



WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATING CHAMPIONSHIPS

TOURNAMENT COMMITTEE AND DEBATE RULES

Part One - The Status of These Rules

1.1 The Status of These Rules

These rules govern -

- (a) any debating tournament organised by the World Schools Debating Championships Limited,
- (b) the procedures of the Tournament Committee of the World Schools Debating Championships Limited.

1.2 Conflict

In the event of any conflict with the Byelaws of the World Schools Debating Championships Limited, the Byelaws prevail.

1.3 Amendments to the Rules

- (a) Motions to amend the Tournament Committee and Debate Rules must either be proposed by the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors, or proposed and seconded by two member nations.
- (b) If the amendment is proposed and seconded by two member nations, the proposing nation must inform the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors at least 14 days before the first day of debates at the Championship.
- (c) The WSDC Ltd Board of Directors must inform the members of the Tournament Committee of a motion to amend the rules at least 10 days prior to the first day of debates at the Championship.
- (d) A proposal to amend the rules that does not comply with 2.1 (a), (b) or (c) cannot be considered at a Tournament Committee meeting unless a two-thirds majority of those present vote in favour of the proposal being discussed and considered.

Part Two - The World Schools Debating Championships

2.1 The World Schools Debating Championships

- (a) Every year, there shall be a debating tournament called the World Schools Debating Championships (“the Championships”).
- (b) The Championships shall be held wholly within the period 1 January to 29 February, or 1 July to 31 August.

Note: The Tournament Committee may vary the dates for a particular championship under Rule 2.6.

2.2 The Host

The organisation that will host the Championships in a year (“**the Host**”) is chosen by the Tournament Committee up to three years in advance of the Championships, in accordance with the Byelaws and these Rules.

2.3 Applications to Host

- (a) An organisation applying to host the Championships must lodge its application with the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors at least 35 days in advance of the meeting of the Tournament Committee at which the host for the Championships is to be decided.
- (b) An application to host the Championships must include the information set out in Schedule 1 (Hosting Criteria).
- (c) Provided that the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors approves the application to be considered by the Tournament Committee, the Board shall send a copy of the application to host a Championships to the Tournament Committee at least 28 days in advance of the meeting of the Tournament Committee at which the host for the Championships is to be decided.

2.4 Choosing the Host

- (a) The Tournament Committee shall choose the Host for a Championship in accordance with this rule.
- (b) The Tournament Committee must first select the Final Applicant in the following way:
 - (i) where there is only one application to host a Championship, that applicant is the Final Applicant,
 - (ii) where there are two applications, the applicant with the highest number of votes of the Committee is the Final Applicant.
 - (iii) where there are more than two applicants -
 - (A) A first round of voting shall be held involving all the applicants
 - (B) If one applicant receives more votes than all the other applicants combined

in the first round of voting, that applicant will be the Final Applicant

- (C) If no applicant receives more votes than all the other applicants combined, a second round of voting shall be held involving the two applicants which had the highest numbers of votes in the first round, with the applicant which receives the highest number of votes in the second round becoming the Final Applicant.

(c) The Tournament Committee must then approve a resolution that the Final Applicant be the Host for a Championship by a majority of members voting on that resolution.

2.5 Conducting the Championships

The Championships must be conducted in accordance with these Rules.

2.6 The Dates of a Championship

- (a) At the time the Tournament Committee chooses the Host for a Championship, the Committee must determine the dates for the Championship.
- (b) The Tournament Committee must determine the venue and dates for a Championship at least 12 months before the Championship is to take place.
- (c) The Tournament Committee may by resolution vary the dates or venue already determined for a Championship, provided that
- (i) the resolution is passed by a two thirds majority of members voting on the resolution, and
 - (ii) if the resolution is proposed less than 12 months before the Championship is due to begin, the reason for the variation is one or more of the following:
 - A. a genuine emergency or disaster,
 - B. a failure by the Host to abide by the Charter,
 - C. a lack of preparedness of the Host.

Part Three - National Representation

3.1 Meaning of "Nation"

- (a) For the purposes of these Rules, every Participant represents or is attached to a Nation.
- (b) In these Rules, "Nation" means either -
- (i) a member state of the United Nations, or
 - (ii) a territory recognised as a Nation under this Rule.

- (c) A territory may be recognised as a Nation under these Rules if it is eligible to enter competitions organised by at least two major international bodies that oversee competitions between national teams, e.g. Fédération Internationale de Football Association (and its subsidiaries), International Olympic Committee (and its subsidiaries), Commonwealth Games Federation, International Rugby Board.
- (d) If a territory applies for recognition as a Nation based on eligibility within a body or bodies not listed above, the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors shall determine the applicability of said international bodies for this purpose.
- (e) A territory may be recognised as a Nation under these Rules if the Tournament Committee, by resolution passed by a two-thirds majority of members voting on the resolution, agrees to recognise the territory as a Nation.
- (f) Two or more territories may be recognised as a single Nation under these rules if the Tournament Committee, by resolution passed by a two-thirds majority of members voting on the resolution, agrees to recognise the territories as a single Nation.

3.2 Change of National Status

- (a) If, immediately before a Championship begins, the national status of a territory changes, a debating organisation representing that territory may apply to be recognised as a Nation.
- (b) If that territory's status is not recognised by Rule 3.1(b) or (c), the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors may recognise the territory as a Nation for the purposes of that one Championship only.
- (c) In deciding whether to recognise the territory as a Nation under sub-rule (b), the Executive must consider the organisational needs of the territory and the Host.
- (d) Notwithstanding sub-rule (b), the Tournament Committee may decide that the territory is not a Nation for future Championships, but may not disqualify the territory from participating in the Championship approved by the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors.

3.3 National Representation

- (a) A Nation may be represented by only one team at a Championships.
- (b) In the event of more than one application from one Nation being submitted, the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors shall use the following procedures to determine which team may represent the Nation:
 - (i) The WSDC Ltd Board of Directors shall contact the applicants and inform them of the situation and encourage them to reach a conclusion internally.
 - (ii) In case the applicants have not reached an agreement, the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors shall provide each competing organisation with a period of at least 10 days to present a formal letter outlining their right to represent the Nation.

(iii) Following this period, the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors shall decide which team represents the nation using the following criteria:

(A) the nature of the organisations' relationship to WSDC,

(B) the organisations' reach and inclusiveness of participation in debate-related activities,

(C) the organisations' ability to provide training and financial support for participating at WSDC.

(c) The Host must ensure that every team represents a Nation in accordance with these Rules.

3.4 National Identification

(a) A team representing a Nation is entitled to use the name, flag and symbols of the Nation that are recognised by all four organisations in sub-rule 3.1(c).

(b) If -

(i) the four organisations do not agree on the name, flag and symbols of a Nation, or

(ii) a team represents a Nation recognised by the Tournament Committee undersub rule 3.1(d) or the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors undersub-rule 3.2(b),

the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors must determine under what name the team may participate and the flag and symbols it may use.

(c) For the purposes of the Charter, neither a Host nor any other Participant may prevent a team from using a name, flag or symbol permitted by this Rule.

Part Four – Eligibility of Participant

4.1 Teams

A team shall have at least 3 and no more than 5 members.

4.2 Age

A member of a nation's team must:

(a) have reached their 14th birthday by the first day of debates at the Championships,
and

(b) not have reached their 20th birthday by the day of the grand final at the Championships.

4.3 Education Status

(a) A member of a nation's team must have been attending classes as a full-time

student at a secondary school in the nation within eight months of the first day of debates at the Championship.

- (b) A member of a nation's 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 Championship.
- (c) For the purposes of this rule,
 - (i) Students completing an extra year of schooling beyond normal requirements at an institution that is plainly a secondary school only, but which gives no tertiary credits, are eligible providing they meet the age criteria,
 - (ii) Students completing an extra year of schooling beyond normal requirements at an institution that is plainly a secondary school only, but who may be given credits at some subsequent tertiary institution, are eligible providing they meet the age criteria,
 - (iii) Students completing at least one year or more, at an institution that spans both secondary and tertiary levels, but who may be given credits at the tertiary level, are eligible providing they meet the age criteria and are not clearly completing the first year at a tertiary level,
 - (iv) Students completing at least one year or more, at an institution that gives credits at the tertiary levels for entry into another tertiary institution at the third year or above, are ineligible even if they meet the age criteria.
 - (v) A student who is home-schooled is eligible to be a member of a team representing the nation in which the student lives provided that they are studying at below tertiary level and provided they meet the age criteria in 4.2.

4.4 Team Coach

- (a) Every team must be accompanied by a team coach.
- (b) A team coach must have reached their 19th birthday by the first day of debates at the Championship.

4.5 Team Manager

- (a) Every team must be accompanied by a team manager.
- (b) A team manager must be a coach, adjudicator or registered observer.
- (c) A team manager must -
 - (i) have reached their 19th birthday, and
 - (ii) have reached the age of majority in both the host nation and the nation the team represents,by the first day of debates at the Championship.

- (d) A team manager is responsible for taking all reasonable steps to –
 - (i) look after the welfare of the members of the team,
 - (ii) ensure the members of the team comply with the Code of Conduct, and
 - (iii) ensure all members of the team are eligible to take part in the Championship subject to the requirements in Part Four - Eligibility of Participant.

4.6 Requirement to Send Judges

- (a) Each nation which sends a team to compete in the Championship shall be required to either:
 - (i) send at least one judge who meets the qualifications outlined in rule 11.1 to adjudicate at the Championship as part of their nation's delegation, or
 - (ii) pay the Host a fee (in addition to the registration fees for the delegates from the nation who attend the Championship) equivalent to the registration fee for one judge at the Championship even though the nation has not sent any judges.
- (b) The Host shall have the right to allow an exemption to the requirements of 4.6 (a) if the Host is satisfied that special circumstances mean that these requirements are unreasonable for a particular nation.
- (c) A nation shall automatically be exempted from the requirements of 4.6 (a) if the nation meets one of the following criteria:
 - (i) the nation has not sent a team to compete in any of the previous ten Championships, or
 - (ii) the nation has sent a team to compete in only one of the previous ten Championships.

Part Five - Format of Debates

5.1 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.

5.2 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 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 chairperson at the start of that debate.

(d) Each speaker speaks only once.

(e) After each speaker has spoken, the first or second speaker for each team gives a reply speech, with the opposition reply going first and the proposition reply second.

5.3 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 chairperson as speaking in that debate may give a speech in substitution.

(b) If a substitute speech is given in accordance with this rule, judges shall score that speech as they would any other speech in the round.

(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 judges shall award that speech the appropriate score in accordance with the Judging Schedule.

5.4 Timing of Speeches

(a) The speaking time for substantive speeches is 8 minutes, and for reply speeches 4 minutes.

(b) The Host shall provide time signals for each speech.

(c) In addition to the time signals provided by the host, team members or the team coach may give time signals to a speaker provided that the signals are discreet and unobtrusive.

5.5 Communication

During a debate speakers may not communicate with their coach, other team members who are not speaking in that debate, or any person in the audience, except to receive time signals in accordance with rule 5.4

Part Six - The Draw

6.1 Ten or Fewer Teams

If the total number of teams at the Championships is 10 or less, every team shall debate every other team in the preliminary rounds.

6.2 11-23 Teams

If the total number of teams at a Championship is more than 10 but less than 24, each team shall debate 8 other teams in the preliminary rounds in a draw conducted before the Championship using a system designed to achieve approximately equal and fair sets of

opponents for all teams.

6.3 24 or More Teams

- (a) If the total number of teams at a Championship is 24 or more, the draw for preliminary rounds 1 and 2 only shall be determined before the start of the Championship and the draw for preliminary rounds 3 to 8 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 8 shall include 2 prepared debates and 4 impromptu debates.
- (c) For preliminary rounds 3 to 8, the Host shall decide which rounds will be prepared rounds and which rounds will be impromptu rounds and shall make this decision in consultation with the Chief Adjudicators.
- (d) The procedures for determining the draw for each preliminary round shall be in accordance with the procedures set out in the document 'Procedures for Power-Pairing at the World Schools Debating Championships', and these procedures shall be implemented by the Chief Adjudicators with the assistance of Chief Adjudicators Panel and the appointed Tab Master(s).
- (e) The document 'Procedures for Power-Pairing at the World Schools Debating Championships' is an official guideline document which may only be amended by a vote of the Tournament Committee, either during a Championship (with the amendments taking effect at the following year's Championship) or in an online ballot between Championships organised by the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors, with more than 50 percent of the Tournament Committee delegates who cast ballots (excluding abstentions) being required to vote in favour for the proposed amendment to be passed.

6.4 Releasing and Amending the Preliminary Rounds Draw

- (a) At least 2 weeks before the first day of debates at the Championship, the Host shall send the participating teams the full preliminary rounds draw if the number teams is less than 24, or the draw for preliminary rounds 1 and 2 if the number of teams is 24 or more.
- (b) The process of completing the draw for preliminary rounds shall be filmed and broadcast live by the Host.
- (c) Once the draw has been released as required by 6.4 (a), amendments can only be made if:
 - (i) In the judgement of the Chief Adjudicators, the amendments will not significantly affect the fairness and balance of the draw, and
 - (ii) all teams affected agree to the new draw.
- (d) In the event that a team withdraws from a tournament involving less than 24 teams and a new draw is not made, all teams who would have debated against the team

which has withdrawn are taken to have won the debate by forfeit if they win at least a majority of their other debates but are otherwise taken to have lost the debate by forfeit, and shall be awarded judges' ballots for that debate according to the following formula:

- (i) if the average number of judges in the team's favour in its other debates is higher than 2.5, it receives 3 judge's ballots for that debate;
- (ii) if the average number of judges in the team's favour in its other debates is higher than 1.5 but less than or equal to 2.5, it receives 2 judge's ballots for that debate;
- (iii) if the average number of judges in the team's favour in its other debates is higher than 0.5 but less than or equal to 1.5, it receives 1 judge's ballot for that debate;
- (iv) if the average number of judges in the team's favour in its other debates is less than or equal to 0.5, it receives no judge's ballots for that debate.

(e) In the event that a team withdraws from a tournament involving more than 24 teams, the procedures followed shall be those outlined in the document 'Procedures for Power-Pairing at the World Schools Debating Championships'.

6.5 Responsibility for the Draw

(a) The draw for the preliminary rounds shall be made by the Chief Adjudicator in consultation with the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors and the Host.

Part Seven - The Break

7.1 The Break

- (a) At the end of the preliminary rounds, teams shall be ranked according to the number of wins.
- (b) If teams are tied on the same number of wins, they shall be separated where practicable by elimination debates and otherwise on the following priority:
 - (i) number of adjudications in favour of the team, then:
 - (ii) average judges' scores for the team.
- (c) A team shall be ineligible to break if a substitution speech is delivered more than once during the preliminary rounds.

7.2 Break Rounds - 12 Teams or Less

If the total number of teams in the Championship is 12 or less, the top 4 teams ranked according to rule 7.1 shall debate in semifinals as follows:

Semifinal A - Team 1 against Team 4

Semifinal B - Team 2 against Team 3

7.3 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 ranked according to rule 7.1 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

7.4 Break Rounds - More Than 24 Teams

(a) If the total number of teams in the Championship is more than 24 but less than 48, the top 16 teams ranked according to rule 7.1 shall debate in Octofinals as follows:

Octofinal A - Team 1 against Team 16

Octofinal B - Team 2 against Team 15

Octofinal C - Team 3 against Team 14

Octofinal D - Team 4 against Team 13

Octofinal E - Team 5 against Team 12

Octofinal F - Team 6 against Team 11

Octofinal G - Team 7 against Team 10

Octofinal H - Team 8 against Team 9

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

Quarterfinal A - Winner Octofinal A against Winner Octofinal H

Quarterfinal B - Winner Octofinal B against Winner Octofinal G

Quarterfinal C - Winner Octofinal C against Winner Octofinal F

Quarterfinal D - Winner Octofinal D against Winner Octofinal E

(c) 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

7.5 Break Rounds - More Than 47 Teams

- (a) If the total number of teams in the draw at the beginning of the tournament is more than 47, the number of teams which qualify for the knock-out rounds shall be as follows:
- (i) If 24 or fewer teams win 5 or more preliminary round debates, 24 teams shall qualify for the knock-out rounds,
 - (ii) If more than 24 but less than 32 teams win 5 or more preliminary round debates, the number of teams which qualify for the knock-out rounds shall be the number of teams which won 5 or more preliminary round debates or half the number of teams competing in the preliminary rounds (rounded down to the nearest whole number), whichever is the smaller number of teams,
 - (iii) If 32 or more teams win 5 or more preliminary round debates, the number of teams which qualify for the knock-out rounds shall be 32 teams or half the number of teams competing in the preliminary rounds (rounded down to the nearest whole number), whichever is the smaller number of teams.
- (b) The number of teams participating in the Partial Double Octofinal round and the number teams proceeding directly to the Octofinal round shall be determined using the following formula:

Teams qualifying for the knock-out rounds	Teams proceeding directly to the Octofinals	Team participating in the Partial Double Octofinals
24	8	16
25	7	18
26	6	20
27	5	22
28	4	24

29	3	26
30	2	28
31	1	30
32	0	32

(c) Based on teams' rankings in the preliminary rounds according to rule 7.1, the draw for the Partial Double Octofinal round shall be as follows except where the team has no opponent which has qualified for the Partial Double Octofinal round in which case the team shall automatically proceed to the Octofinals:

- Partial Double Octofinal debate A - Team 16 v Team 17
- Partial Double Octofinal debate B - Team 15 v Team 18
- Partial Double Octofinal debate C - Team 14 v Team 19
- Partial Double Octofinal debate D - Team 13 v Team 20
- Partial Double Octofinal debate E - Team 12 v Team 21
- Partial Double Octofinal debate F - Team 11 v Team 22
- Partial Double Octofinal debate G - Team 10 v Team 23
- Partial Double Octofinal debate H - Team 9 v Team 24
- Partial Double Octofinal debate I - Team 8 v Team 25
- Partial Double Octofinal debate J - Team 7 v Team 26
- Partial Double Octofinal debate K - Team 6 v Team 27
- Partial Double Octofinal debate L - Team 5 v Team 28
- Partial Double Octofinal debate M - Team 4 v Team 29
- Partial Double Octofinal debate N - Team 3 v Team 30
- Partial Double Octofinal debate O - Team 2 v Team 31
- Partial Double Octofinal debate P - Team 1 v Team 32

(d) The teams which win their Partial Double Octofinal debate (either by defeating their opponent in the round or by default) shall be drawn to face each other in the Octofinals as follows:

Octofinal A - Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate A against Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate P

Octofinal B - Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate B against Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate O

Octofinal C - Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate C against Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate N

Octofinal D - Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate D against Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate M

Octofinal E - Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate E against Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate L

Octofinal F - Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate F against Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate K

Octofinal G - Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate G against Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate J

Octofinal H - Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate H against Winner Partial Double Octofinal debate I

(e) The winning teams in the Octofinals shall debate in Quarterfinals as follows:

Quarterfinal A - Winner Octofinal A against Winner Octofinal H

Quarterfinal B - Winner Octofinal B against Winner Octofinal G

Quarterfinal C - Winner Octofinal C against Winner Octofinal F

Quarterfinal D - Winner Octofinal D against Winner Octofinal E

(f) 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

7.6 Break Rounds – 64 Teams or more

(a) If the total number of teams in the draw at the beginning of the tournament is 64 or more, the number of teams which qualify for the knock-out rounds shall be 32 teams and the double octo-finals should be organized.

- (b) Based on teams' rankings in the preliminary rounds the 1st seeded team should meet the 32nd seeded one, the 2nd seeded team the 31st, the 3rd seeded the 30th and so on.

7.7 Break Rounds - Type of Debate

- (a) All Partial Double Octofinal, Octofinal, Quarterfinal and Semifinal debates shall be Impromptu Debates.
- (b) 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.

7.8 The Grand Final

- (a) The winners of the Semifinals shall debate in the Grand Final.
- (b) The motion for the Grand Final shall be a motion announced at the same time as the motions for the preliminary rounds.
- (c) 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.

7.9 Final Rankings

- (a) At the end of the Championship, 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 Eight - Motions

8.1 The Motions Sub-Committee

There shall be a Motions Sub-Committee for a Championship.

8.2 Composition of Motions Sub-Committee

- (a) The Motions Sub-Committee consists of:
 - (i) two members nominated by the Host, and
 - (ii) five members elected by the Tournament Committee no later than five months before the first day of debates of a Championship.
- (b) The Motions Sub-Committee will also have two advisers who shall be nominated by the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors no later than three months before the first day of debates of a Championship.

- (c) When electing members and selecting advisers for the Motion Sub-Committee, the Tournament Committee and WSDC Ltd Board of Directors should aim to reflect the geographic, cultural, linguistic and gender diversity of the teams participating at the Championship.
- (d) A coach of a team at the Championship is not eligible to be a member of the Motions Sub-Committee or an adviser to the Motions Sub-Committee for that Championship.
- (e) If an elected member of the Motions Sub-Committee resigns, the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors may appoint a replacement.

8.3 Role of Motions Sub-Committee

The Motions Sub-Committee shall select all motions for debate at a Championship.

8.4 Prepared Debates

- (a) At least twelve weeks prior to the first day of debates at a Championship the Motions Sub-Committee shall forward to the two advisers a list of the motions it proposes to use for the prepared debates including the Grand Final.
- (b) The advisers shall either approve the list of proposed motions for the prepared debates, or suggest that the wording or topic areas for some or all of the motions on the list should be reconsidered.
- (c) If the advisers suggest that any motions on the list should be reconsidered, the advisers will then participate in the Motions Sub-Committee's remaining discussions in the capacity of non-voting members until the list of motions for the prepared debates is finalised.
- (d) At least 8 weeks prior to the first day of debates at a Championship, the Motions Sub-Committee shall forward to the Host the motions it has selected for the prepared debates including the Grand Final.
- (e) The Host shall assign motions to particular rounds of debates and forthwith notify all teams of prepared motions for the Championship and the debates to which those motions are assigned.

8.5 Impromptu Debates

- (a) At least four weeks prior to the first day of debates at a Championship the Motions Sub-Committee shall forward to the two advisers a list of the motions it proposes to use for the following purposes:
 - (i) motions for all the preliminary round impromptu debates,
 - (ii) motions for the Partial Double Octofinals, Octofinals, Quarterfinals and Semifinals, and
 - (iii) at least one additional motion to be used if necessary as a spare.
- (b) The advisers shall either approve the list of proposed motions for the impromptu

debates, or suggest that the wording or topic areas for some or all of the motions on the list should be reconsidered.

- (c) If the advisers suggest that any motions on the list should be reconsidered, the advisers will then participate in the Motions Sub-Committee's remaining discussions in the capacity of non-voting members until the list of motions for the impromptu debates is finalised.
- (d) At least one day before the first day of debates at a Championship, the Motions Sub Committee shall give to the Host the list of motions it has selected for impromptu debates, plus at least one additional motion to be used as a spare.
- (e) Motions selected for the impromptu preliminary rounds shall be assigned to these rounds randomly by the host.

8.6 Break Round Motions

At least one day before the first debate in the Break Rounds, the Motions Sub-Committee shall give to the Host the list of motions it has selected for the Partial Double Octofinals, Octofinals, Quarterfinals and Semifinals, plus at least one additional motion for the Break Rounds to be used as a spare.

Part Nine - Language

9.1 Language

All Championship debates shall be in English.

9.2 EFL and ESL Awards

- (a) Before the first day of debates at a Championship, the coach of a team may apply to the Chief Adjudicator(s) for -
 - (i) the team, or
 - (ii) one or more members of the team,to be considered for English as a Foreign Language ("EFL") and English as a Second Language ("ESL") Awards.
- (b) In the application, the coach must provide the following information in relation to each speaker:
 - (i) the language of the speaker's family,
 - (ii) the name of the school the speaker attends or most recently attended, and
 - (iii) the language of instruction of that school.

9.3 EFL Speaker

Members of a team shall be classified as EFL if -

- (a) they do not come from a first-language English-speaking family, and
- (b) they attend a school where English is not used as a medium of instruction (except for classes in the teaching of English).

9.4 ESL Speaker

Members of a team shall be classified as ESL if -

- (a) they do not come from a first-language English-speaking family, and
- (b) they attend a school where English is used as a medium of instruction in addition to classes in the teaching of English.

9.5 Native English Speakers

Members of a team shall be classified as Native English speakers if they come from a first language English-speaking family.

9.6 EFL Teams

Teams shall be classified as an EFL Team if -

- (a) English is not an official language of the nation they represent, and
- (b) no more than one team member does not meet the requirements of an EFL Speaker in accordance with rule 9.3.

9.7 ESL Teams

Teams shall be classified as an ESL Team if -

- (a) English is not the primary language of discourse of the nation they represent,
- (b) the team is not classified as an EFL team in accordance with rule 9.6, and
- (c) no more than one member of the team meets the requirements of a Native English speaker in accordance with rule 9.5.

9.8 Native English Teams

Teams shall be classified as Native English teams if they are neither an EFL nor an ESL team.

9.9 Determination of Speaker and Team Status

- (a) Before the end of the first day of debates at a Championship, the Chief Adjudicator(s) shall determine all applications for ESL and EFL status and publish the list of teams and speakers eligible for ESL and EFL awards.
- (b) In making the determination, the Chief Adjudicator(s) may consider the information in the application forms and any other available published information that the Chief Adjudicator(s) believes to be reliable.

9.10 Appeals

- (a) The coach of a team may appeal, on behalf of the team, against the -
- (i) inclusion of, or
 - (ii) exclusion from,
- a speaker or a team from the published list of EFL and ESL speakers and teams.
- (b) An appeal shall be in writing and given to the Chairperson of the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors no later than 48 hours after the Chief Adjudicator(s) publishes the list of EFL and ESL speakers and teams.
- (c) The Tournament Committee shall determine, in accordance with these Rules, the status of each person or team the subject of an appeal.
- (d) The Tournament Committee shall make its decision under paragraph (c) by simple majority prior to the announcement of the EFL and ESL Awards.

Part Ten - Impromptu Debates

10.1 Impromptu Debates

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

10.2 Preliminary Rounds

- (a) Half of the debates for each team in the preliminary rounds may be Impromptu Debates.
- (b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), where the Draw includes a Bye Round for teams who have a bye in other rounds, teams in the Bye Round may have up to five of their preliminary rounds as Impromptu Debates

10.3 Preparation Time and Procedure

- (a) The preparation time for each team in an Impromptu Debate is one hour 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.

10.4 Participation in Preparation

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

10.5 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 encyclopaedia or almanac per team.

10.6 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.

10.7 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 Eleven - Judges

11.1 Eligibility to Judge

(a) To be eligible to judge at a Championship, a person must be -

(i) experienced at judging the highest level of senior school or university debates in that person's nation and have judged such debates regularly during the two years prior to the Championship, and

(ii) nominated by the organisation or team representing that person's nation on the Tournament Committee.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), the Chief Adjudicator(s) may accept a person to be a judge at a Championship who does not meet the requirements of paragraph (a) if -

(i) that person has judged at a previous championship, or

(ii) in the opinion of the Chief Adjudicator(s), the person is sufficiently experienced and competent to be a judge.

11.2 Number of Judges

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

11.3 National Association

- (a) A judge shall not judge the team from their own nation.
- (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.

11.4 Judging and Coaching

- (a) A team coach may not judge at the Championship at which they are a coach.
- (b) A judge shall not assist in the coaching of a team at the Championship at which they are judging

11.5 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.

11.6 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.

11.7 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.

11.8 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.

11.9 A Judge Unable to Finish Judging a Debate

- (a) If, before a debate begins, one of the judges assigned to the adjudication panel for the debate is unable to judge, the Chief Adjudicator(s) may assign another judge to replace the judge.

(b) If -

(i) The Chief Adjudicator(s) is unable to assign another judge in the situation described in paragraph (a), or

(ii) an assigned judges for a debate has to withdraw from judging the debate after it has begun

the debate shall proceed with the remaining judges, and the result shall be determined in accordance with paragraph (c).

(c) In the situation described in paragraph (b),

(i) if the number of judges who should be on the panel is 3, -

(A) if the remaining judges vote for a team, that team is taken to win the debate unanimously,

(B) if the remaining judges are evenly split, the more senior of those judges (as determined by the Chief Adjudicator prior to the first of the remaining judges casting their ballot) shall have a casting vote to determine the winner, and that team is taken to win the debate by majority;

(ii) if the number of judges who should be on the panel is more than 3 -

(A) if the remaining judges vote for a team, that team is taken to win the debate unanimously,

(B) if the number of remaining judges voting for a team would constitute a majority of the original panel, that team is taken to have won the debate by a majority with the dissenting judges voting for the losing team,

(C) if the remaining judges are evenly split, the most senior of those judges (as determined by the Chief Adjudicator prior to the first of the remaining judges casting their ballot) shall have a casting vote to determine the winner, and that team is taken to win the debate by the narrowest possible majority.

(d) In all the situations described in paragraph (c), if it is necessary to determine the average score for a team or a speaker, that score is the average of the judges remaining on the panel.

Explanatory Examples:

1. A judge on a panel of 3 judges is unable to finish judging the debate. The remaining judges are unanimous. The winning team wins the debate unanimously 3-0, and the average score for each team and speaker is the average of the two remaining judges.

2. A judge on a panel of 3 judges is unable to finish judging the debate. The remaining judges split 1-1. The Chief Adjudicator determines that judge A is more senior before either of the remaining judges cast their ballot, and that judge has a casting vote in favour of the team that that judge decided had won the debate. The winning team wins the debate by majority

2-1, and the average score for each team and speaker is the average of the two remaining judges.

3. A judge on a panel of 5 judges is unable to finish judging the debate. The remaining judges are unanimous. The winning team wins the debate unanimously, and the average score for each team and speaker is the average of the remaining 4 judges.

4. A judge on a panel of 5 judges is unable to finish judging the debate. The remaining judges split 3-1. The winning team wins the debate 4-1, and the average score for each team and speaker is the average of the remaining 4 judges.

5. A judge on a panel of 5 judges is unable to finish judging the debate. The remaining judges split 2-2. The Chief Adjudicator determines that judge A is the most senior before any of the remaining judges cast their vote, and that judge has a casting vote in favour of the team that that judge decided had won the debate. The winning team wins the debate 3-2, and the average score for each team and speaker is the average of the remaining 4 judges.

6. A judge on a panel of 7 judges is unable to finish judging the debate. The remaining judges split 4-2. The winning team wins the debate 5-2, and the average score for each team and speaker is the average of the remaining 6 judges.

Part Twelve - The Chief Adjudicator(s)

12.1 The Chief Adjudicator(s)

- (a) There shall be at least one and no more than two Chief Adjudicators for a Championship.
- (b) A Chief Adjudicator must either have judged in at least one Championship or have attended at least two Championships as a coach prior to being eligible for the role.
- (c) A Chief Adjudicator must have served on a Chief Adjudicator's Panel (see rule 12.4) at least once in order to be eligible for the role. Where two Chief Adjudicators have been appointed, it is only necessary for one to fulfil this requirement.
- (d) If an individual has been appointed to serve as a Chief Adjudicator for two consecutive tournaments, there must be a gap of at least one tournament before he/she can again be appointed to the role.

12.2 Appointment

- (a) The Host shall nominate the Chief Adjudicator(s).
- (b) The nomination must be approved -
 - (i) by the Tournament Committee, or
 - (ii) by the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors if the nomination is made after the last meeting of the Tournament Committee prior to the Championship.

12.3 Functions

In accordance with the Rules, the Chief Adjudicator(s) is responsible for

- (a) determining the eligibility of judges,
- (b) training judges prior to the start of the championship,
- (c) assessing whether judges are competent to judge debates,
- (d) assigning judges to debates,
- (e) recording results of debates,
- (f) determining the team rankings at the end of the preliminary rounds, (g) determining the draw for the Break Rounds and Grand Final, and (h) any other matter connected with the adjudication of debates at the Championship.

12.4 The Chief Adjudicator's Panel

- (a) The Chief Adjudicator(s) shall select a panel of senior and experienced judges to assist them in their responsibilities. This panel shall be known as the 'Chief Adjudicator's Panel' (CAP).
- (b) To be eligible to be a member of the Chief Adjudicator's Panel, the individual must have judged in at least one Championship prior to being appointed.
- (c) An eligible judge who is intending to judge at the Championship must apply to the Chief Adjudicator(s) to be considered for appointment to the Chief Adjudicator's Panel.
 - (i) The Chief Adjudicator(s) are required to conclude the formation process of the Chief Adjudicator's Panel between 3 and 9 months before the first day of debates at the Championship, ensuring it is finalized no earlier than 9 months and no later than 3 months.
- (d) The Chief Adjudicator(s) shall select the members of the Chief Adjudicator's Panel after considering all applications as well as the list of judges expected to be attending the Championship.
- (e) The membership of the Chief Adjudicator's Panel shall reflect, as far as possible, the geographic, linguistic, gender and cultural diversity of the judges expected to be attending the Championship.
- (f) At least one member of the Chief Adjudicator's Panel must not be a native English speaker.
- (g) One place on the Chief Adjudicator's Panel must be reserved for a Chief Adjudicator of a forthcoming Championship if rule 12.1 (c) needs to be fulfilled.
- (h) A member of the Chief Adjudicator's panel may advise and assist the Chief Adjudicator(s), but may not independently carry out any of the Chief Adjudicator's responsibilities or exercise the Chief Adjudicator's powers.

- (i) The members of the Chief Adjudicator's Panel must be approved by the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors before their appointment takes effect.

12.5 Two Chief Adjudicators

Where there are two Chief Adjudicators for a Championship, any function given to a Chief Adjudicator by the Rules may be exercised by either of the Chief Adjudicator.

Part Thirteen - Assessment of Judges

13.1 Assessment of Judges

- (a) At any time before or during a Championship, the Chief Adjudicator(s) 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 Chief Adjudicator(s) shall take into account -
 - (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 championship in a way that casts significant doubt as to the judge's competence or impartiality,
 - (iv) whether as a result of excessive consumption of alcohol or other substances or tiredness or sickness or other such factors, the ability or perceived ability of the judge to judge competently is seriously in question,
 - (v) whether a complaint has been upheld against the judge pursuant to the Rules, (vi) any representations made by the judge in question, and
 - (vi) any other matter the Chief Adjudicator(s) 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.
- (e) 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.
 - (f) Notwithstanding any assessment made under this rule, no result of any debate shall be overturned.

13.2 Complaints about Judges

- (a) A complaint about a judge may be made to the Chief Adjudicator(s), in accordance with this rule, about the competence or impartiality of a judge to judge a debate.
- (b) (i) A judge on a panel of judges for a debate may complain about another judge on the panel.
 - (ii) The coach or team manager of a team in a debate may complain about a judge in a debate involving that team.
- (c) A complaint shall be in writing.
- (d) A complaint shall be made within 24 hours of the end of the debate out of which the complaint arises.
- (e) Without limiting the scope of a complaint, a complaint may allege that a judge -
 - (i) has misdirected himself or herself as to a matter set out in the Rules, the Judging Schedule, or any Authorised Material, or
 - (ii) has made remarks prior to, during or after a debate in a way that raises significant doubt as to his or her impartiality for that debate.

13.3 Investigation of a Complaint

- (a) Upon receipt of a complaint made in accordance with the Rules, the Chief Adjudicator(s) shall determine whether-
 - (i) the complaint should be referred to the Complaints Officer(s), or
 - (ii) the complaint can be resolved without further investigation.
- (b) If the complaint requires further investigation, the Chief Adjudicator(s) shall undertake such further investigation.
- (c) Without limiting the scope of an investigation, the Chief Adjudicator(s) may talk to - (i)

the judge the subject of the complaint,

- (ii) other judges on the panel for the debate out of which the complaint arose,
- (iii) coaches present at the debate out of which the complaint arose, and (iv) any other person.

13.4 Determination of a Complaint

(a) In conjunction with the Chief Adjudicator's Panel, the Chief Adjudicator(s) shall determine the complaint by dismissing or upholding the complaint.

(b) The Chief Adjudicator(s) shall not uphold the complaint without - (i) conducting an investigation under rule 13.3(b), and

- (ii) talking with the judge the subject of the complaint.

(c) If the Chief Adjudicator(s) upholds the complaint, the Chief Adjudicator(s) may also - (i) counsel the judge,

- (ii) direct that the judge act as a shadow judge for such portion of the Championship as the Chief Adjudicator(s) thinks appropriate,

- (iii) direct that the judge undergo further training before being assigned to any future debate at the Championship,

- (iv) stand the judge down for such portion of the Championship as the Chief Adjudicator(s) thinks appropriate,

- (v) refer the complaint to the Complaints Officer,

- (vi) decide to take no further action.

13.5 Notification of Outcome

(a) The Chief Adjudicator(s) shall notify in writing -

- (i) the person who made the complaint, and

- (ii) the judge the subject of the complaint,

of the outcome of the complaint.

(b) Where the Chief Adjudicator(s) has upheld a complaint, he or she shall also notify in writing the Chief Adjudicator(s) of the next Championship of the outcome of the complaint.

13.6 Result of a Debate

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

14.1 The Code of Conduct

The Code of Conduct is set out in Schedule 3.

14.2 Abiding by the Code of Conduct

- (a) Each participant at a Championship shall abide by the Code of Conduct.
- (b) Before attending a Championship, each participant must sign the agreement in Schedule 3 to abide by the Code of Conduct.

Part Fifteen - Awards

15.1 Championship Awards

After the Grand Final the Host shall give individual certificates noting their achievement in the Championship, and may additionally choose to also give individual trophies or plaques, to the following debaters:

- (a) every member of each team which qualified for the Partial Double Octofinals, Octofinals or further,
- (b) every member of the highest ranked EFL team in accordance with Part 9, (c) every member of the highest ranked ESL team in accordance with Part 9,
- (d) every member of the highest ranked new team at the Championship in accordance with rule 15.2,
- (e) the ten highest ranked speakers at the Championship,
- (f) the five highest ranked EFL speakers at the Championship in accordance with Part 9, (g) the five highest ranked ESL speakers at the Championship in accordance with Part 9,
- (h) the highest ranked speaker from a new team at the Championship in accordance with rule 15.2.

15.2 New Teams and Speakers

For the purposes of rule 15.1 -

- (a) a new team is a team from a nation which has not competed in Championships held during the previous nine years,
- (b) a speaker from a new team is a member of a team from a nation which has not competed in Championships held during the previous nine years.

15.3 ESL Award

In addition to rule 15.1, the Host must recognise the highest ranked ESL team in accordance with Part 9, to be awarded with the 'Boby Andika Ruitang Award for the Top English as a

Second Language Team’.

15.4 Other Awards

This Part does not prevent the Host from making other awards at a Championship.

15.5 Form of Awards

The Host is responsible for the form of awards made under this Part.

15.6 Awards for Outstanding Contributions

- (a) The Tournament Committee shall make such awards according to criteria that the Tournament Committee shall determine from time to time.
- (b) The Tournament Committee may make appropriate awards to individuals considered to have made an outstanding contribution to the World Schools Debating Championships.

Part 16 - Online World Schools Debating Championships

16.1 Decision to Hold an Online World Schools Debating Championship

- (a) In a year where a Championship cannot be held in a host nation, an event named the Online World Schools Debating Championship (“Online Championship”) may be held instead and shall be considered as the official World Schools Debating Championship of that year.
- (b) If an Online Championship is held, the following must be approved by the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors and then confirmed in a vote of the Tournament Committee that must conclude at least 90 days before the first day of debates in the Online Championship:
 - (i) The dates of the Online Championship,
 - (ii) The Convenor(s) of the Online Championship, and
 - (iii) The Chief Adjudicator(s) of the Online Championship.
- (c) If a ballot of the Tournament Committee cannot reasonably be held to approve or change the dates of an Online Championship at least 90 days before the event and, in the opinion of the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors, this is due to unforeseen and unusual circumstances which could not have reasonably been predicted in advance, then Board shall have the right to decide that an Online Championship may proceed on dates which the Board has approved.

16.2 Organisational Procedures for an Online World Schools Debating Championship

- (a) All debates in an Online Championship shall be held through an online platform which debaters, coaches, team managers, adjudicators and organisers of the event can log into.

- (b) Other than the debates being held through an online platform, an Online Championship shall as closely as possible follow the rules and format of a World Schools Debating Championship event with the exception of differences outlined in the document 'Procedures for an Online World Schools Debating Championship'.
- (c) The document 'Procedures for an Online World Schools Debating Championship' is an official guideline document which may only be amended by a vote of the Tournament Committee concluded at least 90 days before the first day of debates in the Online Championship with more than 50 percent of the Tournament Committee delegates who cast ballots (excluding abstentions) being required to vote in favour for the proposed amendment to be passed.

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 was announced by the chairperson as being a speaker in that debate may speak in their place. In such a situation judges shall award the speech the lowest possible score within the Marking Standard, regardless of the quality of the speech.
- 2.1 Content is the argument used by the speaker, divorced from the speaking style.
- 2.2 If an argument is weak it should be marked accordingly, even if the other team does not expose its weakness.
- 2.3 In deciding the strength or weakness of an argument, judges should not be influenced by their own personal beliefs or specialised knowledge.
- 3.1 Style is the way speakers speak.
- 3.2 Judges should make allowance for different accents, speaking styles and debating terminology.

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

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

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

3.6 Unnecessary and inaccurate uncharitable rhetoric should diminish a speaker's style score. Rhetoric that can be considered as overly uncharitable may include but would not be limited to things such as using derogatory or demeaning terms about the opposing team's arguments, or claiming that the opposing team had no reasoning whatsoever for their arguments when they actually did.

4.1 Strategy covers three concepts:

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

4.1.2 The selection and prioritisation of the issues in the debate, and

4.1.3 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.

4.3 A speaker who attempts to avoid responding to critical claims by employing inaccurate and unnecessary uncharitable rhetoric to attempt to get the judge to disregard the other side's claims should receive lower marks for strategy as well as content. This may include but would not be limited to things such as using derogatory or demeaning terms about the opposing team's arguments, or claiming that the opposing team had no reasoning whatsoever for their arguments when they actually did.

B. Definitions and Cases

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

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

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

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

5.1.4 When defining the words in the motion so as (i) to allow the obvious meaning to be debated

or (ii) (when there is no obvious meaning) to give effect to a possible meaning which would allow for a reasonable debate, the Proposition must ensure that the definition is one the ordinary intelligent person would accept.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.6.1 A case sums up the team's arguments and states why its side of the motion is correct. 5.6.2 Arguments are reasons or rationales why the team's case is correct.

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

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

argument and/ or by raising other arguments that disprove the motion, as defined).

C. The Roles of the Speakers

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

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

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

6.2.2 allows the opposition team reasonable room to debate,

6.2.3 is not tautological or truistic, and

6.2.4 is otherwise a reasonable definition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.2 If the second proposition does not challenge a re-definition of the debate made by the first

opposition, the proposition is taken to have accepted the opposition's re-definition and no further challenges to the definition may be made.

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

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

9.2 The third speaker of either team may have a small part of the team's case to present, but 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 case.

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

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

D. Points of Information

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. The Judging

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

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

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

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

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

17.5 The adjudication should be constructive, not negative.

F. Marking Standard

Substantive Speeches (out of 100)

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

Reply Speeches (out of 50)

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

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

WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATING CHAMPIONSHIPS CODE OF CONDUCT

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Code of Conduct

The World Schools Debating Championships brings together participants from around the world to compete in a short, intensive debating event. Normally the participants stay together in one host venue, engage in debates at several different host schools during the event, and attend a variety of tours or social events together.

In this environment, it is very important that all the participants have a common understanding of the standards of behaviour expected of them in order 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 following participants in the Championship:

- (a) debaters

- (b) team coaches
- (c) team managers
- (d) adjudicators (including shadow adjudicators)
- (e) registered observers
- (f) individuals assigned other roles by the host organising committee.

1.3 All participants must agree to abide by this Code of Conduct

- (a) Before the start of each Championship, all participants shall sign the undertaking at the conclusion of this Code of Conduct that they will abide by this Code of Conduct for the duration of the tournament.
- (b) At least one parent or guardian of every debater attending the Championship shall also sign the undertaking.
- (c) No participant shall be allowed to be involved in the Championship event unless:
 - (i) he/she has signed such an undertaking
 - (ii) in the case of a participant who is a debater, one parent or guardian has signed the undertaking.

1.4 Who is responsible for ensuring compliance with the Code of Conduct during the Championship?

- (a) All participants shall ensure that they comply with the Code of Conduct for the duration of the Championship.
- (b) In addition, each nation which sends a team to the Championship shall appoint a coach, an adjudicator or a registered observer to serve as the team manager as defined in Rule 4A of the Rules and who shall be responsible for ensuring that the debaters comply with the Code of Conduct for the duration of the Championship and shall be accountable to the Convenor(s) and the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors in doing so.
- (c) The team manager shall:
 - (i) attend the Championship; and
 - (ii) be at least 19 years of age; and
 - (iii) be deemed legally an adult or have attained the age of majority in both the host nation and in the nation the team represents.
- (d) No team of debaters shall be allowed to participate in the Championship unless such a person is appointed.
- (e) The Convenor(s) shall be responsible for ensuring that anyone serving a role appointed by the host organising committee is aware of and complies with the Code of Conduct, including but not limited to all organising committee members, volunteers, host school personnel, guests attending

debates from the local community and representatives of the local media.

1.5 Who is responsible for ensuring compliance with the Code of Conduct between Championships?

The WSDC Ltd Board of Directors will act on any items submitted 30 days after a Championship has concluded and before the arrival day at the next Championship.

1.6 What do the terms in this Code of Conduct mean?

Most of the terms used in this Code of Conduct should be self-explanatory. However, to be clear:

- (a) **“Age of majority”** means the age at which an individual becomes an adult as specified by either the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child or the legislation of the host nation, whichever is the older age
- (b) **“Championship”** means the World Schools Debating Championship in which the people listed in paragraph 1.2 are participating
- (c) **“complainant”** means a person who has complained about a breach of the Code of Conduct
- (d) **“host”** means the organising committee of the country which is hosting the Championship for that year
- (e) **“laws of the host country”** include the law of the state or region within the host country in which the championship is being held, as well as the host country’s national law
- (f) **“nation”** is as defined in Rules 4 and 5 of the World Schools Debating Championship Rules
- (g) **“sexual harassment”** means any unwanted, unwelcome or uninvited behaviour of a sexual nature which makes a person feel humiliated, intimidated or offended. Sexual harassment can take on many different forms and may include physical contact, verbal comments, jokes, propositions, the display of offensive material or other behaviour which creates a sexually hostile environment. Examples of sexual harassment include but are not limited to uninvited touching, smutty jokes or comments, sex-based insults, repeated invitations to go out after prior refusal, persistent insinuations about a person’s private life. Sexual harassment is not behaviour which is consensual, welcome and reciprocated but for the purposes of the Championships does also include behaviour specified in paragraph 2.4.
- (h) **“start of the Championship”** means the commencement of the first formal event or function of the Championship

The Code of Conduct

2. What is expected of participants?

2.1 What participants must do

During the championship, all participants must:

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

(b) abide by the laws of the host nation

(c) abide by any rules, guidelines and restrictions set by the host organising committee to keep the event regulated and ensure the safety of participants.

2.2 What participants must not do

During the championships, 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) stalk or physically harass another individual

(c) engage in any form of violence or threats of violence

(d) engage in any form of sexual harassment [as defined in paragraphs 1.5 (d) and 2.4] (e) take or use other people's property without permission

(f) intentionally cause damage to the property of other individuals or of any host venues

(g) consume any substance which they are not legally entitled to consume in the host country, or supply any such substances to others

(h) consume or be under the influence of alcohol or drugs in a way which may bring the championships into disrepute or which may impair their ability to carry out their role at the tournament.

2.3 Behaviour at debates

(a) Participants in the Championship, especially coaches and debaters, 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 Chief Adjudicators' Panel prior to the debate.

2.4 Relationships

Any romantic or sexually-based relationship during the Championship between a debater or student observer attending the Championship and an adult acting as a coach, adjudicator, shadow adjudicator, team manager, observer or in any other capacity will not be tolerated and shall be

treated as sexual harassment regardless of intention or apparent consent.

Enforcement of the Code of Conduct

3. What happens if a participant breaches the Code of Conduct?

3.1 Breaches can be reported to a Complaints Officer

If a participant believes that another participant has breached this Code of Conduct, they may report the breach to an appointed Complaints Officer, or to their nation's team manager (who may, in turn, report the breach to an appointed Complaints Officer).

3.2 Who are the Complaints Officers?

Before each championship, the Convenor shall nominate two Complaints Officers – one male and one female. The nominations for Complaints Officers must be approved by:

- (a) the Tournament Committee at its meeting at the previous year, or
- (b) the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors at least 90 days before the Championship begins, if the nomination was not approved at the previous meeting of the Council.

3.3 What will the Complaints Officers do?

Each Complaints Officer shall be responsible for:

- (a) being available to participants to receive complaints about breaches of this Code of Conduct
- (b) investigating complaints
- (c) supporting the complainant appropriately, which could include referring him/her to:
 - (i) a counsellor
 - (ii) a doctor
 - (iii) a lawyer
 - (iv) the police
 - (v) their parents
 - (vi) an adult member of their family or contingent.

3.4 Complaints Officers can deal with some complaints themselves

If the Complaints Officer considers it appropriate, they may discuss the complaint with the complainant and the person about whom the complaint has been made to try to resolve the matter by mediation so that both parties are satisfied with the outcome of the matter.

3.5 Complaints Officers can refer complaints to the Complaints Committee

(a) A Complaints Officer may refer a complaint to the Complaints Committee. Such a referral must be submitted in writing to the Chairperson of the Complaints Committee.

(b) Complaints of the following nature must be referred to the Complaints Committee: (i) any form of violence or threat of violence

(ii) sexual harassment

(iii) stalking or physical harassment

(iv) the consumption or supply of substances which are illegal in the host country

(v) a participant's being under the influence of alcohol or drugs in a manner which has brought or threatens to bring the Championship into disrepute

(vi) any form of inappropriate relationship between a debater and any other participant (vii) wilful damage to public property or the property of a host venue.

4. What happens if a complaint is referred to the Complaints Committee?

4.1 Who forms the Complaints Committee?

(a) Every championship shall have a Complaints Committee comprising

(i) at least three members; and

(ii) at least one person of each gender; and

(iii) at least one but no more than two members from the host nation; and

(iv) neither of the Complaints Officers who have been approved for the same Championship as the Complaints Committee.

(b) The members of the Complaints Committee shall be approved by:

(i) the Tournament Committee at its meeting at the previous year, or

(ii) by the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors at least 90 days before the championship begins if the nomination was not approved at the previous meeting of the Council.

(c) The Complaints Committee shall appoint one of its members to serve as Chairperson by the start of each Championship at which it will operate.

(d) Subject to 4.1 (b), each member of the Complaints Committee shall serve until such time as a replacement is appointed.

4.2 When must the Complaints Committee meet?

(a) The Complaints Committee's Chairperson shall convene a committee meeting:

(i) if a Complaints Officer refers a complaint to them in writing

(ii) if the Complaints Committee otherwise considers it appropriate.

(b) The Complaints Committee shall convene a meeting within 24 hours of receiving a complaint in accordance with 4.2 (a) above.

4.3 What can the Complaints Committee do?

(a) At a meeting to discuss a complaint, the Complaints Committee may:

(i) decide to take no further action

(ii) make a decision about the complaint without a hearing (but it may not suspend or expel the person complained about without a hearing) or

(iii) hold a hearing about the complaint.

(b) Regardless of which option it takes, the Complaints Committee may also refer the complaint to the host country's relevant authorities (such as the police) if it considers that this is appropriate.

4.4 What are the rights of a person complained about at a hearing?

If the Complaints Committee holds a hearing, the person complained about must: (a) be told what the complaint is about

(b) be told the date and time of the hearing

(c) be allowed to participate in the hearing and to be heard

(d) be allowed to bring a person of their choice with them to the meeting with whom s/he may confer before and during the hearing

(e) be allowed to remain silent during the hearing if s/he so chooses

(f) be allowed not to attend the hearing if s/he so chooses.

4.5 A person complained about who is a student shall have special protection and assistance

(a) If the Complaints Committee holds a hearing and the person complained about is a student, the Complaints Committee shall:

(i) ensure that the person complained about fully understands his/her rights as set out in paragraph 4.4 above before the hearing begins

(ii) ensure that an adult chosen by the person complained about attends the hearing to support the person complained

(iii) if the person complained about is unable to choose an adult to attend with him or her, select an adult to take on this role.

(b) The adult chosen in accordance with paragraph 4.5(a) shall attend the hearing and shall be able to speak on behalf of the person complained about at the hearing.

4.6 A person making a complaint in a student role shall have special protection and assistance

(a) If the Complaints Committee holds a hearing and where a person making a complaint in a student role is called to give evidence, the Complaints Committee shall:

(i) ensure that the person making the complaint fully understands the purpose of the hearing and their rights including, if appropriate, any rights they may have to file a complaint with local authorities

(ii) ensure that an adult chosen by the person making the complaint attends the hearing with them to give them support

(iii) if the person making the complaint is unable to choose an adult to attend with them, select an appropriate adult to take on this role.

(b) The adult chosen in accordance with paragraph 4.6 (a) shall attend the hearing and shall be able to speak on behalf of the person complained about at the hearing.

4.7 Hearings are confidential

Until the Complaints Committee makes a decision about a complaint, details of the complaint and the hearing shall be kept confidential and shall be discussed only with the people participating in the hearing.

4.8 What can the Complaints Committee do without a hearing?

If the Complaints Committee reaches a decision about a complaint without a hearing, it may:

(a) dismiss the complaint, or

(b) uphold it and:

(i) take no action

(ii) counsel the person complained about

(iii) warn the person complained about.

4.9 What can the Complaints Committee do at the conclusion of a hearing?

If the Complaints Committee holds a hearing, it may:

(a) dismiss the complaint, or

(b) uphold it and:

(i) take no action

(ii) counsel the person complained about

(iii) warn the person complained about

(iv) suspend the person complained about from the Championship for as long as it thinks appropriate

(v) expel the respondent from the Championship

(vi) ban the person complained about from all future Championships or a specified number of future Championships.

4.10 What the Complaints Committee can consider at a hearing.

(a) The Complaints Committee shall inform itself at a hearing and generally as to evidence and facts in its absolute discretion and as it sees fit, subject to this Code of Conduct.

(b) The Complaints Committee may choose to consider, but is not required to consider, reports of conduct that have happened at previous Championships or in between Championships if the conduct has continued and/or potentially impacts the ability of a participant to fully participate in a WSDC Championship without causing concern.

4.11 The Complaints Committee's decision is final

The Complaints Committee's decision shall be final. The person complained about is not able to appeal it, but where the person complained about has been expelled for longer than the next Championship he or she can apply for re-admittance in accordance with section 6 below.

5. Who must be told about the Complaints Committee's decision?

5.1 Where there has been no hearing

Where a complaint has been decided without a hearing, the Chairperson of the Complaints Committee must give a written copy of the decision to:

- (a) the complainant
- (b) the Complaints Officer who referred the complaint
- (c) the Convenor
- (d) the person complained about
- (e) where the person complained about is a debater, the team manager.

5.2 Where there has been a hearing

Where a complaint has led to a hearing, the Chairperson of the Complaints Committee must give a written copy of the decision to:

- (a) the people mentioned above in 5.1 ("Where there has been no hearing")
- (b) the parent or guardian of a person complained about, if that person is a debater and not an adult according to the laws of his/her home nation
- (c) the Chief Adjudicator, if the complaint has been about an adjudicator.

5.3 Where a hearing has led to a suspension or expulsion

Where a complaint has led to a suspension or expulsion, the Chairperson of the Complaints

Committee must give a written copy of the decision to:

- (a) the people mentioned above in rule 5.2 (“Where there has been a hearing”)
- (b) the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors through the Board’s Chairperson
- (c) the Convenor and Chief Adjudicators of the following year’s championship.

5.4 Where the person complained about is expelled from future Championships

(a) Where the person complained about is expelled from all or any future Championships, the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors shall ensure that a copy of the Complaints Committee’s written decision is kept on file.

(b) The person complained about shall have the right to apply to be readmitted in accordance with paragraph 6 below.

5.5 Limitation on disclosing Complaints Committee decision

The written decision of the Complaints Committee shall not be disclosed, published, produced, copied, or otherwise communicated to people other than those specified in 5.1 to 5.4 above unless:

- (a) The complainant and the person complained about agree; or
- (b) Disclosure of the Complaints Committee’s written decision is required by the law which applies in the home nation of the person complained about and/or in the host nation in which the complaint arose.

6. What are the rights of a person who is suspended or expelled?

6.1 A young person must be looked after

Where the Complaints Committee decision has led to a suspension or expulsion and the person suspended or expelled is not legally an adult in the host country, the Complaints Committee, in conjunction with the Convenor, shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the person suspended or expelled is able to make satisfactory arrangements for:

- (a) accommodation and meals for the duration of his/her suspension or until he/she is able to return to his/her home country
- (b) returning to his/her home country if he/she has been expelled from the Championship.

6.2 Where a person has been expelled for longer than the next Championship

(a) Where the Complaints Committee’s decision has led to an expulsion and the person complained about has been expelled for longer than the next Championship, the person complained about may, after the conclusion of the following Championship, apply in writing to the Chairperson of the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors to be readmitted as a participant at future Championships.

(b) If the Chairperson of the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors Committee receives an application by such a person to be readmitted (“the applicant”):

(i) the application shall be forwarded to the Chairperson of the Complaints Committee as soon as possible

(ii) the Chairperson of the Complaints Committee shall discuss the application with the other members of the Complaints Committee, and the Complaints Committee shall make a decision whether to grant or decline the application within 90 days of receiving the application.

6.3 What is the process for a hearing on the application for readmittance?

The process for a hearing on the application is:

(a) the Complaints Committee shall either hold a hearing in person (if practical), or shall discuss the issue by telephone, video link, e-mail or in writing, depending on constraints of cost, time and the distance between the parties

(b) the person applying for reinstatement ("the applicant") shall be invited to submit statements in writing in support of the application to be readmitted, and may additionally be asked to submit answers to specific questions by the Complaints Committee

(c) the Complaints Committee shall determine who, apart from the applicant the applicant and such persons as the applicant may decide, may be asked to submit written statements regarding the applicant. These may include:

(i) referees about the applicant's character or change of circumstances

(ii) the Complaints Officer who received the original complaint

(iii) the original complainant

(iv) a current Complaints Officer.

(d) the Complaints Committee shall inform itself at a hearing about the application and generally as to evidence and facts in its absolute discretion and as it sees fit, subject to this Code of Conduct.

6.4 Hearings about the application are confidential

Until the Complaints Committee makes a decision about the application for re-admittance, details of the application and the hearing shall be kept confidential and shall be discussed only with the people participating in the hearing.

6.5 What must the Complaints Committee do to decide on the application?

(a) The Complaints Committee must make a decision about the application by:

(i) declining the application, or

(ii) readmitting the applicant subject to any conditions the committee thinks fit,
or (iii) readmitting the applicant without any conditions.

(b) After making a decision about the application, the Complaints Committee must send a written copy of its decision to:

- (i) the applicant
- (ii) the current Complaints Officers
- (iii) the WSDC Ltd Board of Directors, through the Board’s Chairperson
- (iv) the Convenor and Chief Adjudicators of the following Championship
- (v) the person who made the original complaint about the applicant.

6.6 Limitation on disclosing Complaints Committee decision about the application

The written decision of the Complaints Committee shall not be disclosed, published, produced, copied, or otherwise communicated to people other than those specified in paragraph 6.5 unless:

- (a) The applicant agrees; or
- (b) Disclosure of the Complaints Committee’s written decision is required by the law which applies in the home nation of the applicant and/or in the host nation in which the breach of this Code of Conduct occurred.

6.7 The Complaints Committee’s decision about the application is final

The Complaints Committee’s decision on the application shall be final. The applicant is not able to appeal it but s/he can apply again for re-admittance or for the removal of any conditions imposed on re-admittance 6 months or more following the decision on the application. The new application must also be made according to paragraph 6.

7. Undertaking required to be signed prior to the commencement of the Championship

Undertaking by all those participating in the World Schools Debating Championship

I undertake that:

- (a) I have read and understood the Code of Conduct above and
- (b) I will abide by the Code of Conduct for the duration of the World Schools Debating Championship

Signed Dated

Undertaking by parent or guardian of debater(s) participating in the Championship

I undertake that:

- (a) I am a parent/guardian of who is a debater participating in the World Schools Debating Championship
- (b) I have read and understood the Code of Conduct above

(c) I have explained the Code of Conduct to the above debater

(d) I have instructed the above debater that I expect and require the debater to abide by the Code of Conduct

(e) the debater has confirmed to me that s/he will abide by the Code of Conduct.

Signed Dated