

RULES OF THE WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Part Five – Debating and Adjudication

11. Format

- 11.1.1 The format for debates in the Championships is three speakers a side with only two teams in each debate.
- 11.1.2 After all speakers have spoken once, the first or second speaker for each side gives a reply speech, with the opposition reply going first and the proposition second.
- 11.2 The host is encouraged to run other competitions on different debating styles during the Championships.
- 11.3.1 Speaking time for speeches is 8 minutes, and for reply speeches 4 minutes.
- 11.3.2 The method of signalling timing for speakers is at the discretion of the host.
- 11.3.3 In addition to time signals referred to in rule 11.3.2, team members or the team coach may give time signals to a speaker provided that the signals are discreet and unobtrusive.
- 11.4.1 Before a debate begins, each team must inform the chairperson of the names of their three speakers and the order they will be speaking in.
- 11.4.2 The only persons who may speak in a debate are the three speakers for each team announced by the chairperson at the start of that debate.
- 11.4.3 During a debate speakers may not communicate with their coach, other team members who are not speaking in that debate, or any person in the audience, except to receive time signals in accordance with rule 11.3.3.
- 11.4.4 Notwithstanding rule 11.4.2, if, during a debate, a speaker declares that they are unable to make their speech, another speaker from that team who was announced by the chairperson as speaking in that debate may give a speech in substitution.
- 11.4.5 If a substitute speech is given in accordance with rule 11.4.4, judges shall award that speech the lowest possible score within the Marking Standard, regardless of the quality of the speech. (If such a situation occurs, the marks for this speech shall not be used in the calculation for any individual speaker rankings or awards.)
- 11.4.6 Rule 11.4.5 shall not apply in the case of reply speeches provided that, in accordance with rule 11.1.2, the reply speech is delivered by either the first or second speaker on the team.

12. Eligibility

- 12.1 Each nation may send only one team to compete at the Championships.
- 12.2 A member of a nation's team must:

- 12.2.1 have been a full-time student at a secondary school within six months of the start of the Championships; and
- 12.2.2 either:
 - 12.2.2.1 have been ordinarily resident in the nation for the previous 12 months, or
 - 12.2.2.2 be a passport-holding citizen of the nation, or
 - 12.2.2.3 have been a full-time student at a secondary school in the nation within six months of the start of the Championship; and
- 12.2.3 have reached their 14th birthday by the start of the Championship;
- 12.2.4 not to have reached their 19th birthday by the start of the Championship; and
- 12.2.5 not be enrolled at a tertiary or post-secondary school institution where their first term of study begins on or before the opening day of the Championship.
- 12.3 The selection and composition of a national team is a matter for the debating organisation of that nation.
- 12.4 A team may have up to five members.
- 12.5 For the purposes of rule 12.2.1, where a student is between school and post secondary study, the period of six months is calculated from the end of the student's final school term.
- 12.6 Definition of institutions:
 - 12.6.1 Students completing an extra year of schooling beyond normal requirements at an institution that is plainly a secondary school only, but which gives no tertiary credits, are eligible providing they meet the age criteria.
 - 12.6.2 Students completing an extra year of schooling beyond normal requirements at an institution that is plainly a secondary school only, but who may be given credits at some subsequent tertiary institution, are eligible providing they meet the age criteria.
 - 12.6.3 Students completing at least one year or more, at an institution that spans both secondary and tertiary levels, but who may be given credits at the tertiary level, are eligible providing they meet the age criteria and are not clearly completing the first year at a tertiary level.
 - 12.6.4 Students completing at least one year or more, at an institution that gives credits at the tertiary levels for entry into another tertiary institution at the third year or above, are ineligible even if they meet the age criteria.
- 12.7.1 Every team at the championship must be accompanied by a team coach.
- 12.7.2 All team coaches must be aged 19 or above.
- 12.7.3 Each nation which sends a team to the championship shall appoint a coach, adjudicator or registered observer from that country to serve as their team manager, who shall be responsible for looking after the welfare of their team members and ensuring their compliance with the Code of Conduct.

12.7.4 All team managers must be aged 19 or older and must have reached the age of majority in both the host nation and the nation the team represents.

13. The Draw

13.1.1 If the total number of teams at the Championships is ten or less, every team shall debate every other team in the preliminary rounds.

13.1.2 If the total number of teams at the Championships is more than ten, every team shall debate eight other teams in the preliminary rounds. The draw for the preliminary debates is to be conducted by the Convenor using a system to achieve approximately equal and fair sets of opponents for all teams.

13.1.3 As far as possible, each team shall have the same number of debates on any day as any other teams. A team may not debate more than three times in a day in the preliminary rounds unless the team agrees prior to the start of the Championships.

13.2.1 At the end of the preliminary rounds, teams shall be ranked according to the number of wins. If teams are tied on the same number of wins, they shall be separated where practicable by elimination debates and otherwise on the following priority:

13.2.1.1 number of adjudications in favour of the team; then

13.2.1.2 average judges' scores for each team.

13.2.2 If the total number of teams is twelve or less, the top four teams shall debate in Semi-Finals, with the top team against the fourth and the second team against the third. The winners of the Semi-Finals compete in the Grand Final.

13.2.3.1 If the total number of teams is more than twelve, the top eight teams shall debate in Quarter-Finals as follows:

- Quarter-Final A - Team 1 and Team 8
- Quarter-Final B - Team 2 and Team 7
- Quarter-Final C - Team 3 and Team 6
- Quarter-Final D - Team 4 and Team 5

13.2.3.2 The winners of the Quarter-Finals debate in Semi-Finals with the winner of Quarter-Final A against the winner of Quarter-Final D and the winner of Quarter-Final B against the winner of Quarter-Final C.

13.2.3.3 If the total number of teams is more than 24, the top 16 teams shall debate in Octo-Finals as follows:

- Octo-Final A - Team 1 and Team 16
- Octo-Final B - Team 2 and Team 15
- Octo-Final C - Team 3 and Team 14
- Octo-Final D - Team 4 and Team 13
- Octo-Final E - Team 5 and Team 12
- Octo-Final F - Team 6 and Team 11

- Octo-Final G - Team 7 and Team 10
- Octo-Final H - Team 8 and Team 9

13.2.3.4 The winners of the Octo-Finals debate in the Quarter-Finals as follows:

- Quarter-Final A - Winner of Octo-Final A and winner of Octo-Final H
- Quarter-Final B - Winner of Octo-Final B and winner of Octo-Final G
- Quarter-Final C - Winner of Octo-Final C and winner of Octo-Final F
- Quarter-Final D - Winner of Octo-Final D and winner of Octo-Final E

13.2.3.5 The winners of the Quarter-Finals debate in Semi-Finals with the winner of Quarter-Final A against the winner of Quarter-Final D, and the winner of Quarter-Final B against the winner of Quarter-Final C. The winners of the Semi-Finals compete in the Grand Final.

13.3 At the end of the championships, teams' final rankings shall be determined as follows:

13.3.1 the champions and runners-up shall be ranked 1 and 2 respectively;

13.3.2 all other teams shall be ranked according the round of the championships the team reached and, where equal, their preliminary round ranking (in accordance with rule 13.2.1);

13.4.1 Octo-Finals, Quarter-Finals and Semi-Finals shall be Impromptu Debates.

13.4.2 The Grand Final shall be on a topic announced at the same time as the topics for the prepared debates in the preliminary rounds. At the end of the second Semi-Final, the two teams in the Grand Final shall toss to decide which team shall take the affirmative.

13.5.1 If a team withdraws after the draw has been sent to the teams, the host may make a new draw only if:

13.5.1.1 to do so would not alter the sides nor topics for any team, or

13.5.1.2 all teams affected by the new draw agree.

13.5.2 Where a new draw has not been made, all teams who would have debated against the team that has withdrawn are taken to have won the debate by forfeit if they win at least a majority of their other debates, but are otherwise taken to have lost the debate by forfeit.

13.6 Where a team has either won or lost a debate by forfeit, the team will be taken to have received the following number of judges in its favour for that debate:

13.6.1 if the average number of judges in its favour in its other debates is higher than 2.5, it receives 3 judges for that debate;

13.6.2 if the average number of judges in its favour in its other debates is higher than 1.5 but less than or equal to 2.5, it receives 2 judges for that debate.

13.6.3 if the average number of judges in its favour in its other debates is higher than 0.5 but less than or equal to 1.5, it receives 1 judge for that debate;

13.6.4 if the average number of judges in its favour in its other debates is less than or equal to 0.5, it receives no judges for that debate.

14. Judges

- 14.1 All championship debates shall be judged by an odd-numbered panel of at least three judges.
- 14.2 Judges shall not judge the team from their own nation.
- 14.3 A team coach shall not judge a debate.
- 14.4 A judge shall not assist in the coaching of a team at the championship.
- 14.5 A judge may judge the same team more than once, provided that the judge does not judge that team a disproportionate number of times.
- 14.6 A debate is won by the team which has a majority of the votes of the judges.
 - 14.6.1 The cumulative judges' marks or winning margins of teams are not used to determine which team wins a debate.
- 14.5 The marking standard, rules of debate, and principles of judging, are set out in the Judging Schedule which is an annex to these rules.
 - 14.5.1 The Judging Schedule is a part of these rules and may be amended in the same way that the rules may be amended.
 - 14.5.2 The Council may authorise guidelines and instructional material for judges, consistent with the Judging Schedule and the rules.
 - 14.5.3 The host shall ensure that judges are familiar with the Judging Schedule and any guidelines and instructional material authorised by the Council.
 - 14.5.4 All judges shall judge in accordance with the Judging Schedule and any guidelines and instructional material authorised by the Council.
- 14.6 To be eligible to judge at a championship ("an eligible judge") a person must:
 - 14.6.1 be nominated by the organisation or team of that person's nation which is the member of the Council for that country as set out in rule 6,
 - 14.6.2 be experienced at judging the highest level of senior school or university debates in that person's nation and have judged such debates regularly during the two years prior to the championship, and
 - 14.6.3 not have been a debater at the previous championship.
- 14.7 The Chief Adjudicator may accept a person to be an eligible judge at a championship who meets the requirements of rule 14.6.3 but who does not meet the requirements of the rest of rule 14.6 if:
 - 14.7.1 that person has judged at a previous championship, or
 - 14.7.2 in the opinion of the Chief Adjudicator, the person is sufficiently experienced and competent to be an eligible judge.

- 14.8 Judges for all Championship debates, including the Grand Final, are to be selected for their ability to judge, not because they hold any particular office or occupation.
- 14.9 The Chief Adjudicator may assess an eligible judge at any time before or during a championship to determine that judge's:
- 14.9.1 competence to judge, and
- 14.9.2 understanding of the Rules, the Judging Schedule, and any guidelines and instructional material authorised by the Council.
- 14.10 The Chief Adjudicator may at any time, as a result of an assessment in accordance with Rule 14.9, decide that that judge should not judge any debates, or should not judge any further debates without a further assessment if the Chief Adjudicator is satisfied that there is sufficient doubt about that judge's ability to judge competently or impartially.
- 14.11 In undertaking an assessment in accordance with rule 14.9 the Chief Adjudicator may take into consideration:
- 14.11.1 whether the judge has been able or unable to give sufficient reasons for awarding the debate to one team as against another;
- 14.11.2 whether the judge has misdirected himself or herself as to some or more of the rules of debate to a significant extent;
- 14.11.3 whether the judge has made remarks to a team or other participant at the championship in a way that casts significant doubt as to the judge's competence or impartiality;
- 14.11.4 whether as a result of excessive consumption of alcohol or other substances or tiredness or sickness or other such factors, the ability or perceived ability of the judge to judge competently is seriously in question;
- 14.11.5 whether a complaint has been upheld against the judge pursuant to rule 15.4;
- 14.11.6 any representations made by the judge in question; or
- 14.11.7 any other matter the Chief Adjudicator considers relevant.
- 14.12 Before deciding whether a judge should not judge a further debate or debates, the Chief Adjudicator in conjunction with the Chief Adjudicator's panel shall determine whether the matter could be more appropriately resolved by counselling or other appropriate procedure.
- 14.13 In undertaking an assessment provided for in 14.9 the Chief Adjudicator shall:
- 14.13.1 inform himself or herself of evidence and facts as he or she deems fit; and
- 14.13.2 consult with the Chief Adjudication Panel
- 14.14 Notwithstanding rule 14.9 – 14.13, no result of any debate shall be overturned.

15. The Chief Adjudicator and the complaints procedure

- 15.1.1 There shall be a Chief Adjudicator for each championship.

- 15.1.2 The Host shall nominate the Chief Adjudicator. The nomination must be approved either by the World Council at its meeting the previous year, or by the Executive if the appointment is made after that.
- 15.1.2 In accordance with the Rules, the Chief Adjudicator is responsible for:
- 15.1.2.1 determining the eligibility of judges,
 - 15.1.2.2 training judges prior to the start of the championship,
 - 15.1.2.3 assessing whether eligible judges are competent to judge debates,
 - 15.1.2.4 assigning judges to debates,
 - 15.1.2.5 recording results of debates,
 - 15.1.2.6 determining the team rankings at the end of the preliminary rounds,
 - 15.1.2.7 determining the draw for the Octo-Finals, Quarter-Finals, Semi -Finals and Grand Final, and
 - 15.1.2.8 any other matter connected with the adjudication of debates at a championship.
- 15.2 Prior to the start of a championship the Chief Adjudicator may nominate a panel of senior and experienced judges from different nations to assist the Chief Adjudicator in his or her responsibilities.
- 15.3 A member of the Chief Adjudicator's panel may advise and assist the Chief Adjudicator, but may not independently carry out any of the Chief Adjudicator's responsibilities or exercise the Chief Adjudicator's powers.
- 15.4 Any complaint about a judge in a particular debate shall be made to the Chief Adjudicator:
- 15.4.1 within 24 hours of the alleged incident giving rise to the complaint, by:
 - 15.4.1.1 a judge or judges accredited by the Chief Adjudicator for the tournament and who were on a panel of judges with the judge who is the subject of the complaint; or
 - 15.4.1.2 the official and registered coach or team manager of a team participating in the tournament who shall make the complaint in writing.
- 15.5 Complaints shall include but are not necessarily restricted to one or more of the following:
- 15.5.1 the judge has misdirected him/herself as to one or more of the rules of debate to a significant extent;
 - 15.5.2 the judge has made remarks prior to, during or after a debate in a way that raises significant doubt as to his or her impartiality for that debate.
- 15.6 Upon receipt of a complaint pursuant to rule 15.4, the Chief Adjudicator shall determine:
- 15.6.1 whether the complaint can be resolved without further investigation; or
 - 15.6.2 whether the complaint requires further investigation in which case the Chief Adjudicator shall undertake such further investigation including but not limited to talking to:

- 15.6.2.1 the judge who is the subject of the complaint; and
- 15.6.2.2 other judges on the panel with that judge; and/or
- 15.6.2.3 coaches present at the debate; and/or
- 15.6.2.4 such other persons as the Chief Adjudicator shall deem appropriate.
- 15.7 In conjunction with the Chief Adjudicator's panel, the Chief Adjudicator shall determine the complaint by:
 - 15.7.1 dismissing the complaint; or
 - 15.7.2 upholding the complaint and:
 - 15.7.2.1 taking no further action; or
 - 15.7.2.2 counselling the judge; or
 - 15.7.2.3 directing that the judge act as a 'shadow judge' for such portion of the championships as the Chief Adjudicator shall deem appropriate; or
 - 15.7.2.4 directing that the judge undergo further training prior to acting further as a judge at the championship; or
 - 15.7.2.5 standing the judge down for such portion of the championship as the Chief Adjudicator shall deem appropriate; or
 - 15.7.2.6 referring the matter to the Complaints Officer.
- 15.8 No determination pursuant to rule 15.7.2 shall be made without the further investigation to which rule 15.6.1 refers and in particular, without first speaking to the judge who is the subject of the complaint.
- 15.9 Where a complaint has been determined according to rule 15.7.1, the Chief Adjudicator shall advise the following people:
 - 15.9.1 the person or persons who made the complaint, either in writing if the complaint was in writing or verbally if the complaint was made verbally.
 - 15.9.2 Where the determination according to rule 15.7.1 is the result of the further investigation to which rule 15.6.1 refers, the judge who was the subject of the complaint shall be advised in writing.
- 15.10 Where any complaint has been determined pursuant to rule 15.7.2, the Chief Adjudicator shall advise the following people in writing:
 - 15.10.1 the person or persons who made the complaint;
 - 15.10.2 the judge who was the subject of the complaint;
 - 15.10.3 the Chief Adjudicator of the immediate following championship.
- 15.11 Notwithstanding rules 15.4 – 15.10, no result of any debate shall be overturned.

16. Motions

- 16.1.1 There shall be a Motions Committee for a championship.
- 16.1.2 The Motions Committee shall consist of:
 - 16.1.2.1 two members nominated by the Host, and
 - 16.1.2.2 five members elected by the Council no later than four months prior to the start of the championships reflecting the geographic, cultural and linguistic diversity of the participants at the championships.
- 16.2 A coach of a team at a championship is not eligible to be a member of the Motions Committee for that championship.
- 16.3 The Motions Committee shall select all motions for debate at the championship.
- 16.4 At least eight weeks prior to the start of the championship, the Motions Committee shall forward to the Host the list of motions it has selected for prepared debates including the Grand Final.
- 16.5 The Host shall forthwith notify all teams of the prepared motions for debate.
- 16.6 At least one day before the start of a championship the Motions Committee shall give to the Host a set of motions for the impromptu preliminary rounds.
- 16.7 That set of motions shall include at least one more motion than is required for the preliminary rounds.
- 16.8 At least one day before the announcement of the draw for the Octo-Finals, Quarter-Finals and Semi-Finals, the Motions Committee shall give to the Host a set of motions for those debates.

17. Language

- 17.1 All Championship debates shall be in English.
- 17.2 Special awards shall be given to:
 - 17.2.1 the highest-ranked English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) team, and
 - 17.2.2 the highest-ranked English-as-a-second-language (ESL) team.
- 17.3 Individual team members shall be classified as follows:
 - 17.3.1 as an EFL speaker if:
 - 17.3.1.1 they do not come from a first-language English-speaking family, and
 - 17.3.1.2 they attend a school where English is not used as a medium of instruction;
 - 17.3.2 as an ESL speaker if:
 - 17.3.2.1 they do not come from a first-language English-speaking family, and

- 17.3.2.1 they attend a school where English is used as a medium of instruction;
- 17.3.3 as a native English speaker if they come from a first-language English-speaking family.
- 17.4 Teams shall be classified as follows:
 - 17.4.1 As an EFL team if:
 - 17.4.1.1 English is not an official language of the country, and
 - 17.4.1.2 All or all-but-one of the team members meet the criteria for being classified as an EFL speaker in accordance with rule 17.3.1.
 - 17.4.2 As an ESL team if:
 - 17.4.2.1 English is not an official language of the country,
 - 17.4.2.2 The team is not eligible to be classified as an EFL team in accordance with rule 17.4.1, and
 - 17.4.2.3 No more than one of the team members meets the criteria for being classified as a native English speaker in accordance with rule 17.3.3
 - 17.4.3 As a native English-speaking team if they do not meet the criteria for being classified as an EFL or ESL team in accordance with rule 17.4.1 – 17.4.2.
- 17.5 If a team wishes to be eligible for the EFL or ESL award (in accordance with rule 17.2), the coach must submit a form to the Convenor prior the start of the championships outlining the family and educational linguistic backgrounds of each of the debaters on the team.
- 17.6 Based on the information in the forms submitted in accordance with rule 17.5 and any other information available, the Chief Adjudicator shall determine which teams in the championships are to be classified as EFL teams and ESL teams in accordance with rule 17.4. The Chief Adjudicator shall publish a list of the teams eligible for the EFL and ESL awards (“the published list”) no later than the end of the first day of debates during the championships.
- 17.7 Any team may appeal against the inclusion on, or exclusion from, the published list of any team, including their own.
- 17.8 An appeal shall be in writing and submitted by the coach to the Chief Adjudicator. The Chief Adjudicator shall circulate any written appeals to the members of the World Schools Debating Council.
- 17.9 The Council shall consider any appeal prior to the announcement of the winners of the ESL and EFL awards. If the Council feels there is sufficient justification (in accordance with these Rules) it may amend the published list by a simple majority vote.
- 17.10 A team which reaches the Grand Final of the Championships shall be ineligible for the EFL and ESL awards.
- 17.11 In addition to the special awards given to the highest-ranked EFL and ESL teams, special awards shall also be given to all teams which reach the Semi-Finals or Grand Final of the championships.

18. Impromptu Debates

- 18.1 At the discretion of the host, up to one-half of the debates for any team in the preliminary rounds may be impromptu debates, provided that every team has as close as possible to the same number of impromptu debates as every other team in the preliminary rounds.
- 18.2 The preparation time and procedure for impromptu debates are in the discretion of the host, provided that:
 - 18.2.1 both teams in an impromptu debate receive the topic (or choice of topics) at the same time,
 - 18.2.2 insofar as possible, each team shall have the same number of affirmative and negative sides in impromptu debates, and
 - 18.2.3 both teams in an impromptu debate are give similar preparation rooms and conditions.
- 18.3 Where the preparation time allowed for an impromptu debate is longer than half an hour, only the members of the team may take part in the preparation.
- 18.4 Teams may not bring any handwritten, printed or published materials with them into their preparation room for impromptu debates, with the exception of an English Language dictionary, a bilingual dictionary, and a single-volume encyclopaedia or almanac per team.
- 18.5 A person taking part in the preparation of an impromptu debate may not take into the preparation room a telephone, computer or any other device capable of communicating or accessing information outside the preparation room.

19. Dates and venues of forthcoming championships

- 19.1 The dates for forthcoming championships shall be proposed by prospective hosts, and approved by a meeting of the Council, subject to Rules 19.1.1—19.1.5 ;
 - 19.1.1 Championships shall be held annually where possible and shall be held either wholly within the period 1 January to 28 February or the period 1 July to 31 August.
 - 19.1.2 The dates and venue for the Championships shall be fixed no later than two Championships prior to the one for which the dates and venue are to be fixed (“the scheduled Championships”) subject to Rule 19.1.3 (deferral) and Rule 19.1.4 and 19.1.5 (variation).
 - 19.1.3 In case the Council is unable to decide the venue and therefore the dates for the scheduled Championships in accordance with Rule 19.1.2, the Council may defer the fixing of the dates and venue of the scheduled Championships for such time as it shall consider necessary, but no later than 12 months prior to the first day of the scheduled Championships.
 - 19.1.4 The Council may vary the dates specified in Rule 19.1.1 provided that such variation is passed by a two-thirds majority of those members entitled to vote according to the rules and either present or casting votes in a postal ballot; and
 - 19.1.4.1 Such variation is passed no later than 12 months before the first day of the scheduled Championships, or;

- 19.1.4.2 In case the dates for the scheduled Championships have already been fixed, and it is proposed to vary the originally fixed dates, no later than 12 months prior to the first day of the originally scheduled Championships, or;
- 19.1.4.3 Where the variation is considered less than 12 months prior to the first day of the originally scheduled Championships, only in a case of genuine emergency, disaster or Act of God (as determined by the Council by a two-thirds majority of those members entitled to vote according to the Rules and either present or casting votes in a postal ballot).
- 19.1.5 The Council may vary the venue which has been fixed in accordance with Rule 19.1.2 or 19.1.3, provided that such variation is passed by a two-thirds majority of those members entitled to vote according to the Rules and either present or casting votes in a postal ballot; and
- 19.1.5.1 Such variation is passed no later than 12 months before the first day of the scheduled Championships, or;
- 19.1.5.2 Where the variation is considered less than 12 months prior to the first day of the originally scheduled Championships, only in a case of genuine emergency, disaster, Act of God, issues of safety for participants, failure of the host to abide by the Charter or lack of preparedness by the host (as determined by the Council by a two-thirds majority of those members entitled to vote according to the Rules and either present or casting votes in a postal ballot).

Annex 3 - Judging Schedule

A. Marking Standard

1.1 Each speaker's substantive speech is marked out of 100, with 40 for content, 40 for style and 20 for strategy.

1.2 The reply speech is marked out of 50, with 20 for content, 20 for style and 10 for strategy.

1.3 In order to encourage consistency of marks, speeches are marked within the accepted range of marks and judges may not go outside that range. (*See the Marking Standard - Annex 2*).

1.4 Judges may not use any other marking standard or categorise of marks.

1.5 If a debater declares that they are unable to make their speech after a debate has begun, another member of their team who was announced by the chairperson as being a speaker in that debate may speak in their place. In such a situation judges shall award the speech the lowest possible score within the Marking Standard, regardless of the quality of the speech.

2.1 Content is the argument used by the speaker, divorced from the speaking style.

2.2 If an argument is weak it should be marked accordingly, even if the other team does not expose its weakness.

2.3 In deciding the strength or weakness of an argument, judges should not be influenced by their own personal beliefs or specialised knowledge.

3.1 Style is the way speakers speak.

3.2 Judges should make allowance for different accents, speaking styles and debating terminology.

3.3 Debaters for whom English is a second language shall be judged as if they were native English speakers.

3.4 In general, the use of palm-cards, lecterns, folders, notepads or other forms of speakers notes should not affect the mark a speaker is given.

3.5 However, speakers should not read their speeches, but should use notes that they refer to only from time to time.

4.1 Strategy covers two concepts:

4.1.1 Whether the speaker understands what are the issues of the debate, and

4.1.2 The structure and timing of the speaker's speech.

4.2 A speaker who answers the critical issues with weak responses should get poor marks for content but good marks for strategy.

B. Definitions and Cases

5.1 The Proposition must present a reasonable definition of the motion. This means:

5.1.1 On receiving a motion, both teams should ask: 'What is the issue that the two teams are expected to debate? What would an ordinary intelligent person reading the motion think that it is about?'

5.1.2 If the motion poses a clear issue for debate (i.e. it has an obvious meaning), the Proposition must define the motion accordingly. When the motion has an obvious meaning (one which the ordinary intelligent person would realise), any other definition would not be reasonable.

5.1.3 If there is no obvious meaning to the motion, the range of possible meanings is limited to those that allow for a reasonable debate. Choosing a meaning that does not allow the Opposition room for debate would not be a reasonable definition. Truisms and tautologies leave the Opposition no room for debate and are clearly illegitimate. Defining absolute words literally may prevent a reasonable debate, and they can therefore be read down.

5.1.4 When defining the words in the motion so as (i) to allow the obvious meaning to be debated or (ii) (when there is no obvious meaning) to give effect to a possible meaning which would allow for a reasonable debate, the Proposition must ensure that the definition is one the ordinary intelligent person would accept.

5.2 The definition must match the level of abstraction (or specificity) of the motion, so that the debate is as specific or general as the motion itself. Specific motions should be defined specifically and general motions generally.

5.3 Motions expressed as general principles must be proven true as general principles. A single example will neither prove nor disprove a general principle. Finding arguments that explain the majority of relevant examples will be more important.

5.4 When suggesting parameters to the debate, or proposing particular models or criteria to judge it by, the Proposition must ensure such parameters, models or criteria are themselves reasonable. They must be ones that the ordinary intelligent person would accept as applicable to the debate.

5.4.1 The Proposition's ability to set reasonable parameters to a debate does not provide a licence to restrict the motion arbitrarily.

5.4.2 When the motion requires the Proposition to propose a solution to a problem and the Proposition has to set out the details of its proposed solution to prove its effectiveness, the Proposition must ensure that the detailed solution given (the Proposition's 'model' or 'plan') is a reasonable one, such that the ordinary intelligent person would accept it is applicable to the debate.

5.5 If the Proposition's definition is unreasonable, the Opposition may:

5.5.1 Accept it anyway (and debate the Proposition's case regardless);

5.5.2 Challenge it (argue that the definition is unreasonable, put up an alternative, reasonable definition and a case based on this);

5.5.3 Broaden the debate back to the words in the motion (if the Proposition has unreasonably restricted the motion and is arguing a narrower version of it);

5.5.4 Challenge the definition (as in 5.5.2), but argue that 'even if' it is reasonable, the Proposition's case is flawed (as in 5.5.1).

5.6 The definition settled, each team has to present a case, supported by arguments and examples.

5.6.1 A case sums up the team's arguments and states why its side of the motion is correct.

5.6.2 Arguments are reasons or rationales why the team's case is correct.

5.6.3 Examples are facts, events, occurrences and the like that show the team's arguments are correct.

5.7 Whereas an unduly restrictive definition (such as limiting a general motion to a single example) is illegitimate and can be challenged or broadened, a Proposition that runs a restrictive case (such as limiting itself to a single argument) acts legitimately and cannot be challenged for doing so, but runs the risk of the Opposition being able to more easily counter that case (by disproving that one argument and/ or by raising other arguments that disprove the motion, as defined).

C. The Roles of the Speakers

6.1 The role of the first speaker of the proposition is to define the topic, establish the issues for the debate, outline the proposition case, announce the case division between the speakers, and present his or her part of the proposition case.

6.2 The proposition may define the topic in any way provided that the definition -

6.2.1 is reasonably close to the plain meaning of the topic,

6.2.2 allows the opposition team reasonable room to debate,

6.2.3 is not tautological or truistic, and

6.2.4 is otherwise a reasonable definition.

6.3 Squirreling, place-setting and time-setting are not permitted

6.3.1 Squirreling is the distortion of the definition to enable a team to argue a pre-prepared argument that it wishes to debate regardless of the motion actually set;

6.3.2 Place-setting is the setting of a debate of general application in a particular place

6.3.3 Time-setting is the setting of a debate of general application in a particular time, past or future.

7.1 The role of the first speaker of the opposition side is to challenge the definition if necessary, present an alternative definition if the definition is challenged, respond to the proposition case,

outline the opposition case, announce the case division, and present his or her part of the opposition case.

7.2 The first opposition may challenge the definition only if it does not conform to 5.2 or 5.3. If it challenges the definition, the first opposition must propose a new definition that conforms to 5.2 and 5.3.

7.3 If the first opposition does not challenge the definition, the opposition is taken to have accepted the definition and the opposition may not challenge the definition in any other speech unless the proposition significantly alters the definition in their subsequent speeches.

7.4 In responding to the proposition case, the opposition team may produce a positive choice of its own, or merely attack the case presented by the proposition. If it chooses to produce a positive case of its own, it must in fact produce that case through its speeches, and not concentrate solely on attacking the case presented by the proposition.

8.1 The role of the second speaker of the proposition is to deal with the definition if it has been challenged, respond to the opposition case, and continue with the proposition case as outlined by the first speaker.

8.2 If the second proposition does not challenge a re-definition of the debate made by the first opposition, the proposition is taken to have accepted the opposition's re-definition and no further challenges to the definition may be made.

8.3 The role of the second speaker of the opposition is to deal with the definition if it is still in issue, respond to the proposition case, and continue with the opposition case as outlined by the first speaker.

9.1 The role of both third speakers is to deal with the definition if it is still in issue, and respond to the other team's case.

9.2 The third speaker of either team may have a small part of the team's case to present, but his is not obligatory as the third speaker's primary role is to respond to what has gone before in the debate.

9.3 If the third speaker is to present a part of the team's case, this must be announced in the case division by the first speaker.

10.1 The more the debate progresses, the more each speaker must spend time dealing with what has been said by previous speakers.

10.2 Hence the more the debate progresses, the less time will be spent by each speaker in presenting a new part of the team case and the more time will be spent responding to the other team's arguments.

11.1 The role of the reply speeches is to sum up the debate from the team's viewpoint, including a response to the other team's overall case and a summary of the speaker's own team's case.

11.2 The reply speaker may be either the first or second speaker of the team, but not the third.

11.3 The reply speakers are in reverse order, with the opposition reply first and the proposition reply last.

11.4 Neither reply speaker may introduce a new part of the team case.

11.5 A reply speaker may respond to an existing argument by raising a new example that illustrates that argument, but may not otherwise introduce a new argument.

12.1 The proposition team does not have to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt, but merely that its case is true in the majority of cases or as a general proposition.

12.2 The opposition team must prove more than a reasonable doubt about the proposition case.

12.3 Where the topic is expressed as an absolute, the proposition must prove the topic true in the significant majority of cases, but not in every single conceivable instance.

12.4 Where the topic is expressed as an absolute, the opposition must do more than present a single instance where the topic is not true and prove that it is not true for at least a significant minority of cases.

D. Points of Information

13.1 Between the first and seventh minutes of a speaker's substantive speech, members of the other team may offer points of information.

13.2 The purpose of a point of information is to make a short point or ask a short question of the speaker.

13.3 Points of information need not be addressed through the person chairing the debate, and may be in the form of a question.

13.4 A point of information should be brief, and no longer than 15 seconds.

14.1 Points of information are an important part of the clash between the teams, and enable speakers to remain a part of the debate even when they are not making a speech.

14.2 Hence a speaker should offer points of information both before and after that speaker has given his or her substantive speech.

15.1 The speaker has the absolute right to refuse to accept a point of information, or to accept it only at the end of the next sentence.

15.2 However, a speaker is obliged to accept some points of information, provided that they have been offered at reasonable times in the speaker's speech.

15.3 As a general rule a speaker should accept at least 2 points of information in his or her speech. But a speaker who accepts a significantly greater number of points of information risks losing control of his or her speech.

15.4 Members of the opposing team should not offer an excessive number of points of information to the point that they are barracking. As a general rule each team member should offer between 2 and 4 points of information per speech, and should not offer them within a short time of a previous point of information having been offered.

16.1 The response by the speaker to a point of information should be included in the mark for that speaker's speech.

16.2 The offering of points of information should be included in the mark for the speaker offering points.

E. The Judging

17.1 Judges mark independently of each other, and should sit apart from each other during the debate so that they cannot see each other's mark-sheets.

17.2 At the end of the debate, the judges fill in their mark-sheets independently, and hand them to the person chairing the debate before leaving the debate room briefly to confer.

17.3 The purpose of the conference is to brief one of the judges to give a short adjudication on behalf of the judges.

17.4 The adjudication should be short, and should explain the result to the audience. In particular, it should set out the key reasons why the winning team won, and comment on significant matters of debate style or technique that were displayed in the debate.

17.5 The adjudication should be constructive, not negative.

Annex 4 - The Marking Standard

1. Substantive Speeches (out of 100)

Standard	Overall (/100)	Style (/40)	Content (/40)	Strategy (/20)
Exceptional	80	32	32	16
Excellent	76-79	31	31	15-16
Extremely Good	74-75	30	30	15
Very Good	71-73	29	29	14-15
Good	70	28	28	14
Satisfactory	67-69	27	27	13-14
Competent	65-66	26	26	13
Pass	61-64	25	25	12-13
Improvement Needed	60	24	24	12

2. Reply Speeches (out of 50)

Standard	Overall (/100)	Style (/40)	Content (/40)	Strategy (/20)
Exceptional	40	16	16	8
Very Good to Excellent	36-39	15	15	7.5
Good	35	14	14	7
Pass to Satisfactory	31-34	13	13	6.5
Improvement Needed	30	12	12	6

In marking reply speeches it might be easier to mark them out of 100 and then halve each mark. That will leave you with half-mark steps, but that is not a problem. Thus a reply speech could be given, say, 13.5 for content, 14.5 for style and 7.5 for strategy, for a total of 35.5.