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# General Philosophical Principles for All Events

#### General Disclaimer on Rules

This document establishes the rules and procedures for operation of the Tournament of Champions. It is not possible to predict every possible situation that may occur during the tournament. Any issue, problem or other instance not dealt with explicitly in this tournament procedures document will be considered and decided by the tab room for the event in which the question arises. All tab room officials will strive to make fair and transparent decisions to expeditiously resolve conflicts and avoid tournament delays that might jeopardize a timely tournament conclusion. Tab room officials will strive to consult with the Tournament Director when feasible, but given the size of the event, there may be situations in which the event tab room will make final decisions to resolve issues, problems or other instances not specifically addressed by this document.

#### Education and Openness Policy

While the TOC is a competitive event, we strongly believe that it is an educational endeavor. All debates at the TOC are considered open to the public, and any person, including coaches, debaters, parents, school officials, and members of the public, may observe and take notes in TOC debate rounds. Any sources read as evidence in round should be available to other competitors should they make a request for the citation after the evidence has been read.

#### Conduct Policy

All debaters and guests attend the TOC at the invitation of the University of Kentucky and must abide by all rules established by the tournament invitation, the TOC Tournament Rules & Procedures document, and any rules set by the University of Kentucky for guests on campus.

# Harassment Policy

#### Policy

All TOC participants should recognize the rights of others and communicate and act with respect for opponents, colleagues, critics, tournament hosts, and audience members. Communication or conduct which engenders ill-will and disrespect for forensics ultimately reduces the utility of forensics for all who participate in it and should, therefore, be avoided.

The Tournament of Champions follows the University of Kentucky’s policies and procedures concerning harassment and discrimination. A compliance officer with the Office of Institutional Equity and Equal Opportunity will be on call for the duration of the tournament. The Tournament Director must first be contacted if an issue involving allegations of harassment or discrimination arises.

All debaters, coaches, judges, staff and all other individuals present at the TOC, or participating in activities associated with the TOC, are expected to know and are required to abide by this Policy. TOC participants should also adhere to the policies and procedures of their own educational institutions, and abide by all local, state and federal laws, avoiding discrimination or harassment on any basis prohibited or regulated by law or applicable policies.

Coaches, program directors, judges, researchers and assistants must ensure their conduct complies with this Policy during the TOC avoiding, mitigating and preventing situations that may generate discriminatory, offensive or harassment actions, including during a judge’s post-round explanation of a reason for decision in a round. Coaches and program directors are encouraged to discuss this Policy with all their school’s participants prior to the TOC and are expected to take any reasonable and necessary actions to ensure compliance by participants who are affiliated with their respective schools. By participating in the TOC or in activities associated with the TOC, each individual shall be deemed to have agreed to comport themselves in accordance with this Policy.

#### Resources

For more information regarding University policy and procedures on harassment please see:

* UK Discrimination & Harassment Policy – <http://www.uky.edu/regs/sites/www.uky.edu.regs/files/files/ar/ar6-1.pdf>
* UK Title IX Policy - <http://www.uky.edu/eeo/title-ix>
* FAQs – <http://www.uky.edu/eeo/faqs>

# Appeals and Ombuds Procedure

Any party seeking an appeal to any rule or regulation set forth in this document should follow these procedures, depending on the subject matter of any challenge or appeal:

* **Evidence and ethics challenges** within the course of a debate are handled by the judge in the round. See the Evidence and Ethics Section below for each specific event.
* **Harassment or Discrimination complaints** are to be brought to the attention of the Tournament Director and then will be handled by Office of Institutional Equity and Equal Opportunity. See the above Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy for those procedures.
* **Procedures for resolving all other complaints**, challenges or appeals not explicitly set out in this document will be conducted by an **Ombudsperson appointed by the Director of the Tournament.**

The Ombuds (in consultation with the Director when deemed necessary and feasible) will strive to make fair and transparent decisions to expeditiously resolve conflicts and avoid tournament delays that might jeopardize a timely tournament conclusion.

Protests must follow the following procedure

Protests are filed with an official ombudsperson on duty appointed by the tournament director. The tournament will provide a form in the Ombuds room on which protests may be filed:

1. Name of coach filing the protest (a coach of record must file the protest) and school, city, state.
2. Name of person being protested.
3. Round being protested.
4. Section/room and speaker number of person/team being protested.
5. Specific infraction being protested, described with supporting detail

After the infraction has been observed/discovered, the protest must be filed in a timely matter. For coaches initiating protests, **decisions of the Ombudsperson are final.** If a perceived violation occurs in a subsequent round, another protest may be filed.

# Use of Technology

For **Policy, Public Forum and Lincoln Douglas Debate**, use of laptop computers, tablet computers, smart phones and other electronic devices able to access the internet are permitted during events. The use of computers during debates is permitted for both flowing and research purposes including retrieval of evidence stored on hard drives and accessing resources via the internet. Students should not attempt to use electronic devices to initiate or respond to contact with outside parties during a debate. The penalty for violation of this rule is loss of the debate in question and zero speaker points assigned to the offending debater. This rule recommends, but does not require, that all text messaging devices and cell phones be turned off during debates. It is meant to restrict the debaters from initiating or responding to any outside contact during a debate round. Example: A student’s cell phone ringing during a debate would not violate the rule. A student calling, emailing, chatting text messaging or responding to any contact from their coach during a debate would violate this rule.

For **Congressional Debate and all Speech Events,** please refer to the event specific rules.

# Qualification Procedures

### Eligibility

Entries are considered “fully qualified” to the TOC with two “bid legs” earned at designated TOC qualifying tournaments. Entries with one bid may apply for at-large slots to compete, availability depending on space available at the tournament.

\*Entries are considered fully qualified in speech with one “bid leg”

All students:

* must be full-time students seeking a high school diploma at the school they are representing. No independent entries or no afterschool programs are permitted to participate
* must have the Principal’s or Headmaster-Headmistress’ signed permission to compete
* must be accompanied by a school-approved responsible adult.

In team events:

* both debaters must be full-time students seeking a high school diploma at the school they are representing
* both bids must be earned together by both team members.

### Bid Tournaments

Tournaments are selected to be TOC qualifying tournaments by the TOC Advisory Committees for each event.

* Tournaments and bid levels will be re-evaluated each April for the next season
* Upon Committee approval, bid tournament participation is final. Feedback received by the Advisory Committees will be reviewed and considered during the re-evaluation process in April.
* All questions about individual tournaments should be directed to that tournament’s host/director
* Tournament Directors seeking consideration for a bid or an increase in the bid level should submit a request by the end of the first week in March, here: <http://ci.uky.edu/UKDebate/applying-be-bid-tournament>
* Directors are encouraged to include any information they think valuable for helping the committee assess the tournament e.g. previous packets, states represented, TOC qualifiers in attendance, quality of judge pool, etc.

Current list of bid tournaments can be found here: <http://www.uktoc.com/bids.html>

### At-Large Qualification

* Applicants that earn only one TOC bid are invited to apply for an At-Large slot to attend the tournament. At-Large spots are not guaranteed and vary in number each year depending on the size of the fully qualified field. Further instructions for processing At-Large applications are available on the application.
* At-Large applicants with ghost bids are eligible to apply for an At-Large bid
* Applications are non-refundable
* Submission of the application provides consent to share application materials with UK debate and members of the relevant advisory committee.

Tips for application: At-large application submissions will be most helpful to the selection committees when they include a cover letter of support explaining why the entry would be competitive at the TOC and providing a clear listing of all tournaments attended by the applicants or by applicant team members. Any extenuating or special circumstances that the committee should be aware of, can be included in the cover letter.

### Ghost Bids

“Ghost bids” are awarded in situations where two entries from the same school meet each other on the pairing in the round that is one elimination round prior to the tournament’s designated qualifying bid round. A debater/team need not have won an elimination round at the tournament where the ghost bid is sought before being eligible to earn a “ghost” bid.

For example, at a Quarters level bid tournament, if two entries from Smithville HS meet in the Octafinals, the entry that does not advance over the other to the quarterfinal round will be awarded a ghost bid.

# Judging

## General

### Obligations

**All judges are obligated through the** first elimination round on Monday in Public Forum, LD, and Policy **and the finals in Congressional Debate and speech events**, and also one round past the school’s elimination in elimination rounds.

So, for example, if your school’s last LD student is eliminated in quarterfinals, your LD judges must be available to judge the LD semifinal round. We are always very short on judging towards the end of the tournament, so we greatly appreciate any volunteers willing to stick around for the late elimination rounds.

**The tournament will assess a $300-dollar penalty for judges who miss a round when obligated.**

### Eligibility

#### Important Note

The tournament director reserves the right to approve any and all judges in all events.

#### Judge Qualifications

For **LD and Congressional debate,** any judge who has judged at a tournament this season in the event they wish to enter the pool at the TOC will be considered a qualified judge. Any judge who has not met this qualification may ask for an exception on a case by case basis. Such exceptions would be granted only to people who have significant prior experience with the event. In all other cases judges who wanted to be added to the pool, will be added as “free strikes”.

For **Policy debate** – For judges to count toward the commitment, they must have judged at least four rounds during the regular season at varsity high school tournaments. Exemptions will be made for those that have made a good faith effort to fulfill the requirement, e.g. putting yourself in for a full commitment at a tournament. Judges who do not meet the requirement are considered a free strike and do not count toward the commitment.

**Parents** - Parents are not eligible to judge in Policy, LD, or Congressional Debate, unless they are experienced and trained in the event. Any parent judges must be approved in advance by the tournament director and/or TOC tab staff. Parents ARE eligible to judge in Public Forum.

#### Judge Philosophies

For **Policy. Lincoln-Douglas and Public Forum**, **all judges must submit a judging philosophy** to Tabroom. No Policy, LD or PF entry will be considered complete until all affiliated judges have submitted a judge philosophy. For examples, please peruse the judge philosophy website. The penalty for any judge who fails to post a judge philosophy before the tournament starts will be that the school the judge is representing will lose school judge preferences.

### First-Year-Out Judges

#### Policy/LD/PF

First year outs are free strikes and DO NOT count toward a school’s judging obligation. They must be entered a minimum of two rounds (Three rounds if the judge is in policy debate).

### The “Entourage” Rule

For **Policy** anyone attending the tournament that contributes to the competitive debate effort for a school **must be entered in the judge pool** for a minimum of **three** rounds.

For **Public Forum** **and Lincoln-Douglas** anyone attending the tournament that contributes to the competitive debate effort for a school **must be entered in the judge pool** for a minimum of **two** rounds.

This includes any volunteers contributing debate work.

Parents (who are not also coaches) and chaperones do not need to be in the pool.

**Any school found violating this rule will be issued a $200 fine**.

### Expectations

#### General

The primary role of judges is to serve as educators. All judges are expected to adjudicate their rounds fairly, limiting their evaluations to the arguments delivered by the students in the round before them. The TOC encourages judge feedback and post-round discussion with the debaters, as appropriate.

In Policy, LD, and PF, judges are expected to assign one winner and one loser per round, by the decision time communicated by the tab room. The tab room will flip a coin to determine the winner of any round where the judge is unable to render a decision in the time allotted.

#### Double-Flighted Event Details

Judge commitments for LD and PF are considered “doubled-flighted” rounds of commitment (so 4 double-flighted rounds of commitment are really 8 single-flights). For LD, the tab room may not always be able to schedule every judge in both the A and B flights of a round, given judge preference constraints.

#### Judge Conflicts

Please indicate on the tournament entry website **all preclusions for all judges**. Judges should preclude themselves from any debater who they have previously coached, had a close, personal relationship with, or for any other reason the judge believes they cannot be objective towards them if assigned. This includes any judge who has done any paid or volunteer coaching, even if conducted digitally or otherwise-remotely. Any college debater or coach should preclude herself or himself from any debater whom they have seriously recruited to attend their school. Judges should preclude themselves from judging their alma mater. Judges should preclude themselves from judging any school which they previously coached in the three-years prior to the 2017-2018 academic year. It is the **judge’s obligation** to communicate any conflicts to the tournament director prior to the start of the tournament.

**Judges are also expected to adhere to Event-Specific Rules regarding Judge Conflicts.**

**In the event a pairing is distributed, and a judge reports a conflict after the fact, resulting in a changing of the pairing, that school will be charged a $200 fine.**

#### Judge Absences

All judges are obligated to adjudicate the round which the tab room assigns them. Any judge who fails to report to judge their debate before the forfeit time (15 minutes after the posted start time for the debate) faces sanction by the tab room, including disqualification of the debate entries from the judge’s school. Any judge who knows they will be late should make every attempt to inform the tab room if they have a legitimate time conflict (an emergency arises, illness, etc.).

**Fines**-Schools will be fined $100 per round missed round by one of their judges.

#### Disclosure of Decisions and Oral Critique Policy

The Tournament of Champions serves as both a competitive and educational forum for the nation’s best debaters, coaches, and judges. As such, the Tournament encourages judge-debater interaction by making decision disclosures and giving oral critiques in the policy, PF, and LD debate divisions. Please submit your ballot online or to the ballot table before giving any post-round feedback.

### FAQs

#### Can I judge an event other than the one my student qualified for?

Yes, on a case by case basis, which **must be approved IN ADVANCE by the Tournament Director** and not merely through private communication with the tab room.

#### What if I can only arrive to the tournament late?

As long as you can cover your commitment, the tournament will make an effort to accommodate your schedule. If you cannot cover your commitment, the school you represent will need to hire additional judging to fully cover the school commitment.

# Event-Specific Rules

## Policy

### Event Rules

#### Topic

The TOC will use the annual NFHS policy debate topic.

#### Event Format

The tournament will host 7 preliminary rounds that follow the traditional “8-5-3” high school policy debate format for constructive, rebuttal, and cross-examination time. There will be a total of 10 minutes of preparation time for each team.

#### Speaker Point Scale

The TOC will use a 30-point speaker point scale with tenths of a point allowed, with no ties between the debaters.

#### Start Times

Teams will be allowed at least 30 minutes of prep time from release of pairings until the official debate start time. Coaches should conclude their coaching 10 minutes prior to the debate. Judges should report to their rooms no later than 5 minutes before official debate start time.

#### Decision Times

For preliminary rounds, decision time for judges to submit their decision will be 2:15 hours from the posted start time of the round. For elimination rounds, the decision time is 2:45 from the posted start time of the round. If the judge is unable to render a decision in the allotted time, the tab room will flip a coin to determine the winner of that debate/ballot.

#### Forfeit Times

Any team arriving later than 15 minutes after the posted start time will be at the risk of forfeit imposed at the exclusive discretion of the event tab room staff. Any team experiencing what they believe to be a legitimate delay should make every attempt to communicate with the tab room if they are going to be late.

#### Number of Clearing Teams

We will clear all teams with a **5-2** win loss or better. There will be a runoff round to complete a full octafinal bracket if necessary.

#### Tiebreakers

1. Wins
2. High low points
3. Double high low points
4. Total points
5. Judge Variance

#### Maverick Debating Rules

Maverick teams are not permitted to enter prior to the tournament. If a team becomes maverick due to an illness of a partner during the tournament, the ill debater may miss no more than 2 debates to be able to return and continue debating. Mavericks may win the debate. Mavericks will not be permitted to clear to elimination rounds.

#### Hybrid Teams

No hybrid teams are allowed to compete at the tournament. Each entry must be comprised of two students from the same school.

### Pairing Process

* All power matched rounds will be paired high-low within brackets as possible.
* The field will be ranked prior to the tournament in order to balance the preset rounds. A member of the UK debate staff will do this ranking and will include a variety of variables including TOC bids and overall performance at TOC qualifying tournaments.
* Sides in Round 7 will be randomly assigned by the tabulation program.

### Judge Placement

#### Prelims

In prelims, starting with round 3, judges will be placed: [A] first for teams in “break rounds” (considered as those teams with 2 losses), then [B] second for teams with 1 loss, then [C] third for teams with no losses, then [D] finally for those teams already considered ineligible to clear to elimination rounds based on their record.

#### Strike Cards

Starting with the quarterfinals, teams will be given strike cards to assemble the panels, when possible, with the number of judges on the card and the number of strikes allowed to be determined by the number of judges available for that round based on MPJ.

### Elimination Rounds

#### Bracket

The elimination round bracket will be released the night before the final day of elimination rounds.

#### Side Assignment

In elimination rounds, all rounds will be flip for sides, unless teams have previously met, in which case the teams will switch sides from the previous debate.

#### Coin Flip

Teams should be present in their competition room no later than 30 minutes prior to the scheduled start time for the debate in order to flip for sides. If one team is not present at the scheduled time for conducting the flip for sides, then the team which is present will be allowed to choose their preferred side. If both teams are not present at the scheduled time for conducting the flip, then the tab room will assign sides for the debate.

### Judging

#### Eligibility \*New as of 2017

For judges to count toward the commitment, they must have judged at least four rounds during the regular season at varsity high school tournaments. Exemptions will be made for those that have made a good faith effort to fulfill the requirement, e.g. putting yourself in for a full commitment at a tournament. Judges who do not meet the requirement are considered a free strike and do not count toward the commitment.

#### One Winner

Judges must vote for one and only one team within the allotted decision time.

#### Entourage Rule

The “entourage rule”- All qualified individuals at the tournament contributing to any school’s competitive effort must be in the judge pool for a **minimum of 3 rounds**.

#### First-Year-Out Judges

Judges who are only one year removed from high school competition will not count towards any school’s judging obligation, they are considered “free strikes.” They must still be entered in the judge pool.

#### Obligations \*\*Revised 2018

Judges are obligated through at least the Octafinal round, plus one round after the team(s) from the school they represent is/are eliminated from the tournament.

**The tournament will assess a $300-dollar penalty for judges who miss a round when obligated.**

#### Philosophies

Judges are required to post a judge philosophy on Tabroom. No entry will be considered complete until all affiliated judges have submitted a judge philosophy. For examples, please peruse the judge philosophy website. The penalty for any judge who fails to post a judge philosophy before the tournament starts will be that the school the judge is representing will lose school judge preferences.

#### Mutual Preference Judging Procedures

We utilize mutual preference judging based on a category system, using a round count system, with the size of each category defined by the tab room prior to the tournament based on the total number of rounds of judging.

Preference sheets will be due prior to start of the tournament at a time announced by the tabulation staff.

### Evidence and Ethics Challenges

If a team believes an opponent committed an evidence or other ethics violation, the accusing team should stop the debate and ask the judge to adjudicate the challenge. This type of challenge includes the following situations:

* a team reads evidence is that fabricated
* a team reads evidence that is meaningfully altered to change the author’s original meaning
* a team misrepresents how much evidence they have read in a debate, such as improperly highlighting their evidence, “clipping cards” (the team says they read more than they actually did by clipping a card short of the indicated end), or “cross reading” (the team skips words or sentences in the middle of the text, but indicates that they read all the highlighted words)
* a team receives argument assistance or reads or responds to communications from a coach or other person after the debate has commenced, whether verbal or electronic, including the transfer of evidence after the round starts.

The accusing team will explain to the judge what alleged violation is being asserted. The judge will evaluate the violation based on the evidence available to the judge. Prior to evaluating the challenge, the judge should inform both teams whether the round will continue after the challenge if the accusation is found to be false or if the judge cannot determine the challenge based upon the evidence available to the judge. After the judge informs both teams of the consequences of a failure to sustain the objection or challenge, the accusing team will be given an opportunity to withdraw the challenge. If the accusing team decides to pursue the objection or challenge, then the consequences announced by the judge for a failed or indeterminable objection or challenge will be binding on the teams.

If the judge finds that an ethics or evidence violation was committed, the offending team will be assigned a loss. If a single team member committed the violation, that debater will receive zero speaker points. The judge may assign speaker points to the non-offending debater. If the violation occurs prior to the non-offending team member delivering a speech, the judge may award points based upon the cross-examination, if applicable. If the non-offending team member has not delivered a speech or participated in a cross-ex, then the tab room will assign the average of the non-offending debater’s speaker points from prior debates.

Any decision to challenge evidence violations or unethical behavior must be made during the round in which the infraction occurred before the judge submits a decision to the tab room. No challenge can be made to conduct committed in any round after the ballot has been submitted to tab room. The judge assigned to the round will decide the challenge made in the round based solely on the evidence submitted by the teams in the round. No appeal, modification or reversal of the judge’s decision regarding the challenge or the consequences resulting from the challenge is permitted.

## Lincoln Douglas

### Event Rules

#### Topic

The TOC topic for LD will be the January/February LD topic selected by the National Speech and Debate Association.

#### Event Format

Speech constraints: 6-3-7-3-4-6-3 with 5 minutes of preparation time.

#### Speaker Point Scale

The TOC will use a 30-point speaker point scale.

#### Start Times

Debaters will be allowed at least 30 minutes of prep time from the release of the pairings until the official start time of the A flight debate. Coaches should conclude their coaching 10 minutes prior to the debate. Judges should report to their rooms no later than 5 minutes until start time.

#### Number of Clearing Teams

We will clear all teams with a **4-2** win loss or better.

#### Tiebreakers

1. Wins
2. High low points
3. Double high low points
4. Total points
5. Judge Variance

#### Forfeit Policy

* Forfeit times – Any team arriving later than 5 minutes after the posted start time will be at the risk of forfeit by the tab room. Any team experiencing what they believe to be a legitimate a delay should make every attempt to communicate with the tab room if they are going to be late.
* If a debater becomes unable to debate due to an illness during the tournament, the may miss no more than 2 debates to be able to return and continue debating. Speaker points will be averaged in this situation.
* Any entry that forfeits for a reason other than illness or serious emergency approved by the tab room will be withdrawn from the tournament.

#### Report Times

1. Flight A debaters are eligible to forfeit a debate if they are not present in the room they are debating in 1 minute after the posted start time.

2. Flight B debaters need to be present in the room they are debating in 61 minutes after the posted start time of a debate (i.e. start time for Flight A). This is true regardless of whether the flight A debate decision is in. Failure to comply will result in a forfeit.

#### Decision Times

The decision time deadline is 1 hour and 15 minutes after a debate begins in its respective flight.

#### Strike Card Times

Strike cards for elimination rounds must be returned to the tab staff 10 minutes after their release. Failure to do so will result in the tab room selecting a three-judge panel for the given debate.

### Pairing Process

* All power matched rounds will be paired high-low within brackets as possible.
* The field will be ranked prior to the tournament in order to balance the preset rounds. A member of the UK debate staff will do this ranking and will include a variety of variables including TOC bids and overall performance at TOC qualifying tournaments.

### Elimination Rounds

#### Bracket

The bracket will be released the night before the final day of elimination rounds.

#### Side Assignments

In elimination rounds, all rounds will be flip for sides, unless debaters have previously met, in which the debaters will switch sides from the previous debate.

#### Coin Flip Policy \*\*New 2018

Debaters meeting in elimination rounds must meet in a central location designated by the tab room (for example outside tab or in awards location) 30 minutes before the scheduled start of the round to flip a coin (or mutually agree) on their preferred sides in the upcoming debate. For the second flight, debaters should be present at the central designated location 20 minutes after the announced start time of the first flight. Debaters must indicate which side they prefer when the coin flip is decided. If a debater fails to arrive at the designated central location at the designated time in a flip for sides round, the tab room will allow the debater present to choose their preferred side for the debate. If sides are locked and the late arriving debater is designated affirmative, the negative debater may request a delay of up to fifteen minutes to ensure both debaters have adequate preparation time.

While the modification of judging panels after a time sides have been chosen in any given debate will be discouraged, the tab room understands that occasionally these changes will have to occur. As such, both sides will be notified of the changes and up to 15 minutes of extended prep time will be allowed to allow teams an opportunity to adapt to the new panel.

### Judge Placement

#### Prelims

In the prelims, starting with round 3, judges will be placed first for debaters in “break rounds”, considered as those with 2 losses, then those with 1 loss, then no losses, then those already considered ineligible to clear to elimination rounds based on their record.

#### Strike Cards

Starting with the quarterfinals, debaters will be given strike cards to assemble the panels, when possible, with the number of judges on the card and the number of strikes allowed to be determined by the number of judges available for that round based on MPJ.

### Judging

#### Qualification

Any judge who has judged at a tournament this season in the event they wish to enter the pool at the TOC will be considered a qualified judge. Any judge who has not met this qualification may ask for an exception on a case by case basis. Such exceptions would be granted only to people who have significant prior experience with the event. In all other cases judges who wanted to be added to the pool, will be added as “free strikes”.

#### One Winner

Judges must vote for one and only one debater within the allotted decision time.

#### Entourage Rule

The “entourage rule”- All qualified individuals at the tournament contributing to any school’s competitive effort must be in the judge pool for a minimum of 2 rounds.

#### First-Year-Out Judges

Judges who are only one year removed from high school competition will not count towards any school’s judging obligation, they are considered “free strikes.” They must still be entered in the judge pool.

#### Obligations \*\*Revised 2018

Judges are obligated through at least the Octafinal round, plus one round after the team(s) from the school they represent is/are eliminated from the tournament.

**The tournament will assess a $300-dollar penalty for judges who miss a round when obligated.**

#### Philosophies

Judges are required to post a judge philosophy on Tabroom.

#### Mutual Preference Judging Procedures

We utilize mutual preference judging based on a category system, using a round count system, with the size of each category defined by the tab room prior to the tournament based on the total number of rounds of judging.

Preference sheets will be due prior to start of the tournament at a time announced by the tabulation staff.

#### Judge Conflict Policy \*\*New 2018

Judges should constrain themselves, \*and\* competitors should mark judges as conflicts/constraints, in the following instances:

1. The judge attended the same school as the competitor;
2. The judge and the competitor are related;
3. The judge worked for the competitor’s school as a coach or judge, paid or unpaid, during the past two years. This does not apply if the judge was only hired to judge at the school’s tournament;
4. The judge attends a school that has offered to hire the competitor to coach or judge in the future, or the competitor attends a school that has offered to hire the judge to coach or judge in the future;
5. The judge has been a primary instructor, e.g. a school coach or personal coach, to the competitor;
6. The judge and competitor have, or have had in the past, a personal friendship or romantic relationship or have socialized in non-debate settings;
7. The judge is being provided transportation or housing by the competitor’s school at this tournament;
8. The judge has offered the competitor a job, e.g. an institute position or a coaching position;
9. The judge’s coach (current or within past two years) coaches the competitor or a competitor’s teammate(s). Examples:
   1. Judge A graduated last year from School B. Judge A’s coach has moved from School B to another team, School C. Judge A should not judge any competitors from School B or School C.
   2. Judge D is coached in college by Coach E. Coach E also provides coaching to a student at School F. Judge D should not judge any competitors from School F.
10. The judge works for a school that is recruiting the competitor, or which the competitor is planning to attend;
11. The judge has, or in the past has had, a romantic relationship with any member of the competitor school’s coaching staff;
12. The judge coaches other students from the competitor’s school or the judge coaches *with* other members of the coaching staff of the competitor’s school;
13. Coach and Prep Sharing

With the exception of summer workshop participation, student competitors and judges who coach or share debate preparation under the aegis of the same school, private coach, or private company should mark each other as a conflict.

* If a student is coached by Individual A, they should mark as a conflict all judges representing students coached by Individual A.
* If a judge coaches Competitor A, they should mark as a conflict all individuals with whom Competitor A shares preparation, and all individuals with whom Competitor A shares a coach.
* If a student receives coaching or shares preparation through School A, they should mark as a conflict all judges who work for School A.
* If a judge works for School A in a coaching capacity, they should mark as a conflict all students receiving coaching from or sharing preparation with School A.
* If a student receives coaching or shares preparation through Company A, they should mark as a conflict all judges who work for Company A.
* If a judge works for Company A, they should mark as a conflict all students receiving coaching from or sharing preparation with Company A.

A coaching relationship exists if a person has worked with that debater on arguments, ideas, drills, research, strategies, or any other element of their debate performance. This includes relationships that are short term and long term, and formal or informal. There are two exceptions to this policy:

* A coaching relationship does not arise as a result of a judge providing feedback to a student competitor after adjudicating a tournament debate round in which the student participated. However, adjudicating practice debates outside of the context of a competition does create a coaching relationship that should be marked as a conflict by both the judge and student competitor.
* Judges do not need to mark as a conflict competitors who attended a summer workshop at which the judge was employed, unless an additional coaching relationship continued beyond the workshop context. Students do not need to mark as conflicts judges who taught at a summer workshop they attended, unless an additional coaching relationship continued beyond the workshop context.

During the tournament, if it is determined that this policy has been violated, all competitors coached by the judge(s) that should have been constrained will have their judge preferences removed immediately;

1. Any other relationship between a judge and competitor that might reasonably be thought to compromise the judge’s impartiality as a judge. To determine whether a relationship meets this test, you might ask yourself, “If I were a competing student and knew nothing about my judge except that they bore the relationship in question to my competitor or my competitor’s coach, would I have any doubts about their impartiality?” If the answer is “yes,” you should mark judges or competitors to whom you bear that relationship as constrained.

When filling out the mutual preference system teams have an affirmative obligation to select as “conflicts/constrained” those judges they know will be required to conflict themselves as identified in the “Judge Conflict Policy” portion of this document.

The tab room will “correct” mistakes in preferences by randomly moving judges up categories to ensure the requisite percentages are met. Judges will all be ranked as A+ for teams not turning in a preference sheet.

Coaches should put all conflicts into the Notes box on Tabroom for each of their judges. It is the coach’s affirmative obligation to discover and report all conflicts. **Judges should also identify in their published judge philosophies those competitors with whom they have a coaching relationship as described above.**

Failure by judges and/or competitors to properly identify conflicts may result in removal of preferences for the school(s) involved.

#### Diversity

The University of Kentucky strongly supports a diverse and inclusive academic environment. As such, the Tournament of Champions values the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion with regard to tournament practice. In particular, the TOC seeks to offer a diverse and inclusive judge pool. Examples of diversity-enhancing measures include:

* Utilization of the diversity enhancement function on tabroom.com. Those who self-identify as diversity enhancing including but not limited to persons of color and women may “opt in”.
* The TOC is committed to providing financial incentives to the creation of a diverse judge pool
* The tabulation staff will seek to enhance the diversity of preliminary as well as elimination round judge assignments. These efforts will seek to balance the goals of inclusion with the policy of mutual preference judging.

As a point of clarification, this position does not imply that judges should be used over their commitment, but that the tab room will seek to actively use those judges where they are obligated and/or have made themselves available to judge. The TOC will, as part of its mission, work to expand the overall pool of diversity-enhancing judges.

### Evidence and Ethics Challenges

If a debater believes an opponent committed an evidence or other ethics violation, the accusing debater should stop the debate and ask the judge to adjudicate the challenge. This type of challenge includes the following situations:

* a debater reads evidence is that fabricated
* a debater reads evidence that is meaningfully altered to change the author’s original meaning
* a debater misrepresents how much evidence they have read in a debate, such as improperly highlighting their evidence, “clipping cards” (the debater says they read more than they actually did by clipping a card short of the indicated end), or “cross reading” (the team skips words or sentences in the middle of the text, but indicates that they read all the highlighted words)
* a debater receives argument assistance or reads or responds to communications from a coach or other person after the debate has commenced, whether verbal or electronic, including the transfer of evidence after the round starts.

The accusing debater will explain to the judge what alleged violation is being asserted. The judge will evaluate the violation based on the evidence available to the judge. Prior to evaluating the challenge, the judge should inform both teams whether the round will continue after the challenge if the accusation is found to be false or if the judge cannot determine the challenge based upon the evidence available to the judge. After the judge informs both debater of the consequences of a failure to sustain the objection or challenge, the accusing debater will be given an opportunity to withdraw the challenge. If the accusing debater decides to pursue the objection or challenge, then the consequences announced by the judge for a failed or indeterminable objection or challenge will be binding on the debater.

If the judge finds that an ethics or evidence violation was committed, the offending debater will be assigned a loss and zero speaker points.

Any decision to challenge evidence violations or unethical behavior must be made during the round in which the infraction occurred before the judge submits a decision to the tab room. No challenge can be made to conduct committed in any round after the ballot has been submitted to Tabroom. The judge assigned to the round will decide the challenge made in the round based solely on the evidence submitted by the teams in the round. No appeal, modification or reversal of the judge’s decision regarding the challenge or the consequences resulting from the challenge is permitted.

## Public Forum

### Event Rules

#### Topic

The TOC will use the April Public Forum topic chosen by the National Speech and Debate Association.

#### Event Format

#### Public Forum will use the National Speech & Debate Association format for speech and preparation times. Public Forum will use the National Speech & Debate Association rules for the coin toss.

#### Start Times

Teams will be allowed at least 20 minutes of prep time from the release of the pairings until the official start time of the A flight debate. Coaches should conclude their coaching 5 minutes prior to the debate. Judges should report to their rooms no later than 5 minutes until start time.

#### Forfeit Times

Any team arriving later than 15 minutes after the posted start time will be at the risk of forfeit by the tab room. Any team experiencing what they believe to be a legitimate a delay should make every attempt to communicate with the tab room if they are going to be late.

#### Number of Clearing Teams

We will clear all teams with a **5-2** win loss or better. There will be a runoff round to complete a full octafinal bracket if necessary.

#### Tiebreakers

1. Wins
2. High low points
3. Double high low points
4. Total points
5. Judge Variance

#### Maverick Debating Rules

Maverick teams are not permitted to enter prior to the tournament. If a team becomes maverick due to an illness of a partner during the tournament, the ill debater may miss no more than 2 debates to be able to return and continue debating. Mavericks will not be permitted to clear to elimination rounds.

#### Hybrid Teams

No hybrid teams are allowed to compete at the tournament. Each entry must be comprised of two students from the same school.

#### Strike Policy

Each team may strike up to five judges in the pool.

### Pairing Process

#### Preliminary Rounds

* The presets will be random.
* All power-matched rounds will be paired high-low within brackets as possible.

#### Elimination Rounds/Coin Flip

* In elimination rounds, all rounds will be flip for sides, unless teams have previously met, in which the teams will switch sides from the previous debate.
* Teams should be present in their competition room no later than 30 minutes prior to the start time for the debate to flip for sides. If they are not, the present team will be allowed to choose their preferred side. If both teams are not present at the scheduled time for conducting the flip, then the tab room will assign sides for the debate.

### Judging

#### One Winner

Judges must vote for one and only one team within the allotted decision time.

#### Entourage Rule

The “entourage rule”- All qualified individuals at the tournament contributing to any school’s competitive effort must be in the judge pool for a minimum of 2 rounds.

#### First-Year-Outs

First Years- In all debate events, judges who are in their first year of judging may not count towards covering an entry’s judging obligation; first-year judges are considered “free strikes.”

#### Obligations \*\*Revised 2018

Judges are obligated through at least the quarterfinals, and further, one round after their team is eliminated in the elimination debates.

**The tournament will assess a $300-dollar penalty for judges who miss a round when obligated.**

#### Philosophies \*\*New for 2018

Judges are required to post a judge philosophy on Tabroom. No entry will be considered complete until all affiliated judges have submitted a judge philosophy.

* For those who have not written a philosophy before, there will be a template posted on the TOC Tabroom website (<http://hstoc.tabroom.com>) to assist with facilitating writing a philosophy.
* For those who already *have* philosophies, it is advised you review the template to see if there are additional items you might address in your philosophy.

### Evidence and Ethics Challenges

Challenges to evidence or ethics will be determined by a committee of three to be appointed by the Tournament of Champions administrators. That committee should not include the tab staff. Two additional alternate committee members should be announced in the case that one or both members of the three-person committee are involved in the challenge. Serving on the committee counts for judge obligations.

In the case where a team believes their opponent to have committed an evidence or other ethics violation, the accusing team should stop the debate, and ask the judge to refer the challenge to the tournament committee. This needs to occur immediately during the debate or immediately after the debate BEFORE a judge offers a decision. This is an ethics challenge and so the challenging team will win or lose based upon the challenge.

This includes the following situations:

* a team reads evidence is that fabricated
* a team reads evidence that has added or deleted words from a quote.
* a team receives argument assistance from a coach or other person after the debate has commenced, whether verbal or electronic, including the transfer of evidence after the round starts.

The accusing team will write up the challenge and present it to the committee.

If the committee does in fact find an ethics or violation, the offending team will be assigned a loss and zero speaker points for the round.

Any decision to challenge evidence or ethical behavior must be made during the round where the infraction occurred, or before the judge submits their decision to the tab room. No challenge can be made to a previous round after the next has commenced.

### Evidence Norms

Debaters may request evidence from the opposing team. Debaters reading evidence must present full carded evidence with full citations immediately to the requesting team. In instances where evidence is stored on an electronic device, students must hand over the electronic device to the requesting team and cannot try to withhold the electronic device for purposes of personal preparation. Prep time for the requesting team will not start until evidence has been handed over to the debater requesting said cards. Teams may prep during this evidence request time, this should encourage teams to have their evidence ready and available to present immediately. Judges should discourage teams from attempting to “game the system” if evidence requests become overly burdensome or create excessive delays in the debate.

For evidence used in Public Forum debates, we recommend as a best practice that all evidence be cited using one of the prominent citation styles (MLA, Chicago, APA, or the standard Policy debate citation style). Failure to do so is not itself a violation of the rules set forth in this document, but following these norms constitutes an educational and ethical citation practice.

## Congressional Debate

Finalized procedures will be posted/distributed, by April 2, in these locations:

* Tabroom TOC webpage – <http://hstoc.tabroom.com> – in the right-hand column.
* TOC web page – <http://ci.uky.edu/UKDebate/tournament-procedures>

## Speech

All Speech Events except Oral Interpretation will follow NSDA rules and procedures. Oral Interpretation will use NCFL rules and procedures.

Both sets of rules – NSDA (2017-2018) and NCFL (NCFLByLaws2017AfterFallMtg) are posted here:

* Tabroom TOC webpage – <http://hstoc.tabroom.com> – in the right-hand column.
* TOC web page – <http://ci.uky.edu/UKDebate/tournament-procedures>