

Dear Parli Community,

The annual National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence recognizes the finest competition in NPDA parliamentary debate, and it is with great pleasure that we invite you to the 2026 National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence National Championship tournament to be held in-person at Mercer University on March 6-8.

January 1: Topic Paper submissions open

January 11: First Round Bid Invitations
(conclusion of Mound High)

*To accept a bid teams who were extended an invitation should email NPTEBoard@gmail.com with the subject line “[Team Name] Accepts”

January 17: Topic Paper Submissions Closes

January 18: Topic Paper Voting Opens

January 25: Topic Votes Due, First Round Bid Applications Process Opens

*Invitations Extended to all teams that have accumulated 15 points, but have not yet accepted an invitation to the NPTE. Teams that do not meet the above criteria or are applying for a hybrid partnership or partial points partnership may submit applications for a bid to

NPTEBoard@gmail.com

*To accept a bid teams who were extended an invitation should email NPTEBoard@gmail.com with the subject line “[Team Name] Accepts”

February 7: Final Wording for Topics Released, Invitation Acceptance Due, First Round bids

Accepted (all 15 point teams or 16 teams total, whichever is smaller)

February 7: Second Round Bids Open (up to 24 team entry cap accepted)

February 22: End of Point Accumulation,

February 23: Second Round Bids Acceptance Window Closes, Registration Opens [insert tabroom link]

February 24: Draw Show

February 25: Contingency Bids open (up to entry cap of 24)

*To submit a contingency bid teams should email NPTEBoard@gmail.com with a request to be considered under one of the following:

Host Bids, Board Bids, Plus-One Bids, Emergency Bids

February 27: Enrollment Certification and Program Responsibility Forms due, Tournament Registration Closes

March 6: Tournament Check-In

March 6-8: NPTE Tournament

The NPTE Board is ready to host a great tournament of outstanding competition. We hope to see you in Macon!

Sincerely,
NPTE Board

President: Baker Weilert-Pekar, Director of Forensics, Whitman College

Secretary, Treasurer, Tournament Director: Dr. Steven Farias, Director of Forensics, University of the Pacific

Vice President: Paul Villa, Director of Forensics, Diablo Valley College

At-Large Member: Alex Li, Coach, Parliamentary Debate at Berkeley

At-Large Member, Tabulation Director: Brent Nicholson, Head Debate Coach, McKendree University

TOURNAMENT ADMINISTRATION

Participants agree to abide by the NPTE guidelines while at the tournament. Rules for qualifying and the rules for the tournament can be found at the bottom of this document.

Tournament entry will be at: [insert link]

Be sure to enter your judge's judging philosophy as you register your teams. If you have any difficulty entering the tournament, please contact Brent Nicholson (Tabroom Director) Head Coach of Debate McKendree University at banicholson@mckendree.edu or (314) 221-7432 or Dr. Steven Kalani Farias (Tournament Director), Director of Forensics University of the Pacific at sfarias@pacific.edu or (209) 471-6470.

Enrollment Verification forms for each student attending the NPTE are due on **February 27, 2026**. The form can be found at the bottom of this document. Note: If a student attended a different school during the fall and wishes to receive points for the fall semester, you will need to complete and email a separate form from that school.

Each program must also submit the Program Responsibility form. That form is also due on **February 27, 2026**. That form can be found at the bottom of this document.

Enrollment Verification Forms and Program Responsibility Forms should be sent to the NPTEboard@gmail.com

Note: The NPTE expects excellence in the behavior of our participants during the tournament. As part of your responsibility, you are expected to receive and maintain written notice from each debater, coach, judge, and observer associated with your program that they understand and will follow the NPTE Expectations noted in the bylaws below.

ANTI-HARASSMENT & VIOLENCE POLICY

The NPTE worked closely with NPDA over the last couple of years to ensure a comprehensive harassment policy to protect students and coaches alike and promote a safe space for competition. The NPTE policy can be found at the end of this document.

The NPTE Board invites community members to serve as the Sexual Harassment Officer. If you are interested, please email the npTEboard@gmail.com indicating your willingness to serve in this position. The Board will update the community once someone has been selected.

ENTRY FEES

The following fees will be assessed as of **February 27, 2026**.

Each College and University entering the Championship Tournament must be a member school of the NPTE. Membership is \$50.00 per year. Additionally, each school is required to pay a \$100.00 fee to support the administrative costs of the tournament. Online payment options will be available prior to the tournament.

School Entry Fee: \$100.00	\$ 100.00
NPTE Membership Fee 2025-2026: \$50.00	\$ 50.00
Team Registration Fee: \$150.00 per team	\$ _____
Hospitality Fee: \$60.00 per person (including judges and coaches)	\$ _____
Hired Judging Fee: \$900.00 per uncovered team	\$ _____

Observer Fee:

JUDGING REQUIREMENTS

Each school must bring one qualified judge for each team that qualifies to and attends the NPTE. Judges must submit judging philosophies. As stated in the fees section, you may hire a judge from the NPTE for \$900.00, but we would rather have your judges than your money!

Hired Judge Outlay:

Hotel: \$375.00

Payment: \$450.00

Transportation/Airfare: \$230.00

Just as with students, judges are also required to adhere to the guidelines under the NPTE bylaws.

TOURNAMENT SCHEDULE (E.S.T.)

March 6, 2026

		2:00	Release Elim 1 Pairings
9:30	Registration	2:15-2:30	Topic/Side Choice
10:15	Release Round 1 Pairings	2:30	Prep Start: Elim 1
10:30-11:00	Topic/Side Choice - Explanation	4:00	Ballot Due to Tabroom
11:00	Prep Start: Round 1		
12:30	Ballots Due to Tabroom	4:15	Release Elim 2 Pairing
		4:15-4:30	Topic/Side Choice
12:30	Lunch Break	4:30	Prep Start: Elim 2
		6:15	Ballots Due to Tabroom
2:00	Release Round 2 Pairings		
2:15-2:30	Topic/Side Choice		
2:30	Prep Start: Round 2		
4:00	Ballots Due to Tabroom		
4:15	Release Round 3 Pairings		
4:15-4:30	Topic/Side Choice		
4:30	Prep Start: Round 3		
6:15	Ballots Due to Tabroom		

March 7, 2026

8:30	Release Round 4 Pairings
8:30-8:45	Topic/Side Choice
8:45	Prep Start: Round 4
10:30	Ballots Due to Tabroom
10:45	Release Round 5 Pairings
10:45-11:00	Topic/Side Choice
11:00	Prep Start: Round 5
12:45	Ballots Due to Tabroom
12:45	Lunch Break

March 8, 2026

8:30	Release Elim 3 Pairings
8:30-8:45	Topic/Side Choice
8:45	Prep Start: Elim 3
10:30	Ballots Due to Tabroom
10:45	Release Elim 4 Pairings
10:45-11:00	Topic/Side Choice
11:00	Prep Start: Elim 4
12:45	Ballots Due to Tabroom
12:45	Lunch Break
2:00	Release Elim 5 Pairings
2:00-2:30	Topic/Side/Judge Choice
2:30	Prep Start: Elim 5
4:15	Ballot Due to Tabroom
5:00	Awards
7:00	Social at Venue TBD

TOURNAMENT LOCATION AND DETAILS

The tournament will be hosted in-person at Mercer University in Macon GA, March 6-8, 2026.

CAMPUS MAP & BUILDING USAGE

We will be using Knight Hall and Groover Hall for the tournament . Meals on campus will be available at the Connell Student Center. Locations are subject to change based on tournament need.

<https://www.mercer.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/merc-macon-campus-map.pdf>

SMOKING

The University has adopted as its goal that of achieving an environment as close to tobacco-free as possible. The following guidelines are designed to achieve a relatively tobacco-free environment on the Mercer campuses: Smoking is prohibited in all indoor locations. All buildings on all campuses are tobacco and smoke-free environments. This includes vapor/electronic smoking devices. Smoking is prohibited within 25 feet of all building entrances, air intakes, and windows. Residence hall public spaces (lobbies, hallways, lounges, recreation areas, restrooms) and rooms are tobacco-free. Use of smokeless tobacco products is prohibited in all University facilities, except in individual residence hall rooms and apartments.

ALCOHOL

Mercer is a “dry” campus. No alcohol is allowed on campus even for people over the age of 21. Please note: there are several independent breweries in downtown Macon for those of age who like to have a drink. However, please do not bring any alcohol back onto campus.

PARKING

There are no options directly on campus to park for the tournament. However, there should be available street parking by Tatnall Square Park on Coleman Ave, College St, or Adams St to use free of charge. There is usually plenty of street parking; it is completely free, and it is not a long walk. Overall, street parking is the easiest option.

Please be aware all Mercer parking lots use a decal system at all times and they do enforce towing. If you would like a visitors pass, it can be acquired by contacting the Mercer Police Department before the tournament. Their contact information is: Phone: 478-301-2970 Email: mercerpolice@mercer.edu

The third possible option: If staying at one of the two hotels on campus, it is possible to simply walk to the tournament and walk back (without the need of parking on campus at all). The hotels are both right beside student housing; students make this identical trek every day. However, it is a bit of a trek, so if mobility issues apply, please choose a different option (for example, the visitor's pass)

LODGING

Mercer University offers two hotel options directly on campus. The first is the Hilton Garden Inn (1220 Stadium Drive, Macon, GA 31204); the second is the TownePlace Suites by Marriott (1550 Mercer University Dr, Macon, GA 31204). Overall, my advice would be to try and stay at one of these two hotels (if possible), simply because they are so close to campus. Both hotels offer free parking and a breakfast option.

There are also multiple other hotels very close to campus. You can find information on these here: <https://undergrad.mercer.edu/hotel-recommendations/>

FOOD SUGGESTIONS

It is possible to go to either of our two cafeterias on campus. It is about \$11.00 per person to eat there and guests are welcome. The two cafeterias are at the Connell Student Center (number 22 on the campus map) or at the University Center (number 47 on the map). Between the two, the University Center is the nicer option.

Mercer also has several restaurants directly beside where we will be competing. All restaurants in what is called the "Mercer Village" are on campus and an easy walk from the classrooms where we will be competing. This includes MVP Pizza, Margaritas Mexican Restaurant, Z-Beans Coffee House, and Francar's Buffalo Wings (number 103-114 on the map).

During lunch, please use either the campus cafeteria options or one of the quicker options in the "Mercer Village."

All restaurants in what is called the “Mercer Landing” are directly beside the two hotels that are on campus. This includes a Papa Johns, Amici Italian Cafe, and the “Library” Taphouse and Kitchen. These could make for an easy dinner option in the evening (number 119-124 on the map).

Macon has a historic downtown, which is also very close to campus, with several more dinner options. If you have a chance, it is worth a visit (most of the buildings are from the 1800’s-1920’s) <https://www.maconga.org/blog/post/top-9-restaurants-in-downtown-macon/>

WIFI

The on-campus Wi-Fi option is “MU-Guest.” It is free and there is short sign-in screen to use it. However, please be forewarned--it is not great. It “works” but can be, at times, a little slow. We would recommend bringing a mobile hotspot, just in case, to supplement to campus Wi-Fi.

ACCESSABILITY

All new buildings and buildings that have been renovated are fully ADA compliant. Unfortunately, Mercer still has some historic buildings that have not been renovated and are not fully accessible. Please let us know of any mobility issues so that we 1. Make sure all of your rounds occur in accessible buildings and classrooms 2. Have, as much as possible, other teams come to you for the debate. If we can assist with accessibility in any way, either before or during the tournament, please do not hesitate to reach out.

GENDER NEUTRAL RESTROOMS

The easiest gender-neutral bathrooms to access are on the first floor of Ryals (#12 on the map), the first floor of Langdale (#13 on the map), the first floor of Groover (#14 on the map), and the first floor of Willingham (#7 on the map).

GETTING TO THE TOURNAMENT

The Atlanta airport is the best airport to use. It is a hub of both Delta airlines and Southwest airlines (which often have the cheapest flights). Macon is a straight 80-minute drive south from Atlanta. In essence, simply take highway 75 south the entire way--just one straight shot--to the campus.

LAND & LABOR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge that the tournament is occurring on land stolen from the Muscogee. We recognize the sustained oppression, land dispossession, and involuntary removals of the Muscogee and Cherokee peoples throughout Georgia and the Southeast. We further acknowledge that Mercer University profited from the ownership of enslaved peoples. This legacy persists today as we continue to work towards racial justice, equity, liberation, and community.

Article I. Tournament Setup and Tabulation Rules

Section 1. Topic Selection Process

1. Submission of Topic Proposals.
 1. Any interested party may submit a topic proposal to the NPTE Board (npteboard@gmail.com) by the deadline of February 23. Topic proposals should include a background/importance of the topic, potential affirmative arguments, potential negative arguments, at least one specific topic wording (with multiple wording options if appropriate), and a bibliography.
 2. Criteria. Topic construction should attempt to ensure that:
 1. The wording of the topic is clear and easily understood.
 2. Both government and opposition have good potential strategic ground.
 3. Both teams will have an idea of what they should prepare when the topic is announced.
2. Membership Vote and Public Review: After the NPTE Board has confirmed that a topic proposal has met NPTE standards for the required proposal elements and topic criteria, proposals will be released to the membership for review and comment until March 1st. Authors of a proposal may revise their proposal at any point up to the March 1st deadline. Each member school may submit a ranked order vote to select the topics for the NPTE. The top five topics will be selected and released by March 22. In the event that two proposals are submitted for the same topic, and both proposals are selected by the community to be used at the tournament, the NPTE shall use only the higher-ranked of the two proposals. The lower-ranked duplicate topic proposal shall be replaced with the highest-ranked topic proposal not selected for use at the tournament (e.g. the 6th-ranked proposal). The NPTE board shall determine whether topic proposals are duplicates via a majority vote, and shall clearly indicate on the topic ballot if they have deemed topic proposals to be duplicates.
3. Topic Committee. A topic committee will be formed of at least three people appointed by the NPTE At-Large Board Member to refine and finalize wordings for the selected topics. The committee should be comprised of individuals who submitted topic proposals. Students may only serve on the committee if they are not competing in the current year's NPTE. The NPTE At-Large Board Member will also solicit community input during this time for suggested alterations to topic wordings.
4. Topic Selection. By March 22, the topic committee shall provide the finalized topics.
5. The topics approved by the NPTE Topic Committee will be used throughout the tournament in accordance with competitor choices.

Section 2. Outreach to Judges

1. The Invitation shall state that the NPTE encourages Directors to reach out to persons from underrepresented groups such as based on race or gender to encourage them to be a judge and/or coach for their programs.
2. The NPTE President shall make an effort to contact qualified persons from underrepresented groups such as based on race or gender to encourage them to be a hired judge for the NPTE.

Section 3. Expectations of Judges for the NPTE

The NPTE President shall ensure all judges used meet the following criteria:

1. Judges must have at least two full years experience coaching, judging, or competing in intercollegiate debate.
2. Judges with remaining eligibility to compete in undergraduate parliamentary debate shall explicitly forfeit all such future eligibility before being deemed qualified to judge at the NPTE.
3. All judges shall be required to submit a judging philosophy at least one week prior to the NPTE tournament. Schools with judges who have not submitted their judging philosophy within six days of the NPTE tournament shall be fined \$50.
4. The NPTE President may give special consent to particular judges deemed qualified for the tournament or, in an emergency, for judges needed to keep the tournament running.
5. Judges are required to give one team a win and the other team a loss within 40 minutes of the time the PMR concludes. In the event that a judge does not render a win and a loss for a debate within that timeframe, the tournament director shall decide which team wins the judge's ballot by coin flip, and the judge or school which hired the judge shall be required to pay for an uncovered round. The tournament director, if needed to assure win-loss ballots and the timeliness of the tournament, shall be able to remove such a judge.
6. Judges shall judge two rounds past the elimination of their teams. Further, before the third elimination round, a member of the tab room will request that judges who are highly preferred by the teams that remain and as much as possible are representative of the percentage of judges as non-white, female, and/or less represented groups continue to judge further elimination rounds. These judges shall be compensated for extra rounds that they judge.
7. Judges who desire to be hired as a tournament judge at the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence must obtain the sponsorship of a member institution.
 1. No individual against whom a complaint has been made and for whom no verification of clearance has been received, as outlined in Section VI of this document, shall be eligible for such sponsorship or to participate in the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence.
 2. Should a complaint be made against an individual who is listed as a tournament judge prior to the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence, NPTE will contact the debate program of the sponsoring institution. At this time, the program may remove their sponsorship of that individual and they will be removed from the judging pool by the tournament director.
 3. If a program elects not to remove sponsorship after notice of a complaint, the NPTE will implement the procedures identified in Section VI.C. In the event a verification of clearance is not received prior to the commencement of the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence, the judge will be removed from the pool of potential judges and barred from participation in the tournament.

Section 4. Pre-Tournament

I. Pre-Tournament

1. *Tournament Timeline.*

- a. By the second Friday of December in each competition year, the Board of Directors will announce a tournament timeline, including all deadlines for NPTE point accumulation, qualification, entry, topic, group announcement, and all other necessary dates for tournament function.

2. Qualifying for the Tournament.

- a. Twenty-four (24) teams will be accepted to compete at the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence as described in this section.
- b. Time stamping. All invitations, bids, and contingency bids in this section are determined in chronological order so that a clear division between teams can be made. The first team to meet a qualification threshold has entry priority over all other teams at that threshold. The second team to meet a qualification threshold has entry priority over all teams other than the first, and so on...
- c. Invitations.
 - i. Invitations are offered to any team which has accumulated fifteen (15) NPTE points as of the conclusion of the Mile High Swing, or its successor (as determined by the board).
 - a. At the conclusion of the Mile High Swing, qualifying teams will be extended an invitation to that year's National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence.
 - i. Invitations may be announced during the award ceremony prior to the end of the Mile High Swing.
 - ii. Teams receiving invitations will be given until 11:59 PM Pacific Time on the final Friday of January to inform the Board of their attendance to that year's NPTE via email to NPTEBoard@gmail.com.
- d. Bids.
 - i. After the invitation acceptance deadline has passed, the remaining entry slots will be available for bids. These bids will be open to application. Applications for bids will be accepted based on total point accumulation over the current NPTE season until either all applications have been accepted or the tournament's entry cap has been met.
 - ii. Teams must debate in at least one tournament together to apply for a bid.
 - iii. There will be two acceptance deadlines for Bids.
 - a. The first bid deadline will occur no later than one calendar month prior to the first day of the NPTE. Bids accepted on this deadline will be referred to as First Round Bids.
 - b. The second bid deadline will occur the day after the NPTE points deadline for the current year. Bids accepted on this deadline will be referred to as Second Round Bids.
 - iv. First Round Bids will be issued to all teams having accumulated 15 points, but not yet accepted to compete at the current year's NPTE, or up to 16 teams, based on NPTE ranking, whichever is greater.
 - v. Second Round Bids will be issued to all teams having accumulated 15 points, but not yet accepted to compete at the current year's NPTE, and then by season-long ranking order, up to 24 total entries.
 - vi. Teams wishing to compete as hybrids (each debater representing a distinct institution) may compete at the National Tournament. However, they may only receive bids via the bid process.
 - vii. Half points. Teams may count half points with other partners in bid applications. Teams must count at least one tournament in which they debater together. Each partner may then count their next three best tournaments (including tournaments debating together or with other partners).
 - a. Teams requesting bids must identify any half-point partners in their bid request.
 - b. Ties in ranking will be broken on the basis of points earned by the partnership entering the NPTE.

- e. Contingency Bids.
 - i. Contingency Bids are offered after all other invitation and bid mechanisms have been exhausted and the tournament entry cap has not yet been reached. These bids will be accepted on a first-come first-served basis in the order listed below and within each category.
 - a. Host Bid. The host institution is guaranteed a single entry to the NPTE regardless of qualification. This bid may only be used if no other team from the host institution is otherwise qualified to compete at the NPTE.
 - i. The host institution may claim this bid at any time before the total entry cap (24) has been reached.
 - ii. Claiming this bid prevents the host institution from submitting any other Bid requests, outside of those described in this Contingency Bid process.
 - b. Board Bids. Any institution represented on the Board of Trustees of the NPTE, but with no teams yet qualified to the NPTE, may submit a single team who would not otherwise qualify to the NPTE to compete. This bid may be used for only one team, per institution, and no other teams from that institution may enter that year's NPTE. If more Board Bids applications are received than remaining slots, teams with more NPTE points over the current season will be accepted first.
 - c. Plus-one Bids. Any institution who has fewer than 4 teams competing at the NPTE may submit Plus-one Bids for additional teams, up to 4. These teams' judging commitments must be covered by their institution. Teams applying for Plus-one Bids will submit the names of the competitors and the judge(s) who will cover their commitment. Teams will be accepted for Plus-one Bids on a first-come first-served basis.
 - d. Emergency Bids. The Board reserves the right to solicit and accept emergency bids to the NPTE to meet the entry requirements for the Round Robin format. Emergency bids will be accepted in the order of all other Invitations and Bids as described in this section.
 - e. Contingency Bids accepted after the tournament's group stage is set will be placed in the exact group position of the team which they replace.

3. The Draw.

- a. On the day after the bid process closes, teams will be assigned to groups by a live draw hosted by a member of the Board. Results of this draw will be made public immediately following the conclusion of the live draw.
- b. Draw Procedure:
 - 1. Teams will be placed into "Pots" of 4 teams in order of their season rankings.
 - i. Pots will be populated according to season ranking after entries are set.
 - 1. Rankings 1-4
 - 2. Rankings 5-8
 - 3. Rankings 9-12
 - 4. Rankings 13-16
 - 5. Rankings 17-20
 - 6. Rankings 21-24
 - 2. These Pots will contain a draw object for each team.
 - 3. Another draw pool will contain 1 object for each Group (A-D).

4. Beginning with Pot 1, a member of the board will draw from the current Pot, then draw from the Group pool. The team that was drawn from the Pot will be placed in the highest available spot from the Group that was drawn.
 - i. If the drawn team is placed in a Group with another team from their school (including a hybrid), a new Group object will be drawn. The drawn team will be placed in that Group, and the unused Group ball will be placed back into its pool.
 - ii. If a drawn team is the final team placed into a Group, and that Group contains another team from the drawn team's school, the drawn team will be switched with the most recently placed team from their Pot who is in a Group that does not already have a team from the drawn team's school.
 5. Pots will be drawn from in sequential order. Once all teams from a Pot are assigned to a Group position, the draw will advance to the next Pot.
 6. Once the Group pool is exhausted, the objects for each Group will be placed back into the pool. If 24 entries have not yet been accepted, contingency bids will be entered as "Contingency Bid 1," "Contingency Bid 2," and teams receiving contingency bids will be placed, based on time stamping described in 2.b. in their respective groups.
- c. The Table.
1. This assignment creates the General Table for Preliminary Rounds in Appendix (A.1) which is used in the preliminary rounds of the tournament.

II. The Tournament

1. Preliminary Rounds.

- a. The tournament will be paired two days before competition using a patterned round robin.
 - i. In Round 1, within each Group, position 1 will debate position 6, position 2 will debate position 5, and position 3 will debate position 4.
 - ii. In Round 2, within each Group, position 1 will debate position 5, position 2 will debate position 3, and position 4 will debate position 6.
 - iii. In Round 3, within each Group, position 1 will debate position 4, position 2 will debate position 6, and position 3 will debate position 5.
 - iv. In Round 4, within each Group, position 1 will debate position 3, position 2 will debate position 4, and position 5 will debate position 6.
 - v. In Round 5, within each Group, position 1 will debate position 2, position 3 will debate position 6, and position 4 will debate position 5.
- b. Two mutually preferred judges will be assigned to each preliminary round when those rounds are paired.
- c. At registration, judges will be told which rounds they are judging, which rounds they are standby judges, and which rounds they are off. Judges will not be told in advance which debates they are watching.
- d. Complete pairings, including rooms, judges, and competitors, will be made available no less than 15 minutes before the start time for each round.
 - i. A representative for each team will come to the Topic Announce Room 10 minutes before the start time for the round.
 - ii. The higher seeded team in each debate (or their representative) will choose their side in the round. Their opponent will be assigned to the other side.
 - iii. Once each of the higher seeds has chosen their respective side, tournament staff will confirm the pairing with sides marked.

- iv. Five minutes after confirming the pairing, the topic for the debate will be released.
- v. A unique topic will be used in each of the five preliminary rounds.

2. Advancing Teams.

- a. The top 2 teams from each Group will advance to elimination rounds.
- b. Teams advancing will be determined by:
 - i. Points. Total points will be used as the first ranking mechanism. The point table is available in Appendix A (A.2).
 - 1. Three points will be awarded for each 2-0 result,
 - 2. One point will be awarded for each 1-1 result,
 - 3. Zero points will be awarded for each 0-2 result.
 - ii. Head-to-head. In the event of a tie in points, the team with more head-to-head ballots in the round robin stage will be ranked higher.
 - iii. Total ballot count. If head-to-head is tied, the team with more total ballots won in the round robin stage will be ranked higher.
 - iv. Z-Score. If total ballot count is tied, the team with the higher combined Z-score (the addition of both debaters' Z-scores) in the group stage will be ranked higher.
 - v. Season Ranking. If team Z-score is tied, the team with the higher NPTE ranking at the time of the tournament will be ranked higher.
 - vi. Random Number. Each team will be assigned a random number, the team with the larger number will be ranked higher. This tiebreaker will be repeated in the case of random number ties.

3. Elimination Rounds.

- a. Elimination rounds will be double elimination, except for the semifinals and final rounds.
- b. Each elimination round before the Final Round will be judged by a panel of 3 judges. No strike cards will be given for these rounds. Judges will be assigned using mutually preferred judging.
- c. The Flip:
 - i. In elimination rounds, the higher seeded teams in each pairing will be given the choice of Topic or Side.
 - ii. Once these decisions have been made and recorded, the teams in each pairing choosing Topic will have 2 minutes to choose the resolution for the debate from among the tournament's resolutions. If a team fails to make their choice they will be randomly assigned a choice by tournament staff.
 - iii. Teams choosing Side in each pairing will then have two minutes to choose whether they will affirm or negate the chosen resolution. If a team fails to make their choice they will be randomly assigned a choice by tournament staff.
 - iv. Tournament staff will make note of these decisions in a publicly available spreadsheet.
- d. Pairing the first elimination round:
 - i. Team seeding for the first elimination round will be determined on the same basis used to determine breaks to elimination rounds.
 - ii. The highest seeded team will debate the lowest seeded team; the second highest seeded team will debate the second lowest seeded team, etc.
 - iii. Teams may not debate another team from their group in the first elimination round.
- e. Pairing the second and third elimination rounds:
 - i. After each elimination round, teams will be re-seeded. Seeding for the remaining elimination rounds will be determined by (1) elimination round wins, (2) number of

- elimination round ballots received, (3) seeding at the end of preliminary rounds. Pairing will be high-low within brackets (highest seeded 1-0 will debate the lowest seeded 1-0; second highest seeded 1-0 will debate the second lowest seeded 1-0, etc.; highest seeded 0-1 will debate the lowest seeded 0-1; second highest seeded 0-1 will debate the second lowest seeded 0-1, etc).
- ii. For purposes of seeding, teams receiving a bye in elimination rounds will be deemed to have received a 2-1 win.
- f. Pairing the fourth elimination round (Semifinals):
- i. Teams losing in elimination round 4 or later will be eliminated from the tournament, regardless of prior elimination round record.
 - ii. Teams will be re-seeded based on elimination round wins, then elimination round ballots, then preliminary seeding. The highest seeded team will debate the lowest seeded team. The second highest seeded team will debate the second lowest seeded team.
- g. The Final Round
- i. The remaining two teams will be paired against each other to create The Final Round.
 - ii. The Final Round will be judged by a panel of no fewer than 7 judges.
 - iii. Teams will be re-seeded based on elimination round wins, then elimination round ballots, then preliminary seeding.
- h. What happens when a Pairing is a Repeat or involves a School vs a School:
- i. Teams with 1 loss should never be paired against teams with 0 losses.
 - ii. Teams should never be paired to debate each other more than once unless doing so is required to avoid having a team with 1 loss debate a team with 0 losses.
 - iii. Teams should never be paired to debate teams from the same school unless doing so is required to avoid having a team with 1 loss debate a team with 0 losses OR unless doing so is required to avoid having teams debate each other more than once.
 - iv. When adjusting pairings to avoid teams debating each other more than once or teams from the same school debating each other, the lower seeded team will be switched with the lower seeded team from the next lower pairing. For example, if seed 5 is hitting seed 10 (teams already hit each other) and seed 6 is hitting seed 9; you would switch seed 10 and 9.
- i. In the event that teams from the same school must be paired against each other, the school in question will inform the tabroom of their decision as to which team advances or if there will be a debate. If the school is unable or unwilling to do so by the end of the round, the tabroom shall advance the higher seed on a 2-1 decision.
 - j. If some unusual situation arises, the tabulation room shall be able to pair remaining elimination rounds via a method as close as is possible to the description in 5 above to assure the tournament finishes in the allotted number of elimination rounds.
 - k. Sides in elimination rounds will be set by computerized flip unless teams have debated once previously. In those cases, sides will be locked with each team taking the opposite side of their previous debate. If teams have debated twice previously, sides will be set by computerized flip.

4. Reversion to Swiss.

- a. If the tournament fails to meet the entry requirement (24) for the preliminary round pairing described in Section II.1, the tournament structure will revert to the Swiss pairing scheme historically used by the NPTE National Tournament.

- b. In the event of reversion to Swiss described in 4.i, the top 8 teams, based on record, head-to-head, Z-score, season ranking, and finally random number (as described in Section II.2) will advance to elimination rounds as described in Section 3.
- c. The Board reserves the right to revert to the historical Swiss system used by the NPTE and to modify the tournament as necessary to facilitate competition. These changes will be publicized and only adopted with 80% or more approval from the Board.

5. Pairing Irregularities

- a. If some unusual situation arises, the tabulation room will be permitted to pair rounds via a method as close as is possible to the descriptions above to assure the tournament finishes in the allotted number of rounds.

6. Tournament Awards

- a. Team Awards.
 - i. The winner of the Final Round will be awarded the NPTE Tournament Champion Cup.
 - ii. The top 8 teams will be recognized and given awards for their respective placings.
 - iii. The highest ranked team by points at the beginning of preliminary rounds will be awarded the Whitman Cup.
- b. Speaker Awards
 - i. The top speaker of the preliminary rounds will be awarded the NPTE Top Speaker Trophy.
 - ii. The top 16 speakers will be recognized and given awards for their respective placing.
 - iii. Speaker order will be determined by:
- c. Additional Awards.
 - i. Top Preferred Critic. The Top Preferred Critic is the judge at each year's tournament who is mostly highly preferred by Average Preference, then by Standard Deviation. In the event of a tie across both measures, all tied judges will be recognized and given an award.

Appendix A. Tables.

Table A.1: The General Table for Preliminary Rounds.

Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D
A1	B1	C1	D1
A2	B2	C2	D2
A3	B3	C3	D3
A4	B4	C4	D4
A5	B5	C5	D5
A6	B6	C6	D6

Table A.2: The Point Table for Possible Preliminary Round Finishes.

Points	Ballots	Result 1	Result 2	Result 3	Result 4	Result 5		Wins	Draws	Losses
15	10	W	W	W	W	W		5	0	0
13	9	W	W	W	W	D		4	1	0
12	8	W	W	W	W	L		4	0	1
11	8	W	W	W	D	D		3	2	0
10	7	W	W	W	D	L		3	1	1
9	7	W	W	D	D	D		2	3	0
9	6	W	W	W	L	L		3	0	2
8	6	W	W	D	D	L		2	2	1
7	6	W	D	D	D	D		1	4	0
7	5	W	W	D	L	L		2	1	2
6	5	W	D	D	D	L		1	3	1
5	5	D	D	D	D	D		0	5	0
6	4	W	W	L	L	L		2	0	3
5	4	W	D	D	L	L		1	2	2
4	4	D	D	D	D	L		0	4	1
4	3	W	D	L	L	L		1	1	3
3	3	D	D	D	L	L		0	3	2
3	2	W	L	L	L	L		1	0	4
2	2	D	D	L	L	L		0	2	3
1	1	D	L	L	L	L		0	1	4
0	0	L	L	L	L	L		0	0	5

Article II. Debating and Judging Rules

Section 1. Scope of Rules

These rules shall be binding upon all rounds at the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence. These rules may be used in whole or in part at other tournaments. Tournaments need not use these rules to qualify for NPTE points, but are encouraged to do so as is practical.

Section 2. Enforcement of Rules

Rules applied to debaters shall be enforced as appropriate by the judges in the rounds. Judges who violate or encourage violation of these rules should be reported to the tournament director. The tournament director may remove judges from the tournament and appropriate fees may be assessed.

Section 3. Topic Announcement and Preparation Time

1. Selection and Announcement of Topics

For all debates, immediately prior to the start of preparation time, the resolution shall be announced.

2. Preparation Time

1. Initiation. Preparation time shall commence immediately upon announcement of the resolution.
2. Duration. Preparation time for each round shall be 25 minutes. The tournament director may add time for travel to rounds. See Section 4C for what happens if debaters are late.
3. Coaching. Coaches may choose to assist teams during preparation time. Coaches must ensure that such activity does not interfere with their judging obligations. Similarly, competitors may choose to collaborate during preparation time. Neither competitors nor coaches may assist teams in a round for which they will be acting as judge.
4. Debaters must prepare during preparation time any materials that they use during the debate. Coaches and debaters may use any materials they wish during preparation time but the debaters for that round should use during the debate itself only items that they themselves prepared during the preparation time. Electronic or other "nearly instant" copying of material to the materials debaters bring to the round is not permitted. Using these "NPTE Rules for Debating and Judging" in a round shall be deemed an exception to this rule. Debaters and judges may possess, reference and/or quote from these rules in rounds as necessary.

Section 4. During the Debate Rounds

1. Audience Attendance.

All rounds shall be open to the public. Use of recording devices shall be permitted so long as such use does not substantially interfere with the round and abides by two-party consent laws. Attendees may applaud, cheer, or hiss as appropriate, but should avoid verbal heckling. Debaters may not use audience members to make substantive, sustained arguments in the round; the debaters themselves should be the source of arguments in the debate. Audience members who do seek to advance arguments or who become disruptive may be removed at the discretion of the judges.

2. Speaking and CX-Prep Order and Times

1. Prime Minister Constructive (PMC): 7 minutes
Cross-examination/Preparation Time: 2 minutes
2. Leader of Opposition Constructive (LOC): 8 minutes
Cross-examination/Preparation Time: 2 minutes
3. Member of Government Constructive (MG): 8 minutes
Cross-examination/Preparation Time: 1 minute
4. Member of Opposition Constructive (MO): 8 minutes
5. Leader of Opposition Rebuttal (LOR): 4 minutes
Cross-examination/Preparation Time: 1 minute
6. Prime Minister Rebuttal (PMR): 5 minutes

7. Cross-examination/Preparation Time is for the debaters from the team speaking next to ask questions should they wish to do so and/or to prepare arguments for their next speech.
3. The two debaters that qualified as a team must debate as that team with both debaters in each round at the NPTE.
 1. The two debaters from that qualified team must be in the room for the duration of each debate.
 2. Each debater from that qualified team must give a speech during each debate. The composition of that speech is up to the debater.
 3. One government team debater must give the PMC speech and the PMR speech; the other government team debater must give the MG speech. One opposition team debater must give the LOC speech and the LOR speech; the other opposition team debater must give the MO speech.
 4. Failure of one or both debaters to follow these expectations is grounds for an automatic loss.
4. If Debaters are late.

If the PMC or LOC of a debate team is late, the judges in the debate shall have a timer begun as soon as the PMC has been scheduled to begin. If it is the PMC speaker who is late, the PMC shall have the remaining time left to complete the PMC. If it is the LOC speaker who is late, the PMC shall begin when the LOC arrives but it is the LOC who shall lose the elapsed time since when the PMC was supposed to begin; the PMC would still have the full 7 minutes to present. If no time is available for the PMC or the LOC, the round will be deemed a forfeit by the team (or teams) with no speaking time remaining. In cases of verifiable circumstances outside of the control of the debaters, the tournament director may approve exceptions to this rule.
5. If a judge is late. If a judge is late by more than 10 minutes, a person in the room should contact the tab director or tournament staff. A late judge does not automatically mean a round is forfeited nor that it results in double wins.
6. Use of Prepared Materials during debates.

With the exception of the document you are reading now, "The NPTE Rules for Debating and Judging," debaters should use only materials that they themselves wrote or similarly transcribed or produced after the announcement of that round's resolution. Debaters should not use in any debate 1) quoted evidence or "cards;" 2) electronically or "nearly instantly" copied files or recordings; 3) art sculpted, painted or drawn, photos taken, music recorded, and similar works of art materially created prior to the topic announcement; 4) any substantive arguments advanced by audience members; nor 5) materials written or similarly transcribed or produced during preparation time by others such as coaches or teammates (except their debate partner for that round). Debaters, of course, may present material they have memorized or remember as they speak. Debaters may cite statistics or sources for facts or definitions, but such factual citations should not be the sole basis upon which an argument rests. Debaters should rely upon their own analysis as the primary basis for arguments.
7. Cases and Arguments.
 1. These rules shall not be interpreted so as to require any specific case structure or judging paradigm. Issues of paradigm and debate theory shall be reserved for argument and justification by the debaters.
 2. Explicit definition of terms in the resolution shall not be required. Definitions may be presented explicitly, implicitly, contextually, and/or by metaphor.

3. Normative values and/or evaluative criteria may be offered either explicitly or implicitly. Explicit presentation of a value or criterion shall not be a required "prima facie" part of a Government case.
 4. Government interpretations of the resolution should reflect a fair division of ground. Specifically, government interpretations should not be framed in such a way as to force the opposition to oppose well-established facts (i.e. physical realities), to embrace overtly racist, sexist, or otherwise discriminatory positions, or to uphold a value that is tautological with the resolution or with the Government case.
 5. Constructive speeches shall be used for the establishment and explication of primary lines of analysis. New arguments may be presented at any time in any constructive speech.
 6. Rebuttal speeches shall be used for the crystallization and weighing of previously established lines of argument. New arguments may not be presented in rebuttal speeches except in the case of a Prime Minister responding to an argument originally made by the Member of Opposition.
8. Specific Knowledge.
- The basis for arguments should lie within the accessible realm of any reasonably well-educated person. Debaters who desire to present obscure or detailed information should be prepared to explain, in detail, the context of such information and its relationship to broader issues. Judges should exclude as "specific knowledge" only information that lies outside the accessible realm of a reasonably well-educated person and is challenged as such by opposing debaters. Judges should limit their consideration of information as narrowly as possible to exclude only those claims that are so specific or inaccessible as to be impossible to discuss without quoted evidence. The accessibility of the information and the debatability of the claim within the round shall be the critical issue, not lack of prior knowledge on the part of debaters or judges.
9. Points of Information.
- Points of information shall be allowed during constructive speeches, excluding "protected time" during the first and last minute of each speech. Debaters desiring to raise a point of information may so indicate verbally and/or by standing and/or by raising their hand. The debater currently speaking shall have the option to accept or decline each point of information and may so indicate verbally and/or by gesture. While a debater may choose to limit the number of points of information he or she will accept, no such limit shall be imposed by the judge. Points of information may be offered in the form of questions or statements. Points of information may not exceed 15 seconds in duration.
10. Points of Order.
- Debaters who perceive a violation of the rules may raise a point of order by standing or raising their hand and verbally announcing "point of order".
- Upon recognition by the judge or chair, the debater should briefly state the nature of the violation. The judge or chair shall then ask the other team for their defense and following that, rule on the point of order. "Point well taken" shall indicate that the point of order was valid. "Point not well taken" shall indicate that the point of order was not valid. "Point taken under consideration" shall indicate that the point of order is being deferred for later evaluation. When a point of order is deemed to be "well taken", the judge may instruct debaters to retract, rephrase, and/or avoid arguments.
- Points of order are intended only to address rule violations and shall not be raised to insert new arguments or to disrupt another debaters' speech.
- Upon recognition by the judge or chair, time shall be stopped, and the debater should briefly state

the nature of the violation. The judge or chair shall then ask the other team for their defense and following that, rule on the point of order, and timing shall begin again.

11. Points of Personal Privilege.

Debaters who perceive that another debater has engaged in personal insult, harassing behavior, or other violation of personal dignity may raise a point of personal privilege. Debaters may also raise a point of personal privilege if they perceive another debater to be deliberately misrepresenting the arguments of others. Such points shall be raised and adjudicated in the same manner as points of order (above). When a point of personal privilege is deemed to be "well taken" the judge may instruct the offending debater to retract and/or apologize for the offensive comments. Points of personal privilege are intended only to maintain the collegial nature of the debate and shall not be raised to insert new arguments or to disrupt another debaters' speech.

12. Timekeeping.

The judge or chair of the judging panel shall provide time signals to the debaters or shall appoint someone to do so. The timekeeper shall indicate to the debaters the end and beginning of "protected time" during constructive speeches by loudly striking the table. Time shall not be stopped for points of information, but shall be stopped during presentation and adjudication of points of order and points of personal privilege.

13. Laptops and Handheld Computers

Refer to NPDA: In accordance with NPDA Bylaws, electronic/laptop flowing by debaters in a round is acceptable for the national tournament. This excludes cutting and pasting previously prepared material as well as flowing done by anyone not in the round on a shared document.

14. Advocating the Splitting of Ballots

Requests by debaters that judges in preliminary round 6 or any round to "split" the ballots to ensure that both teams advance to elimination rounds is considered by the NPTE Board to be a disqualifying offense. The NPTE Board also considers it unethical for judges to collude regarding the splitting of ballots. Prior to turning in ballots, judges should not discuss their decisions with any other person. NPTE Board members and staff may monitor rounds to ensure that such practices do not occur.

Section 5. After Debate Rounds

1. Ballot and Speaker Points.

As soon as possible after the conclusion of the round, judges shall complete and return to the tab room a written ballot. The ballot must include a designated winner and loser ("double-win" and "double-loss" rounds shall not be allowed). Speaker points shall be assigned to each debater on a 24-30 scale in .1 increments as follows:

30: Rare example of outstanding achievement in analysis and presentation.

28-29.9: Very Good/Excellent accomplishment of analysis and presentation.

26-27.9: Okay/Good accomplishment but some deficiencies in analysis and/or presentation.

24.1-25.9: Severe/Significant deficiencies in analysis and/or presentation.

24: Deliberately offensive behavior, intentional violation of rules.

0: Forfeit.

2. Basis for Decision.

The resolution forms the basis for the round. The Government shall enjoy the right to derive any linguistically legitimate interpretation of the resolution and construct a case based upon that. If, at the end of the round, the Government has crafted such an interpretation and successfully defended a case based upon it, the Government should win the round. The Opposition may oppose the linguistic legitimacy of the Government's interpretation of the resolution and/or the case itself

and/or the underlying resolution as the Government interprets it. If, at the end of the round, the Opposition has successfully opposed the Government in one or more of these areas, the Opposition should win the round.

3. Non-Intervention.

1. Judges shall base their decisions upon the arguments made, persuasive style displayed by the debaters, and the rules for the event.
2. Once the decision is announced, that decision is final except in the event of a mistake in the reading of the decision, e.g. the person announcing the decision read the ballot incorrectly, the judge misstates who he or she intended to vote for, or there is a tab error.
3. Decisions may not be changed because a judge changed his or her mind after a decision has been announced.
4. Judges are encouraged to make pedagogically appropriate verbal and written comments to educate debaters about relevant factual or normative concerns that were not raised by the debaters.

4. Announcement (preliminary rounds).

Immediately after the round, debaters and audience members should leave the room. Judges must complete their decision, without conferring with any other person except the Tournament Director if it is absolutely necessary, and return it to the tab room before engaging in any disclosure or verbal critiques.

5. Announcement (elimination rounds).

1. Immediately after the round, the chair shall dismiss the debaters and audience members to wait outside the room.
2. Judges should make their decision as quickly as possible; deferring the writing of detailed comments on the ballot until after the decision has been announced.
3. Judges of the elimination rounds shall not confer with each other nor anyone else except the Tournament Director if it is absolutely necessary in making their decisions.
4. Once all judges have reached a decision, the chair shall invite the debaters and audience back into the room, publicly announce the decision of the panel, and communicate this decision to the tab room.
5. Judges should then provide any verbal critiques, complete their written ballots and return them to the tab room.

6. Disclosure and Verbal Critique.

Judges are encouraged to engage debaters in discussion of issues and perceptions about the round, including the nature and justification for the judge's decision. When possible, the tournament should establish a discrete area for such discussions. Debaters, judges, and coaches should recognize the intensity of the competitive environment and avoid engaging in confrontational, demeaning or challenging behavior.

7. Appeals to Decisions and Pairings

1. Appeals to decisions and pairing should occur only in the most extreme circumstances--where there is demonstrable and serious harm to a team; i.e. inappropriate behavior or a tournament error has caused a loss.
2. Appellants must write their appeal and submit it to the board and should do so prior to the release of the next round's pairings. Appellants must be available to communicate with the board.
3. The Board shall pursue an inquiry under the following conditions:
 1. only if there is demonstrable and serious harm and

2. with at least 50% of voting board members voting to pursue an inquiry with no more than 1 board member dissenting.
4. Throughout this process, board members with teams affected by the appeal shall recuse themselves from the discussion and the vote. The President may consult board members not at the tournament but it is not required as efficiency in running the tournament is a primary concern.
5. Assuming the Board agrees to pursue the appeal, defendants also must write their defense, submit it to the board, and be available to communicate with the board. The President shall provide a reasonable time limit for this defense.
6. The Board will rarely overturn a decision by a judge or judges and will do so only if the harm caused by overturning the decision is less than the harm caused by the decision. Overturning a decision shall require at least 50% of voting board members with no more than 1 board member dissenting.
7. Board rulings are final unless presented with new evidence of a substantial nature showing that the grounds for the board's decision were incorrect. Such a ruling will require a unanimous vote of all voting board members.
8. The President and/or Tournament Director, will as soon as possible, issue a statement to participants explaining to the Board's ruling in a manner that maintains the confidentiality of those involved.

Section 6. Anti Harassment and Violence Policy

1. Introduction

Preamble: The National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence (NPTE) promotes parliamentary debate as a contest of knowledge, wit and argumentation conducted in a setting of civility and mutual respect. All eligible, qualified members should have access to debate activities without regard to race, color, religion, age, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, use of a service animal, or any other characteristic or trait protected by state or federal law. These principles should guide the behavior and conduct of all members of and participants in the organization.

While this policy is largely directed at sexual discrimination, sexual harassment and/or sexual violence, the principles herein shall be considered a model for dealing with all forms of harassment and/or violence.

This policy is intended to eliminate specific behaviors and address concerns which may arise while participating in parliamentary debate events and activities and to provide a forum for resolution of conflicts.

This policy supplements, but does not replace the institutional policies of each participant's school and the applicable federal and state laws.

1. Debate, Free Expression and Harassment

Academic debate provides a forum for the expression, criticism and discussion (and for the tolerance) of a wide range of opinions. Participants are encouraged to develop skills in reasoned and supported argument while avoiding the pitfalls of faulty argument.

Academic debate is not a license for demeaning actions and the NPTE does not tolerate

harassment. Any participant who suffers discrimination or harassment as part of an parliamentary debate event or activity is denied an equal opportunity to work, learn and grow in the arena of academic debate.

2. Sexual Harassment and/or Sexual Violence

Sexual Harassment is unwelcome verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature that is sufficiently severe or persistent or pervasive such that it unreasonably interferes with, limits or deprives someone of the ability to participate in or benefit from participating in the NPTE and other parliamentary debate events and activities. The unwelcome behavior may be based on power differentials (quid pro quo), the creation of a hostile environment, or retaliation. A single instance of sexual assault may be sufficient to constitute a hostile environment.

The NPTE will rely on relevant legal definitions of harassment to guide its implementation of this policy. The complainant's perceptions are an important factor in determining whether specific conduct meets the definition listed above. In addition, it is important to recognize that other factors (e.g., supervisory authority, power relationships, etc.) may affect the relationships between the complainant and the accused and that these factors can compound the degree of threat or potential harm perceived in a situation.

3. Other Forms of Harassment

Like sexual harassment, harassment because of a race, color, religion, age, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, use of a service animal, or any other characteristic or trait protected by state or federal law will not be tolerated. In general, slurs, jokes and other verbal or physical conduct relating to a person's race, color, religion, age, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, use of a service animal, or any other characteristic or trait protected by state or federal law constitute harassment when they are sufficiently severe or persistent or pervasive such that it unreasonably interferes with, limits or deprives someone of the ability to participate in or benefit from participating at the NPTE and other parliamentary debate events and activities.

2. Addressing and reporting harassment and/or violence at the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence or concerning members of the NPTE Board.

1. The NPTE harassment policy shall apply to discrimination and harassment complaints that arise during the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence or from actions taken by officials or employees of NPTE acting at any time in their official capacities.
2. Participants in the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence who are affiliated with an academic institution are also subject to that institution's policies, procedures, rules, and regulations related to harassing conduct, reporting such conduct, and/or addressing such conduct and taking steps to eliminate its recurrence.
3. Individuals who believe that they are being discriminated against or harassed and cannot or do not wish to resolve the matter informally should promptly report the complaint to the Sexual Harassment Officer (SHO), who shall be appointed annually by the President of the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence. The name and contact information for the SHO may be found within this document.
4. Individuals who witness another individual being discriminated against or harassed should inform the SHO. NPTE officers, judges, and employees who witness another individual being discriminated against or harassed are required to inform the SHO.

5. If reporting the matter to the SHO would prove to be uncomfortable or if the individual is not satisfied with the SHO's handling of the complaint, the individual should promptly bring the matter to the attention of any other member of the NPTE Board of Directors.
 6. The SHO and/or a member of the Board of Directors (in cases where the party advancing the complaint is uncomfortable reporting to the SHO, or the SHO has a conflict of interest) shall promptly investigate all allegations of discrimination and/or harassment in as confidential a manner as possible. An appropriate institutional representative of the complainant's institution and the institution of the accused will be informed of the investigation.
 7. The SHO, or the designated member of the Executive Committee, shall, in consultation with the NPTE President, determine what, if any, remedial action should be taken. Depending on the totality of the facts, possible sanctions may include, but not be limited to, any of the following: constructive efforts that assure the offense behavior does not reoccur; oral reprimands; written reprimands to be sent to directors of forensics and/or Deans of Faculty or Students and/or College or University Presidents; removal from future participation at the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence; removal of NPTE points; or suspension of membership in NPTE.
 8. Under no circumstances will an officer, agent, employee or member of the NPTE be allowed to threaten or retaliate against anyone who in good faith alleges unlawful harassment or discrimination or who participates in the investigation of such a complaint.
 9. In the event of a report of harassment, including a report received under the procedures outlined in Section C of this policy, care shall be taken, guided by the totality of the facts, during and after the investigatory process to reduce the potential for future incidents of harassment as defined above, as well as to ensure that complainants and accused are not forced in proximity to one another as part of the competitive experience. These measures include, but are not limited to:
 1. The tabulation room will automatically grant a constraint to ensure that complainants are not judged by an accused individual.
 2. The tabulation room will take care to ensure that, inasmuch as possible, complainants are not forced to debate against an accused individual.
 3. The tournament director shall communicate to coaches involving the institutions with the accused and complainant to 1) inform each other of the hotel they are staying at and 2) consider ways the accused and complainant may want to handle getting food and receiving announcements during the tournament.
 4. The President of NPTE may also issue "no contact" orders at the National tournament, with which participants must comply to maintain eligibility at the tournament. Those who willfully violate the no contact order at the tournament may be subject to sanctions as outlined in B.7.
 10. Appeals of NPTE decisions regarding sexual harassment complaints are limited to questions of proper process or to new evidence that would significantly affect the outcome of the decision. Such appeals shall be directed in writing to the full Board of Directors. Such appeals are not automatic.
3. Addressing and reporting harassment and/or violence that has occurred outside of the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence.
 1. Individuals who believe that they are being discriminated against or harassed outside the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence, and cannot or do not wish to resolve

the matter informally, should promptly report the complaint by submitting a formal complaint utilizing the form available here: [Click Here](#).

1. Upon receipt of a formal complaint meeting the legal definitions of harassment/violence, NPTE will transmit the complaint to the Title IX offices/coordinators or appropriate officer of all schools relevant to the complaint (including the host school if an alleged event occurred at an invitational tournament).
 2. NPTE will also contact the institution of the individual accused of misconduct requesting further information on the ability of that individual to represent the institution in intercollegiate parliamentary debate competitions (a “verification of clearance”). This verification request will not provide or solicit information about the substance of the complaint, but will require the institution to verify that the individual is cleared to participate in intercollegiate debate events on behalf of the institution.
 3. These, and all other actions described below, shall be the responsibility of the NPTE President or their designee. NPTE officers involved in such proceedings will exercise care to maintain, where possible, the confidentiality of individuals involved in such actions.
2. Investigatory responsibility for a complaint of harassment that has occurred outside of the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence will rest with the Title IX compliance offices/compliance coordinators or appropriate officer of relevant home institutions.
1. After 14 business days have elapsed from the time that NPTE transmitted the complaint to the institution, NPTE will again contact the Title IX compliance offices/compliance coordinator or appropriate officer at the institution of the individual accused of misconduct. NPTE will request that the verification of clearance request be completed and returned.
 2. Unless a written verification of clearance has been signed and transmitted to NPTE by an appropriate representative of the home institution, individuals accused of misconduct will not be allowed to attend or participate in parliamentary debate activities beginning 14 business days after the complaint has been sent to the institution.
 3. Should a Title IX compliance office/compliance coordinator or appropriate officer not respond to the request of NPTE, NPTE will presume that clearance has not been authorized and individuals accused of misconduct will not be allowed to attend or participate in parliamentary debate activities beginning 14 business days after the complaint has been sent to the institution.
 4. Directors shall be notified of the individual's status immediately after the 14 days have elapsed or after other information has been received from the Title IX compliance office/compliance coordinator or appropriate officer indicating that the individual is ineligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate parliamentary debate activities. Should the complaint be against a director of a program, the notification shall be provided to the department chair.
 5. Because Title IX investigations and/or other investigations of harassment should occur within a 60 day time period, NPTE will re-send the verification of clearance request 70 business days after the complaint has been sent to the institution of the accused to determine if the individual has been cleared to represent the institution in intercollegiate parliamentary debate activities.

6. An individual's ability to attend and participate in intercollegiate parliamentary debate activities and events can be reinstated at any point once the verification of clearance has been received from the institution. If no verification of clearance is received for an individual who is the subject of a complaint under the processes listed above, the individual shall not be eligible to attend or participate in parliamentary debate competitions until a verification of clearance has been received by the NPTE.
 3. In the event that a complaint is made against an individual who is no longer affiliated with an institution at the time the complaint is made, a record will be kept of the complaint.
 1. Should the individual accused affiliate with an institution at a later date, NPTE will confirm with the complainant whether he or she wishes to proceed with his or her complaint.
 2. If the complainant wishes to proceed, the organizations will start the process as stated above and transmit the complaint to the relevant Title IX compliance offices/compliance coordinators or appropriate officer.
 4. Individuals under this section for whom no verification of clearance has been received, and their affiliated programs as specified below, will be subject to the following sanctions until a verification of clearance has been received by the NPTE.
 1. Individuals under this section for whom no verification of clearance has been received shall not be eligible to attend or participate in NPTE debate competitions in any capacity, including, but not limited to, administering, competing, judging, on-site coaching and/or observing as a spectator.
 2. Individuals under this section for whom no verification of clearance has been received will not be allowed to attend the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence in any capacity and will be asked to leave the premises if they attempt to attend.
 3. Programs that bring an individual against whom a complaint has been made and for whom no verification of clearance has been received to any parliamentary debate tournament in any capacity shall not receive NPTE points for any of their teams attending the tournament.
 5. Tournaments may consult the NPTE to create accommodations similar to those identified in Section B.9 of this policy.
4. Documenting Instances of Concern
 1. Documenting instances of concern which do not rise to the legal standard of sexual harassment, sexual discrimination, and/or sexual violence can be directed to the Board of Directors and/or the Sexual Harassment Officer of NPTE. All members are encouraged to document instances of concern.
 2. Reporting Requirements
 1. Members of the Board of Directors and the Sexual Harassment Officer are required to report all formal complaints as outlined in this policy to relevant Title IX offices.
 2. Members of the Board of Directors and the Sexual Harassment Officer must disclose that they are required to report all formal complaints as outlined in this policy to relevant Title IX offices.
 3. Should the instance of concern rise to the legal standard of sexual harassment, sexual discrimination, and/or sexual violence further action may be required on

the part of the Board of Directors and the Sexual Harassment Officer, with or without the presence of a formal complaint.

5. Organizational Cooperation

In the event that NPTE receives a complaint pursuant to this policy, information, including complaints and verification of clearance, will be shared as necessary and legally permitted with the National Parliamentary Debate Association. Each organization will make independent determinations regarding appropriate sanctions.

ENROLLMENT VERIFICATION FORM

Date: _____

From: _____

To: Name Here, NPTE Championship Tournament Director

RE: Eligibility to participate in NPTE Championship Tournament

I certify that the students listed below are registered for the Spring 2026 semester, considered in good standing, and are pursuing an undergraduate degree at _____, or graduated at the end of the Fall 2025 semester. To attest to this, I hereby affix my signature and the seal of the institution.

School Registrar

Date

— STUDENT NAMES —

--	--

DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS CERTIFICATION

Director of Forensics

Date

Current email address

cell number

PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY FORM

Page 1 of 1

Name of Participating School: _____

Director of Forensics: _____

The NPTE expects all participants to act responsibly throughout the tournament. Failure to have appropriate identification could lead to removal from campus. Any behavior deemed disruptive, threatening, or damaging to others, including behavior that damages tournament facilities, risks immediate removal of those responsible from the tournament and the host school. In addition, participants are expected to comply with the rules, policies, and regulations of the NPTE, including Title IX Compliance. The NPTE Board and/or the host school will assess an appropriate response, including fines or judging fees to associated programs to cover judging obligations, and, if applicable, bill the associated program for costs incurred to replace, repair, or clean (beyond normal expectations) campus property, including property in assigned prep rooms or elsewhere on campus. Should damage be documented before the end of the tournament, teams may be prohibited from competing until payment has been arranged. Failure to pay fines and/or costs will mean that a program will not be allowed to compete at the NPTE Championship Tournament again until these fines and/or costs are paid. As appropriate, failure to observe these conditions of participation, including Title IX policies, will result in formal reporting by the NPTE to responsible academic institutions.

DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS CERTIFICATION

My signature below indicates that I have read the Statement for Program Responsibility. I will inform participants associated with my program of their responsibilities and I will abide by disciplinary decisions made by the NPTE Board, Tournament Director, or host school, to participants who are associated with my squad, including debaters, observers, judges, and coaches.

Director of Forensics (signature)

Date

Current email address

cell number

Name of Senior Coaching member at the Championship Tournament

Current Email

cell number

Signature (if different from DOF)

Date

OTHER IMPORTANT INFORMATION

If you consent to audio/video recording please fill out the below form for EACH team. The NPTE Championship Tournament will abide by two party consent.

**School
Name:** _____

**Team
Members:** _____

Option 1: By signing this document you hereby consent to the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence recording your image and voice. In addition, I waive any right to inspect or approve the finished video recording. I understand that this consent is perpetual, that I may not revoke it, and that it is binding. I understand that these images may appear publicly as part of the NPTE's website and/or other educational materials.

Option 2: By signing this document you hereby consent to the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence recording your image and voice. Additionally, I consent to the recording to be shared with only those competitors in round and their coaches and waive any right to inspect or approve the finished video recording.

Team Member #1 Signature: _____

Team Member #2 Signature: _____

Date: _____

OTHER IMPORTANT INFORMATION

ADA ACCOMMODATIONS – If you or one of your students needs ADA accommodations, please contact the tournament director as soon as possible and no later than the day that strikes are due.

PREPARATION ROOMS – Each school will be assigned a ‘team’ room by the tournament director. These rooms may be used for preparation, but need to be kept clean and usable for competition. If a team fails to keep their preparation room in good condition, the school will lose access to a preparation room for the remainder of the tournament.

DRUG FREE STATEMENT

- A. The unlawful manufacture, distribution, possession, or use of a controlled substance as defined by the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 while on property owned and/or operated by the host institution for the NPDA championship tournament is prohibited.
- B. The distribution, possession, or use of alcohol, marijuana, tobacco or other substances in violation of a host institution’s policies or procedures is prohibited.
- C. Violation of these rules will result in the following penalties.
 1. The first offense will result in the disqualification of the competitor from the current tournament and prohibited entry into the subsequent championship tournament. In the case of a judge, the individual will be removed from the current tournament and prohibited from judging the subsequent championship tournament. In the case of an observer, the individual will be removed from the current tournament.
 2. On the second offense, the competitor will be disqualified from the current tournament and prohibited entry into subsequent championship tournaments. In the case of a judge, the individual will be removed from the current tournament and prohibited from judging in all subsequent championship tournaments. In the case of an observer, the individual will be removed from the current tournament and prohibited from attending subsequent championship tournaments.
 3. The Executive Council shall determine what, if any, additional sanctions may be taken. Depending on the nature of the incident, the Executive Council may issue a written reprimand to be sent to the Director, Dean and/or Provost of the associated institution, order the removal of NPDA points, or enact the suspension of a program from membership in NPDA.