Stoa Tabulation Manual 2017-2018
Includes Joy of Tournaments Instructions

Some updated items and items of special importance are highlighted in red throughout the manual.

All Joy of Tournaments support is managed by Stoa Tab.

- Please contact tab@stoausa.org with any questions.
- Please **do not** contact Joy of Tournaments with support questions.

Stoa supports local tournament control in the setting of openness and transparency. For local tournaments, changes may only be made to Tabulation methods described in this manual (e.g. tiebreakers, power-matching process) if announced in writing on the tournament registration website before tournament registration opens in keeping with the signed Stoa Tournament Registration Form.
Please read through all of the Stoa Tabulation Overview before making any changes.

Joy of Tournaments requires Windows XP or newer.
Joy will run under the latest Windows versions including Windows 10.

Stoa Tabulation Overview

Stoa Tabulation has spent thousands of hours to produce tab processes and procedures to best benefit Stoa students and families participating in speech and debate. This document has a dual purpose. Stoa believes that it is important for both experienced and new tabulation staff to understand not only what to do, but why Stoa makes the recommendations contained in this manual. Consequently, this manual explains the philosophical underpinnings behind some of the encouraged tabulation recommendations as well as practical details for using Joy of Tournaments programmed for Stoa.

Stoa Tabulation has Core Values which it applies to all tabulation processes.

1. The first is Stoa's belief in a Transparent Tabulation policy based on biblical principles. Please read this information on the Stoa website:

    - Stoa's Transparent Tabulation Policy http://stoausa.org/tournament-tabulation/

2. The second is a set of four Core Principles upon which Stoa tabulation (and any tabulation process) must be built. All choices made for tabulation procedures must abide by these four principles.

    Merit

    - Students should be rewarded for their performance at the tournament. The "better" students should earn the highest rankings and the "lesser" students should earn lower rankings
    - The procedures chosen should allow for the separation of the students into appropriate placings during the course of the tournament.
    - The procedures chosen should allow the better students to "rise to the top" and the lesser students "to settle to the bottom."
    - The meritocracy process has the benefit of allowing students to more frequently compete against other students of similar ability.

    Fair

    - It must be understood that no process can be 100% fair to 100% of the student competitors 100% of the time.
    - The procedures chosen should be made to be as fair as possible to the most students possible most of the time.

    Equitable

    - The procedures chosen should impact students as proportionally as possible.

    Consistent

    - The procedures chosen should reflect the overall goal of producing the best result and should be internally consistent with other procedures within the tabulation process.

There are different methods of tabulating speech and debate tournaments. The methods chosen should be based upon and consistent with the core values of Stoa Tab.

Stoa supports local tournament control in the setting of openness and transparency.

For local tournaments, changes may only be made to Tabulation methods described in this manual (e.g. tiebreakers, power-matching process) if announced in writing on the tournament registration website before tournament registration opens in keeping with the signed Stoa Tournament Registration Form. [This does not apply to Section Y, as these are simply recommendations and not tabulation methods.]

Before making changes to tabulation methods please consider carefully the words of John F. Kennedy, paraphrasing a longer G.K. Chesterton quote, "Don't ever take a fence down until you know the reason why it was put up."

Chesterton, and by extension Kennedy, was cautioning individuals from making changes to established procedures without a complete and thorough understanding of why the current processes and procedures have been established.

Please consider carefully how and why any changes you are contemplating better meet the Stoa Tabulation Core Values and principles of Transparency, Merit, Fairness, Equitability and Consistency than current procedures.

A. Install Joy of Tournaments

1. New since 2016-2017

a. Joy of Tournaments no longer requires a software registration key.

b. Those familiar with Stoa Tabulation and Joy of Tournaments are aware that previously Stoa Tournaments were expected to make a donation to Joy of Tournaments to support Mr. Hinkle. This is no longer the case and the software may be used at no cost to local clubs.

c. Tournaments using the stand-alone application (as is done at Stoa tournaments) may use the software free of charge.

i. About the author

I. Brent Hinkle, author of Joy of Tournaments has made a very generous arrangement with Stoa Tab personnel for use of his software, programmed specifically for Stoa, at all Stoa tournaments.

II. Mr. Hinkle is Christian gentleman and computer programmer, with a heart for Christian homeschool forensics.

III. Mr. Hinkle has worked extensively with Stoa Tab personnel to customize the software for use at Stoa tournaments without accepting any compensation in return.

IV. Mr. Hinkle has provided many hours of technical support to Stoa Tab national staff. He normally charges extra for this service, but has never billed Stoa for his time.

ii. *Please do not contact him directly or Joy Support, as Stoa Tab (tab@stoausa.org) provides all technical support for Stoa tournaments.*

2. Information is also available on the Joy of Tournaments website

   a. www.joyoftournaments.com
   b. The complete Help Manual from the Joy of Tournaments website may be downloaded at www.joyoftournaments.com/help
      i. Click on "Tab Software Training Notes" for the comprehensive Joy Manual (PDF file). It is a large file so be patient.
         I. http://www.joyoftournaments.com/help/JOT Training revision date Aug 2010.pdf

3. To download and install the software

   a. Navigate to http://www.joyoftournaments.com/update.asp
   b. Download the full software using this link on the Joy website (if you have not previously installed Joy of Tournaments on your computer):
      i. Full Version Self-Extracting Executable [33.0 MB] (this is not a clickable link in this document)
   c. If you already have Joy of Tournaments installed on your computer, you should update the software to the newest version by using this link:
      i. Update with Self-Extracting Executable [3.5 MB] (this is not a clickable link in this document)
   d. Follow the directions contained in the "Help Installing this Version" link on the Joy website immediately to the right of the above links.
      i. Click on the "Windows XP Installation Instructions"
      ii. In newer versions of Windows you may need to run the file as an administrator (or log in to the Administrator account) in order to install the software. Find the downloaded file titled "trial.exe" (or "trial1.exe," "trial2.exe," etc, if you have downloaded more than once) and right click on the file and choose "run as administrator."

B. View your Tournament Registration Website or Registration File

1. Find all the student names that need some kind of attention

   a. Names not capitalized or names in ALL CAPS
   b. Eliminate middle names – long names don't display well in Joy (they crowd the postings) or when they are uploaded to Speechranks
   c. Eliminate II or III or Jr. – these also don't display well
   d. Eliminate nicknames – there is not enough room to display both given name and nickname
   e. These caveats need to be checked for in both the student's primary registration and for the student's listing under partner registration

2. Check for club name anomalies and duplications

   a. Decide what names your want for clubs in Tab and how you want them displayed – Please also check how they are displayed on Speechranks
      i. E.g., Scarlet vs. SCARLET
      ii. Please keep the names the same as on Speechranks or two clubs will be created on Speechranks with the same students divided between what Speechranks thinks are different clubs

3. Students (and associated data) can either be input manually or imported into Joy

   a. Smaller tournaments may find it simpler to manually input all student information into Joy
   b. Larger tournaments will likely find it easier and faster to import all student information into Joy

4. Export the student list for later entering (either manually or import) into Joy

5. The following is specific to Flowpad Tournament Registration
   http://www.homeschooldebate.net

   a. Click the Students tab along the top of the window
   b. Click Export These Students
   c. Click Deselect All
   d. Check the following boxes in the Students Columns
      i. Student last
      ii. Student first
      iii. Debate Club
      iv. Speech Club
      v. Events at the tournament, e.g. Apologetics, DI, Duo, LDV, Parli, etc.
      vi. Check all the boxes for items listed under Partners
         I. Duo Interpretation partner first
         II. Duo Interpretation partner last
         III. Team Policy partner first
         IV. Team Policy partner last
   e. Click Export
   f. This produces a CSV file (Comma Separated Values)

6. If you are confident that all students are registered with just one speech and debate club, then you can upload this file directly to Joy. Concatenate (combines the first and last name together) partner names first. Alternatively, you may use the ***Flowpad to Joy Converter.*** It automatically concatenates the names for you.

7. Flowpad to Joy Converter

   a. Available on the StoaUSA website at http://stoausa.org/help-files/
      i. Click on the Tab Help button
   b. Creates CSV files that can be uploaded to Joy of Tournaments for students participating in separate clubs for speech and debate
   c. Performs concatenation function automatically
   d. Also assists in the following functions:
      i. Creating CSV Student Contact file for Speechranks upload
      ii. Creating labels for student ballot envelopes
      iii. Creating badges for students
      iv. Creating "Tents" for debate events
   e. Follow the directions in the Flowpad to Joy Converter Excel spreadsheet on the "Instructions" tab in the lower left hand corner of the spreadsheet.
   f. See Section H for details on importing students into Joy

C. General Tournament Setup in Joy of Tournaments

1. Launch Joy of Tournaments

   a. If you get the message that a tournament is locked and a question about whether you want to override the lock -> choose Yes

2. About Joy of Tournaments

   a. Left Window Pane is navigation
   b. Right Window Pane is the work area
      i. Anything in the right pane can be printed by right-clicking -> Print
   c. Menu Bar at the top
   d. Learn to right-click
      i. If you can't find something, try right-clicking
      ii. There are two or three ways to accomplish most tasks in Joy

3. File -> New

4. File -> Save

   a. Opens Save As dialogue box
      i. Navigate to where ever you want to save your tournament
      ii. Click the Create New Folder icon (it looks like a yellow folder with an asterisks in the upper right hand corner)
      iii. Name the New Folder
      iv. Be sure to then navigate into the folder you just created so that the dialogue box shows Save In the folder you just created

v. In the File Name box
    I. Erase the *.trn and replace it with whatever you want the file name for your tournament to be. It does not have to be the exact same name as the tournament, but this is an easy way to remember it
vi. Click Save
    I. The active tournament file will always be saved in this folder
    II. All backups will be saved within this folder in a folder titled "Bak"

5. File -> Properties

a. Shows a dialogue box with a number of Tabs with are dealt with on the next page

6. Tabs – only those listed need attention or action

a. General
i. Name
ii. Start Date and End Date
iii. Backup – specify a time interval, usually best to use 15 minutes
iv. Path – shows the file pathway to where your tournament is saved
    I. If you are ever unsure where your file is being saved, you can click the "Find Data File" button and the program will take you to your data file.
v. Single Expand Tree – checking will limit the expansion of the navigation tree in the left window pane. Some like this, some do not. Use what works for you.
vi. Log Add/Drops – check
vii. Validate on Exit – check

b. Options
i. The following boxes should be checked. All others should not be checked.
    I. Label Speaker Position
    II. Hide Codes on Ballots
    III. Ranks skip on ties
ii. School Order on Tree
    I. Alpha – alphabetize by club name
    II. Code – alphabetize by club code
    III. You can always change it later.

c. Styles
i. Stoa Tournament – Check
ii. Click Apply and you will receive confirmation concerning Stoa presets
    I. If the Stoa Tournament box is already checked, it is recommended to uncheck the box and click "OK." Then go back to File -> Properties -> Styles and recheck the Stoa Tournaments box and click "OK."

7. Import previous tournament information – if you have used Joy for a previous tournament this is a definite time saver

a. File -> Administration -> Import -> Import prior tournament data
i. Choose what information to import
I. E.g. Schedule, events, sweepstakes, rooms, etc.

8. Add Events

a. Right-click Events -> Add
b. Plan how you want to input events
c. The events stay in the order entered
d. Alphabetical vs. Pattern
e. Consider alphabetizing and putting LDV, Parli and TP at the bottom of the list
f. Right-click any event to get to Properties for that event

9. Event Properties – Right-click on any event – Tabs are as follows

a. Basic
i. Abbreviation, Name and Pattern
ii. Method
I. Section for Speech
II. Pair for Debate
iii. Type
I. Team of 2 for Duo, TP, Parli
II. Individual for all else (including LDV)
iv. Options
I. Draw – allows for listing of the Draw Time for Extemp (Some like this and some don't like to use - because if the schedule changes they have to change the times on the postings)

b. Rounds
i. Enter all the rounds and times
ii. For debate events, enter rounds all the way to finals so that the brackets display correctly. Do this even if the tournament stops short of finals.
iii. Panel the correct number of judges for Prelims and Outrounds
iv. Check Flight if flighting the event (If Flight Times desired on Postings and Ballots – see "e. Miscellaneous" on the next page.)
v.Check Flip for Sides in debate Outrounds
vi. ***Copy rounds from the same pattern to save repetitive entry***

c. Rooms

i. Rooms can be added to each event after the rooms are entered – See E below.
ii. Rooms can be entered into Joy at anytime. If they have already been entered, they can be added to events at this step in the process
iii. Right-click Events -> Rooms
iv. Try to do these alphabetically as this is how they will display on the postings. It is generally easier for students and parents to see the rooms listed alphabetically. If you go back and make changes, the rooms will be listed in the order in which they have been listed or changed.
v. Copy the rooms from one round to the next

d. Options

i. Allow ties for last place on ballots - Check for speech events
   I. Absolutely necessary to level uneven panel sizes
ii. Label Aff/Neg as Gov/Opp (Parli) – Check for Parli events
   I. This will label all ballots and postings appropriately for Parli

e. Misc - this is the Tab that sets up Tabulation for the tournament
- this Tab is also where Flight Times are entered

For local tournaments, changes may only be made to Tabulation methods described in this manual (e.g. tiebreakers, power-matching process) if announced in writing on the tournament registration website before tournament registration opens in keeping with the signed Stoa Tournament Registration Form.

i. Speech Events

If the presets are not as listed, go back to the tournament set up under Admin -> Properties -> Style Tab and unclick Stoa Tournament and click OK. Then go back to the Style Tab and recheck Stoa Tournament and check OK. Stoa presets should now be available for choosing. This process must often be followed if you are using data from a previous tournament to set up a new tournament.

I. Tabulation Method – STOA.SPEECH

a. If you click edit, the tiebreakers should be

1. Low Cumulative Rank = win for lowest total cumulative rank points
2. JP (Judge Preference) w/ 3-way Head to Head = breaks three-way ranking tie based on which student "wins" the most judges
3. Judge Preference = breaks two-way ranking tie based on which student "wins" the most judges
4. Sum of Inverse Reciprocals = win for highest total from adding the reciprocal point rank values (e.g. 1^{st} is 1/1 = 1; 2^{nd} is 1/2 = 0.5; 3^{rd} is 1/3 = 0.33; 4^{th} is 1/4 = 0.25; 5^{th} is 1/5 = 0.2; 6^{th} is 1/6 = 0.167; 7^{th} is1/7 = 0.143; etc…)
5. Head to Head = win awarded to student who bested other student in prior round
6. Prior Cumulative = win awarded to student with best placing prior to current round

II. Prelim Ranking Rules – STOA.PRELIMS

b. If you click edit, the tiebreakers should be

1. Adjusted Ranks = win for lowest total cumulative rank points after removing the highest and lowest rank points – increases fairness to students by correcting for potential partiality or inconsistency in judging pool
2. Total Ranks = win for lowest total cumulative rank points
3. Panel Ranks = win for lowest total cumulative room (panel) rankings
4. Inverse Reciprocals = win for highest total from adding the reciprocal point rank values (e.g. 1st is 1/1 = 1; 2nd is 1/2 = 0.5; 3rd is 1/3 = 0.33; 4th is 1/4 = 0.25; 5th is 1/5 = 0.2; 6th is 1/6 = 0.167; 7th is1/7 = 0.143; etc…)
5. Panel Reciprocals = win for highest total from adding the reciprocal room ranking (panel) values (e.g. 1st is 1/1 = 1; 2nd is 1/2 = 0.5; 3rd is 1/3 = 0.33; 4th is 1/4 = 0.25; 5th is 1/5 = 0.2; 6th is 1/6 = 0.167; 7th is1/7 = 0.143; etc…)

NOTE: Breaking ties for speech events if two students are tied through all tiebreakers – Speechranks requires each student to have a unique place of finish. (Continued on next page.)

Use the Show Power / Detail setting for the second and third rounds (if there is a third round) and break the tie by giving the higher placement to the student facing the more difficult competition. If tie is still unbroken, then coin toss is used to break any unbreakable ties as Speechranks requires each student to have a unique place of finish.

III. Ballot Style
   a. STOA Speech (w/ Penalties) – All Events except Cold Reading
   b. STOA Speech (no Penalties) – Cold Reading
IV. Leave NFL Type at Non-Qualifying
V. Speaker Goal – whatever number of students you most desire in each panel

ii. Debate Events

I. These debate tiebreakers are believed to be the best possible method for debate tiebreaking *(see fuller explanation in Section V: Understanding Stoa Tiebreakers)*

a. Previous tiebreakers meant teams facing the toughest competition were often disadvantaged by earning lower Speaker Points and Ranks and teams facing easier competition were advantaged by earning higher Speaker Points and Ranks

b. Previous methods relied on the serial application of the three data points collected (most often resulting in data points that were never utilized)
    1. Speaker Points
    2. Speaker Rank
    3. Opp W/L = Opposition Win vs Loss = Strength of Schedule

c. Teams with the highest Speaker Points were advantaged over the other data points
d. Speaker Rank and Strength of Schedule (Opp W/L) were often not considered
e. The current method applies all three data points at the same time utilizing the previous tiebreaking pattern.
    1. All three data points are ranked (similar to speech events) within record brackets (e.g. 6-0, 5-1, 4-2 etc..) and then combined giving each a one-third weighting

For local tournaments, changes may only be made to Tabulation methods described in this manual (e.g. tiebreakers, power-matching process) if announced in writing on the tournament registration website before tournament registration opens in keeping with the signed Stoa Tournament Registration Form.

II. Tabulation Method – STOA.DEBATE

If the presets are not as listed, go back to the tournament set up under Admin -> Properties -> Style Tab and unclick Stoa Tournament and click OK. Then go back to the Style Tab and recheck Stoa Tournament and check OK. Stoa presets should now be available for choosing. This process must often be followed if you are using data from a previous tournament to set up a new tournament.

III. If you click edit, the tiebreakers should be *(see fuller explanation in Section V: Understanding Stoa Tiebreakers)*

1. Win/Loss = Ranked by Win vs. Loss record

2. STOA 2x Bracket Ranking Sum = STOA 2x Hi/Lo Points Bracket Ranking + STOA 2x Hi/Lo Rank Bracket Ranking + STOA Opp W/L Bracket Ranking

3. STOA Adj Bracket Ranking Sum = STOA Adj Points Bracket Ranking + STOA Adj Rank Bracket Ranking + STOA Opp W/L Bracket Ranking

4. STOA Bracket Ranking Sum = STOA Points Bracket Ranking + STOA Rank Bracket Ranking + STOA Opp W/L Bracket Ranking

5. STOA Opp W/L Bracket Ranking = Ranks debaters with the same win/loss record based on the win/loss records of their opponents (measures strength of schedule)

6. Opp W/L = Opposition Win vs. Loss -- measures strength of schedule with teams facing the better opponents receiving the higher placement (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Opp W/L Bracket Ranking)

7. STOA 2x Hi/Lo Points Bracket Ranking = Ranks debaters within the same Win/Loss record based on 2x Hi/Lo Points

8. 2x Hi/Lo Points = Highest placement to teams with best Speaker Point totals (measured together as a team for each round) after removing the two highest and lowest point totals – increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating points from rounds with mismatched competition, preferential judging, or from judges who over or under rate student Speaker Points relative to the general judge pool (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA 2x Hi/Lo Points Bracket Ranking

9. STOA 2x Hi/Lo Rank Bracket Ranking = Ranks debaters with the same Win/Loss record based on 2x Hi/Lo Rank

10. 2x Hi/Lo Rank = Highest placement to teams with best Speaker Rank totals (measured together as a team for each round) after removing the two highest and lowest rank totals – increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating ranks from rounds with mismatched competition or preferential judging (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA 2x Hi/Lo Rank Bracket Ranking

11. STOA Adj Points Bracket Ranking = Ranks debaters with the same Win/Loss record based on Adj Points

12. Adj Points = Highest placement to teams with best Speaker Point totals (measured together as a team for each round) after removing the highest and lowest point totals – increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating points from rounds with mismatched competition, preferential judging, or from judges who over or under rate student Speaker Points relative to the general judge pool (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Adj Points Bracket Ranking

13. STOA Adj Rank Bracket Ranking = Ranks debaters with the same Win/Loss record based on Adj Rank

14. Adj Rank = Highest placement to teams with best Speaker Rank totals (measured together as a team for each round) after removing the highest and lowest rank totals – increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating ranks from rounds with mismatched competition or preferential judging (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Adj Rank Bracket Ranking)

15. STOA Points Bracket Ranking = Ranks debaters with the same Win/Loss record based on Speaker Points

16. Points = Total Speaker Points (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Points Bracket Ranking)

17. STOA Rank Bracket Ranking = Ranks debaters with the same Win/Loss record based on Rank

18. Rank = Total Speaker Ranks (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Rank Bracket Ranking)

NOTE: *Coin toss is used to break any unbreakable ties as Speechranks requires each team to have a unique place of finish.*

II. Speaker Ranking Rules – STOA.SPEAKERS

a. If you click edit, the tiebreakers should be

1. STOA 2x Hi/Lo Ranking Sum = STOA 2x Hi/Lo Points Ranking + STOA 2x Hi/Lo Rank Ranking

2. STOA Adj Ranking Sum = STOA Adj Points Ranking + STOA Adj Rank Ranking

3. STOA Ranking Sum = STOA Points Ranking + STOA Ranks Ranking

4. STOA 2x Hi/Lo Points Ranking = Ranks debaters based on 2x Hi/Lo Points

5. 2x Hi/Lo Points = Highest placement to student with best Speaker Point total (measured for each individual student) after removing the two highest and lowest points – increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating points from rounds with mismatched competition, preferential judging, or from judges who over or under rate student Speaker Points relative to the general judge pool (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA 2x Hi/Lo Points Ranking)

6. STOA 2x Hi/Lo Ranks Ranking = Ranks debaters based on 2x Hi/Lo Rank

7. 2x Hi/Lo Ranks = Highest placement to student with best Speaker Rank total (measured for each individual student) after removing the two highest and lowest ranks – increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating ranks from rounds with mismatched competition or preferential judging (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA 2x Hi/Lo Ranks Ranking)

8. STOA Adj Points Ranking = Ranks debaters based on Adj Points

9. Adj Points = Highest placement to student with best Speaker Point total (measured for each individual student) after removing the highest and lowest points – increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating points from rounds with mismatched competition, preferential judging, or from judges who over or under rate student speaker points relative to the general judge pool (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Adj Points Ranking)

10. STOA Adj Ranks Ranking = Ranks debaters based on Adj Ranks

11. Adj Ranks = Highest placement to student with best Speaker Rank total (measured for each individual student) after removing the highest and lowest ranks – increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating ranks from rounds with mismatched competition or preferential judging (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Adj Rank Ranking)

12. STOA Total Points Rankings = Ranks debaters based on Total Points

13. Total Points = Total Speaker Points (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Speaker Points Ranks)

14. STOA Total Ranks Rankings = Ranks debaters based on Total Ranks

15. Total Ranks = Total Speaker Ranks (note: this is the data used to calculate the preceding STOA Speaker Rank Ranks)

NOTE: Breaking ties for debate events if two students are tied through all tiebreakers – Speechranks requires each student to have a unique place of finish.

The student with the better Win/Loss record shall be given the higher place of finish. Coin toss is used to break any unbreakable ties as Speechranks requires each student to have a unique place of finish.

III. Ballot Style
   a. LDV - "Debate – Ranks for LD" *<– CHOOSE THIS!!!*
   b. TP – Default
   c. Parli – Default
      1. Remember for Parli -- under the Options Tab -- check the box "Label Aff/Neg as Gov/Opp (Parli)"

IV. Leave NFL Type at Non-Qualifying
V. Speaker Points – Minimum 6, Maximum 30
VI. Duration (in minutes) – prints Flight times on Postings and Ballots
   a. List the length of time of the first Flight in the Single Performance window
   b. Does not matter if Entire Round left at zero or filled in
VII. Speaker Goal – ignore as does not matter for debate
   a. Non-flighted debate events will auto populate with "2"
   b. Flighted debate events will auto-populate with "4"

D. Backing Up

1. Plan frequent backups to flash drives

2. You should have created a folder for the tournament when you originally saved the tournament
3. Copy that entire folder with all the backups onto the flash drive

4. Joy will Auto-Save every 15 minutes and create a backup folder at whatever interval you specify. The default setting is every 15 minutes

   a. This means you are never have to recreate more than 15 minutes of work

5. Joy can be very particular about where you save your files

   a. Be careful about your backing up and saving
   b. Whatever file and folder you open the tournament from is the file location that will be saved to
   c. Where ever you last saved to is where all future saves and backups will go

6. Backup to the flash drive after every significant Tab event, e.g.,

   a. After tournament set up, before entering or importing students
   b. After sectioning and printing a round
   c. After entering ballots for a round
   d. Any other time there is some down time, be sure you are backed up

7. "Save Copy As" allows you to save a separate copy to another file or location and to give it an identifying name to make it easy to determine when the backup was made

    a. Examples would represent progress in the tournament
        i. Speech Round 2
        ii. Speech Semis
        iii. Debate Round 4
        iv. Debate Quarters
        v. Etc.

8. ***Have the tournament backed up to two different flash drives and have those carried by two different people at the end of each day.***

E. Rooms

1. Right-click Add

    a. Name
        i. Try to keep it as short as possible as it improves the display
    b. Notes
        i. Any special notation, e.g. Tab, Judge Hospitality, Ballot Return
    c. Times
        i. Default is always available
        ii. Availability can be specified
    d. Checkboxes
        i. Specify certain preferences
        ii. Generally, uncheck all the boxes
        iii. Not unchecking the boxes can lead to problems in Outrounds
    e. Will alphabetize automatically, especially after a restart of the program.

2. General room scheduling concepts

    a. Schedule the largest rooms for the best attended Speech Finals and Semifinals
        i. Duo draws the largest crowd
        ii. HI usually draws the next largest crowd
        iii. Then OI, Expos, OO, etc…with the Limited Preps drawing the least
            I. There may be regional differences in event popularity
            II. Schedule based on what happens in your area
    b. Schedule large rooms for debate Outrounds, especially the later rounds
    c. Seek to minimize event movement
    d. Plan Extemp Prep rooms to be near competition rooms
    e. Plan for space for Expos paraphernalia, both for competition and storage
    f. Plan for tournament administration rooms, e.g., Tab, Judge Hospitality, etc.

F. Schools = Clubs

1. Right-click Add

2. Code

a. Three or four letters
b. Four letters generally offers better pattern recognition of the abbreviated name (Five letters is too long and wont display properly on postings)

3. Name

a. Full name of the club
b. Try to keep to a single word or as short as possible (displays better on postings)
1. Match Club Names with those on Speechranks
a. Easiest during tournament set-up, but can be done before upload to Speechranks
c. Enter any other information you wish

G. Sweepstakes – Pre-Tournament

1. Right-click on Event and Choose Sweepstakes.

2. General comments (represents the Sweepstakes philosophy of NITOC)

a. Should represent the "sweep" of the tournament
b. All speeches and debates should receive credit
c. A student should be rewarded for performing well on the first day of the tournament as well as performing well on the last day of the tournament
i. More credit is earned as the tournament progresses to outrounds
d. Large events are mathematically more difficult to win
e. Large events can't be given so much credit that the winner of a single large event wins sweepstakes.
f. One method is to divide events up by size, e.g. small, medium, large and extra large and decide how many points an event in each category is worth
g. Attempt to implement meaningful mathematical progressions

3. Speech Events
May count toward Speech Sweeps, Tournament Champion and Club Awards

For example:

a. Start with prelims – 100 minus 10 per place
i. 100 for 1st
ii. 90 for 2nd
iii. 80 for 3rd
iv. 70 for 4th
v. 60 for 5th
vi. 50 for 6th
vii. 40 for 7th
viii. 30 for 8th

b. Semis – 200 minus 20 per place
   i. 200 for 1st
   ii. 180 for 2nd
   iii. 160 for 3rd
   iv. 140 for 4th
   v. 120 for 5th
   vi. 100 for 6th
   vii. 80 for 7th
   viii. 60 for 8th

c. Finals – 400 minus 40 per place
   i. 400 for 1st
   ii. 360 for 2nd
   iii. 320 for 3rd
   iv. 280 for 4th
   v. 240 for 5th
   vi. 200 for 6th
   vii. 160 for 7th
   viii. 120 for 8th

d. This arithmetic progression gives a balanced number of points for finishing 1st in finals as it does for finishing 1st in both prelim rounds and semis combined.
   i. If finals was scored 400, 390, 380, 370, 360… it would weight finals far to heavily
   ii. Each place of finish in each round is given the same relative weight

Consider breaking your events down into category sizes like Extra Small, Small, Medium, Large and Extra Large. Using NITOC 2012 as an example.

Extra Small			
Wildcard	15 students	3 Prelims	100 minus 10 per place
		Finals	500 minus 50 per place
		Total	**800** (if first place in every round)
Small			
DI	43 students	3 Prelims	100 minus 10 per place
Expos	48 students	Semis	400 minus 40 per place
		Finals	500 minus 50 per place
		Total	**1200** (if first place in every round)
Medium			
Duo	63 students	3 Prelims	100 minus 10 per place
HI	70 students	Quarters	300 minus 30 per place
OI	64 students	Semis	400 minus 40 per place
Pers	65 students	Finals	500 minus 50 per place
		Total	**1500** (if first place in every round)
Large			
Apol	109 students	3 Prelims	100 minus 10 per place
Extemp	104 students	Quarters	300 minus 30 per place
OO	96 students	Semis	500 minus 50 per place
		Finals	700 minus 70 per place
		Total	**1800** (if first place in every round)

Extra Large

Cold Reading	222 students	3 Prelims	100 minus 10 per place
		Quarters	300 minus 30 per place
		Semis	600 minus 60 per place
		Finals	900 minus 90 per place
		Total	**2100** (if first place in every round)

e. ***Copy Sweeps to other events of similar size***

4. Debate Events

May count toward Debate Sweeps, Tournament Champion, or Club Awards

a. Plan for Total Points to match similar size speech event

b. Award points for all rounds (similar to all speeches)

At an Example Tournament

Points for Debate Wins/Losses

E.g., TP 64 teams and/or LDV 68 students = Medium Speech Event

Prelim Rounds x 6
30 points for win, 5 point for loss (just as with Speech, students receive credit for participating in each round)
Total Prelim Points180 (if winning every round)

Quarters
200 points for reaching Quarters and 250 points for winning (or reaching Semis)

Semis
350 points for win
(Awards 250 points for reaching Semis via points awarded for winning Quarters)

Finals
500 points for win
(Awards 350 points for reaching Finals via points awarded for winning Semis)

Total Points 1480 (if winning every round) *Similar to the 1500 points for a Medium size speech event.*

Points for Speaker Awards - Must be calculated manually (demonstrated below), as not currently supported in the software. *Stoa has submitted request to have this feature added to the Sweepstakes calculations.*

TP 64 teams -> 128 Students = Large Speech Event

(Note that TP and Parli students are competing against twice as many students as there are teams.)

1800 Points minus 180 per place

LDV 68 students = Medium Speech Event

1500 Points minus 150 per place

Tournament Champion at NITOC = Speech Sweeps Points + Debate Points + Speaker Awards Points

H. Entering or Importing Students

1. If entering students manually, follow the instructions in the Joy of Tournaments manual

2. If importing using the ***Flowpad to Joy Converter***, follow these steps

   a. In Section B, you created three import files (saved as CSV files)
   i. SpeechDebate Upload file for students in a single club
   ii. Speech Upload file for students in separate speech club
   iii. Debate Upload file for students in separate debate club

   b. As mentioned earlier, if all students are only in one club, that file can be imported directly into Joy without the necessity of the three separate files. Concatenate (combine first and last name) the partner names first. Or use the ***Converter*** SpeechDebate tab to automatically concatenate the names for you.

   c. In Joy navigate to: File -> Administration -> Import -> Import Entries
   i. Choose your CSV Upload files, importing them one at a time.
   ii. If using the three files, begin with the SpeechDebate Upload file

   d. This brings up the Import Entries box allowing you to "Map" the data into Joy

      i. Student Last Name -> Last Name
      ii. Student First Name -> First Name
      iii. Speech Club -> School Name
      iv. Event Name (choose the actual event name) -> Event Name
         1. Events can be mapped at one time, they don't have to be done individually
      v. Scroll down to the bottom of the left hand column
      vi. Duo Partner -> Duo Partner
      vii. TP Partner -> Team Policy Partner
      viii. Parli Partner -> Parliamentary Partner
         I. Don't use the Duo Partner First, Duo Partner Last or the Team Policy Debate Partner First, Team Policy Debate Partner Last, etc. for mapping any of the partnered events. Use the concatenated names (first and last names together) further down on the list.
      ix. Click OK
      x. Make sure student names are not all upper or lower case

e. Map the Speech Club to School Name for both the SpeechDebate import and the Speech import

f. Map the Debate Club to School Name for the Debate import

3. Click on the Events folder, as this will list all events and the number of students entered into each event. Verify that the number of students in each event matches the numbers in your tournament registration page. If not, figure out why.

4. In team events, such as Duo, Parli, and TP make sure the teams are all matched correctly. There should not be any singe person teams. Refer to the Joy manual on how to correct unmatched teams

5. Sometimes the students on the team are not listed alphabetically. They should be.

6. Right-click on team and select Change Team.

7. Change the team name for alphabetical correctness.

8. If two or more sets of siblings are partnered in Duo, Parli or TP, add a first initial directly in front of the last name, e.g. two or more sibling with the team name of Smith-Jones. Andrew Smith and Janet Jones become ASmith-JJones and Kathy Smith and Robert Jones become KSmith-RJones

a. This convention will allow for the proper displaying of names in Speaker Results for debate. Other methods of adding initials will result in improper displaying of names.

9. Double check all of your tournament setup

a. Events
b. Rounds
c. Dates and times
d. Rooms
e. Students
f. Expected sections
g. Sweepstakes
h. Clubs
i. Tabulation

I. Sectioning Speech Events

1. Print copies of the ***Tab Speech Workflow Tracking Sheet*** - **http://stoausa.org/help-files/**

   a. This will make sure that you perform all the necessary tasks for each event throughout the tournament.
   i. It is remarkable how easy it is to forget basic tasks.
   ii. Not every checkbox needs to be completed for every round

2. Right-click Event Round One and choose Create Sectioning

   a. This sections all the preliminary rounds for the event at one time.

3. Right-click Event Round One and choose Adjust for Cross Entries

   a. This moves students entered in multiple events to speaker positions that increase the likelihood of the students completing each of their speeches in a particular pattern.
   b. A checkbox will appear. Choose the events in a particular pattern.
   c. If you have manually adjusted the Extemp speaker positions (mentioned below), then do not check the box for Extemp, or your work will be undone.

4. Perform the Section Check

   a. The program will alert you to several potential issues if they exist
   i. Ignore the warning that "Students from the same school are speaking back to back." This is not something to be concerned about. (It is an issue in college)
   ii. Number of students in each section (room) should be balanced to within one
   iii. Make room changes for students with special needs
   iv. **Extemp** students from same club should not be in the same speaker position (This is less of an issue now that many clubs are using Electronic Extemp, but seeking to minimize is still a good idea.)

      I. Joy automatically performs function
         a. Right-click on the Extemp Round in the left window pane
         b. Select "Speaker Order" from the drop down menu
         c. Click the "PRP Extemp" button and click OK
            1. Depending on the number of conflicts, this procedure may need to be performed repeatedly.
               i. May not work and may need to be performed manually
            2. You may need to select another event in the same pattern to cause this to work.
      II. Manual method
         a. Hover the mouse over any student and all students in the same club turn red
         b. Students can be moved by clicking and holding the mouse and then moving the student to the desired location and releasing the mouse.
         c. Perform this activity carefully as there is no "undo" button

5. Build Anonymous Judge Panel by right-clicking on Section One of each event.

a. Choose "Build Anonymous Panels" from the drop down menu
b. This will anonymously panel the number of judges you specified in the event set up for each of the Prelim Rounds. If not, repeat this procedure on subsequent Prelim Rounds

6. Make any Final Room Adjustments

a. Make any necessary room changes
i. Examples might include for students with special needs. This might be a student confined to a wheel chair or a student that is injured and on crutches. Do not assign these students to an inaccessible room such as a second floor room in a building without an elevator.

7. Tab Director performs any necessary quality control

a. The Tab Director should review any of the steps performed above as needed based on any problems or difficulties experienced by the tabulation team

8. Print Ballots

a. Right-click on event round

b. Choose "Print All Ballots" from the drop down menu

c. Print on the back of the pre-printed ballots for the event
i. This will create the Judges Ballot on one side and the event rules will be on the other side

9. Print Postings

a. Right-click on event round
i. Choose "Print Postings" from the drop down menu

b. You may choose to print the large postings from the "Posting – Large" folder under the round. These are easier to read.
i. Right-click in the right window pane and choose to "Print on Default Printer" for a single copy or "Print…" to specify the printer and number of copies.

c. Keep a copy for Tab.

Sibling Protect – As with the concept of Club Protect (addressed later in the debate section), Sibling Protection (preventing siblings from speaking or debating against one another) depends on the tournament's philosophy. There is no right or wrong answer to these choices, just different preferences. There are valid arguments to be made for both options. One side can reasonably support the decision not to have siblings compete against one another at a tournament. The other side recognizes that creating any form of protection advantages some students/families and can also create disadvantages for other students/families.
NITOC – there is **no Sibling Protection** at NITOC (beyond that provided by club diversification in Speech and Club Protect in preliminary rounds of debate).

J. Debate Pairing

1. Print copies of the ***Tab Debate Workflow Tracking Sheet – Preliminary Rounds*** **http://stoausa.org/help-files/**

    a. This will make sure that you perform all the necessary tasks for each event throughout the tournament.
        i. It is remarkable how easy it is to forget basic tasks.
        ii. Not every checkbox needs to be completed for every round.

2. Random Rounds

    a. Right-click on the round to be paired

    b. Random tab – At least first round

    c. Method – Normal

    d. Side Assignment – Balanced

        i. The software will attempt to assign each team an even number of Affirmative (Government) and Negative (Opposition) rounds in a tournament with an even number of preliminary rounds (strongly recommended)
        ii. An even number of rounds on each side of the ballot is a priority which will only be violated in rare cases as noted on Page 25 in J.4.b.

    e. Priorities (these might need to be altered for events heavily populated by one or more clubs or for very small tournaments)

        i. Squad Mates (teams from same club) – Also known as "Club Protect"

            I. Absolute - prevents teams from the same club debating one another
            II. Preferred - allows teams from same club to debate, but only if necessary
            III. Ignore - ignores club affiliation allowing teams from same club to debate
            IV. This choice depends on the tournament's philosophy of whether or not to allow teams from the same club to debate one another. There is no right or wrong answer to these choices, just different preferences. There are valid arguments to be made for both options. The impact of this choice is much more significant in power matched rounds as will be discussed in that section of this manual.

a. The main argument for offering Club Protect is to require students to debate teams from other clubs and not to debate their own teammates against whom they may practice on a regular basis. There are also issues of club spirit and camaraderie.
b. The main argument against offering Club Protect is that any form of protection alters the true random nature of the debate round by increasing the probability that teams from larger clubs will not debate one another. This advantages larger clubs and disadvantages smaller clubs.
c. Some feel the Preferred option is a reasonable middle ground.

ii. Prior Opponents – Absolute (obviously not applicable to Round 1)
iii. School (Club) Variation – Preferred
iv. Squad (Club) Variation – Preferred

f. Double-check Side Assignment again. The program default is Absolute and sometimes after initially choosing Balanced the program will default back to Absolute after making the Priorities choices in the previous step

g. Click "Create Pairings" button

3. Power Matched Rounds

a. The sooner, the better as students are matched against those of like ability and the validity of the results increases. (Small tournaments may need to delay power matching or not use power matching if the event is very small.)

b. Right-click on round -> Pair

c. Hi-Low Power Match tab

d. Use Rankings as of: the round you are Power Matching off of

e. Bracket Balancing

i. Promote – Worst Opposition
I. Moves the team least deserving of their record to the higher bracket
II. This is the fairest method present in any debate software
ii. Placement – Recalculate
I. Pairs the round within the bracket as if all teams share the same record
II. Provides balance to potential uneven pairings increasing fairness

f. Options

i. Prevent squad-mates from hitting

I. Checking the box will keep teams from the same club from debating one another

a. Even if desired, may need to be unchecked for events heavily populated by one or more clubs or for small events as program may not be able to power match the later rounds

b. *A helpful tip if utilizing power matching at a tournament with more than about 30% of the teams from one club is to place all of the teams from the large club on aff / gov or neg /opp in Rounds 3 and 5. That will increase the chance of better power matching in Rounds 4 and 6.*

II. Unchecking the box will allow teams from the same club to debate one another

III. This choice depends on the tournament's philosophy of whether or not to allow teams from the same club to debate one another. There is no right or wrong answer to these choices, just different preferences. There are valid arguments to be made for both options. The impact of this choice is more significant in power matched rounds as it has a greater impact on which teams debate each other in power matched rounds

a. The main argument for offering Club Protect is to require students to debate teams from other clubs and not to debate their own teammates against whom they may practice on a regular basis. There are also issues of club spirit and camaraderie.

b. The main argument against offering Club Protect is that any form of protection alters the debates that "should occur" based on the power matching algorithm increasing the probability that teams from larger clubs will not debate one another. This advantages larger clubs and disadvantages smaller clubs.

c. Analysis of the impact of club protect at NITOC indicates that in each round about 25% of the students will be moved to a debate other than the one the program would have chosen as the best power match. (This is the largest debate tournament with the greatest number of teams. It is expected that at smaller tournaments with fewer teams that the impact will be far greater.) There are still valid arguments for altering the power matching by club protecting, but the tabulation staff (and tournament attendees) must be aware that any form of protect advantages some teams/clubs while disadvantaging others. The question becomes one debated in every round…which advantages and disadvantages will be considered the most important.

ii. Prevent prior opponents from hitting
    I. Check

iii. Adjust pairings to hide power
    I. Uncheck
        a. This allows you more easily review the power matching
            i. It is recommended to review the power matching
        b. If you forget and leave this checked when you Create Pairings you can right-click in the right window pane and choose Show Seedings to reveal the same information

iv. Click "Create Pairing" button

4. Check for any error messages

a. Generally, do not worry about a message that "power matching failed." It just means the strictness of your criteria was not completely met. The round is probably okay. Most commonly this means teams have been "pulled-up" from their brackets to debate teams with better records.

b. The program prefers better power matching at the rare expense of the lowest ranked debaters, e.g. a low ranked team might be given an extra aff /gov or neg/opp round in the final round to improve the power matching to determine who breaks and who does not break. This means the program prefers debates that "matter" in terms of breaks over those debates that do not factor into the break decision matrix.

5. Check validity of pairings

a. Review seedings and power matched pairings
i. If "adjust pairings to hide power" was unchecked then seedings will display
ii. If not unchecked then right-click in right window pane and choose Show Seedings – this can be done anytime you wish to view the seedings and the power matching

b. Review the win/loss records of paired teams
i. Ideally, teams with the same records should be paired against each other.
    I. E.g., the 4-0 teams should be paired against other 4-0 teams. The 3-1 teams should be paired against each other and the 2-2 teams should be paired against each other. However, the program can rarely pair teams in this manner perfectly. Often, the program will "pull-up" a 3-1 team to debate a 4-0 team or "pull-up" a 2-2 team to debate a 3-1 team, etc. This is called a "pull-up". Rarely, the program will need to "pull-up" a 2-2 team to debate a 4-0 team. This is called a "double pull-up." Pull-ups are relatively common so do not be alarmed when they occur.
    II. By choosing earlier to promote the team with the worst opposition record it helps to minimize the number of times an individual team will be pulled-up. The pulled-up team is credited for having faced a team with a better record and this decreases the likelihood the same team will be pulled up repeatedly. (This is addressed in Section W about Pull Ups)

a. When **lag power matching** (power matching off a round previous to the immediate prior round) the chances of a team getting pulled up again increase as the program is using data from an round previous to the last round competed.

c. Check that a student/team is not assigned two Bye rounds
   i. No team should be given two automatic wins
   ii. The program will likely only make this happen if **lag power matching,** but be sure to check for a second Bye in each round

d. Check that a student/team is not assigned a Bye that has a prior win by forfeit or that a team will be receiving a forfeit (if known) if they have a previous Bye
   i. No team should be given two automatic wins

e. Uncheck Show Seedings (right-click in the right window pane) prior to printing ballots and postings
   i. Failure to do so will show the current won/loss records of the teams
   ii. The Show Seedings can be turned on and off anytime you wish to view the seedings and the power matching

6. Re-Order Pairings

a. Right-click in right window pane and choose Re-Order Pairings. Choose Random and click OK.
   i. This step is important because it hides the brackets so the students cannot determine who has what record.
   ii. If not done, the posting will essentially show students records

7. Double Flighting of LDV

a. It is often preferable to have students from the same club in the same room in back to back rounds.
   i. This improves the percentage of rooms that judges can judge

b. Joy will perform this function automatically
   i. Choose each Round being Double Flighted prior to printing ballots or postings
   ii. Right-click in the right window pane, but do not click on or between a debate pairing, e.g. click above or to the right of the debate pairings
   iii. Choose "Re-Order Pairings" from the drop down menu
   iv. Choose "Minimize schools per flight" and click OK
   v. This will place students from the same club in the same room in Flight One and Flight Two (obviously in separate Flights)
   vi. Remember that when double flighting you are essentially re-ordering the pairings twice by first choosing Random and then again choosing Minimize schools per flight

8. Make any Final Room Adjustments

a. Make any necessary room changes
i. Examples might include for students with special needs. This might be a student confined to a wheel chair or a student that is injured and on crutches. Do not assign these students to an inaccessible room such as a second floor room in a building without an elevator.

9. Tab Director performs any necessary quality control

a. The Tab Director should review any of the steps performed above as needed based on any problems or difficulties experienced by the tabulation team.

10. Print Ballots

a. Right-click on the Round -> Debate Ballots

b. Choose "Stoa Ballot" from the Ballot Format window

c. Print on the front of the pre-printed debate ballots for the event
i. Be sure to move all Sections from the left window to the right window
ii. Click the button to print in Section order

d. Right-click on the Round -> Debate Ballots

e. Choose "Stoa Speed Ballot" from the Ballot Format window (if using – this helps tournaments run on time, especially useful at large events)
i. Be sure to move all Sections from the left window to the right window
ii. Click the button to print in Section order

11. Print Postings

a. Right-click on the Round -> Print Postings
i. Or print from the view of the round itself in the right window pane
b. Keep a copy for Tab

K. Speech - Entering Ballots

1. Find Round, Section, and Judge then right-click and Enter Ranks

a. Maximum rank entered should equal the smallest panel (number of students in room) regardless of how many students are in the larger panels
i. E.g., smallest panel has 7 students, so larger rooms are tabbed 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,7

2. Do this for all judges

3. Ballot status can be checked by viewing Ballot Status

4. ALWAYS, ALWAYS, ALWAYS have two people work together to input results

   a. NEVER allow one person to read results and enter data as this is the surest way to introduce error into the recording of results.

   b. One person reads ballot and second person keys in results
      i. Reader reads list of names to confirm speaker order on printed ballot matches the speaker order on the screen
      ii. Reader reads numbers from top to bottom of Judges Ballot
      iii. Data entry person then reads the numbers back from bottom to top

5. Double Checking Results (previously known as Shadow Tab)

   a. For each Round of each event navigate to the folder labeled Results by Section
      i. Print these results
         I. Double check these results against the ballots
         II. Again, have one person read the ballots and another person confirm the results on the printed page
         III. If the same two people are performing the Double Check as originally entered the data, then they must switch roles.
            a. The person who originally keyed in the data should be the one to read the ballots.
            b. The original ballot reader should NEVER re-read ballots during the Double Check as any mistakes made the first time are at risk to be repeated.
         IV. Do not perform this activity on screen, use a paper printout of the Results by Section

6. Tab Director Performs any necessary quality control
   a. The Tab Director should review any of the steps performed above as needed based on any problems or difficulties experienced by the tabulation team

L. Debate - Entering Ballots

1. Can be done by viewing the round and right-clicking on the individual debate and choosing to Enter Ballot

2. Preferred method is to right-click on the round and choose Enter Ballots

3. This brings up all the ballots and you can choose the ballot to enter

4. Confirm teams for Aff (Gov) / Neg(Opp)

   a. Vitally important during outrounds as Tab team places teams on appropriate sides based on coin flip in rounds.
   b. Make sure the correct team is assigned the W/L and not just the Aff (Gov) or Neg (Opp)

5. Just type in the numbers as indicated for Speaker Points, Rank and Decision

    a. No tabbing (using the tab key) is necessary as long as the Speaker Points are 10 or greater. The software will automatically move the entry point from one field to the next. Tab Key is needed if Speaker Points are 6 to 9 to advance to the next field.

6. For Bye rounds, make sure the opponent is listed as BYE

    a. Speaker points and ranks will be averaged

7. Forfeit Rounds

    a. Winning team will have speaker points and ranks averaged
        i. The Results for the round will show "0" and the Check Sheet will show no numbers (only the decision) and neither will reflect the averaging of points on these screens. Review the Prelim Results file and this should reflect the averaging. If not, go back and double-check the data entry.

    b. Forfeiting team will have zero speaker points and ranks will be recorded as "2" for LDV and "4" for TP and Parli

    c. If a team/competitor has already received a win from a forfeit, do not let them receive a bye.
        i. This would give the team two wins without having to debate to earn both wins.
        ii. The speaker points should still calculate correctly, but double check to be sure.

    d. If a team has already received a bye and then is going to receive a forfeit, try to re-pair the round to prevent this from happening.
        i. If there is no time to re-pair the round, there is nothing else to do except to record the results accurately.

    e. There must be an opposing team in forfeit rounds
        i. DO NOT attempt to assign a forfeit to a Bye round.

8. Handling Speaker Results for teams that drop during preliminary rounds at the tournament

    a. Make sure these students finish last in the Speaker Results uploaded to Speechranks as they did not compete fully through all rounds determining speaker placings.
        i. This may need to be done manually on the CSV produced by Joy.

9. ALWAYS, ALWAYS, ALWAYS have two people work together to input results

    a. NEVER allow one person to read results and enter data as this is the surest way to introduce error into the recording of results.

b. One person reads ballot and second person keys in results
   i. Reader reads numbers and decision from the ballot
   ii. Make sure the correct team is assigned the W/L, Speaker Points, Speaker Ranks and not just the Aff (Gov) or Neg (Opp)
   iii. Data entry person then reads the numbers and decision back

10. Double Checking Results (previously known as Shadow Tab)

a. For each round of the event navigate to the folder labeled either Results or Check Sheet
   i. Print these results
      I. Some folks prefer one of the display styles over the other
      II. The information should be the same between the two folders
         a. Very rarely during tournament set up the names of the debate partners may be switched to correctly alphabetize their names. Depending on how the data was input into the program, this could, on rare occasion, result in the switching of Speaker Points and Speaker Rank amongst partners.
            1. This is another reason a double check is performed
            2. If this happens, check the other display format from the other folder (Results vs. Check Sheet) and see if the results are correct in the other folder. If so, then use only that folder format for the remainder of the tournament.
      III. Double check these results against the ballots
         a. If Speed Ballots were used for original ballot entry, use the regular Stoa Ballot for the double check
      IV. Again, have one person read the ballots and another person confirm the results on the printed page
      V. If the same two people are performing the Double Check as originally entered the data, then they must switch roles.
         a. The person who originally keyed in the data should be the one to read the ballots.
         b. The original ballot reader should NEVER re-read ballots during the Double Check as any mistakes made the first time are at risk to be repeated.
      VI. Do not perform this activity on screen, use a paper printout of the Results or Check Sheet

11. Tab Director performs any necessary quality control

a. The Tab Director should review any of the steps performed above as needed based on any problems or difficulties experienced by the tabulation team.

M. Speech Breaks to Outrounds

1. Go to Event, Prelim Results, Anonymous

   a. Do not look at the Prelim Results with names before clicking into the Anonymous folder so as not to be influenced by the names on the list

   b. Decide how many students to advance to Outrounds and ensure that there are no ties between breaking and non-breaking students

   c. Write the number down of anonymous students who will advance

   d. Return to Prelim Results and Double-click under the number of students to be advanced

2. Sectioning

   a. Right-click on the first outround and choose Create Sectioning

   b. Verify the section data for the number of qualifiers, sections and speakers per section

   c. For Method choose Balance Power for all outrounds except Finals. For Finals choose Default.
      i. For all Outrounds do not check the box for Top/Bottom Speaker Order

3. Perform the standard Section Check as on Page 20 I.4. including the Extemp check as in I.4.a.iv.

   a. If a student breaks to Outrounds in Extemporaneous and many other speech events it can be helpful to place the student(s) in one of the first speaking slots in the Extemporaneous section. This will maximize the opportunity for the student(s) to present all of his/her speeches within the time frame allotted for the Outround. This also minimizes wait times for judges and decreases the risk of tournament delays.

4. Club balancing in Outrounds while maintaining power balance

   a. Performed automatically by the software

   b. Right-click between the Sections (in the right window pane) and choose Show Power/History

   c. This show the balance of power in the rooms (as well as giving additional information as documented in the manual produced by Joy of Tournaments)

5. Proceed to the round to be competed and complete all the same tasks as previously documented beginning on Page 20, I.5 through Page 21 I.9 to build panels, make final room adjustments, Tab Director quality control and to print ballots and postings.

6. TAB DIRECTOR should confirm correct qualifiers to Outrounds.

N. Speech Breaks to Next Outround

1. Tabulate the round

2. Right-click on the round just tabulated and choose Break to "Name of Next" Round

a. This will prompt you to enter the number of students from each section to be advanced to the next round

b. Fill in the appropriate number

3. Right-click on the next Outround to be competed and choose Create Sectioning

a. Verify the section data for the number of qualifiers, sections and speakers per section

b. For Method choose Balance Power for all outrounds except Finals. For Finals choose Default.
i. For all Outrounds do not check the box for Top/Bottom Speaker Order

4. Perform the standard Section Check as on Page 20 I.4. including the Extemp check as in I.4.a.iv.

a. If a student breaks to Outrounds in Extemporaneous and many other speech events it can be helpful to place the student(s) in one of the first speaking slots in the Extemporaneous section. This will maximize the opportunity for the student(s) to present all of his/her speeches within the time frame allotted for the Outround. This also minimizes wait times for judges and decreases the risk of tournament delays.

5. Club balancing in Outrounds while maintaining power balance

a. Performed automatically by the software

b. Right-click between the Sections (in the right window pane) and choose Show Power/History

c. This show the balance of power in the rooms (as well as giving additional information as documented in the manual produced by Joy of Tournaments)

6. Proceed to the round to be competed and complete all the same tasks as previously documented beginning on Page 20, I.5 through Page 21 I.9 to build panels, make final room adjustments, Tab Director qualify control and to print ballots and postings.

7. Repeat this process until the tournament is finished

8. TAB DIRECTOR should confirm correct qualifiers to subsequent Outrounds

O. Debate Breaks to Outrounds

1. Print copies of the ***Tab Debate Workflow Tracking Sheet – Outrounds*** **http://stoausa.org/help-files/**

2. Navigate to the Prelim Results folder for the event and open that folder

3. Right-click on Seedings and choose Create Seedings

4. Right-click on Seedings again and choose Seed Bracket or Seed Partial Bracket

   a. If your tournament is competing a Partial Outround bracket the software will ask how many teams will be advanced to Outrounds

   b. Fill in the appropriate number

5. Proceed to the specific Outround to be competed, E.g. Quarterfinals, Semifinal, Finals, etc.

6. Create judge panel

   a. Right-click on the specific Outround and choose Build Anonymous Panels

7. Hide Seedings and Bracket

   a. Navigate to the Judges folder for the specific Outround

   b. Right-click in the right window pane and un-click Show Seedings

   c. Right-click in the right window pane and check "in Aff Code Order"
      i. The default setting of "in Section Order" displays the debate bracket
      ii. Utilizing "in Aff Code Order" makes it harder for debaters to determine seeding and the bracket

8. Make any necessary room changes

9. Print Ballots and Postings

   a. Print Speed Ballot and Student (Regular) Ballot as during preliminary rounds

   b. To print Outround Postings navigate to the Judges folder for the Outround and Right-click in the right pane and choose Print
      i. The Judges folder gives a better format for printing for judges sign up at Ballot Push
      ii. Do not right-click on the Outround name and choose Print as was done in Preliminary rounds as doing so will cause the bracket to print

10. When entering ballots for a partial round, make sure that the teams receiving a Bye are given a win. Sometimes they may not advance correctly if you don't complete this step.

    a. The software may indicate that the ballot could not be recorded, that is okay

11. Entering Ballots must be performed with extreme caution as sides are not assigned except in cases where teams have previously met and sides are locked

    a. Check and double check that sides are correct

    b. Print results and double check results

    c. THE TAB DIRECTOR SHOULD PERSONALLY TRIPLE CHECK RESULTS

13. Continue repeating the same tabulation process until the event is complete

14. Speaker Points and Speaker Rank are not recorded in Outrounds

P. When the Event is Complete

1. Event should show as Complete when it is finished

2. All events should be complete – if not right-click Event -> Complete

Q. Sweepstakes – Post-Tournament (All of these are optional)

1. Review results to make sure they "look right"

2. Picket Fence Awards

    a. Given to students earning the most Picket Fence Rounds
        i. Meaning all judges on a panel rank the student first

    b. Keep track while entering ballots or review results in Joy

3. Speech Sweepstakes

    a. Sweeps Folder and choose Individual Folder

4. Tournament Champion

    a. One method is to use the Speech and Debate Sweeps from Joy

    b. Another method is to sum Speech Sweeps + Debate Points + Speaker Award Points (this is the NITOC method)
        i. Speech and Debate Sweep Points come from Joy
        ii. Speaker Award Points scored manually
            I. Explained in Section G, "Sweepstakes," Page 15

5. Club Awards (Club is defined as having three or more students)

   a. Speech Awards

   b. Debate Awards

   c. Club Champion Awards
      i. A "Club" must have a minimum of three students for NITOC

   d. For all Club Awards use the ***Club Champion Spreadsheet*** - http://stoausa.org/help-files/
      i. Enter all Clubs
      ii. Enter the number of Speech students per club
      iii. Enter the number of LDV students per club
      iv. Enter the number of Parli teams per club
      v. Enter the number of TP teams per club

   e. The Club Champion Spreadsheet balances and compares large clubs with small clubs based on standardized scores for both total points and club efficiency

   f. The number of students in LDV vs. Team/Parli Debate events is also considered

   g. The Standard Rank column shows the order of finish

   h. The Percent Rank column is used as a tiebreaker

R. Create Awards Script

1. Two to three hours from the end of Speech finals is recommended before the tournament results are needed on stage

   a. Depends on the complexity of the awards to be presented

   b. Use results from program
2. Navigate to Final Results at the bottom of each event folder

3. Alternatively, use the Tournament Results produced by Joy

   a. File -> Administration -> Export -> Export Results
      i. Produces a CSV file for each event
      ii. Note: Speaker Awards can be completed after prelims

S. Compiling Results for Review and Distribution

1. Combine the CSV files into one spreadsheet file
    a. Drag and drop the events onto a common spreadsheet file
    b. Arrange in alphabetical speech order and the alphabetical debate order
    c. Save as an Excel file as CSV files only allow a single sheet (tab)
    d. Email to interested parties

T. Upload to National Christian Homeschool Speech and Debate Rankings

1. Browse to www.speechranks.com
2. Register yourself on the site and click, "I am not a competitor."
3. Create a Tournament
    a. Enter all tournament information
4. Create a Flag on the Tournament and request Tournament Access
5. Speechranks Administrators will grant you access to your tournament
6. This provides you the ability to Upload tournament results

The following information is posted on the Speechranks website:
Information Needed for Tournament Administrators to Upload Tournament Results
http://www.speechranks.com/about/uploading_results

7. Joy of Tournaments produces CSV files for each event for upload to Speechranks (Speechranks requires CSV files for uploading tournament results)
    a. File -> Administration -> Export -> Export Results
        i. Produces a CSV file for each event saved in the same folder as the tournament files or wherever you specify when saving
        ii. These CSV files can be uploaded to Speechranks

b. Debate Speaker Results must be obtained separately by another means

i. Navigate to each Debate Event -> Prelim Results -> Speaker Points

ii. Then right-click in the right window pane (the window with the Speaker Points results) and choose "Save Speaker Rankings as Text…"
   I. The text file (noted as a TXT file) will be saved in the same folder as the other tournament files or wherever you specify when saving

iii. Use Excel to convert the TXT file to a CSV file
   I. Open the .txt file from within Excel using the "Open" command
   II. This should launch the Text Import Wizard
      a. You can also choose "Import" from the File menu and Excel will ask, "What type of file do you want to import?"
      b. Choose the Text File button and click Import
      c. Navigate to the text file you want to use and select it and click Get Data (or whatever the prompt is for your version of Excel)
      d. This should also launch the Text Import Wizard
      e. If your version of Excel does not offer this functionality then ask one of your Excel savvy friends to help you
   III. In the "Original Data Type" window choose the "Delimited" button
   IV. Set "Start Import at Row" to 3 (or to whatever row shows Rank, Code, Name… or Rank, School, Team…etc.) and click Next
   V. In the Delimiters window choose "Comma" and click Next
   VI. In the Column Data Format window the "General" button should be checked. Click Finish
   VII. Only the Rank and Name columns will be needed for uploading to Speechranks. You do not need to delete the other columns; you can simply choose the two necessary columns when uploading to Speechranks.

U. Merging the Tournament when Using Multiple Computers

1. Divide the tournament up into separate workstations

a. Speech, LDV, Parli, TP
   i. Speech can be further divided up within each pattern to quicken ballot entry

b. Save the tournament to a flash drive

c. Take flash drive to master computer

d. From master computer choose File -> Administration -> Merge Tournament

e. In the Locate Box click Browse

f. Find the tournament file you will import and chose Open or double-click

g. Click Next

h. Map the event from the Current Tournament window to the same event in the Imported Tournament window
   i. Repeat this for all events you are merging

Congratulations on a job well done!

For from Him and through Him and to Him are all things. To Him be the glory forever. Amen.
Romans 11:36 (NASB®)

V. Understanding Stoa Debate Tiebreakers

Stoa Tab has worked hard to produce tab processes to best benefit Stoa students and families participating in debate. One of these processes is the debate tiebreaking system. This document is meant to help explain the reasoning supporting the processes advocated by Stoa Tab.

Stoa Tab has core values which it applies to all tab processes including debate tie breaking:

Stoa's Transparent Tabulation Policy http://stoausa.org/tournament-tabulation/

Merit

- Teams should be rewarded for their performance at the tournament. The "better" teams should earn the highest rankings and the "lesser" teams should earn lower rankings.
- The procedures chosen should allow for the separation of the teams into appropriate placings during the course of the tournament.
- The procedures chosen should allow the better teams to "rise to the top" and the lesser teams "to settle to the bottom."
- The meritocracy process has the benefit of allowing teams to more frequently debate other teams of similar ability.

Fair

- It must be understood that no process can be 100% fair to 100% of the debate competitors 100% of the time.
- The procedures chosen should be made to be as fair as possible to the most teams possible most of the time.

Equitable

- The procedures chosen should impact teams as proportionally as possible.

Consistent

- The procedures chosen should reflect the overall goal of producing the best result and should be internally consistent with other procedures within the tabulation process.

Stoa debate tournaments are generally run utilizing a process known as "power matching". Some debate tournaments are too small to utilize power matching and this discussion does not apply to those tournaments. Power matching is utilized to pair debate rounds during the tournament. There are different methods of power matching. The methods chosen should be based upon and consistent with the core values of Stoa Tab.

Stoa Debate Tiebreakers

Stoa has developed a comprehensive tiebreaker system to fairly rank debaters. The current model eliminates various problems and increases fairness. Our tabulation software (Joy of Tournaments) utilizes this tiebreaker system.

The old tiebreaker system (pre-2015) had weaknesses that failed, at times, to reward debaters appropriately. For example, consider the following real life example that often occurred under the old tiebreaking method. Team A and Team B participate in six preliminary rounds of debate and both teams finish with 4-2 records. Team A won their first four debates and lost the next two debates. Team B lost their first two debates and won their next four debates. Because of power matching, the teams competed as follows:

After Round 1	
Team A is 1-0	Team B is 0-1
Round 2	
Team A debates another 1-0 Team and wins	Team B debates another 0-1 Team and loses
Round 3	
Team A debates another 2-0 Team and wins	Team B debates another 0-2 Team and wins
Round 4	
Team A debates another 3-0 Team and wins	Team B debates another 1-2 Team and wins
Round 5	
Team A debates another 4-0 Team and loses	Team B debates another 2-2 Team and wins
Round 6	
Team A debates another 4-1 Team and loses	Team B debates another 3-2 Team and wins
After Round 6	
Team A is 4-2	Team B is 4-2

Team A is a good Team and received middle of the road Speaker Points because it debated strong opponents who were also good speakers. Team B is a good Team and collects excellent Speaker Points because it debated weaker opponents who had weaker debating skills. Team B earned more Speaker Points than Team A because Team B looked better in comparison to its less accomplished opponents than Team A looked in comparison to their more successful opponents. Nevertheless, the old tiebreaker system would place Team B above Team A in the tournament standings. There were tournaments where the old tiebreakers would break the 4-2 tie based on Speaker Points and, therefore, Team B would advance to outrounds (not Team A) because Team B received higher Speaker Points (which Team B earned by defeating weaker teams).

However, based on the records of their opponents, Team A faced much tougher competition than Team B. In rounds 2-6, Team A debated an opponent with a winning record in every round (1-0, 2-0, 3-0, 4-0, and 4-1) but Team B debated only one opponent in rounds 2-6 with a winning record (a 3-2 record). All the other opponents of Team B had losing or neutral records (0-1, 0-2, 1-2, 2-2).

In addition, the combined the records of all the opponents of Team A, at the time they debated Team A was 14 wins and 1 loss. Team B, on the other hand, debated teams that, at the time of each debate with Team B, had a combined total of 6 wins and 9 losses.

This stark imbalance in the degree of competition faced by Team A and Team B was troubling because, under the old tiebreaker system, Team B would finish ahead of Team A and could be advanced to outrounds (not Team A) based on Speaker Points.

This scenario occurred repeatedly using the previous tiebreaking methods and it raised important fairness questions.

Was Team A treated fairly from a tiebreaking perspective?
Which team was more deserving of the 4-2 record?
Should Team B advance to outrounds after debating significantly weaker opponents?
Should Team B be rewarded for collecting better Speaker Points against weaker opponents?

As a result, Stoa Tab was not satisfied that the debate results produced using the previous tiebreaking methods were as fair as they could be or even fair at all. Stoa Tab was convinced that a superior method of tiebreaking was needed and could be developed. When considering tiebreakers, Stoa Tab believes that each of the data points produced during the round should be used. Specifically, each round produces four data points:

a. The Win/Loss record of the debate team
b. Speaker Points
c. Speaker Rank
d. Strength of Schedule: the combined Win/Loss records of all opponents of a debate team

The first basis for ranking debaters is always the Win/Loss record. Initially ranking debaters based on their own Win/Loss records is universally agreed upon. Thereafter, tiebreakers are a matter of tab philosophy. There are no right or wrong tiebreakers, but Stoa Tab does believe in the method adopted (discussed below) and will advocate for the tiebreakers currently in use.

Stoa Tab has produced what many believe to be the fairest tiebreaking method available. The Stoa Tiebreakers were produced by the combined work of the NITOC Tab Directors with input from other Tab Directors. The Stoa Tiebreakers are available only in Joy of Tournaments thanks to special computer programming for Stoa. Other debate software only offers the old tiebreaking methods producing the problematic results detailed previously.

After grouping teams into Win/Loss brackets (e.g. 6-0, 5-1, 4-2, 3-3, 2-4, 1-5, 0-6) the question becomes how to determine where each team places within the bracket. What should be the tiebreakers for distinguishing between the 6-0 teams, the 5-1 teams, the 4-2 teams, etc.? This placement will determine a team's final place of finish at a tournament and may determine which teams advance to outrounds and which teams do not.

The old tiebreaking methods relied upon the serial application of the remaining three data points: Speaker Points, Speaker Rank and Strength of Schedule. Before discussing the old and current tiebreakers, each data point should be analyzed.

Speaker Points. Speaker Points range from 6 to 30. In practice, judges tend to award Speaker Points in the range of about 15 to 30 with most judges awarding between 20 to 30 points. Wide variations in the possible scores exist. Speaker Points is the most arbitrary of the data points because judges may assign whatever scores they want including the same score for all debaters. As a result, the Speaker Points in any debate may or may not be relative to other debaters in the room because the scores may all be different or all be the same. The range of scores may be wide or narrow (or tied).

Some people believe that earning Speaker Points is primarily under the control of the speaker: speak well and receive high points or speak poorly and receive low points. Others contend that Speaker Points is primarily under the control of the judge because: (1) some judges "correctly" award high Speaker Points to good speakers and low Speaker Points to weaker speakers, (2) some judges "incorrectly" award high Speaker Points to novices, (3) other judges "incorrectly" award low Speaker Points to excellent speakers and (4) the strength of the opponent's speaking ability can influence the outcome.

The primary problem with Speaker Points is that it is impossible to accurately compare debaters in one room to debaters to another room. Debaters are debating for different judges in different rooms against different opponents of different talent levels. The worst speaker in one room might be better than all the speakers in another room and vice versa. A meaningful comparison cannot be made. Admittedly, this problem is true no matter which data points are being considered, including wins and losses.

Speaker Ranks. In each debate, the judge ranks the speaker in order (i.e. 1^{st}, 2^{nd}, 3^{rd}, 4^{th}). Speaker Ranks range from 1 to 4 for Parliamentary debate and from 1 to 2 for Lincoln Douglas and Individual Policy. Unlike Speaker Points, Speaker Ranks involves minimal variation and is a less arbitrary data point. The judge must assign a rank order for the debaters and no ties are possible. Thus, ranks are always relative to other debaters in room (unlike Speaker Points).

Some people believe that earning Speaker Ranks is primarily under the control of the speaker: speak well and receive high ranks or speak poorly and receive low ranks. Others contend that Speaker Ranks is primarily under the control of the judge because: (1) some judges "correctly" award high Speaker Ranks to good speakers and low Speaker Ranks to weaker speakers, (2) some judges "incorrectly" award high Speaker Ranks to novices, (3) other judges "incorrectly" award low Speaker Ranks to excellent speakers and (4) the strength of the opponent's speaking ability can influence the outcome.

As with Speaker Points, the primary problem with Speaker Ranks is that it is difficult to accurately compare debaters in one room to debaters to another room. Debaters are debating for different judges in different rooms against different opponents of different talent levels. The worst speaker in one room might be better than all the speakers in another room and vice versa. A meaningful comparison is not possible. Admittedly, this problem is true no matter which data points are being considered, including wins and losses.

Strength of Schedule. Strength of Schedule refers to the combined Win/Loss record of the opposition. So if Team A faces six teams in a tournament and those six opponents finish the preliminary rounds with records of 5-1, 5-1, 4-2, 4-2, 3-3 and 1-5, the Strength of Schedule for Team A is 22-14. Strength of Schedule is a general measure of the level of competition faced during the tournament. It is a cumulative sum of rounds won and loss by all opponents at a tournament.

Some teams will face easier competition during a tournament and others will face tougher competition. This regularly happens for a variety of reasons.

First, most tournaments power match which means the tab software tries to match teams against each other which have the same records (e.g. 4-0 teams against 4-0 teams in the fifth round and 5-0 teams against 5-0 teams in the sixth round, etc.). Successful teams face more successful teams and unsuccessful teams face more unsuccessful teams. Simply put, the more you win, the more tough teams you face in future rounds. The more you lose, the more you are paired against easier teams in future rounds.

Second, subsequence performance by an opponent will affect a team's Strength of Schedule. So, for example, assume Teams A and B never debate each other but (1) they both finish 5-1 and (2) in each of the six rounds Teams A and B debated others team with the same record as Teams A and B (i.e. both Team A and B were 3-0 after three rounds and they debated other 3-0 teams in the fourth round, etc.). If the opponents of Team B lost all their subsequent rounds after debating Team B but the opponents of Team A all won their subsequent rounds after debating Team A, then the Strength of Schedule of Team A would be greater than Team B.

Third, some rounds are randomized instead of power matched (for example, the first preliminary round).

Fourth, the computer cannot always match teams in a round with the same Win/Loss record. For example, a tournament might have an odd number of 4-0 or 3-1 teams heading in to the fifth round resulting in "pull-ups" (i.e. a 4-0 team facing a 3-1 team).

Fifth, side constraints, club protection, prior opponents protection and other factors will sometimes result in other pull-ups such as a 5-0 team debating a 4-1 team in the sixth round.

Tiebreaker Problem. So how should tournaments use Speaker Points, Speaker Ranks and Strength of Schedule when breaking ties? How should these three data points be used to determine a team's rank within a particular Win/Loss bracket? In past years, the tiebreakers were applied serially. The computer looked at the first tiebreaker before all others. The second tiebreaker was only used if there was a tie at the first tiebreaker. The third tiebreaker was only used if there was a tie at the second tiebreaker. The fourth tiebreaker was only used if there was a tie at the third tiebreaker. The fifth tiebreaker was only used if there was a tie at the fourth tiebreaker. This process continued through all the given tiebreakers.

In the past, the first tiebreaker was traditionally a variation on Speaker Points and the second tiebreaker was traditionally a variation on Speaker Ranks. Subsequent tiebreakers usually went back and forth on additional variations of Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks. Strength of Schedule was used far down the list, if at all.

The main problem with this method was that two thirds of the data collected round by round was not being used to determine ranking within the bracket. Speaker Points were being used to the significant exclusion of the other data points. Speaker Points were being looked at independent of how the speakers ranked and who they were debating to earn the Speaker Points. The first tiebreaker (Speaker Points) often broke ties and, when that occurred, neither Speaker Rank nor Strength of Schedule was used at all.

- **Is the serial application of debate tiebreakers aligned with Stoa Tab core values?**
    - Merit – Impossible to determine
    - Fair – No
    - Equitable – No
    - Consistent – No

Tiebreaker Solution. Stoa Tab sought to develop a method that incorporated all three data points in parallel fashion rather that in a series. Applying all three data points at the same time by combining them is superior to applying them one at a time because, in the past, ties were often broken based on Speaker Points alone. As noted previously, Speaker Points alone cannot be used to meaningfully compare debaters debating in different rooms, for different judges, against differing levels of competition. As a result, the current tiebreaker system creates a bracket ranking (Win/Loss bracket) using all three data points and is consistent with the room ranking system used in speech events. This is one way in which the current tiebreakers meet the consistency criteria of Stoa Tab core values. In the steps that follow, one can see the importance of consistency to Stoa Tab.

There is no fancy math, complicated formulas, or manipulated weighting of data. Stoa Tab lets the data speak for itself by keeping the process as simple as possible and using the data collected directly from the judge's ballots each round: Win/Loss, Speaker Points, Speaker Ranks and Strength of Schedule.

Each Win/Loss bracket is treated consistent with a single speech room. Every team within the Win/Loss bracket is given an ordinal rank from first to N based on their Speaker Points, Speaker Rank, and Strength of Schedule. So all four data points are used, including Win/Loss, within a single Win/Loss bracket. This is superior to systems in which a significant percentage of the data points are never utilized.

The team with the best Speaker Points in each Win/Loss bracket earns first place. The team with the second best Speaker Points in the bracket earns second place. The team with the third best Speaker Points in the bracket earns third place, etc… If teams are tied, they earn the same placement as other teams with whom they are tied.

In this consistent fashion, the team with the best Speaker Ranks in each Win/Loss bracket earns first place. The team with the second best Speaker Ranks in the bracket earns second place. The team with the third best Speaker Ranks in the bracket earns third place, etc… If teams are tied, they earn the same placement as other teams with whom they are tied.

Again in the consistent process, the team with the most difficult Strength of Schedule in each Win/Loss bracket earns first place. The team with the second most difficult Strength of Schedule in the bracket earns second place. The team with the third most difficult Strength of Schedule in the bracket earns third place, etc… If teams are tied, they earn the same placement as other teams with whom they are tied.

Consistent with Stoa's own processes from the speech side of tab, the first place team earns a one, the second place team earns a two, the third place team earns a three, etc… The three ordinals are then summed with the lowest point total winning - consistent with judge panels in speech. For example,…1+1+1=3, and 2+4+1=7, and 3+2+3=8. The team with 3 points earns first place within the Win/Loss bracket, the team with 7 points earns second place in the bracket and the team with 8 points earns third place in bracket.

Stoa tab kept the system consistent with Stoa's prior system of progressive tiebreakers: 2X Hi/Lo, then 1X Hi/Lo (called Adj Hi/Lo in Joy of Tournaments) and then all results. The 2X Hi/Lo, then 1X, Hi/Lo, then all results also maintains a consistent progression from one level of tiebreaking to the next.

Some folks might be concerned that 2X Hi/Lo or even 1X Hi/Lo is not utilizing all the data collected, but that is an erroneous understanding of what is taking place. The 2x Hi/Lo does not mean those data points are not used. They are, in fact, being used to determine which teams have been most consistently earning the highest Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks. The same holds true for 1X Hi/Lo. As noted in the Tab Manual this also increases fairness to students by rewarding the most consistent speakers from round to round by eliminating points from rounds with mismatched competition, preferential judging, or from judges who over or under rate student Speaker Points relative to the general judge pool

This parallel utilization of data system provides many advantages. For example, think of the situation (discussed earlier) in which a judge gives all the debaters in a TP or Parli room 30 Speaker Points. While this is good for the few fortunate students in this room, it hurts other students in all the other debate rooms who did not benefit from this one judge's generosity. Maybe all four speakers were truly outstanding, but it is unlikely that each was a "perfect" speaker. Serial tiebreakers (the old method) consider only these Speaker Points. Parallel tiebreakers (Stoa method) consider that although each speaker received a 30, they were also ranked 1, 2, 3, 4 (for Parli or TP) or 1, 2 (for LDV). Incorporating Speaker Ranks into the first tiebreaker mitigates the impact of one judge giving all four debaters 30 Speaker Points.

The same result occurs if a judge gives every speaker in a debate 15 Speaker Points**.** While unfortunate for the students before this judge it helps all the other students in all the other debates who were not hurt by this one judge awarding low points. Maybe all four speakers were truly poor speakers, but it is unlikely. Serial tiebreakers (old method) consider only these Speaker Points. Parallel tiebreakers (Stoa method) consider that although each speaker received a 15, they were also ranked 1, 2, 3, 4 (for Parli or TP) or 1, 2 (for LDV). Incorporating Speaker Ranks into the first tiebreaker mitigates the impact of one judge giving four debaters all 15 Speaker Points.

Overall, in every round, Speaker Points are considered, but they are balanced with Speaker Ranks within the room, which provides better results when reconciling diverse data. One student may receive a 30 and be the top speaker in the room and another student may receive a 30, but is the fourth speaker in the room. Another student may receive a 15 and be the fourth speaker in the room and another student may receive a 15, but is the top speaker in the room. The parallel application of Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks goes a long way toward balancing out the disparity between judges who give high Speaker Points, low Speaker Points, high Speaker Ranks and low Speaker Ranks. Overall, it is much fairer to the students.

Likewise, the strength of the opponent against which the Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks were earned is also taken into consideration, which provides better results when reconciling diverse data. One student may debate the top team at the tournament and receive lower scores for Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks because their opponent is so strong. Another student debates the worst team at the tournament and receives high scores for Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks because their opponent is not as strong. The parallel application of Speaker Points, Speaker Ranks, and Strength of Schedule helps balance out the disparity that occurs in Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks based on how strong or weak the debater's opponent is.

Strength of Schedule gives meaning and context to Speaker Points and Speaker Ranks, otherwise they are just random data. Debate coaches preach context and for good reason. The absence of context renders information meaningless.

As a result of this method, two-thirds of the tiebreakers within a Win/Loss bracket are based on a team's speaking ability (Speaker Points plus Speaker Ranks) and one-third is based on the team's Strength of Schedule.

The Stoa parallel tiebreakers account for and take into consideration virtually every combination of teams being benefitted by or hurt by facing better or weaker teams, teams with better or worse records and teams that are better or worse speakers along with judges who are more generous awarding points and those that are less generous awarding points. The Stoa parallel tiebreakers also ameliorate the harmful impact of "pull-up" rounds (e.g. a team is 2-2 and should debate another 2-2 team, but they get pulled up to debate a 3-1 team).

A significant disadvantage under the old tiebreaking method was that a team may be pulled up multiple times to debate opponents with a better record**.** This could happen multiple times to the same team placing that team at a significant disadvantage.

However, the blended tiebreakers prevent a team from being pulled up multiple times. Once a team is pulled up it gains the benefit of the Strength of Schedule of the team with the better record. Based on the algorithm for pull-ups, the team should only be pulled up once each tournament. The larger the tournament, the more this will be true. Even at smaller tournaments, the number of pull-ups will be balanced out amongst the competing teams rather than some teams being disadvantaged relative to other teams by being assigned multiple pull-up rounds. Even if the team loses the pull-up round to the team with the better record, they are benefitted by "taking on" the better Strength of Schedule from the team with the better record.

CONCLUSION: (next page)

CONCLUSION:

- **Is the blended/parallel application of debate tiebreakers aligned with Stoa Tab core values?**
    - Merit – Yes
    - Fair – Yes
    - Equitable – Yes
    - Consistent – Yes

Impact. The Stoa Tiebreakers (the blended/parallel tiebreakers) are applied throughout the tournament and improve the quality of the power matching even more as the tournament progresses. Tournament results are improved because they take into account Speaker Points, Speaker Rank and Strength of Schedule all at the same time in a balanced fashion.

W. Understanding Stoa Debate Power Matching and the Issue of "Pull-Ups"

Stoa Tab has worked hard to produce tab processes to best benefit Stoa students and families participating in debate. One of these processes is debate power matching. This document is meant to help explain the reasoning supporting the processes advocated by Stoa Tab.

Stoa Tab has core values which it applies to all tab processes including debate power matching:

Stoa's Transparent Tabulation Policy http://stoausa.org/tournament-tabulation/

Merit

- Teams should be rewarded for their performance at the tournament. The "better" teams should earn the highest rankings and the "lesser" teams should earn lower rankings.
- The procedures chosen should allow for the separation of the teams into appropriate placings during the course of the tournament.
- The procedures chosen should allow the better teams to "rise to the top" and the lesser teams "to settle to the bottom."
- The meritocracy process has the benefit of allowing teams to more frequently debate other teams of similar ability.

Fair

- It must be understood that no process can be 100% fair to 100% of the debate competitors 100% of the time.
- The procedures chosen should be made to be as fair as possible to the most teams possible most of the time.

Equitable

- The procedures chosen should impact teams as proportionally as possible.

Consistent

- The procedures chosen should reflect the overall goal of producing the best result and should be internally consistent with other procedures within the tabulation process.

Stoa debate tournaments are generally run utilizing a process known as "power matching". Some debate tournaments are too small to utilize power matching and this discussion does not apply to those tournaments. Power matching is utilized to pair debate rounds during the tournament. There are different methods of power matching. The methods chosen should be based upon and consistent with the core values of Stoa Tab.

Random Pairing Versus Power Matching

Power matching typically starts in the second preliminary round of a tournament because, of course, in the first round there is no prior data to use for Power Matching. As a result, the first preliminary round of a tournament is paired randomly. Then, after the first round results are received, power matching is possible.

After the first round results are received, the tournament software ranks the teams. For example, assuming 40 debate teams participate at a tournament, the tabulation program will rank them from 1st to 40th. After the first round, there will be 20 teams with 1-0 records and 20 teams with 0-1 records. The program places all the 1-0 teams in the first group and ranks them 1st to 20th and places all the 0-1 teams in the second group and ranks them 21st to 40th. The program uses a tie breaker system for ranking all the 1-0 teams and all the 0-1 teams using speaker points, panel ranks and opposition win-loss records. For a complete discussion of this tiebreaker system look at the section in the Joy Manual entitled "Stoa Debate Tiebreakers (A Better Understanding)".

So, in the first instance, teams are ranked and grouped by win-loss records. The 20 teams who won the first round are placed in the top group (the 1-0 group) and the 20 teams who lost (the 0-1 group) and are placed in the bottom group. This is the first and most logical basis for initially ranking teams. Obviously, many teams will have the same win-loss records and the program then uses the tiebreaker system to rank them within each group of teams who have the same win-loss records.

When pairing the second round and all subsequent rounds, power matching is far preferable to random pairing. The reasons are fairly straightforward. When power matching is not used and, instead, pairing occurs randomly throughout preliminary rounds, the results of the tournament are less sound.

For example, if a tournament randomly pairs all six preliminary rounds, a nationally ranked team (i.e. a team in the top 10 prior to the tournament) could face a series of six novice or poor opponents (i.e. teams who typically finish 0-6 or 1-5 at tournaments). Facing such weak competition, the nationally ranked team could easily finish 6-0 but the accomplishment would be rather meaningless.

Simultaneously, an average debate team (one which typically finishes 3-3 at tournaments) could also face a series of six novice or poor opponents (i.e. teams which typically finish 0-6 or 1-5 at tournaments) and also finish 6-0. But that accomplishment, again, is not all that significant because the competition was so weak.

In addition, both debate teams finished with the same 6-0 preliminary record and, therefore, may appear to be of equal skill but, in truth, neither team was really tested. Both teams excelled simply because they were randomly assigned weak opponents. The two 6-0 teams faced competition that had a combined win-loss record of 5-30 or 0-36.

Meanwhile, another debate team may finish 4-2 at the tournament after having faced six other teams who finished with records of 3-3, 4-2 and 5-1. The combined win-loss record of its opponents could be 24-12. Yet the team finished the preliminary rounds well behind the two 6-0 teams simply because it faced much stiffer competition.

- Does Random Matching support the Stoa Tab core values?
    - Merit – No
    - Fair – No
    - Equitable – No
    - Consistent – No

These examples illustrate how randomly matched rounds can produce poor tournament results. Power matching avoids this problem. Power matching allows the better teams to rise to the top and the weaker teams to fall to the bottom. The goal of power matching is to create debate matchups using similarly skilled teams. In each round, it is best (as much as is possible) to match teams against each other based on skill and performance.

So, for example, in the fifth preliminary round of a tournament, power matching seeks to have the 4-0 teams debate other 4-0 teams, the 3-1 teams debate other 3-1 teams, the 2-2 teams debate other 2-2 teams, the 1-3 teams debate other 1-3 teams and the 0-4 teams debate other 0-4 teams. There would be little point in matching the 4-0 teams against the 0-4 teams. All the 4-0 teams would likely win and move up to 5-0 records. But those rounds would be largely meaningless. Instead, arranging for the 4-0 teams to debate each other in the fifth round means that the 4-0 teams who win in the fifth round really earned their victories. They moved up to 5-0 records far more legitimately than if they had beaten 0-4 teams.

Also, there is little point in matching the worst teams at a tournament (the 0-4 teams) against the best (the 4-0 teams). It not only is relatively meaningless when the 4-0 teams win, it is also discourages the 0-4 teams. Instead, having the 0-4 teams debate each other would give them more of an opportunity to win and improve to 1-4. So power matching (1) minimizes situations in which a 4-0 team "earns" a 5-0 record far too easily and (2) encourages weaker teams to keep trying by giving them better opportunities to win a round.

Power Matching: Hi/Hi versus Hi/Lo

So, again, the goal when power matching is to create matches between teams that have the same records based on prior rounds. Returning to the first example above (involving 40 teams at a tournament), after the first round, 20 teams are 1-0 and 20 teams are 0-1. The program takes all the 1-0 teams and ranks them 1st to 20th using the Stoa tiebreaker system.

When the program then power matches the second preliminary round, there are two basic options: Hi/Hi Power Matching and Hi/Lo Power Matching.

Hi/Hi Power Matching. In Hi/Hi power matching, the program attempts to pair the 1st ranked debate team against the 2nd ranked debate team and the 3rd ranked team against the 4th ranked team and the 5th against the 6th, 7th against the 8th, etc.

Hi/Lo Power Matching. In Hi/Lo power matching, the program attempts to pair the 1st ranked debate team against the 20th ranked debate team and the 2nd ranked team against the 19th ranked team and the 3rd against the 18th, 4th against the 17th, etc.

In both Hi/Hi and Hi/Lo, the program cannot always perfectly match teams in the desired manner. Certain constrains will, at times, interfere with the desired matchups such as side constraints (i.e. making sure each team debates the affirmative and negative sides an equal number of times), club protection (if used) and avoiding hitting the same opponent twice. But, to the greatest degree possible, the program seeks to match opponents in the manner indicated above.

Stoa uses Hi/Lo for two key reasons. First, Hi/Lo power matching is consistent with seeding outround brackets. Hi/Hi power matching is not.

In outrounds, if 16 debate teams break to octo-finals, the program seeds the bracket by matching the 1st team against the 16th team in the first outround, the 2nd against the 15th, the 3rd against the 14th, etc. This is (by far) the most common way in which a playoff bracket is seeded in most competitions of any kind (sports, debate, etc.).

The basic theory is that the team who is ranked 1st deserves the greatest chance to move on. Or stated differently, who should have the benefit of facing the lowest ranked team (16th place)? In the Hi/Lo system, the 1st ranked team is deemed the most deserving. In the Hi/Hi system, the 15th ranked team would debate the 16th ranked team and, therefore, would have the easiest opponent in the first outround. But the 1st ranked team has had more prior success and most people agree that the 1st ranked team is more deserving. Therefore, outround brackets are seeded using Hi/Lo power matching.

For similar reasons, Hi/Lo power matching is used when pairing preliminary debate rounds. Using the example above (involving 40 debate teams), in the second round, the Hi/Lo power matching attempts to pair the 1st ranked team against the 20th, the 2nd against the 19th, etc. This system gives the higher ranked teams the easier matchups for the second round. This method rewards the best 1-0 teams with the easiest matchups for the next round.

The Hi/Lo power matching system is also preferable to Hi/Hi for another reason. Under Hi/Hi, the 1st debate team would be matched against the 2nd, the 3rd against the 4th, the 5th against the 6th, the 7th against the 8th, the 9th against the 10th, etc. Under this system, 50% of the teams in the top 50% of the group are guaranteed to lose. In other words, assuming that 20 debate teams exist with a 1-0 loss record after the first round, under the Hi/Hi system the top 10 teams with 1-0 records will debate each other and, obviously, 50% will lose. Likewise, the bottom 10 teams with 1-0 records debate each other and 50% are guaranteed to win.

The Hi/Lo Power Matching system does not have this problem. Hi/Lo is better because it creates matchups which allow for the possibility that all of the top 50% of the group can win and advance to the next round with a better win-loss record. Whereas Hi/Hi insures that 50% of the top 50% of the group will lose, Hi/Lo does not.

In summary, Hi/Hi Power Matching does not produce the results that Stoa Tab, or most debate tournaments, are looking for during preliminary rounds and is not applicable to Stoa tournaments. It disrespects win-loss brackets and does not encourage the meritocracy that Stoa values. The Hi/Hi method does not produce a preliminary tournament that encourages movement from one win-loss bracket to another and does not create an environment where the better teams rise through the rounds and the lesser teams fall through the rounds. It is not fair in the same way that Hi/Lo Power Matching is, nor is it equitable in same way that Hi/Lo Power Matching is either. Hi/Hi Power Matching is also not consistent with the overall goals of Stoa debate, or internally consistent with preliminary and outround debates, or with Speech tabulation. (Speech tabulation analogues are used in debate tiebreakers for ranking purposes. Speech sectioning in outrounds utilizes a variation on Hi/Lo Power Matching of students.)

- **Does Hi/Hi Power Matching support the Stoa Tab core values?**
    - Merit – No
    - Fair – No
    - Equitable – No
    - Consistent – No

Consequently, the remainder of this document will focus on Hi/Lo Power Matching.

Hi/Lo Power Matching is the standard method used for most debate tournaments, high school and college, public, private and homeschool around the country. Hi/lo Power Matching honors the merit of the team's performance and is fair by arranging debates within win-loss groups. The better teams within the bracket debate the lesser teams within the same bracket. Hi/Lo Power Matching encourages movement between win-loss groups and allows the better teams to rise to the top and the lesser teams to fall to the bottom. The Hi/Lo method is equitable to teams and it is consistent with the overall goals of Stoa debate. Hi/Lo Power Matching in preliminary rounds is internally consistent with debate outrounds since outrounds are matched Hi/Lo, as is also true in Speech tabulation.

- Does Hi/Lo Power Matching support the Stoa Tab core values?
    - Merit – Yes
    - Fair – Yes
    - Equitable – Yes
    - Consistent – Yes

In conclusion, Hi/Lo Power Matching is better than randomly pairing rounds because it improves tournament results by matching teams against each other who have similar win-loss records. Power matching avoids poor tournament results caused by random pairing. And Hi/Lo Power Matching is better than Hi/Hi Power Matching because after grouping teams who have the same win-loss records, Hi/Lo power creates matches in the same way an outround bracket is seeded. The easiest matches are awarded to the most deserving: in each group of teams with the same win-loss record, the higher ranked teams are paired against the lower ranked teams.

The "Pull-Up Problem"

Power matching cannot always pair rounds exactly as desired within a particular win-loss group. There are often constraints that prevent the pairings from occurring in a perfect Hi/Lo pattern. Examples of such constraints include:

- Odd Number of Teams – there are an odd number of teams within a particular win-loss group
- Prior Meets – teams have previously debated in an earlier round at the tournament
- Side Constraints – teams that are "supposed" to debate require same side (affirmative (government) or negative (opposition)) of the ballot
- Club Constraints – teams are from the same club and the tournament is employing club protection

So, for example, if after four preliminary rounds at a tournament there are seven 4-0 teams, the tabulation program cannot apply power matching perfectly. The program needs to create four matches for the 4-0 teams but there are only seven of them. So the program must "pull-up" a 3-1 team from the next lowest group. Whenever an odd number of teams have the same win-loss record, a pull-up will occur. Likewise, the other constraints mentioned above can lead to a situation where a team must be "pulled up" from one win-loss group to debate a team in a higher win-loss group.

The question then becomes how can this best be done based on the **merits** of the team and be done **fairly, equitably** and **consistently** with the overall goals of the tabulation process and remaining internally consistent with those tabulation processes.

Two choices must be made:

- **Promote** – How to select the team to pull-up
- **Placement** - Where to place the pulled up team into the higher win-loss group

The **Promote** options for pulling up a team are:

- **High Ranked** – this selects the highest team in the next lowest win-loss group to promote to the higher win-loss group. For example, if a 3-1 team must be pulled up to face a 4-0 team, under this option the highest ranked 3-1 team is pulled up.

- **Middle Ranked** – this selects the middle team from the next lowest win-loss group to promote to the higher win-loss group (e.g. take the middle ranked 3-1 team to debate the 4-0 team)

- **Low Ranked** – this selects the worst ranked team from the next lowest win-loss group to promote to the higher win-loss group (e.g. take the worst ranked 3-1 team to debate the 4-0 team)

- **Worst Opposition** – this selects the team with the worst opposition record to promote to the higher bracket. This is the team that faced competition with the weakest combined win-loss record during the tournament. In other words, of all the teams with the same win-loss record, this team has enjoyed the easiest path to achieving that win-loss record because it faced the weakest opponents. **Some misunderstand the Worst Opposition to mean the Low Ranked team or the team with the lowest ranking in the win-loss group. This is not true. It could be any of the teams in the win-loss group.** This team can be considered to be the least deserving of the win-loss record for the particular bracket as the team has faced the worst competition to achieve a particular win-loss record.

In a sense it is unfair to pull-up any team from a particular win-loss group to face a team in a higher win-loss group. Based on merit the team "should" debate another team within the same win-loss group. So the question becomes how to pull-up a team fairly, how to distribute the pull-ups equitably amongst the teams and how to perform this task based on the merit of the individual teams. How also is this choice consistent with the overall goals of the process and internally consistent with Hi/Lo Power Matching, debate prelims and outrounds and even speech tabulation. Each of the promote options will be examined.

In considering all four options, two policies are paramount. First, maintain the integrity of power matching overall and avoid internal inconsistency. Second, minimize situations in which the same team is pulled up repeatedly during a tournament.

High Ranked. As discussed above, one of the core Stoa principles for power matching, based on Hi/Lo Power Matching and merit, is that the highest ranked debate team in each win/loss group deserves the easiest pairing in the next round. So, for example, if, after four preliminary rounds, eight teams have 4-0 records, the 1st ranked 4-0 team deserves a chance to debate the 8th ranked 4-0 team. The 1st ranked team should be rewarded with the easiest matchup for the fifth round.

The Hi/Lo Power Matching method is a merit based system designed to offer the high ranked team what should be the easiest debate in the next round, affording them the greatest opportunity for a win. But when a pull-up is necessary (because, for example, there are an odd number of 4-0 teams), pulling up the high ranked team from the next lowest group (i.e. the group of teams with 3-1 records) into the next higher bracket can seem intuitively like a good choice. When viewing the rankings presented in the tabulation program, the high ranked team (i.e. the top 3-1 team) is only one rank below the team above it (i.e. the lowest 4-0 team) in the next higher win-loss group. The high ranked team "appears" to be almost the same as the teams listed above in the next win-loss group.

However, appearances are deceptive as they do not take into consideration the difference in win-loss group. It does "appear" as though the high ranked team is not being moved much from its current position as the team is only one rank away from the higher ranked teams. Unfortunately, the visual on the computer screen or on paper can be deceptive.

Remember, the core Stoa power matching principle is that within each win/loss group, the highest ranked team deserves the "easiest" pairing against the lowest ranked member. Pulling up the highest ranked 3-1 team would violate that principle. Just like the highest team in the 4-0 group deserves a chance to debate the lowest ranked team in the 4-0 group, the highest ranked 3-1 team deserves the change to debate the lowest ranked team in the 3-1 group. So pulling up the high ranked team in the 3-1 group to face the high ranked team in the 4-0 group would violate this core principle.

The highest ranked 3-1 team deserves an opportunity to debate the lowest ranked 3-1 team. Likewise, the highest ranked 2-2 team deserves an opportunity to debate the lowest ranked 2-2 team. This principle applies for all win/loss groups.

Pulling up the high ranked team also exposes that team to a higher risk of repeated pull-ups more than other teams. For example, if the program pulls-up the top 3-1 team to debate the top 4-0 team then it is statistically more likely that the 4-0 team will win causing the 3-1 team to become 3-2. Because the losing team was previously the highest ranked 3-1 team, this team (which now has a 3-2 record) has a higher chance of being ranked highest within the 3-2 group. The new 3-2 group will consist of all the 3-1 teams that lost in the fifth round and all the 2-2 teams that won in the fifth round. The 3-1 team that was pulled up to face the 4-0 team was ranked higher than all the 3-1 teams that lost and, therefore, this pulled up team has the highest chance of repeating as the highest rank team among all the 3-2 teams. This certainly will not always happen as other outcomes are possible. But over time, the more likely result is that the team ranked highest at 3-1 after four rounds will also be ranked as the highest 3-2 team after the fifth round. But this leaves this team vulnerable to yet another pull-up in the next round.

If, after five rounds, there are seven 4-1 teams (or any odd number of 4-1 teams), the tabulation program would then need to pull up the top ranked 3-2 team which is likely to be that same team that was pulled up in the prior round. This creates a situation in which the same team is repeatedly pulled up over multiple rounds. Statistically, this problem is likely to arise most frequently when the program uses a fixed ranking for pull-ups (i.e. the highest ranked team in a win-loss group or the lowest ranked team in a win-loss group).

So while pulling up the high ranked 3-1 team to face the high ranked 4-0 team may "appear" to be a move of only one ranking spot, it is actually a significant move in the wrong direction. **For large tournaments like NITOC, this may be a move of in the wrong direction of 20 or 30 places.**

- Impact: Choosing the high ranked option means moving the team that should be debating the lowest ranked team in the same win-loss group up to debate a team in the next higher win-loss group. This is unfair to the high ranked team and is not consistent with a merit based system, or internally consistent with Hi/Lo Power matching, or the overall goal of producing the best results. In addition, there is the likely inequity that the high ranked team may be pulled up multiple rounds. Tab personnel recognize that the high ranked teams often maintain the high ranking for several rounds. This would mean the same high ranked team would be the team pulled up for multiple rounds. The repeated pull-up of the same team further increases the unfair disadvantage to this team and compounds the inequitable distribution of pull-ups amongst various teams.

- Does the high ranked option support the Stoa Tab core values?
  - Merit – No
  - Fair – No
  - Equitable – No
  - Consistent – No

- As this option violates the core values of Stoa Tab, using the high ranked option is not recommended.

Middle Ranked. The second option is to pull-up the middle ranked team from the lower win-loss group. But that option is also problematic because, based on both Hi/Lo Power Matching and merit, the middle ranked team in the win-loss group should debate another middle ranked team in the same win-loss group. The Hi/Lo method is a merit based system designed to offer the middle ranked team what should be an equitable debate against a similar team in the same win-loss group for a particular round. Pulling up the middle ranked team to face a team with a better win-loss record violates this principle.

- Impact: Choosing the middle ranked option means moving the team that should be debating another middle ranked team in the same win-loss group up to debate a team in the next higher win-loss group. This is arguably unfair to the middle ranked team and is not consistent with a merit based system, or internally consistent with Hi/Lo Power Matching, or the overall goal of producing the best results. In addition, there is the likely inequity that the middle ranked team may be pulled up multiple rounds. Tab personnel recognize that the middle ranked teams often maintain the middle ranking for several rounds. This would mean the same middle ranked team could be the team pulled up for multiple rounds. Admittedly, this scenario of multiple pull-ups of a middle ranked team is less likely than for the high ranked or low ranked team. Still, the possibility of repeated pull-up of the same team further increases the unfair disadvantage to this team and compounds the inequitable distribution of pull-ups amongst various teams.

- Does the middle ranked option support the Stoa Tab core values?
  - Merit – No
  - Fair – No
  - Equitable – No
  - Consistent – No

- As this option violates the core values of Stoa Tab, using the middle ranked option is not recommended.

Low Ranked. The third option pulls up the lowest ranked team from the lower win-loss group. Pulling up the low ranked team into the next highest bracket can seem intuitively like a good choice. That team is already ranked low in the bracket and is facing the toughest debate in the bracket, it may seem reasonable to move them up into the next bracket. But this approach is problematic for two reasons.

First, as described above, the Hi/Lo method is a merit based system designed to match similarly situated teams (i.e. teams with the same win-loss record) against each other. Under this system the lowest ranked team in the win-loss group deserves, based on both Hi/Lo Power Matching and merit, to debate someone in its own win-loss group. If the low ranked team is pulled up they now face an even more difficult challenge than the one they should already be facing. They have been pulled up all the way from the bottom of one win-loss group and placed into an even higher win-loss group.

Second, pulling up the low ranked team also exposes that team to a higher risk of repeated pull-ups more than other teams. For example, if the tabulation program pulls up the lowest ranked 3-1 team to debate the top 4-0 team then it is statistically more likely that the 4-0 team will win causing the 3-1 team to become 3-2. Because the losing team was previously the lowest ranked 3-1 team, this team (which now has a 3-2 record) has a higher chance of being ranked lowest within the 3-2 group. The new 3-2 group will consist of all the 3-1 teams that lost in the fifth round and all the 2-2 teams that won in the fifth round. The 3-1 team that was pulled up to face the 4-0 team was ranked lower than all the 3-1 teams that lost and, therefore, this pulled up team has the highest chance of repeating as the lowest rank team among all the 3-2 teams. It will certainly not happen always. Other outcomes are possible. But over time, the more likely result is that the team ranked lowest at 3-1 after four rounds will also be ranked as the lowest 3-2 team after the fifth round. But that leaves this team vulnerable to yet another pull-up in the next round.

If, after five rounds, there are seven 4-1 teams (or any odd number of 4-1 teams), the program would then need to pull up the lowest ranked 3-2 team which is likely to be that same team that was pulled up in the prior round. This creates a situation in which the same team is repeatedly pulled up over multiple rounds. Statistically, this problem is likely to arise most frequently when the program uses a fixed ranking for pull-ups (i.e. the highest ranked team in a win-loss group or the lowest ranked team in a win-loss group). This is a key reason why Stoa avoids both the “high ranked” option and the “low ranked” option.

- Impact: Choosing the low ranked option means moving the team that should be debating the highest ranked team in the same win-loss group up to debate a team in the next higher win-loss group. This is arguably unfair to the low ranked team and is not consistent with a merit based system, or internally consistent with Hi/Lo Power Matching, or the overall goal of producing the best results. In addition, there is the likely inequity that the low

ranked team may be pulled up multiple rounds. Tab personnel recognize that the low ranked teams often maintain the low ranking for several rounds. This would mean the same low ranked team would be the team pulled up for multiple rounds. The repeated pull-up of the same team further increases the unfair disadvantage to this team and compounds the inequitable distribution of pull-ups amongst various teams.

- Does the high ranked option support the Stoa Tab core values?
  - Merit – No
  - Fair – No
  - Equitable – No
  - Consistent – No

- As this option violates the core values of Stoa Tab, using the low ranked option is not recommended.

Worst Opposition. The fourth option pulls up the team that faced the worst opposition. For example, if the program needs to pull-up a 3-1 team to face a 4-0 team, the program looks at each 3-1 team and compiles the combined win-loss records for all opponents faced by each 3-1 team. For ease of illustration, one 3-1 team may have faced four opponents who are all 1-3 which means the opposition win-loss record for that 3-1 team would be 4-12. Another 3-1 team may have faced four opponents who are now 3-1 themselves. The combined win-loss record of his opponents would be 12-4. The 3-1 team who faced opponents with a combined record of 4-12 faced much weaker opposition than the 3-1 team who faced opponents with a combined win-loss record of 12-4. Under this scenario, the program would pull-up the 3-1 team who faced opponents with the 4-12 record because this 3-1 team faced the "worst opposition" amount all 3-1 teams. Stated differently, this 3-1 team had the easiest chance to earn a 3-1 record and, in some sense, is the least deserving of that 3-1 record.

Using the worst opposition option for pull-ups is unique among the options available as **the team with the worst opposition could be any team within the win-loss group including the high ranked, middle ranked, low ranked team or any other team.** This option pulls up the team least deserving of a particular record to debate a team in the higher win-loss group. While no option is 100% fair to this team for the particular round, it is arguably the fairest choice available from the promote options.

- Impact: Promoting the worst opposition team has the advantage of working in coordination with the Hi/Lo Power MATCHING option and Stoa debate tiebreakers to bring equity and consistency to the system, whereas the other choices do not.

- When the worst opposition team is promoted to the higher win-loss group, the worst opposition team will debate a team in that higher win-loss group which will improve their rankings in the tiebreaking process by having an improved opposition win-loss record. Since the promoted team will now have a better opponent opposition record they are less likely to be the team with the worst opposition record in the future.

  - This has the obvious advantage that it decreases the likelihood of any one team being pulled up during multiple rounds as they will no longer be the team with the worst opposition record. This is a significant advantage over the other promotion options which offer no such protection or benefit. This also increases the equitable distribution of pull-ups among the teams and is most consistent of all the promote choices with values of Stoa Tab and internally consistent with Stoa Tab practices.

- **Utilizing worst opposition has the effect of balancing the negative impact of the pull-up by increasing the team's standing in the tiebreakers while decreasing the likelihood the team will by pulled up again.**

- Does the worst opposition option support the Stoa Tab core values?
  - Merit – Yes and supports both Hi/Lo Power Matching and Stoa tiebreakers.
  - Fair – Yes**,** as much as possible, by balancing the negative impact of the pull-up by increasing the team's standing in the tiebreakers while decreasing the likelihood the team will be pulled up again.
  - Equitable – Yes by balancing pull-ups amongst various teams.
  - Consistent – Yes, both in terms of overall values and internal consistency with Stoa Tab practices.

- **As this option best supports all the core values of Stoa Tab, using the worst opposition option is strongly recommended.**

The **Placement** options for the promoted (pulled up) team are:

- **Top** – place the pull-up team at the top of the higher win-loss group

- **Middle** – place the pull-up team in the middle of the higher win-loss group

- **Bottom** – place the pull-up at the bottom of the higher win-loss group

- **Recalculate** – place the pull-up team at the position in the higher bracket that the team would occupy assuming that they actually had the win-loss record of the higher win-loss group

Based on merit the pull-up team "should" be debating a team in the same win-loss group, but when a team must be pulled up to the next higher win-loss group the question becomes where to place them in the higher win-loss group.

- **Top, Middle, Bottom** - All three of these options can be dealt with together as similar problems with all three exist. Each of these is an arbitrary choice. At first blush, it seems intuitive to place the team being pulled up from the lower win-loss group to be placed the same place in the higher win-loss group. However, the situation is not that simple. Consider the scenario where the pull-up team is placed at the top of the higher win-loss group. It seems reasonable if it is the high ranked team that is being pulled up. But, this ignores the repercussion on the team that is actually at the top of the higher win-loss group. By merit that team belongs at the top of the bracket and now they are being demoted to a lower placement within the bracket. Consider also the scenario where the low ranked team is placed at the bottom of the higher win-loss group. The low ranked team was supposed to debate the team at the top of their own win-loss group and now they have been pulled up to debate the top team in the next higher win-loss group. The low ranked team already had the most difficult debate in the bracket and now it's difficulty has been made an order of magnitude greater.

- **Impact**: Does the Top, Middle, or Bottom option support the Stoa Tab core values?
  - Merit – No
  - Fair – No
  - Equitable – No
  - Consistent – No

- As these options violate the core values of Stoa Tab, using the Top, Middle, or Bottom options are not recommended.

- **Recalculate** – this placement option is unique among the options available and works in conjunction with the Worst Opposition promotion option. The Recalculate option respects that the Worst Opposition pull-up team could be the high ranked, middle ranked, or low ranked team within each win-loss group. The Worst Opposition team "should" debate whatever team is dictated by the Hi/Lo Power Matching system. The Recalculate option places the pull-up team in the higher win-loss group in the same place it would be if it actually had the same win-loss record as the teams in the higher win-loss group. This improves the fairness to the team being pulled up and to the teams in the higher win-loss group. While no option is 100% fair to this team for the particular round, it is arguably the fairest choice available from the **Placement** options.

  - Impact: Using the Recalculate placement option in conjunction with the Worst Opposition promotion option has the advantage of working in coordination with the Hi/Lo Power Matching option and Stoa Debate Tiebreakers to bring equity and consistency to the system, whereas the other choices do not.
  - When recalculating placement, the Worst Opposition team is promoted to the higher win-loss group and is benefitted by "taking on" the record of the teams in the higher win-loss group both during the round and for tiebreaking purposes moving forward throughout the rest of the tournament.
  - The Recalculate option also increases the equitable distribution of the pull-up team among the teams in the higher win-loss group and is most consistent of all the placement choices with the values of Stoa Tab and internally consistent with Stoa Tab practices.
  - Utilizing Recalculate with Worst Opposition has the effect of balancing the negative impact of the pull-up and subsequently increases the team's standing in the tiebreakers while decreasing the likelihood the team will by pulled up again.

  - Does the Recalculate option support the Stoa Tab core values?
    - Merit – Yes and supports both Hi/Lo Power Matching and Stoa Tiebreakers
    - Fair – Yes**,** as much as possible, by balancing the negative impact of the pull-up by placing the team in the appropriate location in the higher win-loss group relative to both the pulled up team and the other teams in the higher win-loss group.
    - Equitable – Yes by balancing pull-ups amongst the teams in the higher win-loss group.
    - Consistent – Yes, both in terms of overall values and internal consistency with Stoa Tab practices.

  - **As this option best supports all the core values of Stoa Tab, using the Recalculate option is strongly recommended.**

X. Caution Against a Prelim Round Six "Final"

Caution Against Trying To Make Round 6 Of Prelims A "Final Round" Debate

Stoa offers local tournaments control over their own tournament schedules. Many tournaments choose to offer just six preliminary rounds of debate. The Stoa tiebreakers are then used to determine the final placings of the debaters at those tournaments. **Tabbers should not attempt to manipulate Round 6 into some sort of final round debate or a "hidden final round debate." Round 6 may be the last round of the tournament, but it is not a final round.**

After five rounds of a six round tournament, tabbers are sometimes tempted to match the 1st and 2nd place teams against each other in the sixth round (rather than power matching). The idea is that the 1st and 2nd place team will debate each other in the sixth round and the team who wins finishes first in the tournament and the team who loses finishes second in the tournament. This seems attractive because it seems to offer a way to create a "final round" between the top two teams while the other teams complete the sixth preliminary round for places 3rd and below.

This idea demonstrates a misunderstanding of the way in which power matching works in the preliminary rounds to determine the top seeds for outrounds or for the final placings for tournaments with no outrounds. Because many Stoa tournaments offer only six preliminary debate rounds and no outrounds, folks often consider the later rounds like an outround or a finals round. In a sense, they try to "finish the tournament early," by manipulating the final preliminary rounds into some sort of outround debate. Round 6 may be the final (meaning last) round of the tournament, but it is not a final round.

Matching the 1st and 2nd place teams against each other in the last preliminary round violates the Stoa Tabulation Core Values of Merit, Fair, Equitable and Consistent Tabulation practices and should not be attempted for several reasons.

I. False Premise

First, the idea flows from a false premise. There really is not a true 1st or 2nd place team after five rounds. Every resolution has a bias to some extent in favor of the affirmative or the negative. No resolution is completely neutral. For this reason, tournaments almost never provide for an odd number of preliminary rounds (5 rounds) in Lincoln Douglass Value or Team Policy Debate. Tournaments offer an even number of LDV and TP preliminary rounds so that competitors have the opportunity to debate each side of a resolution an equal number of times. In general, the preliminary ranking of teams is not complete after an odd number of rounds. Only after an even number of rounds is it permissible to think of the top two teams as the top two teams. So matching the 1st and 2nd place teams against each other in a sixth round based on rankings after five rounds is not a sound procedure. It assumes the false premise that after five rounds there is a true 1st place team and a true 2nd place team but this is an erroneous assumption.

II. Departs From The Power Matching System

Second, tabbers cannot take the top two teams after five rounds and match them against each other in the sixth round without abandoning power matching, unless the tabulation program creates this

match up. Under power matching principles, the 1st and 2nd place teams will not normally hit each other in any given round (assuming there are more than two teams in the top win/loss group). Rather, the power matching system seeks to match the 1st place team in the top win/loss group against the last ranked team within the top win/loss group. Likewise, the power matching system seeks to match the 2nd place team in the top win/loss group against the second to last ranked team within the top win/loss bracket. So tabbers can only match the 1st and 2nd place teams against each other by overriding power matching. That means all the other matches in the sixth round will be power matched differently than the 1st and 2nd place teams.

The same power matching used for all other rounds must be used during Round 6 as the preliminary results will then give a true picture of the best and most proper results. It is a significant tabulation error to think that 1st place team should debate the 2nd place team in Round 6 to determine a "tournament champion." The same would be true of the 3rd and 4th place teams or any other rankings after Round 5. The 1st place team seed after 5 preliminary rounds is just that, the 1st place team seed after 5 rounds. The 1st place team seed after five rounds is not guaranteed to finish in 1st or 2nd place after Round 6. Neither is the 2nd place team after 5 rounds guaranteed to finish as the 1st or 2nd place team. The 1st place team might have a 5-0 record and loose during Round 6 and end up at the bottom of the bracket of teams that are 5-1 after Round 6. The top preliminary round rankings only occur after all six rounds are finished, not after five rounds of competition.

III. Violates The Power Matching System Within Brackets

Third, preliminary round power matching is consistent with outround power matching. Outrounds do not start with the 1st place team debating the 2nd place team (the obvious exception being if the first outround is the final round). If the tournament has outrounds, then the 1st place team should not debate the 2nd place team until the very final round, if both teams keep winning. The 1st place team will debate the weakest remaining opponents all the way through outrounds (assuming the1st place team keeps winning) relative to the teams that the 2nd place team will debate if the 2nd place team keeps winning. The preliminary round power matching works the same way. It matches the top team in a win/loss bracket against the weakest team in the same win/loss bracket. This matching must be performed in the same manner all the way through Round 6 in order for the tiebreakers to properly determine the seedings for outrounds or the final rankings for a preliminary round only tournament.

IV. Harms Other Teams

Fourth, matching the 1st and 2nd place teams in the sixth round harms others teams because it deprives other teams of the opportunity to finish first or second. For example, if there are four 5-0 teams after five rounds and Tab matches the 1st and 2nd place teams against each other in the sixth round, the 3rd and 4th place teams are deprived of the opportunity to finish first or second. In other words, if the 1st and 2nd place teams both lose in the sixth round (as does happen if they are not artificially chosen to debate each other) and the third and fourth place teams may win their final rounds and move up to 1st and 2nd.

Creating some artificial pairing of the 1st and 2nd places teams (or any other matchups) eliminates the chance for other teams to finish in the top spot. It is quite possible for the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, place team…after five rounds to end up as the 1st place team ranked team after six rounds. There can be lots of movement of the top seeds after Round 6 and the full results of all six rounds are needed to

determine where the teams will place. The Round 1 results are just as important as the Round 6 results in determining the overall standings. All teams must be given the equivalent opportunity to finish as the top ranked teams and should not be blocked from this opportunity because Tab artificially intervened in the Power Matching process.

V. Creates Improper Tournament Results

Fifth, overriding power matching to match the 1st and 2nd place teams distorts the final results. If the 1st and 2nd place teams are both 5-0 after five rounds, one will finish 6-0 and the other will finish 5-1. But if there are four or more 5-0 teams after five rounds, one or more of the teams with 5-0 records will likely win their last round and finish 6-0. But if the 1st and 2nd place teams are matched against each other in the last round, the team that loses is guaranteed to finish 2nd with a 5-1 record, but other teams may finish with 6-0 records. Thus, the 2nd place finisher would have a worse win/loss record that the 3rd or 4th (as an example) place finishers. Those are improper results.

VI. Harms The Top Two Teams.

Sixth, when Tab matches the 1st and 2nd place teams against each other, Tab harms both teams. Again, under power matching principles, the 1st and 2nd place teams will not normally hit each other in any given round (assuming there are more than two teams in the top win/loss group). They have won the right to face weaker opponents in their win/loss group in the sixth round. Since they have not debated the resolution an even number of times, they should have the opportunity to benefit from power matching just like all the other debaters will in the sixth round.

VII. General Cautions Against Odd Number of Prelim Rounds

As an alternative, tabbers who really want a "final round" in the sixth round, may be tempted to end preliminary rounds after five rounds and make the sixth round a true "final round" by breaking just the top two teams (or some combination of teams) to the last round and not have other teams compete in the sixth round. But there are several obvious problems. First, as stated above, it is not a good idea to have an odd number of preliminary rounds because it means the teams will not debate both sides of the resolution the same number of times. That means if the resolution has an affirmative bias, the teams that debate three times on the affirmative and twice on the negative have an advantage in the tournament over all other teams that must debate the negative three times. The rankings after five rounds reflect (in part) the bias of the resolution and so one simply cannot assume that the 1st and 2nd place teams after five rounds are the most deserving top two teams. One more round is needed to better identify the truly deserving top two teams. Second, is that fewer teams will earn Green Check Marks on Speechranks as only teams with a 5-0, and 4-1 records will be awarded Green Check Marks. The 3-2 teams will not get Green Check Marks as a team must have two more wins than losses at the end of prelims (assuming no outrounds) to get a Checkmark.

Y. Recommendations for When Things Go Wrong

By NITOC Tab Directors, Speech and Debate Committees

Thank you for serving Stoa families as part of the tournament administration and tabulation team. This document was assembled to help you in this process because tournaments rarely run flawlessly from start to finish. Often something unexpected comes up and usually at the most inopportune time...a student gives a speech in the wrong room, a debate team can't find their room and is late for the round, students begin competing before all the judges have arrived, or a judge leaves before the round is complete. These situations create stress as tournament administrators are often under pressure to make rapid, time limited, decisions while attempting to balance any number of competing agendas. Often the best time to make these decisions is not during the hurry of a tournament, but at another time allowing for more careful consideration and reflection. This document is a humble attempt to do just that.

This document was assembled with input from NITOC Tournament Directors, NITOC Tabulation Directors, the NITOC tabulation team, and the Speech and Debate Committees to provide guidance for what to do at NITOC and local tournaments when events don't proceed as planned. The following scenarios have occurred, or could reasonably be expected to occur, at tournaments with suggestions for how best to handle these situations. Having this information available may help to alleviate unnecessary stress for tournament staff.

This document is not an exhaustive list of all possible scenarios, nor is it meant to address every unusual circumstance that will occur at NITOC or other tournaments. There will likely be unique situations that do not fit neatly into the scenarios presented. Lessons learned at tournaments will be added to this document for future years. This document should give Stoa members an idea of the care, thought, and planning that goes into administering both local tournaments and the National Championship tournament.

Please understand that the suggestions presented are not mandates or "Stoa gospel," but a concerted effort by a group of fellow servants to provide helpful recommendations based on years of tournament experience. To the extent that this document serves to help both local and national tournament administrators then it has accomplished its purpose. Tournament administrators are always encouraged to utilize the collective wisdom of the tournament administration team and tabulation team when working through unforeseen circumstances.

A word about student/family expectations:

1. **Students are expected to compete through the end of the tournament**
    - **a.** Students that cannot compete through to Finals should not register for NITOC or local tournaments as this places an unreasonable burden on the tournament administration and tabulation staff
        - i. If students (or their parents by virtue of registering the student) misrepresent their ability to compete throughout the tournament their place of finish may be demoted as deemed necessary by the tournament administration staff
            1. Student may not receive an award if one would have otherwise been earned

SPEECH

1. **Wrong event speech given (e.g. OI speech given in a DI room or OO given in Persuasive room)**

    a. **Wrong speech given first time during Finals, Semis, Quarters or Prelims**

        i. Student
            1. In correct event room, but gives wrong event speech (e.g. student legitimately in OI and DI, but student gives OI speech in DI room)
                a. Student does not then get to deliver DI speech in DI room after already having given OI speech in DI room, as student already gave wrong speech
                    i. Student does not deliver two speeches in same room
                    ii. Student may still deliver speech in correct room if time available to do so (e.g. student goes to OI room and gives OI speech)
            2. In wrong event room as student not entered in event, but student somehow convinces judges that he/she should be in room (student not in event and not on judges ballots, but allowed by judges to give speech)
                a. Student may still deliver speech in correct room if time available to do so
            3. In correct event, but delivers speech in wrong room. Student somehow convinces judges that he/she should be in room (student entered in event, but not on judges ballots because he/she is in the wrong room, but allowed by judges to give speech)
                a. Student may still deliver speech in correct room if time available to do so

        ii. Judges
            1. No judge instruction may be necessary depending on circumstances
            2. If judges aware of some issue or mistake as in Scenario 1 (student gives wrong speech in room)
                a. Instruct judges to judge all students in room, but judges should not listen to same student twice
            3. If judges aware of some issue or mistake as in Scenario 2 or 3 (student not scheduled in room, but somehow allowed to speak in room)
                a. Pull student ballot from judges for the student not scheduled in room
                b. Judges given extra ballot as needed

        iii. Tab
            1. Placing of student giving wrong speech depends on which round the wrong speech was given
                a. If student scheduled in event for a particular round
                    i. If Finals – student places 8th
                        1. Wrong speech student placed 8th - other ballots are adjusted to rank students 1 through 7
                    ii. If Semis – student places as lowest ranked Semifinalist
                        1. In room - wrong speech student placed last in room - other ballots are adjusted to rank students1 through next to last
                    iii. If Quarters – student places as lowest ranked Quarterfinalist
                        1. In room - wrong speech student placed last in room - other ballots are adjusted to rank students1 through next to last

iv. If Prelims – student placed last in event if correct speech presented in other prelim rounds
    1. In room - wrong speech student placed last in room - other ballots are adjusted to rank students1 through next to last
v. If Prelims – student DQ if gave wrong speech in all three prelim rounds

b. If student not scheduled to be in event for particular round
  i. If Finals – All ballots for wrong speech discarded and placing in room removed
    1. Other ballots are adjusted to rank students1 through 8
  ii. If Semis – All ballots for wrong speech discarded and placing in room removed
    1. Other ballots are adjusted to rank students first to last
  iii. If Quarters – All ballots for wrong speech discarded and placing in room removed
    1. Other ballots are adjusted to rank students first to last
  iv. If Prelims – All ballots for wrong speech discarded and placing in room removed
    1. Other ballots are adjusted to rank students first to last

b. Wrong speech given in an earlier round and student advanced based on results from having delivered wrong speech

i. **Student in Finals**

1. **Student has already delivered speech in Finals**

a. Student
  i. Top non-advancing student is contacted and allowed to compete in Finals
    1. If extra student found – gives speech
    2. If extra student not found – no further action

b. Judges
  i. If extra student found - judges given extra ballot and instructed to rank all 9 students
  ii. If extra student not found – no action concerning judges

c. Tab
  i. Speech not considered to have happened in round
  ii. All ballots for wrong speech discarded and placing in room removed
  iii. Remaining student scores adjusted based on removed scores
    1. Students placing below removed student will have placement advanced one place
    2. Students placing above removed student will not have placement affected

iv. Placing of student giving wrong speech depends on which prior round the wrong speech was given
    1. If Semis – student placed as top non-advancing Quarterfinalist (or top non-advancing Prelim student if no Quarters)
    2. If Quarters – student placed as top non-advancing Prelim student
    3. If Prelims – student placed last in event if correct speech presented in other prelim rounds
    4. If Prelims – student DQ if gave wrong speech in all three prelim rounds
v. All other student results adjusted accordingly

2. **Student has not yet delivered speech in Finals**

a. Student
   i. Student removed from room
   ii. Top non-advancing student is contacted and allowed to compete in Finals
       1. If extra student found – gives speech
       2. If extra student not found – no further action

b. Judges
   i. If extra student found –
       1. If time permits - judges given new tabulation and student ballots by Tab
       2. If time not permitting - judges cross off name of wrong competitor on judge tab ballot and student ballot and replace with correct competitor
   ii. If extra student not found – no action concerning judges

c. Tab
   i. Extra student found
       1. Wrong student replaced with top prior non-advancing student
       2. If time permits – tab reprints judge tabulation and student ballots for judges
       3. Tab normally
   ii. Extra student not found
       1. Tab normally with one fewer student
   iii. Placing of student giving wrong speech depends on which prior round the wrong speech was given
       1. If Semis – student placed as top non-advancing Quarterfinalist (or top non-advancing Prelim student if no Quarters)
       2. If Quarters – student placed as top non-advancing Prelim student
       3. If Prelims – student placed last in event if correct speech presented in other prelim rounds
       4. If Prelims – student DQ if gave wrong speech in all three prelim rounds
   iv. All other student results adjusted accordingly

b. Wrong speech given in an earlier round and student advanced based on results from having delivered wrong speech (continued)

ii. **Student in Semifinals**

1. **Student has already delivered speech in Semis**

a. Student
   i. Top non-advancing student is contacted and allowed to compete in Semifinals
      1. Rooms should be balanced
      2. If extra student found – gives speech
      3. If extra student not found – no further action

b. Judges
   i. If extra student found - judges given extra ballot and instructed to rank all 9 students
   ii. If extra student not found – no action concerning judges

c. Tab
   i. Speech not considered to have happened in round
   ii. All ballots for wrong speech discarded and placing in room removed
   iii. Remaining student scores adjusted based on removed scores
      1. Students placing below removed student will have placement advanced one place
      2. Students placing above removed student will not have placement affected
   iv. Placing of student giving wrong speech depends on which prior round the wrong speech was given
      1. If Quarters – student placed as top non-advancing Prelim student
      2. If Prelims – student placed last in event if correct speech presented in other prelim rounds
      3. If Prelims – student DQ if gave wrong speech in all three prelim rounds
   v. All other student results adjusted accordingl

2. **Student has not yet delivered speech in Semis**

a. Student
   i. Student removed from room
   ii. Top non-advancing student is contacted and allowed to compete in Semifinals
      1. Rooms should be balanced
      2. If extra student found – gives speech
      3. If extra student not found – no further action

b. Wrong speech given in an earlier round and student advanced based on results from having delivered wrong speech – Student has not yet delivered speech in Semis (continued)

b. Judges
   i. If extra student found –
      1. If time permits - judges given new tabulation and student ballots by Tab
      2. If time not permitting - judges cross off name of wrong competitor on judge tab ballot and student ballot and replace with correct competitor
   ii. If extra student not found – no action concerning judges

c. Tab
   i. Extra student found
      1. Wrong student replaced with top prior non-advancing student
      2. If time permits – tab reprints judge tabulation and student ballots for judges
      3. Tab normally
   ii. Extra student not found
      1. Tab normally with one fewer student
   iii. Placing of student giving wrong speech depends on which prior round the wrong speech was given
      1. If Quarters – student placed as top non-advancing Prelim student
      2. If Prelims – student placed last in event if correct speech presented in other prelim rounds
      3. If Prelims – student DQ if gave wrong speech in all three prelim rounds
   iv. All other student results adjusted accordingly

iii. **Student in Quarterfinals**

1. **Student has already delivered speech in Quarters**

a. Student
   i. Top non-advancing student is contacted and allowed to compete in Quarterfinals
      1. Rooms should be balanced
      2. If extra student found – gives speech
      3. If extra student not found – no further action

b. Judges
   i. If extra student found - judges given extra ballot and instructed to rank all 9 students
   ii. If extra student not found – no action concerning judges

c. Tab
   i. Speech not considered to have happened in round
   ii. All ballots for wrong speech discarded and placing in room removed
   iii. Remaining student scores adjusted based on removed scores
      1. Students placing below removed student will have placement advanced one place
      2. Students placing above removed student will not have placement affected
   iv. Placing of student giving wrong speech depends on which prior round the wrong speech was given
      1. If Prelims – student placed last in event if correct speech presented in other prelim rounds
      2. If Prelims – student DQ if gave wrong speech in all three prelim rounds
   v. All other student results adjusted accordingly

2. **Student has not yet delivered speech in Quarters**

a. Student
   i. Student removed from room
   ii. Top non-advancing student is contacted and allowed to compete in Quarterfinals
      1. Rooms should be balanced
      2. If extra student found – gives speech
      3. If extra student not found – no further action

b. Judges
   i. If extra student found –
      1. If time permits - judges given new tabulation and student ballots by Tab
      2. If time not permitting - judges cross off name of wrong competitor on judge tab ballot and student ballot and replace with correct competitor
   ii. If extra student not found – no action concerning judges

c. Tab
   i. Extra student found
      1. Wrong student replaced with top prior non-advancing student
      2. If time permits – tab reprints judge tabulation and student ballots for judges
      3. Tab normally
   ii. Extra student not found
      1. Tab normally with one fewer student
   iii. Placing of student giving wrong speech depends on which prior round the wrong speech was given
      1. If Prelims – student placed last in event if correct speech presented in other prelim rounds
      2. If Prelims – student DQ if gave wrong speech in all three prelim rounds
   iv. All other student results adjusted accordingly

2. Speech delivered prior to all judges being present in room

a. Platform or Interpretive Speech

i. Student
   1. Gives speech to missing judge(s) after other students have delivered speeches
      a. Other judges who have heard speech dismissed

ii. Judges
   1. Missing judge(s) listens to speech
      a. Other judges who have heard speech dismissed
   2. Judges rank all students from 1 to N

iii. Tab
   1. Tab normally

b. Limited Prep Speech

i. Student
   1. Students draws new topic
   2. Gives speech to missing judge(s) after other students have delivered speeches
      a. Other judges who have heard speech dismissed

ii. Judges
   1. Missing judge(s) listens to speech
      a. Other judges who have heard speech dismissed
   2. Judges rank all students from 1 to N

iii. Tab
   1. Tab normally

3. Judge(s) does not listen to all speeches in room

a. Outrounds

i. Student
   1. All students give speeches in round

ii. Judges
   1. Remaining judges listen to all speeches

iii. Tab
   1. Tab without missing judge(s) scores – discard ballots from missing judge(s)
      a. If no ties – results stand
         i. Hypothetical judge must be created to make event final rankings work
         ii. Hypothetical judge rankings to match room rank
      b. If ties – make following adjustments
         i. Create a hypothetical judge (to make for odd numbered panel) by averaging the scores of the other judges and creating ordinals (whole numbers) for the hypothetical judge rankings
            1. If tie broken – use results
         ii. If tie is not broken, re-create the hypothetical judge ballot by adding the inverse reciprocals of the judge's rankings (e.g. 1 becomes 1/1=1, 2 becomes 1/2=0.5, 3 becomes 1/3=0.33, 4 becomes 1/4=0.25, etc) and creating ordinals (whole numbers) with the higher totals becoming 1, 2, 3, 4…
            1. If tie broken – use results
         iii. If tie not broken – review prior rounds for students having competed in front of same judge panel (priority: Semis > Quarters > Prelims) – break the tie by giving the higher ranking to the student having receiving the higher ranking in front of the other judge panel.
            1. If tie broken – use results
         iv. If tie not broken – give higher ranking to the student with the better prelim ranking
            1. If tie broken – use result
         v. If tie not broken – review the ballot from the judge that did not hear all the speeches. See if that judge did hear the speeches of the students that are tied. If so use that judges rankings to break the tie.
            1. If tie broken – use result
         vi. If tie not broken – flip a coin

3. Judge(s) does not listen to all speeches in room (continued)

b. Preliminary Rounds

i. Student
   1. All students give speeches in round

ii. Judges
   1. Remaining judges listen to all speeches

iii. Tab
   1. Tab round without missing judge(s) scores
      a. Review the section results without the ballot information from the missing judge. Use those results (even if a tie exists) to replace the ballot for the missing judge.
         i. Create a hypothetical judge ballot to replace the ballot of the missing judge by using the section results generated from using the ballots of the remaining judges in the section and re-tab the section with all ballots.
         ii. This step is necessary so that there are the same number of judge results for all students. Otherwise students with missing judge results will be scored higher in overall preliminary round and tournament results.

      b. If this procedure generates no ties then the results will stand and no further action is necessary.

      c. If this procedure results in any ties, take no further immediate action, but hold on to any ballots from the judge that did not listen to all of the speeches.
         i. Wait until all preliminary rounds have concluded.
         ii. It is highly likely that the other ballots received by tied students in prior or subsequent preliminary rounds will break the tie.

      d. If a tie remains after preliminary rounds – does the tie affect who breaks?
         i. If all tied students break to Outrounds then no further action is required as the ties will likely be broken in Outrounds
         ii. If some tied students do not break to Outrounds, the ties will need to be broken.
            1. Return to the problematic section in the preliminary round, but DO NOT utilize the hypothetical ballot previously created in Step 3.b.iii.a.i which used section results to create a hypothetical ballot for the missing judge.
            2. Instead, create a new hypothetical ballot (and replace the old one) by averaging the scores of the other judges in the problematic section and create ordinals (whole numbers) for the hypothetical judge rankings.
               a. If tie is broken – use results

3. If tie is not broken, re-create the hypothetical judge ballot by adding the inverse reciprocals of the judge's rankings (e.g. 1 becomes 1/1=1, 2 becomes 1/2=0.5, 3 becomes 1/3=0.33, 4 becomes 1/4=0.25, etc) and creating ordinals (whole numbers) with the higher totals becoming 1, 2, 3, 4…
    a. If tie is broken – use results
4. If tie is not broken, then review all other preliminary rounds for instances in which the tied students competed in front of the same judge panel (i.e. the same section) – break the tie by giving the higher ranking to the student who receiving the higher ranking in front of the other judge panel.
    a. If tie broken – use results
5. If tie not broken, review the ballot from the judge that did not hear all the speeches. See if that judge did hear the speeches of the students that are tied. If so use that judges rankings to break the tie.
    a. If tie broken – use result
6. If tie not broken – flip a coin

4. Student misses full prep time for Extemp

- **a.** Student at fault
    i. Student responsible for time management
- **b.** Tab at fault
    i. Tab will make effort to give student full prep time

5. Student late to room

- **a.** Goal is to keep tournament on time
- **b.** Dealt with at the discretion of the tournament admin team based on the circumstances
- **c.** Student
    i. Responsible for managing time
- **d.** Judges
    i. Generally should not be made to wait for late students
- **e.** Tab
    i. If student does not deliver speech – rank last in room

6. Action to be taken if student suddenly cannot compete due to family emergency, illness, etc…

- **a.** Parent of student (or responsible adult) should immediately notify Tab that the student is no longer able to compete
- **b.** Parent (or responsible adult) will notify Tab of the reason for student withdrawal from competition

7. Student unable to compete in Finals

- **a.** Is student replaced?
  - i. No
    1. Unless student had previously scheduled engagement, then replaced by next highest ranked student
- **b.** Do only 7 students compete?
  - i. Yes
    1. Unless student replaced secondary to previously scheduled engagement
- **c.** Where does the student place?
  - i. Eighth

8. Student unable to compete in Semis

- **a.** Is student replaced?
  - i. Yes
    1. By next competitor in the rankings not previously advanced
- **b.** Unbalanced rooms?
  - i. No
- **c.** Where does the student place?
  - i. One place below the rankings for the current round

9. Student unable to compete in Quarters

- **a.** Is student replaced?
  - i. Yes
    1. By next competitor in the rankings not previously advanced
- **b.** Unbalanced rooms?
  - i. No
- **c.** Where does the student place?
  - i. One place below the rankings for the current round

10. Student unable to compete in Prelims

- **a.** Student marked as "no show" in round or dropped if not competing
- **b.** If discovered soon enough and rooms would be unbalanced, then rooms are re-sectioned

DEBATE

1. **Student/Team late to room**

    a. Goal is to keep tournament on time
    b. Dealt with at the discretion of the tournament admin team based on the circumstances
    c. Student
        i. Responsible for managing time
    d. Judges
        i. Generally should not be made to wait for late students
    e. Tab
        i. If late student/team prevents debate from occurring – other student/team given forfeit win

2. **Students/Teams debate wrong side of resolution (Gov/Opp or Aff/Neg switch)**

    a. Students/Teams
        i. Responsible for knowing correct side of resolution
    b. Judges
        i. Judge debate presented
    c. Tab
        i. Ballot(s) stand as judged

3. **Debate begun prior to all judges being present in room (Outrounds)**

    a. Student/Team
        i. Debate before judge(s) present – do not restart if single or odd number of judges present
    b. Judges
        i. Present for entire debate
            1. Judge debate as presented
            2. Ballot counted
        ii. Not present for entire debate
            1. Ballot not counted
    c. Tab
        i. Ballots counted only from judges hearing entire debate

4. **Judge does not hear entire debate (judge leaves for any reason or does not render a decision) –Prelims**

    a. If very early in round and time permitting

        i. Students/Teams
            1. Restart debate

        ii. Judge
            1. New judge assigned for debate

        iii. Tab
            1. Tab normally

    b. If not very early in round or time not permitting

        i. Students/Teams
            1. Debate not repeated

        ii. Judge
            1. No new judge assigned

        iii. Tab
            1. Both teams given a Bye (Win)

5. **Judge does not hear entire debate (judge leaves for any reason or does not render a decision) --Outrounds**

    a. If very early in round and time permitting
        i. Students/Teams
            1. Restart debate – same sides of resolution
        ii. Judges
            1. New judges assigned for debate
        iii. Tab
            1. Tab normally

    b. If not very early in round and no time available to allow for re-debate
        i. Student/Team
            1. Debate before judges present
        ii. Judges
            1. Present for entire debate
                a. Judge debate as presented
                b. Ballot counted
            2. Not present for entire debate
                a. Ballot not counted

iii. Tab
1. Ballots counted only from judges hearing entire debate
2. If clear decision – ballots stand
3. If ballots tied – the team with the better preliminary round ranking wins
4. If tie not broken by preliminary round ranking – flip a coin

c. If not very early in round, but time available to allow for re-debate

i. Student/Team
1. Restart debate

2. Team Policy
a. If coin toss for sides in original debate
i. Team winning original coin toss may choose same side of debate for re-debate or may choose opposite side of debate for re-debate
b. If teams locked for sides in original debate
i. Teams will now have debated on both sides of debate, so…
ii. Coin toss for sides with winner choosing Aff/Neg

3. Lincoln Douglas Value Debate
a. If coin toss for sides in original debate
i. Team winning original coin toss may choose same side of debate for re-debate or may choose opposite side of debate for re-debate
b. If teams locked for sides in original debate
i. Teams will now have debated on both sides of debate, so…
ii. Coin toss for sides with winner choosing Aff/Neg

4. Parliamentary
a. New resolution
i. New resolution assigned by tournament admins, or…
ii. Teams choose from remaining resolutions not struck in current round, or…
iii. Teams choose from among resolutions not debated in previous Outrounds (as determined by tournament admins)
b. If coin toss for sides in original debate
i. Sides remain the same
c. If teams locked for sides in original debate
i. Sides remain the same

ii. Judges
1. New judges assigned for debate

iii. Tab
1. Tab normally

6. Action to be taken if student suddenly cannot compete due to family emergency, illness, etc…

- **a.** Parent of student (or responsible adult) should immediately notify Tab that the student is no longer able to compete
- **b.** Parent (or responsible adult) will notify Tab of the reason for student withdrawal from competition

7. Student/Team unable to compete in Finals

- **a.** Student/team replaced?
  - i. No
    1. Exception is if previously scheduled engagement, then by next highest ranked student/team not advancing
  - ii. Forfeit win assigned to remaining team
  - iii. Where does the student/team place?
    1. Second
       - **a.** Unless replaced because of previously scheduled engagement – then places Third or lower as determined by tournament administrators

8. Student/Team unable to compete in Semis

- **a.** Student/team replaced?
  - i. Yes
    1. By next highest ranked student/team not advancing
  - ii. Where does the student/team place?
    1. One place below the rankings for the current round

9. Student/Team unable to compete in Quarters, Octos, Double Octos, Triple Octos or Down Bracket

- **a.** Student/team replaced?
  - i. Yes
    1. By next highest ranked student/team not advancing
  - ii. Where does the student/team place?
    1. One place below the rankings for the current round

10. Student/Team unable to compete in Prelim Rounds 1 – 6

- **a.** Student/team will be given forfeit loss

Z. Update Log

Updates are listed in reverse chronological order so that the more recent updates are listed first.

11.17.17
Updated Tab Manual Page 10 Section C.9.e.i.III. Ballot Style a and b to read:

III. Ballot Style
a. STOA Speech (w/ Penalties) – All Events except Cold Reading
b. STOA Speech (no Penalties) – Cold Reading

11.13.17
Updated wording in Section V: Understanding Stoa Tiebreakers to better explain the tiebreaking within Win/Loss brackets

9.7.17
Recommendations guidelines becomes Section Y and Update Log becomes Section Z

9.7.17
Added Section X: Caution Against Trying to Make Round 6 Of Prelims A "Final Round" Debate

9.7.17
Added Section W: Understanding Stoa Debate Power Matching and the Issue of "Pull-Ups"

8.20.17
Name of manual changed to Stoa Tabulation Manual

8.18.17
Removed Green wording identifying updated debate tiebreaker nomenclature

8.18.17
Added new Prelude section at beginning of manual addressing Stoa Tabulation Transparency Policy and Stoa Tab Core Values

8.18.17
Changed name of entire document to Stoa Tabulation Manual

12.30.16
Added "*[This does not apply to Section Y, as these are simply recommendations and not tabulation methods.]"* to instructions not to change tabulation methods for tournaments unless posted to tournament website before opening registration.

Added to Page 13 C.9.e.ii.VII that "Speaker Goal" can be ignored when setting up debate events

12.30.16
Updated Y: Recommendations Debate Section 5: Judge does not hear entire debate when re-debate is not possible.
Language updated to provide consistency with speech process by using preliminary round data to break tie. Coin toss is a last resort that likely will never need to be used.

11.20.16
Added to Page 28 K.6 Entering Speech Ballots - Tab Director performs any necessary quality control

11.15.16
Updated Tab Sections I, J, K, L, M, N, and O to match the updated Speech and Debate Workflow Tracking Sheets. These sections and the Workflow Tracking Sheets were both updated with expanded language to better clarify the process and procedure to be followed.

11.15.16
Updated Y: Recommendations Speech Section 3: Judge does not listen to all speeches in room. Language updated and explanations expanded and clarified to make the recommended process easier to follow.