[New Haven Urban Debate League](http://udl.sites.yale.edu/)

**Curriculum, September 2017**

Opening note:

This year, UDL is shifting its focus more towards building skills rather than pushing content. It is our belief that teaching students how to debate is just important if not more than preparing them for what they will debate at the end of the month. This building of analytical, public speaking, flowing, and teamwork skills will serve them way past a debate round. We want to help students understand how to think and not what to think.

Additionally, we recognize that in such a divided and tumultuous political climate as we are experiencing in America, we see more than ever the importance of problem oriented discourse that is focused on the principles of ethos, logos, and pathos. As coaches, I believe we have an imperative to be sensitive to how our students may be experiencing the political climate. You are just as much a debate coach as you are a potential mentor and it’s important to care for the wellbeing of your students as well. Some of these topics may resonate with students in ways that it never has before. If you have any questions about how to maneuver this landscape, please reach out to Jane, Xavier, or Karnessia.

First semester tournament dates! Plug into your calendars now!

October 6, 2017

November 3, 2017

December 8, 2017

TOPIC: No topic for this month! Focus on skills and getting familiar with debate! October will be Artificial Intelligence!

Skill focus for the month: Public Speaking Comfort and getting everyone up to a semi equal understanding of basic structure of debate

**Week 1: Introduce yourself, expectation setting for beginner groups/ Flowing and debate skills for more advanced groups**

*Learning objectives: This week, you will be getting your students back in the business of debate! It’s important for the students to either 1) get to know each other or 2) reacquaint themselves with each other. This week focus on learning names and setting expectations for new students about what to expect in urban debate league. We want to dive in getting students getting comfortable with both listening and presenting which also included flowing practice.*

\*\*I am providing two introductory options for this week! Education should be flexible and catered to your group dynamics! I would recommend that you elect the first option introductory speeches with a newer, inexperienced group and a one-on-one refutation drill for a more experienced group.

**General Flow:**

**Minutes 0-20-** Allow students to trickle in and have them sign in with their emails so you can create a email panlist. Greet students and try to set up any materials you may need. Make sure to chat up with the advisor to start building a good relationship with them.

* Begin by introducing yourself, name, major, hometown, if you had debate experience… etc…
* Try to identify a student that has done urban debate league before and ask if they’d be willing to talk about their experience for 5 minutes! (this builds leadership development and impromptu speaking skills).
* Wrap up by explaining that UDL uses parliamentary style debate to discuss current events and engaged in debate.
* Ask the question, “What’s the difference between debating and arguing?

**Minutes 20-50-** Introductory speeches activity OR One-on-One refutation drill (\*\*\*See breakdown of activity below)

**Minutes- 50-60-**

* Wrap up!
* Preview for students that this is a weekly commitment. Tell them that next week, we will comb out the details of tournaments sign up, etc...

\*\*\*DRILLS BREAKDOWN

1. Introductory speeches -- recommended for newer more novice groups.

Drill: Introductory Speeches

Time allotment: ~30 minutes

Objectives By the end of this activity, each student will: • be introduced to delivering speeches in front of the class. • be introduced to using a clear structure to organize ideas. • get to know one another.

Time Allotment 30 minutes

Method: Assign each student in the class a partner.

A**llow 3 minutes to interview one another.** Students should ask one another about favorite foods, family members, hobbies, interests, personal history, etc. Each student should take notes on the partner’s responses to their questions. After each student has had a chance to both ask and answer questions, bring the class back together.

**Allow students 1 minute to prepare a 30-second speech introducing their partner to the class.** Encourage them to focus on four key things they would like to communicate about their partner and to clearly separate them in their speech. Each student should say “The first important thing about [student X] are her hobbies. Her hobbies are…..The second important thing about [student X] is….”

Each student gets up and says a 45 second speech about the person that they interviewed.

OR

2. One-on-One Refutation Drill (adapted from Atlanta urban debate league)

**Objectives By the end of this activity, each student will: • be introduced to recording**

**debate arguments in the format of a flow. • be introduced to responding to individual**

**arguments in a structured and understandable way.**

Time Allotment: About 10 minutes. Can be extended by repeating the activity with different student speakers.

Method: **Ask two students to volunteer to sit face to face in desks at the front of the classroom.** Try to get “old heads”--students that have participated in UDL before. **Ask the rest of the students to take out a piece of paper and pen in order to flow the debate they are about to observe.**  Each student should divide their paper into three columns in order to flow the debate. You may wish to flow the debate on the board as well to demonstrate to students the basic technique of flowing.

**The first student at the front of the class should make a simple, controversial statement** (e.g. “The collection of health records through Apple Health App is a benefit to society”).\*You can also come up with this less controversial statements, like “Uniforms are a wonderful school policy or froyo is better than ice cream\*. This time, we will start with a light topic but as the year progresses, we will have the students throw out more weighty statements. Guage the experience level and interests of your group and go from there! The students in the class should write this statement in the first column of their paper.

Give the student about two minutes (timed). **The second student should come up with 3 or 4 arguments against the proposal and deliver them with clear distinction between the arguments** “My first argument is…, My second argument is…, My third argument is…..) The students in the class should write each of these points, in order, one beneath the other, in the second column of their paper.

**The original speaker should answer each of the second speaker’s arguments one by one**. The original speaker should reference her opponent’s arguments and then offer at least two responses. For example: “Her first argument is… One. [Speaker’s first response] Two. [Speaker’s second response] Her second argument is… One [Speaker’s first response] Two [Speaker’s second response].” The students in the class should write the original speaker’s responses in the third column of their paper next to each of the second speaker’s arguments.

As the coach, flow the arguments yourself and review your flow. Ask students to recall arguments and responses. Start with having the students being descriptive and then move onto analysis.

**Week 2: Establish Debate Structure and General Argument structure**

*Learning objectives: This week students is the week of structure. Students will come to understand the structure of parliamentary debate and the basic structure of the argument. This may feel redundant for old students so it may be helpful to involve more experienced debaters as wise sage figures in the classroom. It’s important to get everyone up to speed this week.*

**General Flow:**

**Minutes 0-7**- Introduce yourself again for new students. Plug the October 6 tournament and tell them that sign up will happen at the end of class! Assuage fears etc.

**7-14**: Rapid fire Mini lecture on format of UDL debate: It may be helpful to print out time and speech information as a handout and pass it out to the students about the format. Try not to take too long and tell them that you will email this information to them so that they don’t have to write everything down.

\*\*more information on debate format further down\*

**15-25**- Introduction of claim, data, warrant impact structure to building arguments.

C-W-I

**25-50**- Intro to arguments activity

**50-60** Wrap up and get tournament sign ups!

\*\*ADDITIONAL Information on debate format (Explanation adapted from past UD(Explanation adapted from past UDL curriculums)

(Explanation adapted from past UDL curriculums)

\*\*\*\*Explain the broad stroke structure of a debate round:

A motion-A thing that the government believes or wants to happen (THBT/THW)

Examples of motions:

a. THBT sanctions are never justified

b. THW lead a military action against the Islamic State

c. THW invade North Korea

d. THBT the U.S. ought to join the International Court of Justice.

ii. Two sides, the government and the opposition- the people who believe the motion and the ones who don’t

go through very quickly what the Gov’t and Opposition would respectively be advocating for--what would their position be?

Times

o PM: 4 minutes

o LO: 5 minutes

o MG: 5 minutes

o MO: 5 minutes

o LOR: 2 minutes

o PMR: 3 minutes

\*\*\*\*Quick explanation of CWI

But how does the judge decide between the two sides? Arguments!

a. Explain what an argument is-- i. An 1. independent, 2. complete reason to believe something.

b. Components of an argument:

i. Claim--what you are saying is true about the world.

ii. Warrant--why what you are saying is true actually is true; evidence.

iii. Impact--why people should care that what you are saying is true.

c. Examples of arguments, on THW invade North Korea.

i. Claim: Invading North Korea would end serious human rights abuses.

Warrant 1: North Korea is an authoritarian police state with concentration camps, hero-worship of the Kim family, and an atrocious record of human rights violations.

2. Warrant 2: North Korea’s military is weaker than ours, so we could easily do it.

a. Impact: By invading North Korea and displacing the current regime, we could materially and drastically improve the lives of millions. This is worth doing.

ii. Claim: Invading North Korea would harm US foreign policy goals.

1. Warrant: China and North Korea have a strong relationship.

2. Warrant: China has a great deal of sway in that region of the world.

3. Warrant: China probably wouldn’t like us invading one of their allies.

a. Impact: We will be much less capable of getting anything done in Asia than we were before.

iii. Have the class generate new arguments (probably call on students when they raise their hands so it isn’t a ton of people calling out at once).

d. The concept of a case: i. 2 to 4 arguments grouped together. The government and opposition each have their own case.

\*\*\*\*Intro to arguments activity

Objectives By the end of this activity, each student will: • be introduced to basic skills of argumentation. • be introduced to basic vocabulary and technique of claims and refutations.

Method Have students take a small piece of paper (like an index card) and write two controversial statements on them that could be about any topic (for example: Prisoners should be able to vote, or X musical artist stole his material from Michael Jackson).

Collect all the index cards, and put them in a pile face down. Get the class out of their seats and have them form three lines - claim, warrant, and refutation. The first student in each line should step to the front of the class, and the first person from the claim line should choose a card and read one of the controversial statements (claims).

Then, the first person from the warrant line should give a warrant or reason why the claim is correct (for example: Prisoners should be able to vote because otherwise there are few protections for their rights, or X musical artist stole his material from Michael Jackson because he sampled a beat).

Finally, the first person from the refutation line should say “I disagree because ...” and then give a reason for the refutation (for example, prisoners already have means to claim grievances and they gave up claim to some rights when they committed a crime, or X musical artist only sampled Michael Jackson on one song and the rest is all original).

When they have finished, the person from the claim line should go the the warrant line, the warrant line to the refutation line, and the refutation line to the claim line. Then, the next people in line should pick a card and start.

We would love constructive feedback! Fill out the form please!

<https://goo.gl/forms/QhXVJo6olRn9Z3v42>