Tournament Rules of the
United Asians Debating Championships Citation and Commencement

1.1. This document should be cited as “The Tournament Rules of the United Asians Debating Championships 2010” or “The Tournament Rules”.

2. Definitions

“Championship” refers to the United Asians Debating Championships, the flagship tournament of the Union.

“Composite team” a team of participants from more than one university formed by the host university. The composition of the team is stable for the duration of the tournament.

“Contingent” means all the participants registered at a tournament from one university.

“Disputes Tribunal” is the body, which hears complaints regarding the conduct of participants at Union Championships.

“Executive Committee” is the body appointed at the Union Meeting to represent the Union and is the body authorised to discharge actions on behalf of the Union over the course of the year.

“Host institution” means the institution which has been endorsed by the Council to host the Championship.

“Institution” means any institution listed in Schedule III to this Constitution or approved by Council in accordance with Section ???.

“Swing team” means a team formed by the host university to create an even number of teams in the draw. The composition of this team is not stable.

“Tournament accreditation” means a process by which the Union assesses tournaments with respect to compliance with a number of key procedures.

“Union” refers to the Asian University Debating Union.

“Union Meeting” is the annual meeting of the Union and is the peak body which governs the operation of the United Asians Debating Championships.

“Union Session” refers to sessions of the Union convened to address matters that arise in between Championships.

3. Aims of the Championships

3.1. To identify a winner of the tournament who will be accorded the title of “Asian Universities Debating Champion).
3.2. To identify a winner of the "English as a Foreign Language" competition who will be accorded the title of "Asian Universities English as a Foreign Language Category Debating Champion".

4. Activities which comprise the Championship

4.1. The Championship will include:
   4.1.1. A debating competition with a preliminary series and two final series, one for all participants and another for teams designated English as a Foreign Language status as defined in article 10.
   4.1.2. A preliminary and main Union Meeting as outlined in article 5.4 of the Constitution.

4.2. The Championships may include:
   4.2.1. Public speaking competition
   4.2.2. Stand-up comedy competition
   4.2.3. Masters debating competition

5. Debates Structure

5.1. There will be at least seven preliminary rounds of debate. There will be 4 rounds of competition in the finals series, and there will be at least 2 rounds of competition in the "English as a foreign language" finals series. These debates shall be conducted in the manner described in this article.

5.2. Debates will have 30 minutes preparation prior to debate.

5.3. Debates shall be three persons per side with a reply speech. One side shall be affirmative and the other will be negative.

5.4. The adjudication core shall release the match-ups for each round determining who shall be affirmative and who shall be negative for each debate in that round. Upon confirming this, the adjudication core shall release a set of three motions, at which time, the 30 minute preparation period commences.

5.5. The motion to be debated in a particular chamber between the teams matched therein is to be chosen in the following manner:
   5.5.1. The teams discuss preferred choices separately (less than 2 minutes). Number the motion in order of preference (1-most preferred, 3-least preferred).
   5.5.2. The teams identify each other before leaving the briefing room/area.
   5.5.3. Teams compare preferences:
       a. third choice motions are automatically vetoed
       b. if teams' first choice motion is the same, they debate that motion
       c. if teams' first choice motions are different, but the third is the same, they toss a coin, affirmative's representative calls and if calling correctly, teams debate affirmative's first choice. If the call is incorrect, the teams debate negative's first choice.

5.6. Teams are then permitted to leave the briefing room/area and begin their preparations.
for the debate.

5.7. The Affirmative have the right to prepare in chambers (venue).

5.8. A debate shall be run under the auspices of a 'Speaker' who shall be referred to as 'The Speaker of the House' or 'Mister/Madam Speaker'.

5.9. A debate shall be adjudicated by a panel comprising an odd number of adjudicators. One of these shall be designated as Chairperson, by the organizers, and may function as Speaker in the event that none has been nominated in a particular chamber (venue).

5.10. A debate shall be timed by a timekeeper. In the event that none has been nominated in a particular chamber, the function of the timekeeper is to be taken over by one of the panel of adjudicators.

5.11. The order of debate will be: first affirmative speaker, first negative speaker, second affirmative speaker, second negative speaker, third affirmative speaker, third negative speaker, negative reply speaker, affirmative reply speaker.

5.12. The reply must not be given by the third speaker.

5.13. Substantive speeches will be seven minutes in duration.

5.14. Between the first and sixth minutes of a speaker's substantive speech, points of information may be offered by the opposing team.

5.15. The reply speech must be four minutes in duration.

5.16. At the conclusion of all preliminary round debates, the chair of the adjudication panel shall announce the result and deliver an oral adjudication. If the chair is the dissenting member of the panel, he or she should request one of his or her panelists to deliver the oral adjudication.

5.17. Members of the adjudication panels may not confer upon their decision at the conclusion of the debate until they make their individual decision. Upon all members having reached their decision and it being written on individual ballots provided to them, the chair shall open these ballots and determine who won by ascertaining which team garnered an absolute majority of the votes. There can be no "tie" submitted by any adjudicator.

5.18. At the conclusions of all finals debates, the chair of the adjudication panel will announce the result of the debate and will not deliver an oral adjudication.

5.19. Printed and prepared materials may be used during the thirty-minute preparation period. No access to electronic media, electronic storage or retrieval devices is permitted after motions have been released, except electronic dictionaries. Printed and prepared materials may be accessed during a debate, but MAY NOT be used during a speech.

5.20. Teams must prepare on their own. Once motions have been released, there must be
no contact between debaters in a particular team and their reserves, coaches, trainers, observers or any other individual for the purposes of assistance in the context of the debate. Such contact and assistance is ‘cheating’ and will be punished by the disqualification of teams thus affected from the round in question, at the least, and the competition, at the most, at the discretion of the Union.

5.21. Teams must arrive at their chamber within five minutes of the scheduled/given time of commencement of debate.

5.22. Teams failing to arrive in time will forfeit the debate, at the discretion of the chair of the adjudication panel.

5.23. Speakers not ‘holding the floor’ may not rise during speech, unless it is to offer a ‘Point of Information’. Speakers doing so, or considered to be heckling, barracking or whose behavior is interfering with the acceptable course of a debate will be declared ‘out of order’ or will be ‘called to order’ by the Chairperson.

5.24. Interjections should be brief, pertinent and preferably witty. Interjections are comments made by members directed at the speech of the member holding the floor, and made from a seated position.

6. Adjudication

6.1. Role of the adjudicator

6.1.1. The adjudicator must decide which team has won, explain reasons for their decision and provide constructive feedback to teams.

6.1.2. The adjudicator must take the position of an average reasonable person. They must disregard any expert of special knowledge, but assume that the average reasonable person is intelligent and capable of assessing flaws in argument.

6.2. Breaking adjudicators should have adjudicated in at least 5 of the 7 preliminary rounds in the preliminary series. They shall be the top 24 in terms of grades (scores) of all such adjudicators. The grades (scores) shall be determined purely by their performance in the adjudication test, and the cumulative consolidated debater and peer feedback ratings obtained during the rounds they adjudicated. Please refer to the tabulation section for more details.

6.3. Chairs may not announce marks, nor indicate the margin of win/loss unless asked to by the Chief Adjudicator of the competition. All adjudicators are expected to observe the confidentiality of individual and team scores, and margins.

6.4. Adjudication will be based on the awards of marks in three categories: Matter (40%), Manner (40%) and Method (20%), for individual speeches and a team’s response to the dynamics of the debate.

7. Elements of a debate / speech

7.1. Definition
7.1.1. The definition should state the issue or issues arising out of the motion to be debated, state the meanings of any terms in the motion requiring clarification and display clear and logical links to the wording and spirit of the motion.

7.1.2. A definition may only be challenged where it is unreasonable. An unreasonable definition is defined as one which:
    7.1.2.1. is self-proving - tautological;
    7.1.2.2. a matter stated as fact - trivial;
    7.1.2.3. has no clear or logical link to the topic;
    7.1.2.4. wholly unreasonable and purposefully misinterprets the motion - squirrel; or,
    7.1.2.5. sets an unnaturally restrictive geographical or spatial location as its major parameter has been time set or unfairly place set;
    7.1.2.6. Sets an unnaturally restrictive chronological duration as its main parameter - time set.

7.1.3. Only the first negative speaker may challenge the definition based on the grounds outlined in 6.1.2.
    7.1.3.1. The speaker must make it clear that the definition has been rejected, with an explanation upon which of the grounds the definition is considered unreasonable.
    7.1.3.2. The speaker must provide a more reasonable definition and must argue why the definition is reasonable.
    7.1.3.3. The negative team needs to engage with the affirmative team's case by use of the 'even if' argument.
    7.1.3.4. The negative team needs to negate the proposition of the debate according to their definition.

7.2. Matter

7.2.1. Matter refers to the content of speeches. Adjudicators are to evaluate the persuasiveness of the arguments presented by teams.

7.2.2. The two major benchmarks adjudicators must use for evaluating matter are logic and relevance of arguments.
    7.2.2.1. An argument is logical if its conclusion flows from its premise.
    7.2.2.2. An argument is relevant if it is pertinent to the case and the motion.

7.2.3. Both teams must develop a constructive case. The affirmative team must assert positively that the proposition under debate is true, the negative team must assert positively that the proposition is untrue.
    7.2.3.1. Invalid and hung cases are to be avoided. These are cases in which a stand and outline of arguments is provided by the First Affirmative speaker, but there is no substantiation in his / her speech. This renders a distinct disadvantage upon the First Negative speaker who can no longer be expected to reasonably engage with such an argument.

7.2.4. Third Negative speakers may not introduce new matter. Third Affirmative speakers may introduce new matter, however this is not advised.
    7.2.4.1. New matter is defined as a fresh line of argumentation and does not refer to new rebuttal points, new perspectives on an old argument or new examples,
unless these change the course of the original argument entirely.

7.2.5. A Negative team cannot rely purely on its rebuttal of the Affirmative case and must present a case in opposition.

7.3. Manner

7.3.1. Manner refers to the presentation style of speeches. Adjudicators are to evaluate the persuasiveness of the individual speakers’ and teams’ presentation.

7.3.2. The two major components adjudicators should use for evaluating manner are body language and vocal style.
7.3.2.1. Body language can include eye contact with audience, use of notes, gestures and stances.
7.3.2.2. Vocal style can include volume, clarity, pronunciation, pace, intonation, fluency, confidence, authority, use of language.

7.3.3. In assessment of manner, adjudicators must respect the individuality of speakers and the diverse range of backgrounds from which they come. Adjudicators should evaluate manner with respect to the extent to which a particular component contributed or detracted from the force of their arguments.

7.4. Method

7.4.1. Method refers to the structure and organisation of the speech and case. Adjudicators are to evaluate the effectiveness of organisation.

7.4.2. The two major components adjudicators should use for evaluating method are responsiveness and structure.
7.4.2.1. Responsiveness refers to the ability of speakers and teams to respond dynamically to the strategic issues which emerge over the course of the debate. This can include relevance of rebuttal, changing emphases of the cases in the case of concessions, and points of information.
7.4.2.2. Structure refers to the prioritisation of arguments (both constructive and rebuttal) within speeches and with respect to the team’s case.

7.5. Reply Speeches

7.5.1. Reply speeches can not be delivered by third speakers.

7.5.2. Reply speeches present teams with an opportunity to focus on the major issues in the debate and the way in which both teams approached the clash points.

7.5.3. Reply speeches should give an ‘optimistic overview’ of the general approach to the debate by both sides and focus on the relative merits of the case by the side delivering the replying, and the relative weaknesses in the case of the opposing team.

7.5.4. No new matter is to be introduced during reply speeches.

7.5.5. Reply speeches should neither continue rebuttal arguments nor advance old arguments into significantly new ‘territory’.
7.5.6. Reply speeches will be scored out of a total of 50 with an average of 37.5.

7.6. Points of information may only be offered to speakers on the opposing side.

7.6.1. Points of information must be indicated by a member of an opposing team rising from his/her seat, placing one hand on top of his/her head and extending the other towards the member holding the floor. A member offering a point of information may draw attention to the offer by saying, “Point of information”, "On that point", "On the point of", or similar.

7.6.2. Points of information should be offered regularly and throughout the course of the debate.

7.6.3. Points of information should not be used to badger or heckle the opposition. Adjudicators may penalize speakers if, after warnings and attempts to discourage this behaviour, a team or speaker continues to badger or heckle a speaker.

7.6.4. Points of information are not allowed in reply speeches.

7.6.5. Speakers are entitled to decline points of information however speakers must answer a reasonable number of points of information offered.

7.6.6. Points of information must be brief and should not last more than 15 seconds.

7.6.7. Speakers must attempt to answer points of information clearly and succinctly.

7.6.8. Adjudicators should evaluate both the delivery and response to points of information as part of a speaker's total score.

8. Marking scheme

8.1. The marking scheme allows a maximum of 100 marks to be awarded for each constructive speaker, subdivided into 40 marks for each of matter and manner and 20 marks for method.

8.1.1. A debater who speaks at the expected level in each of matter, manner and method should receive a score of 30, 30, 15, totaling 75.

8.1.2. Individual speaker scores are to be range from 69-81. No half marks are to be awarded for constructive speeches.

8.1.2.1. Individual matter and manner scores are to range from 27-33.

8.1.2.2. Individual method scores are to range from 13-17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter or Manner</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Average or expected standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2. Reply speeches will
8.3. Margins must reflect the nature of the win.
8.4. Margins are to range between 0.5 to 12 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margin</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5 - 3.5 marks</td>
<td>A very close debate, with only minor differences separating the teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 marks</td>
<td>A relatively clear debate, with one team having an obvious advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 - 12 marks</td>
<td>A very clear win, with the losing team probably having failed on one or more fundamental aspects of its argument or presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Adjudicator Assessment

9.1. There shall be an adjudication test
9.1.1. The test shall be based on a pre-taped video.
9.1.2. The adjudication core shall view the video and come up with their "sample adjudication" on consensus. They will also then frame a test based on the debate for adjudicators to answer, with sample answers. The sample adjudication and sample answers shall be used as a reference during marking the tests and a photocopy of this shall be given back to each adjudicator along with the adjudicator's marked and graded test paper.
9.1.3. Every Adjudicator except the Adjudication Core will be expected to write the test.

9.2. The marking of the adjudicator test shall be as follows: -
9.2.1. After the test, the adjudication core shall mark the tests, using the following guidelines:
9.2.1.1. The test shall be evaluated as per the
gerstitutions
9.2.1.2. The All Asians debating guidelines as per the constitution
9.2.1.3. The guidelines published in advance and explained during the Adjudication workshop by the Adjudication Core
9.2.2. Each paper shall be assigned a Grade A to F as will appear in the tab system
9.2.3. The marker will further write comments - about 3 lines as to why the adjudicator was graded a grade
9.2.4. The paper will then be reviewed by another member of the Adjudication Core and signed off by a checker. Therefore a marker-checker process will be used to trap errors and inconsistencies if any
9.2.5. The marker will further attach a copy of the sample answers and adjudication to the paper before returning the paper to the adjudicator
9.2.6. The feedback to the adjudicator by the marker would be in the form of questions of the following nature: -
9.2.6.1. Did the adjudicator identify the right issues of clash in the debate? If not, what were the key issues in the debate left identified
9.2.6.2. Did the adjudicator make errors in arriving at the decision e.g. enter some of the issues of the debate, miss out certain arguments presented by teams, judge the debate on purely technical grounds
9.2.6.3. Did the adjudicator mark the teams and speakers as per the guidelines
provided by the adjudication core during the workshop?

9.2.6.4. This form of feedback along with the sample test answers and adjudication
would serve as a form of open evaluation and self assessment for the
adjudicators writing the test and would help standardize some of the
tournament guidelines.

9.3. Each adjudicator would be rated in the tab system from A-F, A being the best and F
being the worst. At the end of the adjudication test, the adjudicators would know their
rating within the system.

9.4. Debater and Panelist feedback in each debate will be compulsory. The adjudication
core will be allowed to penalise debaters and panelists in the case that they do not
provide requisite feedback. This could include the docking of speaker and adjudication
feedback points repeatedly. However these should only be used for repeated lack of
provision of feedback forms, and after ensuring with the tournament director and the
team/adjudicator that there was indeed no feedback form provided.

9.5. During the course of the tournament, the adjudicators would be given feedback scores
(1-5) by panelists with the following guidelines:

5: The adjudicator got the decision right. She/he identified the correct issues of
the debate and prioritized them correctly. This adjudicator is capable of
adjudicating the Grand Finals of this tournament.
4: The adjudicator got the decision right. She/he identified the key issues of the
debate correctly, although it is possible that she/he may have misprioritized
some of the issues and assessed certain issues with too much or too little
weightage. This adjudicator should break into the octos or quarters of the
tournament.
3: The adjudicator got the decision marginally right or wrong. She/he identified
some of the issues of the debate correctly although he or she may have
misprioritized some of the tertiary issues of the debate. This adjudicator may
marginally break or not break.
2: The adjudicator got the decision wrong or right on the wrong grounds.
She/he seemed to see some issues but did not understand or prioritize the issues
correctly. The adjudicator may have entered the debate. This adjudicator should
not break or chair a round.
1: The adjudicator may have decided the debate purely on technical grounds like
matter, manner regardless of relevance. The adjudicator has a fundamental
misunderstanding of the rules of this style of debating. This adjudicator should
be a trainee.

9.5.1. Both the assenting adjudicators and the dissenting adjudicators in the room will
need to present an oral adjudication
9.5.2. Each team will fill in two forms for adjudicator feedback - one for dissenting
and one for assenting adjudicators.
9.5.3. In addition, each panelist will fill in adjudication feedback for the other
adjudicators in the room.
9.5.4. The debater feedback will be averaged with the panelist feedback. Therefore
each adjudicator will be given a score at the end of the debate that is the average of
the scores of the three teams in the room and that of the adjudicators.
9.6. In addition to the Adjudication Core, there shall be appointed (by the adjudication core) a shadow adjudication core to handle reviews and appeals effectively and independently. The Shadow Adjudication Core, consisting of a maximum of three adjudicators, shall constitute of adjudicators of the calibre that would otherwise be considered for DCA roles.

9.6.1. The shadow adjudication core will serve as appeals mechanism if called upon to review any of the grading of the sample papers by the Adjudication Core. The Shadow Adjudication Core will not be informed of who graded and reviewed the adjudication paper, and will have the authority to revise the grade assigned upwards, but may not revise the assigned grade downwards.

9.6.2. Every adjudicator who has a genuine grievance with the actual marking of the paper vs. the guidelines provided by the adjudication core will write down the exact element of the appeal and the justification for it.

9.6.3. This together with the paper will be provided to the shadow adjudication core, who after considering the specific appeal in context of the adjudication paper and guidelines may revise the assigned grade upwards only.

9.6.4. All appeals need to be submitted before the commencement of the first debate, and the results of the shadow adjudication core will need to be obtained before the commencement of the third debate. Any grades assigned upwards will be reflected retro-actively in the tabulation system.

9.6.5. The shadow adjudication core will not have any say in any other aspect of adjudication including motion setting and feedback consolidation. The shadow adjudication is not expected to re-evaluate the entire test result of a participant, but rather specific grievances.

9.7. The procedure for filing an appeal is as follows:-

9.7.1. In order to file an appeal, any debater or adjudicator at UADC can approach the Shadow Adjudication Core. This may be done anonymously and the Shadow Adjudication Core is to respect the privacy and anonymity of the complainant.

9.7.2. Since anyone can effectively file an appeal, the machinery of appeals would break down if every single person wanted to have their grades reviewed. Therefore the process must be used with honour and good faith.

9.7.3. It is important to recognize that the appeals mechanism only works as a check to the Adjudication Core in itself. It cannot work as a substitute to the Adjudication Core. Therefore complaints that are not about the Adjudication Core or its members should be directed to the Adjudication Core before they can be brought up before the Appeals process.

10. Tabulation guidelines for debates

10.1. The first round of the competition will be completely random.

10.2. The subsequent rounds shall be power paired.

10.3. Teams shall be ranked and divided into pools based on win-loss ratio at the end of each round for the purpose of power pairing.

10.3.1. In case a pool has an odd number of teams, the top team (based first on speaker scores, then on margin of victory) from the bottom pool will be pulled up to the higher pool.
10.3.2. In case the bottom pool has an odd number of teams, a swing team shall debate as the bottom team in that pool.

10.4. Within each pool, teams shall be ranked first in order of aggregate speaker scores (including reply scores), then where speaker scores are equal, by aggregate margin of victory (with a negative margin for defeats) and if that is equal as well, by random order.

10.5. Power pairing shall be done by the sliding-half concept - the pool is divided into half and then top half then debates the bottom half. The top team in the top half debates the top team in the bottom half and so on till the bottom team in the top half debates the bottom team in the bottom half.

10.6. The software will automatically allocate affirmative and negative positions using the following guidelines in the following priority:
10.6.1. As far as possible, teams should not see three continuous debates in the same position.
10.6.2. As far as possible, teams should be allocated an even number of affirmative and negative positions.
10.6.3. As far as possible, teams should be allocated alternating affirmative and negative positions.
10.6.4. One-up one-down may be used to ensure that the aforementioned affirmative and negative guidelines are followed but this rule is subservient to the rule ensuring that two teams do not meet more than once in the course of the tournament.

10.7. One up, One down shall be used in only the following scenarios in the following order:
10.7.1. If the two teams have not met before
10.7.2. To ensure that the affirmative - negative guidelines explained in 9.6.2 and 9.6.3 are met.
10.7.3. If one up or one down due to 9.7.2 results in 9.6.1, then the original combination is reverted to.
10.7.4. One up and one-down may only be used within a win-loss pool (including the extra team that is pulled up from the lower pool in case of odd number of teams in that pool).

10.8. The tabulation software should be able to allocate debates to venues.
10.8.1. Lecture theatres should be preferentially allocated to rooms with high win-loss ratios.
10.8.2. The remaining rooms should preferably be allocated to the debates at random.
10.8.3. The software should allow for manual intervention for venue allocation changes.

10.9. The tabulation software should also allow for tabulation of speaker scores through the debates and display of speaker rankings.
10.9.1. Speaker rankings should not include marks for reply speeches.
10.9.2. When computing speaker scores for a round, the average of the speaker score (excluding reply) of all assenting adjudicators for that speaker in that round must be taken.
10.9.3. Replies will be counted towards team totals.
10.9.4. When computing team scores for a round, the average of the team totals given by all assenting adjudicators must be used.
10.9.5. The margin of victory should only be the average of margins provided by all the
assenting adjudicators in that debate.

11. Tabulation guidelines for adjudicators

11.1. The key objectives of Adjudicator Allocation in the tab software are:
- To ensure that initially all teams and debates have roughly equal access to the better
  pool of adjudicators
- To ensure that from the 4th round onwards, the teams with the highest chances to
  break get the best adjudicators
- To ensure that good adjudicators aren’t placed in panels with majority adjudicators
  of a lower grade, impairing their ability to make a fair decision by getting voted out.
  Therefore higher grade adjudicators would be allocated to be single chairs unless
  they can be placed with another adjudicator of the same grade. No debate should
  have a majority of adjudicators from a lower grade than the minority adjudicators.

11.2. Adjudicator allocation needs to be done by three methodologies that follow three
distinct phases. This section introduces the phases while the detailed specifications for
the adjudicator allocation during the three phases will be detailed in the appendix for
the detailed tab design.
- **Phase A: (usually from Rounds 1-3) Random Allocation**
  During this phase, adjudicator panels are randomly allocated to the various rooms
  since at this point of the tournament, it is assumed that all teams have an equal
  chance of breaking into the knock out stages of the tournament.
- **Phase B: (usually from Rounds 4-5) Pure Win-Loss Ratio based Allocation**
  During this phase, adjudicator panels are allocated based purely on the win-loss
  ratio of the debating teams. The teams with highest win-loss ratio are deemed most
  likely to break and therefore deemed most deserving of the best adjudicators, while
  the teams at the bottom of the pool, are deemed least likely to break and therefore
  less deserving of the best adjudicators (though efforts shall be made to ensure that
  they don’t get all the bottom pool adjudicators).
- **Phase C: (usually from Rounds 6-7) Sorted pool based Allocation**
  By the 6th round of a 7 round tournament, the pools are relatively sorted to
  indicate that one pool has already broken and one or possibly two pools cannot
  break. Therefore during this phase, the allocation of adjudicators is done in a
  way that the middle pool of teams that have a maximum chance of breaking are
  provided with the best panels, followed by the pool of debates that have already
  broken, followed by the pool of debates that are unlikely to break. In these
  rounds, less effort will be taken to ensure that the pools that cannot break at the
  tournament will also get relatively good adjudicators.

11.3. Adjudicator break to octos

11.3.1. Since all adjudicators will receive grades (that shall translate to marks) and will
therefore be graded throughout the tournament based on the scoring given by
debaters and panelists during the rounds, the adjudicators will be ranked based on
the scores received throughout the tournament.

11.3.2. The top bracket of adjudicators (as defined in the constitution) will break into
the finals and the "English as a Foreign language" finals series. The break will be
based purely on the scores obtained in the adjudication test and the consolidated feedback.

11.3.3. Since the Adjudication Core will not be writing the adjudication test, they shall be graded as 'A's. They will then be scored based on feedback similar to the rest of the pool of adjudicators and will also break as per their scores through the tournament. Therefore it is possible, although unlikely, that they may not break based on debater and panelist feedback.

11.4. Adjudicator break into subsequent break rounds

11.4.1. Since octos, quarters and semis are silent rounds, there will be no debater feedback. Panelist feedback will be weighted into the previous test scores and feedback received by the adjudicators throughout the tournament. This consolidated tournament feedback will be used to decide the break for the quarters, semis and finals. Therefore it is entirely possible that the CA, the DCA's and the Shadow Adjudication Core may not break into these final rounds based on feedback.

11.4.2. The adjudication core will still be responsible for adjudicator allocation in the post break rounds.

12. Motion setting

12.1. The motions for the UADC as selected by the Adjudication Core need to meet the following guidelines:

12.1.1. The motions must be balanced and provide equal opportunity for both sides
12.1.2. The motions must be relevant
12.1.3. The motions if geographically place-set should preferably be a current issue in that area.
12.1.4. Motions should not offer undue advantage to debaters of any particular country or region
12.1.5. Motions must be displayed in written form to the debaters

12.2. If any motion is believed by a debater or an adjudicator to be in contravention of the above guidelines, they may bring the issue for discussion at the union meeting or a special union session. If the contravention is believed to be a genuine one, then the Union can advise the adjudication core to strike similar motions for future rounds, and censure the adjudication core upon repeated offence, as deemed necessary. A 2/3 majority vote of the union is required for the censure. A simple majority is required to validate the claim of the motion not adhering to the specified guidelines.

13. Tab Software

13.1. There shall be one official open source tab software in custody of the Union that shall be used for the championship after initial ratification at the first championship by the Union at the Union meeting
13.2. This software is available for anyone to use for any other tournament
13.3. This software must be used at all championships unless 14.5 is applicable
13.4. This software shall accommodate all the rules in this rulebook, as well as the functional specifications provided in Appendix B
13.5. Any subsequent host who wishes to improve the software may do so at the express
approval of the Union by a simple majority vote. The modified or new software should be made open source as well. Clear indications as to what will be improved and a demonstration of understanding of what is available and needs to be replicated should be provided to the union by the host wishing to carry out this exercise.

13.6. At the end of the trial of the new software at a subsequent championship, the Union shall then decide if the new software will replace the official version.

14. Finals series Eligibility

14.1. In order to compete in the final series, institutions participating in the Championships must provide the same number of adjudicators equal to the number of teams sent by that institution (hereafter referred to as the n rule).

14.1.1. Union may exercise discretion over the n equals one rule only where:

14.1.1.1. the university debating association is a relatively new participant in debating tournaments, or where

14.1.1.2. the university debating association has had inadequate notice of the n equals one rule.

14.1.2. Institutions which do not comply which, but have been informed of the n equals one rule, and do not attend the preliminary meeting where they could reasonably attend will be ineligible to compete in the finals series.

14.2. Break eligibility should follow the constitution guidelines provided in article 12 of the constitution.

14.3. After the preliminary rounds, the top 16 teams (subject to 9.1 and 9.2) will progress to contest the finals.

14.3.1. The following draw will operate:

**Ode Finals**:

- Debate A 1st ranked team vs. 16th ranked team
- Debate B 8th ranked team vs. 9th ranked team
- Debate C 5th ranked team vs. 12th ranked team
- Debate D 4th ranked team vs. 13th ranked team
- Debate E 3rd ranked team vs. 14th ranked team
- Debate F 6th ranked team vs. 11th ranked team
- Debate G 7th ranked team vs. 10th ranked team
- Debate H 2nd ranked team vs. 15th ranked team

**Quarter Finals**:

- Debate I Debate A winner vs. Debate B winner
- Debate J Debate C winner vs. Debate D winner
- Debate K Debate E winner vs. Debate F winner
- Debate L Debate G winner vs. Debate H winner

**Semi Finals**:

- Debate M Debate I winner vs. Debate J winner
- Debate N Debate K winner vs. Debate L winner

**Grand Final**:

- Debate O Debate M winner vs. Debate N winner

14.4. After the preliminary rounds, the top 4 English as a Foreign Language teams (subject to 9.1 and 9.2) will progress to contest the EFL finals.
14.4.1. The following draw will operate:

**Semi Finals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate A</th>
<th>1st ranked team</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>4th ranked team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debate B</td>
<td>2nd ranked team</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>3rd ranked team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Final:**

| Debate C | Debate A winner | vs. | Debate B winner |
APPENDIX A (Information Only)- How the Adjudication accreditation and allocation system deals with biases and errors

This system is predicated on the following ideas:
- That judges should enjoy no more advantage based on past performance than debaters currently do.
- That transparent grading, a review mechanism and an appeals mechanism ensure as necessary and sufficient checks and balances in ensuring errors and biases don't enter the rating of adjudicators.
- That panelists and debaters should have an equal and transparent part in choosing the breaking adjudicators.
- That biases and errors in debater and panelist feedback get diversified and diluted over the parties providing the feedback and over the many rounds. Therefore consistently good adjudicators are more likely to break while consistently bad adjudicators more likely won't break. This is in line with the same criteria that governs the breaking of consistently good and bad teams at a tournament and is inherently more fair than the Adjudication Core deciding the break on unpublished and opaque grounds.