

Speech & Debate Supplemental Standards for English Language Arts

Introduction

Speech and Debate provides students an opportunity to develop skills in research, critical thinking, organization, persuasion and communication. Students must set aside personal bias and previous knowledge to objectively debate various sides of an issue and understand the complexities of the world in order to develop solutions that are workable and solve inherent problems. These skills are invaluable for college, career, and citizenship.

These standards were created knowing that Utah LEAs and schools structure their speech and debate courses differently based on individual needs and demands. Therefore, some of the standards may not be applicable to all speech/debate courses but should be used as guides. For example, some schools may have a speech/debate course that is *not* a competition class, while others may. Additionally, some schools may offer Speech/Debate I, II, and/or III, and thus, they may divide these standards across the various courses. Competition policies and guidelines are dictated by Utah High School Activities Association (UHSAA) and the Utah Debate Coaches Association (UDCA).

Speech and Debate courses are applied or advanced courses that may be used to fulfill up to 1 credit of the English Language Arts graduation requirement. These standards align with the Utah Core Standards for English Language Arts.

Strand 1: Research and Development. Students will read and collect research from textual evidence to prepare for debates.

S&D.1.1: Prepare for and present in a variety of *speech and debate formats* (see appendix).

S&D.1.2: Analyze current events and political atmosphere (e.g., domestic policy, economic policy, foreign policy, social climate).

S&D.1.3: Collaborate to define issues and develop strategies.

S&D.1.4: Research arguments to support substantive claims using a variety of primary and/or secondary sources including but not limited to historical, scientific, and technical texts:

- central idea
- discrepancies in content
- explanation for action or events
- points of view
- specialized vocabulary
- textual evidence

S&D.1.5: Evaluate researched texts for validity, reliability, and credibility of source, content, and/or author.

Strand 2: Fundamentals. Students will analyze and evaluate various speech and debate formats to develop fundamental knowledge for application.

S&D.2.1: Compare and contrast classical and contemporary philosophers and their contributions to speech and debate.

S&D.2.2: Explain the historical and contemporary role that speech and debate play in democratic society (e.g., diplomacy, government policy, justice system, politics).

S&D.2.3: Discuss ethical dilemmas and practices as found in various speaking topics, contentions, and presentations.

S&D.2.4: Demonstrate ethical practices in speech and debate (e.g., behavior, courtesy, verbal and nonverbal communication).

S&D.2.5: Demonstrate effective communication skills in speech and debate:

- Speaking (e.g., framing questions, responding to questions, speaking extemporaneously, using appropriate language)
- Listening (e.g., critical and attentive listening demonstrated by note taking, critiquing)
- Nonverbal communication (e.g., attire, eye contact, facial expressions, gestures, proximity)

S&D.2.6: Analyze a variety of speech and debate structures for task, audience, and purpose.

S&D.2.7: Use *speech and debate conventions* appropriately (see appendix A)

S&D.2.8: Use speech and debate *terminology* effectively (see appendix A)

S&D.2.9: Identify, develop, and argue stock issues:

- Harm
- Inherency
- Significance
- Solvency
- Topicality

S&D.2.10: Apply critical thinking skills when researching, preparing, and presenting arguments:

- Causal arguments
- Logical fallacies
- Source validity
- Topic and analysis support using strong evidence
- Challenge the status quo and current policy proposals, using a variety of arguments and rhetorical devices

Strand 3: Performance and Evaluation. Students will demonstrate fundamental speaking and debating skills and evaluate best practices.

S&D.3.1: Apply principles of ethical communication appropriate to context:

- Academic honesty
- Bias
- Communication responsibility
- Plagiarism
- Respect for diversity

S&D.3.2: Identify and adjust behaviors and arguments based on *evaluation paradigms* (See appendix).

S&D.3.3: Present arguments using clear and concise language.

S&D.3.4: Demonstrate the process of refutation and cross examination in debate settings and provide effective rebuttals.

S&D.3.5: Demonstrate the ability to give and receive constructive criticism to self and peers.

S&D.3.6: Develop presentation skills to convey complex ideas:

- Extemporaneous speech
- Formal register
- Persuasive techniques

S&D.3.7: Analyze the reduction of *communication barriers* (see appendix).

S&D.3.8: Demonstrate mutual respect in interpersonal communication.

S&D.3.9: Demonstrate appropriate critical, empathetic, appreciative, and reflective listening skills in formal and informal situations:

- Active listening behaviors
- False assumptions
- Loaded terms
- Note-taking
- Sarcasm

Appendix A

1.1: *Speech and debate formats* such as agent of action, ballot, burden of proof, card, claim, counter plans, data, fiat, flow, judge, presumption, resolution, status quo, stock issues, warrant.

2.7: *Speech and debate conventions* such as affirmative, closing, constructive, cross examination, direct examination, negative, rebuttal, opening.

2.8: *Speech and Debate Terminology* such as agent of action, ballot, burden of proof, card, claim, counter plans, data, fiat, flow, judge, presumption, resolution, status quo, stock issues, and warrant.

3.2: *Evaluation Paradigms* such as appearance, games player, policymaker, stock issues, tabula rasa.

3.7: *Communication barriers* such as adversarial mindset, bias, communication apprehension, environment, noise, nonverbal communication, perception, proxemics/spatial, reticence, semantics.

Appendix B

Strands	Connections to Utah Core ELA Standards
1	RI.1, RI.2, RI.8 W.1, W.2, W.4, W.7, W.8, W.9, W.10 SL.1, SL.2, SL.3, SL.4, SL.5, SL.6 L.3
2	R.1, R.6, R.7 W.7, W.8, W.9 SL.1, SL.2, SL.3, SL.4, SL.6 L.3
3	SL.1, SL.2, SL.3, SL.4, SL.6 L.3

Speech & Debate Supplemental Standards Public Review Summary

Total Responses: 6

Shared via English language arts, social studies, and library media mailing lists, and LEA leadership mail lists.

Speech & Debate Feedback

No change suggested, like as is: 4

Specific feedback submitted: 2

Participant Role

Educators: 6

Significant Feedback Responses

- The specific stock issues shouldn't be a standard for ALL debate students (just Policy debaters), same with the philosophers standard (that should just be for LD). It should be clear that a few of the standards are specific to a certain debate event. In my classroom, I teach debate basics, let students choose which event to specialize in, and then help them become experts in that event specifically. Also, I didn't see any standards that specifically mentioned rebuttals, I think that should be added.
- I'd like to see a standard or two about debate tournaments specifically.

Key Changes Made Based on Feedback

- Clarification about how these supplemental standards can be implemented based on LEA and school context were added to the introduction section to give educators the flexibility to apply standards to their local speech/debate context.
- Rebuttals were added to standard 3.4.
- In the introduction, a statement was added to indicate that debate tournament standards are dictated by the Utah High School Activities Association (UHSAA) and the Utah Debate Coaches Association (UDCA).