

NCFCA

2005 Qualifying Debate Tournament Rules

I. MISSION

The National Christian Forensics and Communications Association (NCFCA) believes that competitive forensics provides a means for home schooled students to learn and exercise analytical and oratorical skills in addressing life issues from a biblical worldview in a manner that glorifies God. NCFCA shall facilitate Qualifying Tournaments and host a National Tournament to provide this opportunity to home schooled students.

II. QUALIFYING TOURNAMENT REQUIREMENTS

A. Teams

1. Policy Debate Teams
Policy Debate Teams will consist of two people.
2. Lincoln Douglas Debate “Teams”
Lincoln Douglas Debate Teams will consist of one person.

B. Rule Changes and Modifications

All additions and modifications to these tournament rules must be approved in writing by NCFCA. Change requests shall be specified in writing when the Host Application is submitted.

C. Preliminary Debate Rounds

There shall be six preliminary debate rounds in the debate tournament.

1. Byes
In the event that an odd number of debate teams is registered in the tournament, six teams, randomly chosen by the tabulation room, shall receive a bye.
2. Scoring Byes
 - a. Win/Loss Record
A bye shall be scored as a win.
 - b. Speaker Points
The average of the total number of speaker points for the five rounds in which the team debated shall be used to score speaker points for the bye.
3. Matching Teams
 - a. Each team shall debate three rounds on the affirmative side and three rounds on the negative side. Exception: teams that receive a bye shall debate three rounds on one side and two rounds on the other side.
 - b. No team shall debate the same opponent on the same side (i.e., affirmative and negative).
 - c. Teams shall be randomly paired for preliminary competition with the following exceptions to be exercised at the discretion of the Tournament Director:
 - 1) Power Match and Power Protect Rounds
 - 2) Protecting Club Teams
Every effort should be taken to protect debaters from meeting their own clubs whenever possible.
 - 3) Matching Previously Qualified Teams
Tournament Directors may want to ensure that a non-qualified team does not meet previously qualified teams in more rounds than other non-qualified teams.

D. Outrounds

1. Qualifications
If there are between nine and eleven teams in the tournament, the Sponsoring Organization may decide whether or not to have a quarterfinal round. If there are twelve or more teams in the tournament, the eight teams with the best win/loss records shall proceed to the quarterfinals. In tournaments with thirty-two or more teams, it is strongly suggested that the

top sixteen teams advance to an octafinal round. If there are only eight debate teams, the top four teams shall proceed directly to semifinals.

2. Outround Judges

- a. Each outround shall be at least triple-paneled (three judges per round).
- b. Final rounds shall be decided by an odd-numbered panel of not less than three judges.
- c. Final round judges should be individuals with debate-related experience, including current and former debaters and coaches, attorneys, professors, judges, experts in the topic, etc.

3. Tie Breakers

In the event that two teams have the same win/loss record, the following methods shall be used, in the specified order, to break the tie:

- a. Adjust for High-Low Team Speaker Points
Omit the ballot with the highest total team speaker points and the ballot with the lowest. The points from the remaining ballots are totaled, and the team with the highest total wins the tie break.
- b. Total Speaker Points
Add the speaker points from all six rounds. The team with the highest number wins the tie break.
- c. Adjust for Double High-Low Team Speaker Points
Omit the ballots from the rounds with the two highest and the two lowest team speaker points, totaling the speaker points from the two remaining ballots. The team with the highest number wins the tie break.
- d. Speaker Rank
The team with the best (lowest) combined speaker ranking from all six rounds shall win the tie break.
- e. Head-to-Head
If two teams faced each other in preliminary competition, the team which won shall win the tie break.
- f. Schedule Difficulty – Opponent Wins
The team whose opponents in preliminary competition won the most rounds shall win the tie break.
- g. Schedule Difficulty – Opponent Speaker Points
The team whose opponents in preliminary competition earned the highest combined speaker point total shall win the tie break.
- h. Adjusted High-Low Speaker Rank
Omit the rounds with the highest and lowest team speaker rank and total combined speaker ranks from the remaining four rounds. The lowest combined total shall win the tie break.
- i. Coin Toss
When all the above methods fail to resolve the tie, a coin toss may be used to determine which team wins the tie break.

4. Matching Teams

- a. In outrounds, pairings shall be established in accordance with each team's preliminary ranking. The highest ranking team shall meet the lowest ranking team, the second highest shall meet the second lowest, etc.
- b. Brackets shall be established based on the number of teams advancing in outrounds. Teams shall debate through their brackets until they are eliminated or advance to the final round. The brackets form for tabbing outrounds is available on the NCFCA web site.
- c. If the two teams have faced each other once in the preliminary rounds, the teams shall switch sides for outround competition.
- d. If the two teams have faced each other twice in the preliminary rounds, or have never met, a coin toss shall determine which side each team shall take.

E. Tournament Director Authority

The Tournament Director is responsible to ensure that the tournament is run in accordance with the NCFCA rules and mission. Thus, the Tournament Director shall have the following authority:

1. Tournament Directors shall adjudicate all matters of alleged ethics violations. The decision of the Tournament Director in such cases is final.
2. Tournament Directors shall make final decisions regarding appropriate tournament attire and dress code compliance.
3. Tournament Directors shall resolve problems that threaten either the integrity or operation of the tournament, including disqualifying teams and ejecting disruptive parties from the tournament site.
4. In cases where participants or observers related to participants (i.e., family members, coaches, close friends, etc.) attempt to influence the judge before, during or after the round, the tournament director may impose any or all of the following penalties:
 - a. loss of the round,
 - b. reduction of team speaker points for that round by up to 50%, or
 - c. for serious offenses, disqualification of the team from the tournament.

III. SCORING

A. Win/Loss Record

After every debate round, the judge shall cast the ballot for either the affirmative or negative team. In special – though rare – cases, the judge may choose to give both teams a loss for the round (see VI-C).

B. Speaker Points

1. Persuasiveness
2. Organization
3. Delivery
4. Evidence (Team Policy), Support (LD Value)
5. Cross-Examination
6. Refutation

Each area shall be scored on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being excellent and 1 being poor, for a total of 30 possible speaker points per debater. The judge is free to give higher speaker points to the members of the losing team.

C. Speaker Rank

In each debate round, the judge shall rank the speakers, assigning the best speaker a rank of “1,” the second best speaker a rank of “2,” the third best speaker a rank of “3,” and the fourth best speaker a rank of “4.” No ties in speaker rank are permitted, and ranks must be consistent with speaker points (i.e., the speaker with the highest point total shall be ranked “1”).

IV. JUDGING

A. Judging Pools

Judging pools may consist of directors of debate, subject experts in the area of the resolution, current or former members of collegiate or high school debate teams, and/or lay judges. Judges must be completely unrelated to the competitors they are assigned to judge.

B. Judge Eligibility

A judge must be at least 18 years old before January 1, 2004 and not competing in any event in the league during the current season.

C. Double Loss Option

Judges have the option of giving a double loss in a round in which neither team argues in a manner consistent with the standards outlined in these rules.

D. Mid-Round Decisions

Judges may stop the round and render an immediate decision against any team whose actions demean other participants in a round or subvert the possibility of meaningful clash through:

1. incomprehensible or non-communicative style,
2. behavior that is rude, abusive, or hostile to other participants in the round (parents, participants, judges, etc.)

E. Decisions

All decisions of the judges are final.

V. ARGUMENT CONTENT AND STYLE

A. General Argumentation and Reasoning

Arguments should be supported with what a general listener would consider “good reasons.”

1. Argumentation: Analysis, explanation, and appeals to common sense are considered appropriate argumentative strategy.
2. Evidence: Use of evidence adds validity to the advocate’s arguments. Debaters should be prepared to provide the full citation of sources, source qualifications, and publication dates to enable clash over evidence quality. In cases where false evidence is presented, the judge shall give a loss and immediately report the instance to the tournament director.
3. Tag Teaming: A debater should rely upon his or her own reasoning while speaking in the round. Communicating with his or her partner during a debater’s speaking time in any way (i.e., “tag teaming”) is not allowed. Judges should deduct speaker points or give losses to teams that engage in tag teaming.

B. In and Out Speaking

“In and Out Speaking” – partners switching order in the middle of the round – is not allowed. The 1AC speaker shall deliver the 1AR; the 2AC and the 2AR; the 1NC the 1NR; and the 2NC the 2NR.

C. Delivery

Eloquence invigorates content. Delivery should be civil and comprehensible.

D. Conduct

With respect to general behavioral constraints, participants, coaches, and parents are reminded that debate is a formal event done for the glory of the Lord. Conduct should reflect respect for our Lord Jesus Christ, other participants, the debate activity, and the mission statement.

VI. AWARDS

A. Determining Speaker Awards

High-low speaker points shall be used to determine individual speaker ranking. This is calculated by omitting the rounds with the highest and lowest speaker points, and then totaling the scores from the remaining four rounds. The highest adjusted speaker point totals receive the highest awards.

B. Breaking Speaker Point Ties

If the high-low speaker points calculation results in ties between one or more speakers, the following methods shall be used, in the order listed, to determine which speaker ranks higher:

1. Total Speaker Points
Total the speaker points from all six rounds.
2. Double High-Low Speaker Points
Omit the rounds with the two highest and two lowest scores, totaling the scores from the remaining two rounds.
3. Speaker Rank
Total individual speaker ranks from all six rounds. The speaker with the lowest total ranks higher.
4. High-Low Speaker Rank
Omit the highest and lowest speaker rank of each speaker and total the remaining four rounds. The lowest speaker total ranks higher.
5. Head-to-Head
If two speakers met in the preliminary rounds, the speaker with the higher ranking in that round shall receive the higher speaker award.

C. Qualifying Tournament Awards

1. Team Awards
Awards shall be given to all teams who advance to outrounds. Awards shall be decided as described within these tournament rules.
2. Individual Speaker Awards

The minimum number of individual speaker awards shall be determined by the number of teams advancing to outrounds, e.g., if the tournament goes to quarterfinals, the top eight speakers shall be awarded; if semifinals, the top four speakers, etc.

3. **Type of Awards**

The Sponsoring Organization shall determine the type of awards given in the tournament. Trophies, plaques, gavels, medals, certificates and monetary awards may be used.

VII. PREVIOUSLY QUALIFIED TEAMS (PQTs)

A. PQT Participation

Teams that have already qualified for Nationals shall be allowed to compete in and win at subsequent Qualifying Tournaments. In this case, the number of newly qualified teams shall remain the same, but shall be selected from those who have finished highest in the outrounds but have not previously qualified. For example, in a tournament with 15 teams, if the first and second place finishers have already qualified, the third and fourth place finishers may participate in the National Tournament. Previously qualified teams may be given options between advancing into tournament outrounds or competing in a separate track hosted for PQTs.

B. Runner-Up Teams

If a team that has qualified is not able to participate in the National Tournament, the Tournament Director may petition to send the runner-up. All petitions must be submitted to NCFCA before May 4, 2004.

VIII. TEAMS QUALIFIED IN BOTH TEAM POLICY AND LD VALUE DEBATE

A debater may qualify for the National Tournament in both LD and Team Policy Debate. However, at the tournament in which he or she qualifies for the second event, he or she must notify the Tournament Director of the event in which he or she will compete at the National Tournament. The Tournament Director shall notify NCFCA accordingly, and the decision may not subsequently be changed.

IX. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

NCFCA is committed to Biblical conflict resolution and the Peacemakers Pledge (www.HisPeace.org). All disputes related to NCFCA Qualifying Tournaments or the National Tournament shall be resolved in accordance with the principles and guidelines established by the Institute for Christian Conciliation.