

## District-Specific Reminders

- Preliminary rounds will only have 1 judge, elimination rounds will be paneled. Please check all pairings and your ballot to make sure you have the correct number of judges in the room and the correct students ready to speak in front of you.
- Speech and prep times shall only follow NSDA standards:

### Big Questions

Time Limits		
Speech	Time Limit	Purpose
Affirmative Constructive	5 minutes	Present case
Negative Constructive	5 minutes	Present case
Question Segment	3 minutes	Alternate asking and answering questions
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes	Refute the opposing side's arguments
Negative Rebuttal	4 minutes	Refute the opposing side's arguments
Question Segment	3 minutes	Alternate asking and answering questions
Affirmative Consolidation	3 minutes	Begin crystallizing the main issues in the round
Negative Consolidation	3 minutes	Begin crystallizing the main issues in the round
Affirmative Rationale	3 minutes	Explain reasons that you win the round
Negative Rationale	3 minutes	Explain reasons that you win the round

\*Each team is entitled to three minutes of prep time during the round.

### Cross Examination (Policy)

Time Limits		
Speech	Abbreviation	Time Limit
1st Affirmative Constructive	1AC	8 minutes
Negative Cross-Examination of Affirmative		3 minutes
1st Negative Constructive	1NC	8 minutes
Affirmative Cross-Examination of Negative		3 minutes
2nd Affirmative Constructive	2AC	8 minutes
Negative Cross-Examination of Affirmative		3 minutes
2nd Negative Constructive	2NC	8 minutes
Affirmative Cross-Examination of Negative		3 minutes
1st Negative Rebuttal	1NR	5 minutes
1st Affirmative Rebuttal	1AR	5 minutes
2nd Negative Rebuttal	2NR	5 minutes
2nd Affirmative Rebuttal	2AR	5 minutes
Prep Time (each team)		8 minutes

## Lincoln Douglas

### Time Limits

Speech	Time Limit	Purpose
Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes	Present the affirmative case
Negative Cross-Examination	3 minutes	Negative asks questions of the affirmative
Negative Constructive	7 minutes	Present the negative case and refute the affirmative case
Affirmative Cross-Examination	3 minutes	Affirmative asks questions of the negative
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes	Refute the negative case and rebuild the affirmative case
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes	Refute the affirmative case, rebuild the negative case, and offer reasons that negative should win the round, commonly referred to as voting issues.
2nd Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes	Address negative voting issues and offer reasons for why the affirmative should win.

\*Each debater is also entitled to four minutes of prep time during the round.

## Public Forum

### Time Limits

Speech	Time Limit	Purpose
Team A Speaker 1 – Constructive	4 minutes	Present the team's case
Team B Speaker 1 – Constructive	4 minutes	Present the team's case
Crossfire	3 minutes	Speaker 1 from Team A & B alternate asking and answering questions
Team A Speaker 2 – Rebuttal	4 minutes	Refute the opposing side's arguments
Team B Speaker 2 – Rebuttal	4 minutes	Refute the opposing side's arguments
Crossfire	3 minutes	Speaker 2 from Team A & B alternate asking and answering questions
Team A Speaker 1 – Summary	3 minutes	Begin crystallizing the main issues in the round
Team B Speaker 1 – Summary	3 minutes	Begin crystallizing the main issues in the round
Grand Crossfire	3 minutes	All four debaters involved in a crossfire at once
Team A Speaker 2 – Final Focus	2 minutes	Explain reasons that you win the round
Team B Speaker 2 – Final Focus	2 minutes	Explain reasons that you win the round

\*Each team is entitled to three minutes of prep time during the round.

## NSDA Evidence Standards

- The [NSDA Unified Unified Manual](#)'s evidence standards for this tournament are copied below. Judges are expected to uphold these standards.

### Evidence Rules for Policy, Public Forum, Lincoln-Douglas, and Big Questions Debate

Evidence is one of the important components of arguments in debate rounds. All debaters involved are expected to act in an ethical manner that is in accordance with the rules. In keeping with the National Speech & Debate Association Code of Honor, all participants are expected to use and interpret evidence, evidence rules, and procedures in good faith.

The rules regarding use of generative artificial intelligence at the 2026 National Tournament can be found in the [National Tournament Operations Manual](#) section.

#### 7.1. Responsibilities of Contestants Reading Evidence

- Evidence defined.** Debaters are responsible for the validity of all evidence they introduce in the debate. Evidence includes, but is not limited to: facts, statistics, or examples attributable to a specific, identifiable, authoritative source used to support a claim. Unattributed ideas are the opinion of the student competitor and are not evidence.
- Oral source citation.** In all debate events, contestants are expected to, at a minimum, orally deliver the following when introducing evidence in a debate round: primary author(s)' name (last) and year of publication. **Any other information such as source, author's qualifications, etc., may be given, but is not required.** Should two or more quotations be used from the same source, the author and year must be given orally only for the first piece of evidence from that source. Subsequently, only the author's name is required. Oral citations do not substitute for the written source citation. The full written citation must be provided if requested by an opponent or judge.
- Written source citation.** To the extent provided by the original source, a written source citation must include:
  1. Full name of primary author and/or editor
  2. Publication date
  3. Source
  4. Title of article
  5. Date accessed for digital evidence
  6. Full URL, if applicable
  7. Author qualifications
  8. Page number(s)

- D. **Paraphrasing, authoritative source versus general understanding.** If paraphrasing is used in a debate, the debater will be held to the same standard of citation and accuracy as if the entire text of the evidence were read. Paraphrasing may be used to shorten or clarify one specific portion of an original source. It should not be confused with general summary of an entire book, chapter, study, etc., which may only be used for information that is widely considered to be common knowledge. Paraphrasing focuses on a single idea, while summary focuses on a general concept. For example, if a debater references a specific theory by a specific author, the debater must also be able to provide an original source as well as the specific text from the original source which is being paraphrased. If a debater were to reference social contract theory in general, that would not be an authoritative source that would require citation. However, if the debater references “John Locke’s Social Contract,” evidence would need to be available.
- E. **Ellipses prohibited.** In all debate events, the use of internal ellipsis (...) is prohibited **unless it is a replication of the original document.** Debaters may omit the reading of certain words; however, the text that is verbally omitted must be present in the text of what was read for opposing debaters and/or judges to examine. The portions of the evidence read including where the debater begins and ends must be clearly marked (as outlined in 7.1.G.2.).
- F. **Availability of evidence.**
1. In all debate events, for reference, any material (evidence, cases, written citations, etc.) that is presented during the round must be made available to the opponent and/or judge during the round if requested. When requested, the original source or copy of the relevant (as outlined in 7.1.F.2.) pages of evidence read in the round must be available to the opponent in a timely fashion during the round and/or judge at the conclusion of the round.
  2. **Original source(s) defined.** Understanding that teams/individuals obtain their evidence in multiple ways, the original source for evidence may include, but is not limited solely to, one of the following:
    - a. Accessing the live or displaying a copy of a web page (teams/individuals may access the internet to provide this information if requested).
    - b. A copy of the page(s) the evidence is on, the page preceding, and the page following, or the actual printed (book, periodical, pamphlet, etc.) source.
    - c. Copies or electronic versions of published handbooks (i.e., Baylor Briefs; Planet Debate, etc.).
    - d. Electronic or printed versions or the web page for a debate institute or the NDCA sponsored Open Evidence Project or similar sites.

3. Debaters, even if they have acquired the evidence other than by original research, are responsible for the content and accuracy of all evidence they present and/or read.

**G. Distinguishing between which parts of each piece of evidence are and are not read in a particular round.** In all debate events, debaters must mark their evidence in two ways:

1. Oral delivery of each piece of evidence must be identified by a clear oral pause or by saying phrases such as “quote/unquote” or “mark the card.” The use of a phrase is definitive and may be preferable to debaters. Clear, oral pauses are left solely to the discretion of the judge.
2. The written text must be marked to clearly indicate the portions read or paraphrased in the debate. See 7.2.B.3 for the penalty for failing to clearly indicate paraphrased text. In the written text the standard practices of underlining what is read, or highlighting what is read, and/or minimizing what is unread, is definitive and may be preferable to debaters. The clarity of other means of marking evidence is left to the discretion of the judge.

**H. Private communication prohibited.** Private, personal correspondence or communication between an author and the debater is inadmissible as evidence.

## **7.2. Definitions of Evidence Violations**

- A. “Distortion” exists when the textual evidence itself contains added and/or deleted word(s), which significantly alters the conclusion of the author (e.g., **deleting ‘not’**; **adding** the word **‘not’**). Additionally, failure to bracket added words would be considered distortion of evidence.
- B. “Non-existent evidence” means one or more of the following:
  1. The debater citing the evidence is unable to provide the original source or copy of the relevant pages when requested by their opponent, judge, or tournament official.
  2. The original source provided does not contain the evidence cited.
  3. The evidence is paraphrased but lacks an original source to verify the accuracy of the paraphrasing. If a student paraphrases from a book, study, or any other source, the specific lines or section from which the paraphrase is taken must be highlighted or otherwise formatted for identification in the round.
  4. The debater is in possession of the original source, but declines to provide it to their opponent upon request in a timely fashion (as outlined in 7.4.C.).
- C. “Clipping” occurs when the debater claims to have read the complete text of highlighted and/or underlined evidence when, in fact, the contestant skips or omits portions of evidence.

D. "Straw argument"

A "straw argument" is a position or argumentative claim introduced by an author for the purpose of refuting, discrediting or characterizing it. Reliance on a straw argument occurs in a debate round when a debater asserts incorrectly that the author supports or endorses the straw argument as their own position.

Note: A debater who acknowledges using a "straw argument" when verbally first read in the round, would **not** be misrepresenting evidence. However, if the debater fails to acknowledge the use of a "straw argument" and their opponent questions the use of such an argument, then that debater has committed an evidence violation.

### 7.3. Procedures for Resolving Evidence Violations

- A. Judges are responsible for resolving disputes between debaters regarding oral citations (7.1.B.); written source citations (7.1.C.); distinguishing between what parts of each piece of evidence are and are not read in a particular round (7.1.G.). When the judge(s) have such a dispute in the round, they must make a written note on the ballot or inform the tabulation committee of the dispute. They must do so particularly if it impacts the decision in the debate. **These decisions may not be appealed.**
- B. An appeal can only be made if the issue has been raised in the round with the exception of the issues listed in 7.3.C. Appeals may only be made if judge(s) have misapplied, misinterpreted, or ignored a rule.
- C. A formal allegation of violation of the evidence rules is permitted during the round only if the debater(s) allege a violation of 7.2.A. (distortion); 7.2.B. (nonexistent evidence); 7.2.C. (clipping). If a formal allegation of violation of these rules is made during a round, the following procedures must be followed: (see section 7.3.D. for procedures for making a formal allegation after the conclusion of the round):
  1. The team/individual alleging a violation must make a definitive indication that they are formally alleging a violation of an evidence rule.
  2. The team/individual alleging the violation of the evidence must articulate the specific violation as defined in 7.2.A.; 7.2.B. and/or 7.2.C.
  3. The judge should stop the round at that time to examine the evidence from both teams/individuals and render a decision about the credibility of the evidence.
    - a. If the judge determines that the allegation is legitimate and an evidence violation has occurred, the team/individual committing the violation will be given the loss in the round. Other sanctions may apply as well as articulated in 7.3.E.
    - b. If the judge determines that the allegation is not legitimate and that there is no violation, the team/individual making the challenge will receive the loss in the round.

Note: Teams/individuals may question the credibility and/or efficacy of the evidence without a formal allegation that requires the round to end. Teams/debaters may make in-round arguments regarding the credibility of evidence without making a formal allegation or violation of these rules. Such informal arguments about the evidence will not automatically end the round, and will be treated by the judge in the same fashion as any other argument.

- D. The tabulation committee is authorized to hear: (1) appeals, pursuant to 7.3.B., claiming that a judge ignored, misinterpreted or misapplied rules other than those from which no appeal is permitted pursuant to 7.3.A.; (2) appeals from a judge's decision, pursuant to 7.3.C., on a formal in-round allegation of distortion or non-existent evidence (note: **judge decisions regarding clipping may not be appealed**); and (3) a formal allegation of distortion or nonexistent evidence that is made for the first time after conclusion of the debate.
- E. The procedures for making an appeal or post-round formal allegation are as follows:
1. A coach or school-affiliated adult representative from the school(s) competing in the debate or a judge for the round must notify the tabulation committee of intent to submit an appeal or formal post-round allegation within 20 minutes of the end of the debate round. The 20-minute time period begins once the last ballot from all rounds (if flighted, both flights) has been collected by the tabulation committee.
  2. The coach must submit the post-round formal allegation to the tabulation committee within 10 minutes of the formal notification of the intent to appeal. The allegation must be in writing and articulate the specific evidence violation that is being challenged. The challenged contestant and coach will then be notified.
  3. If the tabulation committee determines that the original protest has merit, the coach or school affiliated adult and contestant(s) being challenged will be given 20 minutes to provide evidence denying, or to the contrary of the claim. If such evidence cannot be offered, the challenged debater(s) will be given the loss in the round and may be subject to additional penalties. If the tabulation committee determines that the allegation is not legitimate and that there is no violation, the team/individual making the challenge will receive the loss in the round.
  4. The tabulation committee has the discretion of extending the time limits for these actions if circumstances do not allow a coach or school-affiliated adult to be available within the prescribed time limits.
- F. The tabulation committee's decision to disqualify a student can be appealed by the coach or school affiliated adult. The following procedure should be followed:

1. The appeal must be submitted in writing to the tabulation committee within 10 minutes of the notification to disqualify.
  2. The tabulation committee will then submit the appeal to the national office referee(s). The committee will contact the national office referee once the written appeal has been received. Both sides will be able to provide written explanations and supporting evidence to defend their individual side.
  3. A decision will be rendered in a timely manner. The decision of the national office shall be final and cannot be appealed.
  4. No more than one round may occur between the round being protested and the decision of the national office referee.
  5. If the appeal is successful and the contestant(s) may now continue in the tournament, they will be put into the appropriate bracket for pairing the debates.
- G. If appeals are made in rounds in which multiple judges are being used, normal procedures should be followed to ensure each judge reaches their decision as independently as possible. Judges will be instructed not to confer or discuss the charge and/or answer to the potential violation. It will be possible for one judge to determine that an evidence violation has occurred and the other judge(s) to determine no violation has occurred. The tabulation committee will record the panel's decision in the same fashion as a normal win or loss; the outcome is thus tabulated in the same fashion as a round in which an evidence violation has not occurred. If the majority of the panel finds an evidence violation did not occur, no sanction may be applied to the team/individual charged with the violation. If the majority finds a violation has occurred, the appropriate penalties will be administered.

#### **7.4. Penalties for Evidence Violations**

- A. If the judge determines that an entry has violated one of the rules listed in 7.3.A. and 7.1.H. (oral citation, written citation, indication of parts of card read or not read, use of private communication), the judge may at their discretion disregard the evidence, diminish the credibility given to the evidence, take the violation into account (solely or partially) in deciding the winner of the debate, or take no action.
- B. If a debater(s) commits an evidence violation for “clipping” (7.2.C.), the use of a “straw argument” (7.2.D.), or the use of “ellipses” (7.1.E.), it will result in a loss for the debater(s) committing the evidence violation. The judge should award zero speaker points (if applicable), and indicate the reason for decision on the ballot.
- C. If debater(s) commits an evidence violation of “distortion” (7.2.A.) or have used “non-existent evidence” (as defined by 7.2.B.) the offending debater(s) will lose the debate and be disqualified from the tournament. However, if a debater(s) loses a round

due to “non-existent evidence” (7.2.B.) violation during an in-round formal allegation, but can produce it after the round within 20 minutes to the tabulation committee, the committee may decide not to disqualify the entry. The loss that was recorded by the judge may not be changed. If a post-round protest is levied against a debater for not providing evidence or an original source in round (non-existent evidence), and the judge confirms they in fact did not provide the evidence in a timely fashion when requested in round, the debater(s) will lose the round and be disqualified from the tournament. However, if a debater(s) produces the evidence within the post-round challenge period, that debater(s) may avoid disqualification.

- D. Evidence infractions violate the Code of Honor. Depending on the severity, an offense may result in notification of said offense to the contestant’s high school administration and chapter advisor, loss of all District and/or National Tournament merit points, including trophy and sweepstakes points for the offending student(s), and/or revocation of Association membership. These decisions would be left to the national office, and not the individual District Committee.

### **7.5. Tournament Adjustments**

- A. Under no circumstance will a tournament or part of a tournament be re-run because of a violation of these rules.
- B. In the case of a disqualification of a debater(s), all ranks and decisions of other debater(s) made prior to the start of the round being protested stand and no revision of past round ranks will take place. Penalties listed in 7.4. will be applied.
- C. When a round has been held between the round being protested and a final decision regarding the protest, the result of that round will be recorded as follows:
  - 1. If the protest is upheld, and a debater is disqualified, the opponent of the disqualified debater will receive a forfeit win.
  - 2. If the protest is overruled, and the protesting debater won the protested round, no revision of the result on the ballot will take place.
  - 3. If the protest is overruled, the protesting debater lost the protested round, and had no previous losses, no revision of the result on the ballot will take place.
  - 4. If the protest is overruled, the protesting debater lost the protested round, and had a previous loss, the opponent will receive a forfeit win regardless of the result on the ballot.

### **What should my ballots look like?**

In addition to logging your Reason For Decision (RFD), which will be visible to all students who participated in the round and their coaches, tabroom.com will also give you tabs to include feedback specifically for each team, which only they and their coaches can see.

**A Good Ballot**

**A Ballot That Needs Improvement**

<p>RFD</p> <p>Neg prevails because they argued that the U.S.'s surplus resources can help other nations seemed truer than that the U.S. would tend to give away resources that would help its own citizens.</p> <p>Much of the debate focused on vaccines, with competing fact claims about whether the U.S. had a shortage. Even if the U.S. does not have surplus vaccines, I was not convinced that the resolution requires the U.S. to treat people in other nations so equally as to seize vaccines from the shoulders of Americans. Neither side does the weighing on this issue, so it ends up being a wash. Ignoring vaccines, I took Neg's broader point as that the U.S. often has more resources than it needs. How exactly technological or other resources help other nations was not explained, but it is more convincing than Aff's assertion that other nations find the U.S. annoying (there are plenty of arguments for why the U.S. might be found annoying, but they were not made).</p> <p>Aff had an outsourcing jobs argument that I only heard in their first speech and then not again. If the argument on the value of jobs or more employment had more developed and weighed against the benefits of other nations getting surplus U.S. resources, or the surplus U.S. resources were argued to make U.S. enemies stronger, or that other nations' governments often use the U.S. resources that they receive to oppress their citizens, those would be some interesting ideas to directly take on Neg.</p>	<p>Neg won because they had a stronger argument</p> <p>Aff, make your argument clearer next time</p>
--	--