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# 1) General rules

Introduction

The “FLTRP Cup” National English Debating Competition (hereafter referred to as “the Competition”) inaugurated in 1997 is the most prestigious National English Debating Event in China. The 19th “FLTRP Cup” National English Debating Competition is organized by the Youth League, All Students Union and Beijing Foreign Studies University, and jointly hosted by the Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Competition Format

The Competition shall be conducted in the British Parliamentary Debating Style (also known as the World Universities Debating Championships Style) as defined in Part 2.

Eligibility to Compete in the Competition

A debater must be a registered full-time student of Chinese nationality (including residents of Hong Kong SAR, Macau SAR and Taiwan Province who hold Home Return Permits) studying in an educational institution on the Chinese territory. Those who have won best speaker awards or made to the Grand Final of past FLTRP Cup National English Debating Competition are excluded from participating in the FLTRP Cup.

# 2) The British Parliamentary format

The Teams

Four teams of two debaters participate in each British Parliamentary debate round. The teams supporting the motion are referred to as the "Government". The teams arguing against the motion are known as the "Opposition". Two teams represent the Government: the Opening Government and the Closing Government. Two teams represent the Opposition: the Opening Opposition and the Closing Opposition. Each of these teams competes against all other teams in the round and will be ranked 1st through 4th at the conclusion of the debate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Opening Government | Opening Opposition |
| Closing Government | Closing Opposition |

Speaker Order

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Common Titles for Speaker** | **Time** |
| Opening Government Team, 1st speaker | "Prime Minister" or “Leader of the Government” | 7 minutes |
| Opening Opposition Team, 1st speaker | "Leader of the Opposition" | 7 minutes |
| Opening Government Team, 2nd speaker | "Deputy Prime Minister" or "Deputy Leader of the Government" | 7 minutes |
| Opening Opposition Team, 2nd speaker | "Deputy Leader of the Opposition" | 7 minutes |
| Closing Government Team, 1st speaker | "Member of the Government" | 7 minutes |
| Closing Opposition Team, 1st speaker | "Member of the Opposition" | 7 minutes |
| Closing Government Team, 2nd speaker | "Government Whip" | 7 minutes |
| Closing Opposition Team, 2nd speaker | "Opposition Whip" | 7 minutes |

Each speaker will present a single speech in the order prescribed below.

Speech timing

Each speech will be 7 minutes. Points of Information (POI) are allowed after the first minute and before the last minute of all speeches.

Timing of the speech begins when the speaker begins speaking; all materials—including acknowledgements, introductions, etc.—will be timed. A timekeeper will provide a series of signals during each speech as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Timing** | **Signal** |
| 1’00’’ | Single ring of a bell (POIs allowed) |
| 6’00’’ | Single ring of a bell (POIs no longer allowed) |
| 7’00’’ | Double ring of a bell (Conclusion of speaking time) |
| 7’15’’ | Continuous ringing (Conclusion of grace period) |

Once the double ring has sounded, speakers have a 15-second ‘grace period’, during which they should conclude their remarks. The grace period is not a time for new matter to be introduced, and any new matter offered in the grace period may be discounted by the adjudicators. Speakers continuing after this ‘grace period’ may be penalized by the adjudication panel.

Speaker Roles

Each speaker has a role and each speech has a specific purpose. The descriptions of speaker roles listed below are suggestive and are not intended to be exhaustive or exclusive. For reasons that vary from debate to debate, speakers may sometimes need to fulfill roles not mentioned here and speeches may be constructed to serve other purposes as long as Proposition speakers affirm the motion and Opposition speakers oppose it.

All speakers, except the final speakers for the Proposition and Opposition (Proposition and Opposition Whips), should introduce new material (but not necessarily new arguments). All debaters should refute the opposing teams’ arguments, except the Prime Minister.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Role and Responsibility** |
| "Prime Minister" or "Leader of the Government” | The first speaker's responsibility is to present a case supporting the motion. The primary role of Opening Proposition team, initiated in this speech, is to establish the foundation for meaningful debate on the motion. |
| “Leader of the Opposition" | The Opening Opposition's primary team role is to counter the first Proposition team's case through direct or indirect refutation and/or provide substantive arguments against the motion. |
| "Deputy Prime Minister" | This speaker should refute the Leader of the Opposition's speech, and further develop the Opening Proposition team's case. |
| "Deputy Leader of the Opposition" | This speaker supports his or her teammate, answering objections from the other side and introducing additional arguments or support. |
| "Member of the Government" | This speaker should support the position developed by the Opening Proposition team by introducing an extension. A successful extension will develop a distinct argument identity (which could be achieved through either introducing new argument or providing distinctive deeper analysis) for the Closing Proposition team while supporting the Opening Proposition team. The Member of the Proposition may also refute the arguments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. |
| "Member of the Opposition" | This speaker should support the position developed by the Opening Opposition team and must also introduce an extension. As with the Member Proposition, the Member Opposition’s extension will be most successful if it establishes a unique argument identity(which could be achieved through either introducing new argument or providing distinctive deeper analysis) that distinguishes the Closing from the Opening Opposition while continuing the general direction of argument initiated by the Opening Opposition. The Member Opposition may also directly or indirectly refute the arguments of the Member Proposition. |
| "Government Whip" | This speaker summarizes the Proposition’s arguments and summarizes the refutation of the Opposition side. With the exception of refuting the Member Opposition’s extension, the speaker should not introduce positive (new) matter. New examples or case studies added for the purpose of comparing existing positive matter shall be allowed. |
| "Opposition Whip" | This speaker summarizes opposition to the extension and makes reply to each team's position in the debate. This speaker should not introduce positive (new) matter. New examples or case studies added for the purpose of comparing existing positive matter shall be allowed. |

The Motions

A single motion will be announced twenty minutes prior to the beginning of the debate and will be presented to all debaters simultaneously in a general assembly. A different motion will be used for each round.

Motions typically focus on current issues or timeless controversies and are phrased in a way that is intended to be specific and unambiguous.

Focus and content of debates

British Parliamentary debating is a contest of ideas in which the Government teams are responsible for providing reasons why the motion is true and the Opposition teams are responsible for providing reasons why the motion is not true or why the Government has failed to prove the motion true. All teams have a responsibility to refute, either directly or indirectly, arguments presented by the opposing side.

Motions are written in plain language. The debaters—particularly the Opening Government team—should respect the meaning and focus of the motion. While the Opening Government team may clarify the meaning of terms in the motion, they should not attempt to alter the meaning of the motion. The Leader of the Government should provide any clarification of terms at the beginning of his or her speech.

In the majority of cases, the clarification provided by the Opening Government team will serve as an adequate foundation for the rest of the debate. Should the Opening Government fail to make clear the focus of the debate, or if the interpretation offered by the Opening Government team completely inhibits meaningful debate or completely misinterprets the meaning the motion, the Opening Opposition may offer clarification of the terms of the motion. No teams beyond the Opening Government and Opening Opposition may substantially modify the terms of the motion.

Preparation

All debates shall commence 20 minutes after the motion has been announced. Debaters may consult any written materials during the preparation time. Electronic media, electronic storage and retrieval devices are all prohibited after motions have been released. Printed and prepared materials may be accessed during a debate.

Debaters may confer with their debate partner during preparation time. Debaters may not confer with any other individuals (i.e.: coaches, other debaters, trainers, adjudicators, etc.) during the preparation time, with the exception of mentors assigned to teams for specific rounds (i.e. a Regional Grand Final) at the joint discretion of the Tournament Organizing Committee and the Adjudication Core.

The Opening Government shall have the right to prepare in the debating venue. All other teams must prepare in separate locations specified by the Tournament.

Teams must arrive at their chamber immediately after the commencement of debate. Teams failing to arrive in time will forfeit the debate, at the discretion of the Chair of the panel, and shall be replaced by a swing team for the completion of the round.

Points of Information

Debaters may offer a Point of Information (either verbally or by rising) at any time after the first minute, and before the last minute, of any speech.

The debater holding the floor may accept or refuse any Points of Information within this time. If accepted, the debater making the request has 15 seconds to make a statement or ask a question. During the Point of Information, the speaking time of the floor debater continues. Management of Points of Information—for both the debaters offering and answering Points of Information—will be considered in the adjudicators’ ranking of teams and assignment of individual speaker points.

No other parliamentary points such as points of order or points of personal privilege are allowed.

# 3) Competition Administration for Regional Tournaments and FLTRP Open

Introduction to FLTRP Open

FLTRP Open is a series of Open Tournaments which would take place in various regions across China throughout a year. FLTRP Open would serve as Preparatory Tournaments for the FLTRP Cup. Certificates and prizes will be awarded to excellent participants.

FLTRP Open aims at providing opportunities of diagnosis and high-quality judging for debaters who are preparing for the FLTRP Cup, as well as offering introductory seminars on BP Debating, Critical Thinking, and the application of Debating/Critical Thinking Skills in real life, particularly to render assistance to debaters/institutions who are relatively new in the debating community.

As suggested by its name, FLTRP Open Tournaments would ‘Open Tournaments’ by international standard. This means, the eligibility to compete in the FLTRP would not apply for FLTRP Open; any debaters, including international students studying in Chinese Institutions, debaters from overseas institutions, high school debaters, working professionals, are all welcome to register to participate in the Open as debater, judge, or observer.

FLTRP Open Tournaments are designed to be 3-day events which starts on Friday morning and Concludes on Sunday afternoon. Friday would be for training and seminars. The actual tournament would be 5 Rounds plus a Pro-Am demonstration debate, with the first 3 Rounds on Saturday and last 2 Rounds plus the demonstration debate happening on Sunday.

One hour will be reserved after each and every round for a master trainer to provide Video Comment and Analysis, Post-Debate Motion Analysis, or PM/LO Demonstration Speeches on the topic that was just debated, as well as a Q&A session.

The Pro-Am demonstration debate will involve 4 teams each consists of one chair/trainer and one volunteer among the participants. The debate shall be on a topic that was announced on Friday, and all 8 speakers in the debate should share their experience preparing and debating together with all the other participants of the Open. The introduction of Pro-Am demonstration aims at setting a good standard of BP debating for new participants, expediting deeper understanding between debaters and judges, as well as presenting and sharing the learning experience of preparing, discussing, and debating with a master debater.

A Registration Fee will be charged for all participants of the Open, including debaters, judges, and observers. One might be allowed to change his/her role at the tournament after attending the seminars on Friday (for instance, registered as observer, yet finally decide to opt to judge at the event) as long as the change is within in tournament’s capacity. The registration fee will be utilized to recruit a number of chair-level adjudicators that should suffice the tournament based on the number of debates anticipated, plus a master trainer who would be in charge of Analytical Sessions in between Rounds.

Structure of the competition

The “FLTRP Cup” National English Debating Competition consists of three stages: Campus Selections, Regional Tournaments, and the National Competition.

Campus Selection Tournaments shall be organized by individual institutions, or a coalition of institutions that wish to participate in the “FLTRP Cup”. Institutional reward points will be granted to all institutions that organized Campus Selection Tournaments. The reward points could be redeemed to English Books, or debate-related services including workshops.

There should be 4 Regional Tournaments: North China Regionals, West China Regionals, South China Regionals, and East China Regionals. The provinces and autonomous regions included in each Regional are listed below:

North China: Beijing, Tianjin, Hebei, Heilongjiang, Liaoning, and Jilin

West China: Sichuan, Chongqing, Shaanxi, Henan, Shanxi, Xinjiang, Gansu, Ningxia, Tibet, Qinghai, and Inner Mongolia

South China: Guangdong, Guangxi, Fujian, Guizhou, Hainan, Jiangxi, Hunan, Hubei, Yunnan, Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan

East China: Shanghai, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Anhui, Shandong

In the Regional Tournaments, the Competition shall be run in two main phases: Phase One, known as the ‘Preliminary rounds’ and Phase Two, known as the 'Final'. There shall be one mock round, five Preliminary Rounds and one Final.

All teams entered in the Competition shall participate in the Preliminary Rounds. All teams shall be ranked according to their total team points, total speaker points, and win-loss records. This Overall Team Ranking shall be the basis of the ‘Break’ into the National Tournament (in compliance with Regional Breaking Quota and Provincial Breaking Quota).

The Regional Final, while still serving competition purposes, should also be a demonstration debate with educational values of promoting debate and critical thinking in the Region. With regard to this principle, the teams participating in the Regional Final should be the Top 3 Teams on the Overall Team Ranking and the Team from the Hosting Institution. In the event of the Hosting Institution made it to the Top 3 Teams, the fourth ranking team on the Overall Team Ranking should be the team joining the Top 3 Teams in the Regional Final.

Pairing the Preliminary Rounds in Regional Tournaments

If the total number of teams entered in the Competition is not divisible by four, or during the Competition the withdrawal of teams results in a total number of teams not divisible by four, the tournament administrators shall employ “swing teams” to fill vacant slots. The swing teams shall be ranked in each round relative to the teams against whom they compete (i.e.: if a swing team is the best team in a round they should be ranked 1st) but will be ineligible to advance to the Final.

The first round of the Competition will be paired randomly.

At the conclusion of each preliminary round (except for the last round) teams shall be ranked in order of their aggregate team points accumulated by the team; from highest aggregate to lowest.

The teams should then be divided up into pools of teams with the same amount of aggregate team points, with pools being ranked from highest aggregate to lowest.

If any pool (the “Upper Pool”) consists of an amount of teams equivalent to a number that is not divisible by four, then teams from the pool ranking immediately below that pool (the “Lower Pool”) may be promoted to the Upper Pool so that the Upper Pool consists of a number of teams that is divisible by four. The team selected for promotion must be selected randomly from the Lower Pool. If promotion of a team to the Upper Pool results in a number of teams in the Lower Pool not divisible by four, each consecutive pool should be adjusted in the same fashion until all pools have a number of teams divisible by four.

Once the pools have been adjusted, the pools are paired into debates of four teams in such a way that equalizes the team positions in which each team will debate. The pairing should promote, to the greatest extent possible, equality of distribution of team positions over the Preliminary rounds.

All the Preliminary rounds shall be “open rounds,” with oral adjudications given by the adjudication panel following each debate.

Selection of teams for the Regional Final and the National Competition

At the conclusion of the Preliminary rounds, the teams shall be ranked in order according to 1) their aggregate team points from the eight preliminary rounds; 2) their aggregate team scores, as determined by combining the individual speaker scores for each team member; 3) preponderance of first place rankings, followed by preponderance of second place rankings; and 4) head-to-head matches between two teams tied for a rank. If, after these tie-breakers are applied, a tie still exists, the rankings of the tied teams shall be determined by other tie-breakers determined at the discretion Adjudication Core before the Tournament.

For the Final, the adjudication panel shall select one Championship team, one Runner-up team, and two Second runner-up teams.

The Regional Breaking Quota (the number of teams from a region that shall proceed to the National Competition) shall be announced by the Tournament Organizing Committee before the Regional Competition. The Regional Breaking Quota of a Regional should be determined by the number of teams participating in the Regional Tournament this year as well as the performance of teams from this Region in the National Tournament during the last season of competition.

In the event of a team not able to make it to the National Competition based on Regional Breaking Quota yet is the highest ranking team from their province on the Overall Team Ranking, a Provincial Breaking Slot would be automatically allocated to them to allow the team to participate in the National Competition.

Access to debates

In preliminary rounds, observers may watch a debate round with the consent of the teams participating in the round. Similarly, those interested in photographing or recording video of the preliminary rounds must obtain the consent of the debaters participating in the round.

The Final is open to all observers subject to the restrictions of the tournament administration and the constraints of the debating venue.

Tabulation staff

A tabulation staff shall be appointed and shall be responsible for the pairing and scheduling of the tournament according to the provisions spelled out in the Charter.

# 4) Adjudication

The Adjudication staff

In general, the Chief Adjudicator is responsible for monitoring the quality and efficacy of adjudication at the competition. Specifically, the Chief Adjudicator will participate in the training of adjudicators, administer and mark the adjudication test, rank adjudicators, oversee the placement of adjudicators into panels, oversee on-going evaluation of the adjudicators in the pool, identify the pool of the Final Round.

The Tournament will appoint a number of Deputy Chief Adjudicators to assist with these responsibilities.

The adjudication pool may be comprised of institutional adjudicators, independent adjudicators, and others as deemed qualified by the Adjudication staff.

Each institution participating in the Competition must bring one qualified adjudicator to join the adjudication pool.

The role of the adjudicators

Prior to the competition, adjudicators should be ranked as either “Chairs,” “Panelists” or “Trainees.” Each debate should be adjudicated by at least one “Chair” level adjudicator. Ideally, each debate will be adjudicated by a panel comprised of one “Chair” and two “Panelist” level adjudicators.

Each Preliminary round will be judged by panel comprised of an odd number of adjudicators, ideally 3. Each panel will have a designated Chair. Panels may include Trainee adjudicators who will participate in the deliberation of the debate but will not have their decision recorded.

Following each round, the debaters will be dismissed and the each adjudicator must confer upon and discuss the debate with the other adjudicators to determine the rankings of the teams and determine the individual speaker marks. The panel will attempt to reach consensus in their adjudication. Should the panel be unable to reach consensus, the will of the majority of adjudicators on the panel will prevail. If a panel has an even number of judges, and the result of a vote is tied, the Chair’s ‘casting’ vote breaks the tie (i.e. whichever side of the tie the Chair was on is the final result).

The role of the Chair

The Chair will be responsible for administering the round (calling the house to order, acknowledging the speakers, maintaining order, etc.). Following the debate, the Chair should facilitate the panel’s deliberation to promote participation and input from the other panelists and trainees.

Following the deliberation, the Chair should complete the ballot provided by the tournament administrators, noting particularly that the ballot accurately reflects the will of the panel with regard to team rankings and speaker scores. The ballot should be returned to the tournament staff prior to the oral adjudication. Once the ballot has been delivered, the Chair should invite the debaters back into the venue and provide an oral adjudication to the teams.

****Ranking teams in Preliminary Rounds****

Following each Preliminary round and as a result of the adjudication panel’s consideration, teams should be ranked from 1st place to 4th place. Ties in rank are not permitted.

Teams, under no circumstances, shall receive an automatic 4th. When teams fail to arrive at the debate more than five minutes after the scheduled time for debate, a swing team will be deployed to facilitate the debate and for the other teams to receive fair adjudication as it should be in any debate round with four teams. If a team or one member of a team has harassed another debater on the basis of religion, sex, race, color, nationality, sexual orientation or disability, such equity violations shall be reported to the Adjudication Core and the Organizing Committee for their discretion, and the judging panel should judge the debate as it is. In any case, the debate should continue to provide all teams in the round the opportunity to earn a rank.

Teams should be ranked on the basis of their *matter* and *manner*.

*Matter* refers to the content and substance of a team’s arguments. Matter includes arguments and reasoning, evidence, examples, case studies, facts, statistics and any other material that a team uses to further the case. Matter includes both positive (or substantive) material and refutation (arguments specifically aimed to counter the arguments of the opposing team(s)).

*Matter* should be relevant, logical and consistent. It should relate to the issues of the debate: positive material should support the case being presented and refutation should engage the material presented by the opposing team(s). Arguments should be developed logically in order to be clear and well reasoned and therefore plausible. The conclusion of all arguments should support the member’s case. Members should ensure that the matter they present is consistent within their speech, their team and the remainder of the members on their side of the debate. All members should present positive matter (except the final two members in the debate) and all members should engage in refutation (except the first member in the debate). The Government Whip may choose to present positive matter if it is relevant to refuting the Member of the Opposition’s extension.

*Manner* refers to the strategy and presentation of a team’s arguments. Manner includes elements such as argument choice, speech structure, vocal and physical delivery, use of POIs, and so forth.

*Manner* should enhance the team’s effort to prove or disprove the motion and should be compelling. To enhance their effort, the team should appropriately prioritize and apportion time to the dynamic issues of the debate, present their arguments in an order that is clear and logical, engage the arguments of the opposing side through direct or indirect refutation. Compelling manner is that which presents the material in a way that demonstrates a concern for vocal and physical presentation. Compelling teams deliver arguments with appropriate levels of passion, present their material in a way that attends to appropriate vocal and physical delivery, and avoid behaviors that detract from the force and effectiveness of their arguments.

This description of matter and manner is necessarily incomplete. The adjudication panel should assess the totality of each team’s efforts (including, but not limited to, matter and manner) to achieve a just and fair decision.

Participants in FLTRP Cup must be aware that they will experience many different debating styles from the different universities and experience levels represented therein. There is no single ‘correct’ or ‘right’ style to adopt in this competition.

Assigning speaker scores

After the adjudicators have agreed upon the ranking for each team, the panel should determine the speaker scores for each debater. Individual speaker scores should be assigned as follows, where a score of 75 would reflect an average effort at the tournament.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Points** | **Meaning** |
| 90-100 | Excellent to flawless. The standard of speech you would expect to see from a speaker at the Grand Final level of the tournament. This speaker has many strengths and few, if any, weaknesses. |
| 80-89 | Above average to very good. The standard you would expect to see from a speaker at the semi finals level or in contention to make to the finals. This speaker has clear strengths and some minor weaknesses. |
| 70-79 | Average. The speaker has strengths and weaknesses and roughly equal proportions. |
| 60-69 | Poor to below average. The team has clear problems and some minor strengths. |
| 50-59 | Very poor. This speaker has fundamental weaknesses and few, if any, strengths. |

The aggregate of the two team members’ individual speaker scores will comprise their team’s team score. Each team must receive a team score appropriate to their rank in the debate; no “low point wins” may be assigned. For example, if the 2nd place team in the round is assigned an aggregate team score of 170 points, the 1st place team must receive at least 171 aggregate points. Ties in team scores are not permitted.

Deliberations

The deliberations of the adjudication panel shall be closed; only the members of the adjudication panel and the timer may remain in the room for the panel’s deliberation.

Trainee adjudicators should also participate in the deliberation, and should be given sufficient time to express their opinions as both a learning experience and an assessment for future promotion.

All notes made of the round or the deliberation are the sole property of the adjudicators. The adjudicators may not be compelled to make available their notes of the round or the deliberation.

Adjudicators should confer in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect. The panel’s deliberations should not exceed 15 minutes.

Oral Adjudication

Following the adjudication panel’s deliberation and after the ballot has been returned to the tournament staff, the Chair should offer the teams an oral adjudication that reveals the teams’ rankings, the reason for the panel’s decision and comments and suggestions for improvement. Team points should not be revealed during an oral adjudication. In the event of the Chair being ‘out-voted’, meaning the Chair is in the minority of the Adjudication Panel, a representative of the majority shall give the oral adjudication.

Other panelists may participate in the oral adjudication at their discretion and as time permits. The oral adjudication should not exceed 10 minutes.

Debaters must not harass the adjudicators following the verbal adjudication.

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

Oral adjudications shall be offered only in the Mock round and Preliminary rounds 1-3.

# 5) Grievance Policy

Constitution of the Grievance Committee

The Grievance Committee will be comprised of members from both the Adjudication core and the Organization Committee. Chief Adjudicator and the Convenor will act as an *ex officio* members of the Grievance Committee

The Grievance Committee will be responsible for hearing, investigating and resolving grievances brought by the participants in the FLTRP Cup.

Definition of a Grievance

A grievance is an allegation of a rule violation or a breach of conduct on the part of (a) participant(s), competitor(s) or judge(s) in the FTLRP Cup. Grievances concern errors in the process of administering or contesting the round.

Adjudicators’ decisions about substantive issues debated in the round are not subject to the grievance policy. With the exception of those decisions that are the product of some defect in procedure, the decision of the adjudicator(s) will not be overturned.

To be valid, a grievance must be filed in writing with the Grievance Committee.

Any matter may be discussed informally with the Chief Adjudicator or the Convenor prior to a participant filing a grievance.

Processing a Grievance

* + 1. Filing a Grievance

A grievance should be filed as soon as possible after the event that gave rise to the grievance. In general, the grievance committee will not consider grievances that address events from a round immediately previous after the subsequent round has begun.

The written grievance should contain the following information

* + - * 1. Name, role (debater, coach, tutor, adjudicator, etc.) and university affiliation of the participant filing the grievance.
        2. Date, time, location and round in which the event that gave rise to the grievance occurred.
        3. Participants who observed or participated in the event that gave rise to the grievance.
        4. A brief description of the event that gave rise to the grievance.
        5. Identification of the section of the FLTRP Cup Charter that allegedly was violated.
        6. The remedy sought by the participant who filed the grievance

Upon receiving a written grievance, the Grievance Committee may interview the grievant(s).

If the Grievance Committee feels an investigation is warranted, they shall move the grievance to the investigation stage.

If the Grievance Committee feels that no further investigation is warranted, they shall declare the grievance dismissed.

* + 1. Investigating a Grievance

The Grievance Committee may interview any participant whom they believe will help them understand the events that gave rise to the grievance.

Interviews of participants may be conducted in private.

The Grievance Committee may review any documents they believe will help them understand the events that gave rise to the grievance.

The investigation phase of the grievance processing should be concluded as soon as possible.

* + 1. Resolving a Grievance

The Grievance Committee has broad discretion when deciding how a grievance will be resolved.

In general, the resolution for a grievance will be focused on preventing the circumstances that caused the grievance from arising again.

A written notice of the decision of the Grievance Committee shall be provided to the Chief Adjudicator and the Convener, with copies to the affected participants.

iv) Finality of Decision: Any decision of the grievance committee is final and may not be appealed.

Compiled by George Chen & Xin Xin. December, 2015.

Special thanks to Prof. Steven L. Johnson, for his original work on the Charter of the “FLTRP Cup” National English Debating Competition

This Charter relies, in part, on material adapted from the following sources:

*Charter of the “FLTRP Cup” National English Debating Competition, 2012 Version*

*The Constitution of the World Universities Debating Championships*

*The World Universities Debating Championships Rules*

*The International Debate Education Association’s Four-Team Debate Rules*

一、总则

1. 简介

“外研社杯”全国英语辩论赛（下文称为“比赛”）创办于1997年，是目前中国国内最具影响力的英语辩论赛事。2016年的第19届“外研社杯”全国英语辩论赛由共青团中央、全国学联和北京外国语大学主办，由外语教学与研究出版社承办。

2. 比赛形式

比赛采用英国议会辩论制式（也称为世界大学辩论赛制式），具体形式会在本章程第二部分中详尽说明。

3. 比赛报名条件

参赛选手必须是中国籍全日制大学在校生（包括香港特别行政区居民、澳门特别行政区居民和持有往来大陆通行证的台湾省居民）。在往届“外研社杯”全国英语辩论赛中获得最佳辩手或进入决赛的选手不能再报名参赛。

二、英国议会制辩论

1. 辩论队

每轮英国议会制辩论比赛中有4支辩论队同场，每队2人。支持辩题的队伍称为“正方”，驳斥辩题的队伍称为“反方”。代表正方的两支队伍是正方上院和正方下院，代表反方的两支队伍是反方上院和反方下院。每支队伍都需要与另3队进行竞争，最后决出1至4名。

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 正方上院 | 正方下院 |
| 反方上院 | 反方下院 |

2. 选手发言顺序

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **发言者** | **发言者的角色** | **发言时间** |
| 正方上院第一位辩手 | “首相”或“正方领袖” | 7分钟 |
| 反方上院第一位辩手 | “反方领袖” | 7分钟 |
| 正方上院第二位辩手 | “副首相”或“正方副领袖” | 7分钟 |
| 反方上院第二位辩手 | “反方副领袖” | 7分钟 |
| 正方下院第一位辩手 | “正方成员” | 7分钟 |
| 反方下院第一位辩手 | “反方成员” | 7分钟 |
| 正方下院第二位辩手 | “正方党鞭” | 7分钟 |
| 反方下院第二位辩手 | “反方党鞭” | 7分钟 |

所有辩手须按照以上顺序进行发言。

3. 发言计时

每位辩手的发言的时间均为7分钟。辩手提出“质询”的时间应在发言人讲话的第2到第6分钟之间。

发言计时从辩手开始说话为始，所有发言内容（包括致谢、开场白等）都在计时范围内。计时人员将在以下时间点向选手示意：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **时间标示** | **示意** |
| 1’00’’ | 响铃一次（允许开始提出“质询”） |
| 6’00’’ | 响铃一次（提出“质询”的时间结束） |
| 7’00’’ | 连续响铃两次（发言时间结束） |
| 7’15’’ | 连续响铃（发言“缓冲”时间结束） |

在连续两次响铃结束后，辩手有15秒“缓冲”时间，在这段时间内允许选手进行总结。“缓冲”时间内不应提出新观点，且裁判可能会判此时间段内提出的新观点与论据为无效。在“缓冲”时间后仍继续发言的辩手将被裁判扣分。

4. 辩手角色分配

每个辩手都有特定角色且每段发言都须有明确具体的目的。下面列出的辩手角色及职责可提供借鉴，但比赛中的辩手角色既不仅限于此，也并非皆须面面俱到。由于具体辩论情况不一，在正方支持辩题、反方驳斥辩题的前提下，辩手可能会完成设定角色以外的任务，其发言也可能不仅限于以下陈列的目的。

除了两方最后一位辩手（正方和反方党鞭），其他所有辩手都应引入新的论据和材料（但并不须是新观点）。除了首相，所有辩手都应反驳对方辩手的观点。

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **选手** | **角色及职责** |
| “首相”或“正方领袖” | 第一个发言选手的职责是展开辩题。正方上院的首要职责就是为整场辩论铺垫构建一个有意义的可辩的基础。 |
| “反方领袖” | 反方上院的首要任务是直接或间接地驳斥正方提出的观点，并提出确凿的论据来反驳辩题。 |
| “副首相” | 辩手应该驳斥反方领袖的发言，并进一步论证“首相”提出的观点。 |
| “反方副领袖” | 辩手应支持队友，答复对方辩手提出的驳论并且在驳论中添加新论点。 |
| “正方成员” | 辩手应该支持正方上院队伍的立场，并引入对已有观点进行延展。有力的延展观点必须与正方上院的观点明显不同（可以是全新的观点，也可以是相较于上院而言更深刻的分析）。正方下院成员应反驳反方上院副领袖提出的观点。 |
| “反方成员” | 辩手应该支持反方上院的立场，并且必须引入新的延展观点。与正方成员辩手一样，反方成员辩手独特的延展观点应与反方上院的观点明显不同（可以是全新的观点，也可以是相较于上院而言更深刻的分析）。反方下院成员应反驳正方下院成员提出的观点。 |
| “正方党鞭” | 辩手应该总结正方的观点和反方的反驳，除了反驳反方辩手的论述，正方党鞭总结中不应再提出新的立论点。不过，为了更好地比较已有的观点，党鞭可以引入新的例子和案例研究。 |
| “反方党鞭” | 辩手应该总结反方的观点，并回应整场辩论中出现的主要观点。反方党鞭总结中不应再提出新的立论点。不过，为了更好地比较已有的观点，党鞭可以引入新的例子和案例研究。 |

5. 辩题

辩题会在全部辩手聚集后公布，辩题公布后20分钟开始辩论。每轮的辩题都不相同。

大多辩题源于时事或长期热议话题，题目措词清晰明确。

6. 辩论的重点和内容

英国议会制辩论中，正方辩手应论证辩题为真，反方辩手应阐明辩题为假或说明正方辩手提出的辩护无法论证辩题为真的原因。双方都应通过直接或间接的方式反驳对方辩手提出的观点。

辩题的措辞平白中立，辩手应尊重辩题原意，并将辩论核心构建于辩题原意之上。正方上院诠释辩题时，不应试图歪曲辩题本意。正方上院首相应在演讲开始为辩题中可能混淆辩论的词语给出定义。

大多数情况下正方上院对辩题的解释将会成为整场辩论的基础。如果正方上院没能明确阐释辩论的重点，或者完全误读了辩题，反方上院可以重新定义辩题。下院队伍不能再改变辩题中对重要词汇的定义。

7. 准备

所有赛场的辩论都将在辩题公布后的20分钟后开始。辩手可以在这20分钟的准备时间里查阅纸质资料。禁止在辩题公布后查阅电子媒介的资料、电子存储的信息和在电子平台上进行信息检索。只能查看预先准备好且打印出来的资料。

在准备时间内辩手可以与本队辩友进行讨论。辩手不能在准备时间内与其他任何人（包括其他队伍的教练、其他队伍辩手、教导人员、裁判等）进行讨论。但是在特殊轮次（比如地区赛决赛），可能会允许队伍教练对队伍进行指导。这个最终将由赛事主办方和评委会一同决定。

正方上院有权在辩论场地进行讨论，抽到其他位置的队伍将在赛事指定的不同场所进行讨论。

辩论开始，辩手务必进入辩论场地，未能在规定时间内到达场地的辩论队将被剥夺参赛权利。这将视裁判长裁决而定。为保证比赛顺利进行，被剥夺资格的队伍将被换成替补队伍。

8. 质询

选手可以在辩论的第1分钟末至第6分钟末期间的任意时间口头提问或起身要求质询，被提问的辩手可以接受或回绝质询。如果接受质询，提问辩手有15秒时间提出异议或提出问题。质询和回答时间记在被提问辩手的发言时间中。提问与回答双方辩手对质询的把握能力，将会被裁判列入裁定辩论队名次及辩手评分内。质询的次数以及优先度不计入评分范围。

三、地区赛的赛程管理和“外研社杯”公开赛

1.“外研社杯”公开赛简介

“外研社杯”公开赛（下文简称公开赛）是“外研社杯”组委会全年在全国的若干城市开展的一系列公开赛，它是“外研社杯”辩论赛的预备赛。获奖选手会被授予荣誉证书并颁发奖金。

公开赛旨在为准备参加“外研社杯”辩论赛的选手提供能力鉴定和深入评判，通过开展与英国议会制比赛、思辨能力及辩论/思辨能力实践等主题相关的专题讲座，助力辩论赛事的新加入选手或机构。

“外研社杯”公开赛，顾名思义，不限制参赛人员的身份，并遵照国际化标准组织开展。其报名资格不同于“外研社杯”辩论赛，所有人（包括在华留学生、外籍人员、中学生和在职人员）均可以辩手或观摩人员的身份注册参赛。

公开赛为期三天（周五至周日）。周五为培训和讲座时间，周六和周日为比赛时间。比赛包括五轮正式赛和一轮职业和业余联赛。周六安排前三轮，周日安排后两轮和职业业余联赛。

每轮比赛过后，会预留一小时作大赛视频评述分析和赛后辩题分析，或针对已辩辩题作正反方一辩的示范演讲，和赛制相关的答疑。

职业和业余联赛共有四队参与，每队有一名主持人/培训师和一名志愿者（参赛选手）。周五公布辩题，八名发言人均需和其他几位辩手分享准备和辩论经验。职业和业余联赛旨在为新加入的辩手树立良好规范，加深辩手和裁判的相互了解，分享专业辩手准备、讨论和辩论的经验。

公开赛的所有参赛人（包括辩手、裁判和观摩人员）均应缴纳报名费。周五的培训和讲座结束之后，参赛者均可在比赛可控的范围内更改角色（例如，以观摩人员的身份报名，最终可以裁判的身份参赛）。报名费用于聘请若干裁判长以匹配若干赛场，用于聘请专业培训师以主持场际的分析研讨会等。

2.地区赛比赛结构

“外研社杯”全国英语辩论赛分为三个阶段：校园选拔阶段，地区赛阶段和全国总决赛阶段。

校园选拔由单一高校独立完成，或由几所高校联合完成。所有举办校选赛的高校均可获取一定的校园积分。积分可兑换相应赠书或培训等思辨服务产品。

地区赛分为华北、华西、华南和华东四大赛区。具体省市划分如下：

华北：北京市、天津市、河北省、黑龙江省、辽宁省和吉林省

华西：四川省、重庆市、陕西省、河南省、山西省、新疆维吾尔自治区、甘肃省、宁夏回族自治区、西藏自自治区、内蒙古自治区

华南：广东省、广西壮族自治区、福建省、贵州省、海南省、江西省、湖南省、湖北省、云南省、香港特别行政区、澳门特别行政区、台湾省

华东：上海、江苏、浙江、安徽、山东

在地区赛中，赛事分为两个主要阶段：第一阶段的“循环赛”和第二阶段的“总决赛”。比赛应包括1轮热身赛、5轮循环赛和1轮总决赛。

所有参赛队都应参加循环赛，根据队伍积分、辩手分数和输赢记录进行排名。这个排名是队伍晋级全国赛的依据（同时还须参考地区晋级配额和省份晋级配额）。

在地区赛决赛中，除了竞技的目的，还应彰显教育意义，推广辩论及思辨理念。以此原则，进入地区赛决赛的应是循环赛中排名前三的队伍和主办地区赛的学校，但如果主办地区赛的学校进入了地区赛前三，那么参加决赛的第四支队伍则应是总排名第四的队伍。

3. 地区赛的循环赛对阵

如果参赛队总数无法被4整除，或者在比赛过程中有参赛队退出比赛使参赛队总数无法被4整除，赛事主办方应用“替补队”填补空缺。替补队每轮的比赛成绩应按实际情况评价（如果一轮比赛中替补队是表现最好的辩论队，他们将会被评为最佳），但替补队不能晋级地区决赛。

比赛第一轮的队伍对阵随机。

在每轮循环赛结束后（除去第一轮），将按照队伍积分总分由高至低的顺序对参赛队排名。

依排名情况，参赛队将被分组，得分相同或相近的队分在一组，各组也会从高到低依次排名。

如果任何组（例如“高分组”）的参赛队总数不能被4整除，那么就必须从排在其下的一组（“次高分组”）中随机挑选参赛队加入“高分组”，使“高分组”的队数成为4的倍数。如果“次高分组”因有参赛队被选入“高分组”而使得队伍总数不能被4整除，则按照以上规则调整，直到所有组的队数都是4的整数倍。

所有的循环赛均为“公开轮次”，每场比赛结束时，裁判会在现场进行口头评判。

4. 地区决赛和全国赛队伍选拔机制

在所有的循环赛结束时，辩论队将会依以下条件排名：1）5轮比赛的队伍总分；2）队内选手总分，即两个辩手得分的总和；3）优先比获得第一名的次数，再比获得第二名的次数；4）若两队排名一致则以两队相遇时的比赛结果为依据；如果这些仍没能打破所有平局情况，那么将另行寻找打破平局的标准。后续标准将由赛前裁判会议讨论得出。

地区总决赛中，裁判团将选出冠军一名、亚军一名和两名季军。

赛事主办方应在比赛开始前向选手公布地区赛晋级名额（从该地区晋级全国赛的名额数量）。地区赛晋级名额视该地区参赛队伍数量以及上一赛季该地区整体表现而定。

如果一个队伍由于地区晋级配额限制不能晋级全国赛，但这个队伍仍是该省份排名最高的队伍，那么省内晋级名额将会自动分配给该支队伍，该队伍将因此有资格参加全国赛。

5. 比赛观摩规则

预选赛中，观摩人员经过参赛队的允许可以在场地内观摩，若需要录音、录像，须经场地内参赛辩手同意。在赛事委员会商讨出的名额限制和比赛场地情况的允许下，地区决赛向所有观摩者开放。

6. 对阵官及相关工作人员

比赛应指定对阵官及相关工作人员，其职责是按章程规定为辩论比赛策划时间表并对阵比赛队伍。

四、裁判

1. 裁判人员组成

总体上，总裁判长的职责在于监督比赛裁决的权威性和有效性。具体来说，总裁判长会参与裁判员的培训、管理和审批裁判员考试，为裁判员排名，指导裁判员在裁判团中就位，在比赛过程中评定裁判员水准，选拔决赛裁判人选。

总裁判长将选择几名副总裁判长协助其工作。

裁判团中可有随队裁判、独立裁判和其他有资质的裁判。

每个参赛学校必须带一个有资质的裁判加入裁判团。

2. 裁判职责

比赛之前，裁判应被任职为本场的“评委主席”，“评委”或“见习评委”。每场比赛的裁判组成中至少应包含一位“评委主席”。理想状态下，一轮比赛的裁判团组成应包含一名“评委主席”和两名“评委”。

循环赛每轮有奇数名裁判，一般应为3名。每个裁判团将会有一个评委主席。评委中可能有见习评委，见习评委将参与到比赛结束后的讨论中，但是其结果不会记录于最终裁决里。

每轮结束后，辩手将暂时离场，每个裁判必须思考并与裁判团其他评委进行讨论，最终决定队伍排名和辩手分数。评委应该尽可能在裁决中达成一致意见。如果评委不能够达成一致，那么应该听从大多数人意见。如果有偶数个裁判，且投票结果为平局，那么裁判的投票将打破平局（裁判投给的那一方为最终结果）。

3. 评委主席工作职责

评委主席负责指导比赛进程（召集比赛人员，介绍发言者，维持赛场秩序等）。比赛之后，评委主席应辅助裁判团进行评审，提高其他裁判的参与度。

评审结束后，评委主席应完成赛事主办方提供的投票表格，明确说明投票结果反映了裁判团对比赛队伍和辩手成绩的评估。在宣布裁判结果之前，投票结果应交给比赛工作人员。一旦上交比赛结果，评委主席应该请辩手回到比赛场地，并宣布比赛裁决结果。

4. 循环赛辩论队评分标准

每轮循环赛结束之后，裁判团队应为参赛队伍排出一至四名，不允许出现并列名次。

不应有任何队伍因任何情形而自动排名第四。如果辩论队在比赛开始后5分钟之内未能赶到赛场，主办方会安排一支替补队伍到场辩论，从而使得其他队伍能够继续辩论且得到公正的裁决。如果一个队伍或队伍中的成员因宗教、性别、肤色、国籍、性取向或残疾状况而歧视骚扰其他辩手，那么其他人应将此情况报告给裁判长和主办方。裁判团应该按照比赛的真实进程进行裁决。所有队伍都应有机会获得合理客观的名次。

评判队伍名次应基于队伍的辩论内容和辩论方式

辩论内容代表辩论队呈现观点的实质内容和其重要性。辩论内容包括论点和推理、依据、具体事例、案例分析、事实呈现、数据和其他任何能用来支持本方论点的材料。辩论内容包括正面辩护（或延伸）内容和反驳（专门用于应对对方提出观点的辩论）。

辩论内容应与辩题关联性强、逻辑严密并且前后一致。它应该与辩题紧密相联：正面辩护应该支持已提出的观点，而反驳则应该针对对方辩手提出的材料。论点的提出应该逻辑严密，以使之明确、具有说服力。党鞭所有论点的总结应该支持本队成员辩手提出的观点。辩手应该保证他们所呈现的辩论内容在其发言内、队内以及同方两队内前后一致，不相互矛盾。每个辩手都应该提供正面辩护（除去每轮比赛最后发言的两名辩手），并且每个辩手都应该提供反驳（每轮比赛第一位发言的辩手除外）。如果认为有助于反驳对方辩手的新延展的内容，正方党鞭可以选择提供正面辩护。

辩论方式涉及辩论的战略和辩论队的论点呈现方式。辩论方式包括论据选择、发言结构、语音和肢体语言表现及质询质量等因素。

辩论方式应该加强辩论队证明或反驳辩题的力度，并且应该具有说服力。要加强辩论方式的效力，辩论队应该随辩论中发生的变化合理安排内容和时间，用清晰、逻辑鲜明的方式呈现观点，通过直接或间接的方式与对方辩手提出的论点进行交锋。若使辩论富有说服力，则要根据辩论材料内容来改变语音语调和肢体语言从而帮助呈现材料。富有说服力的队伍应表现出一定程度的激情，能够用合适的语音语调和肢体语言来辅助陈述论据，并且能够避免影响自己的辩论有效呈现的因素。

以上对于辩论内容和辩论方式的阐释不尽完整。裁判团应该综合评价辩论队的优劣（包括但不限于辩论内容和辩论方式），以求获得最正确和公平的判定。

参与“外研社杯”辩论赛的选手必须了解，他们将会面对来自多个院校的多种辩论风格，并且会遇到的对手水平不一。比赛不存在单纯“正确”或“错误”的辩论方式。

5. 辩手评分标准

决定队伍排名之后，裁判团应该决定每位辩手的个人得分。辩手评分标准如下， 75分应是本次参赛辩手的平均水平分数。

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 得分 | 表现 |
| 90 - 100 | 完美，无懈可击。这个分数的演讲应该是比赛总决赛水准的。此辩手优点很多，几乎没有弱点。 |
| 80 - 89 | 中上到非常出色之间。这个分数的演讲应该半决赛水准甚至决赛水准的。此辩手优势明显，略有薄弱点。 |
| 70 - 79 | 平均水平。此选手优缺点并存。 |
| 60 - 69 | 低于平均水平。此辩手缺点明显，优势有限。 |
| 50 - 59 | 非常拙劣。此辩手有致命弱点并且几乎没有优点。 |

每支辩论队两名辩手得分之和为队伍得分。队伍分数应与队伍排名相称；不允许出现低分高名次。例如，如果第二名小队得分为170分，第一名得分则应为171分或以上。不允许出现相同的小组得分。

6. 裁判团内讨论

裁判团讨论应封闭进行；讨论过程中只有裁判团人员和计时员允许留在场地内。

见习评委应参与讨论且应被给予充分的时间表达观点，这既利于其自身的学习进步，也便于对见习评委能否晋升进行评估。

裁判们应本着合作和互相尊重的原则进行讨论、得出结果。裁判团讨论时间不应超过15分钟。

7. 宣布裁判结果

裁判组内投票过程结束且将投票结果交给赛事工作人员后，裁判长应向辩论队伍宣布裁判结果并阐释投票结果。阐释说明应包括队伍排名、排名理由和评价、建议和改进方式。如果评委主席得出的结果被多数票击败，那意味着评委主席在裁判团中是少数一方，那么多数一方中应选出代表来说明投票结果。

在时间允许的情况下，裁判团其他成员也可以参与讲解。结果宣布过程不应超过10分钟。

辩手不可在讲解过程中干扰裁判。

裁判讲解结束之后辩手可以向裁判针对裁决结果进行询问。询问时态度必须礼貌，不要对裁判质问结果。

只有在热身赛和第1至3轮预选赛中有裁判宣布并讲解结果的环节。

五、申诉政策

1. 申诉小组章程

申诉小组将由裁判团核心成员和主办方成员组成。裁判长和赛事主办方负责人依权职成为申诉小组成员。

申诉小组负责倾听、调查并解决“外研社杯”参赛选手递交的申诉。

2. 申诉的定义

“外研社杯”英语辩论赛中，对参与者、辩手或裁判的违规行为提出的异议视为申诉。申诉内容主要涉及比赛管理和比赛过程中的失误。

裁判对辩论的裁决不在申诉范围内。除非裁判的裁决是由于赛事程序上的问题造成的，一般不收回裁决结果。

为确认申诉有效，申诉信必须书面提交至申诉委员会。

在申诉之前申诉人可以与裁判长或大赛主席私下沟通。

3. 申诉处理

1)投递申诉表

申诉表应在引起异议后的第一时间投出。一般情况下，在下一轮开始的时候，申诉委员会将不再受理针对前一轮比赛的申诉。

申诉信应包括以下内容：

a. 姓名，角色（辩手、教练、教师、裁判等）和申诉人所在院校。

b. 日期，时间，地点和引起异议比赛场次。

c. 引起异议比赛场次参与者和见证者。

d. 异议事件简要描述。

e. 异议事件所违反的规程。

f. 申诉人所期待的解决方案。

收到申诉信后，申诉委员会向申诉人询问情况。

如果申诉委员会认为申诉有深入调查的必要，申诉将会进入调查阶段。

如果申诉委员会认为申诉没有调查的必要，申诉将会被驳回。

2) 申诉调查

申诉委员会有权询问任何他们认为对了解事件实情有帮助的人员。

对相关人员的询问应私下进行。

申诉委员会有权获得任何他们认为对了解事件实情有帮助的文件。

申诉调查应尽快完成。

3)申诉解决

申诉委员对解决申诉的方式有充分的裁量权。

一般情况下，对申诉的解决办法应该是防止此类申诉再次发生。

申诉小组解决方案的最终通知应上交总裁判长和大赛主席，同时分发给申诉审受双方。

4) 最终解决办法

申诉委员会的申诉解决办法为最终解决办法，不接受再次申诉。

本章程汇编于2015年12月，汇编人为陈聪和辛欣。

特别鸣谢“外研社杯”全国英语辩论赛原章程撰写者史蒂文·L.约翰逊（Steven L. Johnson）教授。
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