

SPEECH & DEBATE Policies and Guidelines

CHAPTER I – UHSAA Policies

Article I – Recommendations

Section 1: Region Representative

Each region shall elect one-member coach to represent that region to the Utah Debate Coaches Association (UDCA) to help solve problems occurring at major tournaments and to keep an open line of communication with the Activities Association.

Section 2: Missed School Time

It is recommended that no student miss more than five days of school for Speech and Debate practice or meets during a given school year.

Article II – Financial Rules

Section 1: Entry Fees

No entry fee in excess of \$5.00 per student per event per day may be assessed for any meet. A maximum \$25 school entry fee per day may be charged at invitational tournaments if deemed necessary by the host school. The only exception is for a Tournament of Champions qualifier or if the Executive Committee approves an exception.

Section 2: No Shows

A contract is formed when participant entries are submitted to the state tournament director and each “no show” entry will be fined \$25. Invitational tournaments may also levy a \$25 fine for each “no show” entry at UHSAA sanctioned tournaments. Schools are obligated to pay all fees unless they withdraw 72 hours prior to the tournament. Tournament Directors have discretion to override fees on a case-by-case basis.

Article III – Conduct of Tournaments

Section 1: In-State Sanctioning Process

All speech and debate competitions must be sanctioned by the UHSAA (see UHSAA By-Laws Article 4). In the case of virtual or online tournaments, schools still must sanction the tournament, acknowledging they are responsible for “hosting” by running Tab Room and the online platform chosen, as well as facilitating the delivery/shipment of trophies. Include “online” or “virtual” in the tournament title, and principals still will sign off as normal. Forms must be submitted to and approved by the UHSAA no less than 30 days prior to the tournament.

Section 2: Online Sanctioning

1. Online tournaments allow out of state schools the opportunity to attend and support Utah Tournaments; bringing diversity, increased educational opportunities, and funding as well. Therefore, any tournament hosted online by a UHSAA school, may allow out of state schools to register and still be sanctioned as long as the following criteria is met:

a. The Tournament is still sanctioned through UHSAA as a virtual or Mixed virtual tournament. Out of state schools must compete online only or tournament must go through the normal out of state sanctioning process.

b. The out of state School registering is an actual school sponsored team/club, verified with a letter from principal on school letter head approving their participation.

c. Students competing are sanctioned by their coach who agrees in writing and agree to ensure judges and meet any financial obligations that may be incurred by attending.

Section 3: Preliminary Round Start Time

No preliminary round of a tournament, which is not a round robin or a Tournament of Champions qualifier, may be scheduled to start after 8:30 p.m.

Section 4: Novice Participation Guidelines

Participants participating in a Speech or Debate event as a novice should not have competed in more than one tournament worth of competition prior to the current season within their 9-12 educational career.

Section 5: Novice Policy Guidelines

Novice teams will only be allowed to run arguments from the approved argument list and corresponding evidence set. Novice policy teams will be limited to a “closed deck” of evidence files (every competitor will have the same set of cards). Novice students may rearrange the organization of evidence but may not add and/or change the content in order to produce new arguments not labeled in the evidence set, nor can they alter the fundamental intent of the argument.

These limits will be enforced from the start of the season until the end of December. Novices will be allowed to run any argument or evidence in January until the end of the season. Any novice team found to be running an affirmative not on the case list will forfeit the round. “Novice teams” are strictly and universally defined as two-person policy teams wherein neither student on said team has had more than one tournament’s worth of competitive experience before the start of October of the given competitive season.

The novice evidence set is established each year by the UDCA and NFHS to limit the areas of the high school debate resolution that novices will have to prepare to debate. The goal is to make the debating more manageable for novice students and to enhance the quality of each debate. Judges, coaches, and debaters should also understand that by selecting these specific argument limits, the UDCA/NFHS is not necessarily endorsing the topicality any case, nor are they commenting on the strategic value of any one position. Traditional topicality arguments can still be presented by the negative team and should be considered by the judge. Theory and kritik arguments will not be allowed.

An executive committee of coaches will create the evidence set to be published on the Utah Debate Coaches Association website by the end of August.

Section 6: Ballots

Debate Ballots will not be accepted with “oral critique” only written. Every ballot must have a warranted reason for decision stating, “I vote affirmative or negative because...” Congress/Speech Ballots should give constructive feedback for each individual competing.

Section 7: Contest Limitations

Contest Limitations are 10 meets per individual.

A. Contest: Any meet or game (this does not include practices and scrimmages) in which 4+ schools participate, judging/feedback is provided, and students earn NSDA points counts toward the contest limitation. Practice, Scrimmage, or combined learning opportunities, may not include more than 4 schools, must be online/virtual format, and no judging or NSDA points earned.

B. Tournament: Competition among four or more schools.

C. The contest limitations apply from the starting date of competition until the first day of the state tournament in each classification. This applies to all levels of competition (i.e., Varsity, J.V., Sophomore, Freshman, Novice). State and qualifying region, NCFL and NSDA national qualifying tournaments do not count in the contest limitation total.

D. An individual who violates the contest limit is ineligible to compete at the Region or State Tournaments.

Article IV – Electronic Devices

Section 1: Events in Which Computer Use is Allowed

No electronic devices will be allowed in any competition with the following exception: The use of computers within the guidelines stated in Section 2 is allowed at region and state tournaments in the following events: Extemporaneous Speaking, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Policy Debate, Public Forum Debate, Student Congress.

Section 2: General Rules

A. Contestants must follow all rules regarding electronic devices and Internet access as described in the National Speech and Debate Association Unified Manual.

B. Communication outside of in-round communication with partners or opponents is prohibited.

C. Penalty: Contestants found to have violated these provisions will be disqualified from the tournament and will forfeit all rounds and sweepstakes points in that event.

Chapter II: Region Tournaments

Article 1: Guidelines

Section 1: Region Representative Responsibility

It is the responsibility of each region representative to conduct the region tournament.

- A. Make sure that there is a school to host the tournament, make sure that the tournament schedule is set and published, and make sure that judges have been secured.
- B. Make sure that each coach in the region has a copy of the handbook, times and location for the tournament, and a thorough understanding of judge expectations well in advance of the tournament start date.
- C. Submit results to the UHSAA office and the State Tournament Director by the deadline listed on the UHSAA calendar or within five (5) days of completion of the region tournament, whichever is sooner.
- D. Request and secure region awards, including the team trophy, from their region's Board of Managers.
- E. Secure Congress judges.

Section 2: Appeals

In matters that involve appeals, the region representative should bring all unsettled matters to the UDCA Executive Committee. The UDCA Executive Committee will determine if the issue merits a UCDA Judicial Meeting or if the Region Board of Managers (principals) should address the issue.

Clerical scoring errors may be corrected up to 72 hours after the conclusion of the tournament. A team must file a written protest to the UHSAA within that time period. After that time, results will stand.

Section 3: Region Entries

- A. Region tournaments shall not allow phantom entries. Drops should be removed as soon as possible, and debaters should have as few byes as possible, regardless of entry numbers. The exception to this is that schools will not be required to compete against themselves in preliminary debate rounds.
- B. Students must participate at the region tournament to qualify for State.
- C. Partnerships count as one entry.

Section 4: Participant Eligibility

All participants must meet UHSAA eligibility requirements.

Section 5: Publication of Results

Results should be published to coaches after each round but should not be made public until the tournament is completed. It is unethical for coaches or anyone else to divulge the results of a round before the tournament is completed.

Section 6: Rules to Be Followed

The region tournament is to follow exclusively the rules for each event, including the timing and eligibility of all materials to be used in speech areas. Rules regarding events can be found in this handbook.

Section 7: Awards

Awards should be given to schools or participants as determined by the Region Board of Managers.

Chapter III–State Tournaments

Article I – General Instructions

Section 1. Qualification and Entry Limits

- A. The top 10 in each event at region qualify to state, or 50% of the field in that event, whichever is greater.
- B. All schools in the region shall be rank ordered based upon sweepstakes points at the region tournament. The top 50 percent will qualify a full slate. Regions with an uneven number should round up to determine the top 50 percent.
- C. Full Slate is defined as:
 - a. 1-2A: 25 participants allowed per the event limits.
 - b. 3-6A: 30 participants allowed per event limits
 - c. If the school exceeds the limitations, schools should list alternates in each event. Alternates will be allowed to compete only in the events they entered at region meet.
- D. Debate partnership alternate/substitutions: In the event of an emergency/documentated medical illness a coach may substitute another qualified member of the team into that partnership prior to rounds beginning. The substitute must also have competed in that same event at region. This only applies to partnership events: Policy and Public Forum Debate.

Section 2: Event Entry Limits

A. 1A:

- a. 4 LD
- b. 4 SpAr
- c. 3 PF
- d. 4 Congress
- e. 4 Oratory, Impromptu, Combined Extemp

B. 2A:

- a. 4 LD, SpAr, PF, Congress
- b. 4 Oratory, Impromptu, Combined Extemp, Combined Interp, Informative.

C. 3-6A:

- a. 4 LD, CX, PF, Congress
- b. 4 Oratory, Impromptu, International Extemp, US Extemp, Combined Interp, Informative.

D. Double Entry:

Students may double enter in one speech event and one debate event, except for policy teams. In 1A, Congress is a Speech Event, while 2-6A Congress is considered a debate event.

- E. Proposals for changes to the UHSAA State Tournament event lineup may only be introduced and voted on once every four years

Section 3: Schools to provide Judges

Schools who fail to supply their allotted judges will be fined \$100.00 per judge.

A. Schools are required to supply the following qualified judges:

- a. One judge per two Debate teams
- b. One judge for one per six Speech entries.
- c. If asked to provide by tournament director, 1 Congress Judge.
- d. A full slate is required to bring a minimum of six judges.
- e. Each judge must be available for assignments one round beyond the elimination of all students from that school. Judges who miss rounds will result in a \$25 fine to the school.

Section 4: Judge Restrictions for Contestants

Any student who knowingly allows himself or herself to be judged by any of the following individuals, without informing the meet directors, at any of the State Tournaments shall be disqualified and shall lose all sweepstakes points.

- A. Any judge judging for his or her school.
- B. A family member.
- C. Any alumnus from his or her school.

- D. Any student teacher assigned to his/her school.
- E. Any adult who has worked for his/her school in the past two years.
- F. Any person who may be construed to have a bias for a participant.
- G. For 1A only: No judge may judge 1A participants at the State Speech-and-Debate Tournament who has graduated from a 1A high school within the past two years. Beginning the third year after graduation, a judge would be eligible.
- H. Any exceptions must be approved by the tournament director. When unavoidable and with all coaches involved permission, a judge may be assigned to a round with participants from his/her school.

Section 6: Judge Requirements

- A. All judges must be graduated, and whenever possible, have some knowledge of Speech/Debate events. It is also the responsibility of judges to make a good faith effort to comply with all expectations listed in Section 4.
- B. Judges in the Policy debate, Public Forum, and Lincoln-Douglas rounds must adhere to the following requirements in order to receive payment from the State Forensic Tournament:
 - a. Return ballots to the tabulation room within 15 minutes of the end of the round
 - b. Never ask the teams which school they represent.
 - c. Mark the speaker points on the ballot, using the rubric provided in tabroom to ensure accuracy.
 - d. Confine all of their comments to the ballots and make no oral critiques.
 - e. Judges no contestant twice during the four preliminary rounds, whenever possible.

Section 7: Codes

- A. All judges and participants should be assigned a code, which will identify conflicts of interest. In no way, however, should a participant be identified according to his or her school, or have any clothing or insignia that could indicate their school affiliation.
- B. Teams and contestants should in no way reveal their school identities to the judges or other coaches, unless they are a tournament official.
- C. All code letters should be kept throughout the State Tournament.
- D. Teams and contestants should use both their first and last names for balloting.
- E. An official listing of teams and contestants and their school will be provided after the completion of the State Forensic Tournament.

Section 8: Alternate Clearance

All alternates participating in the state tournament must be cleared by the State Tournament Directors before the State Tournament begins.

Section 9: Late Drops

Schools who drop contestants on the day of the state tournament without due cause will be fined \$25 for each participant dropped.

Section 10: Time Limit to Appear for Rounds

Contestants in each event must be in their assigned room and the round must begin within 15 minutes of the posted beginning time. A team or individual who fails to comply will forfeit that round and lose sweepstakes points.

Section 11: Missed Rounds

- A. Any participant at the State Forensic Tournament who misses a round or session of an event will not be eligible for a final rating or team sweepstakes points.
- B. A \$25 charge may be fined.

Section 12: Tab Room

The state tournament director will have at least two other persons in the tab room. These people may include State Speech Committee members, classification representatives, region representatives, as well as any others appointed by the tournament director.

A ballot review is required before final rounds are posted.

The ombuds and state tournament director will be open to any questions and/or comments.

Section 13: Ballots

Only UDCA approved ballots may be used at state tournaments. Paperless ballots are allowed at state tournaments.

Section 14: Ballot Review

For online tabulation, Ballots will be published to coaches only following each round completion for ballot review. Paper ballots, ballots will be made available for coaches to review once entered.

- a. Coaches must not disclose results of win/loss, ranking, rfd or feedback to contestants in any way until after the award ceremony.

Section 15: Observers

Observers will be permitted in all rounds of all events, the only exception is that a Lincoln-Douglas contestant and Public Forum teams in the B Panel cannot observe the A panel and the A Panel cannot observe the B panel. Contestants and judges have the right to limit observers and in elimination rounds if room does not permit, or ask them to leave if disruptive. Flowing in rounds will be allowed for educational purposes.

Observers should not be disruptive, distracting, or communicating with the contestants in any way.

Section 16: Awards

Awards will be given as listed in the UHSAA Yearbook.

Article II – Sweepstakes Points

Section 1: Quartiling

All contestants (including disqualifications, drops the day of the tournament, no shows, etc.) in each category shall be ranked in order of finish. The category shall then be divided into equal fourths. Odd numbers shall be placed in the highest fourth possible (one odd number shall be added to the first quarter; two odd numbers shall add one to each of the two highest quarters, etc.).

Section 2: Sweepstakes Points

Points are to be scored as follows for the State Forensic Tournaments:

	CX and PF	Other Rating Debate Events
First fourth	10	5
Second fourth	6	3
Third fourth	2	1
Bottom fourth	0	0

Section 3: Quartile Breaks

When quartiles do not break cleanly, adjustment will be made in the direction which least skews the quartile. For example: If ten superiors are needed and the choice is between nine superiors or seventeen superiors, nine will be used since it more closely approximates the quartile. If the number is the same, regardless of direction, the greater number should be used.

Section 4: Speech/Congress Event Rankings

Rankings in all Individual Events shall be based on cumulative ranks in preliminary rounds. Ties shall be broken by considering reciprocal ranks which gives preference to the speaker with the greatest number of 1s, greatest number of 2s and so on.

Unavoidable ties shall increase the higher quartile by the number involved and decrease the lower quartile by the same number.

Section 5: Debate Event Rankings

Rankings in Policy, Public Forum, Lincoln-Douglas, and Spontaneous Argumentation Debate shall be based on win-loss records in preliminary rounds. Ties shall not be broken on speaker points. Unavoidable ties shall increase the higher quartile by the number of teams involved and decrease the lower quartile by the same number.

Section 6: Sweepstakes Tie Breaking Procedure (for all classifications)

If two schools tie for either 1st or 2nd place sweepstakes, the following tie-breaking procedure will be followed:

- A. The lowest total ranking score in all events wins the tie.
- B. Policy, Public Forum and Lincoln-Douglas Debate will be broken with 1 for wins and 3 for loss.
- C. Congress will quartile by judge.
- D. Only ties for 1st and 2nd place sweepstakes will be broken, all other sweepstakes ties will be listed and announced as ties.

Article III – Debate

Section 1: Resolutions

- A. The Policy Debate Resolution used at the State Tournament shall be the national topic/resolution for the current school year.
- B. The Lincoln-Douglas and Public Forum resolution used at the State Tournaments shall be the resolution designated by the National Speech & Debate Association or its successor organization for the month of March.

Section 2: No Late Substitution

Substitution of participants after the State Speech/Debate Tournament has begun is illegal. Violators will be disqualified.

Section 6: Maintenance of Pairings

Policy Debate teams, Public Forum Teams, and Lincoln-Douglas contestants must debate against the teams/ individuals they are scheduled to meet and they must debate on the side of which they are scheduled. All rounds must be fully complete in order to count for sweepstakes.

Section 7: Preliminary Rounds Pairing

Whenever possible, pairing preliminary debate rounds for the State Forensic Tournament shall be as follows:

- A. Whenever possible, all efforts shall be made to ensure that No team shall meet two teams from the same Region in the first two rounds.
- B. Whenever possible, all efforts shall be made to ensure that teams do not meet another school from their own region in the first two rounds.
- C. No team will debate the same school twice in the first two rounds, except when a region with more teams must meet a region with fewer teams.
- D. No team shall debate a team from its own school.

Section 8: Rounds III, IV

Pairing rounds III and IV for debate events at States Forensic Tournaments shall be as follows:

- A. In rounds III, IV), all measures will be used to guarantee each team or contestant a fair number of affirmative and negative rounds.
 - B. Round III shall be power matched (based on results of the first two rounds), high-low, by placing teams or contestants with the highest speaker points against the teams or contestants with the lowest points and the same win-loss record.
 - C. Round IV shall be power matched (based on results of the first 3 rounds), high-low, by placing teams or contestants with the highest speaker points against the teams or contestants with the lowest points and the same win-loss record.
- A. These brackets will be broken if:
- a. A team or contestant is scheduled to meet another from its own school.
 - b. A team or contestant meets a team, which it has met previously in the preliminary rounds.
 - c. When brackets are broken the next logical bracket shall be pulled up to fit the pairing from the middle of the lower bracket.

Section 10: Debate Final Rounds

- A. After round IV, quarterfinals will be held unless either:
 - a. There is a clean break that would allow a partial octo round of 4 or fewer additional debaters to debate into quarterfinals for the 7 and 8 seeds (this should be done only if there are more than 30 original contestants in the event) OR
 - b. quarterfinals will break more than 50% of the participants in that event. If this is the case, semi-finals will be held instead.

- B. Final Rounds at the State Forensic Tournaments shall be paired as follow:
 - a. Teams or contestants from this point shall be ranked 1 through 8.
- C. The ranking of the top eight teams (or contestants) advancing will be:
 - a. first on the basis of win-loss record; and
 - b. second on the basis of speaker points.
- D. These teams will be bracketed according to the following schematic.
 - a. The bracket is not adjusted to avoid two teams (or contestants) from the same school meeting.
 - i. 1 seed vs. 8 seed
 - ii. 5 seed vs. 4 seed
 - iii. 3 seed vs. 6 seed
 - iv. 2 seed vs. 7 seed
- E. Winners of the quarterfinal rounds will debate each other in a semi-final round, following the quarterfinal bracketing, regardless of preliminary records.
- F. Semi-final winners will debate in a final round.
- G. A panel of at least three judges shall be used in elimination rounds and they will receive additional payment.
- H. Teams choosing not to debate elimination rounds are ineligible for state tournament awards unless the elimination participants are from the same school.
 - a. A first place will be awarded to the winner of the final round.
 - b. The loser of the final round will be awarded second place.
 - c. Both semi-final round losers will receive a third place award.
 - d. If participants from the same school are scheduled to debate themselves in elimination rounds, the coach of that school may either choose to have the round run normally with a panel of judges, or they may decide which team to advance without debating. Their decision to run the round must be announced to the tab-room within 10 minutes of the round being posted
If the coach decides to advance a team without debating, that team must be declared to the tab-room before the end of that elimination round (i.e. they may not wait to see the outcomes of the other debates).
 - e. If one school closes out the bracket such that no other debates can occur with different schools, those contestants will be considered co-champions.

Article IV – Student Congress

Section 1: Number of Houses

- A. There shall be at least one house.
- B. If there are more than 25 contestants, there will be two houses of not less than 13 or larger than 25 members in each for the preliminary rounds.
- C. A final session will be held if there are two houses.

Section 2 : Legislation

All legislation will be selected from the current docket by the tournament directors at the UHSAA State Planning meeting. The tournament docket will be published at least two weeks in advance of the state tournament.

Section 3: Operation

The operation of the State Student Congress shall be as follows:

- A. A session is a minimum of 2 1/2 hours.
 - a. Congressional Sessions default size should be 11-18 and shall be capped at no more than 23 in a session. Sessions are a minimum of 2.5 hours and if larger than 18 should be held as a 3 hour session.
- B. Election of presiding officer is with a majority vote in presence of parliamentarian by secret vote. If top vote is tied, eliminate lower vote candidates and recall votes for those remaining. A Presiding officer presides for the entirety of a session.
- C. Precedence DOES NOT reset between preliminary sessions.
- D. Seating Charts DO reset between preliminary sessions.
- E. Setting the Docket: "Docket order will be established in-round by the students in each chamber at the start of the first session of the day. After the presiding officer selection, but before debate begins, there must be a "main motion to open the floor for docket nominations", at which point any interested student may "motion to propose a docket". Upon being recognized by the presiding officer, the motioner will verbally state their docket proposal, which will be written on the board by the presiding officer for all to see. A valid docket proposal must list each provided piece of legislation in the order they are to be debated in. The nomination process continues until all students who wish to submit a docket proposal have been recognized, at which point there must be a "main motion to close the floor for docket nominations". There must be at least one proposed docket in order to close the floor for nominations and proceed with the round. If only one docket is proposed, that will be the set docket.
 - a. If there are two or more proposed dockets, the presiding officer will conduct a public vote by show of hands, and the docket which receives a simple majority (50% plus one) of votes will be selected. If there are exactly two proposed dockets tied in votes, the presiding officer will break a tie.
 - b. If there are three or more proposed dockets, an instant-runoff voting system will be used. If one docket receives a simple majority after the first round of voting, that will be the set docket. If there is no simple majority, the docket with the fewest votes will be eliminated and votes will be recast as many times as are necessary until there is a majority winner. If a vote produces no simple majority and multiple dockets tied for fewest votes, there will be a separate round of voting on only the tied dockets to decide which is eliminated.
 - c. Once the docket is selected, there will be a "main motion to open the floor for debate" on the first piece of legislation in the established docket order, and debate may begin
- F. Preset priority is up to the individual tournament director, but will be used at state.
- G. When more than one speaker seeks the floor, presidency shall followed
 - a. Presiding officers should establish clear, fair explanations in the recognition process and be consistent. (Jumping should NOT be used; instead use raising of placards, hands, etc.)
- H. Speakers may yield time to the floor during the debate for questions or clarifications, but the speaker will remain in control of their three minutes.
- I. Speeches are up to 3 minutes in length, but do not have to be the full time.

- J. Author of legislation (or school of legislation) has authorship privilege in presentation of legislation regardless of precedence. If no individual rises to give an authorship speech for a bill, then it is reverted to current precedence.
- K. Direct questioning: The presiding officer will open the floor for questions following each speech. The presiding officer will recognize questioners for a cross-examination period of no more than 30 seconds. a Questioners will be chosen according to a separate questioning recency and precedence should be kept.
- L. PO's should not call for motions. They should pause for those from the floor to call for motions.
- M. Amendments: must be presented to parliamentarians and PO in writing with specific references to lines and clauses that change. This must be done in advance of moving to amend.
 - a. The parliamentarian will recommend whether the amendment is "germane"--that is, upholds the original intent of the legislation---otherwise it is discounted.
 - b. A legislator may move to amend between floor speeches. The PO will read the proposed amendment and call for a second by one third vote.
 - c. Should students wish to speak on the proposed amendment, the PO will recognize them per standing precedence and recency and count towards the total number of speeches given.
 - d. Simply proposing an amendment DOES NOT guarantee authorship speech and the one minute questioning period that follows an amendment authorship speech.
 - e. If there are no speakers on the amendment, the previous question is moved and the chamber may vote without debating it.
- N. Following the first two speeches on legislation, the presiding officer will alternately recognize affirmative and negative speakers, who will address the chamber for up to three minutes, followed by one minute of questioning by other delegates. If no one wishes to oppose the preceding speaker, the presiding officer may recognize a speaker upholding the same side. When no one seeks the floor for debate, the presiding officer may ask the chamber if they are "ready for the question," at which point, if there is no objection, voting may commence on the legislation itself.
- O. All major voting shall be done with counted vote. Secret balloting is used when voting for presiding officer.
- P. Visual aids are permitted in Congressional Debate, provided they do not require electronic retrieval devices in the chamber.
- Q. All evidence used is subject to verification and subject to the rules of evidence. Any concern or complaint of rule violation must be brought to the judges/Parliamentarian within the round it occurs. If a concern or complaint needs to be discussed privately, a note may be given to the parliamentarian (or sent in the private chat if online) and at the next break the parliamentarian and contestant can address the issue. If it is serious and needs to be addressed immediately, then the individual can let the parliamentarian know and the parliamentarian can pause the time of the session to deal with it. THIS WILL NOT COUNT IN SESSION TIME AND WILL BE ADDED ON TO THE SESSION to ensure that the full speaking time is met.
- R. Congressional Debate entries must rise to a point of information after a speech to formally request a copy of the evidence cited, the citation, or the original source of evidence.
 - a. When requested during the point of information, the presiding officer will instruct the debater being challenged to produce the copy of the evidence, citation, or original source. The debater being challenged must produce the requested materials in a timely fashion. Should a debater feel they are not receiving the information they requested in a timely fashion, they may rise to another point of information for the presiding officer and parliamentarian to address the situation.
 - b. Debaters who request the information may receive the evidence from the presiding officer within a period of two speeches. The round would not be put on hold for the request to be completed.

- i. For example, if a debater rises to a point of order after speech #4, then by the conclusion of speech #6, the requested evidence should be presented to the presiding officer.
 - ii. If after reviewing the evidence in question, a debater feels that an evidence violation has occurred, they may submit a formal allegation by completing an evidence challenge form and, after making a motion to approach the chair, the debater will present the form to the presiding officer and parliamentarian.
- S. The use of internet enabled electronic devices is permitted. Students may not use the internet to gain help from coaches, other students, or any person, such that it would prevent the speech from being the original work of the competitor.
- T. Electronic device use must comply with the “New Guidelines for Use of Internet-Enabled Devices in Debate Events.”
- U. These rules may NOT be suspended, and the PO should rule such motions out of order, except to extend questioning or allow for open chambers.
- V. Congress Tie Breaks shall be as follows for Preliminary Rounds:
 - a. 1. Ranks
 - 2. Judge Pref
 - 3. Reciprocals
 - 4. Ranks drop 1 High/1 Low
 - 5. Parli Vote

Article V – Individual Events

Section 1: Number of Preliminary Rounds

There shall be three preliminary rounds for each individual event.

Section 2: Pairing

Pairing should meet the following objectives.

- A. There should be at least five students in a section when possible. There may be no more than seven students in a section.
- B. The student’s speaking order should vary from round to round.
- C. All effort will be made to ensure that no student should be judged by the same person more than once in prelims.

Section 3: Recording Results

- A. Contestants shall be ranked 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 in all rounds. Tied rankings are not permitted.
- B. Ranks must be truncated to the size of the smallest section in tabulation.
- C. Prelim Tie breaks are as follows:
 - a. Cumulative ranks in preliminary rounds.
 - b. Reciprocal ranks, which gives preference to the speaker with the greatest number of 1s, greatest number of 2s, and so on
 - c. Drop highest and lowest rankings

Section 4: Final Rounds

Final rounds at the state tournaments will be determined in the following manner:

- A. The best 6 participants or the cleanest break closest to 6 will advance to the final rounds.
- B. Three-judge panels shall be used in all final rounds.
- C. Final Tie Breaks are as follows:
 - a. Final round results for impromptu and extemporaneous speaking will be determined with tiebreakers in the following order:
 - i. Rank score from all rounds.
 - ii. Rank score from final round.
 - iii. Judge pref score from final round.
 - iv. Reciprocals score from preliminary rounds.
 - v. Rank score from the preliminary rounds, except the highest and lowest score.
 - b. Final round results for Oratory, Informative, and Combined Interps will be determined with tiebreakers in the following order:
 - i. Rank score from final round.
 - ii. Rank score from all rounds.
 - iii. Judge pref score from final round.
 - iv. Reciprocals score from preliminary rounds.
 - v. Rank score from the preliminary rounds, except the highest and lowest score.

Chapter IV--Region Representative and Tournament Director Duties for State

Article 1. Tournament Director Responsibilities

Section 1: Before the Tournament

- A. Check Settings on Rules/Tiebreaks to ensure they are correct on Tabroom. (Tournament Will be created by UDCA Tourn Director)
- B. Work with Region reps, or on own, to secure congress judges and qualified Parliamentarians.
- C. Ask at least two of the region reps to help run tournament in tabroom to ensure three individuals in tabroom.
- D. Create and assign Regions in Tabroom
- E. Get tabroom licenses and paid for. Work with treasurer.to pay with UDCA Card.
- F. Extemp Prep Assigned and review procedure and timing for schedule.
- G. IF ONLINE: Make Utility rooms (separate Judge room with a liaison coach to go between--zoom recommended otherwise you will have a lot of utility rooms to go between).
- H. If ONLINE: Coach/Tabroom--recommend zoom with breakouts available to keep things manageable.

- I. Double Check judges and that their availability is correct.
- J. Double Check Entries and numbers from the schools.
- K. Send judge training module instructions for certification and ensure training certification completed.

Section 2: During the Tournament

- A. Have the Handbook and Event Rule book printed, or electronically available, ready to use as needed.
- B. Be in the Tabroom with staff at least 30 min before start of tournament to ensure ready to go. Review who is doing what and overall procedures.
- C. IF ONLINE: Trouble Shooting Tech issues: [Use NSDA recommendations](#)---20 min to fix. Possibility, Coach could record a speech in that 20 min of trying and give to director to give to judge if all else fails. LAST RESORT FOR SPEECH! Kindness and best for students is motto.
 - a. Debate, they get the loss if can't figure out at that point.
 - i. Recommend having a zoom that has breakout rooms or a google meet set up as an option for those who can't get into campus emergency and see if that works, have another coach/region representative to be on that job.
- D. Event procedures:
 - a. Individual Events:
 - i. Set a time prior to round start for extemp prep.
 - ii. pair all rounds in tabroom in advance of tournament. Prior to publishing, double check for any errors and adjustments for drops, changes, etc.
 - iii. Publish and blast rounds at least 5 minutes before extemp prep is set to begin.
 - b. Debate Events:
 - i. Preset rounds I-II at least 30 minutes before tournament begins.
 - ii. Publish and blast rounds at least 15 min prior to round start time.
 - c. Congress:
 - i. Prepanel congress houses at least 30 minutes before tournament start time.
 - ii. Create seating charts in tabroom, print a copy of each for scorers and PO of each house.
 - iii. Publish and blast sessions at least 15 min before round start.
- E. After start of rounds, ensure judges have clicked start in tabroom, are in their rooms, and that rounds are going. Replace judges and take care of problems as needed.
- F. While rounds are going, ensure the next rounds are ready to go.
- G. At conclusion of each round, Publish results to **Coaches only** after each round for ballot review. Remind them NOT to disclose or discuss with students.
- H. Hold formal, or informal, coach meetings at some point during rounds to ensure region/state reps and locations are secured for the next year, discuss rule changes or concerns, and vote for Classification Coach of the Year.
- I. After preliminary rounds are complete and during elimination rounds

- a. Complete the Sweepstakes Quartling. Tabroom staff to print, mark and tally. Then put these out for all coaches to review and sign if agreed with, or adjust after discussion if errors are found.
- b. If there is conflict or need a second opinion on quartling/sweeps...use the ombudsman.

Section 3: After the Tournament

- A. Upload results, winning team photos, and any proposals, voting results, etc to the UHSAA/UDCA via provided online folders.
- B. Make a copy of the Pay Template and fill in. Share this with the treasurer and coaches to ensure payment. Coaches pay judges and treasurer pays the schools, except in case of hires by tournament directors if needed. Treasurer will then pay hires directly.

Article II–Region Representatives

Section 1: Committee Membership

State Tournament committees are made up of State Tournament Director, Region Representatives, and the ombudsman.

Section 2: Committee Member Duties at State Tournament

- A. Assist the Tournament director with Tournament/ tabroom duties.
- B. In case of rule violation appeal of ombuds/tournament director ruling, the committee may meet to discuss, without knowledge of school/individual, to make a decision in the spirit of what is best for the tournament and activity.
- C. Be available for consultation with the Tournament Director for any decisions not covered in the rules.

Chapter V: Protests, Procedures, Consequences

Article I: Protest Procedures

Section 1: Definitions of roles

- A. Ombudsmen: At the State Tournament, the Ombudsperson Office is the go-to space for answers related to the tournament rules and procedure. They also serve as the intake for any formal rules protests. This Individual will also provide a safer place for attendees to report violations of the harassment/discrimination policy at our tournament.
- B. UHSAA Representative is the Tournament Director. The Tournament Director has been selected to represent the UHSAA and make decisions on their behalf. (This is per the UHSAA

Section 2: In Round Protest Procedures

Protests should be regarding a violation of rules/Honor code.

Rules infractions at the UHSAA State Speech and Debate Tournaments will result in consequences based on the circumstance and magnitude of the infraction. The following options are listed progressively according to their level of severity. Each may be utilized independently.

- A. **Level 1:** Issue a warning with the instruction to correct the infraction for the next round. If not corrected, the competitor will be penalized accordingly. (misunderstanding of rules, innocent mistake, etc).

- B. **Level 2:** Cannot receive a rank of 1 from any judge in the round. All competitors' scores will be re-adjusted accordingly (e.g., over the grace period, use of script, etc.).
- C. **Level 3:** Drop 2 ranks from all judges in the round (e.g., 1 to 3, 2 to 4, etc.). All competitors' scores will be re-adjusted accordingly. (has not fixed the issue post warning, used prop when not allowed, clear violation of event specified rules, etc)
- D. **Level 4:** Change ranks to last or a loss from all judges in round. All competitors' scores will be re-adjusted accordingly. (e.g., a student competes in the wrong contest section or against the wrong opponent at no fault of their opponent or tournament officials, etc.).
- E. **Level 5:** Disqualify the entry. All competitors' scores will be re-adjusted accordingly. For example but not limited to:
 - a. plagiarism,
 - b. exceeding transitional material guidelines,
 - c. using non-existent evidence in extemporaneous/debate events,
 - d. misrepresenting the content of the script submitted with what is actually presented in the round,
 - e. using internet to communicate with outside sources during extemporaneous preparation,
 - f. Communication in person with anyone in or outside of the extemp prep room, other than Extemp Prep Facilitator, including anywhere between prep and competition room.
 - g. Communicating via cell phone or electronic device with anyone outside/inside of round other than partner, or sharing evidence between opponents, partner and/or judge.
 - h. Any other clear/flagrant violation of rules, repeated violations after warnings and other levels, etc as determined by the committee.
- D. If an entry is disqualified, one or more of the following may happen:
 - 1. If in a final round, any placings or points earned by that student will be vacated. All competitors ranked lower than the disqualified competitor will be moved up one placement in that round. If multiple violations in the same event have occurred, competitors will be advanced accordingly. If the violation is discovered during the semifinal round, the offending competitor will be ranked last in the semifinal round. If the student still qualifies for the final round with that ranking, their place in the final round will be vacated, and the next place competitor will be placed in the final round. If re-ranking is necessary, it is only applicable to the round in which the violation occurred, not previous rounds in the tournament.
 - 2. If the violation occurs in a final round and the violation would result in a new champion, the championship will be vacated.
 - 3. If violation includes other students competing at the tournament, they may be referred for rule violation review as well.
 - 4. If a violation includes a coach facilitating/participating in the violation, that coach will be referred for sanction by the UDCA and UHSAA. 5. Referrals for Honor Code Violations may be made the NSDA if a member.

Artificial Intelligence:

- 1. In events in which speeches must be the original created work of a competitor (OO, INF, IX, USX, SW, EXC, IMP, EXP) students are prohibited from quoting or paraphrasing text directly from generative AI sources. Generative AI should not be cited as a source. The exception is that a student delivering a speech about the topic of AI may quote AI to illustrate their points about AI, in accordance with existing quoted word limits. While generative AI may be used to guide students to articles, ideas, and sources, the original source of any quoted or paraphrased evidence must be available if requested.

In debate events, generative AI should not be cited as a source; while generative AI may be used to guide students to articles, ideas, and sources, the original source of any quoted or paraphrased evidence must be available if requested.

In Interpretation events, students are prohibited from performing material created by generative AI sources. Generative AI should not be used as a source of material; while generative AI may be used to guide students to articles, ideas, and material, the original source of any material that is performed must be available if requested.

Debate Specific Electornics/Evidence Rules:

These rules apply to Policy Debate, Public Forum Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, and Congressional Debate. These rules are used at the State Tournaments. Contestants may use electronic devices (including laptop computers, tablets, and/or cell phones) to access the internet during debate rounds with the following conditions:

1. Computers or other electronic devices may not be used to receive information for competitive advantage from non-competitors (coaches, assistant coaches, other non-competing students) inside or outside of the room in which the competition occurs. Information that would be restricted would include but not be limited to coach/non-participating competitor generated arguments, advice on arguments to run, questions to ask during cross examination, and other information not generated by the participating competitors in your round.
 2. Internet access may be used to retrieve files, exchange evidence and/or arguments, research arguments, and partner to partner communication, and communication between other participants in the round. **These electronic device guidelines do not limit communication between debate partners during the debate round.**
- A. **Penalty:** Contestants found to have violated these provisions will be disqualified from the tournament and will forfeit all rounds and merit points in that event.
 - B. **Availability of Evidence:** Contestants electing to use computers have the responsibility to promptly provide a copy of any evidence read in a speech for inspection by the judge or opponent. Printers may be used. Evidence may be printed in the round or produced electronically but must be provided in a format readable by the opposing team and the judge.
 - C. Contestants electing to use computers are responsible for providing their own computers, batteries, extension cords, and all other necessary accessories. Tournament hosts will not be responsible for providing computers, printers, software, paper, or extension cords for contestants. Host schools may provide wireless internet access, but will not guarantee that contestants will be able to gain access when needed.
 - D. Contestants choosing to use laptop computers and/or related devices accept the risk of equipment failure. Judges and/or contest directors will give no special consideration or accommodation, including no additional speech time or prep time, should equipment failure occur.
 - E. By choosing to use electronic devices in the round, debaters and other relevant parties are consenting to give tournament officials the right to search their devices in the event of a protest. The device may only be searched by tournament officials and must be restricted to files and/or electronic exchanges relevant to the protest. Failure to comply would result in the upholding of the protest. Debaters and coaches should be present as their device is searched. Debaters who do not wish to consent should not use electronic devices in the round.

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 UDCA And National Speech & Debate Association Code of Honor, all participants are expected to use and interpret evidence, evidence rules, and procedures in good faith.

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 a 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 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.
- 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 ombudsman and 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 ombudsman and 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 ombudsman and 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 ombudsman and committee will then submit the appeal to the UHSAA). The committee will contact the UHSAA 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 UHSAA.
 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 UDCA and NSDA national office, and not the 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.

Section 3: Non-Rule Related issues

- A. The Tournament director, in consultation with the region representatives, and UHSAA Representative if needed, has the authority to rule promptly and in the spirit of good sportsmanship and best interest of the activity, in any situation not specifically covered in the rules.

Chapter VI: Event Rules & Rubrics

Introduction: The State tournament will follow the event rules outlined by the NSDA. This manual has both the main event rules from the NSDA as well as a copy of the ballot and scoring rubric that will be used at all state tournaments.

Article 1: Policy Debate

(Source: See *High School Unified Manual, Chapter, Rules, and Tournament Operations*, 2021-2022, pg 24. <https://www.speechanddebate.org/high-school-unified-manual/>)

Section 1: Resolution: The resolution will be one requiring a policy judgment. The current national question will be used. Refer to www.speechanddebate.org/topics for the current topic.

Section 2: Entries: An entry is comprised of two students from the same school; each debating both sides of the resolution and advancing on its own record. No substitution is permitted once the tournament has begun.

Section 3: Order of Speeches: Each debater must give one and only one constructive speech, one period of questioning, one period of answering, and one rebuttal speech, in the following order:

Affirmative Constructive Speech	8 minutes
Negative Cross Examines Affirmative	3 minutes
Negative Constructive Speech	8 minutes
Affirmative Cross Examines Negative	3 minutes
Affirmative Constructive Speech	8 minutes
Negative Cross Examines Affirmative	3 minutes
Negative Constructive Speech	8 minutes
Affirmative Cross Examines Negative	3 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	5 minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal	5 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	5 minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal	5 minutes
Prep time	8 minutes per team

Section 4: Prompting Philosophy: Oral prompting, except time signals, either by the speaker's colleague or by any other person while the debater has the floor, is discouraged though not prohibited and may be penalized by some judges. Debaters may, however, refer to their notes and materials and may consult with their teammate while they do not have the floor.

Section 5: Use of Electronic Devices: The use of laptop computers is permitted at the National Tournament. The use of laptop computers at the qualifying tournament will be the autonomous decision of each district. Laptop use must comply with the "Guidelines for Use of Internet-Enabled Devices in Debate Events." **(UHSAA follows the National Tournament rules)**

Section 6: Timing: Timekeepers are an option but not required. If no timekeeper is used, debaters may time for their partners or the judge may keep time. Prep time for each team is eight minutes.

Section 7: Sample Policy Ballot



Policy Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:			Tournament Location:		
Round:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name:	Judge School:	
Affirmative Code:			Negative Code:		
Print debaters' names below; rank 1-4 →			Points	Rank	
1A:					
2A:					
Print debaters' names below; rank 1-4 →			Points	Rank	
1N:					
2N:					
Award points to each speaker: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding					
Decision: ☐ Affirmative ☐ Negative			Team/Code:		Low-point win? ☐ Yes

Reasons for Decision (provide detailed justification referring to central issues presented in the round, for debaters and their coaches):

**Order/Time Limits
of Speeches**

Affirmative Constructive8 min.
 Neg Cross-Examines Aff.....3 min.
 Negative Constructive8 min.
 Aff Cross-Examines Neg.....3 min.
 Affirmative Constructive8 min.
 Neg Cross-Examines Aff.....3 min.
 Negative Constructive8 min.
 Aff Cross-Examines Neg.....3 min.
 Negative Rebuttal.....5 min.
 Affirmative Rebuttal.....5 min.
 Negative Rebuttal.....5 min.
 Affirmative Rebuttal.....5 min.
 8 minutes of Prep Time per team

01/05/2022

Section 8: Tabroom judging rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

A. Judging guidelines:

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not on personal beliefs.
- Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas.

Speaker Points Rubric: 4-6 Points awarded in each area to total no less than 20

Clarity: arguments were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to the judge

Delivery: presentation, style, poise, articulation/enunciation, and inflection are effective in delivering the arguments and responding to the opponent.

Evidence and Logic: cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly that is relevant and supports claim/ideas, . The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.

Cross Examination: Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments

Overall Presentation: Behavior is ethical, respectful of topic, opponent, and judge in manners and tone.

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	Clarity	arguments were presented in a ma	☐	4	6
2	Delivery	presentation, style, poise, arti	☐	4	6
3	Evidence and Logic	cites credible sources and warra	☐	4	6
4	Cross Examination	Cross-examination should clarify	☐	4	6
5	Overall Presentation	Behavior is ethical, respectful	☐	4	6

Article 2: Public Forum Debate

(Source: See *High School Unified Manual, Chapter, Rules, and Tournament Operations*, 2021-2022, pg 25-26. <https://www.speechanddebate.org/high-school-unified-manual/>)

Section1: Resolution: Specific resolutions for district tournaments held during certain months and the National Tournament topic are available online at www.speechanddebate.org/topics. Public Forum Debate focuses on advocacy of a position derived from the issues presented in the resolution, not a prescribed set of burdens.

Section 2: Entries: An entry is comprised of two students from the same school; each debating both sides of the resolution and advancing on its own record. No substitution is permitted once the tournament has begun.

Section 3: Procedure and Order of Speeches:

- A. Prior to EVERY round and in the presence of the judge(s), a coin is tossed by one team and called by the other team.
- B. The team that wins the flip may choose one of two options:
 - a. EITHER the SIDE of the topic they wish to defend (pro or con) OR the SPEAKING POSITION they wish to have (begin the debate or end the debate).
 - b. The remaining option (SIDE OR SPEAKING POSITION) is the choice of the team that loses the flip.
- C. Once speaking positions and sides has been determined, the debate begins (the con team may lead, depending on the coin flip results). Following the first two constructive speeches, the two debaters who have just given speeches will stand and participate in a three-minute "crossfire".
 - a. In "crossfire" both debaters "hold the floor." However, the speaker who spoke first must ask the first question. After that question, either debater may question and/or answer at will.
- D. At the conclusion of the summary speeches, all four debaters will remain seated and participate in a three-minute "Grand Crossfire" in which all four debaters are allowed to cross-examine one another.
 - a. The speaker who gave the first summary speech must ask the first question. The speakers from each team will continue to ask and answer questions. Teams should alternate asking and answering questions rather than allowing one team to dominate so that a balance between teams is achieved. All speakers are encouraged to participate in the Grand Crossfire. Speakers should listen respectfully to opponents' questions and answers.

First Speaker - Team A	4 minutes
First Speaker - Team B	4 minutes
Crossfire	3 minutes
Second Speaker - Team A	4 minutes
Second Speaker - Team B	4 minutes
Crossfire	3 minutes
Summary - First Speaker - Team A	3 minutes
Summary - First Speaker - Team B	3 minutes
Grand Crossfire	3 minutes
Final Focus - Second Speaker - Team A	2 minutes
Final Focus - Second Speaker - Team B	2 minutes
Prep Time	3 minutes per team

Section 4: Plans/Counterplans: In Public Forum Debate, the Association defines a plan or counterplan as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Neither the pro or con side is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan; rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.

Section 5: Prompting Philosophy: Oral prompting, except time signals, either by the speaker's colleague or by any other person while the debater has the floor, is discouraged though not prohibited and may be penalized by some judges. Debaters may, however, refer to their notes and materials and may consult with their teammate while they do not have the floor and during the Grand Crossfire.

Section 6: Use of Electronic Devices: The use of laptop computers is permitted at the National Tournament. The use of laptop computers at the qualifying tournament will be the autonomous decision of each district. Laptop use must comply with the "Guidelines for Use of Internet-Enabled Devices in Debate Events." (UHSAA follows the National Tournament rules)

Section 7: Timing: Timekeepers are an option but not required. If no timekeeper is used, debaters may time for their partners or the judge may keep time. Prep time for each team is three minutes.

Section 8: Sample Public Forum Ballot

Tournament				Public Forum Debate Ballot	
Date:		Tournament Location:			
Round/Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name:	Affiliation/ Occupation:	
Resolution/ Topic:					
EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing <i>either</i> the side (pro or con) <i>or</i> the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first):					
First Team			Second Team		
Code:	Side: ☐ Pro ☐ Con	Points	Code:	Side: ☐ Pro ☐ Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name:			Speaker 2 Name:		
Speaker 3 Name:			Speaker 4 Name:		
Rate each speaker: < 20 Unethical/ Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding					
Winning Team: ☐ Pro ☐ Con			Team/Code:		
♦ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. ♦ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate. ♦ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas. ♦ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. ♦ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously. ♦ No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.					
Comments to debaters:			Comments to debaters:		
Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):					

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	3 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	3 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.
3 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

Section 9: Public Forum Judging Rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

A. Judging guidelines:

- a. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not on personal beliefs.
- b. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in a manner clear to a non-specialist judge (ie: jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- c. Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas.
- d. Neither pro or con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized practical solutions as a part of examples/possibilities in supporting their position.
- e. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- f. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus: however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
- g. Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc

Speaker Points Rubric: 4-6 Points awarded in each area to total no less than 20

Clarity: arguments were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to the judge. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to them as a judge.

Delivery: presentation, style, poise, articulation/enunciation, and inflection are effective in delivering the arguments and responding to opponent.

Evidence and Logic: cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly that is relevant and supports claim/ideas, . The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.

Cross Examination: Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments

Overall Presentation: Behavior is ethical, respectful of topic, opponent, and judge in manners and tone.

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	Clarity	arguments were presented in a ma	☐	4	6
2	Delivery	presentation, style, poise, arti	☐	4	6
3	Evidence and Logic	cites credible sources and warra	☐	4	6
4	Cross Examination	Cross-examination should clarify	☐	4	6
5	Overall Presentation	Behavior is ethical, respectful	☐	4	6

Article 3: Lincoln Douglas Debate

(Source: See *High School Unified Manual, Chapter, Rules, and Tournament Operations*, 2021-2022, pg 27-29. <https://www.speechanddebate.org/high-school-unified-manual/>)

Section 1: Resolution: The resolution will be one requiring a value judgment. Districts must use the current Lincoln-Douglas topic for the month in which the competition occurs. Refer to www.speechanddebate.org/topics for the current topic.

Section 2: Entries: Each contestant will debate both sides. No substitution is permitted once the tournament has begun.

Section 3: Order of Speeches:

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Negative Cross Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Affirmative Cross Examination	3 minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Prep Time	4 minutes per debater

Section 4: Timing: A timekeeper is an option but isn't required. If no timekeeper is used, debaters may time for their opponent or the judge may keep time. Prep time for each debater is four minutes.

Section 5: Use of Electronic Devices: The use of laptop computers is permitted at the National Tournament. The use of laptop computers at the qualifying tournament will be the autonomous decision of each district. Laptop use must comply with the "Guidelines for Use of Internet-Enabled Devices in Debate Events." (**UHSAA follows the National Tournament rules**)

Section 6: Sample Lincoln Douglas Ballot



Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:			Tournament Location:		
Round/Flight:	Room:	Division:	Judge Name:	Judge School:	
Affirmative:			Name or Code →	Negative:	
Aff. Points:	← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) →				Neg. Points:
	20-21 Below Average	22-23 Average	24-26 Good	27-28 Excellent	29-30 Outstanding
Decision: ☐ Affirmative ☐ Negative			Winning Team/Code:		Low-point win? ☐ Yes

1. The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
2. Each debater has the burden to prove their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
3. Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
4. Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to them as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
5. After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of their opponent; there must be dash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
6. The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
7. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Affirmative Constructive ... 6 min.
 Neg. Cross-Ix of Aff. 3 min.
 Negative Constructive 7 min.
 Aff. Cross-Ix of Neg. 3 min.
 Affirmative Rebuttal 4 min.
 Negative Rebuttal 6 min.
 Affirmative Rebuttal 3 min.
 Each debater has 4 min. prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.

08/24/2021

Section 7: Lincoln Douglas Judging Rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

Judging guidelines:

- A. The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- B. Each debater has the burden to prove their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- C. Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- D. Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to them as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- E. After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of their opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- F. The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- G. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
- H. Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc

Tabroom judging rubric

Speaker Points Rubric: 4-6 Points awarded in each area to total no less than 20

Clarity: arguments were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to the judge

Delivery: presentation, style, poise, articulation/enunciation, and inflection are effective in delivering the arguments and responding to the opponent.

Evidence and Logic: cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly that is relevant and supports claim/ideas, . The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.

Cross Examination: Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.

Overall Presentation: Behavior is ethical, respectful of topic, opponent, and judge in manners and tone.

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	Clarity	arguments were presented in a ma	☐	4	6
2	Delivery	presentation, style, poise, arti	☐	4	6
3	Evidence and Logic	cites credible sources and warra	☐	4	6
4	Cross Examination	Cross-examination should clarify	☐	4	6
5	Overall Presentation	Behavior is ethical, respectful	☐	4	6

Article 3: Evidence Rules Debate

(Source: See *High School Unified Manual, Chapter, Rules, and Tournament Operations*, 2021-2022, pg 30-34. <https://www.speechanddebate.org/high-school-unified-manual/>)

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.

Section 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:
- a. Full name of primary author and/or editor
 - b. Publication date
 - c. Source
 - d. Title of article
 - e. Date accessed for digital evidence
 - f. Full URL, if applicable
 - g. Author qualifications
 - h. 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 webpage 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.

Section 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:
- a. 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.
 - b. The original source provided does not contain the evidence cited.
 - c. 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.
 - d. 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. National Speech & Debate Association • © 2021-2022 High School Event Rules Manual 32

Section 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):
- a. The team/individual alleging a violation must make a definitive indication that they are formally alleging a violation of an evidence rule.
 - b. 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.
 - c. 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.
 - i. 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.
 - . If the judge determines that the allegation is not legitimate and that there is no violation, the round will continue on as normal.
- 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:
- a. A coach or school-affiliated adult representative from the school(s) competing in the debate or a judge for the round must notify the ombuds/tournament director 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.
 - b. The coach must submit the post-round formal allegation 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.

- c. If the ombuds/tournament director 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 it is determined that the allegation is not legitimate and that there is no violation, no changes will be made.
 - d. The tournament director 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 committee's decision to disqualify a student can be appealed by the coach or school affiliated adult. The following procedure should be followed:
- a. The appeal must be submitted in writing to the ombuds within 10 minutes of the notification to disqualify.
 - b. The ombuds will then submit the appeal to the tournament director and committee of representatives. 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.
 - c. A decision will be rendered in a timely manner. The decision of the committee shall be final and cannot be appealed.
 - d. 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.
 - e. 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.

Section.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 face possible disqualification. 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.
- 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 face possible disqualification and other consequences.

Section.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:
- a. If the protest is upheld, and a debater is disqualified, the opponent of the disqualified debater will receive a forfeit win.
 - b. If the protest is overruled, and the protesting debater won the protested round, no revision of the result on the ballot will take place.
 - c. 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.
 - d. 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.

Article IV — Spontaneous Argumentation (SPAR)

Section 1: Timing Rules

- 1 min. Prep
- 2 min. Affirmative Constructive
- 2 min. Negative Constructive
- 3 min. Cross Examination
- 1 min. Affirmative Rebuttal
- 1 min. Negative Rebuttal

Section 2: General Rules

- A. SpAr will begin with a coin toss. The winner of the toss will select topic or side, with the loser choosing the alternative. The contestant selecting the topic weighs three topic choices, followed by the selection of the side (Affirmative or Negative). Preparation time will begin following the selection of the topic.
- B. SpAr shall be classified and administered as a Debate event at Region and State tournaments, with the judge deciding a winner at the close of each round. However, SpAr may be treated as a speech during regular season tournaments at the discretion of a tournament director, with the judge ranking all speakers in the round as first place, second place, third place, etc.
- C. 4-6 Points shall be awarded in each of the following areas, totaling no less than twenty (20) and no more than thirty (30) points:
 - (i) Clarity: Arguments were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to the judge;
 - (ii) Delivery: Presentation, style, poise, articulation/enunciation, and inflection are effective in delivering the arguments and responding to the opponent;
 - (iii) Evidence and Logic: Cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly that is relevant and supports claim/ideas - the nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion;
 - (iv) Cross Examination: Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments;
 - (v) Overall Presentation: Behavior is ethical, respectful of topic, opponent, and judge in manners and tone;
- D. Use of the internet is strictly prohibited during all SpAr rounds, in keeping with Chapter I, Article IV of these Speech & Debate Policies and Guidelines,
- E. Sources that have been memorized may be used, but are discouraged, given that SPAR is primarily a logic-based debate.
- F. Topics at Region and State tournaments should be socially relevant, educational, or relate to current events. However, topics at regular season tournaments may range in terms of seriousness to promote quick-thinking in a fun, engaging, and appropriate manner.

Article 5: Congressional Debate

(Source: See *High School Unified Manual, Chapter, Rules, and Tournament Operations*, 2021-2022, pg 35-43. <https://www.speechanddebate.org/high-school-unified-manual/>)

Section 1:

. **A session** is defined as including:

- A. Minimum of 2.5 hours.
- B. 18-20 students as the optimum number for a three-hour session; otherwise, a session should be lengthened by ten minutes per each additional student beyond 20. Chambers may not be larger than 30 students.
- C. Election of a presiding officer. The presiding officer must be elected with a majority of the vote. If one candidate does not receive a majority of votes, eliminate the candidate with the fewest votes and vote again. If candidates are tied for the fewest number of votes, vote to determine which of the tied candidates should remain in contention. Repeat this process until one candidate receives a majority of votes.
- D. New seating chart (necessary accommodations for students with special needs may be made).
- F. New legislation that has not been debated in a previous session at that tournament.

Section 2. Recognizing Speakers

- A. When more than one speaker seeks the floor, the presiding officer must follow the precedence/recency method: 1) First recognize students who have not spoken during the session. 2) Next recognize students who have spoken fewer times. 3) Then recognize students who spoke earlier (least recently).
- B. If a tournament is not using preset recency, before recency is established, the presiding officer should recognize speakers fairly and consistently. They may not link recognition of speakers to previous recognition of students asking questions, moving motions, or longest standing (standing time). Before precedence is established, the presiding officer should explain their recognition process and it must be fair, consistent and justifiable. All district tournaments must use preset, randomized recency in Congressional Debate beginning in 2022-2023.
- C. During any session, precedence/recency should not reset, to ensure that all students in a chamber have an equal opportunity to speak and receive evaluation from scorers. When a new session begins, precedence/recency may be reset along with a new seating chart, and election of a presiding officer.
- D. Scorers will include answers to questions when evaluating speeches.
- E. A speaker may yield time on the floor during debate (for questions or clarifications) but that speaker will remain in control of their three minutes (see #6 below regarding questioning).

Section 3. Speeches introducing legislation are allotted up to three minutes, followed by two minutes of questioning by other delegates. A student from the school (or at the national level, the district) who wrote the legislation gets the privilege of recognition (called authorship), regardless of precedence; otherwise the presiding officer may recognize a “sponsor” from the chamber, provided this recognition follows the precedence guidelines above. Regardless, this speech of introduction must be followed by two minutes of questions. Should no student seek recognition for the authorship/sponsorship, the chamber will move to lay the legislation on the table until such time that a student is prepared to introduce it.

Section 4. The first negative speech must be followed by two minutes of questions.

Section 5. Following the first two speeches on legislation, the presiding officer will alternately recognize affirmative and negative speakers, who will address the chamber for up to three minutes, followed by one minute of questioning by other delegates.

- A. If no one wishes to oppose the preceding speaker, the presiding officer may recognize a speaker upholding the same side.
- B. When no one seeks the floor for debate, the presiding officer may ask the chamber if they are “ready for the question,” at which point, if there is no objection, voting may commence on the legislation itself.
- C. There is no “minimum cycle” rule; however, if debate gets “one-sided,” the chamber may decide to move the previous question.
- D. In the event a student speaks on the wrong side called for by the presiding officer and the error is not caught, the speaker shall be scored and the speech shall count in precedence, but the speaker must be penalized at least three points for not paying close attention to the flow of debate.
- E. In the event a student speaks on an item of legislation not currently being debated, said speech shall count in precedence, but zero points shall be awarded.

Section 6. The presiding officer fairly and equitably recognizes members to ask questions following each speech. The presiding officer starts timing questioning periods when they have recognized the first questioner, and keeps the clock running continuously until the time has lapsed. There are two different questioning methods.

- A. **Traditional questioning:** Speakers are encouraged to ask brief questions, and may only ask one question at a time. Two-part/multiple-part questions are not allowed. There is no formal “permission to preface,” however; presiding officers should discourage students from making statements as part of questioning, since that is an abusive use of the limited time available.
- B. **STATE WILL USE Direct questioning:** The presiding officer will open the floor for questions following each speech. The presiding officer will recognize questioners for a cross-examination period of no more than 30 seconds. Questioners will be chosen according to a separate questioning recency.

Section 7. The presiding officer will pause briefly between speeches to recognize any motions from the floor; however, they should not call for motions (at the beginning of a session, the presiding officer should remind members to seek their attention between speeches).

Section 8. Amendments must be presented to the presiding officer in writing with specific references to lines and clauses that change. This must be done in advance of moving to amend.

- A. The parliamentarian will recommend whether the amendment is “germane”—that is, it upholds the original intent of the legislation—otherwise, it is considered “dilatory.” The title of the legislation may be changed.
- B. A legislator may move to amend between floor speeches. Once that motion is made, the presiding officer will read the proposed amendment aloud and call for a second by one-third of those members present, unless they rule it dilatory.
- C. Should students wish to speak on the proposed amendment, the presiding officer will recognize them as per the standing precedence and recency, and the speech will be counted toward their totals, accordingly.
- D. Simply proposing an amendment does not guarantee an “author/sponsor” speech, and any speeches on amendments are followed by the normal one minute of questioning.
- E. Amendments are considered neutral and do not constitute an affirmative or negative speech on the original legislation.
- F. If there are no speakers or the previous question is moved, the chamber may vote on a proposed amendment without debating it.

Section 9. All major voting (such as the main motion/legislation) which a congressperson’s constituents should have a record of, shall be done with a counted vote. Secret balloting is used when voting for presiding officer.

Section 10. Students should ask permission to leave and enter the chamber when it is in session (move a personal privilege). However, do not interrupt a speaker who is addressing the chamber.

A Bill to Establish a Specific Policy	
BE IT ENACTED BY THIS CONGRESS THAT:	
1. SECTION 1.	State the new policy in a brief
2.	declarative sentence, or in as few
3.	sentences as possible.
4. SECTION 2.	Define any ambiguous terms inherent
5.	in the first section.
6. SECTION 3.	Name the government agency that will
7.	oversee the enforcement of the bill
8.	along with the specific enforcement
9.	mechanism.
10. SECTION 4.	Indicate the implementation
11.	date/timeframe.
12. SECTION 5.	State that all other laws that are in
13.	conflict with this new policy shall
14.	hereby be declared null and void.
Introduced by Name of School	
A Resolution to Urge Further Action on a Specific Issue	
1. WHEREAS,	State the current problem (this needs
2.	to be accomplished in one brief
3.	sentence); and
4. WHEREAS,	Describe the scope of the problem
5.	cited in the first whereas clause (this
6.	clause needs to flow logically from the
7.	first); and
8. WHEREAS,	Explain the impact and harms allowed
9.	by the current problem (once again,
10.	the clause needs to flow in a logical
11.	sequence); now, therefore, be it
12. RESOLVED,	By this Congress that: state your
13.	recommendation for dealing with the
14.	problem (the resolution should be a
15.	clear call for action); and, be it
16. FURTHER RESOLVED,	That (an <u>optional</u> additional
17.	recommendation; if not used, end the
18.	previous clause with a period).
Introduced by Name of School	

Section 11. Use of Evidence (also see the section on Congressional Debate Evidence Rules)

- A. Visual aids are permitted in Congressional Debate, provided they do not require electronic retrieval devices in the chamber.
- B. All evidence used is subject to verification. Honesty and integrity are of utmost importance in legislative debate. Falsification or deliberate misuse of evidence may result in the legislator being suspended by tournament officials.
- C. The use of internet enabled electronic devices is permitted. Students may not use the internet to gain help from coaches, other students, or any person, such that it would prevent the speech from being the original work of the competitor. Electronic device use must comply with the “New Guidelines for Use of Internet-Enabled Devices in Debate Events.”

Section 12. Since the rules above ensure fairness for competition, they may not be suspended; the presiding officer should rule such motions out of order; except to extend questioning and allow for open chambers provided the tournament staff permits doing so.

Section 13: Congressional Debate Legislation Guidelines

Most legislation should have a national/domestic focus that the U.S. Congress would have *jurisdiction* over, taking the form of a **bill**. A bill establishes details behind how a particular law must work, including when it takes effect, how much tax levy would be appropriated (if applicable), how infractions/violations will be dealt with, etc. A bill will answer the who, what, when, where—and most specifically how—but it will never answer “why.” Legislators explain rationale behind bills in their speeches, and how a bill implements its solution can spark deeper, more meaningful debate.

Writing an effective bill involves more time and research than researching one written by someone else. Students must ask themselves what the legislation does, who is involved (government agencies), where it happens, when it is feasible to take place and how much time is needed for implementation, and how it should be carried out (a plan of action). All of these questions must be answered in writing the sections of the bill, with thoughtful consideration as to how thoroughly each section explains its plank of implementing the overall bill’s plan of action.

Resolutions are simply position statements on issues Congress does not have jurisdiction over (such as foreign issue, although a bill can suggest foreign aid), or further action (such as amending the Constitution). Resolutions lack the force of law, and never establish enforcement.

Appropriate **topics** exhibit seriousness of purpose. The action proposed should be feasible, and such that the actual United States Congress might debate it. Topics should be debatable, meaning substantive argumentation exists on both sides. Legislation should be typed and double-spaced with line numbers, **not exceeding one page**. Capitalizing the words “WHEREAS” and “RESOLVED” in resolutions, and “SECTION” in bills, as well as inverse-indenting each clause or section helps to distinguish between ideas and concepts.

The samples above show proper formatting. In the resolution, note the semicolon, and how it precedes the word “and” at the end of each “whereas” clause, and the phrase “now, therefore, be it” at the end of the last “whereas” clause.

Note: Legislation that is submitted for consideration at the district and/or national tournament may be rejected if serious issues exist with the adherence to these guidelines.

Templates for bills, resolutions, and resolutions to amend the Constitution are available online at www.speechanddebate.org.

Article 6: Congressional Debate Evidence Rules

Based on recommendations from the Congress Evidence Committee, the Board of Directors had a discussion of how evidence is currently used in Congressional Debate and the concerns surrounding students' appropriate, substantiated, and ethical use of evidence in Congressional Debate speeches. The Board of Directors officially voted to adopt these Congressional Debate evidence rules for use during the 2017-2018 competition season and beyond.

Section 1. Responsibilities of Contestants Reading Evidence in Congressional Debate

- 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. For example, if a debater references a specific theory by a specific author, the debater must also be able to provide an original source. 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 original source.

1. When challenged, the original source or copy of the relevant (as outlined in 7.1.F.2.) pages of evidence read in round must be available to the student making the challenge within two speeches. In all debate events, for reference, any evidence that is presented during the round must be made available to the opponent during the round if requested.
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 webpage 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 still responsible for the content and accuracy of the 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:

- a. 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(s) and parliamentarian.
- b. The written text must be marked in some way to clearly indicate the portions read in the debate. 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.

Section.2. Definitions of Evidence Violations in Congressional Debate

- 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:
 - a. 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.
 - b. The original source provided does not contain the evidence cited.
 - c. The evidence is paraphrased but lacks an original source to verify the accuracy of the paraphrasing.
 - d. The debater is in possession of the original source, but declines to provide it to a student who challenges, the chair, or the parliamentarian upon request.
- 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.

Section 3. Procedures for Raising Evidence Questions During a Congressional Debate Session

The procedures for making an In-round evidence question are as follows:

- A. Congressional Debate entries must rise to a point of information after a speech to formally request a copy of the evidence cited, the citation, or the original source of evidence. When requested during the point of information, the presiding officer will instruct the debater being challenged to produce the copy of the evidence, citation, or original source. The debater being challenged must produce the requested materials in a timely fashion. Should a debater feel they are not receiving the information they requested in a timely fashion, they may rise to another point of information for the presiding officer and parliamentarian to address the situation.
- B. Debaters who request the information may receive the evidence from the presiding officer within a period of two speeches. The round would not be put on hold for the request to be completed. For example, if a debater rises to a point of order after speech #4, then by the conclusion of speech #6, the requested evidence should be presented to the presiding officer.

- C. If after reviewing the evidence in question, a debater feels that an evidence violation has occurred, they may submit a formal allegation by completing an evidence challenge form (see Appendix) and, after making a motion to approach the chair, the debater will present the form to the presiding officer and parliamentarian.

Section 4. Penalties for Resolving Evidence Violations During Congressional Debate

- A. All evidence challenges must occur during the session of Congressional Debate where an alleged violation took place, and should happen before a vote on the pending legislation. If the concern arises during the last cycle of speeches, the parliamentarian may grant a challenge after the vote, prior to the first speech on a new piece of legislation.
- B. Parliamentarians are responsible for resolving disputes between debaters regarding oral citations (7.1.B.); and written source citations (7.1.C.). When the parliamentarian has such a dispute in the round, the parliamentarian must submit the protest form to the tabulation committee. All protest forms will be submitted to the tabulation committee.
 - a. The parliamentarian will determine the legitimacy of the challenge, and if the parliamentarian considers the request justified, the debater making the allegation will move a point of order to address the allegation to the chamber.
 - b. The debater being challenged will be recognized by the presiding officer for a response to the evidence violation.
 - c. The parliamentarian will evaluate the legitimacy and severity of the charge and make a recommendation to the presiding officer for action. The recommendation may be charged against either student involved in the dispute. Depending upon the severity of the offense, the parliamentarian may opt to censure the debater(s). Refer to section 7.5. for an outline of the severity of offenses and corresponding actions.
 - d. The presiding officer will announce the parliamentarian's decision and recognize either/both debaters for consequent action.
- C. Procedures for Appealing the Parliamentarian's Decision
 - a. An appeal can only be made if the issue-in-question has been raised, by a student, in the round. Appeals may only be made if the parliamentarian has misapplied, misinterpreted, or ignored a rule.
 - b. A coach or school-affiliated adult representative must notify the tabulation committee of intent to submit an appeal of the parliamentarian's ruling within 20 minutes of the end of session as recorded by the Parliamentarian for that chamber.
 - i. The coach must submit the post-round appeal to the ombuds/tournament director within 10 minutes of the formal notification of the intent to appeal. The allegation must be in writing and articulate the specific evidence violation and ruling that is being challenged.
 - ii. If the ombuds/tournament director determines the appeal has merit, both parties involved in the original dispute will be given 20 minutes to respond.
 - iii. The tournament director/ombuds/committee of representatives will make a decision and 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.

3. At the district tournament level, the committee's decision to disqualify a student's rankings for that session can be appealed by the coach or school-affiliated adult. The following procedure should be followed:
 - a. The appeal must be submitted in writing to the ombuds within 10 minutes of the notification to disqualify.
 - b. The ombuds will then submit the appeal to the tournament director/committee. Both sides will be able to provide written explanations and supporting evidence to defend their individual side.
 - c. A decision will be rendered in a timely manner. The decision of the committee shall be final and cannot be appealed.
 - d. No elimination session may occur before a ruling is made. If the appeal is successful, any student(s) involved will receive the appropriate rank as if the evidence challenge was never called into question.

Section.5. Penalties for Evidence Violations in Congressional Debate

- A. If the parliamentarian determines that an entry has violated one of the rules listed in 7.1(A-D, F-H) (oral citation, written citation, indication of parts of card read or not read, use of private communication), the parliamentarian must notify the judge(s) of the violation. The judge(s) and parliamentarian may at their discretion disregard the evidence, diminish the credibility given to the evidence, take the violation into account (solely or partially) in the ranking of chamber participants, or take no action. These offenses are considered minor and a parliamentarian sanction is the only prescribed penalty.
- B. If a debater(s) commits an evidence violation of "distortion" (7.2.A.), uses "nonexistent evidence" (7.2.B.), uses a "straw argument" (7.2.C.) or the use of "ellipses" (7.1.E.) such action will result in the debater(s) committing the evidence violation not being ranked by the judge(s) and parliamentarian. These offenses are considered major and censure by the parliamentarian would be applied.
- C. Evidence infractions violate the Code of Honor. Depending on the severity, an offense may result in the notification of said offense to the contestant's high school administration, disqualification, etc.

Section.6. Tournament Adjustments in Congressional Debate

- 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 censure, all ranks and decisions made prior to the start of the round being protested stand and no revision of past session ranks will take place. Penalties listed in 7.4. will be applied.
- C. When a session has been held between the session being appealed and a final decision regarding the protest, the result of that session will be recorded as follows:
 - a. If the protest is upheld, all ranks and scores will remain as recorded. The evidence violation would apply only to the session in which it occurred and not affect prior or subsequent sessions.
 - b. If the appeal is upheld, the judge and/or parliamentarian will restore any ranks and scores that were earned by that debater.

Section 7: Sample Congressional Debate Ballot



CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Speech Evaluation

Student Name:		School Code:
Session:	Room:	Chamber #:

DIRECTIONS: RATE each speech 1-8 points, with one being the worst, eight being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement. At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively **RANK** students, on a separate form.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly in the spaces provided: **ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT** (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments); **ORGANIZATION AND UNITY** (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt cohesiveness); **EVIDENCE AND LOGIC** (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly); **DELIVERY** (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise). How well the speaker **ANSWERS QUESTIONS** for each speech should be considered.

SPEECH 1	Topic:	Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG
	Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:	Circle Point Rating: 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 2	Topic:	Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG
	Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:	Circle Point Rating: 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

SPEECH 3	Topic:	Side: ☐ Sponsor ☐ AFF ☐ NEG
	Explain your evaluation and justify your rating of both speaking and answering questions:	Circle Point Rating: 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 highest ← → lowest

QUESTIONING of other speakers
Comment on relevance to debate, quality of clarification, etc.

PRINT Judge Name:
School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER								
Circle one. Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9.								
1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	None

Section 8: Sample Congressional Debate Presiding Officer Ballot



CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE Presiding Evaluation

Student Name:		School Code:
Session:	Room:	Chamber #:

DIRECTIONS: AWARD A RATING of 3-8 points per hour of presiding, with three being the worst, eight being the best. You will RANK students holistically, at the end of the session, on a separate form. You *may or may not* include the presiding officer in your ranking. The presiding officer may also have an evaluation ballot for speaking – please be sure to circle the same rank at the bottom of the speech and presiding forms.

CRITERIA: When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly below. **PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE** (clear in explaining protocols and rulings); **RECOGNITION** (fair and efficient in recognizing speakers and questioners, and maintains appropriate speaker precedence and recency); **CONTROL** (maintains decorum of delegates, and willing to rule dilatory motions/business out of order); **DEMEANOR** (fosters a respectful, professional, and collegial atmosphere); **COMMUNICATION** (overall use of language, avoiding unnecessary verbiage).

FIRST HOUR OF SERVICE	SECOND HOUR OF SERVICE	THIRD HOUR OF SERVICE
Circle Point Rating: 8 7 6 5 4 3 highest ← → lowest	Circle Point Rating: 8 7 6 5 4 3 highest ← → lowest	Circle Point Rating: 8 7 6 5 4 3 highest ← → lowest

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: Explain your evaluation and justify your rating, providing constructive suggestions for improvement:

PRINT Judge Name:
School/Affiliation:

RANK THIS SPEAKER

Circle one: Students not in the top eight will be given a rank of 9

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th None

Reminder: POs *may or may not* be considered in your ranking.

Section 9: Congressional Debate Rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

DIRECTIONS:

RATE each speech 1-8 points, with one being the worst, eight being the best, providing comments to justify your rating, with constructive suggestions for improvement.

At the end of the session, you will holistically and comparatively RANK students, on a separate form. Scorer/Judges will rank 1-9 (tie all those at that point 9). Parliamentarians will rank all the way through with no ties. Remember: You do not have to rank by number of speeches, it is the quality overall of students throughout the round.

The Presiding Officer receives the equivalent of 1 speech per hour based on their quality of running the house and should be ranked accordingly as well. When rating, consider the following elements and comment accordingly below.

2 Pts PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE (clear in explaining protocols and rulings);

2Pts RECOGNITION (fair and efficient in recognizing speakers and questioners, and maintains appropriate speaker precedence and recency);

2 Pt CONTROL (maintains decorum of delegates, and willing to rule dilatory motions/business out of order);

1 pt Demeanor (fosters a respectful, professional, and collegial atmosphere);

1 pt COMMUNICATION (overall use of language, avoiding unnecessary verbiage).

Speaker points/Speech (These are used to help evaluate each speech and the speaker overall for final ranking. Speaker points here do not impact congress Rankings or placement in Utah Debate)

1 PT ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT (extent to which speech advances debate or merely repeats previously stated ideas; whether speaker refutes opposing arguments);

2 PT ORGANIZATION AND UNITY (while speeches that respond to other arguments advanced in the session are often spontaneous and extemporaneous, the speaker should attempt to organize ideas and have cohesiveness);

2 PT EVIDENCE AND LOGIC (cites credible sources and warrants claims accordingly that is relevant and supports claim/ideas);

2 PT DELIVERY (extemporaneous vs. reading a manuscript, seriousness of purpose, style and poise, articulation, inflection, enunciation).

1 PT How well the speaker ANSWERS QUESTIONS for each speech should be considered: logic, reasonable, uses evidence when needed.

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	ORIGINALITY OF THOUGHT	extent to which speech advances	☐		1
2	Organization and Unity	while speeches that respond to o	☐		2
3	Evidence and Logic	cites credible sources and warra	☐		2
4	Delivery	extemporaneous vs. reading a man	☐		2
5	Direct Questioning	How well the speaker ANSWERS QUE	☐		1

Article 7: Speech Events

Section 1: Oratory

(Source: See *High School Unified Manual, Chapter, Rules, and Tournament Operations*, 2021-2022, pg 44. <https://www.speechanddebate.org/high-school-unified-manual/>)

Original Oratory

- A. **Purpose:** The general purpose of the speech is to persuade. Any other purpose such as to inform or entertain shall be secondary.
- B. **Contest:** This contest comprises only memorized orations actually composed by the contestants and not used by them during a previous contest season. No visual aids are permitted.
- C. **Subject:** Any appropriate subject may be used, but the orator must be truthful. Any non-factual reference, especially a personal one, must be so identified.
- D. **Length:** The time limit in Original Oratory is ten minutes with a 30-second “grace period.” If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period. The ranking is up to each individual judge’s discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.
- E. **Quotation:** Not more than 150 words of the oration may be direct quotation from any other speech or writing and such quotations must be identified in a printed copy of the oration supplied prior to registration. Extensive paraphrasing from other sources is prohibited.
- F. **Script:** The orator’s script must identify the quoted materials, state the number of quoted words, include a work cited page in APA or MLA format, and both the orator and the coach must attest by signature that the oration is the original work of the contestant. It is the responsibility of the contestant to have a script ready upon request should the speech be challenged. At the National Tournament, all quarterfinalists in OO are required to turn in a printed, typed copy of their manuscript, including a works cited page, to the ombudsperson before noon on the third day of competition.
- G. **Re-Use:** A student may not use an oration the student used in region, state competition in any previous contest year.

H. Sample Oratory Ballot

Original Oratory
Comment Sheet

Contestant Name _____ Code _____

Round _____ Section _____ Speaker Time _____

Title/Topic _____

Judge Name _____ Judge Affiliation _____

Directions: Using the prompts below, please provide constructive feedback to the competitor. Your comments should highlight areas of strength as well as provide areas for growth. Be as specific as possible in your feedback. Use the space to expand your thoughts on any of these areas or to comment on specific moments or lines that stood out to you. Please do not comment on participants' attire or appearance; this should not play a role in your decision.

Importance

Is the topic significant? Is the thesis clearly established? Does the delivery assist in establishing the importance of the topic?

Relatability

Can the audience relate to the topic? Is the delivery personable? Does the speaker establish how others are impacted by their topic? Is the rhetoric of the speech inclusive?

Originality

Does the speaker address the topic in a unique, inventive way? Are the supporting examples new and interesting?

Reason for Decision: *(Why did this performance earn the rank that you assigned?)*

Contestant Rank _____ / _____

Speaker Points _____ (out of 100)

Judge Signature _____

I. Oratory Rubric

Tabroom judging rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

At the end of the round you will rank students 1-7, 1 being who did the best job based on their overall skill performance considering the following:

Speech Evaluation Rubric

Importance: Is the topic significant? Is the thesis clearly established? Does the delivery assist in establishing the importance of the topic?

Relatability: Can the audience relate to the topic? Is the delivery personable? Does the speaker establish how others are impacted by their topic? Is the rhetoric of the speech inclusive?

Originality: Does the speaker address the topic in a unique, inventive way? Are the supporting examples new and interesting?

Delivery: Is the student using voice, movement, and expression effectively? Is the speaker confident? Is there consistent eye contact? Is the volume appropriate?

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	Importance	Is the topic significant? Is th	☐		
2	Relatability	Can the audience relate to the t	☐		
3	Originality	Does the speaker address the top	☐		
4	Delivery	Is the student using voice, move	☐		

Section 2: Extemporaneous Speaking

(Source: See *High School Unified Manual, Chapter, Rules, and Tournament Operations*, 2021-2022, pgS 52-53. <https://www.speechanddebate.org/high-school-unified-manual/>)

Extemporaneous Speaking

A. **Divisions:** United States (Domestic), International (Foreign) and Mixed:

- United States Division:** Questions will cover U.S. domestic and U.S. foreign policy.
- International Division:** Questions will cover the domestic affairs of foreign countries and the foreign affairs of all countries, including the United States.
- Mixed Extemp:** Questions may come from either United States or International.

B. **Topics:** The tournament director will obtain a list of questions phrased for contest use and based on subjects discussed in periodicals during the current school year. The contents of the list must not be disclosed except as contestants draw questions. A new subject area will be used for each round with no duplication of questions between the divisions.

C. **Entry:** At Reguib abd State, no student is allowed to enter both divisions in a single contest year.

- D. **Drawing:** Students will be given a set of three questions to choose from 30 minutes prior to their speaking time. They will select one to speak on. Tournament directors/Extemp prep room coordinators may run per standard operations procedures for Utah contests.
- E. **Preparation:** As soon as a question is chosen, the contestant will prepare a speech without consultation and without references to prepared notes. Students may consult published books, magazines, newspapers and journals or articles, and internet (see K) provided:
- a. They are originals or copies of whole pages.
 - b. Provided those originals or copies are uncut.
 - c. There is no written material on that original or copy other than citation information.
 - d. Topical index without annotation may be present.
 - e. No other material will be allowed in the Extemp prep room other than stated above.
 - f. Extemp speeches, handbooks, briefs and outlines are prohibited from the Extemp prep room.
 - g. Underlining or highlighting in Extemp will be allowed if done in only one color on each article or copy. **Please see rules concerning Use of Internet-Enabled Devices in Extemporaneous Speaking.**
 - h. Printed copies of information from online computer services may be used. Electronically retrieved evidence used in Extemp competition must conform to the citation standard of the Modern Language Association [consult the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers (7th edition) or <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/05/>].
- F. **Notes:** Contestants may make notes during the preparation time, but the use of notes, cards, briefs or other aids is prohibited during the speech.
- G. **Time:** The time limit in both Extemporaneous Speaking events is seven minutes with a 30-second "grace period." If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period. The ranking is up to each individual judge's discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.
- H. **Recuse:** Contestants may not leave the preparation area until dismissed by the Extemp proctor. Consultation with any person other than the Extemp proctor between the time of drawing and time of speaking is prohibited.

I. Cross-Examination: (NSDA ONLY, NOT APPLICABLE TO STATE) Each district has the autonomy to determine whether cross-examination will be used in the final round of Extemporaneous Speaking events at the district tournament. The National Tournament will utilize an open cross examination period of two minutes for both the semifinal and final rounds. If cross-examination is used, the district must use the National Tournament final round format. The decision of the District Committee is final. Procedure: Each speaker shall be assigned a speaker order position. Drawing shall take place at 12-minute intervals. Thirty minutes after speaker first has drawn, speakers first and last shall enter the contest room. Speaker first shall give a speech and speaker last shall listen and may take notes. At the conclusion of speaker first's speech, speaker last shall question speaker first for two minutes. Speaker last shall return to the prep room and speaker first shall stay and question speaker second. Speaker second will question speaker third, etc. Unless it is unavoidable, students from the same school shall not cross-examine one another. Speaker order should be adjusted accordingly.

J. Observation: Students in Extemporaneous Speaking are encouraged, but not required, to stay and watch the remaining speakers after they deliver their speech. Students who are double entered may be able to observe as time permits.

K. NEW GUIDELINES for Use of Internet-Enabled Devices in Extemporaneous Speaking

- A. Preparation:** As soon as a question is chosen, the contestant will prepare a speech without consultation and without references to prepared notes. Students may consult published books, magazines, newspapers and journals or articles, including internet enabled devices either used in the draw or those materials published from internet sources, provided:
- They are originals or copies of whole pages.
 - Provided those originals or copies are uncut.
 - There is no written material on that original or copy other than citation information. Contestants with laptops are responsible for providing sufficient battery power. No electrical power will be supplied by the tournament, and contestants may not plug in to outlets in the Extemp prep area.
 - Topical index without annotation may be present.
 - Files stored either on a computer or electronic device hard drive or cloud storage system. All files in this format must meet the same guidelines as printed sources.
 - Active research from the internet during the round that meets the established criteria found in the "Guidelines for Use of Internet Enabled Devices."
- B. No other material will be allowed in the Extemp prep room other than stated above. Extemp speeches, handbooks, briefs and outlines, including those stored on cloud storage systems or published on websites created for that purpose, are prohibited from the Extemp prep room.**
- Students may not use the internet to gain help from coaches, other students, or any person, such that it would prevent the speech from being the original work of the competitor.
 - Students are prohibited from accessing outlines and speeches that have been written prior to their draw time. Underlining or highlighting in Extemp will be allowed if done in only one color on each article or copy.
 - Electronic device use must comply with the "Guidelines for Use of Internet-Enabled Devices in Debate Events."**
 - Printed copies of information from online computer services may be used.
 - Electronically retrieved evidence used in any Association Extemp competition must conform to the same citation standards as evidence used in debate events as described on p. 27 of the Unified Manual.

C. Sample Extemporaneous Ballot

Extemporaneous Speaking Comment Sheet



Contestant Name _____ Code _____

Round _____ Section _____ Speaker Time _____

Question/Prompt _____

Judge Name _____ Judge Affiliation _____

Directions: Using the prompts below, please provide constructive feedback to the competitor. Your comments should highlight areas of strength as well as provide areas for growth. Be as specific as possible in your feedback. Use the space to expand your thoughts on any of these areas or to comment on specific moments or lines that stood out to you. Please do not comment on participants' attire or appearance; this should not play a role in your decision.

Argumentation and Analysis
Is the student directly answering the question? Does the student develop justifications for their ideas and establish the significance of their points? Have they established a clear understanding of the topic area?

Source Consideration
Does the speaker offer a variety of sources? Are the sources provided credible? Are appropriate citations used when citing a source?

Delivery
Is the student using voice, movement, and expression effectively? Is the speaker confident? Is there consistent eye contact? Is the volume appropriate?

Reason for Decision: *(Why did this performance earn the rank that you assigned?)*

Contestant Rank _____ / _____ Speaker Points _____ (out of 100)

Judge Signature _____

D. Extemporaneous Speaking Rubric

Tabroom judging rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

Rank speakers 1st through last using the speech evaluation below.

Speech Evaluation Rubric

Argumentation and Analysis: Is the student directly answering the question? Does the student develop justifications for their ideas and establish the significance of their points? Have they established a clear understanding of the topic area?

Source Consideration: Does the speaker offer a variety of sources? Are the sources provided credible? Are appropriate citations used when citing a source?

Delivery: Is the student using voice, movement, and expression effectively? Is the speaker confident? Is there consistent eye contact? Is the volume appropriate?

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	Argumentation/Analysis	Is the student directly answering the prompt?	☐		
2	Source Consideration	Does the speaker offer a variety of sources?	☐		
3	Delivery	Is the student using voice, movement, and expression effectively?	☐		

Section 3: Impromptu:

- A. Topics: Topics may include proverbs, abstract words, events, quotations, and famous people.
- B. Drawing: Judges will pick up topics from designated area of tournament. Each round will have 3 topics per speaker. On their turn, contestants will receive the slip of topics from the Judge and select one to speak on. Timing begins when they look at the slip of paper.
- C. Preparation and Delivery: The speaker has seven minutes in which to prepare a response and present a speech without consultation of prepared notes.
- D. No electronic retrieval device may be used, but printed materials from online computer services may be used.
- E. Recuse: Once a speaker has spoken, they may listen to other speakers in that round.
- F. Notes: No notes shall be used during presentation.
- G. Time: The maximum time limit is 7 minutes with a 30-second "grace period," which includes both preparation and speaking.
- H. If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period.
 - i. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period.
- I. The ranking is up to each individual judge's discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices.
- J. No minimum time is mandated.

K. Tabroom judging rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

Rank speakers 1st through last using the speech evaluation below.

Speech Evaluation Rubric

Organization: Does the student have a clear structure to their speech? Are transitions used to move effectively between each part of the speech? Does the development of the speech make sense?

Analysis: Does the student directly address the prompt? Does the student develop justifications for their ideas and establish significance to the points?

Delivery: Does the student use voice, movement, and expression effectively? Is the speaker confident? Is there consistent eye contact? Is the volume appropriate?

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	Organization	Does the student have a clear st	☐		
2	Analysis	Does the student directly addre	☐		
3	Delivery	Does the student use voice, move	☐		

Section 4: Informative

A. Purpose: An informative speech is an original speech designed to explain, define, describe, or illustrate a particular subject. The general purpose of the speech is for the audience to gain understanding and/or knowledge of a topic. Any other purpose such as to entertain or to convince shall be secondary. The use of audio/visual aids is optional. (See # 4 on Aids.)

B. Contest: This contest comprises only memorized speeches composed by the contestants and not used by them during a previous contest season.

C. Subject: Effective speeches provide new information or perspectives on a topic, including those that are widely known. The responsibility for choosing a worthwhile topic rests with the contestant. A fabricated topic may not be used. Any non-factual reference, including a personal reference, must be so identified.

D. Aids: Audio/visual aids may or may not be used to supplement and reinforce the message.

- a. If used, the audio/visual aids should enhance or support the message rather than distract from the overall effectiveness of the presentation.
- b. During the presentation, no electronic equipment is permitted. Electronic equipment is defined as any object requiring an electrical cord, battery, or solar power to operate it (projectors, cell phones, radios, iPads, computers, etc.).
- c. The use of live animals or any additional people as visual aids is not allowed during the speech.
- d. Items of dress put on and/or removed for illustration during the course of the presentation are considered costumes and may not be part of the contestant's presentation.
- e. Visual aids may not violate policies as dictated by local and state law (weapons, drugs, etc.)
- f. Contestants may not distribute items to the judges or audience before, during, or after the round. This includes but is not limited to food, objects, handouts, flyers, and promotional merchandise.
- g. The host school is not responsible for providing any facilities, equipment, including tables, chairs, or easels, or assistance in a contestant's use of visual aids.
- h. Expedient set up and take down of aids is expected.
- i. If a visual aid displays published pictorial material, the source must be included in the work-cited page but does not need to be cited orally.

E Length: The time limit is 10 minutes with a 30-second "grace period." If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period. The ranking is up to each individual judge's discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.

F. Quotation: Not more than 150 words of the speech may be direct quotation and such quotations must be identified orally and in a printed copy of the speech supplied prior to registration.

G. Script: Manuscripts must be available at all region/state tournament contests in the event of a protest. Scripts will be uploaded via tabroom or be available electronically to the Tournament Director prior to the state tournament.

- a. The script must identify the quoted materials, state the number of quoted words, include a work-cited page in APA or MLA format, and both the speaker and the coach must attest by signature that the speech is the original work of the contestant.

H. Re-Use: A student may not use an informative speech the student used in region, state competition in any previous contest year.

I: Tabroom judging rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

Rank speakers 1st through last using the speech evaluation below.

Speech Evaluation Rubric

Relevance: Is the topic timely? Is the thesis clearly established? Does the delivery assist in establishing the importance of the topic?

Relatability: Can the audience relate to the topic? Is the delivery personable? Does the speaker establish how others are impacted by the topic? Does the speaker do a good job informing?

Originality: Does the speaker address the topic in a unique, inventive way? Are the supporting examples new and interesting?

Delivery: Does the student use voice, movement, and expression effectively? Is the speaker confident? Is there consistent eye contact? Is the volume appropriate? If using a visual-does it add to their speech in an appropriate manner? (NOTE-VISUALS ARE NOT REQUIRED AND IF A CONTESTANT DOES NOT HAVE ONE IT SHOULD IN NO WAY BE A FACTOR IN LOWERING THEIR RANKING)

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	Relevance	Is the topic timely? Is the the	☐		
2	Relatability	Can the audience relate to the t	☐		
3	Originality	Does the speaker address	☐		
4	Delivery	Does the student use voice, move	☐		

Section 5: Combined Interpretation

Introduction: For UDCA Region and State, 2-6A will allow a Combined interpretation event which includes POI/Dramatic/Humorous Interpretations.

A. Program Oral Interpretation

- a. Purpose: POI is a program of oral interpretation of thematically-linked selections chosen from two or three genres: prose, poetry, drama (plays).
 - i. At least two pieces of literature that represent at least two separate genres must be used. Unlike the other interpretation events, Program Oral Interpretation may use multiple sources for the program.

- ii. The title or author of all selections must be verbally identified in either the introduction and/or transitional phrases. The title may identify the primary source (e.g., book, anthology, journal, magazine, newspaper, approved website, etc.) or the specific title within the primary source (e.g., a poem, a play, a short story, a journal/magazine article, a newspaper article, etc.).
 - iii. If more than one author is attributed to the source, at a minimum, the primary author should be verbally cited. A Works Cited of all sources must be available to tournament officials upon request.
 - iv. Competitors are encouraged to devote approximately equal times to each of the genres used in the program. This distinction pertains to these two or three genres as a whole, not types of literature within a genre (such as fiction/nonfiction).
 - v. Prose expresses thought through language recorded in sentences and paragraphs: fiction (short stories, novels) and non-fiction (articles, essays, journals, biographies).
 - vi. Poetry is writing which expresses ideas, experience, or emotion through the creative arrangement of words according to their sound, their rhythm, their meaning. Poetry may rely on verse and stanza form.
- b. Contest: The use of a manuscript during the performance is required. Common practices include the use of a binder or folder. Reading from a book or magazine is not permitted.
 - i. The intact manuscript may be used by the contestant as a prop, so long as it is in the contestant's control by remaining in contact with the body at all times.
 - ii. No costumes or props other than the manuscript are permitted
 - iii. Pictures, graphics, and/or illustrations are considered a visual aid, even if included in the original manuscript, and may not be displayed. The contestant must address the script; however, introduction and transitional material may be memorized.
- c. Length: The time limit is 10 minutes with a 30-second "grace period."
- d. If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st.
 - i. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period. The ranking is up to each individual judge's discretion.
- e. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.
- f. Publication Rules: All literature performed must meet the publication rules of the Association.
- g. Adaptations to material may only be used for the purpose of transition.
 - i. Any word changes (to eliminate profane language) and/or additions (for transition) must be indicated clearly in ink.
 - ii. Failure to clearly indicate the addition of words will be subject to disqualification. Changes to the script may only be used for the purpose of transition or to eliminate profane language.
 - iii. The voice of a script may not be changed. For example, changing "She moved to California when she was 13" to "I moved to California when I was 13" is not permitted.
 - iv. Combining small fractions of sentences or singular words to create humorous or dramatic dialogue, scenes, moments, and/or plot lines not intended in the original literature is prohibited.

–For example, it is not permitted to take one word from page 13 (e.g. home), a phrase from page 211 (e.g. ran away from), and a name, (e.g. Tyler) from page 59 to create dialogue between characters or events that do not exist in the script. Example: adding “Tyler ran away from home.” when this did not occur and was not said in the script is not permitted.

v. Transitions only may be used to clarify the logical sequence of ideas. They are not to be used for the purpose of embellishing the humorous or dramatic effect of the literature.

B: Dramatic/Humorous Interpretations:

This includes categories of individual (solo) performance of dramatic (serious) and humorous literature, with selections drawn from published, printed: novels, short stories, plays, poetry, or other printed, published works, PDFs, e-books, as well as limited online and recorded works as provided for in the rules below.

- a. Divisions. Contests are conducted in Dramatic, Humorous, Duo, and Program Oral Interpretation. See additional rules for the supplemental interpretation events of Poetry, Prose, and Storytelling.
- b. Length: The time limit in Interpretation Main Events (Dramatic, Humorous, Duo, and Program Oral Interpretation) is ten minutes with a 30-second “grace period.”
 - i. If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period.
 - ii. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st.
 - iii. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period.
 - iv. The ranking is up to each individual judge’s discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices.
 - v.. No minimum time is mandated.
- c. Material: Selections used in the oral interpretation main events of Dramatic and Humorous, must be cuttings from a single work of literature (one short story, play, or novel), unless poetry is used, in which case cuttings may come from one or more poems from a single source.
 - i. If the source is an anthology collection of short stories, plays, or novels, each selection of literature is independent and only one selection can be used, even if it is from the same author.
 - ii. If the source is an anthology which includes poetry, multiple poems may be used from this single source by one or a variety of authors.
 - iii. Unlike the other oral interpretation main events, Program Oral Interpretation may use multiple sources for the program.
 - iv. Song lyrics may be used if the performer has an original, hard copy of the lyrics such as sheet music or a CD jacket or if they can be found from online sources that meet the digital source rules below.
 - v. See specific rules for Program Oral Interpretation and Supplemental interpretation events. Note: In 2020, the Board of Directors voted to pilot the following new rules regarding what sources for material may be used in Interpretation events, including removal of the requirement that digital sources must be found on the Approved Websites List. The following pilot publication rules will be continued in 2021-2022. Any source material is permitted as long as it meets the standards outlined below:
 - A. Original source material must not be written by the competitor who is performing it.
 - B. Original source material must be publicly accessible throughout the duration of the tournament.

- a. Digital printed publications such as web pages and PDFs retrieved or purchased from web pages are permitted as long as the web page is publicly accessible throughout the duration of the tournament.
- b. Digital unprinted publications such as videos, audio files, and films are permitted as long as the original source is publicly accessible throughout the duration of the tournament and the competitor can obtain an official transcript of the original source.
 - i. For print publications such as novels, short stories, plays, or poetry, the original source is the physical book or e-book. Photocopies of original literature are not acceptable. Presenting the physical book or e-book is sufficient to prove that a printed publication is publicly accessible.
 - ii. For digital printed publications such as web pages, original source material is no longer required to come from online publishing sources listed on the NSDA Approved Websites List.
- c. The original source must be publicly accessible for viewing or purchase by a simple internet search or by a URL not requiring passwords or access codes.
- d. Competitors must also present a printed manuscript to be used in the case of a protest, but presenting a printed copy of a website is not alone sufficient to prove that a digital printed publication is publicly accessible.
- e. PDFs are permitted as long as the website from which the PDF is retrieved or purchased is publicly accessible for viewing or purchase by a simple internet search or by a URL not requiring passwords or access codes. Competitors must also present a printed copy of the PDF to be used in the case of a protest, but presenting a printed copy of the PDF is not alone sufficient to prove that a PDF is publicly accessible.
- f. For non-English print material that a competitor will perform in English, the original source material in its original language must be publicly accessible. Competitors must present an official English translation to be used in the case of a protest.
- g. An official translation must be obtained in one of two ways:
 - i. An official translation is obtained through the original source's producer, licensing agent, or copyright holder.
 - ii. Or, an official translation is obtained through a translation service which uses non-automated, manual translation.
 - iii. Then, the competitor receives approval to perform the translation by the original source's producer, licensing agent, or copyright holder.
- h. For digital unprinted publications such as videos, audio files, and films, the original source must be publicly accessible for viewing or purchase by a simple internet search or by a URL not requiring passwords or access codes.
- i. Competitors must also present a printed official transcript of the original source to be used in the case of a protest, but presenting an official transcript is not alone sufficient to prove that the original source is publicly accessible.
- j. An official transcript must be obtained in one of two ways:
 - i. An official transcript is obtained through the original source's producer, licensing agent, or copyright holder.
 - ii. Or, an official transcript is obtained through an official transcription service such as TranscribeMe, Scribie, or iScribed, which use non-automated, manual transcription.

- iii. Then, the competitor receives approval to perform the transcription by the original source's producer, licensing agent, or copyright holder.
 - iv. If the digital unprinted source is not in English and the competitor wishes to perform it in English, an official transcription and an official translation of the transcription (see #4 above) are required.
- k. Source Verification: It is the affirmative duty of each coach and each student entered in Interpretation contests to determine absolutely that the cutting being performed meets all rules for material. Interp source material must be available at all district tournament contests in the event of a protest. Any contestant failing to produce the following items to the ombudsperson by the aforementioned deadline will not qualify for the semifinal rounds of competition. 1) The original published source of any selection used must be immediately available at the tournament. When requested by tournament officials, access to the source material upon demand, either in electronic or print form, must be presented.
- i. For print publications, the original source is the physical book. Photocopies of original literature are not acceptable.
 - ii. For PDFs, an original, unaltered PDF via flash drive, email, or on an electronic device (e.g., laptop) must be presented. Manipulation of a PDF script outside the scope of the rules will be subject to disqualification.
 - iii. PDF publications from an online source that meets the above standards and e-books are permitted. Competitors may turn in an e-book via flashdrive, email, or e-reader. For e-books, an original, unaltered e-pub or other recognized e-book format via flash drive or email must be presented; however, as some e-book formats are exclusive to their specific apps or electronic readers, students must provide the required technology and/or internet access to verify the material performed for tournament officials.
 - iv. For non-English publications that are being performed in English, both the original non-English source and the official English transcript must be provided.
 - v. For a digital publication, a printed manuscript will be turned in as the original source. Only the printed manuscript shall be considered adequate proof of authenticity.
 - vi. The material the competitor performs must presently appear on the website if questions arise in competition. The website and online version of the digital publication need to be available for comparison if challenged. Online access the fundamental responsibility of tournament officials and/or individual filing the protest. NOTE: If tournament officials cannot gain online access and the above requirements have been met, the piece is considered legal for use.
 - vii. Manuscript items to be printed directly from the screen for digital printed materials:
 - A. The first page in the website (the home page)
 - B. All other linked pages needed to navigate to the literary text selected for competition shall be printed out and the link must be highlighted in the manuscript
 - C. All web pages upon which the cutting appears
 - D. Each page must have printed in the header and/or footer including:
 - a. Date the page was printed
 - b. Web address

2) A photocopy or printed screenshot of every page of the original source from which any line of the cutting was taken. The photocopy will be kept for evaluation during the semifinal round.

Pages are to be placed in the order in which they are performed (e.g., if text from one page is used more than once within the cutting, that page should be copied again with those words highlighted and reinserted where it is used in the cutting).

Students are not required to photocopy or print pages that are not used in their cutting.

l. All words used from the script should be highlighted (any words/lines not used should be left unmarked).

i. Any word changes (to eliminate profane language) and/or additions (for transition) must be indicated clearly in ink. Failure to clearly indicate the addition of words will be subject to disqualification.

ii. Changes to the script may only be used for the purpose of transition or to eliminate profane language.

iii. Transitions may be used to clarify the logical sequence of ideas. They are not to be used for the purpose of embellishing the humorous or dramatic effect of the literature.

m. Performance: The presentation may not use physical objects or costuming. During the presentation, the contestant/team must name the author and the book or magazine from which the cutting was made.

n. Additionally: A. Adaptations to material may only be used for the purpose of transition. Any word changes (to eliminate profane language) and/or additions (for transition) must be indicated clearly in ink. Failure to clearly indicate the addition of words will be subject to disqualification. Changes to the script may only be used for the purpose of transition or to eliminate profane language. The voice of a script may not be changed. For example, changing "She moved to California when she was 13" to "I moved to California when I was 13" is not permitted. Combining small fractions of sentences or singular words to create humorous or dramatic dialogue, scenes, moments, and/or plot lines not intended in the original literature is prohibited. For example, it is not permitted to take one word from page 13 (e.g. home), a phrase from page 211 (e.g. ran away from), and a name, (e.g. Tyler) from page 59 to create dialogue between characters or events that do not exist in the script. Example: adding "Tyler ran away from home." when this did not occur and was not said in the script is not permitted. Transitions only may be used to clarify the logical sequence of ideas. They are not to be used for the purpose of embellishing the humorous or dramatic effect of the literature.

o. Humorous, Dramatic, and Duo Interpretation selections must be presented from memory. Program Oral Interpretation must use a manuscript.

p. Monologues, prose, and poetry selections are acceptable in Dramatic, Humorous, and Program Oral Interpretation. In Duo Interpretation, if the selection is prose or poetry and contains narration, either or both of the performers may present the narration.

q. Artistic Plagiarism: Videos of previous final round performances and/or other video media are intended to provide educational examples for coaches and students. They are not intended to serve as a model to directly imitate or duplicate in performance. Although universal human emotions may lead to similarities in portrayal of characters, wholesale impersonation, including cutting, blocking, and/or interpretation (verbal and/or nonverbal portrayal of characters and text) of material of previous semifinal round, final round, and other video media performances is prohibited and grounds for penalty. Given the extent of the artistic plagiarism, the performance penalty may range from lowering the ranking in the round to disqualification (see page 123). It is the burden of proof of the individual filing the protest to provide documented evidence of the artistic plagiarism demonstrated in the performance. This includes providing access to the plagiarized video material and written verification of examples to substantiate the complaint.

r. Focus: In Dramatic, Humorous, and Program Oral Interpretation, use of focal points and/or direct contact with the audience should be determined by the requirements of the literature being interpreted.

s. Re-Use: A student may not use a cutting from a work of literature the student used in National Speech & Debate Association district or national competition in any previous contest year. A student entered in two events may not use the same selection of literature in both events.

t. UDCA Combined Interp Ballot

NSDA Interp Ballots for POI/HI/DI

There is a set time limit of ten minutes, with a thirty second grace period

Humorous/Dramatic Interp/Program of Oral Interp (POI):: Interps rely on the performer's ability to portray one or more characters from a selected piece of literature that explores a story, argument, theme, etc.

In Dramatic/Humorous: They will take their cutting from only one source. No script to be held.

In POI: Each program must contain at least two of the three genres and students are encouraged to include all three. They must hold a binder/script in hand at all times.

Order	Label	Description	Speaker?	Min	Max
1	Cutting: Organization	Is the storyline easy to follow	☐		
2	Cutting: Originality	Does the speaker address a signi	☐		
3	Cutting: Relatabili	Can the audience relate to the t	☐		
4	Cutting for POI:	Were at least two of the three g	☐		
5	Characterization	Is each character well-developed	☐		
6	Blocking/Movement	Can you tell what the performer	☐		
7	Physical Presence	Is the presenter comfortable and	☐		
8	Vocal Presentation	Tone: Does the performer's voice	☐		

Tabroom judging rubric (UHSAA/UDCA Specific)

Ranking: At the end of the round you will rank them 1-7, 1 being who did the best job based on their overall skill performance considering the following:

Speech Evaluation Rubric

Skill	Explanation of Skill to be Demonstrated
Cutting	Organization of ideas/plot: Is the storyline easy to follow and understandable? Is the central theme/argument to be made in the Interpretation clear and developed throughout the piece? Originality Does the speaker address a significant topic in a unique, inventive way? Relatability Can the audience relate to the topic? Is the delivery personable? Is the rhetoric of the piece inclusive/appropriate for age level? IF A POI also consider Were at least two of the three genres of literature (Poetry/Prose/Drama) used in the program? Did all of the literature contribute to the theme or argument? Was there a balance among genres in the performance?
Characterization	Is each character well-developed and relatable? Does a character's response seem believable given the situation being portrayed? Did the selection(s) have distinct and engaging characters? Did the performance match the genre (did the performer emphasize poetic elements when performing a Poetry selection, Humorous, Dramatic)?
Blocking/Movement	Can you tell what the performer is doing in the scene and what character they are playing? Is the movement motivated by clear objectives/purpose? IF POI also consider: Did the performer maintain control of the manuscript/Binder at all times?
Physical Presence/ Presentation	Is the presenter comfortable and commanding in the space? Does the presenter's use of physicality, facial expression, and gestures enhance the performance? Does the presenter bring the words to life using effective techniques to convey appropriate emotion?
Vocal Presentation	Tone: Does the performer's voice align with the type of story/theme/genre? Does the presenter seem engaged in the literature? Articulation: Are the words clearly articulated and understood? Is volume/pace/inflection appropriately used throughout and effective in articulating the emotion of the text?

Article 8: : Internet/Electronic Device Usage

A. Contestants may use electronic devices (including laptop computers, tablets, and/or cell phones) to access the internet during debate, congress and extemp prep with the following conditions:

a.. Computers or other electronic devices may not be used to receive information for competitive advantage from non-competitors (coaches, assistant coaches, other non-competing students) inside or outside of the room in which the competition occurs. Information that would be restricted would include but not be limited to coach/non-participating competitor generated arguments, advice on arguments to run, questions to ask during cross examination, and other information not generated by the participating competitors in your round.

b.. Internet access may be used to retrieve files, exchange evidence and/or arguments, research arguments, and partner to partner communication, and communication between other participants in the round. These electronic device guidelines do not limit communication between debate partners during the debate round.

c. Penalty: Contestants found to have violated these provisions will be disqualified from the tournament and will forfeit all rounds and merit points in that event.

d. . Availability of Evidence: Contestants electing to use computers have the responsibility to promptly provide a copy of any evidence read in a speech for inspection by the judge or opponent. Printers may be used. Evidence may be printed in the round or produced electronically but must be provided in a format readable by the opposing team and the judge.

e.. In extemp, the internet may be used for research, access to article files, etc. In no way should they be accessing and using pre prepared speeches on topics.

f. Contestants electing to use computers are responsible for providing their own computers, batteries, extension cords, and all other necessary accessories. Tournament hosts will not be responsible for providing computers, printers, software, paper, or extension cords for contestants. Host schools may provide wireless internet access, but will not guarantee that contestants will be able to gain access when needed.

g. Contestants choosing to use laptop computers and/or related devices accept the risk of equipment failure. Judges and/or contest directors will give no special consideration or accommodation, including no additional speech time or prep time, should equipment failure occur.

h. By choosing to use electronic devices in the round, debaters and other relevant parties are consenting to give tournament officials the right to search their devices in the event of a protest. The device may only be searched by tournament officials and must be restricted to files and/or electronic exchanges relevant to the protest. Failure to comply would result in the upholding of the protest. Debaters and coaches should be present as their device is searched. Debaters who do not wish to consent should not use electronic devices in the round.

UHSAA State Tournament Schedule

Tournament Schedule

A: All tournament schedules will follow this schedule for State Tournaments. As always, tournaments may run ahead or behind scheduled times, but all efforts should be made to adhere to this schedule as much as possible.

Friday	1A Congress	Speech	Policy
3pm	Session 1	Extemp Prep 3:15	
3:30pm		Round 1	Round 1
4:30		Extemp Prep	
4:45		Round 2	
5:30	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner
6:00	Session 2	Extemp Prep 6:15	
6:30		Round 3	Round 2
8pm		Finals	

Saturday	3-6A Congress	LD/PF/SPAR	Policy
8am	Session 1 if 2+Houses Break at 10:30 for brunch		
8:30am	Session 1 if only one house Break at 11 for lunch		Round 3
9am		Round 1	
10am		Round 2	
11am	Session 2 if 2+ houses		Round 4
11:30am	Session 2 if only one house	Round 3	
12:30 pm		Lunch	Lunch
1:30pm		Round 4	Elim 1
2pm	Finals Session if 2+ houses		
2:45		Elim 1	
4pm		Elim 2	Elim 2 if needed
5pm		Elim 3 as needed	
6pm			Elim 3 if needed

A. Awards: 4:30pm

Awards Can be held while elim rounds are going, or pause last elims for awards and then resume, if desired and then give out awards in elim rounds.

- B. Elim rounds 2-3 can be done virtually the following week at discretion of Tournament director and agreement of all teams/schools involved. The Tournament director will secure judges and arrange the virtual room and adjust tournament end dates and times in schedule accordingly