



**PANDUAN
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY ENGLISH DEBATING CHAMPIONSHIP
(NUEDC)**

DEPARTEMEN PENDIDIKAN NASIONAL
DIREKTORAT JENDERAL PENDIDIKAN TINGGI
DIREKTORAT AKADEMIK
2010

KATA PENGANTAR

Lomba debat Bahasa Inggris sudah menjadi bagian penting dalam persaingan global. Lomba ini semakin dikembangkan di beberapa negara, terutama negara-negara berkembang, dalam rangka meningkatkan kualitas daya saing bangsa. Sudah selayaknya, pemerintah melalui Departemen Pendidikan Nasional mengembangkan debat Bahasa Inggris bagi mahasiswa di Indonesia.

Di dalam debat Bahasa Inggris, terdapat tuntutan penggunaan kombinasi kemampuan berbahasa Inggris dan kemampuan berargumen. *Judgement* yang dihasilkan selalu melalui alasan (*reasoning*) dan dukungan fakta yang jelas. Debat ini menuntut mahasiswa tidak hanya mengetahui isu-isu global tetapi juga menganalisisnya. Secara langsung, debat bahasa Inggris mampu menginternalisasikan kemampuan berpikir kritis dalam keterampilan berkomunikasi.

Menyadari pentingnya lomba debat Bahasa Inggris bagi kualitas pendidikan bangsa, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi mengembangkan kegiatan ini melalui *National University English Debating Championship* (NUEDC). Lomba ini bertujuan meningkatkan kemampuan komunikasi internasional mahasiswa Indonesia dan berjejaring dalam rangka meningkatkan daya saing bangsa. Dengan menggunakan sistem yang sama dengan yang digunakan di tingkat dunia, mahasiswa Indonesia diharapkan mampu bersaing pada tingkat internasional.

Pemenang tahun 2009 telah diutus sebagai Delegasi Indonesia ke ajang perlombaan di Turkey. Prinsipnya adalah bukan menang menjadi tujuan tetapi proses pembelajaran yang dapat ditularkan yang lebih penting di perguruan tinggi.

Jakarta, Januari 2010
Direktur Akademik,

Dr. Ir. Illah Sailah, MS
NIP 195805211982121001

DAFTAR ISI

	Halaman
KATA PENGANTAR	i
DAFTAR ISI	ii
I. PENDAHULUAN	1
A. Latar Belakang	1
B. Tujuan	1
C. SASARAN	1
II. SISTEM DAN MEKANISME LOMBA	3
A. Sistem Lomba	3
B. Mekanisme Lomba	3
III. PESERTA	4
A. Persyaratan	4
B. Pendaftaran	4
IV. PENJURIAN	5
A. Adjudicator/Dewan Juri	6
B. Syarat Adjudicator	6
C. Mekanisme Penilaian	6
V. SUSUNAN ACARA DAN JADWAL KEGIATAN	7
A. Acara	7
B. Jadwal Kegiatan	7
VI. FASILITAS	8
A. Ruangan	8
B. Alat	8
VI. PENGHARGAAN DAN PENUTUP	9
A. Penghargaan	9
B. Penutup	9

LAMPIRAN

I. PENDAHULUAN

A. Latar Belakang

Tingkat persaingan sumber daya manusia (SDM) di pasar kerja nasional dan internasional terus meningkat seiring dengan peningkatan pemanfaatan ilmu pengetahuan dan teknologi baru pada berbagai bidang usaha, serta kebutuhan tingkat profesionalisme (*knowledge, hard skill, soft skill*) yang semakin tinggi (HELTS 2003 – 2010).

Sesuai dengan visi Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (Depdiknas), yaitu **Terselenggaranya Layanan Prima Pendidikan Nasional untuk membentuk Insan Indonesia Cerdas Komprehensif**, Direktorat Akademik Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Depdiknas merumuskan kebijakan dan pembinaan kepada mahasiswa agar mampu menjadi manusia Indonesia yang bermutu dan kompetitif. Salah satu usaha pembinaan tersebut adalah melalui kompetisi debat Bahasa Inggris, yang telah dirumuskan dalam *National University English Debating Championship (NUEDC)*.

Debat bahasa Inggris sudah menjadi kebutuhan dunia akademik mahasiswa. Tuntutan kompetensi penguasaan pengetahuan global menjadi salah satu alasan mengapa debat bahasa Inggris perlu menjadi bagian akademik mahasiswa. Di saat negara-negara berkembang mewajibkan muatan debat bahasa Inggris ke dalam kurikulum pendidikan mereka, Indonesia perlu terus menjadikan debat bahasa Inggris sebagai bagian kajian akademik, dalam bentuk apapun.

Debat bahasa Inggris menuntut mahasiswa tidak hanya mampu mengungkapkan ide dalam bahasa Inggris, tetapi juga menuntut mahasiswa mampu menguasai pengetahuan global, menganalisis, membuat *judgement*, dan meyakinkan publik. Di dalam debat bahasa Inggris, mahasiswa akan dihadapkan persoalan-persoalan nyata yang dihadapi suatu masyarakat atau bangsa. Mahasiswa harus mampu berposisi dan meyakinkan publik bahwa posisi mereka benar dan tepat. Oleh karena itu, debat bahasa Inggris merupakan media yang tepat dalam melatih kemampuan negosiasi dan argumentasi mahasiswa dalam skala internasional. Sudah tepat jika institusi pendidikan di Indonesia melaksanakan lomba debat bahasa Inggris antar mahasiswa dalam rangka internalisasi semangat kompetisi positif yang bermuatan tuntutan kemampuan komunikasi dan argumentasi.

B. Tujuan

1. Meningkatkan daya saing lulusan perguruan tinggi melalui media debat ilmiah, meningkatkan kemampuan bahasa Inggris lisan, dan menciptakan iklim kompetitif.
2. Meningkatkan kemampuan mahasiswa untuk berpikir kritis dan analitis, sehingga mahasiswa mampu bersaing di tingkat nasional maupun internasional.
3. Mengembangkan kemampuan mahasiswa untuk menyampaikan pendapat secara logis dan sistematis.

C. Sasaran

Sasaran NUEDC adalah semua mahasiswa aktif S1 atau Diploma di Perguruan Tinggi Negeri dan Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di lingkungan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

II. SISTEM DAN MEKANISME LOMBA

A. Sistem Lomba

Sistem yang digunakan dalam NUEDC adalah sistem *British Parliamentary* (BP). Sistem ini adalah sistem yang digunakan dalam *World University Debating Championship* (WUDC) atau Lomba debat bahasa Inggris tingkat dunia.

Ada dua kategori lomba, yaitu Main draw dan English as a Foreign Language (EFL).

Penjelasan tentang kategori Main draw dalam NUEDC tingkat nasional memiliki beberapa babak berikut:

1. *Preliminary Rounds.*
Ini merupakan babak penyisihan.
Terdapat 5 (lima) kali babak penyisihan di NUEDC tingkat nasional, artinya semua tim akan melalui lima kali debat. 32 (tiga puluh dua) tim terbaik hasil dari penyisihan akan maju ke babak berikutnya.
2. *Octofinal Rounds.*
Ini merupakan babak hasil seleksi 32 tim terbaik dari penyisihan.
Babak ini merupakan sistem gugur, artinya tim hanya melakukan sekali perdebatan. Terdapat 8 (delapan) ruang debat. Masing-masing ruang terdiri atas 4 (empat) tim. 2 (dua) tim terbaik dari masing-masing ruang akan maju ke babak selanjutnya.
3. *Quarter Final Rounds.*
Babak ini merupakan babak perempat final.
Dalam babak ini, terdapat 16 tim yang berdebat di dalam empat ruang debat. 2 (dua) tim terbaik di masing-masing ruang akan maju ke babak berikutnya.
4. *Semifinal Rounds.*
Babak ini mempertemukan 8 tim terbaik yang terbagi dalam dua ruang debat. Dua tim terbaik dari masing-masing ruang akan maju ke babak selanjutnya.
5. *Grand Final Round.*
Babak ini merupakan babak puncak yang mempertemukan 4 (empat) tim terbaik. Dari babak ini, akan dipilih Juara 1, 2, 3, dan 4.

Penjelasan mengenai kategori EFL adalah sebagai berikut:

1. Kategori EFL diikuti oleh tim yang mendaftar dalam kategori ini sejak awal registrasi dan ditentukan melalui mekanisme wawancara setelah pendaftaran ulang.
2. Tim yang masuk kategori EFL adalah 16 Tim teratas yang terdaftar sebagai tim EFL dan tidak masuk dalam 32 besar Main Draw.
3. Enam belas tim akan mengikuti *Quarter Final Rounds dengan system gugur*
4. Delapan tim terbaik akan mengikuti *Semifinal Rounds dengan system gugur*

5. Empat tim terbaik akan mengikuti *Grand Final Round*. Dari babak ini, akan dipilih Juara 1,2,3, dan 4.

Untuk NUEDC tingkat Kopertis, sistem perlombaan adalah sebagai berikut:

1. *Preliminary Rounds*. Ini merupakan babak penyisihan. Terdapat 3 babak penyisihan untuk jumlah tim maksimal 32 tim. 16 tim terbaik berhak maju ke babak selanjutnya.
2. *Quarter Final Rounds*. Babak ini merupakan babak perempat final. Dalam babak ini, terdapat 16 tim yang berdebat di dalam empat ruang debat. 2 (dua) tim terbaik di masing-masing ruang akan maju ke babak berikutnya.
3. *Semifinal Rounds*. Babak ini mempertemukan 8 tim terbaik yang terbagi dalam dua ruang debat. 2 (dua) tim terbaik dari masing-masing ruang akan maju ke babak selanjutnya.
4. *Grand Final Round*. Babak ini merupakan babak puncak yang mempertemukan 4 (empat) tim terbaik. Dari babak ini, akan dipilih Juara 1 dan 2 untuk mewakili Kopertis ke tingkat Nasional.

B. Mekanisme Lomba

NUEDC melalui beberapa tahap perlombaan berikut:

1. **Tingkat Kopertis**
Sebanyak 12 Kopertis di Indonesia wajib melakukan lomba debat dengan sistem yang sama dengan NUEDC. Peserta NUEDC tingkat Kopertis adalah mahasiswa dari Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di wilayahnya untuk menentukan 2 (dua) tim terbaik di masing-masing Kopertis yang berhak mengikuti seleksi ke tingkat nasional.
2. **Tingkat Nasional**
Peserta NUEDC terdiri atas wakil-wakil dari PTN (hasil seleksi tingkat PTN) dan PTS (hasil seleksi tingkat Kopertis). NUEDC tingkat nasional akan diikuti maksimal 106 tim.
3. **Tingkat Internasional**
Tiga tim terbaik Main draw dan satu tim terbaik EFL di NUEDC tingkat nasional akan diprioritaskan untuk mewakili Indonesia mengikuti debat bahasa Inggris tingkat dunia (WUDC).

III. PESERTA

A. Persyaratan

1. Peserta NUEDC adalah Warga Negara Indonesia (WNI)
2. Peserta adalah mahasiswa aktif dalam program S1 atau Diploma pada perguruan tinggi tertentu.
3. Satu tim terdiri atas dua *debaters* dan 1 (satu) calon *adjudicator*.
4. *Debater* wajib mengikuti *seminar on debating* dan calon *adjudicator* wajib mengikuti *adjudication seminar*.
5. Anggota tim tidak boleh diganti dengan alasan apapun.
6. Anggota tim masih berstatus mahasiswa aktif S1 atau Diploma sampai saat pengiriman ke tingkat dunia, dengan batas usia maksimum 27 tahun.
7. Khusus bagi peserta EFL disyaratkan :
 - a. Belum pernah mencapai babak *octofinal* di NUEDC nasional sebelumnya atau di kejuaraan tingkat nasional lainnya seperti IVED, JOVED, FT (*Founder's Trophy*), ALSA, BIPEDS.
 - b. Belum pernah tinggal di luar negeri lebih dari tiga (3) bulan

B. Pendaftaran

1. Peserta mendaftar ke panitia NUEDC di Direktorat Akademik Ditjen Pendidikan Tinggi, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional
2. Perguruan Tinggi Negeri berhak diwakili oleh 1 (satu) tim dengan menunjukkan surat tugas dan surat pernyataan resmi dari pimpinan Perguruan Tinggi Bidang Kemahasiswaan bahwa tim yang dikirim adalah hasil seleksi internal PTN yang bersangkutan.
3. Perguruan tinggi Swasta harus menunjukkan bukti telah menjadi juara 1 (satu) atau 2 (dua) di tingkat Kopertis Wilayah.

IV. PENJURIAN

A. Adjudicator/Dewan Juri

Adjudicator di NUEDC terdiri atas *Chief of Adjudicator (CA)*, *Deputy Chief of Adjudicator (DCA)*, *Invited Adjudicator*, *Accredited Adjudicator*, dan *Trainee Adjudicator*.

1. *Chief of Adjudicator (CA)* adalah ketua *adjudicator* yang dipilih oleh Ditjen Pendidikan Tinggi.
2. *Deputy Chief of Adjudicator (DCA)* adalah wakil CA yang dipilih oleh CA atas persetujuan Ditjen Pendidikan Tinggi.
3. *Invited Adjudicators* adalah *adjudicator* yang dipilih oleh Ditjen Pendidikan Tinggi atas dasar kompetensi dalam debat bahasa Inggris atau pengalaman menjadi *adjudicators*.
4. *Accredited Adjudicators* adalah *adjudicator* hasil akreditasi pada awal perlombaan. Terdapat tiga jenis akreditasi, yaitu A, B, dan C.
5. *Trainee Adjudicators* adalah *adjudicator* yang tidak lulus akreditasi namun masih diberi kesempatan untuk ikut menjadi juri dengan catatan tidak berhak ikut dalam memberikan keputusan.

B. Syarat-syarat Menjadi Adjudicator

1. *Invited Adjudicator* harus memenuhi satu atau lebih dari kriteria berikut :
 - a. pernah menjuarai NUEDC tahun sebelumnya,
 - b. pernah mengikuti WUDC
 - c. pernah menjadi *invited adjudicator* di lomba debat dengan system BP.
2. *Accredited adjudicator* harus lulus akreditasi *adjudicator* NUEDC

C. Mekanisme Penilaian

1. Penilaian ditentukan berdasarkan aturan dalam sistem BP (*British Parliamentary*);
2. Penilaian terdiri atas penilaian tim dan individu;
3. Penilaian tim harus berdasarkan pada ketentuan berikut:

Grade	Marks	Meaning
A	180-200	<i>Excellent to flawless. The standard you would expect to see from a team at the Semi Final / Grand Final level of the tournament. The team has much strength and few, if any, weaknesses.</i>
B	160-179	<i>Above average to very good. The standard you would expect to see from a team at the finals level or in contention to make to the finals. The team has clear strengths and some minor weaknesses.</i>
C	140-159	<i>Average. The team has strengths and weaknesses in roughly equal proportions.</i>
D	120-139	<i>Poor to below average. The team has clear problems and some minor strengths.</i>
E	100-119	<i>Very poor. The team has fundamental weaknesses and few, if any, strengths.</i>

4. Penilaian individu harus berdasar pada ketentuan berikut;

Grade	Marks	Meaning
A	90-100	<i>Excellent to flawless. The standard of speech you would expect to see from a speaker at the Semi Final / Grand Final level of the tournament. This speaker has much strength and few, if any, weaknesses.</i>
B	80-89	<i>Above average to very good. The standard you would expect to see from a speaker at the finals level or in contention to make to the finals. This speaker has clear strengths and some minor weaknesses.</i>
C	70-79	<i>Average. The speaker has strengths and weaknesses and roughly equal proportions.</i>
D	60-69	<i>Poor to below average. The team has clear problems and some minor strength.</i>
E	50-59	<i>Very poor. This speaker has fundamental weaknesses and few, if any, strengths.</i>

V. SUSUNAN ACARA DAN JADWAL KEGIATAN

A. Acara dalam NUEDC nasional adalah sebagai berikut:

1. Upacara Pembukaan.
2. *Seminar on Debating*. Merupakan pertemuan teknis antar tim peserta. Materi seminar adalah penjelasan system dan strategi perlombaan
3. *Seminar on Adjudicating*. Seminar ini merupakan ajang akreditasi bagi calon adjudicator. Materi dalam seminar ini adalah tata cara penilaian. Seminar ini diikuti dengan tes bagi calon adjudicator. Seminar ini diadakan bersamaan waktunya dengan seminar on debating.
4. *Preliminary Rounds*.
5. *Octofinal Rounds/ EFL quarterfinal*
6. *Quarterfinal Rounds/ EFL Semifinal*
7. *Semifinal Rounds*
8. EFL final
9. *Grand Final Round*

B. Jadwal Kegiatan

Jadwal kegiatan NUEDC adalah sebagai berikut:

NO	KEGIATAN	WAKTU
1	Sosialisasi NUEDC	Januari s.d. Maret
2	Seleksi tingkat masing-masing PTN	April s.d. Mei
3	Seleksi tingkat Kopertis (untuk PTS)	April s.d. Mei
4	Pendaftaran NUEDC tingkat nasional	Mei (mg 1 - 2)
5	Pelaksanaan NUEDC tingkat nasional	Juni Awal (mg 1)
6	Pendaftaran delegasi ke WUDC	Juni (mg 2)
7	Pembinaan delegasi Indonesia ke tingkat dunia	September
8	Pengiriman ke tingkat dunia	Desember
9	Laporan dan Evaluasi	Desember

VI. FASILITAS

Fasilitas yang dibutuhkan dalam NUEDC disiapkan oleh panitia. Ketersediaan fasilitas sangat menentukan kualitas NUEDC.

Berikut adalah daftar sarana/prasarana yang wajib dipenuhi dalam pelaksanaan NUEDC.

A. Ruangan

1. Dua ruang besar/hall yang digunakan untuk *debaters' hall* dan *adjudicators' hall*. Kapasitas *debaters' hall* adalah untuk 250 orang dan *Adjudicators' hall* untuk 150 orang. Masing-masing hall dilengkapi LCD.
2. Ruang-ruang kecil. Disesuaikan dengan jumlah Preliminary Rounds yang diadakan. Untuk NUEDC tingkat nasional, dibutuhkan 26 ruang kecil. Ruang ini **tidak** perlu dilengkapi dengan LCD.
3. Ruang untuk panitia.

B. Alat

1. Lap Top / computer untuk ruang debater dan adjudicator.
2. Sound system.

VII. PENGHARGAAN DAN PENUTUP

A. Penghargaan

Penghargaan di NUEDC nasional adalah sebagai berikut:

1. Sertifikat
2. Medali
3. Bantuan Modal Kerja
4. Pengiriman tim ke tingkat dunia untuk juara I,II , III *main draw* dan juara I *EFL*

B. Penutup

Buku panduan NUEDC ini diharapkan dapat membantu pelaksanaan lomba debat bahasa Inggris antar mahasiswa se-Indonesia. Buku panduan ini memuat materi pedoman pelaksanaan NUEDC. Dengan menggunakan sistem yang sama dengan sistem perlombaan di tingkat dunia (WUDC), diharapkan kualitas tim debat Indonesia akan semakin meningkat dan mampu bersaing di tingkat Internasional.

SYSTEM BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY

Part 1— Introduction

1.1 The format of the debate

1.1.1 The debate will consist of four teams of two persons (persons will be known as "members"), a chairperson (known as the "Speaker of the House" or "Mister/Madame Speaker" and an adjudicator or panel of adjudicators.

1.1.2 Teams will consist of the following members:

1.1.3 Members will deliver substantive speeches in the following order:

- (1) Prime Minister;
- (2) Opposition Leader;
- (3) Deputy Prime Minister;
- (4) Deputy Opposition Leader;
- (5) Member for the Government;
- (6) Member for the Opposition;
- (7) Government Whip;
- (8) Opposition Whip.

Opening Government:

" Prime Minister" or "First Government member" and
" Deputy Prime Minister" or "Second Government member";

Opening Opposition:

" Leader of the Opposition" or "First Opposition member" and
" Deputy Leader of the Opposition" or "Second Opposition member";

Closing Government:

" Member for the Government" or "Third Government member" and
" Government Whip" or "Fourth Opposition member";

Closing Opposition:

" Member for the Opposition" or "Third Opposition member" and
" Opposition Whip" or "Fourth Opposition member".

1.1.4 Members will deliver a substantive speech of seven minutes duration and should offer points of information while members of the opposing teams are speaking.

1.2 The motion

1.2.1 The motion should be unambiguously worded.

1.2.2 The motion should reflect that the World Universities Debating Championship is an international tournament.

1.2.3 The members should debate the motion in the spirit of the motion and the tournament.

1.3 Preparation

1.3.1 The debate should commence 15 minutes after the motion is announced.

1.3.2 Teams should arrive at their debate within five minutes of the scheduled starting time for that debate.

1.3.3 Members are permitted to use printed or written material during preparation and during the debate. Printed material includes books, journals, newspapers and other similar materials. The use of electronic equipment is prohibited during preparation and in the debate.

1.4 Points of Information

1.4.1 Points of Information (questions directed to the member speaking) may be asked between first minute mark and the six-minute mark of the members' speeches (speeches are of seven minutes duration).

1.4.2 To ask a Point of Information, a member should stand, place one hand on his or her head and extend the other towards the member speaking. The member may announce that they would like to ask a "Point of Information" or use other words to this effect.

1.4.3 The member who is speaking may accept or decline to answer the Point of Information.

1.4.4 Points of Information should not exceed 15 seconds in length.

1.4.5 The member who is speaking may ask the person offering the Point of Information to sit down where the offeror has had a reasonable opportunity to be heard and understood.

1.4.6 Members should attempt to answer at least two Points of Information during their speech. Members should also offer Points of Information.

1.4.7 Points of Information should be assessed in accordance with clause 3.3.4 of these rules.

1.4.8 Points of Order and Points of Personal Privilege are not permitted.

1.5 Timing of the speeches

1.5.1 Speeches should be seven minutes in duration (this should be signaled by two strikes of the gavel). Speeches over seven minutes and 15 seconds may be penalized.

1.5.2 Points of Information may only be offered between the first minute mark and the six minute mark of the speech (this period should be signaled by one strike of the gavel at the first minute and one strike at the sixth minute).

1.5.3 It is the duty of the Speaker of the House to time speeches.

1.5.4 In the absence of the Speaker of the House, it is the duty of the Chair of the Adjudication panel to ensure that speeches are timed.

1.6 The adjudication

- 1.6.1 The debate should be adjudicated by a panel of at least three adjudicators, where this is possible.
- 1.6.2 At the conclusion of the debate, the adjudicators should confer and rank the teams, from first placed to last place. (see Part 5: The Adjudication).
- 1.6.3 There will be verbal adjudication of the debate after the first six preliminary rounds of the tournament. The verbal adjudication should be delivered in accordance with clause 5.5 of these rules.

Part 2 — Definitions

2.1 The definition

- 2.1.1 The definition should state the issue (or issues) for debate arising out of the motion and state the meaning of any terms in the motion which require interpretation.
- 2.1.2 The Prime Minister should provide the definition at the beginning of his or her speech.
- 2.1.3 The definition must:
 - (a) have a clear and logical link to the motion - this means that an average reasonable person would accept the link made by the member between the motion and the definition (where there is no such link the definition is sometimes referred to as a "squirrel");
 - (b) not be self-proving - a definition is self-proving when the case is that something should or should not be done and there is no reasonable rebuttal. A definition is may also be self-proving when the case is that a certain state of affairs exists or does not exist and there is no reasonable rebuttal (these definitions are sometimes referred to as "truisms").
 - (c) not be time set - this means that the debate must take place in the present and that the definition cannot set the debate in the past or the future; and
 - (d) not be place set unfairly - this means that the definition cannot restrict the debate so narrowly to a particular geographical or political location that a participant of the tournament could not reasonably be expected to have knowledge of the place.

2.2 Challenging the definition

- 2.2.1 The Leader of the Opposition may challenge the definition if it violates clause 2.1.3 of these rules. The Leader of the Opposition should clearly state that he or she is challenging the definition.
- 2.2.2 The Leader of the Opposition should substitute an alternative definition after challenging the definition of the Prime Minister.

2.3 Assessing the definitional challenge

- 2.3.1 The adjudicator should determine the definition to be ‘unreasonable’ where it violates clause 2.1.3 of these rules.
- 2.3.2 The onus to establish that the definition is unreasonable is on the members asserting that the definition is unreasonable.
- 2.3.3 Where the definition is unreasonable, the opposition should substitute an alternative definition that should be accepted by the adjudicator provided it is not unreasonable.
- 2.3.4 Where the definition of the Opening Government is unreasonable and an alternative definition is substituted by the Opening Opposition, the Closing Government may introduce matter which is inconsistent with the matter presented by the Opening Government and consistent with the definition of the Opening Opposition.
- 2.3.5 If the Opening Opposition has substituted a definition that is also unreasonable, the Closing Government may challenge the definition of the Opening Opposition and substitute an alternative definition.
- 2.3.6 If the Closing Government has substituted a definition that is also unreasonable (in addition to the unreasonable definitions of the Opening Government and Opening Opposition, the Closing Opposition may challenge the definition of the Closing Government and substitute an alternative definition.

Part 3 - Matter

3.1 The definition of matter

- 3.1.1 Matter is the content of the speech. It is the arguments a debater uses to further his or her case and persuade the audience.
- 3.1.2 Matter includes arguments and reasoning, examples, case studies, facts and any other material that attempts to further the case.
- 3.1.3 Matter includes positive (or substantive) material and rebuttal (arguments specifically aimed to refute the arguments of the opposing team(s)). Matter includes Points of Information.

3.2 The elements of matter

- 3.2.1 Matter should be relevant, logical and consistent.
- 3.2.2 Matter should be relevant. It should relate to the issues of the debate: positive material should support the case being presented and rebuttal should refute the material being presented by the opposing team(s). The Member should appropriately prioritize and apportion time to the dynamic issues of the debate.
- 3.2.3 Matter should be logical. Arguments should be developed logically in order to be clear and well reasoned and therefore plausible. The conclusion of all arguments should support the member’s case.
- 3.2.4 Matter should be consistent. Members should ensure that the matter they present is consistent within their speech, their team and the remainder of the members on their side of the debate (subject to clauses 2.3.4, 2.3.5 or 2.3.6 of these rules).
- 3.2.5 All Members should present positive matter (except the final two members in the debate) and all members should present rebuttal (except the first member in the debate). The Government Whip may choose to present positive matter.
- 3.2.6 All Members should attempt to answer at least two points of information during their own speech and offer points of information during opposing speeches.

3.3 Assessing matter

3.3.1 The matter presented should be persuasive. ‘The elements of matter’ should assist an adjudicator to assess the persuasiveness and credibility of the matter presented.

3.3.2 Matter should be assessed from the viewpoint of the average reasonable person. Adjudicators should analyze the matter presented and assess its persuasiveness, while disregarding any specialist knowledge they may have on the issue of the debate.

3.3.3 Adjudicators should not allow bias to influence their assessment. Debaters should not be discriminated against on the basis of religion, sex, race, color, nationality, sexual preference, age, social status or disability.

3.3.4 Points of information should be assessed according to the effect they have on the persuasiveness of the cases of both the member answering the point of information and the member offering the point of information.

Part 4 - Manner

4.1 The definition of manner

4.1.1 Manner is the presentation of the speech. It is the style and structure a member uses to further his or her case and persuade the audience.

4.1.2 Manner is comprised of many separate elements. Some, but not all, of these elements are listed below.

4.2 The elements of style

4.2.1 The elements of style include eye contact, voice modulation, hand gestures, language, the use of notes and any other element which may affect the effectiveness of the presentation of the member.

4.2.2 Eye contact will generally assist a member to persuade an audience as it allows the member to appear more sincere.

4.2.3 Voice modulation will generally assist a member to persuade an audience as the debater may emphasize important arguments and keep the attention of the audience. This includes the pitch, tone, and volume of the member’s voice and the use of pauses.

4.2.4 Hand gestures will generally assist a member to emphasize important arguments. Excessive hand movements may however be distracting and reduce the attentiveness of the audience to the arguments.

4.2.5 Language should be clear and simple. Members who use language which is too verbose or confusing may detract from the argument if they lose the attention of the audience.

4.2.6 The use of notes is permitted, but members should be careful that they do not rely on their notes too much and detract from the other elements of manner.

4.3 The elements of structure

4.3.1 The elements of structure include the structure of the speech of the member and the structure of the speech of the team.

4.3.2 The matter of the speech of each member must be structured. The member should organize his or her matter to improve the effectiveness of their presentation. The substantive speech of each member should:

4.3.3 The matter of the team must be structured. The team should organize their matter to improve the effectiveness of their presentation. The team should:

(a) contain a consistent approach to the issues being debated; and

- (b) allocate positive matter to each member where both members of the team are introducing positive matter; and
- (a) include: an introduction, conclusion and a series of arguments; and
- (b) be well-timed in accordance with the time limitations and the need to prioritize and apportion time to matter.

4.4 Assessing manner

- 4.4.1 Adjudicators should assess the elements of manner together in order to determine the overall effectiveness of the member's presentation. Adjudicators should assess whether the member's presentation is assisted or diminished by their manner.
- 4.4.2 Adjudicators should be aware that at a World Championship, there are many styles which are appropriate, and that they should not discriminate against a member simply because the manner would be deemed 'inappropriate Parliamentary debating' in their own country.
- 4.4.3 Adjudicators should not allow bias to influence their assessment. Members should not be discriminated against on the basis of religion, sex, race, color, nationality, language (subject to Rule 4.2.4), sexual preference, age, social status or disability.

Part 5 - The Adjudication

5.1 The role of the adjudicator

- 5.1.1 The adjudicator must: (a) Confer upon and discuss the debate with the other adjudicators;
- (b) Determine the rankings of the teams;
- (c) Determine the team grades;
- (d) Determine the speaker marks;
- (e) Provide a verbal adjudication to the members; and
- (f) Complete any documentation required by the tournament.
- 5.1.2 The adjudication panel should attempt to agree on the adjudication of the debate. Adjudicators should therefore confer in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect
- 5.1.3 Adjudicators should acknowledge that adjudicators on a panel may form different or opposite views of the debate. Adjudicators should therefore attempt to base their conclusions on these rules in order to limit subjectivity and to provide a consistent approach to the assessment of debates.

5.2 Ranking teams

- 5.2.1 Teams should be ranked from first place to last place. First placed teams should be awarded three points, second placed teams should be awarded two points, third placed teams should be awarded one point and fourth placed teams should be awarded zero points.
- 5.2.2 Teams may receive zero points where they fail to arrive at the debate more than five minutes after the scheduled time for debate.

5.2.3 Teams may receive zero points where the adjudicators unanimously agree that the Member has (or Members have) harassed another debater on the basis of religion, sex, race, color, nationality, sexual preference or disability.

5.2.4 Adjudicators should confer upon team rankings. Where a unanimous decision cannot be reached after conferral, the decision of the majority will determine the rankings. Where a majority decision cannot be reached, the Chair of the panel of adjudicators will determine the rankings.

5.3 Grading and marking the teams

5.3.1 The panel of adjudicators should agree upon the grade that each team is to be awarded. Each adjudicator may then mark the teams at their discretion but within the agreed grade. Where there is a member of the panel who has dissented in the ranking of the teams, that adjudicator will not need to agree upon the team grades and may complete their score sheet at their own discretion.

5.3.2 Team grades and marks should be given the following interpretation:

Grade	Marks	Meaning
A	180-200	Excellent to flawless. The standard you would expect to see from a team at the Semi Final/Grand Final level of the tournament. The team has much strength and few, if any, weaknesses.
B	160-179	Above average to very good. The standard you would expect to see from a team at the finals level or in contention to make to the the finals. The team has clear strengths and some minor weaknesses.
C	140-159	Average. The team has strengths and weaknesses in roughly equal proportions.
D	120-139	Poor to below average. The team has clear problems and some minor strength.
E	100-119	Very poor. The team has fundamental weaknesses and few, if any, strengths.

5.4 Marking the members 5.4.1 After the adjudicators have agreed upon the grade that each team is to be awarded, each adjudicator may mark the individual members at their discretion but must ensure that the aggregate points of the team members is within the agreed grade for that team.

5.4.2 Individual members' marks should be given the following interpretation:

Grade	Marks	Meaning
A	90-100	Excellent to flawless. The standard of speech you would expect to see from a speaker at the Semi Final/Grand Final level of the tournament. This speaker has much strength and few, if any, weaknesses.

B	80-89	Above average to very good. The standard you would expect to see from a speaker at the finals level or in contention to make to the finals. This speaker has clear strengths and some minor weaknesses.
C	70-79	Average. The speaker has strengths and weaknesses and roughly equal proportions.
D	60-69	Poor to below average. The team has clear problems and some minor strength.
E	50-59	Very poor. This speaker has fundamental weaknesses and few, if any, strengths.

5.5 Verbal adjudications

5.5.1 At the conclusion of the conferral, the adjudication panel should provide a verbal adjudication of the debate.

5.5.2 The verbal adjudication should be delivered by the Chair of the adjudication panel, or where the Chair dissents, by a member of the adjudication panel nominated by the Chair of the panel.

5.5.3 The verbal adjudication should:

5.5.4 The verbal adjudication should not exceed 10 minutes.

5.5.5 The members must not harass the adjudicators following the verbal adjudication.

5.5.6 The members may approach an adjudicator for further clarification following the verbal adjudication; these inquiries must at all times be polite and non-confrontational.

(a) identify the order in which the teams were ranked

(b) explain the reasons for the rankings of team, ensuring that each team is referred to in this explanation; and

(c) provide constructive comments to individual members where the adjudication panel believes this is necessary.

5.5.4 The verbal adjudication should not exceed 10 minutes.

5.5.5 The members must not harass the adjudicators following the verbal adjudication.

5.5.6 The members may approach an adjudicator for further clarification following the verbal adjudication; these inquiries must at all times be polite and non-confrontational.