Each MESAC school will submit a Debate and Forensics team of up to 20 students. Each student may compete in a maximum of one event in Flight A, as well as one event in Flight B.

**FLIGHT A**
- Debate
- Impromptu Speaking
- Serious Oral Interpretation
- Serious Duet Acting

**FLIGHT B**
- Extemporaneous Speaking
- Oratory
- Comic Oral Interpretation
- Comic Duet Acting

Schools may submit a maximum of five students in each of the five solo performance events: Impromptu Speaking, Serious Oral Interpretation, Extemporaneous Speaking, Oratory, and Comic Oral Interpretation.

Schools may submit a maximum of four teams, comprising eight students, in each of the duet events: Debate, Serious Duet Acting, and Comic Duet Acting.

This document most recently revised: March 2016
MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content Guidelines

The following guideline is meant to be a framework for participants and coaches to consider, regarding the appropriateness of Forensic performances. The guidelines listed below may be superseded by any guideline that is distributed from the host school of a MESAC Forensics competition.

These guidelines apply to all events, but it is generally recognized that issues of theme and content most commonly arise during the Acting, Oral Interpretation, and Oratory events.

These guidelines may still permit significant differences of interpretation. All participants and coaches are strongly encouraged to discuss any specific instances of potential concern with the host school organizers, well in advance of the MESAC Forensics competition.

**Topics which are prohibited from inclusion in any Forensics event/performance**

1. Direct insult or ridicule of a religious belief system
2. The direct promotion of racial or cultural discrimination
3. The direct promotion of excessive violence
4. The direct promotion of the abuse of alcohol, tobacco or illegal drugs

**Specific actions or simulated actions which are prohibited from inclusion in any Forensics event/performance**

1. Any excessive expression/simulation of extreme violence – such as torture, murder (a violent act or description, including murder, may be permissible if the effect is either comic, or not considered excessive)
2. Excessively sexually provocative actions (a quick kiss is permissible, fondling is not – discretion is advised)
3. The gratuitous use of alcohol, tobacco or illegal drugs

**Language which is prohibited from inclusion in any Forensics event/performance**

1. Gratuitous references to sexual anatomy or sexual intercourse
2. The use of profanity or profane actions is not allowed. These items may include but are not limited to: emotional references or outbursts with connections to excretory, religious or sexual matters. The editing of such language is required.

If participants believe they cannot remove or replace prohibited specific actions, simulated actions, or language, without irreversibly damaging the impact of the original work, then another work must be selected.
MESAC Forensics
Procedure for the Advance Review of Forensics Scripts

Although the “MESAC Appropriate Materials and Content Guideline” exists as a support mechanism, it is not feasible to create absolute rules with regard to what is appropriate. Different schools within MESAC have different traditions of school performance, as well as standards of behavior. It should be emphasized that Forensics is a school-sanctioned event at the high school level, with an anticipated school community audience. The host school has an especially important obligation to guarantee that all potential performances are considered appropriate for their particular audience.

It becomes much more difficult to reach a consensus regarding appropriate material once the MESAC Forensics competition is underway. Most important, it can be both extremely difficult and disappointing for the students involved, to implement consequences regarding inappropriate material, once the competition is underway.

For these reasons, all Forensics coaches and participants are expected to make every effort to resolve potential concerns for appropriate material well in advance of the competition date.

If at any point either before or during the competition, a script is recommended for removal from consideration, the participant students will have the option of submitting an alternate script for performance, at no penalty to the participants. The participants may elect to voluntarily withdraw from the competition in the event in question. The aim of this procedure is not to penalize students: it is to uphold the best understanding of materials and content appropriate for a MESAC school performance setting.

The following procedure codifies the steps required to meet this goal.

Steps in the Advance Review Process

1. Each school conducts In-School Review of scripts
2. Each school submits “In-School Script Review Form” to host organizers
3. Host organizers review forms, and consider potential concerns
4. Host organizers facilitate final decision for potential concerns
5. Contingency actions

Step 1: In-School Review of Scripts

Coaches must submit scripts for performance in Oratory, Oral Interpretation, and Duet Acting to the athletic/activities director (AD) of their own participating school, as soon as possible. The AD must then coordinate a review of scripts, to determine whether concerns exist concerning appropriate content or materials.

As a general guideline, each school should:

- Have an in-school title record of every script proposed for performance
- Guarantee that every script is reviewed for appropriate content, by someone other than the coach who initially approves the script. This may not require a word-for-word reading in every case. Schools should aim to be as comprehensive and thorough as is feasible, however, regarding this process.

The early review of scripts does not bind the participants to perform the script under consideration, either in full or in part. If participants choose a new script after initial review, that new script must also undergo the review process.
Step 2: Submission of Scripts to the Host Organizers

The AD will report the results of the review to the host event organizers, at least two weeks before the beginning of the MESAC Forensics competition, by submitting a completed “Forensics In-School Script Review Form.” The report will include an explanatory statement, identifying any script for which there may be a concern with regard to appropriate content. Identified scripts will be submitted in full, as part of the report.

As a general guideline, each school should:

- Err on the side of caution and transparency, in bringing scripts to the attention of the host school.
- Submit script concerns well before the two-week advance deadline if at all possible.

Step 3: Follow-up Review by Host Organizers

It is the responsibility of the host event organizers to:

- Confirm that content reports are received from all participating schools
- Make a follow-up review of any scripts that are tagged as potential concerns, and submitted in full. This must include a word-for-word reading of the scripts in question.
- Confirm all recommendations for editing or removal of scripts with the athletic/activities directors of all participating schools, within three school days of the receipt of those scripts.

Step 4: Host Facilitation of Final Decision

If the host event organizers recommend that any script should be either edited or removed from the competition, the hosts will explain the nature of the concern to the ADs of each of the participating MESAC schools. Schools may appeal the decision of the host organizers. In such cases, the ADs representing each of the participating schools are advised to reach a consensus decision regarding the matter, as quickly as possible. As a practical matter, it may be very difficult to resolve appeals before the competition date. The host organizers retain the ultimate authority regarding the appropriateness of any script. Participants are required to act upon any final decision, or remove their performance from the competition.

Step 5: Contingency Measures

This procedure does not preclude the possibility that:

1) some scripts may not reach the host school in time for proper review
2) this process may not identify a script that is later recognized, by general consensus, as inappropriate.

It is the responsibility of the participant schools and host organizers, at the initial Forensics coaches meeting, to mention any script concerns which have not yet undergone review. At this time, the host organizers will make as quick a review as possible of the aforementioned scripts. All of the participant schools are once again advised to reach a consensus decision regarding content and consequences, as quickly as possible.

During the competition, judges, coaches and event organizers may submit an “Appropriate Materials and Content Notice Form.” Upon receipt of the form, the host organizers will confirm whether the script in question has already undergone sufficient review. If not, the organizers will convene a meeting of representatives from all the participating MESAC schools, with the aim to reach a consensus decision regarding the matter as quickly as possible.
MESAC Forensics and Debate
“Forensics In-School Script Review Form”

Completion of this form indicates that the school has completed its initial review of all proposed scripts for the current Forensics season competition, in the events of Serious and Comic Duet Acting, Serious and Comic Oral Interpretation, and Oratory.

Submitting MESAC School ___________________________ Date __________________

Athletic/Activities Director ___________________________

All schools are expected to:

1. Conduct an in-house review of every script
2. Be as transparent as possible in bringing potential concerns to the notice of the host organizers
3. Submit this form to the host organizers as soon as possible in advance of the competition date
4. Include further comments as desired to justify the inclusion of a script in the Forensics competition

For each potential concern identified below, please provide a copy of the full text of the script. If the school wishes to bring more than three scripts to the attention of the host organizers, please submit an additional page of this form. Thank you.

**Script with Potential Concern**

Title ___________________________ Event ___________________

Area of possible concern, please circle all that apply:

violence       sexual content       language       use/abuse of illegal substances

**Script with Potential Concern**

Title ___________________________ Event ___________________

Area of possible concern, please circle all that apply:

violence       sexual content       language       use/abuse of illegal substances

**Script with Potential Concern**

Title ___________________________ Event ___________________

Area of possible concern, please circle all that apply:

violence       sexual content       language       use/abuse of illegal substances
Determining Finalists – all events except debate

Forensics tournaments include a series of four preliminary rounds for each event, to be followed by a final round. Qualifiers as finalists are determined as followed:

The ideal goal is to identify 5 finalists for each event. There may be exceptions, however, to this ideal result. The maximum number of permissible finalists is 6. The minimum number of finalists is 4.

All entries (solo and duet) earn both a ranking and a total point score, for each preliminary round. The ranks for each round are totaled, with each 1st place finish worth 4 points, 2nd place worth 3 points, 3rd place worth 2, and 4th = 1. The entry (solo or duet) with the best overall ranking total is the top finisher in the preliminary rounds. As a reminder, all participants who do not finish in the top 3 of a preliminary round are considered tied for 4th. Entries may also earn an automatic 4th place finish for a rules violation.

The first tiebreaker is determined by cumulative points awarded.

The second tiebreaker is determined by head-to-head performance in the preliminary rounds, as assessed by the Speechwire Forensics administration program.

If there is a tie, through both tiebreakers, between the 5th and 6th place finishers, then the finals will be expanded to 6 entries.

If there is a tie, through both tiebreakers, between the 5th through 7th place finishers, then the finals will include only the top four.

If there is an absolute tie from 4th-7th place or beyond, the judges will identify 4-6 finalists using the following priority

1. Participants with more 1st place finishes in the preliminaries advance to the finals
2. Participants with more 2nd place finishes advance to the finals
3. Participants with the highest single round point score advance to the finals
4. Coaches from the participating schools will reach a consensus decision to determine the finalists
School Championship Determination

Schools earn points toward the School Championship in the following manner:

Points earned in Debate:

1 point for each quarterfinal losing team
2 points for each semifinal losing team
3 points for the team that loses in the finals
5 points for the team that wins the finals

Points earned in all other events:

1 point for all fourth-place finalists. All finalists who do not place in the top 3 are considered tied for 4th.
2 points for all 3rd place finalists, including finalists who tie for third.
3 points for all 2nd place finalists.
4 points for all 1st place finalists.

1st tiebreak - in situations where two or more schools tie in total points earned, the school with the most first place entries earns the higher ranking

2nd tiebreak - in situations where two or more schools remain tied, the school with the most second place entries earns the higher ranking

3rd tiebreak - in situations where two or more schools remain tied, the school with the most third place entries earns the higher ranking

If teams remain tied after considering these tiebreaks, the ranking remains a tie
MESAC Forensics – General Time Management Rules

The Official Start of an Event Round

Once the door is closed for a particular event round, it can only be opened for transit by coaches wearing a competition badge, and to control the sequence of participation in extemporaneous and impromptu speaking. This holds true, even for late arriving participants. The judge should grant up to five minutes if necessary for late arrivals. Scheduled participants who do not attend the event are automatically awarded a fourth-place finish, and a minimum 10 points. This rule applies, even in the case of only three scheduled participants for a round.

Minimum Time Requirements

Oratory, Oral Interpretation, and Duet Acting have minimum time requirements which participants must meet. If any entry does not meet the minimum requirement in one of these events, the judges must first assess a score to the performance on its merit, and then reduce the score by four points. The final score, however, is not to fall below 10 points. This reduction may also affect the rank order. In this case, the judge should first determine point values on the basis of performance, without considering the four-point penalty. Next, the judge should assess the penalty. The judge should determine rank order of each entry, in line with the adjusted point values earned after any time standard penalties have been assessed.

Maximum Time Requirements

All debate stages and non-debate events have maximum permissible time requirements. When the time remaining in an event or stage reaches zero, the timekeeper will display the "Stop" card. The participants are granted the opportunity to complete a sentence or phrase, at no penalty. At time plus 10 seconds, the timer will say “TIME”. The participants must respect the timekeeper’s declaration of “TIME” in each instance. If for any reason the timer does not say “TIME” at the appropriate time, participants will not be penalized for exceeding the maximum time requirement.

Allowance for Extra Time in an Event

Judges may extend time in the case of a performance which experiences extended audience interruptions. In such cases, the judge can quietly instruct the timekeeper, before the maximum time limit approaches, to “add X seconds” before revealing the “0” time card.
MESAC Debate Rules and Procedures

MESAC debates are conducted between two different two-person teams. One team is identified as the affirmative, the other team is identified as the negative. The affirmative team is required to argue in favor of a resolution, with an action plan to carry out the principles of the resolution. The negative team is required to demonstrate that the plan presented by the affirmative team is flawed.

Identifying the Resolution

The same resolution will be used for every debate during the entire MESAC competition. The host organizing school must distribute the resolution to all participating schools, at least two months prior to the scheduled MESAC competition opening date. The resolution should address an issue with international implications, and with opportunities for a reasoned argument incorporating more than one perspective.

The Preliminary Round Schedule

The MESAC host organizers must assign 4 preliminary debate rounds, with the following guidelines:

1. Each participant team should compete in as many of the rounds as possible. If there is an odd number of teams, one team will receive a bye for each round. No team will receive more than one bye during the competition.
2. Each team should have a relatively equal distribution of rounds as the affirmative and negative.
3. A participating team should not compete against another team from the same school.

Determination of the Winner in a Debate

Judges are instructed to recognize a winner for every debate. There is no allowance for a tie. In the most general terms, the team that does the better debating wins.

- The affirmative team wins if it succeeds in demonstrating that the proposed plan addresses the resolution and should be adopted. The negative team wins if it succeeds in demonstrating that the affirmative plan should not be adopted. If neither team meets their goal, the team that debates best in the effort to meet their defined goal is the winner.
- The judge must base his/her decision entirely on the material presented.
- The judge is required to accept as true arguments backed by reasonable proof, until such arguments are overthrown by the opposing team.
- The judge must not accept ideas which are not backed by reasonable proof.
- The judges must attribute a point score for both teams in the debate. The winning team must also earn more points. Judges are strongly encouraged to first consider a winner on the basis identified above, and to then guarantee that the team point values reflect the judge’s holistic impression.
MESAC Debate Rules and Procedures - 2

Determination of Negative and Affirmative Sides in the Playoff Rounds

The following priority will be used to determine the Negative and Affirmative in each playoff debate

1. If the two teams met previously in the preliminary rounds, they must accept opposite roles in their playoff match.
2. If one of the teams has had fewer debates as either the affirmative or negative side, they must accept that side for the ensuing playoff round (this priority is not used to determine negative or affirmative sides, however, in the championship final).
3. If both teams debated opposite sides of the argument in the preceding round, they will both switch their affiliated side for the ensuing round.
4. If none of the previous criteria apply, the host organizers will designate a person to conduct a coin toss – the toss will determine which team takes which side of the debate. There will not be an option to choose granted to either team.
MESAC Debate Rules and Procedures – 3

General Guidelines for the Sequence of the Debate

- The first affirmative constructive speech may be fully prepared in advance of the debate.
- No new constructive arguments may be presented in the rebuttal or summary speeches.
- New evidence may be presented in the rebuttal and summary, to support previous arguments.
- Speakers must alternate responsibility for the rebuttal and summary speeches. Either debater may deliver the rebuttal, and the teammate must then deliver the summary.

First Affirmative Constructive (6 minutes) (1st Affirmative Speaker)
1. State the resolution.
2. Define terms.
3. State the affirmative case.
4. Present the affirmative plan.

Negative questioning of 1st affirmative (3 minutes) (2nd Negative Speaker)

First Negative Constructive (6 minutes) (1st Neg Speaker)
1. Accept or object to affirmative definition of terms.
2. Attack the affirmative’s effort to address the topic, as appropriate.
3. Defend the status quo, if the negative chooses to do so.
4. Attack specific affirmative contentions.

Affirmative questioning of 1st negative (3 minutes) (1st Aff Speaker)

Second Affirmative Constructive (6 minutes) (2nd Aff Speaker)
1. Respond to any objections to definition of terms, or adherence to topic
2. Attack the negative position
3. Respond to objections to affirmative contentions
4. Further explain the affirmative plan.

Negative questioning of 2nd affirmative (3 minutes) (1st Neg Speaker)

Second Negative Constructive (6 minutes) (2nd Neg Speaker)
1. Continue to attack the affirmative plan, and adherence to topic, as appropriate
2. Elaborate the negative position, as appropriate

Affirmative questioning of 2nd negative (3 minutes) (2nd Aff Speaker)
**MESAC Debate Rules and Procedures – 4**

**Affirmative rebuttal (3 minutes) (Either affirmative speaker)**
1. Refute any new arguments presented by the second negative constructive
2. Elaborate upon the affirmative position, as appropriate

**Negative rebuttal (3 minutes) (Either negative speaker)**
1. Refute any new arguments presented by the second affirmative constructive
2. Elaborate upon the negative position, as appropriate

**Break for summary preparation (2 minutes)**

**Negative summary (3 minutes) (Speaker not responsible for rebuttal)**
1. Renew the attack on topicality (if it was an issue).
2. Rebuild the attack against the affirmative plan.
3. Rebuild the negative position
4. Explain why these issues are sufficient to merit a negative ballot.

**Affirmative summary – (3 minutes) (Speaker not responsible for rebuttal)**
1. Refute any new arguments presented by the second negative constructive
2. Refute the negative summary
3. Rebuild the affirmative plan
4. Explain why these issues are sufficient to merit an affirmative ballot.
Definition of Terms

- The affirmative has the right to make any reasonable definition for each of the terms of the resolution.
- Definitions of terms must be made in the first affirmative constructive statement.
- Any challenge to a definition must be made in the first negative constructive statement.

Burden of Proof

- The affirmative has the burden of proof to advocate all of the terms of the resolution, as defined.
- The affirmative must show that its plan, if adopted, would be desirable. This does not in any way obligate the affirmative to show that all the approvals required to implement the plan will be obtained. The affirmative is obligated to recommend action be taken within a reasonable time frame, and that there is a reasonable chance that necessary approvals could be obtained.
- Either side may introduce print documents of texts, as well as visual aids, as verification of factual evidence, or support for logical assertions. Once a visual aid is introduced, it must be made available for use by the opposing team, if requested.

In order to establish an assertion, from either side, the following conditions must be met:

- The team must support each assertion with enough factual evidence and/or logic to convince an intelligent but previously uniformed person of the assertion.
- The team must be able to provide documentation for all significant factual evidence.

Questioning

- Each speaker is questioned as soon as he/she concludes his/her constructive speech.
- The questioner must confine himself/herself to questions and not make comments or statements.
- The questioner may ask any fair, clear question that has direct bearing on the debate.
- The questioner controls the time. He/she may interrupt the witness to request shorter or more direct answers or to indicate the answer is sufficient. The questioner must permit sufficient opportunity, however, for the witness to reasonably respond to the question as it was phrased. The questioner may not insist on a simple “Yes” or “No” answer unless his question is simple, direct, and factual.
- The witness must answer every question unless he/she can show that it would be unfair or unreasonable to expect an answer.
- The witness must confine himself/herself to answers and not question the questioner or make comments on other subjects.
- The witness may request that the question be repeated or rephrased if unclear.
- The witness must answer the questions without consulting his/her colleague.

Demeanor and courtesy

- All communication during the debate is dictated by rules of courtesy.
- Speeches must be delivered from the front of the debate room.
- When both members of a team are seated and the other team is speaking, communication must be by notes, so as not to interrupt or distract the speaker.
- When delivering a constructive speech, the speaker may return to the table for materials, including notes from his/her partner, but he/she should not speak to the partner. Teammates must refrain from communicating verbally with the speaker during a speech.
MESAC Debate Rules and Procedures - 6

Determining Finalists

In each debate, a winner is identified. Both teams in each debate also earn points in accordance with their performance.

A bye in the preliminary round is considered as a win.

The top 8 teams in the preliminary rounds advance to the debate playoff quarterfinals. Following all the preliminary rounds, teams are ranked according to the following priority:

1. Most wins (including byes)
2. Most wins (not including byes)
3. Average points earned per round (not total points – this is to account for byes)
4. Head-to-head performance
5. Average points earned per round for Civility
6. Average points earned per round for Arguments and Evidence
7. Average points earned per round for Cross Examination
8. If still tied at this point, the team on the school with the fewest number of other debate finalists will earn the higher ranking, this rule also applies to the 8th-9th place ranking
9. If still tied at this point, the host school will initiate a coin flip to determine ranking, this rule also applies to the 8th-9th ranking

The top four ranked teams are slotted regardless of school affiliation.

Playoffs begin with a quarterfinal of 1 vs. 8, 2 vs. 7, 3 vs. 6, 4 vs. 5. The MESAC host school has the responsibility to adjust rank orders of the 5th-8th place teams, with the goal to avoid teams from the same school debating each other in the quarterfinals. Adjustments to meet this goal must be as minimal as possible. There will be no provision to replace an 8th rank team with a 9th rank team.

Semifinals, winner of 1-8 vs 4-5; and winner of 2-7 vs. 3-6 – regardless of school affiliation

Finals, pairs off the winners of the semis

There is no 3rd place debate. The two semifinal losing teams share the third place award.
MESAC Forensics Debate Ballot

PLEASE ALSO COMPLETE THE COMMENTS SECTION ON THE SEPARATE PAPER

Affirmative team members and school ____________________________________________________

Negative team members and school _____________________________________________________

Judge ____________________________ Debate Round ___________

Judges are reminded of the following guidelines to determine victory in debate:
1. Judges are required to identify a winner. Judges must not designate a tie.
2. The affirmative team wins if it succeeds in demonstrating that the proposed plan addresses the resolution and should be adopted. The negative team wins if it succeeds in demonstrating that the affirmative plan should not be adopted. If neither team meets their goal, the team that debates best in the effort to meet their defined goal is the winner.

In my determination the ____________ team won the debate. My reasons for this determination are (please explain in the space provided):

Signature of Judge ________________________________

Please fill out the following rubric, by circling the appropriate score for each team, and adding the totals. As a reminder, judges are advised to first determine a winner, and then assess points which align with the holistic assessment of the result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Arguments and Evidence</th>
<th>Cross Examination</th>
<th>Presentation and Civility</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>4 - 3 - 2 - 1</td>
<td>8 - 7 - 6 - 5 - 4</td>
<td>6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2</td>
<td>3 - 2 - 1</td>
<td>6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4 - 3 - 2 - 1</td>
<td>8 - 7 - 6 - 5 - 4</td>
<td>6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2</td>
<td>3 - 2 - 1</td>
<td>6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organization:** Do the debaters present their arguments in an orderly, logical way?

**Arguments and Evidence:** Do the debaters support cases with sound reasoning? Do they challenge the opposing position effectively? Do the debaters provide sufficient, credible facts to support their assertions?

**Cross-examination:** Do the questioners draw out useful information? Do they utilize this information in a subsequent speech? Do the witnesses effectively respond to the questions?

**Presentation and Civility:** Do the debaters deliver their statements articulately? Are debaters polite and respectful? (Debaters may be emphatic but not rude. Questioners may interrupt answers during cross-examination, but must provide the time and opportunity for a sufficient answer to address the question in the manner it was asked)
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MESAC Forensics Debate Ballot

PLEASE ALSO COMPLETE THE COMMENTS FOR THE NEGATIVE ON THE REVERSE SIDE

Judge’s Comments

Judges and debaters: please note that these comments will be shared with the debaters. Comments are intended to be constructive in helping the debaters recognize their strengths and determine targets for improvement.

Affirmative Team School Name ________________________________

Affirmative Speaker 1 Name ________________________________
Comments: ________________________________

Affirmative Speaker 2 Name ________________________________
Comments: ________________________________
MESAC Forensics Debate Ballot

PLEASE ALSO COMPLETE THE COMMENTS FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE
ON THE REVERSE SIDE

Judge’s Comments

Judges and debaters: please note that these comments will be shared with the debaters. Comments are intended to be constructive in helping the debaters recognize their strengths and determine targets for improvement.

Negative Team School Name

Negative Speaker 1 Name
Comments:

Negative Speaker 2 Name
Comments:
**MESAC Debate Flow Chart – Optional** (not intended for distribution to students – judges may use their own flow chart)

**Aff School _____ Members _____________________ Neg School _____ Members _____________________**

Indicate the resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive Statements</th>
<th>Cross-Examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Negative Constructive: Main Points of Argument</td>
<td>Cross Exam: Aff Pts The Questioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Affirmative Constructive: Main Points of Argument</td>
<td>Cross Exam: Neg Pts The Questioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Negative Constructive: Main Points of Argument</td>
<td>Cross Exam: Aff Pts The Questioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Rebuttal: Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Rebuttal: Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Summary: Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Summary: Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extemporaneous Speaking Rules and Procedures

The extemporaneous speech is an oration on a topic unknown to the contestant until 1/2 hour before his/her performance. The participant’s goal is to produce an oral essay that addresses a topic chosen from three options. Content and delivery are both considered.

There is no minimum time allowance. The maximum time limit is 6 minutes. There is also a 10 second standard extra discretion to finish a sentence, before the judge announces “Time.” Judges may permit an additional time allowance (in addition to the 10 discretionary seconds) for speeches that incur audience interruptions, or any other disruption outside the control of the speaker. Contestants do not suffer any penalty for the use of discretionary time awarded by the judge. If a contestant exceeds the discretionary time awarded by the judge, a four point penalty will be assessed.

In each round, participants are provided a choice of 3 topics, upon which to construct their speech. Topics are questions based on information taken from *Time* and *The Economist* magazines in the three months prior to the tournament, but not from the most recent two weeks before the tournament. Students are strongly encouraged to investigate different viewpoints and research from a wide variety of sources.

Speeches are expected to comprehensively and consistently address the topic as phrased in the prompt. The degree to which students stray from the topic, or fail to address some aspect of the topic as written, will result in a reduced overall content score. The judge is instructed to reduce such speeches by up to 10 points.

The event organizers will solicit topic requests from all participating schools, one month preceding the competition. All topic suggestions will be shared with each of the participating schools, soon after their receipt by the organizers. The event organizers will compile and condense the list of potential topics and share it with the other schools at least 21 days before the event. This list may be shared with the students.

The event organizers are responsible for determining:
1. The potential topics to be used
2. The specific phrasing of potential topic statements/questions
3. The order in which topics will be used throughout the competition, including the final round.

Each contestant in the same round of the competition must receive the same 3 topic choices. The organizers must identify a sufficient number of topics to guarantee topics are not repeated. It is recommended that the event organizers hold a random drawing with all participating schools, immediately in advance of the competition, to establish the exact statements/questions used in the competition.

The random grouping of topics is strongly encouraged, with the following exceptions
1. The organizers should limit overlapping subject matter or geographical focus of topics in any round
2. The organizers should aim not to combine three of the most arcane or minor topics in the final round

All participants will work within the same preparation room, before delivering their speech. Each team must deliver all of its research documents into this preparation room. Students must be guided into and out of the preparation room, in conjunction with their sequential order of performance. It is the responsibility of the room monitor to insure that each participant receives 30 minutes of preparation time in the room.

Participants are encouraged to gather a wide range of research materials – including newspapers, magazines, individual articles and printouts, and original notes pertaining to prospective topics. Access to a laptop or tablet, without Internet access or the ability to print, will be allowed in the preparation room. Participants must not have access to previously written extemporaneous speeches, or formal outlines which could be considered a detailed blueprint of a prospective speech.

Upon entering the preparation room, each participant will receive as many unused notecards as desired. These notecards, and the topic statement/question slip, are the only supporting materials the participants may retain upon leaving the preparation room to deliver their speeches.

While in the preparation room, students may talk only to request the sharing of research documents. The room monitors are advised that since there are only 3 topics for participants to choose from, and significant overlap of work time in the room, document sharing is to be anticipated. Students must not discuss the topics under consideration, nor may they share notecards.

All judges must receive a copy of the topic choices, immediately prior to each round of the competition. Before beginning the speech, the judge should prompt the speaker to read their chosen topic out loud. This is not part of the actual speech or the speaking time.
MESAC Forensics – Judge’s Ballot – Extemporaneous Speaking

Participant’s Name _______________________________ Participant school ___________

Round (indicate by circling): 1 2 3 4 Finals Time of speech (6:00 max) ________

Topic _______________________________ Judge _______________________________

Judges: Please fill out every part of this ballot, including remarks. You may write additional remarks on the back.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker have a clear thesis (main idea)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker get your attention with an effective introduction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker have a clear organization of main ideas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker provide clear transitions from one idea to the next?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker conclude effectively?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of supporting arguments and evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker clearly articulate his/her supporting arguments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker use enough quality evidence from credible sources to support his/her arguments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker provide enough arguments and evidence to support his/her thesis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker provide sufficient attribution of quotes and ideas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Score for Content /15 |

Does the speaker consistently and comprehensively address the topic, as indicated in the specific wording of the prompt? If not, subtract up to 10 points from the speaker’s score:

| Revised Total score for content /15 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker use language appropriate for the topic and the event?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker use appropriate and effective rate, volume, enunciation and projection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Was the use of vocal variety appropriate and sufficient?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Were posture and gestures effective and appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Is the speaker poised and engaging?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the speaker make effective eye contact with the audience?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Is the overall presentation effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Score for Delivery /10               |
| TOTAL SCORE FOR CONTENT + DELIVERY /25    |

Time penalty - subtract 4 points if the speaker was over the time limit.

| FINAL SCORE (Cannot be below 10) /25 |

RANK FOR THIS ROUND: (circle): 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th (Entries which do not earn 1st, 2nd, or 3rd will all earn 4th.)
Oratory Rules and Procedures

Each speaker prepares a written persuasive speech on a topic of some social significance. It is permissible to treat the topic in a light or humorous manner, yet a point of some importance should be made.

The maximum time limit is 8 minutes. There is also a 10 second standard extra discretion before the timekeeper announces “Time.” Judges may permit an additional time allowance (in addition to the 10 discretionary seconds) for speeches that incur audience interruptions, or any other disruption outside the control of the speaker.

There is no minimum time limit, but speakers are strongly encouraged to provide at least five minutes for the adequate development of their ideas.

An oration is the original work of the speaker. It should be persuasive in nature, which may include alerting people to a potential danger, proposing a solution, strengthening dedication to an accepted cause, or eulogizing a person.

The speaker should state the source of the most important information presented in the speech. Not all information, however, needs to be documented. No more than 100 words of quoted material should be included.

The speech must be delivered from memory without the use of a podium.

All material must comply with the MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content Guidelines.
 Participant's Name ___________________________ Participant school _____________________

Round (indicate by circling): 1 2 3 4 Finals Time of speech (8:00 max) _______

Topic ____________________________________ Judge ____________________

Judges: Please fill out every part of this ballot, including remarks. You may write additional remarks on the back.

**Content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker have a clear thesis (main idea) or purpose?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker get your attention with an effective introduction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker have a clear organization of main ideas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker provide clear transitions from one idea to the next?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker conclude effectively?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of supporting arguments and evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker clearly articulate his/her supporting arguments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker use enough quality evidence from credible sources to support his/her arguments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker provide enough arguments and evidence to support his/her thesis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker provide sufficient attribution of quotes and ideas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker use language appropriate for the topic and the event?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker use appropriate and effective rate, volume, enunciation and projection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the use of vocal variety appropriate and sufficient?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were posture and gestures effective and appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the speaker poised and engaging?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the speaker make effective eye contact with the audience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the overall presentation effective?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the speaker comfortable with the memorization of the speech?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Remarks:**

**Thesis**

**Organization**

**Strength of supporting arguments and evidence**

**Total score for content** /15

**Language usage**

**Speaking style**

**Poise**

**Memorization**

**Total Score for Delivery** /10

**TOTAL SCORE FOR CONTENT + DELIVERY** /25

**Time penalty - subtract 4 points if the speaker was over the time limit.**

**FINAL SCORE** (Cannot be below 10) /25

RANK FOR THIS ROUND: (circle): 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th (Entries which do not earn 1st, 2nd, or 3rd will all earn 4th.)
Duet Acting Rules and Procedures

In duet acting, two participants present a scene from anthology of prose, poetry, film/video script, and/or dramatic literature, it may come from multiple sources. The actors should aim to communicate the playwright's intentions regarding mood and/or message. Pieces should be selected for their dramatic quality and potential characterizations. Actors using film/video scripts should aim to have original blocking and performance ideas. Actors are allowed to edit published scripts.

Time limit: 6:50-9:00 minutes (inclusive of an introduction). Judges may permit an additional time allowance (in addition to the 10 discretionary seconds) for performances that incur audience interruptions, or any other disruption outside the control of the student performers.

If any entry does not meet the 6:50 minimum requirement, the judges must first assess a score for the performance on its merit, and then reduce the score by four points. The final score, however, is not to fall below 10 points.

The performance must have two characters and be self-contained. The dialogue and overall participation should be divided as equally as possible between the two actors.

The introduction is included in the total permitted time for the performance.

Lines must be memorized. Actors must be able to provide a script upon request from the judge and/or MESAC host organizers. There should not be significant changes in the sequence or wording of the dialogue from one performance to the next.

Two chairs will be provided. These may be used in any way deemed necessary by the actors.

No costumes, make-up, music, lighting or props (other than the two chairs) may be used.

All material must comply with the MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content Guidelines.

As a reminder, the guidelines state, “If participants believe they cannot remove or replace prohibited specific actions, simulated actions, or language, without irreversibly damaging the impact of the original work, then another work must be selected.” Actors and their coaches are very strongly encouraged to alert the host organizers to the proposed inclusion of any potentially objectionable material, as soon as possible in advance of the MESAC competition.
MESAC Forensics – Judge’s Ballot – Duet Acting

Participant’s Name ___________________ Participant school ______________ Round (indicate by circling): 1 2 3 4 Finals

Time (6:50 minimum to 9:00 maximum) ________ Title of Selection ___________________________

Author _____________________ Judge ________________________________ Circle: Comic / Serious

Judges: Please fill out every part of this ballot, including remarks. You may write additional remarks on the back.

### Content: Selection and Understanding of Script

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Were the title and author clearly stated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Was the introduction sufficient and information relevant to prepare the audience for the piece?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the introduction create interest in the piece?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the selection interesting for a MESAC audience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does the selection demonstrate strong dramatic value?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the selection appropriately challenging?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the selection a good fit for the event?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight and Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the actors convey insight into the mood and meaning of the selection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Were the ideas clearly expressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the actors display an understanding of the author’s theme?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total score for Content: Selection and Understanding of Script**

### Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the actors use appropriate and effective rate, volume, enunciation and projection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Was the vocal delivery appropriate to the selection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Was the use of vocal variety appropriate and sufficient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the actors clearly distinguish each character and stay “in character” throughout the performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Were the characters and their motivations clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Were the gestures and vocal expression purposeful and appropriate to the characters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocking (movement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the blocking help convey the intentions of the selection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Were movements and transitions purposeful and appropriate to the sequence of the selection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the actors interact naturally and effectively throughout the performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did the performance maintain interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Was the performance consistent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Was the overall performance effective?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score for Delivery**

**TOTAL SCORE FOR CONTENT + DELIVERY**

**Time Penalty:** Subtract 4 points if the speaker was over or under the time limits.

**FINAL SCORE** (Cannot be below 10)

**RANK FOR THIS ROUND:** (circle): 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th  (Entries which do not earn 1st, 2nd, or 3rd will all earn 4th.)
Oral Interpretation Rules and Procedures

Oral Interpretation is an event in which the participant reads a passage from poetry, prose or drama. It is the art of analysing literature and effectively communicating the meaning and mood to an audience. Oral interpretation is primarily a vocal exercise. Effective interpretation may also include facial expressions, gestures, and shifts in posture.

Time limit: 5:50 to 8 minutes (inclusive of an introduction). Judges may permit an additional time allowance (in addition to the 10 discretionary seconds) for speeches that incur audience interruptions, or any other disruption outside the control of the student performers.

If any entry does not meet the 5:50 minimum requirement, the judges must first assess a score for the performance on its merit, and then reduce the score by four points. The final score, however, is not to fall below 10 points.

The participant presents the material while seated on a stool or chair (both will be provided), and must never leave his or her seat.

The participant must hold the material in a solid-color binder or folder for the duration of the presentation.

No costumes, make-up, music, lighting or props may be used.

All material must comply with the MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content Guidelines.
MESAC Forensics – Judge’s Ballot – Oral Interpretation

Participant’s Name ___________________ Participant school _____________________

Round (indicate by circling): 1 2 3 4 Finals Time of speech (5:50 - 8:00) ____________

Title of Selection _____________________ Author _____________________

Judge ______________________________ Circle: Comic / Serious

Judges: Please fill out every part of this ballot, including remarks. You may write additional remarks on the back.

Content: Selection and understanding of script

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Were the title and author clearly stated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Was the introduction sufficient and information relevant to prepare the audience for the piece?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Did the introduction create interest in the piece?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Is the selection interesting for a MESAC audience?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the selection demonstrate strong literary value?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Is the selection appropriately challenging? (eg: wide range of emotion or multiple characters or complex theme, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Is the selection a good fit for the speaker?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insight and Understanding</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Did the speaker appear to have insight into the mood and the meaning of the selection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Were the ideas clearly expressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Did the speaker display an understanding of the theme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score for Content: Selection and Understanding /10

Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking style</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Did the speaker use appropriate and effective rate, volume, enunciation and projection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Was the speaker’s vocal delivery appropriate to the selection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Was the use of vocal variety appropriate and sufficient?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narration/ Characterization</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● If the piece is narrator-driven, was the narration distinct and appropriately expressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● If character-driven, were the characters distinct and appropriately expressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Did the speaker create an original interpretation (rather than imitating a famous performer or performance)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Expression</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Was the speaker poised?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Did gestures, facial expressions, and eye contact contribute to the interpretation of the material?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Presentation</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Did the speaker clearly communicate the selection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Did the speaker maintain the listener’s interest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Was the performance consistent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Was the total performance effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score for Delivery /15

TOTAL SCORE FOR CONTENT + DELIVERY /25

Time penalty - subtract 4 points if the speaker was over or under the time limits.

FINAL SCORE (Cannot be below 10) /25

RANK FOR THIS ROUND: (circle): 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th (Entries which do not earn 1st, 2nd, or 3rd will all earn 4th.)
Impromptu Speaking Rules and Guidelines

The impromptu speech is an extemporaneous oration on a topic unknown to the contestant until immediately before his/her performance. The participant’s goal is to produce an oral essay that addresses a topic chosen from three options. Content and delivery are both considered.

Time limit: 2 minutes minimum, 3 minutes maximum. Judges may permit an additional time allowance (in addition to the 10 discretionary seconds) for performances that incur audience interruptions, or any other disruption outside the control of the student performers.

If any entry does not meet the 2 minute minimum requirement, the judges must first assess a score to the performance on its merit, and then reduce the score by four points. The final score, however, is not to fall below 10 points.

It is the responsibility of the host organizers to create the topic selections. In each round, participants will receive three prompts.

1. a single word
2. an incomplete sentence of phrase (for example: “When I grow up, I will…”)
3. a quote

Each participant in a round will receive the same three topic options. Judges will be presented with a copy of the three topic options, at the beginning of the round.

Impromptu participants will be retained in a waiting room, in advance of their turn to compete. When they enter the competition room, they will be guided to a table with pencils, blank note cards, and an envelope containing the topic prompts.

The judge and timekeeper will signal to the participant, when it is appropriate to open the envelope. The participant will then have up to 30 seconds to read the prompts. Upon completion of the 30 seconds, the participant will have one minute to write notes in support of the anticipated speech.

If at any point during the initial 30 seconds, the participant picks up a pencil, the judge will inform the participant that only one minute of preparation remains, and that note-taking may begin.

Because of the time-sensitive nature of the preparation, it is very important for the judge to guarantee that nobody leaves the competition room once an impromptu round as begun. Exceptions will be made only for coaches with badges to enter and exit between presentations. A participant who completes a speech must remain in the room until all participants in the round, in every competition room, have finished delivering their speeches.
## MESAC Forensics – Judge’s Ballot – Impromptu Speaking

**Participant’s Name ______________________________**

**Participant’s School ______________**

**Round (circle):** 1 2 3 4 Finals  
**Time (2:00 minimum to 3:00 maximum) ______________**

**Topic ______________________________  
Judge ______________________________**

*Judges: Please fill out every part of this ballot, including remarks. You may write additional remarks on the back.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Organization** | | Does the speaker get your attention with an effective introduction?  
Does the speaker have a clear organization of main ideas?  
Does the speaker provide clear transitions from one idea to the next?  
Does the speaker conclude effectively? |
| **Development of Topic** | | Does the speaker clearly articulate his/her supporting arguments?  
Does the speaker use enough quality evidence from credible sources to support his/her arguments?  
Does the speaker provide enough arguments to support his/her thesis (main idea)? |
| **Total Score for Content** | /15 |
| Does the speaker consistently address the topic, as indicated in the prompt? If not, subtract up to 10 points from this portion of his/her score. | |
| **Revised Total Score for Content** | /15 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Judge’s Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Language usage** | | Does the speaker use language appropriate for the topic?  
Does the speaker use language to maintain the attention and interest of the audience? |
| **Speaking Style** | | Does the speaker use appropriate and effective enunciation, rate, volume, and projection?  
Was the use of vocal variety appropriate and sufficient? |
| **Poise** | | Were posture and gestures effective and appropriate?  
Is the speaker poised and engaging?  
Does the speaker make effective eye contact with the audience?  
Is the overall presentation effective? |
| **Total Score for Delivery** | /10 |
| **Time Penalty:** If the speech does not meet the 2-minute minimum requirement, assign a score to the performance on its merit, and then reduce that score by 4 points. | |
| **TOTAL SCORE FOR CONTENT + DELIVERY** (not to be below 10 pts.) | /25 |

**RANK FOR THIS ROUND:** (circle): 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th (Entries which do not earn 1st, 2nd, or 3rd will all earn 4th.)
MESAC Debate and Forensics
Handbook of Rules and Procedures

Appendix

The following items are provided as support documents for the organization of a MESAC Forensics competition. The organizers are free to use and revise these documents, as long as the rules and procedures outlined in the handbook are maintained. Please note, the official ballots for the various events are included in the body of the handbook, and must be used as is.

I. Documents to Support Judges and Timekeepers
   A. Judge and Timekeeper Selection Guidelines  used by the host organizers to assign volunteers
   B. Judge Responsibilities Form  used in judge training sessions
   C. Judge Scorekeeping Procedure Forms  used in judge training sessions, and at tourney events
      1. Debate
      2. Non-debate events
   D. Single-Page Judge Procedure Guideline  provided to judges at the time of the event
      1. Debate
      2. Impromptu Speaking
      3. Oral Interpretation
      4. Duet Acting
      5. Extemporaneous Speaking
      6. Oratory
   E. Timekeeper Responsibilities  used in timekeeper training sessions
   F. Single-Page Timekeeper Procedure Guidelines  provided to timekeepers at the time of the event
      1. Debate
      2. Impromptu Speaking
      3. Oral Interpretation
      4. Duet Acting
      5. Extemporaneous Speaking
      6. Oratory
   G. Single-Page Debate Stage Time Limits  provided in each debate room
   H. “Appropriate Materials and Content Notice” form

II. Documents to Support Event Hosting
   A. Forensics Room Assignment Guidelines
   B. Estimated Room Requirements
   C. Presentation Order and Scoring Submission Form  organizers fill in the presentation order in advance of each non-debate event, judges fill in the rank order and points, and return the form to the organizers
   D. Sample Tournament Schedule from 2011
   E. Sample Competition Schedule from 2011
MESAC Forensics
Judges and Timekeepers
Selection Guidelines

It is the responsibility of the host school organizers to implement an appropriate selection and training process for all MESAC Forensics and Debate timekeepers and judges. The following documents exist to support this process:

“Judge Scorekeeping Procedures for Non-Debate Events”
“Judge Scorekeeping Procedures for Debate”
A specific single-page “Judge Procedure Guideline” for each event
A specific “Judge’s Ballot” for scorekeeping of each event
“Timekeeper General Procedures”
A specific single-page “Timekeeper Procedure Guideline” for each event
“MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content Guidelines”  (page 2 of this handbook)

General Guidelines for the Assignment of Timekeepers to Events

Timekeepers must be familiar with the timekeeping procedures concerning the event they are to keep time for. Host organizers should anticipate an average of 15-20 different timekeepers needed for each of the eight preliminary rounds. It is entirely appropriate for student volunteers from the host school to serve as timekeepers.

General Guidelines for the Assignment of Judges to Events

• Judges must be familiar with the basic procedures and criteria for assessment, concerning the event they are to judge
• Judges must maintain impartiality with regard to each entry in a competition
• Judges must never be assigned to judge direct relatives – children, nieces/nephews
• Coaches who serve as judges should not be assigned to judge their own students in their own designated events

General Guidelines Concerning the Authority of Judges

It is essential for all parties to respect the integrity and service the judges provide to the competition. MESAC Forensics and Debate judges have volunteered significant time, both in training, and during the event itself. Without these volunteers it would be impossible to conduct the competition.

The judging of Forensics is a very subjective matter, and different observers very often have differing opinions with regard to the quality of any particular performance. A judge’s evaluation must be considered absolute and final in all instances.

Questions, comments and suggestions regarding the assignment or conduct of judges during a MESAC Forensics competition should be brought to the attention of the host school organizers. It is the responsibility of the host organizers to handle inquiries in the best interest of the competition, and the MESAC organization.
The Assignment of Judges in Preliminary Rounds of the Competition

A single judge must be identified for each designated area of each preliminary round of the competition. Host organizers should anticipate an average of 15-20 different areas (and thus judges) needed for each of the eight preliminary rounds.

It is understood that Forensics team coaches may be called upon to supplement the overall judges roster. It is also understood that the host school organizers should make every effort to set reasonable limits of coach participation as judges in the preliminary rounds.

The Assignment of Judges and Timekeepers in Debate Playoffs and Non-Debate Finals

A single judge will be assigned for any debate quarterfinal round
Three judges will be assigned for the debate semi-final and final rounds
Three judges will be assigned for all non-debate events

It is highly recommended that Forensics team coaches serve as judges for the debate playoffs and non-debate finals. Coaches should not be assigned to judge students from their school in the final round. If every participating school is represented in a non-debate event final, the host organizers will randomly select the three schools which will then submit judges for the event. Schools should not submit judges who have been directly involved in coaching any of the students competing in the finals event.
MESAC Forensics
Judge Responsibilities for all Events

Preparation for Judges

• Be early to your assigned room/performance area
• Confirm that you have a timekeeper for the event, and that this timekeeper is fully prepared for the event – with materials and sufficient understanding of the process
• Confirm that you have the appropriate materials and setup for the event and round
• Read the “MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content Guidelines”

Before Closing Access to Signal the Official Beginning of an Event

• For all events except extemporaneous and impromptu speaking, the judge must confirm that all participants are in the assigned room, ready to begin
• For extemporaneous and impromptu speaking, the judge must confirm that the participants are in their proper waiting area, and that couriers are identified to guide participants to the performance room
• Remind all audience members of the event in question, and that they may not leave the area until the event round is concluded

After Closing Access, and Before the Beginning of the First Performance

• Remind everyone in the room to turn off noise-making electronic devices
• Remind everyone of common audience courtesy concerning the event
• Confirm the sequence of performance with all participants

The Sequence of Participation

Judges must adhere to the sequence of participation as indicated on the performance sheet for the round in question. Do not entertain requests from the participants to switch their order of delivery.

Audience Members

Audience Members are permitted at all events. Audience members must be advised, in advance, that they will not be allowed to leave in the middle of an event. They must attend for the duration – typically 45 minutes to an hour.

The Official Start of an Event Round

Once the door is closed for a particular event round, it can only be opened for transit by coaches wearing a competition badge, and to control the sequence of participation in extemporaneous and impromptu speaking. This holds true, even for late arriving participants. The judge should grant up to five minutes if necessary for late arrivals. Scheduled participants who do not attend the event are automatically awarded a fourth-place finish, and a minimum 10 points. This is true, even in the case of only three scheduled participants for a round.
Judge Responsibilities for all Events - 2

Time Management for Events and Debate Stages

The judge will prompt each participant to begin when ready. The timekeeper can begin tracking time with the participant’s first words.

If a participant verbally stumbles, and asks to start over, the judge must respond: “Please continue, time is running.”

If there is an unforeseen significant disturbance in the very early stages of an event, for example someone loudly entering a room, or a disruptive public address announcement, the judge may take the authority to instruct the participant to restart the performance.

If there is an unforeseen significant disturbance in the later stages of an event, the judge may instruct the participant to pause, and resume their performance from a convenient point, when ready to do so. In such cases, the judge should first alert the timekeeper to stop time, and resume timekeeping once the performance resumes.

It is entirely at the judge’s discretion to decide when a disturbance should be considered significant. Please note that participants are coached to pause and work through disturbances such as ringing bells, or dropped objects. If the participant does not appear distracted, or the disturbance quickly concludes, the judge should aim to not aggravate the disruption with any further instruction.

Special Case for Added Time

Judges may extend time in the case of a performance which experiences extended audience interruptions. In such cases, the judge can quietly instruct the timekeeper, before the maximum time limit approaches, to “add X seconds” before revealing the “0” time card.

Participants in Extemporaneous Speaking are permitted to complete a final sentence of their speech, making use of extra discretionary time not to exceed 10 seconds. The judge is instructed to say “Time” if necessary, to indicate the end of permissible discretionary time.

Maintaining Appropriate Theme and Content

Judges must familiarize themselves in advance with the “MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content Guidelines.” If, in the context of a Forensics performance, a participant introduces content or specific speech in apparent violation of the guidelines, the judge should make a note of the occurrence. This apparent violation should not, however, influence the judge’s scorekeeping in any way, with the possible exception of debate – as a measure of the “Civility” score.

Upon completion of the event round, the judge must complete the “Appropriate Materials and Content” notice form, and notify the host school organizers of any apparent violation. The host organizers, in conjunction with MESAC coaches and/or school officials, will determine any consequence which may arise as a result of the apparent violation.
MESAC Forensics
Judge Scorekeeping Procedure: Debate

Determining a winner is a primary responsibility for the debate judge. Judges are instructed to recognize a winner for every debate. There is no allowance for a tie. In the most general terms, the team that does the better debating wins.

The affirmative team wins if it succeeds in demonstrating that the proposed action plan addresses the resolution and should be adopted. The negative team wins if it succeeds in demonstrating that the affirmative plan should not be adopted. If neither team meets their goal, the team that debates best in the effort to meet their defined goal is the winner.

Judges may take additional time, after completion of the debate, to write extra notes, establish score values, and most importantly, confirm that the debate winner is clearly identified on the ballot. Judges should return their completed ballot to the designated scorekeeper’s station within 30 minutes of the completed round.

Constructive comments are greatly appreciated. A ballot with thoughtful comments provides an important basis for instruction and improvement. Participants should not be held to a professional standard, with regard to comments. Negative comments should be kept to a minimum, and should focus upon specific areas of recommended improvement, as opposed to negative value judgments.

Debate judges may find it beneficial to maintain an additional “flow chart” of notes and comments, identifying key points and other pertinent details from each particular stage of the debate. These notes do not need to be shared. Judges are permitted to use either the optional flow chart provided in the handbook, or any other flow chart of their choosing.

**Point Value Scorekeeping**

MESAC Debate uses absolute point value as a tie-breaking procedure, if necessary, to determine playoff participants. Each member of each debate team earns points in six different categories, as identified on the judge’s ballot. The ballot includes a brief description of the criteria to apply for each category.

Please remember, the most important judgment is the determination of the team winner. The team winner should be determined on the holistic assessment of demonstrated debate skill. For this reason, the point totals should be assessed in subordination to the holistic assessment: not the other way around. The judge must confirm that the winning debate team members earn a higher combined point value than the losing team members.
MESAC Forensics
Judge Scorekeeping Procedure: Non-Debate Events

Scorekeeping is each judge’s primary responsibility. Judges must maintain a consistent, objective, clearly discernible rank order and absolute point value for each performance. The following are guidelines to keep in mind when determining scores during the non-debate events.

Event rounds move quickly, and the ultimate time manager for any round is the judge. The judge must indicate when he/she has completed filling in a ballot for the previous participant, and is thus ready for the next participant to begin his/her performance. Judges should allow three minutes or less between individual performances in any round. This does not permit an excessive amount of note-taking or deliberation over scoring between performances. The judge should focus initial notes/comments upon the specific criteria for evaluation of the event.

Judges may take additional time, after completion of the event round, to write extra notes, confirm absolute score values, and most importantly, check the rank order of the participants. Judges should return their completed ballots, along with the “Rank Order and Point Value” form, to the designated scorekeeper’s station within 30 minutes of the completed round.

Constructive comments are greatly appreciated. A ballot with thoughtful comments provides an important basis for instruction and improvement. Participants should not be held to a professional standard, with regard to comments. Negative comments should be kept to a minimum, and should focus upon specific areas of recommended improvement, as opposed to negative value judgments.

Rank Order Scorekeeping

The rank order of participants is the top priority score for any non-debate event. The judge must identify one entry for each of the top three rank positions, first through third. There can be no ties in rank, except for fourth place. Entries which do not earn 1st through 3rd place will all earn fourth. The rank order should be a holistic assessment of the demonstrated value of each participant’s performance, based upon the criteria identified for the event.

Point Value Scorekeeping

MESAC Forensics uses absolute point value as a tie-breaking procedure. Each entry earns a point ranking from 10-25. A higher point total must correspond with a higher ranking, except in the case of 4th place rankings. Judges may use their discretion in assessing points, as a measure of the relative difference in value between one performance and the next. Entries may tie for points earned. For example, a judge may decide a particular round was very close and contested at a high level, and award each of the top three finishers 23 points. In this case, it would still be necessary for the judge to identify a 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place finisher – for the purposes of rank order.

Scorekeeping for Performances that do not meet a Minimum Time Standard

Oral Interpretation, Duet Acting, and Impromptu Speaking have minimum time standards which the participants must aim to meet or exceed. If any entry does not meet the minimum requirement, the judge must first assess a score to the performance on its merit, and then reduce the score by four points. The final score, however, is not to fall below 10 points.

This reduction may also affect the rank order. In this case, the judge should first determine point values on the basis of performance, without considering the four-point penalty. Next, the judge should assess the penalty. At this point the judge should determine rank order of each entry, in line with the adjusted point values earned after any time standard penalties have been assessed.
### Do You Have?

- Your student timekeeper, with stopwatch and numbered time cards
- Identification of team participants as affirmative and negative for this round
- “Judge’s Ballot”
- Pencils
- “Debate Flow Chart”
- “MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content” notice form
- “Debate Stages” checklist

### Basic Procedures

- Constructive statements, rebuttals and summaries must be delivered from the podium.
- During a speech, a debater may move to his/partner, or the desk, to receive notes, but may not speak with his/her partner.
- 1st affirmative statement may be read from a prepared document. Notes and supporting materials may be used at any time.
- The negative may challenge definitions, only in the 1st negative statement.
- During cross-examination, the questioner may interrupt the witness and introduce a new question, if the witness has received adequate opportunity to answer the prior question.
- The questioner must deliver all statements in the form of a question.

### Before You Close The Door

- Confirm that the participants are in the competition area.
- Remind audience members they may not leave the area until the debate concludes.
- Remind everyone in the room to turn off noise-making electronic devices. Remind everyone of common audience courtesy concerning the event.

### Upon Conclusion of the Round

- Confirm your scores as indicated on each “Judge’s Ballot,” and on the “Rank Order and Point Value” form.
- Complete any “Appropriate Materials and Content” notice forms as necessary.
- Return these documents to the designated scorekeeper’s station.
Do You Have?

- Your student timekeeper, with stopwatch and numbered time cards
- A “runner” assigned to your room to bring contestants from the “holding room.”
- Envelope with 3 prompts, on a desk at front of room. You also need a copy of the prompts.
- List of entries/presentations for this round
- A desk with blank note cards and pens/pencils for students
- Enough copies of the “Judge’s Ballot”
- “Rank Order and Point Value” form
- “MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content” guidelines & notice forms

Basic Procedures

- Participants wait in “holding room” and are brought in turn by the runner and wait outside room until let in.
- The participant sits at the desk and opens envelope and reads the 3 prompts. At this time, timer begins timing 30 seconds.
- Speaker has 30 seconds to view topics and mentally choose among them. They may not write at this time.
- Speaker has one minute to make notes. If they begin writing during the 30 second “viewing time”, the timer must begin timing one minute from that moment.
- The speaker may refer to note cards during speech
- 2 minute time minimum for speech.
- 3 minute maximum.
- All speakers must remain in the room until the end of the entire round.

Before You Close The Door

- Confirm the 1st speaker is waiting outside the room and that your runner is ready.
- Remind all audience members of the event that is about to begin. They may not leave the area until the event round is concluded.
- Remind everyone in the room to turn off noise-making electronic devices. Remind everyone of common audience courtesy concerning the event.

Upon Conclusion of the Round

- Confirm your scores as indicated on each “Judge’s Ballot,” and on the “Rank Order and Point Value” form.
- Complete any “Appropriate Materials and Content” notice forms as necessary.
- Return these documents to the designated scorekeeper’s station.
### Do You Have?
- Your student timekeeper, with stopwatch and numbered time cards
- List of entries/presentations for this round
- Pencils
- Enough copies of the “Judge’s Ballot” for one ballot per contestant
- “Rank Order and Point Value” form
- “MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content” guidelines & notice forms

### Basic Procedures
- The participant presents the selection while seated at the front of the room.
- The participant must hold the material in a binder or folder of a solid color.
- Minimum time limit is **5:50**, inclusive of the introduction.
- Maximum time is **8 minutes**, again inclusive of the introduction.
- The participant must stop speaking once the timekeeper calls time.

### Before You Close The Door
- Confirm that the participants are in the competition area, and that they are aware of their sequence of presentation.
- Remind all audience members of the event that is about to begin. They may not leave the area until the event round is concluded.
- Remind everyone in the room to turn off noise-making electronic devices. Remind everyone of common audience courtesy concerning the event.

### Upon Conclusion of the Round
- Confirm your scores as indicated on each “Judge’s Ballot,” and on the “Rank Order and Point Value” form.
- Complete any “Appropriate Materials and Content” notice forms as necessary.
- Return these documents to the designated scorekeeper’s station.
### MESAC Forensics Judges’ Procedural Guide – Duet Acting

#### Do You Have?
- Your student timekeeper, with stopwatch and numbered time cards
- List of entries/presentations for this round
- Pencils
- Enough copies of the “Judge’s Ballot” for one ballot per contestant
- “Rank Order and Point Value” form
- “MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content” guidelines & notice forms

#### Basic Procedures
- The performance area should be cleared of all materials, excepting two chairs.
- The actors cannot use costumes, additional props, additional lighting, or music.
- Minimum time limit is 6:50, inclusive of the introduction. Maximum time is 9 minutes, again inclusive of the introduction.
- The participant must stop speaking once the timekeeper calls time.

#### Before You Close The Door
- Confirm that the participants are in the competition area, and that they are aware of their sequence of presentation.
- Remind all audience members of the event that is about to begin. They may not leave the area until the event round is concluded.
- Remind everyone in the room to turn off noise-making electronic devices. Remind everyone of common audience courtesy concerning the event.

#### Upon Conclusion of the Round
- Confirm your scores as indicated on each “Judge’s Ballot,” and on the “Rank Order and Point Value” form.
- Complete any “Appropriate Materials and Content” notice forms as necessary.
- Return these documents to the designated scorekeeper’s station.
# Do You Have?

- Your student timekeeper, with stopwatch and numbered time cards
- A “runner” assigned to your room to bring contestants from the “holding room.”
- A copy of the 3 prompts for the round.
- List of entries/presentations for this round
- Enough copies of the “Judge’s Ballot”
- “Rank Order and Point Value” form
- “MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content” guidelines & notice forms

---

# Basic Procedures

- Participants will need 30 minutes to prepare their speeches, at the start of each round.
- Participants are brought in turn to the room by the “runner,” and wait outside the room until let in.
- Participants may deliver their speech with the aid of a podium.
- There is no minimum time limit for the speech.
- Maximum time is 6 minutes.
- All participants must remain in the room until the end of the entire round.

---

# Before You Close The Door

- Confirm the 1st speaker is waiting outside the room and that your runner is ready.
- Remind all audience members of the event that is about to begin. They may not leave the area until the event round is concluded.
- Remind everyone in the room to turn off noise-making electronic devices. Remind everyone of common audience courtesy concerning the event.

---

# Upon Conclusion of the Round

- Confirm your scores as indicated on each “Judge’s Ballot,” and on the “Rank Order and Point Value” form.
- Complete any “Appropriate Materials and Content” notice forms as necessary.
- Return these documents to the designated scorekeeper’s station.
## MESAC Forensics Judges’ Procedural Guide – Oratory

### Do You Have?
- Your student timekeeper, with stopwatch and numbered time cards
- List of entries/presentations for this round
- Pencils
- Enough copies of the “Judge’s Ballot” for one ballot per contestant
- “Rank Order and Point Value” form
- “MESAC Forensics Appropriate Materials and Content” guidelines & notice form

### Basic Procedures
- The participant presents the speech from the front of the room.
- The participant must speak from memory.
- There is no minimum time.
- Maximum time is 8 minutes. Participants are expected to have prepared a speech to fit the time frame. Judges are at their discretion to determine the scoring impact of a speech which must be stopped due to the limitations of time.
- The participant must stop speaking once the timekeeper calls time.

### Before You Close The Door
- Confirm that the participants are in the competition area, and that they are aware of their sequence of presentation.
- Remind all audience members of the event that is about to begin. They may not leave the area until the event round is concluded.
- Remind everyone in the room to turn off noise-making electronic devices. Remind everyone of common audience courtesy concerning the event.

### Upon Conclusion of the Round
- Confirm your scores as indicated on each “Judge’s Ballot,” and on the “Rank Order and Point Value” form.
- Complete any “Appropriate Materials and Content” notice forms as necessary.
- Return these documents to the designated scorekeeper’s station.
MESAC Forensics and Debate Timekeepers
Responsibilities

Basic Expectations

- The timekeeper sits beside the judge or judges, during each forensics event.
- The timekeeper confirms the start of each specific performance, and begins stopwatch time at the designated moment.
- The timekeeper indicates if and when the maximum allowed time has elapsed for a performance or debate stage.
- For all non-debate events, the timekeeper informs the judge of the total elapsed time for each specific performance.

Preparation for Timekeepers

- Be early to your assigned room/performance area
- Be certain your stopwatch is functioning properly, and that you are familiar with how to reset the stopwatch after each performance or debate stage.
- Check the event-specific guidelines, indicating the maximum time permissible for that event. Confirm that you have the appropriate numbered cards for your event.

Maximum Time for Non-Debate Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Maximum Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duet Acting</td>
<td>9 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oratory</td>
<td>8 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Interpretation</td>
<td>8 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extemporaneous Speaking</td>
<td>6 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impromptu Speaking</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Time for Non-Debate Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Minimum Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duet Acting</td>
<td>6:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Interpretation</td>
<td>5:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impromptu</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timing Sequence for a Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Affirmative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the First Affirmative</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Negative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the First Negative</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Affirmative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the Second Affirmative</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Negative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the Second Negative</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Rebuttal</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Rebuttal</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Prepare Summary Statements</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Summary Statement</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Summary Statement</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESAC Forensics and Debate Timekeepers Responsibilities – 2

Beginning Time Measurement for Events and Debate Stages

The judge will prompt the participant to begin when ready. The timekeeper can begin tracking time with the participant’s first words.

Time-Display During All Events and Debate Stages

Timekeepers provide a minute-by-minute countdown of time remaining for each event, with a series of numbered cards. The first card on display will indicate the maximum time allotted for the event, or in the case of debate, each specific stage of the debate.

With each passing minute, the timekeeper will reveal the new lower number to indicate the minutes remaining. Therefore, if a student sees the "2" card in any performance, he/she should know that there is between 1 and 2 minutes remaining for the activity. The timekeepers will also reveal a card to indicate 1/2 minute remaining, and a “STOP” card indicating that time has expired.

The stopwatches will typically track the forward progress of time – meaning, they start at zero and count up. The timekeeper needs to do the simple mental math required to coordinate the stopwatch timing with the card countdown.

Timekeeper Responsibilities When the Maximum Time is Reached

Participants must aim to operate within the time constraints of each event, and stop when instructed to do so. When the time remaining reaches zero, the timekeeper will display the "STOP" card. The participants are granted the opportunity to complete a sentence or phrase, at no penalty. At some point during this discretionary period, the judge will say “TIME,” if necessary. The participants must respect the judge’s declaration of “TIME,” or be subject to a four point penalty.

During the debate cross examination stage, if a question has been asked, and the witness/respondent has begun answering the question before the maximum 3 minute limit elapses, the timekeeper should wait for a signal from the judge before announcing “TIME.” The judge must determine if sufficient time has elapsed to conclude a cross examination stage, whether or not a final question has been completely answered.

Special Case for Added Time

Judges may extend time in the case of a performance which experiences any extended audience interruptions. In such cases, the judge can quietly instruct the timekeeper, before the maximum time limit approaches, to “add X seconds” before revealing the “STOP” time card. The timekeeper needs to coordinate the stopwatch time and card countdown, and make the appropriate allowance of extra time as instructed.
Do You Have?

Stopwatch – and is it working properly?

All of the necessary numbered cards, to keep track of the elapsed minutes in a performance

**Remember:** Speakers get a 10 second grace period to complete a thought or sentence, after you display your card which says “STOP” to the judge. You say nothing. Restart the stopwatch and stop it when the judge says “TIME”

During cross examination, if a question has been asked, and the witness has begun answering the question before the maximum 3 minute limit elapses, the judge has the authority to decide if sufficient time has elapsed to conclude the cross-examination, whether or not a final question has been completely answered.

**Debate Stage-by-Stage Timing Sequence**
* (reset the stopwatch after each stage)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Affirmative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the First Affirmative</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Negative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the First Negative</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Affirmative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the Second Affirmative</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Negative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the Second Negative</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Rebuttal</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Rebuttal</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Prepare Summary Statements</td>
<td>2 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Summary Statement</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Summary Statement</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESAC Forensics Timekeepers
Procedure Guideline – Impromptu Speaking

Do You Have?

- Stopwatch – and is it working properly?
- All of the necessary numbered cards, to keep track of the elapsed minutes

Preparation Time for the Presenter

Confirm the signal from the judge that the presenter’s preparation time may begin.

As soon as the participant opens the envelope of prompts, begin the initial 30 second count on your stopwatch.

At the end of 30 seconds, you must alert the judge to announce, “You have one minute to write notes.” You can keep the stopwatch running through your announcement.

If the presenter begins using a pencil before 30 seconds have elapsed, you must alert the judge to announce “You have one minute to write notes” at that moment. Again, you can keep your stopwatch running.

In either case, at the end of 60 additional seconds, announce “TIME.” The presenter must stop writing at this time.

Maximum Time Permitted for the Speech: 3 Minutes

Remember: Speakers get a 10 second grace period to complete a thought or sentence, after you display your card which says “STOP” to the judge. You say nothing. Restart the stopwatch and stop it when the judge says “TIME”

After the Conclusion of Each Speech:

- Inform the judge of the total time of the speech. It’s very important to be exact. Speeches of less than 2 minutes will be penalized.
- Reset your stopwatch.
- Confirm that the prompts paper has been returned to the envelope on the presenter’s desk, and that the prompts are still entirely readable.
- Open the door and check for the entry of the next speaker. Escort the next speaker into the room.
MESAC Forensics Timekeepers
Procedure Guideline – Oral Interpretation

Do You Have?

Stopwatch – and is it working properly?

All of the necessary numbered cards, to keep track of the elapsed minutes in a performance

Maximum Time Permitted: 8 Minutes

**Remember**: Presenters get a 10 second grace period to complete a thought or sentence, after you display your card which says “STOP” to the judge. You say nothing. Restart the stopwatch and stop it when the judge says “TIME”

After the Conclusion of Each Presentation:

- Inform the judge of the total time of the presentation. It’s very important to be exact. Speeches of less than 5:50 will be penalized.

- Reset your stopwatch.
MESAC Forensics Timekeepers
Procedure Guideline – Duet Acting

Do You Have?

- Stopwatch – and is it working properly?
- All of the necessary numbered cards, to keep track of the elapsed minutes in a performance

Maximum Time Permitted: 9 Minutes

Remember: Actors get a 10 second grace period to complete a thought or sentence, after you display your card which says “STOP” to the judge. You say nothing. Restart the stopwatch and stop it when the judge says “TIME”

Allowance for the Judge to Allocate Extra Time:

Judges may extend time in the case of a performance which experiences any extended audience interruptions. In this case, the judge will instruct you to “add X seconds” before revealing the “STOP” time card. Let the stopwatch continue to run. Coordinate your stopwatch time and card countdown, and make the appropriate allowance of extra time.

After the Conclusion of Each Performance:

- Inform the judge of the total time of the performance. It’s very important to be exact. Performances of less than 6:50 will be penalized.
- Reset your stopwatch.
MESAC Forensics Timekeepers
Procedure Guideline – Extemporaneous Speaking

Do You Have?

Stopwatch – and is it working properly?

All of the necessary numbered cards, to keep track of the elapsed minutes in a performance

Maximum Time Permitted: 6 Minutes

Remember: Speakers get a 10 second grace period to complete a thought or sentence, after you display your card which says “STOP” to the judge. You say nothing. Restart the stopwatch and stop it when the judge says “TIME”

After the Conclusion of Each Speech:

• Inform the judge of the total time of the speech.

• Reset your stopwatch.

• Open the door and check for the entry of the next speaker. Escort the next speaker into the room.
MESAC Forensics Timekeepers
Procedure Guideline – Oratory

Do You Have?

Stopwatch – and is it working properly?

All of the necessary numbered cards, to keep track of the elapsed minutes in a performance

Maximum Time Permitted: 8 Minutes

Remember: Speakers get a 10 second grace period to complete a thought or sentence, after you display your card which says “STOP” to the judge. You say nothing. Restart the stopwatch and stop it when the judge says “TIME”

After the Conclusion of Each Speech:

• Inform the judge of the total time of the speech. It’s very important to be exact.

• Reset your stopwatch.
### MESAC Debate Stages Time Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Affirmative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the First Affirmative</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Negative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the First Negative</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Affirmative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the Second Affirmative</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Negative Constructive Speech</td>
<td>6 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of the Second Negative</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Rebuttal</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Rebuttal</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Prepare Summary Statements</td>
<td>2 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Summary Statement</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Summary Statement</td>
<td>3 minutes max</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESAC Forensics
Appropriate Materials and Content Notice Form

Forensics Event ____________________________       Round __________

Name of Participant(s) ____________________________

Participant(s) school ______________

Please describe the circumstance:

Name of Judge: ____________________________       Signature of Judge: ____________________________

MESAC Forensics
Appropriate Materials and Content Notice Form

Forensics Event ____________________________       Round __________

Name of Participant(s) ____________________________

Participant(s) school ______________

Please describe the circumstance:

Name of Judge: ____________________________       Signature of Judge: ____________________________
MESAC Forensics
Room Assignment Guidelines for Participants

In assigning how many entries will participate in a room, during any particular round, the goals are to:

- Complete the round within a one-hour time frame (max number of presentations)
- Limit the total number of support people and rooms required (aim close to max in each room)
- Encourage sufficient competition in each round (at least 4 competitors whenever practical)

Specific limitations of the host organizers take priority, however, over these recommendations.

Although there is no minimum number of entries required in an event to warrant a competition, it is highly recommended that the schools make every effort to contribute at least 1 entry in every event. If the initial roster submission reveals any event has less than 4 entries, the athletic/activities directors will decide whether roster assignments can be modified, or if that particular event may be cancelled.

Maximum entries per round for Oral Interpretation, Oratory, Impromptu = 7
Maximum entries per round for Duet Acting = 6
Maximum entries per round for Extemporaneous Speaking = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Of Entries</th>
<th>Duet Acting</th>
<th>Extemp</th>
<th>OI, Oratory</th>
<th>Impromptu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>all in one room</td>
<td>all in one room</td>
<td>all in one room</td>
<td>all in one room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>3-4-4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4-4-4</td>
<td>4-4-4</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>6-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4-4-5</td>
<td>4-4-5</td>
<td>4-4-5</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4-5-5</td>
<td>4-5-5</td>
<td>4-5-5</td>
<td>4-5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5-5-5</td>
<td>5-5-5</td>
<td>5-5-5</td>
<td>5-5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5-5-6</td>
<td>4-4-4</td>
<td>5-5-6</td>
<td>5-5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5-6-6</td>
<td>4-4-5</td>
<td>5-6-6</td>
<td>5-6-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6-6-6</td>
<td>4-5-5</td>
<td>6-6-6</td>
<td>6-6-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4-5-5-5</td>
<td>4-5-5-5</td>
<td>4-5-5-5</td>
<td>6-6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5-5-5-5</td>
<td>5-5-5-5</td>
<td>5-5-5-5</td>
<td>5-5-5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4-4-4-4-5</td>
<td>5-5-5-6</td>
<td>5-5-5-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4-4-4-5-5</td>
<td>5-5-6-6</td>
<td>5-5-6-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4-4-5-5-5</td>
<td>5-6-6-6</td>
<td>5-6-6-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4-5-5-5-5</td>
<td>6-6-6-6</td>
<td>6-6-6-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5-5-5-5-5</td>
<td>6-6-6-7</td>
<td>6-6-6-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of Recommended Room Assignments
(# of entries per room indicated – host organizers may use at their discretion)
MESAC Forensics

Estimated Room Requirements

**15-20 rooms**
One room for every group of participants in each of the four events held in each flight (the same rooms can be designated for both Flight A and Flight B events)

**2 rooms**
1 holding room for extemporaneous speakers and impromptu speakers
1 supervised preparation/work room for extemporaneous speakers

**1-2 rooms**
ballet distribution room (pickup and return)
scorekeeper’s room

**6 rooms**
Team meeting rooms for each school

**1 room**
Coach’s meeting and lounge room

School’s should identify up to 4 larger performance spaces, if at all possible, to host the preliminary rounds of duet acting.

**Additional requirements**

Up to 8 podiums – one for each of the debate rooms
MESAC Forensics

Official Presentation Order
and
Rank Order and Scoring Form

Event

Round

Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and School</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenter 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter 5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter 6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter 7:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judge name (print)  
Judge signature
MESAC Forensics Schedule – competition events and meetings only (2011 sample)

Thursday, April 14
7:00pm Coaches meeting

Friday, April 15
8:30am – 9:00am Welcome
9:00am – 9:30am Coaches meeting / Student orientation
9:30am – 10:00am Team preparation time in rooms
10:00am – 11:00am Flight A, Round 1
11:15am – 12:15pm Flight B, Round 1

12:30pm – 1:30pm Lunch
1:30pm – 2:30pm Flight A, Round 2
2:45pm – 3:45pm Flight B, Round 2

3:45pm – 4:15pm Break
4:15pm – 5:15pm Flight A, Round 3
5:15pm – 5:30pm Teams Debrief in Homerooms

Saturday, November 21st
8:00am – 8:30am Coaches meeting
8:30am Students arrive at school
8:30am – 8:45am Teams in Home room
8:45am – 9:45am Flight B, Round 3

9:45am – 10:15am Break
10:15am – 11:15am Flight A, Round 4
11:30am – 12:30pm Flight B, Round 4

12:30pm – 1:30pm Lunch
1:45pm – 2:45pm Debate Quarter Finals
3:00pm – 3:45pm Impromptu Finals in auditorium
3:45pm – 5:00pm Extemporaneous Finals in auditorium
5:00pm – 5:15pm Teams Debrief in Homerooms

Sunday, November 22nd
8:00am Students arrive at school
8:00am – 8:30am Coaches meeting – one coach per team, quick check-in
8:00am – 8:30am Team Homerooms
8:30am – 9:30am Comic Oral Interp. Finals in auditorium
9:35am – 10:35am Debate Semi-Finals in MPRs
10:45am – 11:45am Dramatic Duet Acting Finals in auditorium

12:00pm – 1:00pm Lunch
1:15pm – 2:15pm Original Oratory Finals in auditorium
2:15pm – 3:15pm Comic Duet Acting Finals in auditorium

3:15pm – 3:45pm Break
3:45pm – 4:45pm Serious Oral Interpretation Finals in auditorium
5:00pm – 6:00pm Debate Finals in auditorium
6:00pm – 6:30pm Teams Debrief in Homerooms – final scoring

6:30pm – 8:00pm Dinner and Awards Ceremony
Flight A: Round 1  Friday 10:00am-11:00am

Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez-Haridas DAA 1</td>
<td>Eichhorst-Goyal ACS 1</td>
<td>M. Topolski</td>
<td>J. Jeong</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks-Park ASD-Dubai 1</td>
<td>Sahai-Talaat DAA 2</td>
<td>H. Nazmy</td>
<td>N. Cobb</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadhilah-Laguitin DAA 3</td>
<td>Salchi-Langlois CAC 1</td>
<td>J. Roberts</td>
<td>Y. Ibrahim</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao-Nazmy ACS 2</td>
<td>Hassanally-Saborin ASD-Dubai 2</td>
<td>N. Block</td>
<td>N. Dalle</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekhs-Al Kudsi ACS 3</td>
<td>Hruska-Wiens Doha 3</td>
<td>A. Subaey</td>
<td>S. Liu</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Lone Doha 1</td>
<td>Marshall-Stryker ACS 4</td>
<td>D. Waldoch</td>
<td>S. Pape</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer-Syed ASD-Dubai 3</td>
<td>Reynolds-Shalia Doha 2</td>
<td>P. Hopkins</td>
<td>N. Barcicki</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestidge-Thomas CAC 2</td>
<td>Qasim-Khan ASD-Dubai 4</td>
<td>C. Wolf</td>
<td>V. Dharon</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu – Room 264

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: V. Chagas</th>
<th>Timer: Y. Ibrahim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarek Alwan</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina Casey</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Elliot</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Alfridiyanta</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kim</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu – Room 266

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: Boyle-Woods</th>
<th>Timer: B. Worrell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Jaber</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Rafail</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shireen Gohari</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hoke</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayed Al-Mansouri</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Carlson</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu – Room 265

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: Matared-Issa</th>
<th>Timer: K. Brackett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Evans</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akarshi Vinod</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Hoiness</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarthak Saxena</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Waldock</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu Runner/Escort

| F. Leech |

Serious Oral Interp – Room 153

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: J. Wiley</th>
<th>Timer: D. Shriem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aditya Ramachardran</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohan Kanna</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Gomez</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Borland</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Oral Interp – Room 154

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: M. Sommers</th>
<th>Timer: J. Orfali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camilla Rechchad</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iman Virji</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Tice</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou King</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Topolski</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Oral Interp – Room 155

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: J. Shartzer</th>
<th>Timer: D. Bur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diya Chopra</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alec Martin</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maha Ibraheen</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy Shafi</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joho Park</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Oral Interp – Room 156

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: A. Khanna</th>
<th>Timer: A. Stefanidi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen McCarty</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seungah Song</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Seo</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Mierzjejewska</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Duet Acting – Auditorium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: J. Bryans</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Zawad-Mikiewicz</td>
<td>ACS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volis-Zimmer</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff-Parks</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-Otoum</td>
<td>DAA 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson-Schloegl</td>
<td>ASD-Doha 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flight B: Round 1  Friday 11:15am-12:15pm

Extemporaneous Speaking Room 220
Judge: J. Roberts  Timer: A. Stefanidi
Priya Goyal  ACS
Cameron Banks  ASD-Dubai
Amol Shalia  ASD-Doha
Zayed Al-Mansouri  ACS

Extemporaneous Speaking Room 222
Judge: A. Khanna  Timer: N. Jeong
Nikhil Rao  ACS
Guillaume Saborin  ASD-Dubai
Yoon Kyu Park  ASD-Dubai

Extemporaneous Room 221
Judge: N. Block  Timer: J. Jeong
Ian Hoke  ACS
Rachel Singer  ASD-Dubai
Enushe Khan  ASD-Dubai
Salar Lone  ASD-Doha

Extemp Speaking Runner/Escorts
N Barcicki
J Orfali

Oratory – Room 262
Judge: M. Sommers  Timer: N. Cobb
Samantha Scott  DAA
Christopher Evans  ASD-Dubai
Sherin Salchi  CAC
Oliver Alfridijanta  ASD-Doha
Nour Al-Kuds  ACS

Oratory – Room 264
Judge: J. Bryans  Timer: D. Bur
Maya Otoum  DAA
Shireen Gohari  ASD-Dubai
Camille Reynolds  ASD-Doha
Natasha Topolski  ACS
Emily Waldoch  CAC

Oratory – Room 266
Judge: Matared-Issa  Timer: Y. Ibrahim
Seungah Song  CAC
Rohan Kanna  ASD-Dubai
Achshana Haridas  DAA
Sarah Borland  ACS
Shanardra Fadhilah  DAA

Comic Oral Interp – Room 153A
Judge: M. Topolski  Timer: F. Leech
Joho Park  CAC
Nick Carlson  ASD-Doha
Ahmad Al-Zawad  ACS
Maria Hruska  ASD-Doha

Comic Oral Interp – Room 154
Judge: J. Pohl  Timer: Arbid
Jeffrey Thomas  CAC
Mazna Lone  ASD-Doha
Steven Jaber  ASD-Dubai
Hannah Seo  ASD-Doha

Comic Oral Interp – Room 155
Judge: S. Whitney  Timer: Arbid
Diya Chopra  DAA
Amelia Wiens  ASD-Doha
Aleezah Qasim  ASD-Dubai
Gabby Mikiewicz  ACS
Sarah Parks  ASD-Dubai

Comic Oral Interp – Room 156
Judge: H. Sattar  Timer: Pape
Mauricio Gutierrez  DAA
Sara Rafail  CAC
Sarah Syed  ASD-Dubai
Danil Lagutin  DAA

Comic Duet Acting – Gym MPR
Judge: J. Holroyd  Timer: Y. Ibrahim
King-McCarty  ASD-Doha 2
Duff-Tice  ASD-Dubai 2
Prestidge-Langlois  CAC 1
Stryker-Eichhorst  ACS 4

Comic Duet Acting – Auditorium
Judge: M. Rodgers  Timer: D. Shriem
Marshall-Saxena  ACS 3
Hassanally-Alwan  ASD-Dubai 1
Shafi-Mierzejewska  ACS 2
Vinod-Schloegl  ASD-Doha 3
Ramachardran-Talaat  DAA 1

Comic Duet Acting – ES MPR
Judge: L. Krell  Timer: K. Brackett
Carlson-Gomez  ASD-Doha 1
Volis-Zimmer  ASD-Dubai 3
Virji-Casey  DAA 2
Kim-Nazmy  ACS 1

SAMPLE
Flight A: Round 2

Friday 1:30pm-2:30pm

Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eichhorst-Goyal ACS 1</td>
<td>Prestidge-Thomas CAC 2</td>
<td>Krause</td>
<td>A. Romero</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahai-Talaat DAA 2</td>
<td>Lone-Lone ASD-Doha 1</td>
<td>Nazmy</td>
<td>J. DeWeerth</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds-Shalia ASD-Doha 2</td>
<td>Gutierrez-Haridas DAA 1</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Krell</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salchi-Langlois CAC 1</td>
<td>Banks-Park ASD-Dubai 1</td>
<td>Sabaey</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassanally-Saborin ASD-Dubai 2</td>
<td>Fadhilah-Lagutin DAA 3</td>
<td>D. Waldoch</td>
<td>A. Goyal</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall-Stryker ACS 4</td>
<td>Singer-Syd ASD-Dubai 3</td>
<td>Matared-Issa</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qasim-Khan ASD-Dubai 4</td>
<td>Kekhia-Al Kudsi ACS 3</td>
<td>L. Hoiseth</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hruska-Wiens ASD-Doha 3</td>
<td>Rao-Nazmy ACS 2</td>
<td>P. Hopkins</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu – Room 264

**Judge:** A. Jordan **Timer:** A. Ibrahim

- Oliver Alfridijanta: ASD-Doha
- Zayed Al-Mansouri: ACS
- Emily Waldoch: CAC
- Steven Jabber: ASD-Dubai
- Alex Elliot: ASD-Dubai

Impromptu – Room 266

**Judge:** C. Wolf

- Alexander Kim: ACS
- Charlotte Hoiness: ACS
- Sara Rafai: CAC
- Shireen Gohari: ASD-Dubai
- Akash Vinod: ASD-Doha
- Sabrina Casey: DAA

Serious Oral Interp – Room 153A

**Judge:** J. Wiley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Seo</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
<td>153A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Mierzejewska</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Tice</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditya Ramachardran</td>
<td>DAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maha Ibraheen</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Oral Interp – Room 155

**Judge:** M. Rodgers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Gomez</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla Rechhad</td>
<td>CAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joho Park</td>
<td>CAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alec Martin</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Duet Acting – Auditorium

**Judge:** M. Topolski **Timer:**

- Duff-Parks: ASD-Dubai 2
- Scott-Otoum: DAA 1
- Carlson-Schloegl: ASD-Doha 1
- Volis-Zimmer: ASD-Dubai 1
- Al-Zawad-Mikiewicz: ACS 1
Flight B: Round 2  Friday 2:45pm-3:45pm

Extemporaneous Speaking Room 220

Judge: Shoemaker  Timer: A. Romero  Enushe Khan  ASD-Dubai  Zayed Al-Mansouri  ACS  Guillaume Saborin  ASD-Dubai  Nikhil Rao  ACS

Extemporaneous Speaking Room 222

Judge: M. Moffett  Timer: Krell  Cameron Banks  ASD-Dubai  Amol Shalia  ASD-Dubai  Ian Hoke  ACS

Extemporaneous Room 221


Oratory – Room 262

Judge: L. Graciano  Timer:  Oliver Alfridijanta  ASD-Doha  Natasha Topolski  ACS  Seungah Song  CAC  Maya Oroum  DAA  Alec Martin  ASD-Dubai

Oratory – Room 264

Judge: N. Block  Timer:  Sarah Borland  ACS  Sherin Salchi  CAC  Achshana Haridas  DAA  Samantha Scott  DAA  Maha Ibraheen  ASD-Doha

Oratory – Room 265

Judge: S. Krause  Timer:  Camille Reynolds  ASD-Doha  Nour Al-Kudsi  ACS  Rohan Kanna  ASD-Dubai  Camilla Rechchad  CAC  Neha Sahai  DAA

Oratory – Room 266

Judge: J. Bryans  Timer:  Christopher Evans  ASD-Dubai  Emily Waldoch  CAC  Shanardra Fadhilah  DAA  Shireen Gohari  ASD-Dubai  Charlotte Hoiness  ACS

Comic Oral Interp – Room 153A

Judge: A. Jordan  Timer:  Maria Hruska  ASD-Doha  Sarah Syed  ASD-Dubai  Diya Chopra  CAC  Jeffrey Thomas  DAA  Amelia Wiens  ASD-Doha

Comic Oral Interp – Room 154

Judge: H. Sattar  Timer:  Sarah Parks  ASD-Dubai  Gabby Mikiewicz  ACS  Nick Carlson  ASD-Doha  Sara Rafael  CAC  Jhoo Park  CAC

Comic Oral Interp – Room 155

Judge: J. Pohl  Timer:  Ahmad Al-Zawad  ACS  Steven Jaber  ASD-Dubai  Mauricio Gutierrez  DAA  Aleezah Qasim  ASD-Dubai  Muzna Lone  ASD-Doha

Comic Oral Interp – Room 156

Judge: A. Jollimore  Timer:  Juman Kekhia  ACS  Alex Elliot  ASD-Dubai  Danil Lagutin  DAA  Hannah Seo  ASD-Doha

Comic Duet Acting – Gym MPR

Judge: S. Krause  Timer:  Virji-Casey  DAA 2  King-McCarty  ASD-Doha 2  Hassanally-Alwan  ASD-Dubai 1  Shafi-Mierzejewska  ACS 2

Comic Duet Acting – ES MPR


Comic Duet Acting – Auditorium

Judge: M. Rodgers  Timer:  Prestidge-Langlois  CAC 1  Carlson-Gomez  ASD-Doha 1  Kim-Nazmy  ACS 1  Ramachardran-Talaat  DAA 1  Stryker-Eichhorst  ACS 4
## Flight A: Round 3  Friday 4:15pm-5:15pm

### Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qasim-Khan ASD-Dubai 4</td>
<td>Salchi-Langlois ACS 1</td>
<td>P. Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks-Park ASD-Dubai 1</td>
<td>Marshall-Stryker ACS 4</td>
<td>C. Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadhilah-Laguitin DAA 3</td>
<td>Rao-Nazmy ACS 2</td>
<td>D. Waldoch</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekhia-Al Kudsi ACS 3</td>
<td>Sahara-Talaat DAA 2</td>
<td>N. Block</td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez-Haridas DAA 1</td>
<td>Hassanal-Saborin ASD-Dubai 2</td>
<td>A. Subaey</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Lone Doha 1</td>
<td>Prestidge-Thomas CAC 2</td>
<td>M. Topolski</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer-Syed ASD-Dubai 3</td>
<td>Hruska-Wiens Doha 3</td>
<td>S. Krause</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds-Shalia Doha 2</td>
<td>Eichhorst-Goyal ACS 1</td>
<td>A. Jollimore</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impromptu – Room 264

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex Elliot</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Carlson</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarek Alwan</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kim</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hoke</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impromptu – Room 266

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Waldoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Hoiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shireen Gohari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impromptu – Room 265

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zayed Al-Mansouri</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Jaber</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akarsh Vinod</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarthak Saxena</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Rafael</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Alfridijanta</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impromptu Runner/Escort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Krause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Serious Oral Interp – Room 153A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Topolski</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Seo</td>
<td>ASAD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seungah Song</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditya Ramachardran</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Serious Oral Interp – Room 154

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Borland</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou King</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joho Park</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen McCarty</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Tice</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Serious Oral Interp – Room 155

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maha Ibraheen</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohan Kanna</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Mierzejewska</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla Reechad</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diya Chopra</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Serious Oral Interp – Room 156

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzy Shafi</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Gomez</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iman Virji</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alec Martin</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Serious Duet Acting – Auditorium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott-Otum</td>
<td>DAA 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson-Schloegl</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Zawad-Mikiewicz</td>
<td>ACS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff-Parks</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volis-Zimmer</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flight B: Round 3  Saturday 8:45am-9:15am

Extemporaneous Speaking Room 220
Judge: A. Khanna  Timer: Guillaume Saborin  ASD-Dubai
Ian Hoke  ACS
Rachel Singer  ASD-Dubai
Amol Shalia  ASD-Doha

Extemporaneous Speaking Room 222
Judge: C. Wolf  Timer: Salar Lone  ASD-Doha
Enushe Khan  ASD-Dubai
Priya Goyal  ACS

Oratory – Room 262
Judge: S. Kerr  Timer: Shanardra Fadhilah  DAA
Samantha Scott  DAA
Emily Waldoch  CAC
Natasha Topolski  ACS
Rohan Kanna  ASD-Dubai

Oratory – Room 265
Judge: S. Whitney  Timer: Alec Martin  ASD-Dubai
Oliver Alfridijanta  ASD-Doha
Neha Sahai  DAA
Sarah Borland  ACS
Sherin Salchi  CAC

Comic Oral Interp – Room 153A
Judge: A. McDowell  Timer: Steven Jaber  ASD-Dubai
Alex Elliot  ASD-Dubai
Amelia Wiens  ASD-Doha
Gabby Mikiewicz  ACS
Nick Carlson  ASD-Doha

Comic Oral Interp – Room 155
Judge: C. Clark  Timer: Muzna Lone  ASD-Doha
Aleezah Qasim  ASD-Dubai
Ahmad Al-Zawad  ACS
JoHo Park  CAC
Diya Chopra  DAA

Comic Duet Acting – Gym MPR
Judge: J. Holroyd  Timer: Kim-Nazmy  ACS 1
Ramachandran-Talat  DAA 1
King-McCarty  ASD-Doha 2
Hassanally-Alwan  ASD-Dubai 1

Comic Duet Acting – Auditorium
Judge: H. Nazmy  Timer: Stryker-Eichhorst  ACS 4
Shafi-Mierzejewska  ACS 2
Vinod-Schloegl  ASD-Doha 3
Virji-Casey  DAA 2
Volis-Zimmer  ASD-Dubai 3

Extemporaneous Room 221
Judge: W. Fox  Timer: Zayed Al-Mansouri  ACS
Yoon Kyu-Park  ASD-Dubai
Nikhil Rao  ACS
Cameron Banks  ASD-Dubai

Extemp Speaking Runner/Escort
Judge: C. Wolf
Salar Lone  ASD-Doha
Enushe Khan  ASD-Dubai
Priya Goyal  ACS

Oratory – Room 264
Judge: L. Hoiseth  Timer: Seungah Song  CAC
Camille Reynolds  ASD-Doha
Maya Otoum  DAA
Nour Al-Kudsi  ACS
Christopher Evans  ASD-Dubai

Oratory – Room 266
Judge: M. Moffett  Timer: Charlotte Hoiness  ACS
Camilla Rechchad  CAC
Shireen Gohari  ASD-Dubai
Maha Ibraheen  ASD-Doha
Achshana Haridas  DAA

Comic Oral Interp – Room 154
Judge: A. Jordan  Timer: Daniil Lagutin  DAA
Hannah Seo  ASD-Doha
Sarah Syed  ASD-Dubai
Sarah Parks  ASD-Duba
Jeffrey Thomas  CAC

Comic Oral Interp – Room 156
Judge: L. Block  Timer: Sara Rafail  CAC
Mauricio Gutierrez  DAA
Maria Hruska  ASD-Doha
Juman Kekhia  ACS

Comic Duet Acting – ES MPR
Judge: L. Krell  Timer: Prestidge-Langlois  CAC 1
Duff-Tice  ASD-Dubai 2
Carlson-Gomez  ASD-Doha 1
Marshall-Saxena  ACS 3
Flight A: Round 4       Saturday 10:15pm-11:15pm

Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Timer</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salchi-Langlois CAC 1</td>
<td>Gutierrez-Haridas DAA 1</td>
<td>K. Fernandez</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hruska-Wiens ASD-Doha 3</td>
<td>Qasim-Khan ASD-Dubai 4</td>
<td>C. Fernandez</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassanally-Saborin ASD-Dubai 2</td>
<td>Lone-Lone ASD-Doha 1</td>
<td>H. Nazmy</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahai-Talaat DAA 2</td>
<td>Reynolds-Shalia ASD-Doha 2</td>
<td>A. Khanna</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichhorst-Goyal ACS 1</td>
<td>Singer-Syed ASD-Dubai 3</td>
<td>A. Subaey</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao-Nazmy ACS 2</td>
<td>Banks-Palia ASD-Doha 1</td>
<td>D. Waldoch</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestidge-Thomas CAC 2</td>
<td>Kekhia-Al Kudo ACS 3</td>
<td>C. Clark</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall-Stryker ACS 4</td>
<td>Fadhilah-Lagutin DAA 3</td>
<td>S. Boyle</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu – Room 264

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: S. Kerr</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saarthak Saxena</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Evans</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Rafael</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina Casey</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hoke</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shireen Gohari</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu – Room 266

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: L. Shoemaker</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Carlson</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Elliot</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kim</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akash Vinod</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayed Al-Mansouri</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu – Room 265

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: L. Graciano</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Hoiness</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Alfridijanta</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Waldoch</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Jaber</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarek Alwan</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impromptu Runner/Escort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: L. Shoemaker</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volis-Zimmer</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson-Schloegl</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff-Parks</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Zawad-Mikiewicz</td>
<td>ACS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-Otoum</td>
<td>DAA 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Oral Interp – Room 153A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: J. Holroyd</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iman Virji</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Mierzejewska</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Seo</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen McCarty</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Oral Interp – Room 154

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: J. Pohl</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alec Martin</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joho Park</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditya Ramachandr</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Topolski</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou King</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Oral Interp – Room 155

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: L. Block</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rohan Kanna</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diya Chopra</td>
<td>DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Gomez</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy Shafi</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seungah Song</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Oral Interp – Room 156

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: S. Garza</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Tice</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Borland</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla Rechcad</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maha Ibraheen</td>
<td>ASD-Doha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Duet Acting – Auditorium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge: L. Krell</th>
<th>Timer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volis-Zimmer</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson-Schloegl</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff-Parks</td>
<td>ASD-Dubai 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Zawad-Mikiewicz</td>
<td>ACS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-Otoum</td>
<td>DAA 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flight B: Round 4  Saturday 11:30am-12:30pm

Extemporaneous Speaking Room 220
Judge: L. Shoemaker  Timer: A. Stefanidi
Priya Goyal  ACS
Yoon Kyu-Park  ASD-Dubai
Cameron Banks  ASD-Dubai
Ian Hoke  ACS

Extemporaneous Speaking Room 222
Judge: L. Hoiseth
Rachel Singer  ASD-Dubai
Zayed Al-Mansouri  ACS
Guillaume Saborin  ASD-Dubai

Oratory – Room 262
Judge: S. Kerr  Timer:
Camilla Rechchad  CAC
Shireen Gohari  ASD-Dubai
Nour Al-Kudsi  ACS
Maya Otoum  DAA
Shanadra Fadhilah  DAA

Oratory – Room 265
Judge: A. Jollimore  Timer:
Sherin Salchi  CAC
Charlotte Hoiness  ACS
Christopher Evans  ASD-Dubai
Neha Sahai  DAA
Camille Reynolds  ASD-Dubai

Comics Oral Interp – Room 153A
Judge: J. Holroyd  Timer:
Gabby Mikiewicz  ACS
Jojo Park  CAC
Hannah Seo  ASD-Dubai
Muzna Lone  ASD-Dubai
Alex Elliot  ASD-Dubai

Comics Oral Interp – Room 155
Judge: C. Clark  Timer:
Amelia Wiens  ASD-Dubai
Danil Lagutin  DAA
Steven Jaber  ASD-Dubai
Ahmad Al-Zawad  ACS

Comics Duet Acting – Gym MPR
Judge: C. Fernandez  Timer:
Ramachardran-Talaat  DAA 1
Shafi-Mierzewiecka  ACS 2
Vinod-Schloegl  ASD-Dubai 3
Volis-Zimmer  ASD-Dubai 3

Comics Duet Acting – Auditorium
Judge: K. Fernandez  Timer:
Hassanally-Alwan  ASD-Dubai 1
Virji-Casey  DAA 2
Marshall-Saxena  ACS 3
King-McCarty  ASD-Dubai 2
Prestidge-Langlois  CAC 1

Extemporaneous Room 221
Judge: W. Fox  Timer: J. Jeong
Amol Shalia  ASD-Doha
Nikhil Rao  ACS
Salar Lone  ASD-Dubai
Enushe Khan  ASD-Dubai

Oratory – Room 264
Judge: C. Wolf  Timer:
Rohan Kanna  ASD-Dubai
Achshana Haridas  DAA
Emily Waldoch  CAC
Sarah Borland  ACS
Oliver Alfridijanta  ASD-Doha

Oratory – Room 266
Judge: S. Junkin  Timer:
Natalia Topolski  ACS
Samantha Scott  DAA
Maha Ibraheem  ASD-Dubai
Alec Martin  ASD-Dubai
Seungah Song  CAC

Comics Oral Interp – Room 154
Judge: A. Khanna  Timer:
Aleeezah Qasim  ASD-Dubai
Sarah Parks  ASD-Dubai
Jeffrey Thomas  CAC
Maria Hruska  ASD-Doha
Mauricio Gutierrez  DAA

Comics Oral Interp – Room 156
Judge: S. Garza  Timer:
Sarah Syed  ASD-Dubai
Juman Kekhia  ACS
Nick Carlson  ASD-Doha
Diya Chopra  DAA
Sara Rafaif  CAC

Comics Duet Acting – ES MPR
Judge: L. Graciano  Timer:
Duff-Tice  ASD-Dubai 2
Strayer-Eichhorst  ACS 4
Kim-Nazmy  ACS 1
Carlson-Gomez  ASD-Doha 1