In-Round Reminders for ALL EVENTS:

- **Silence all devices before a round starts**
- Sit in a place where all competitors are in front of you but you can still hear everything going on in the round.
- Do not rearrange classroom furniture unless absolutely necessary – if any furniture is moved, please return the room to how you found it before the round's start – nothing on teachers' desks / in containers/cabinets should be disturbed.
- Greet students politely as they enter the room and wish them luck as they exit: beyond that, please keep communication with competitors to a minimum; you are the adult in the room, the umpire/referee in this game, and a part of the educational process, please convey this in your demeanor and attitude at all times.
- Take "roll" in speech/debate rounds: read through the list of codes on the schematic for the group so that you are certain that the right students are in the right place. If there is a question about a certain student, please bring it to the attention of the tabroom. Under no circumstances should you ever ask for the school affiliation of a student. Congress should do a roll call before the start of session.
- All speech judges need to keep time, and provide speakers with time signals – ask "how would you like your time" and follow their requests to the letter. Debate judges should keep official time, even if students are timing themselves. Congress will be timed by the Presiding Officer.
- All ballots are online ballots via tabroom.com. Speak to WK after the morning judges' meeting if you're not sure how to access your online ballots
- We recommend taking your notes in a separate document (e.g. Google Doc, Microsoft Word, or Notes app), then copy and paste your notes into Tabroom later. This will ensure that you don't lose your feedback
- Start on time and end on time: submit win/loss/ranks and speaker points ASAP: you will have time to input more in-depth comments throughout the day!

Speech Events Overview

The following pages outline what each event is and how it should be evaluated. In addition to ranking the speakers, you are also expected to write ballots that both highlight strengths of the performance and its weaknesses. Overall:

What Strong Ballots Do

- Explain ranking decisions, not just performance traits
- Reference event goals (analysis, clarity, interpretation, organization)
- Balance specific praise with actionable critiques
- Focus on performance choices within the student's control
    - Never mention a student's manner of dress, perceived or assumed racial/ethnic/economic background, gender or sex, dis/ability, or any other immutable characteristic
- Use language geared towards learning and growth: you are both referee/umpire and educator, and your language should reflect both of those roles.

See this document for examples of strong ballots, and continue on to review standards of adjudication for each event.

Speaker Points: A Guide

- 95-100: this is the platonic ideal. Almost no critical feedback, this student could be in national elims/state finals
- 90-100: this student does a great job. Some small notes on tech and parts to polish, but this student would almost certainly break at states/could at nationals
- 85-90, this is a good performance. Student has technical components they can sharpen, but largely conveys the message of the text.
- 80-85. This performance needs work – significant technical issues/difficulty conveying the message of the text.
- 70-80: This performance has major issues that need to be addressed before the next tournament. Consult with the tabroom before assigning a score in the 70s.

Extemporaneous Speaking (International or United States)

Extemp (IX or USX) is a seven-minute speech event (with a 30-second grace period). Students have 30 minutes to prepare a speech in response to one of three selected questions. During prep, students may consult research they've brought with them; at most tournaments, including this one and the National Tournament, they may also use the internet. Each speech is delivered from memory without notes. Successful Extempers are reflective, focused, and inquisitive. They enjoy research, grasp the connections among global events, and are quick thinkers who can analyze complex issues, structure clear arguments, and support their claims with strong evidence—all under pressure. They tend to be reflective, driven, and deeply interested in how national events shape everyday life. To excel, students must think critically, organize ideas quickly, and deliver with clarity and confidence.

I am evaluating speakers on…	***I am not evaluating speakers on…***
• a clear and well-structured answer to the question • use of logic and evidence to support that answer • persuasive delivery and vocal variety • Platform presence	• my opinion about their answer to the question – I do not need to agree with their answer, nor should I reward a speaker with whom I agree • whether they have 3 points – there is no required structure/number of points • Whether they went 6:30 and not 7:30

Original Oratory

Original Oratory (OO) is a 10-minute speech event (with a 30-second grace period) in which students deliver a self-written speech designed to persuade an audience on a topic of significance. While the speech may incorporate humor and emotional appeals, it must be grounded in evidence, logic, and clear structure. The speech is delivered from memory and competitors are limited in their use of direct quotations. Successful orators are creative, enthusiastic, and thoughtful communicators. Because oratories are often revised and refined throughout the season, students should choose a topic they're genuinely excited to explore, continuously research, and present repeatedly. Strong orators are process-driven, personable, and confident in connecting ideas with impact.

I am evaluating speakers on…	***I am not evaluating speakers on…***
• quality, clarity, and development of the speech's main message • effective organization and logical progression • original analysis, insight, and perspective • persuasive delivery, vocal variety, and presence • appropriate and effective use of rhetorical devices / evidence ○ effective integration and citation of sources when used	• alignment with my personal worldview/opinions • topic choice alone: serious v. funny, etc. • whether they have 3 points – there is no required structure/number of points • amount of evidence (while some is nice, it is not a demand of the event)

Informative Speaking

Informative Speaking (INF) is a 10-minute original speech event (with a 30-second grace period) in which students aim to educate the audience about a topic of significance. The speech is written and delivered by the student and may include optional visual aids. While the primary purpose is to inform rather than persuade, appropriate use of humor and personality can enhance audience engagement and support effective communication.The speech must be delivered from memory. Effective topics aim to teach the audience something new or provide a fresh perspective on a familiar idea. Speeches should be supported by research and structured to clearly explain concepts using logic, evidence, and engaging delivery.

I am evaluating speakers on...	***I am not evaluating speakers on...***
• clarity and accuracy of the information presented • organization that supports audience learning • clear explanation of new ideas and concepts • effective integration and citation of sources • Professional, engaging and audience-centered delivery	• novelty / whether I already knew the information presented • how persuasive/opinionated the speech is • my personal interest in the topic • entertainment value alone • advocacy for/against a particular position

Dramatic Interpretation

Dramatic Interpretation (DI) is a 10-minute event (with a 30-second grace period) that challenges students to bring a published piece of serious literature to life using only their voice, facial expressions, and physicality without the use of props, costumes, or sets. While the name suggests high drama, DI is not about melodrama or excessive emotion. Instead, it calls for authentic portrayals of emotionally compelling narratives that connect deeply with the audience. To succeed in Dramatic Interpretation, students must demonstrate emotional control, character depth, and strong internal focus. Successful competitors are able to suspend disbelief and guide audiences through a believable emotional journey. Piece selection is key; students should choose material that aligns with their maturity level and school guidelines.

I am evaluating speakers on…	***I am not evaluating speakers on…***
• depth, consistency, and clarity of character work • emotional authenticity and range • physical and vocal control • clear storytelling, vocally and physically in the space • interpretive choices aligned with the text	• number of characters portrayed • volume alone as a marker of intensity • whether the piece is dark, challenging, or representative of an identity / movement • personal taste in the material ○ "your text is too modern" and "your text is too dated" are equally invalid critiques

Humorous Interpretation

Humorous Interpretation (HI) is a 10-minute event (with a 30-second grace period) that challenges students to entertain and connect with audiences through comedic storytelling. Using published material, performers often portray multiple characters, shifting voices, and physicality to bring dynamic scenes to life, all without props, costumes, or sets. At its core, HI uses humor as a tool to reveal universal truths, create connection, and make people laugh. But humor is complex and subjective; what gets big laughs from one audience might fall flat with another. That's why successful HI competitors think carefully about their material: Is it genuinely funny? Is it appropriate and engaging for a broad audience? Will the story resonate even if a particular joke doesn't land? Students should choose material appropriate for their age, maturity level, and school or team standards, ensuring that the content is both suitable and effective.

I am evaluating speakers on…	***I am not evaluating speakers on…***

• comedic timing, pacing, and clarity
• character consistency and commitment
• interpretive choices aligned with the text
• physical and vocal control
• audience engagement
• clear storytelling through humor
	• the number of characters portrayed
	• joke quantity alone
	• whether I personally find the piece funny
	• conventions of stand-up / sketch comedy
	• personal taste in the material
	  ○ if I find the piece too risque
	  ○ "your text is too modern" and "your text is too dated" are equally invalid critiques

Duo Interpretation

Duo Interpretation (DUO) is a 10-minute event (with a 30-second grace period) that showcases two performers bringing a published script to life. The performance can be dramatic, comedic, or a blend of both. What sets Duo apart is its off-stage focus requirement: partners must perform without making direct eye contact or physical contact with each other, challenging them to build chemistry and connection entirely through performance. Successful Duo teams are balanced, sharing a complementary performance style, work ethic, and level of commitment. On-stage chemistry matters most, and personal rapport doesn't always translate into effective performance synergy. Duo also opens the door to pieces that one performer alone might struggle to bring to life, such as scripts with rich dialogue, dual protagonists, or intricate character dynamics that require two distinct voices. Effective Duo scripts often feature strong contrasts in tone or character, tightly written exchanges, and clear relationships that evolve throughout the performance. A strong Duo performance hinges on equal energy, thoughtful staging, and believable relationships between characters.

I am evaluating speakers on…	***I am not evaluating speakers on…***

• strong and balanced teamwork
• coordinated performance
• clear character relationships
• vocal and physical contrast between characters
• no eye contact (students may position themselves to give the illusion of eye contact)
• no physical contact (students may block their piece to give the illusion of physical contact)
	• number of characters portrayed
	• theatrical standards of scenework / duet acting
	• personal taste in the material
	  ○ if I find the piece too risque
	  ○ "your text is too modern" and "your text is too dated" are equally invalid critiques

Program Oral Interpretation

Program Oral Interpretation (POI) is a ten-minute event (with a 30-second grace period) that challenges students to weave together multiple genres of

literature: prose, poetry, and drama, into a cohesive, theme-driven performance. Each program must include at least two of the three genres, though many students choose to incorporate all three, with the goal of crafting a compelling argument or central message supported by the selected texts. Performers begin with an original introduction written by the student, which frames the theme and identifies the titles and authors of the pieces used. POI highlights both literary analysis and interpretive performance. Students construct their programs by selecting published material that explores a common theme from multiple perspectives. A strong POI blends emotional depth, narrative clarity, and performative range, often incorporating both serious and humorous moments. Students are expected to portray multiple characters, shift tone and style, and maintain a strong throughline, all without the use of props or costumes (except for the required manuscript. For the avoidance of doubt, the manuscript may be used as a prop).

I am evaluating speakers on...	***I am not evaluating speakers on...***
• a clear and intentional unifying theme • quality and clarity of transitions • balance and cohesion among the text selections • interpretive choices that reinforce the theme/message • delivery that supports the overall program.	• number of genres of literature/source material selected alone • prestige or familiarity of sources • an expectation of equal time per selection • personal agreement/alignment with the theme/its advocacy

Congress Overview

NSDA Districts-specific reminders

- You will have multiple judges in each room, as well as a parliamentarian. Please do not start the round without all adult scorers/parliamentarian as listed on the schematic / the righthand side of your ballot page on tabroom.com.
- Parliamentarians are the final say on issues of procedure, they should consult the Committee if there are any concerns.
- Direct Questioning is mandated by the NSDA Unified Manual, p. 45.
- There is no "motion to open the floor for debate" under NSDA rules

NSDA Evidence Standards

- Please review pp. 49-54 of the NSDA Unified Unified Manual to fully understand the evidence standards for this tournament. Parliamentarians will be instructed to closely and fully understand these rules.
- Copies of the NSDA Evidence Challenge form will be distributed to Parliamentarians. (Appendix D of the NSDA Unified Manual).

Types of Speeches

Though the types of speeches in Congress are not explicitly stated, speeches will fall into one or more of the following categories

- Authorship/Sponsorship - 1ST SPEECH ON EVERY BILL
    - Introduces the bill/resolution for debate
    - Should establish that there is an issue that needs solving (inherency) and how the bill solves the issue (solvency)
- 1st Negation - 2ND SPEECH ON EVERY BILL
    - constructs opposition by explaining how attempting to solve/mitigate a problem using this legislation will fail to meet objectives or will make the problem worse
        - "Doesn't do enough," or "actively does harm"
- Rebuttal
    - Directly responds to and refutes arguments made on the other side of the debate with evidence and active analysis/explanation
    - NOT just namedropping other competitors
- Extension
    - Expands and expounds upon a previously made argument with new evidence/analysis
    - NOT just namedropping other competitors and repeating/rehashing

SPEECHES AFTER THE FIRST CYCLE ARE OFTEN A COMBO OF REBUTTAL AND EXTENSION, AND EARLIER ON WILL OFTEN CONSTRUCT NEW ARGUMENTS

- Crystallization
    - summarizing positions of both sides, and weighing the impacts to prove why one side wins over the other. This speech establishes key voting issues in the round. They will be in the last few speeches of the debate.

What makes a good speaker?

- Content: organization, evidence and language; logical arrangement of ideas; depth of thought; support from a variety of credible quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (expert testimony) evidence analyzed to draw conclusions; compelling language; memorable introduction and conclusion; and cohesive transitions to establish speaker's purpose and frame perspective of the issue's significance
- Argument & Refutation: arguments have clear claims, are substantiated with sound, analysis and evidence, and explain the impact on those affected; these ideas are either new/fresh, or clear extensions rather than mere repetition of what has already been said; refutation of opposing arguments actually disproves them, rather than simply listing and saying they're wrong; answers to questions are given in similar structure.
- Delivery: vocal control and physical poise are deliberate, crisp and confident. Delivery should be extemporaneous and engaging others in the room, with few errors in pronunciation. Eye contact is effective and consistent.
- Good Legislator: command of parliamentary procedure; asks questions; makes motions; takes actions that are in service of the chamber; plays the role of Congressperson effectively; respects the chamber and all those in it

So who wins?

- You will rank the top 8 speakers in the room, with 1 being the best and 8 being the furthest from the best. Your ranks will be averaged with the other judges' to determine who advances to the elimination rounds and final placements for the day.

How do I score/rank the PO?

- You are evaluating them on:
    - Speaker Recognition: methods are clearly explained at the beginning of the session and executed consistently. The PO is consistent in recognition (very few errors) and rulings, distributing speeches throughout the room, equally between schools of the same size, and among individuals.

    - Parliamentary Procedure: command of parliamentary procedure (motions) to transparently run a fair and efficient session, seldom consulting written rules and ruling immediately on whether motions pass or fail, but consulting the parliamentarian when necessary to ensure accuracy.
    - Delivery/Presence: dynamically fosters order and trust, and relates to peers well through vocal and physical presence. Word choice is economical and eloquent. The PO does not hesitate to rule abusive or inappropriate motions out of order. they foster trust by peers
- Unless the PO has made a noticeable and dramatic series of mistakes, they should get a rank from you commensurate with their performance in the aforementioned areas.

What should my ballots look like?

You will write a critique and give speaker points (2-6, 2 being barely intelligible and/or offensive and 6 being better than actual Congresspeople) for each speech a student gives. Separate from these critiques for individual speeches, you will also rank the top 8 speakers in the room, with 1 being the best and 8 being the furthest from the best. Your ranks will be averaged with the other judges' to determine who advances to the elimination rounds and final placements for the day. Ranks are on cumulative performance in the session, inclusive of all speeches/activity in that session. To do this, your ballot on tabroom.com will have two tabs: one to record feedback on individual speeches, and the other to input ranks. Please see WK Kay at the conclusion of the session if you are struggling to navigate tabroom.com

A Good Ballot	A Ballot That Needs Improvement
Fracking Aff - Time was 3:02 - Love the intro, but slow it down to make sure we catch the wordplay - Good to go right for the text of the bill and explain the "it's not in the bill" debate that was happening a bit early on - Excellent work of speaking extemporaneously and not relying on your notes - You're doing solid crystallization in a relatively early cycle speech, nicely done - Warrant 'entire towns can perish" more: you don't tell us how that happens	You are a good speaker, you had a good pace and tone. Just be careful with your balance with your notes and eye contact with the chamber. Time 3.03

- Rhetoric is strong in the “harming our constituents” bit of the first point - Investopedia is not as helpful as you think as it is - find what they’re citing from and cite that instead; you wouldn’t cite Wikipedia, don’t cite this - Great clash with Smith, who has the strongest Neg so far - make your gestures stronger: we lose anything you do below the waist - Strong rhetoric in conclusion, just don’t stumble during the wordplay (which was clever!) - Well done in questioning, stood strong especially against Johnson - Great questioning against Jones late in the debate, nice job to re-insert yourself in the debate	

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

A. **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.

B. **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.

C. **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
RFD 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. 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). 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.	Neg won because they had a stronger argument Aff, make your argument clearer next time