



THE BRONX HIGH SCHOOL OF SCIENCE
SPEECH & DEBATE TEAM
75 BRONX SCIENCE BOULEVARD, BRONX, NY 10468

Dear Participants at the NYC Invitational,

The Bronx High School of Science Speech & Debate Team is delighted to welcome you to the Forty-Seventh New York City Invitational Tournament. We are proud to continue our longstanding tradition of offering a challenging and competitive tournament early in the Speech & Debate season calendar. The New York City Invitational features varsity competition in Public Forum Debate, Policy Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Congressional Debate, and, Dramatic Interpretation of Literature, Duo Interpretation of Literature, Extemporaneous Speaking, Humorous Interpretation of Literature, Original Oratory, Program Oral Interpretation and Prose & Poetry.

We wanted to share some key information as you prepare to visit Bronx Science.

Dates & Time

The tournament is from Friday, October 13th through October 15th. A complete schedule has been posted to tabroom.com. We will begin on Friday, October 13th at 3pm for Policy Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Public Forum debate. Speech and Congress will begin on Saturday, October 14th at 8:00 a.m. We anticipate the entire tournament concluding on Sunday, October 15th by 8:00 p.m., with different events ending at earlier times.

Tournament Locations

The tournament will be held at The Bronx High School of Science on Friday, Saturday and Sunday located at:

The Bronx High School of Science
75 Bronx Science Boulevard
Bronx, NY 10468

Public Transportation: Take the #4 or D/B train to the Bedford Park Blvd stop. Walk west on Bedford Park Boulevard and turn right on Paul Avenue. The school is about a 10 minute walk from the train station.

For Saturday only, the Speech and Congress divisions will be held at PS/MS 95 conveniently located near Bronx Science at:

PS/MS 95
3961 Hillman Avenue
Bronx, NY 10463

PS/MS 95 is a 15 minute walk from Bronx Science. Make a right out the main entrance and then a right on Goulden Avenue. Walk straight for about 5 minutes, then make a left on Sedgwick Avenue and a right on Hillman Avenue.

Public Transportation: Take the #4 train to either the Bedford Park Blvd and walk from Bronx Science or take the 4 train to Mosholu Parkway.

From Mosholu, walk along until it turns into Sedgwick Avenue and then make a right on Hillman Avenue.

Registration & Payment

Registration will begin at Bronx Science on Friday, October 13th at 12:00 p.m. on the stage in the main auditorium of the school and, for Speech and Congress, will continue on Saturday at PS/MS 95 beginning at 8:00 a.m. on Saturday. For Speech, you may register in person or by phone by 5pm on Friday. Even though Congress does not begin until Saturday, if you are prepared, you may register them on Friday at Bronx Science or at PS/MS 95 on Saturday. Look out for more information on registration by email.

All invoices will be produced within tabroom. All name changes must be complete by October 13th at 9:00 a.m.

If you pay in full with a credit card, we will waive your school fee. We are unable to waive the school fee for schools paying by checks or not paying in full. goo.gl/saADpS

Please bring your check to registration. Payment must be received when you register (including any amount in arrears) – there are no exceptions to this rule. Please make checks payable to The Bronx High School of Science Alumni Foundation.

Parking

There is ample street parking around Bronx Science. Beginning on Friday after 3pm, you will be able to park in the Bronx Science faculty parking lot located behind the school, the entrance is on Paul Avenue. The parking lot will be open and available for parking all day on Saturday and Sunday as well.

Note: There is no parking available in the faculty parking lot on Friday before 3pm. Please do not count on availability in the lot if you arrive early.

PS/MS 95 has street parking that can be difficult to find. We recommend parking at Bronx Science and walking over as well as leaving yourself sufficient time to look for parking and/or walk over from Bronx Science since rounds will start promptly.

Food & Beverage

At Bronx Science, we will provide participants with dinner on Friday, lunch and dinner on Saturday and lunch on Sunday. Once again, our volunteer parents are working hard to prepare a delicious feast for these days. At PS/MS 95, only lunch will also be served on Saturday. Speech and Congress participants will be able to have dinner at Bronx Science. As in the past, all meals at the NYC Invitational will represent a wide range of cuisines and the culinary talents of our team parents.

Concessions, including snacks and beverages, will be available for purchase at both Bronx Science and PS/MS 95.

The judges lounge will be well stocked at both schools with delicious food and a lovely variety of snacks for the duration of the tournament.

Classrooms and Offices

All rounds will be held in classrooms and offices at Bronx Science and PS/MS 95. We ask that all participants, coaches and judges only consume food in the cafeteria and judge's lounges. Please also be mindful to return the classrooms and offices to the way you found them. Both schools and their school yards are a no smoking environment.

Electronic Devices

WiFi information for both schools will be provided at the tournament. Coaches, judges and competitors should all have their own wireless compatible device for easy access to tabroom. For Policy, Lincoln-Douglas and Public Forum, the tournament will be entirely electronic. For Speech and Congress, we strongly recommend that all coaches, judges and competitors also have electronic access.

Bids

Bronx Science remains a qualifying competition for the National High School Tournament of Champions (TOC) in all four debate events: octofinalists in Lincoln-Douglas Debate, octofinalists in Public Forum Debate, quarterfinalists in Policy Debate and finalists in Congressional Debate. The NYC Invitational is a bid tournament for the TOC in all speech categories. Additionally, we expect finalists in certain speech categories to qualify to compete at the NIETOC.

We anticipate that the New York City Invitational will be a maximum-points qualifier to the National Debate Coaches Association (NDCA) National Championships in both Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Public Forum Debate.

Tournament Rules & Procedures

As this is an invitational tournament, the final interpretation of all rules and procedures will be at the sole discretion of the tournament hosts, with all competitors hereby agreeing to such interpretations with their attendance at the tournament.

Policy Debate: Policy debate teams will debate the 2017-18 National high school topic. The resolution to be debated is – Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its funding and/or regulation of elementary and/or secondary education in the United States.

Policy debate will feature 6 prelim rounds (powered paired after round 2). We expect to hold a runoff or sextodecimofinals as circumstances dictate. Awards will be given to all teams that reach elimination rounds. Speaker awards will be given to the top speakers.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate: Lincoln-Douglas debaters will debate the September/October 2017 National Speech & Debate Association LD topic. Resolved: In the United States, national service ought to be compulsory.

Lincoln-Douglas debate will feature seven preliminary rounds (power paired after round 2). The division will clear to a runoff to ensure that debaters with a preliminary record of 5-2 or better will have an opportunity to earn a spot in an elimination round. Awards will be given to all debaters that reach elimination rounds and speaker awards will be given to the top speakers.

Public Forum Debate: Public Forum debaters will debate the September/October 2017 Public Forum Debate topic. Resolved: Deployment of anti-missile systems is in South Korea's best interest.

Public Forum debate will feature seven preliminary rounds (power paired after round 2). The division will clear to a runoff to ensure that teams with a preliminary record of 5-2 or better will have an opportunity to earn a spot in an elimination round. Awards will be given to all teams that reach elimination rounds and speaker awards will be given to the top speakers.

For the three above debate events, there can only be one win and one loss in each round. Speaker points are on a 30-point scale with tenth point increments. Unless otherwise stated, NSDA rules apply to the tournament. Modified NSDA evidence rules are attached, showing changes from the existing rules for your reference. Such modifications are intended to clarify procedural (but not substantive) issues.

Congressional Debate: Congressional Debate will feature three preliminary sessions and then clear to semifinals. Each Congressional Debate session is allotted at least 2.5 hours. Awards will be given to all finalists and semifinalists. Unless otherwise stated, NSDA rules apply to the tournament. Only the semifinal and final session will feature Direct Questioning as the format for Cross Examination.

In addition to the NSDA rules, we would like to highlight the following: We expect limited recesses during each session and certainly no more than 15 minutes in total. Chambers should use the maximum amount of time to debate and certainly not adjourn more than five minutes prior to the allotted session time. In general, a session ends after the earlier of a minimum of two cycles of debate and the official session closing time. Additionally, in order to maximize the time for debate, when ranking competitors judges and parliamentarians will be instructed to consider a penalty to any competitor who uses the point of privilege to address the chamber.

Speech: Individual events will feature Dramatic Interpretation of Literature, Duo Interpretation of Literature, Extemporaneous Speaking, Humorous Interpretation of Literature, Original Oratory, Program Oral Interpretation and Prose & Poetry.

Speech will feature five preliminary rounds and clear semis or quarters as the circumstances dictate. Awards will be all participants in the elimination rounds. Unless otherwise stated, NCFL rules apply to the Prose & Poetry division and NSDA rules apply to other divisions.

Judges

Hired judges in all events have been allocated. Failure to fulfill a judging obligation may result in the inability of students to compete at the tournament. Any school-affiliated judge that misses a round will be assessed \$50 per missed round. There are no half-judge commitments permitted nor are schools allowed to share a judge.

All Policy and LD judges MUST have judging philosophies.

Separate documents will be sent on the issue of conflicts for both teams and for judges.

Other announcements will be forthcoming via email so be sure to check your email. We can't wait to see everyone and we look forward to an excellent tournament. If you have any questions, please contact us at 718-817-7700 or speechanddebate@bxscience.edu.

Sincerely,

Jean M. Donahue '77, Ph.D.
Principal
The Bronx High School of Science

Kirby Chin '88
Co-Tournament Host
Bronx Science Speech & Debate

Robert Levinson '80
Co-Tournament Host
Bronx Science Speech & Debate

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

Evidence is one of the important components of arguments in debate rounds. All debaters involved are expected to act in an ethical manner that is in accordance with the rules. In keeping with the National Speech & Debate Association Code of Honor, all participants are expected to use and interpret evidence, evidence rules, and procedures in good faith. Note: Highlighted sentences were modified or added since the release of the 2014-2015 piloted debate evidence rules.

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. 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 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 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.

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.
 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 his or her 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.); **or private communications with an author (7.1.H.)**. 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); **or 7.2.D. (straw arguments)**. 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.; 7.2.C. and/or 7.2.~~E~~D.
3. The judge should stop the round at that time to examine the evidence from both teams/individuals and render a decision about the credibility of the evidence.
 - a. If the judge determines that the allegation is legitimate and an evidence violation has occurred, the team/individual committing the violation will be given the loss in the round. Other sanctions may apply as well as articulated in 7.3.E.
 - b. If the judge determines that the allegation is not legitimate and that there is no violation, the team/individual making the challenge will receive the loss in the round.

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

D. The tabulation committee is authorized to hear:

(1) appeals, pursuant to 7.3.B., claiming that a judge ignored, misinterpreted or misapplied rules other than those from which no appeal is permitted pursuant to 7.3.A.;

(2) appeals from a judge's decision, pursuant to 7.3.C., on a formal in-round allegation of distortion or non-existent evidence (note: judge decisions regarding clipping or straw arguments 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.~~ immediately, and certainly prior to the release of the next pairing.

Such coach or school-affiliated adult representative is strongly encouraged to locate and notify the judge of that round and the opposing team/individual.

2. The coach must submit the post-round formal allegation to the tabulation committee ~~within 10 minutes of the formal~~ promptly after notification ~~of the intent to appeal~~ pursuant to 7.3.E.1. 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~~ an opportunity to provide evidence denying, or to the contrary of the claim, with a time period determined in the discretion of the tabulation committee. 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 and may be subject to additional penalties.
 4. The tabulation committee has the discretion of extending the time limits for these actions if circumstances do not allow a coach or school-affiliated adult to be available within the prescribed time limits.
- F. The tabulation committee's decision ~~to disqualify a student can be appealed by the coach or school-affiliated adult. The following procedure should be followed:~~ is final and binding. Attendance at the tournament is an agreement by all parties to abide by such decision.
1. ~~The appeal must be submitted in writing to the tabulation committee within 10 minutes of the notification to disqualify.~~
 2. ~~The tabulation committee will then submit the appeal to the national office referee(s). The committee will contact the national office referee once the written appeal has been received. Both sides will be able to provide written explanations and supporting evidence to defend their individual side.~~
 3. ~~A decision will be rendered in a timely manner. The decision of the national office shall be final and cannot be appealed.~~
 4. ~~No more than one round may occur between the round being protested and the decision of the national office referee.~~
 5. ~~If the appeal is successful and the contestant(s) may now continue in the tournament, they will be put into the appropriate bracket for pairing the debates.~~
- G. If appeals disputes 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/or~~ 7.1.H. (oral citation, written citation, indication of parts of card read or not read, use of private communication), the judge may at his or her 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 awarded zero speaker points (if applicable) and, at the discretion of the tournament committee, may 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~~ promptly to the tabulation committee, the committee may decide not to disqualify the entry. The loss and points that ~~was/were~~ 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 at the discretion of the tournament committee, may be disqualified from the tournament. However, if a debater(s) produces the evidence ~~within the post-round challenge period~~ promptly to the tabulation committee, that debater(s) may avoid disqualification.
- D. Evidence infractions violate the Code of Honor. Depending on the severity, an offense may result in notification of said offense to the contestant’s high school administration ~~and chapter advisor, loss of all District and/or National Tournament merit points, including trophy and sweepstakes points for the offending student(s), and/or revocation of Association membership. These decisions would be left to the national office, and not the individual District Committee.~~

7.5 Tabulation Committee. The tabulation committee shall be designated by the tournament host at its sole discretion and may comprise of one or more individuals, so long

as each such individual is not affiliated with any competitor or judge participating in the round in question. There may be one or more tabulation committee(s) designated by the tournament host.