is to be provided with a set of adjudication sheets. Ideally, each adjudicator should also be provided with a table. They should be spread throughout the room, or at the rear.
4. Time keepers need to be allocated and provided with a Time Keeper’s Sheet. A bell and stopwatch need to be available. If a mobile phone is used as a stopwatch, make sure that its operation is practised.
5. The chairman needs a list of team members of each team in order of speaking and also the names of the adjudicators.
6. The chairman should proceed as follows:
   * 1. Welcome everyone (unless done earlier)
     2. Explain that this is heat x in a series of four, with the final being held at the District Conference
     3. Introduce teams, affirmative first, naming schools and debaters.
     4. Introduce the adjudicators.
     5. Announce the topic.
     6. Explain the timing; a single warning gong at 3 minutes and a double gong at 4 minutes. Ask for a demonstration of the gongs. Ensure that they are loud enough.
     7. Ensure that the adjudicators are ready and then introduce speakers in order; beginning with the 1st affirmative speaker.
     8. Allow a consistent 1½ - 2 minutes between speakers.
     9. After the final speaker, ask timekeeper to give times to the adjudicators and then explain that the adjudicators will withdraw to decide the winner.
     10. When the adjudicators return invite their spokesperson to deliver the adjudication.
     11. Thank the debaters, their coaches, the supporters and the adjudicators.

**Time Sheets.**

Thank you for offering to act as timer for this debate.

It is helpful to have another person to assist you.

You need to have a bell, pen and a stopwatch. If a mobile phone is used as a stopwatch,

ensure that it can be operated effectively.

Each speech is to be of 4 minutes duration. There is to be a single warning bell at 3 minutes

and a double gong at 4 minutes.

After each speech there should be a consistent period of between 11/2 – 2 minutes between

speeches. Indicate to the chairman when this time has elapsed.

At the end of each speech, write the duration on the table below.

At the end of the debate, hand this sheet to the adjudicators.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Affirmative** | Duration | **Negative** | Duration |
| 1st Affirmative |  | 1st Negative |  |
| 2nd Affirmative |  | 2nd Negative |  |
| 3rd Affirmative |  | 3rd Negative |  |

Thank you for helping.

**Notes on Adjudication**

Thank you for offering to perform the very important task of adjudicating this debate.

**Attached are the sheets to be used**.

They are arranged so that the adjudicator can assess speakers in pairs and then decide which team is in front after each pair of speakers. The extra spaces at the bottom of each sheet can be used to emphasise points that might be raised in the adjudication summary.

Whilst there are certain protocols that apply in debating, the most important thing to consider is what a reasonable listener might conclude after listening to the debate. This principle is succinctly stated on page 51 of ‘*Taking the Initiative’*,\* a handbook on debating published by the Department of Education and Training in New South Wales. The authors say:

“While the various rules of debating are important to know, minor infractions should not form the basis of a decision. Such rules exist to ensure that the Matter a team presents is as effective as possible, and any mistake a team makes in following those rules is only as important as the impact that mistake has on the case they present.”

Some points that can be a source of confusion:

* Three great speeches by one team do not constitute a debate. Teams must demonstrate that they have listened to their opponents and have been able to effectively rebut the arguments put forward. A team with ineffective rebuttal should not win the debate.
* Any statement made is considered to be true unless it is effectively rebutted. It is not the adjudicator’s role to point out errors of fact; - it is the opposing team’s job.
* The final speaker should not introduce new lines of argument. However, new material put forward as part of rebuttal is allowed.
* It is important that speakers make good use of the time allocated. Being seriously under or over time is a method error.

**The person who delivers the adjudication should be as positive as possible, pointing out the good points and suggesting aspects that could be improved in future debates.**

‘*Taking the Initiative’* is an excellent publication that can be downloaded as a .pdf file from:

<https://www.artsunit.nsw.edu.au/sites/default/files/Lloyd%20Cameron/2014%20Taking%20the%20Initiative.pdf>

Date: Sheet 1

**Adjudication Sheet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic: | |
| 1st Speaker School: | 2nd Speaker School: |
| Definition: | Definition: |
| Allocation: 1st spkr. 2nd spkr. | Allocation: 1st spkr. 2nd spkr. |
| Team Line?  Case clear?    Method score /20 | Team Line?  Case clear?    Method score /20 |
| Arguments:  Matter score /40 | Rebuttal/Arguments:  Matter score /40 |
| Effectiveness of delivery:  Manner score /40 | Effectiveness of delivery:  Manner score /40 |
| Total: /100 | Total: /100 |
| Commendable aspects: | Commendable aspects: |
| Weaknesses: | Weaknesses: |
| Which of these two speakers was more convincing?  Why? | |

Sheet 2

**Adjudication Sheet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3rd Speaker | 4th Speaker |
| Rebuttal/Arguments:  Matter score /40 | Rebuttal/Arguments:  Matter score /40 |
| Effectiveness of delivery:  Manner score /40 | Effectiveness of delivery:  Manner score /40 |
| Teamwork, continuity, consistency, use of time  Method score /20 | Teamwork, continuity, consistency, use of time  Method score /20 |
| Total: /100 | Total: /100 |
| Commendable aspects: | Commendable aspects: |
| Weaknesses: | Weaknesses: |
| Which of these two speakers was more convincing? Why?  Who is winning the debate at this stage and by how much? | |

Sheet 3

**Adjudication Sheet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5th Speaker | 6th Speaker |
| Rebuttal/Summary  Matter score /40 | Rebuttal/Summary    Matter score /40 | |
| Effectiveness of delivery:  Manner score /40 | Effectiveness of delivery:  Manner score /40 |
| Teamwork, continuity, consistency, use of time  Method score /20 | Teamwork, continuity, consistency, use of time, no new material  Method score /20 |
| Total: /100 | Total: /100 |
| Commendable aspects: | Commendable aspects: |
| Weaknesses: | Weaknesses: |
| Which of these two speakers was more convincing?    Who won the overall debate and why? | |
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