SYLLABUS

CODE: SPCH 106A ***TITLE:*** Argumentation and Debate

DIVISION: Arts & Communication ***DEPARTMENT:*** Performing Arts (Speech)

***COURSE DESCRIPTION*:** Students will sharpen their critical thinking skills through their participation in structured argument and debate. Through several debate formats students will learn how to research in support of an argument, compose sound and logical arguments, and present those arguments orally.

***PREREQUISITES*:** SPCH 115; ENGL 095, ENGL 097, or passing score in English on Basic Skills Test; or permission of instructor.

CREDITS: 3 ***LECTURE CREDITS:*** 3

REQUIRED MATERIALS: Freeley, Austin J. and David L. Steinberg. Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making, 11th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2005.

INTENDED COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES/COURSE GOALS (CORE COMPETENCIES):

- Students who complete this course will sharpen their critical thinking skills through their participation in structured argumentation and debate. (Communication, Critical Thinking)
- Through policy and value debate, moot court debating, extemporaneous argumentation, and persuasive speech, students will learn how to research in support of an argument, compose sound and logical arguments, and present those arguments orally. (Communication, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy)
- Students will be able to persuasively make a case and will begin to better understand the actual formal and informal arguments used daily. (Communication, Critical Thinking)

GRADING STANDARD:

Grading:

One-on-one debate	50
Evidence cards	30
Extemporaneous argumentation	30
Presidential debate critique	30
Moot court debate	50
Case manuscripts	30
Jury sentencing cases	30
Final exam	50
Total	300

Final Grade:

A	269-300
B+	260-268
B	239-259
C+	230-238
C	209-229
D	179-208
F	0-178

COLLEGE POLICIES:

For information regarding Brookdale's Academic Integrity Code, Student Conduct Code, or Student Grade Appeal Process, please refer to the **Student Handbook and BCC Catalog.**

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT/LABS: For additional support, please contact one of the Speech Department's Learning Assistants in LAH 301. Geoff Shields - 732-224-2171. Erica Osmond - 732-224-1883.

***NOTIFICATION FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES*:**

Brookdale Community College offers reasonable accommodations and/or services to persons with disabilities. Students with disabilities who wish to self-identify, must contact the Disabilities Services Office at 732-224-2730 or 732-842-4211 (TTY), provide appropriate documentation of the disability, and request specific accommodations or services. If a student qualifies, reasonable accommodations and/or services, which are appropriate for the college level and are recommended in the documentation, can be approved.

SYLLABUS

Course Schedule

Week 1	Course introduction, explanation of syllabus Persuasion, propaganda, and coercion (pp. 9-12) Applied and academic debate (pp. 15-22) Ethical debating (pp. 31-35) Stating the controversy/burdens of proof (pp. 37-51) Locating sources (pp. 78-91); library research session
Week 2	One-on-one format (pp. 325-326) Toulmin's Model (pp. 148-152) Requirements of prima facie and policy cases (pp. 186-187, 189-193) The affirmative policy case (pp. 200-202, 204-221) The negative policy case (pp. 225-226, 229-254) Discussion and selection of partners and topics for one-on-one debates Discussion of evidence cards
Week 3	Refutation (pp. 255-268) Note-taking in debate (pp. 262-263, 304-305) Viewing one-on-one debate Discussion of debate topics
Week 4	**One-On-One Debates (Evidence Cards due)**
Week 5	**One-On-One Debates (Evidence Cards due)**
Week 6	**One-On-One Debates (Evidence Cards due)** Discussion of value debating Discussion of team debating Propositions of value (pp. 49-50, 65-66, 187-189)
Week 7	**One-On-One Debates (Evidence Cards due)** The affirmative value case (pp. 202-204) The negative value case (pp. 227-229)
Week 8	**Extemporaneous Argumentation (Half of the class is researching)** **Presidential Debate Viewing – (Half will watch a debate)**
Week 9	**Extemporaneous Argumentation (two-on-two)** **Presidential Debate Viewing**
Week 10	Moot court debating (p. 17) Discussion of Moot Court Debates and Case Manuscripts
Week 11	**Moot Court Debates (Case Manuscripts due)**
Week 12	**Moot Court Debates (Case Manuscripts due)**
Week 13	**Moot Court Debates (Case Manuscripts due)**
Week 14	**Jury Sentencing Cases - (Half of the class is working in small groups)** **Final Exam - (Half will take the final exam)**
Week 15	**Jury Sentencing Cases** **Final Exam**

SYLLABUS

Assignments:

One-on-one Policy Debate: Students will select any policy-oriented topic and pair up to debate that topic with one student choosing the affirmative and the other choosing the negative. During the debate each student will be responsible for two speeches and a period of cross-examination of the other debater. Typical topic for this debate might be capital punishment, gun control, same sex marriage, legalization of marijuana, euthanasia, etc.

Evidence Cards: Each student will submit 50 authoritative quotations in support of his/her chosen side (affirmative or negative) of the one-on-one policy debate topic. At least 8 different sources must be used. Each card should contain a concise argument label used to categorize the card, a complete bibliographical citation, and the quotation (as will be explained in a course handout). The cards will be evaluated on format, how effectively the quotations support the arguments, and the credibility of the sources.

Extemporaneous Argumentation: Using the same format as that of the one-on-one debate (though less time), students will, with limited preparation, debate a topic assigned in class (one of a similar level of complexity as those chosen for one-on-one debates). One person will be assigned the affirmative side of the debate and one person the negative side. After one hour of preparation in the library, one-on-one debates will commence.

Critique of Presidential Debate: Each student will submit a 2-3 page analysis of a videotaped presidential debate, which will be shown in class. The analysis should address the following: 1) What were the two or three most significant issues in the debate? Why did you find those issues significant? 2) Which candidate was the most effective advocate in the debate? Why? 3) What non-argumentative factors (staging, gestures, expressions, prior expectations, use of humor, etc.) may have influenced your perception of the argumentative factors of the candidates?

Moot Court Debates: In this one-on-one debate, the two debaters serve as prosecutor and defender of someone accused of a crime. The cases for the debates emanate from actual legal cases (Charles Manson, Clarence Thomas, Kobe Bryant, John Scopes, etc.). Each prosecutor/defender pair chooses a case, and their arguments are based on research into the actual issues involved in the case.

Case Manuscript: Each student will submit a manuscript of the opening speech s/he presents in the Moot Court Debate. The speech should include a concise statement of the facts of the case with appropriate evidence for controversial factual statements, arguments relevant to the appropriate definition of the conduct of the accused, arguments suggesting any mitigating circumstances relevant to the case including testimony as to the character of the accused and/or the alleged victim, and arguments relative to the right of the jury to judge the accused. The case manuscript will be evaluated on its imaginativeness and logical coherence of arguments, the clarity of its organization, the credibility and variety of its sources, and its style.

Jury Sentencing Cases: In small groups, students will discuss and debate one fictitious case (each group will have a different case). After approximately one hour of debate and discussion, students will prepare 2-3 minute speeches explaining their chosen sentence and their rationale for that decision. Speeches will be evaluated on their communicativeness, their clarity of argument, their use of logic and reasoning, and their avoidance of logical fallacies.

Final Exam: For the final exam, students will receive a group of articles on two sides of an issue. Each student will have to write two argument briefs, one affirmative brief and one negative brief.