

AMERICAN DEBATE ASSOCIATION

STANDING RULES OF TOURNAMENT PROCEDURE

I. RULES GOVERNING THE CONDUCT OF A DEBATE

1. FORMAT

Cross-examination style debate format will be used, with two-person teams. There will be four nine-minute constructive speeches, beginning with the affirmative. After each constructive, there will be a three-minute cross-examination by a member of the opposition. There will be four six-minute rebuttals, beginning with the negative. Each team will be allocated ten minutes of preparation time to be used in between speeches and cross-examination periods. Each debater must give one constructive speech and one rebuttal.

If debates occur utilizing an online venue, tournaments may permit each team to be allocated up to 10 minutes of “Tech Time” for resolving exclusively tech-related problems (e.g. internet connection, audio/video issues). Tech time should not be used as additional standard prep time. If the time elapses before the team can resolve the issue, they will forfeit the debate. In the event a speech needs to be redelivered entirely or in part, the time for that should count as tech time for the team experiencing the problem, if their tech time runs out while giving the speech the remaining time should be deducted from prep time. In the event a speech needs to be redelivered entirely or in part due to a judge tech issue, the judge must communicate the issue to the tab room immediately in order to minimize delays in the tournament schedule.

2. TOPIC

The ADA will adopt the policy topic approved by the Executive Committee.

3. CONSTRAINTS ON THE AFFIRMATIVE

The first affirmative constructive speaker is expected to present a complete case which includes a topical plan of action and a rationale justifying that plan. The affirmative team must present and defend through the entirety of the debate only one plan, and once presented, this plan cannot be changed, altered, or amended in any way during the debate. This does not preclude permutations.

4. COUNTERPLANS

Counterplans should compete with the affirmative.

5. CRITIQUES

If the negative chooses to critique it has the burden of defending an alternative which justifies rejection of the affirmative's proposed plan of action. A unique reason for voting must be clearly identified during the initial presentation of the criticism. If the affirmative team demonstrates that the critique fails to meet any of these criteria the judge must disregard the critique.

6. TOPICALITY

Topicality asks whether the affirmative is sufficiently within the scope of the resolution and is a voting issue.

7. CONSTRAINTS DURING REBUTTALS

No new constructive argument or new constructive positions may be advanced in rebuttal speeches, absent arguments or positions made in the 1AR to address new 2NC constructions. This does not restrict the use of new evidence to address arguments presented in the constructive speeches.

8. MATERIALS

Evidence presented in debates should include the following orally presented citation: the author (if any) or the source of the publication, author's qualifications, and date. Page numbers and the remaining full citation including, where applicable, the full web site and date accessed, must be available upon request. This citation is expected for all pieces of evidence the first time the evidence is presented. For subsequent references to the same author or work, the citation may be abbreviated. If an evidence challenge is made premised upon intentional fabrication, distortion, or misrepresentation, then it is an ethical challenge and the burden of proof is upon the challenger. Debaters should understand that judges may choose to penalize frivolous accusations. All words inserted in evidence must be enclosed in square brackets or slash marks; all internally ellipsed parts of the evidence must be available immediately upon the request by the opponents, or at the conclusion of the round upon request by the judge. The material in the brackets or internally ellipsed ought in no way alter the original author's intent. Material presented in the debate must be accompanied by an original oral explanation justifying the introduction of that material into the debate and the material being presented must be available as a textual transcription for inspection by the opposing team. At tournaments where the Tournament host has designated that the Novice Division will be utilizing a restricted evidence set all evidence presented in such debates should be from the evidence maintained by the ADA Novice Curriculum Committee, and Debaters may not present evidence from outside the evidence set. Debaters may re-purpose, change underlining, or re-tag the evidence if they desire as long as it remains consistent with the originally produced argument. At a minimum judges should disregard evidence that is read that has not been approved by the NCC.

9. OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE

Once the debate has begun, a team may not receive assistance, suggestions, or coaching from anyone while the round is in progress. This does not prevent debate partners from helping one another, but does prevent outside persons from helping a team during the course of a debate. In an online debate, a debate team may receive assistance from tournament staff in order to resolve technology issues with debate equipment or the ability to transmit the debate.

10. PROMPTING/CROSS-TALK

It is expected that only the person speaking, asking a question in cross-examination, or answering a question in cross-examination should be talking. It is also expected that partners should not vocally 'prompt' the speaker during his/her speech. . It is also expected that partners Cross-examination questions should be asked and answered only by the two debaters involved in the cross-examination period, however MINIMAL consultation with partners is allowed if necessary to prevent confusion. MINIMAL consultation with opponents is allowed during the questioning team's preparation time. Interaction that is deemed beyond MINIMAL by the judge should be reflected in assigning speaker points.

11. DECORUM

Debaters and judges should refrain from the use of profanity during debates. Debaters and judges should treat one another with civility during debates and when debate decisions are revealed and discussed. Debaters and judges should treat one another with generosity, respect and kindness. Participants (debaters, judges, coaches, observers, etc.) may not engage in any nudity, sexually explicit or illegal behavior, or use illegal substances while at the location of the debate

rounds or during a debate. Debaters and judges are bound by the code of conduct and any institutional rules of their own colleges or universities and should conduct themselves as if they are in a classroom environment.

12. DELIVERY

Debaters should speak comprehensively and intelligibly while giving speeches and engaging in cross-examination. Debaters should refrain from shouting or yelling while speaking. Debaters have the burden to develop clearly all ideas presented and to do so in an oral style that recognizes and adapts to the expressed preferences of the judge in the round.

13. EXPIRATION OF TIME

Debaters should cease speaking when the time expires. The debater's idea which is being presented when time expires may be finished but no new statements may be initiated after the time expires.

14. RESPONSIBILITIES OF JUDGES

A. Judges should listen conscientiously and in a manner designed to promote recognition and recall of positions advanced in speeches and question periods. Judges are encouraged to provide verbal and nonverbal feedback to encourage comprehensibility and to discourage violating the rules of debate. During debates conducted online, the judge should maintain a visible video presence during speeches and cross examination. Further, judges will attempt to avoid verbal and nonverbal feedback which degrades, humiliates or otherwise belittles the efforts of the debater speaking. Judges should listen to all proofs offered by debaters and render a decision based on the clash in the debate, uninfluenced by the judge's preconceptions about the proposition or the type of proof called for in a given situation.

B. Decision Time

In preliminary rounds, judges are expected to render a decision within 2:15 of the announced start time. In elimination rounds, judges are expected to render a decision within 2:30 of the announced start time. At debate tournaments conducted online the time given to render a decision may be expanded by time allotted to resolve technical difficulties. If a judge needs to take additional time following a delay because of technical difficulties (Tech Time), the judge should promptly communicate the need to delay and the amount of time of the delay to the tournament tab room staff. If the judge is unable to make a decision within the appropriate time parameters for that round, the tab room should randomly decide a winner by coin flip.

C. Oral critiques by judges are encouraged for all rounds so long as the critique does not delay teams or the judge from getting to the next scheduled round before the scheduled start time. Tournaments are also encouraged to require written ballot comments. During a debate conducted online, the judge should conclude their oral critique no later than five minutes before the scheduled check-in time for the next round. Judges should refrain from long critiques when debaters need to get off campus to eat during meal breaks.

D. Judges must render a decision in which one of the teams participating in the debate is declared the winner.

E. Judges are expected to abide by and enforce American Debate Association rules when judging.

15. DEBATE DECISIONS

Judges choosing to reveal decisions will do so to both teams involved in the debate. Judges must write a critique for each preliminary round debate they are assigned to judge. Written critiques for preliminary rounds should be turned in to the tabulation room so that they can be distributed to competing teams. A school's packet of ballots and results sheets will not be released by the tab room if any judge from that school or hired by that school has not turned in a completed ballot for any preliminary round in which they judged. Judges hired by the tournament will not be paid until they have turned in a completed ballot for any preliminary round judged. Writing a statement such as 'oral critique given' on the ballot does not satisfy the expectation that judges should write a critique for each preliminary round they are assigned to judge. Written critiques presenting a judge's reasons for decision in elimination rounds are optional and completed at the judge's discretion. If completed they should be turned in so that they can be distributed no later than the conclusion of the tournament. If the judge elects not to write an elimination round critique, they should discuss the debate and the rationale for the decision made with both teams involved in the debate.

16. ANNOUNCEMENT OF ELIMINATION ROUND DECISIONS AT ADA TOURNAMENTS

At ADA tournaments, the Tournament Director shall designate a Chair for all elimination round panels except for the final round in each division. Judges shall submit their ballots to the designated Chair. After all judges have voted and the original ballots have been returned to the Tournament Director or his/her designated representative, the Chair shall announce the decision of the judges in the room in which the debate was held. Decisions in the final round of each division shall be announced by the Tournament Director or his/her designee at a time and place designated by the Director.

II. RULES GOVERNING THE ADMINISTRATION OF TOURNAMENTS

1. COMPLIANCE WITH THE A.F.A. CODE

Tournament Directors agree to abide by the American Forensic Association Code of Forensics Program and Forensics Tournament Standards for Colleges and Universities, Article IV (Tournament Practice).

2. TOURNAMENT SANCTIONING

A. Criteria for a tournament to be sanctioned by the ADA and to count for ADA Sweepstakes points:

1. The host school must be an institutional member of the ADA.

2. The tournament director must submit a request to be sanctioned to the President of the ADA by August 1 before the season of competition for which that tournament wishes to be sanctioned. That tournament director shall agree in writing that the tournament will be conducted in accordance with the American Debate Association rules, to enforce the ADA rules as the tournament director, and to submit tournament results to the Vice-President for Records within two weeks after the conclusion of the tournament, and shall also agree in writing to announce the above in the tournament invitation. At this time the Tournament should indicate if it intends to host a Novice Division with the restricted Novice Curriculum as described in section 9 below.

B. Sanctioning Process

The President of the ADA in consultation with the ADA Executive Committee will approve a tournament's request by August 15 before the season of competition for which a tournament is seeking sanctioning. Tournament directors should make their request to the President of the ADA in written form or via e-mail. The ADA National Tournament is automatically sanctioned. Under special circumstances, the Executive Committee can vote to sanction a tournament after the August 15th deadline. If a tournament sanctioned by the ADA is found to have violated ADA rules in its administration, the ADA Executive Committee can retroactively withdraw sanctioning.

3. JUDGING

A. Eligibility

1. To be eligible to judge in an ADA tournament a person must either:
 - a) have attained a baccalaureate degree, or
 - b) have no remaining intercollegiate debate eligibility, or
 - c) have waived any remaining intercollegiate debate eligibility. If a judge competed in the same academic year they are judging, they may only judge in divisions of lesser debate experience than those they competed in during that year.

Tournament Directors may make individual exceptions to this rule in the case of persons who are enrolled in their last two semesters of undergraduate study and who are no longer competing in intercollegiate debate. Undergraduate students are eligible to judge for a maximum of two semesters. Any person who judges at an ADA tournament forfeits the right to compete in any ADA tournament thereafter. Exceptions to this rule based on emergencies or tournaments of special character may be made by the director, in consultation with available members of the ADA Executive Committee, in such circumstances to enable the tournament to continue.

2. Judging Requirements at ADA Nationals

To judge at the National Championship, a judge must:

- a) Hold a baccalaureate degree, or have no eligibility for future ADA Nationals, or waive such eligibility, and
- b) Not have competed on the current topic, and
- c) Have an appropriately published judge philosophy that includes how the judge evaluates and resolves debates, and
- d) Abide by the tournament's judge conflict policy, and
- e) Be available for a minimum commitment of at least 2 debates, and
- f) Be available for assignment to any debate through the second elimination round, at the discretion of the Director, plus one debate beyond the elimination of the school for which the person is judging.

If a judge entered to judge at the National Championship has not judged at least 10 rounds on the current topic, the judge will not count towards the school's commitment and will be a "free strike."

3. Judge Conflict Policy

Judges and students have an affirmative obligation to identify conflicts prior to the start of the tournament. Failure to do so may result in removal of preferences for the teams from the schools involved, adjustment of the judge's schools judging obligations, and/or financial penalties.

Conflicts of interest in which a judge should preclude themselves from judging a particular team or school, and for which a team should constrain a judge, include:

- a) Previous significant coaching relationship with a debater,
- b) Current or previous romantic relationship with a debater,
- c) Current romantic relationship with a member of the coaching staff of a school,
- d) Familial relationship with a debater or member of the coaching staff of a school,
- e) Recent (within the last four academic years) coaching position with a school,
- f) Recent (within the last four academic years) undergraduate competitor for a school.

4. Judging Shortages during the Course of a Tournament. Undergraduates may judge rounds and maintain their ADA competitive eligibility if all of the following circumstances exist:

- a) The tournament in question must be unable to continue without the addition of undergraduate judges. This presupposes the use of qualified tournament staff and attempts to procure additional rounds from judges currently in the pool and other qualified judges.
- b) A pre-tournament shortage in judging prior to the close of entries is not a sufficient condition to allow undergraduate judges to maintain ADA eligibility.
- c) A majority of the Executive Committee must agree to waive the above requirements for judging eligibility under the circumstances. If the entire Executive Committee is not available, a majority of those available will suffice. In the event of a tie, the default will be to waive.
- d) The judges in question must be varsity-level debaters, and will only be eligible to judge novice debates.

B. Assignment. Judges will be assigned to debate rounds by using a method of judge placement decided by the tournament director and announced in the tournament invitation. The American Debate Association's commitment to novice debate should be reflected in judge placement. We believe that the benefits and burden of judge placement should be shared equally across the novice, junior varsity, and open divisions. Judges should never be subjectively evaluated by tournament directors for preclusion from teams or divisions, for mutual preference or for judge placement. The ADA National Championship Tournament will place judges using an ordinal rank, mutual preference system.

The following criteria should be observed in placing judges in debates:

- i. A judge should not judge his/her own teams;
- ii. A judge will not judge a team if they debated at that school within the last four years, coached at the school within the last two four years, or coached either of the debaters on the team;
- iii. Judges may request for good reasons that they not judge a particular team;
- iv. Judges should not judge the same team twice in preliminary rounds, unless it is mathematically unavoidable. If this rule cannot be upheld, a judge should hear the same team a second time on the opposite side of the proposition and they should hear the team a second time only in one of the last two prelim rounds;
- v. Judges will be assigned to debates in accordance with some predetermined, mathematical order. In instances where mutual preference judging is not used, a judge will hear the first debate they are eligible to hear;
- vi. All judges entered in the pool are expected to be available to judge all divisions of debate whether or not they have teams entered in those divisions. Judges may not preclude themselves from judging any division of debate, unless they are judges who are in their first or second year of judging or they have judged fewer than fifty debates during the past three years, in which case, they may restrict themselves to judging in the novice and junior varsity divisions. Emergency eligibility exceptions to this rule can be made by the tournament director in consultation with the ADA Executive Committee.
- vii. The same judge placement system should be used in all divisions of debate. When using ordinal mutual preference judge placement, this includes the percentages used to determine acceptable mutuality and preference. For example, if the tournament places judges in the open division with 50% preference and 30% mutuality, the tournament must also use 50/30 in the junior varsity and novice divisions.
- viii. When the computer tabulation system used allows, judges should be placed simultaneously in all divisions in every round, including elimination rounds.
- ix. If the tabulation system requires judges to be placed one division at a time, the tournament should rotate the order of judge placement round by round. For example, in a 6 round tournament with 3 divisions, each

division would be the first to receive judges in 2 rounds, the 2nd to receive judges in 2 rounds, and the 3rd to receive judges in 2 rounds. In an 8 round tournament, the tournament director may use their own discretion to determine the order of judge placement in rounds 7 and 8, however, no division should be 1st, 2nd, or 3rd in judge placement order more than 3 times in preliminary rounds. Tournament directors should continue rotating judge placement in elimination rounds.

C. Philosophies. Judges should make judge philosophies on tabroom.com. If the tournament uses any system that requires teams to rank or strike judges prior to the start of preliminary rounds, philosophies should be uploaded to tabroom.com before the tournament opens the judge ranking system. Judge philosophies are required for the ADA National Tournament, and must be submitted prior to the opening of the judge ranking system. At the discretion of the executive committee, judges who fail to comply at the ADA National Tournament will be subject to the following:

1. The judge may be dropped from the tournament and/or
2. Other judges from the school they represent may have their commitment increased and/or
3. The schools they represent may be fined \$50 plus \$30 per committed round and/or
4. Teams from the school they represent may lose the right to have their rankings considered when placing judges.

4. SECRECY

Tournament staff will not disclose round pairings to debaters or coaches or judges prior to the public announcement of those pairings.

5. FORFEITURE

A. All Rounds: A fifteen-minute forfeiture rule will be in effect. Beginning with the announced starting time for a round of debate, teams and judges will have a fifteen minute 'grace' period. A team which is not ready to begin debating after the fifteen minutes have expired will be declared to have lost the debate.

If debates occur utilizing an online venue, tournaments may require a Check-in Time by which all debaters and judges must have been officially checked in to their room and performed audio and video checks. Failure to do so may result in forfeiture and/or disqualification. Following Check-in Time, standard start time/forfeiture policy applies.

B. Coin Flip Rule:

A representative from each team must be available at least 30 minutes before the announced start time of the first elimination round of the morning. If said representative is not available and the debate is a flip-for-sides debate, the team that is present may choose their side for the debate.

If debates occur utilizing an online venue, tournaments may require the coin flip rule be used for all elimination rounds and/or rounds requiring a coin flip, and may also choose to automate/electronically manage the coin flip.

C. Judges: A judge who is not prepared to start judging at the end of the grace period will cause their best team in the tournament at that point to receive a loss for the round the judge failed to be ready to judge. Hired judges will forfeit all pay for the tournament if they fail to meet a judging obligation and if they cannot be replaced by a substitute judge.

If debates occur utilizing an online venue, tournaments may require a Check-in Time by which all judges must have been officially checked in to their room and performed audio and video checks. Failure to do so may be treated as a violation of their judging obligation and subjected to penalties. Following Check-in Time, standard start time/forfeiture policy applies.

6. TOURNAMENT PROFIT

Tournament directors should ensure that their tournament is not run to benefit financially the host school. An anticipated profit in excess of 10% of total entry fees is considered excessive.

7. NOVICE DEBATE

A. TEACH-IN -- Tournaments should strive to provide at least one round of “teaching sessions” for novices where novice debaters meet with judges and coaches during the time allotted for the debate (2 hours or two 50-minute sessions). These teaching sessions could focus on any number of topics and could involve small or large groups.

B. EARLY MOVES - Novice teams progressing to junior varsity or varsity during their first year and not returning to novice (at any tournament after the move up) should be recognized at ADA Nationals. The school of each debater that moves up and competes in at least three additional non-novice tournaments including ADA Nationals should be awarded 5 points in the Grand Sweepstakes (limited to a maximum of 5 points per school). It is the responsibility of the director of each individual program to notify the Vice President of Records of the progression

8. NOVICE CURRICULUM

A. TOURNAMENT DESIGNATION – Tournaments may choose to host a Novice Division with a restricted evidence set. If a tournament chooses to host such a Novice Division, Debaters competing in that division may only use evidence from the set maintained by the ADA Novice Curriculum Committee. Tournaments that wish to host a Novice Division with the curriculum restriction should notify the ADA Executive Committee with their request for tournament sanctioning and state the same in the tournament invitation. Tournaments during the Fall Semester are encouraged to host a Novice Division with a restricted evidence set. Sweepstakes points from Novice Divisions with a restricted evidence set shall be counted the same as from those without.

B. EVIDENCE SET – It shall be the duty of the ADA Novice Curriculum Committee (NCC) to create, maintain, and distribute the Evidence Set for use in restricted evidence Novice Divisions. At the beginning of each season the NCC shall release a list of the tournaments that have indicated their intention to host a Novice Division where evidence is to be limited to the evidence set. At that time the NCC shall release the initial evidence set as well as a schedule of planned additions to the evidence set for the season. The NCC shall make the evidence set available to all ADA members and anyone attending a tournament utilizing the evidence set. The NCC may make the evidence set available to any other person or school as it deems beneficial.

C. STUDENT UPDATES – In addition to evidence created or solicited by the NCC, Novice Debaters who compete in tournaments utilizing the restricted evidence set may submit updates from their own research to any file in the set for inclusion in the set. The NCC shall include in its initial season announcement the procedure and timing for submission of Novice Debater updates. No evidence from such updates may be used until the NCC has approved the evidence and

added it to the evidence set. Such updates are to be the product of the Novice Debaters' own research, and not that of other teammates or coaches.

9. PROCEDURES FOR PAIRING AT AMERICAN DEBATE ASSOCIATION TOURNAMENTS

A. ADA Nationals

1. There will be two preset rounds of competition. The President will select three members of the Executive Committee to rank teams in each division prior to the start of the tournament; rankings should be based on team performance in regular season competition. In preset rounds, teams will receive a balanced draw based on these seeds.
2. Prelim brackets will be formed by win-loss record and power-matched.
3. Unless numbers make it impossible, each division will have an even number of affirmative and negative debates, and teams will not debate each other twice. In the event of the loss of teams during the tournament which makes this impossible, the number of rounds in the division will decrease to 5 to make the tournament operable.

B. ADA Tournaments

1. There should be at least two preset rounds of competition. Preset rounds should either be paired based on a ranking system that guarantees teams receive a balanced draw based on the seeding or paired at random.
2. Prelim brackets will be formed by win-loss record and power-matched unless the number of entries make a prelim bracket impossible.
3. Unless numbers make it impossible, each division will have an even number of affirmative and negative debates, and teams will not debate each other twice. If entry drops during the tournament make the tournament inoperable, the tournament may reduce the number of preliminary rounds.
4. Elimination rounds should proceed with a single elimination bracket.

III. RULES GOVERNING DEBATER ELIGIBILITY

1. DEBATER ELIGIBILITY

To participate in the ADA National Championship Tournament a debater must be an undergraduate student who is regularly enrolled and in good standing at the institution for which s/he is competing at the tournament. Each student participant's school needs to be have an institutional membership in the ADA at the start of ADA Nationals. Any student in compliance with the AFA standards is eligible for competition for the ADA National Tournament. Students may attend a maximum of four ADA Nationals. A student who has debated at any intercollegiate debate tournament in more than ten semesters is ineligible to attend ADA Nationals.

2. TRANSFER STUDENTS

Students transferring from one four-year college debate program to another will be eligible for competition unless the transfer violates the rules specified in the AFA Code of Forensics Program and Forensics Tournament Standards. If a transfer student is held to have violated those provisions, they will be ineligible for competition in ADA until the academic year following the transfer.

3. PIRACY

Coaches agree to refrain from acts of piracy, meaning that they will voluntarily avoid attempts to lure debaters away from active four-year college debate programs and into their own.

4. ELIGIBILITY FOR DEBATE DIVISIONS

Tournaments will define eligibility for particular divisions of debate in the following ways:

A. Varsity Debate--open to all students;

B. Junior Varsity Debate

1. Open only to students who are competing in their first two academic years of intercollegiate debate beyond the novice level.

2. Progression during the year. Debaters competing in JV must progress to open or varsity debate:

a. If they advance to the final round of three JV, open, or varsity tournaments (no matter where) in which there are 20 or more teams in the division, or

b. If they qualify to attend the National Debate Tournament

3. ADA Nationals. The aforementioned progression requirement based on advancing to the final rounds of three junior varsity, open, or varsity tournaments does not apply to ADA Nationals and Round Robins.

C. Novice Debate--This division is designed for debaters who are truly in their first year of competitive debate or who have so little previous experience that they are functionally first-year debaters.

A novice is defined as an individual with:

- no more than 24 rounds of policy debate at the high school or college level prior to the academic year.*
- no more than 50 rounds of prior experience in either high school or college Lincoln-Douglas, parliamentary, public forum, or policy debate.
- has never qualified to the Tournament of Champions in policy, Lincoln-Douglas, or public forum.

*If a debater competes in no more than 24 rounds of team policy debate during their first year as a novice at the college level, they retain novice eligibility during their second academic year in debate. However, if debaters have more than 24 rounds of team policy debate during their first year at the college level but have not advanced to elimination rounds at two tournaments during that first year of novice eligibility they are entitled to a second year of eligibility until advancing to elimination rounds in two tournaments or upon completion of the second academic year. If a debater becomes ineligible for novice during the year, they are not eligible to compete in the novice division at ADA Nationals. If a debater has competed at ADA Nationals in a previous year, they are not eligible to compete in the novice division at ADA Nationals.

D. Any program director seeking an exemption from the above standards shall submit a request to the Vice President who, in conjunction with the Executive Committee or subcommittee thereof, shall rule upon it. Appeals, once granted, may be revoked based on tournament performance. The Vice President will notify the program, the Executive Committee, and tournament directors of ADA-sanctioned tournaments, of exemptions that have been granted.

5. DEFINITION OF DEBATE TEAM:

A. ADA Nationals. For the purposes of the ADA National tournament only, a debate team is defined as the two-person team that begins the first rounds of the tournament and who debate together throughout the course of the tournament. If one of the debaters of a team cannot debate in any given round, that round will be forfeited. To debate in a round is defined as to give one constructive speech and one rebuttal. Teams that forfeit rounds will be given average speaker points. Teams that forfeit rounds are ineligible to clear to elimination rounds if they miss more than 1/3rd of their rounds rounded down to the nearest round. Debaters who forfeit more than 1/3rd of their rounds rounded down to the nearest round are ineligible for speaker awards. Hybrid teams composed of debaters from different schools may debate together at the ADA National Tournament, but they may not clear to elimination rounds, unless they have at least three ADA tournaments together as a team prior to ADA Nationals. Such teams need to provide notice to the President upon entry and identify the tournaments at which they have previously debated together.

B. ADA Tournaments. For the purposes of ADA tournaments, a debate team is defined as the two-person team that begins the first round of the tournament and who debate together throughout the course of the tournament. If one of the debaters of a team cannot debate in any given round, that round will be forfeited. To debate in a round is defined as to give one constructive speech and one rebuttal. Teams that forfeit rounds will be given average speaker points. Teams that forfeit rounds are ineligible to clear to elimination rounds if they miss more than 1/3rd of their rounds rounded down to the nearest whole round. The debate may still occur for educational purposes. However, that team will still be eligible for speaker awards and elimination rounds. Hybrid teams are allowed at the discretion of the tournament director and are allowed to clear to elimination rounds at the discretion of the tournament director. A tournament's policy on hybrid teams must be indicated in the tournament invitation.

IV. RULES GOVERNING THE CONDUCT OF COACHES, PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND JUDGES.

Coaches and Program Directors should treat one another and debaters (whether from their school or other institutions) with civility, generosity, respect and kindness during ADA sanctioned debate tournaments. This, at a minimum, means refraining from the use of hostile or abusive speech, acts of intimidation, or threats or acts of physical violence.

V. ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

1. VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE I BY DEBATERS

Unless otherwise specified, violations of rules in Article I will be penalized by the judge either disregarding arguments which do not meet the standards established, diminishing the speaker points for debaters violating the rules in Article I, or in extreme cases (to be determined by the judge) awarding a loss to the team which has violated these rules.

2. VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE I BY JUDGES/COACHES

Unless otherwise specified, a coach/judge held in violation of the ADA rules in Article I will be penalized after investigation by an ad hoc group commissioned by the ADA President. If the complaint is judged to be substantial, the offending coach/judge may either receive a letter of reprimand (with copies sent to appropriate school officials) or be barred from judging at ADA tournaments. Judges who are in violation of rule I.14 of ADA rules may be removed from the judge pool by the tournament director. Judges who are removed from the tournament are responsible for compensating the tournament for judging fees or removal of an appropriate number of their teams.

3. VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE II

Unless otherwise specified, violations of Article II provisions will result in penalties imposed on the school which hosted the tournaments. If a complaint is raised, the president of the American Debate Association will appoint an ad hoc group to investigate and rule on the complaint. If the complaint is judged to be substantial, the following penalties will be imposed:

- A. The host school (if a member of ADA) will forfeit its best tournament results for sweepstakes purposes;

- B. The host school will receive a letter of reprimand from the ADA President, with copies sent to appropriate school officials;

- C. The host school will be prevented from participation in ADA tournaments in subsequent years.

4. VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE III

Unless otherwise specified, schools which compete in ADA events with ineligible students will forfeit any points earned by those students at the tournaments in which those students were ineligible. Any school which incurs two infractions involving the use of ineligible students in the same academic year will be barred from further competition in ADA.

5. VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV

Unless otherwise specified, a coach, program director or judge held in violation of the ADA rules in Article IV will be penalized after investigation by an ad hoc group commissioned by the ADA President. If the complaint is judged to be substantial, the punishment may include a letter of reprimand or being barred from attending or judging at ADA tournaments or the loss of all ADA points accumulated at the tournament at which the infraction occurred.

6. DUE PROCESS

Schools or persons charged with violations of ADA rules will be informed of any charges against them. These persons will have the right to present their 'case' to the ADA President or the ad hoc investigative group. Any decisions made may be appealed to the President, who will call an appeals board to review the appeal. This board will be made up of persons not on the ad hoc investigative group. Any special groups or boards convened will be made up of three to five persons who are subscribers to the ADA.

VI: RULES GOVERNING PRESENTATION OF SEASON-LONG AWARDS AT ADA NATIONALS

The Awards Chair, assisted by the remainder of the Executive Committee, is empowered to present the following awards at the American Debate Association National Tournament:

1. The American Debate Association Coaching Excellence Award, recognizing excellent performance by a coach (whether director, assistant, or graduate student) at an ADA school.
2. The Founders' Award for Service, recognizing outstanding contribution to the activity by a member of the ADA Community.
3. The Distinguished Alumni Award, recognizing outstanding contribution to the world by a former ADA Debater.
4. Outstanding New Director Award. This award is given to a new Director who demonstrates outstanding achievement in scholarship, service, community building, or competitive success. The ideal candidate should be in their first seven years as a Director.

The following awards will be given by community vote, and tabulated by the Awards Chair, assisted by the remainder of the Executive Committee:

1. Novice Debater of the Year
2. Junior Varsity Debater of the Year
3. Varsity Debater of the Year
4. Judge of the Year (with honorable mention to the highest placed first-year judge)

Each debater (either in the division, for the student awards, or all debaters for the judging award) will be given a list of all eligible candidates. Students may not vote for persons from their own school. To be eligible for the award, debaters and judges must be entered in the pool at ADA Nationals. Votes will be collected prior to and tabulated during the final preliminary round.

The following award will be tabulated under the supervision of the Awards Chair, assisted by the remainder of the Executive Committee:

The Front Royal Cup, given to the highest performing 2 person team in each division over the course of the ADA season, prior to ADA Nationals. To be eligible, the teams must attend at least three tournaments prior to ADA Nationals, and compete at ADA Nationals. The Awards Chair will also recognize the four runners-up to the award in each division at the ADA Awards Ceremony.

VII. RULES GOVERNING SWEEPSTAKES COMPETITION

1. Only ADA member schools who have paid the annual patron membership dues prior to the start of the opening round of ADA Nationals (or whatever tournament concludes the ADA season), or have been certified as a New or Emergent Program are eligible to win sweepstakes awards.

2. A school's best eight records in a given division count; however, no more than two of these records may be compiled at a single tournament.

3. 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th place awards will be presented in varsity, junior varsity, and novice divisions. The 'Grand Sweepstakes' category, where points from the other three divisions are added together, will also feature 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th place awards. There will finally be an appropriate number of "Newcomer" awards, presented to the highest-ranked new or re-newed (after at least a five-year absence) program/s in the "Grand Sweepstakes" category.

4. Teams earn points as follows:

6 or 8 prelims:

Undefeated – 10 points

7-1 – 8 points

6-2 or 5-1 – 7 points

5-3 or 4-2 – 6 points

4-4 or 3-3 – 5 points

3-5 or 2-4 – 4 points

2-6 or 1-5 – 3 points

1-7 – 2 points

0-8 or 0-6 – 1 point

7 prelims:

7-0: 10 points

6-1: 8 points

5-2: 7 points

4-3: 6 points

3-4: 4 points

2-5: 3 points

1-6: 2 points

0-7: 1 point

9 prelims:

9-0: 10 points

8-1: 9 points

7-2: 8 points

5-4: 6 points

4-5: 4 points

3-6: 3 points

2-7: 2 points

1-8: 1 point

0-9: 1 point

Other points:

Missing Elims on Points – 1 point

Clearing to Elims – 3 points

Each Elim round win – 3 points

1st Speaker – 3 points

2nd Speaker – 2 points

3rd -10th Speakers – 1 point

5. Host teams may earn full ADA points for participating in their own tournament if that tournament is run by a committee composed of representatives from at least three different schools or an autonomous tournament director from a non-participating school.

6. Speaker awards are awarded with the following restrictions:

20 or fewer debaters in a division--Speakers 1-3;

22-30 debaters in a division--Speakers 1-5;

31 or more debaters in a division--Speakers 1-10

7. The first elimination round held in any division of debate shall include no more than or less than half of the teams competing in the preliminary rounds of debate in that division, up to 32 teams. In divisions with an odd number of teams entered, the number of teams clearing will be rounded down to the next whole number. A tournament may depart from the provision under only two circumstances:

- a) building space is unavailable to hold the required number of elim round debates on the final day of the tournament; or

- b) the announced prelim round tournament schedule would have to be altered to accommodate the required number of elim rounds.

Results of all elim round debates will count toward sweepstakes points unless the elim bracket contained more than half of the teams competing in the preliminary rounds.

If an ADA tournament 'breaks' to a partial elim round bracket, the partial bracket should involve the maximum number of teams eligible to break (with the exception of a double-octo-final bracket or beyond). Prior to the start of the first debate, the tournament director must announce the size of the first elim round bracket for each division. Once announced, the elim round bracket decisions are final.

Junior varsity teams who are the higher seed must advance over other teammates unless the team advancing is in their final semester of debate.

8. If a tournament director chooses to collapse two or more divisions into one in the preliminary rounds, only one set of elimination rounds shall count for points for that combined division. In the case of combining varsity and junior varsity, points shall be awarded in varsity. In the case of combining junior varsity and novice division, points will be awarded in junior varsity.

9. Ties in the sweepstakes competition will not be broken.

10. A school's record earned at the ADA National Tournament will be multiplied by 1.5 for purposes of calculating sweepstakes points.

Revisions--American Debate Association Standing Rules of Tournament Procedure

Written June, 1985 by John T. Morello

Revised July, 1986 by Theodore F. Sheckels, Jr.

Revised June, 1987 by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Frederick, Maryland, May 8, 1987. Theodore F. Sheckels, Jr.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Frederick, Maryland, May 17, 1988. Edward Grinder, O.S.B.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Frederick, Maryland, May 18, 1989. Edward Grinder, O.S.B.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Frederick, Maryland, May 17, 1990. Edward Grinder, O.S.B.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 18, 1991. Edward Grinder, O.S.B.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, November 2, 1991. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Arnie Madsen.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 15, 1992. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Arnie Madsen.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Annapolis, Maryland May 11, 1993. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Arnie Madsen.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Annapolis, Maryland May 17, 1994. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Arnie Madsen.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Annapolis, Maryland May 5, 1995. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Ron Wastyn.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Annapolis, Maryland May 13, 1996. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Arnie Madsen.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 19, 1997. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Sue Wenzlaff.

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Annapolis, Maryland, May 15, 1999. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Brent Brossmann

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 18, 2000. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Brent Brossmann

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Baltimore, Virginia, May 17, 2001. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Brent Brossmann

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 17, 2002. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Brent Brossmann

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 17, 2002. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Brent Brossmann

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Annapolis, Maryland, May 16, 2003. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Brent Brossmann

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 14, 2004. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Brent Brossmann

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Orlando, Florida. May 14, 2005. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Michael Dutcher

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Cleveland, Ohio. May 18, 2006. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Michael Hall

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 18, 2007. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Michael Hall

Revised by action of the schools attending ADA meeting in Richmond, Virginia. May 16, 2008. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Michael Hall

Revised by action of the schools attending the ADA meeting in Winston-Salem, NC, June 8, 2009. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Jim Lyle

Revised by action of the schools attending the ADA meeting in Harrisonburg, Virginia, May 14, 2010. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Jim Lyle

Revised by action of the schools attending the ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, Virginia, May 20, 2011. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Jim Lyle

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Washington, DC. May 16, 2014. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Danielle O’Gorman

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Annapolis, MD. May 15, 2015. Approved by membership via mail ballot. Nicholas Ryan

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Fredericksburg, VA. May 13, 2016. Approved by membership via email ballot. Nicholas Ryan

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting via Zoom. May 22, 2020. Approved by membership via email ballot. Nicholas Ryan

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota and via Zoom, June 1, 2022. Approved by membership via email ballot. Nicholas Ryan

Revised by action of schools attending ADA meeting via Zoom, May 31, 2023. Approved by membership via email ballot. David Cram Helwich