

HONG KONG DEBATE TOURNAMENT

2023 TOURNAMENT AND DEBATE

RULES

Part One - The Status of These Rules

1.1 The Status of These Rules

These rules govern The Hong Kong Debate Tournament

1.2 Conflict

In the event of any conflict, decision(s) undertaken by appointed members of host shall be final.

Part Two - Eligibility of Participant

2.1 Teams

A team shall have at least 3 and no more than 4 members.

2.2 Age

A member of a team must:

- (a) have reached their 11th birthday by the first day of January of the current calendar year of the tournament, and
- (b) not have reached their 19th birthday by the first day of January of the current calendar year of the tournament.

2.3 Education Status

- (a) A member of a team must have been attending classes as a full-time student at a secondary school within three months of the first day of the tournament.
- (b) A member of a team must not be enrolled at a tertiary or post-secondary school institution where their first term of study begins on or before the first day of debates at the tournament.

2.4 Team Classification

- (c) A team will be classified as a Junior team if all members of the team are currently studying in secondary 3 / year 9 / grade 8 or below.

2.5 Option to Send Judges

- (a) Each team that competes in the tournament may send at most one judge who meets the qualifications outlined in rule 7.1 to adjudicate at the tournament.

- (b) Institutions sending teams may send judges at most equal to the number of teams that would be registered as a delegation representing the institution.
- (c) Registration fee adjustments may be provisioned to delegations that do send judge(s).

2.6 Option to Send Coaches

Each team that competes in the tournament may be accompanied by one coach.

2.7 Capacity of Tournament

Should the number of teams registered exceed the maximum capacity of the tournament, the following criteria will be taken into consideration when accepting registration of potential teams:

- (a) Date of registration entry;
- (b) Date of registration confirmation with payment;
- (c) Number of teams already representing the same institution(s);
- (d) Judges that would accompany the registered team.

Part Three - Format of Debates

3.1 Teams in a Debate

- (a) In a debate there are two teams.
- (b) One team proposes the motion for debate, the other team opposes it.

3.2 Speakers in a Team

- (a) In a team in a debate, there are three speakers.
- (b) Before a debate begins, each team must inform the adjudicator(s)/chairperson of the names of their three speakers and the order they will be speaking in.
- (c) The only persons who may speak in a debate are the three speakers for each team announced by the adjudicator(s)/chairperson at the start of that debate.
- (d) Each speaker speaks only once.
- (e) After each speaker has spoken, the first or second speaker of each team gives a reply speech, with the opposition reply going first and the proposition reply second.

3.3 Substitute Speeches

- (a) During a debate, if a speaker declares that they are unable to make their speech, another speaker from that team who was announced by the adjudicator(s)/chairperson as speaking in that debate may give a speech in substitution.
- (b) If a substitute speech is given in accordance with this rule, adjudicator(s) shall award

that speech the lowest possible score within the Marking Standard in the Judging Schedule, regardless of the quality of the speech.

- (c) The marks for a substitute speech shall not be used in the calculation for any individual speaker rankings or awards.
- (d) However, paragraphs (b) and (c) do not apply if a substitute reply speech is given by the first or second speaker of the team, and adjudicator(s) shall award that speech the appropriate score in accordance with the Judging Schedule.

3.4 Timing of Speeches

- (a) The speaking time for substantive speeches is 5 minutes, and for reply speeches 3 minutes.
- (b) The adjudicator(s)/ chairperson shall provide time signals for each speech.
- (c) In addition to the time signals provided by the adjudicator(s)/ chairperson, team members may give time signals to a speaker provided that the signals are discreet and unobtrusive.

3.5 Communication

During a debate, speakers may not communicate with their team members who are not speaking in that debate, or any person in the audience, except to receive time signals in accordance with rule 3.4

Part Four - The Draw

4.1 12 or less Teams

If the total number of teams at a tournament is more than 8 but less than 12, each team shall debate 4 other teams in the preliminary rounds in a draw conducted before the tournament using a system designed to achieve approximately equal and fair sets of opponents for all teams.

4.2 14 or More Teams

- (a) If the total number of teams at a Championship is 14 or more, the draw for preliminary rounds 1 and 2 only shall be determined before the start of the tournament and the draw for preliminary rounds 3 to 4 shall be created during the Championship using a power-pairing system.
- (b) Preliminary rounds 1 and 2 shall be prepared debates and preliminary rounds 3 to 4 shall be 2 impromptu debates.

4.3 Releasing and Amending the Preliminary Rounds Draw

- (a) At most 2 weeks before the first day of debates at the tournament, the host shall send the participating teams the full preliminary rounds draw if the number of teams is less than 12, or the draw for preliminary rounds 1 and 2 if the number of teams is 14 or more.

- (b) Once the draw has been released as required by 6.4 (a), amendments can only be made if:
- (i) In the judgement of the host, the amendments will not significantly affect the fairness and balance of the draw, and
- (c) In the event that a team withdraws from a tournament involving less than 12 teams and a new draw is not made, all teams who would have debated against the team which has withdrawn will either,
- (i) face a swing team arranged by the host; or
 - (ii) taken to have won the debate by forfeit.

Part Five - The Break

5.1 The Main Break

- (a) At the end of the preliminary rounds, teams shall be ranked according to the number of wins. All teams would be first considered for the Main Break, inclusive of teams who would be classified as Junior teams as well.
- (b) If teams are tied on the same number of wins, they shall be separated where practicable by the following priority:
- (i) number of adjudications in favour of the team, then:
 - (ii) average judges' scores for the team.

5.2 Main Break Rounds - 12 Teams or Less

If the total number of teams in the Championship is 12 or less, the top 4 teams ranked shall debate in semifinals as follows:

Semifinal A - Team 1 against Team 4
Semifinal B - Team 2 against Team 3

5.3 Main Break Rounds - 13 to 24 Teams

- (a) If the total number of teams in the Championship is more than 12 but 24 or less, the top 8 teams shall debate in quarterfinals as follows:

Quarterfinal A - Team 1 against Team 8
Quarterfinal B - Team 2 against Team 7
Quarterfinal C - Team 3 against Team 6
Quarterfinal D - Team 4 against Team 5

- (b) The winning teams in the quarterfinals shall debate in semifinals as follows:

Semifinal A - Winner Quarterfinal A against Winner Quarterfinal D
Semifinal B - Winner Quarterfinal B against Winner Quarterfinal C

5.4 Junior Break Rounds – 6 Junior Teams or more

If the total number of junior teams that do not qualify for the main break is 6 or more, the top 4 teams shall debate in semifinals as follows:

Semifinal A - Team 1 against Team 4

Semifinal B - Team 2 against Team 3

Winners of Semifinal A and Semifinal B will proceed to the Junior Final.

5.5 Junior Break Rounds - 5 Teams or less

If the total number of junior teams that do not qualify for the main break is 5 or less, the top 2 teams ranked shall debate in a Junior Final.

5.6 Break Rounds - Type of Debate

5.6.1 All Quarterfinal and Semifinal debates shall be Impromptu Debates.

5.6.2 The team to propose the motion in each debate in the break rounds shall be determined by the toss of a coin between those teams at the start of the preparation period for the debate.

5.7 The Grand Final

(a) The winners of the Semifinals shall debate in the Grand Final.

(b) The team to propose the motion in the Grand Final shall be determined by the toss of a coin between those teams at the end of the second Semifinal.

5.8 Final Rankings

(a) At the end of the Tournament, teams' final rankings shall be determined as follows:

(i) The champions and runners-up shall be ranked 1 and 2 respectively;

(ii) All other teams shall be ranked according to the round of the Championship the team reached and, where equal, their preliminary round ranking (in accordance with 7.1).

Part Six - Impromptu Debates

6.1 Impromptu Debates

This part of the rule applies to any impromptu debates held during the preliminary rounds, and to the Impromptu Debates in the break rounds.

6.2 Preliminary Rounds

Half of the debates for each team in the preliminary rounds may be Impromptu Debates.

6.3 Preparation Time and Procedure

(a) The preparation time for each team in an Impromptu Debate is thirty minutes

commencing immediately after the motion is read out.

- (b) If there is a substantial walking distance between venues, the Chief Adjudicator(s) may use their discretion to award up to a maximum of ten additional minutes to the preparation time of the teams affected.
- (c) The preparation room and conditions for each team in an Impromptu Debate shall be as similar as possible.

6.4 Participation in Preparation

Only the members of the team may take part in the preparation of an Impromptu Debate.

6.5 Materials

Teams may not bring any handwritten, printed or published materials with them into their preparation room for Impromptu Debates, with the exception of an English Language dictionary, a bilingual dictionary, and a single-volume encyclopedia or almanac per team.

6.6 Communication

A person taking part in the preparation of an Impromptu Debate may not take into the preparation room a telephone, computer or any other device capable of communicating or accessing information outside the preparation room.

6.7 Motion Clarifications

- (a) If a team is uncertain about the wording of an impromptu motion, they may ask for clarification within the first 15 minutes of their preparation time only.
- (b) If one team in a debate has requested clarification on a motion, their opponents must also be provided with the same clarification. There is no requirement to share this clarification with every team in the round.

Part Seven - Judges

7.1 Eligibility to Judge

- (a) To be eligible to judge at a tournament, a person must be -
 - (i) experienced at judging the highest level of senior school or university debates and have judged such debates regularly during the two years prior to the Tournament, and
 - (ii) nominated by a participating team
- (b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), the host may accept a person to be a judge at a tournament who does not meet the requirements of paragraph (a) if -
 - (i) that person has judged at a previous tournament, or

- (ii) in the opinion of the the host, the person is sufficiently experienced and competent to be a judge.

7.2 Number of Judges

All debates shall be judged by an odd-numbered panel of at least one judges.

7.3 Affiliation and association

- (a) A judge shall not judge the team they are nominated by.
- (b) A judge shall not judge a team where to do so would lead a reasonable person to believe that the judge could not judge the team impartially.

7.4 Judging the Same Team

A judge may judge the same team more than once, provided that the judge does not judge that team a disproportionate number of times.

7.5 Winning a Debate

- (a) A debate is won by the team which has the majority of the votes of the judges.
- (b) The cumulative judges' scores or cumulative winning margins are not used to determine which team wins the debate, though they may be used to rank teams for the purposes of the Break Rounds and the final awards.

7.6 The Judging Schedule

- (a) The marking standard, rules of debate, and principles of judging, are set out in Schedule 1 (The Judging Schedule).
- (b) The Tournament Committee may authorise instructional material and guidelines for judges ("Authorised Material"), consistent with the Judging Schedule and the Rules.
- (c) The Chief Adjudicator(s) shall ensure that judges are familiar with the Judging Schedule and any Authorised Material.
- (d) All judges shall judge in accordance with the Judging Schedule and any Authorised Material.

7.7 Allocation of Judges

- (a) The Chief Adjudicator(s) shall allocate judges to debates in accordance with the Rules.
- (b) Judges for all Championship debates, including the Grand Final, are to be selected for their ability to judge, not because they hold any particular office or occupation.

Part Eight - Assessment of Judges

8.1 Assessment of Judges

- (a) At any time before or during a tournament, the host may assess a judge to determine that judge's
 - (i) competence to judge, or
 - (ii) understanding of the Rules, the Judging Schedule, or any Authorised Material.
- (b) In undertaking an assessment under paragraph (a), the host shall consider -
 - (i) whether the judge has been able or unable to give sufficient reasons for awarding the debate to one team as against another,
 - (ii) whether the judge has misdirected himself or herself as to some or more of the rules of debate to a significant extent.
 - (iii) whether the judge has made remarks to a team or other participant at the tournament in a way that casts significant doubt as to the judge's competence or impartiality,
 - (iv) any other matter the host considers relevant.
- (c) In undertaking an assessment provided for in paragraph (a) the Chief adjudicator(s) shall -
 - (i) inform himself or herself of evidence and facts as he or she deems fit, and
 - (ii) consult with the Chief Adjudicator's Panel.
- (d) The Chief Adjudicator(s) may, at any time, as a result of an assessment in accordance with paragraph (a), decide that that judge should not
 - (i) judge any debates, or
 - (ii) judge any further debates without a further assessment,
 if the Chief Adjudicator(s) is satisfied that there is sufficient doubt about that judge's ability to judge competently or impartially.
- (a) Before deciding whether a judge should not judge a further debate or debates, the Chief Adjudicator(s) in conjunction with the Chief Adjudicator's panel shall determine whether the matter could be more appropriately resolved by counselling or other appropriate procedure.
- (b) Notwithstanding any assessment made under this rule, no result of any debate shall be overturned.

8.2 Complaints about Judges

- (a) A complaint about a judge may be made to the host, in accordance with this rule, about the competence or impartiality of a judge to judge a debate.
- (b) A complaint shall be in writing.
- (c) A complaint shall be made within 24 hours of the end of the debate out of which the complaint arises.

8.3 Investigation and Determination of a Complaint

Upon receipt of a complaint made, the host Adjudicator(s) investigate and determine by dismissing or upholding the complaint.

8.4 Notification of Outcome

- (a) the host shall notify in writing OR in person
 - (i) the person who made the complaint, and
 - (ii) the judge the subject of the complaint, of the outcome of the complaint.

8.5 Result of a Debate

Notwithstanding the outcome of a complaint, the result of a debate shall not be overturned.

Part Nine - The Code of Conduct

9.1 The Code of Conduct

The Code of Conduct is set out in Schedule 3.

9.2 Abiding by the Code of Conduct

- a) Each participant at a tournament shall abide by the Code of Conduct.
- b) By attending a tournament, each participant agrees to Schedule 3 and shall abide by the Code of Conduct.

SCHEDULE 1

The Judging Schedule

A. Marking Standard

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1 Style is the way speakers speak.

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

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

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

4.1 Strategy covers two concepts:

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

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

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

B. Definitions and Cases

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

case is flawed (as in 5.5.1).

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.2 The Proposition may define the topic in any way provided that the definition –

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

6.2.2 allows the opposition team reasonable room to debate,

6.2.3 is not tautological or truistic, and

6.2.4 is otherwise a reasonable definition.

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

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

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

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

7.1 The role of the first speaker of the opposition side is to challenge the definition, if necessary, present an alternative definition if the definition is challenged, respond to the Proposition's case, outline the Opposition's case, announce the case division, and present his or her part of the Opposition's case.

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

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

7.4 In responding to the Proposition's case, the opposition team may produce a positive choice

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12.2 The Opposition team must prove more than a reasonable doubt about the proposition's case.

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

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

C. Points of Information

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. The Judging

17.1 Judges should mark independently and sit apart from one another during the debate during the debate so that they cannot see each other's marking sheets.

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

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

17.4 The adjudication should be short and should explain the result to the audience. In particular, it

should set out the key reasons why the winning team won, and comment on significant matters of debate style or technique that were displayed in the debate.

17.5 The adjudication should be constructive, not negative.

E. Marking Standard

Substantive Speeches (*out of 100*)

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

Reply Speeches (*out of 50*)

STANDARD	OVERALL (/50)	STYLE (/20)	CONTENT (/20)	STRATEGY (/10)
Exceptional	40	16	16	8
Very Good to Excellent	36-39	15	15	7.5
Good	35	14	14	7
Pass to Satisfactory	31-34	13	13	6.5
Improvement Needed	30	12	12	6

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

SCHEDULE 2

CODE OF CONDUCT

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Code of Conduct

The the host Debate Tournament brings together participants to compete in a short, intensive debating event. In this environment, it is very important that all the participants have a common understanding of the standards of behaviour expected of them to maintain a safe and enjoyable event for everyone involved. The purpose of this Code of Conduct is thus to help maintain a pleasant, safe and healthy environment for all participants in each Championship.

1.2 To whom does the Code of Conduct apply?

This Code of Conduct shall apply to the participants in the tournament.

The Code of Conduct

2. What is expected of participants?

2.1 What participants must do

During the tournament, all participants must behave in a respectful and courteous manner towards other participants in the event, guests and sponsors of the tournament, and members of the public attending events (this applies to both direct interactions and interactions through electronic communications/social media).

2.2 What participants must not do

During the tournament, participants must not:

- (a) make insulting comments, jokes, insults, or insinuations about another person's culture, race, religion, gender or sexual orientation or which may be construed as being derogatory or as harassment, whether in the presence of that person or in any other forum in which the person may not be present.
- (b) harass another individual
- (c) engage in any form of violence or threats of violence

2.3 Behaviour at debates

- (a) Participants in the tournament must not confront adjudicators in an aggressive manner after a debate.

(b) Feedback between teams and adjudicators must be given and received in a constructive and non-confrontational manner.

(c) Adjudicators shall be impartial when judging debates and shall declare any relationships with other participants which might make impartial adjudication come into question to the host prior to the debate.