



**REGENTS'  
CUP** ASU • NAU • UA

**2026** *Liberty* & **RESPONSIBILITY**



## **Contents**

Overview	1
Student eligibility	1
Student team recruitment philosophy and promotion	2
Student team selection and preparation	2
Student application timeline	2
Scholarships	2
Internship and course credit	3
Adherence to Student Code of Conduct	3
Tournament judges	3
Judge recruitment timeline	3
Tournament theme and prompts	4
Tournament format overview	4
Regents' Cup venue and schedule of events	4
Event Structure/Location/Costs	5
Detail and scoring for event formats	5
Tournament attire	32

## Overview

The Regent's Cup is an annual competition designed to showcase the commitment to free speech and civil discourse at Arizona's public universities. Founded in 2019 by former Regent Karrin Taylor Robson, the event brings together students from Arizona's public universities – Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University and the University of Arizona - in a competitive debate and story-telling tournament in which winners receive scholarship and course credit and one of the universities takes the Cup title.

Regents' Cup honors participants for articulating different points of view in an environment where competitors remain civil and respectful. The competition is held on the campuses of each respective university on a rotational basis.

The Regents' Cup tournament is intended to highlight Arizona's public universities as places that celebrate and encourage free speech, open exchanges of ideas, civil discourse, and diversity of thought. The Regents' Cup Competition is designed to:

- be a team competition.
- highlight free speech by having the teams address timely topics.
- demonstrate commitment to free speech in our university system.
- award a large purse/scholarship to champion.
- be solutions-driven debate and discussion.
- offer opportunities to foster civil discourse.

## Student eligibility

Any full-time, enrolled student at ASU, NAU or U of A is eligible to apply to represent their institution in the Regents Cup. Prior debate experience is not required and students from all academic backgrounds are encouraged to participate. To be considered, applicants must submit a brief application form that is available on the Regents' Cup website. The application includes submission of an essay related to and reflecting on the theme of the tournament. Finalists may be asked to participate in interviews with the universities' Regents' Cup coaches.

There is no limit to how many times a student may apply. In fact, many students have participated in the tournament for multiple years.

Teams are chosen by the universities' Regents' Cup coaches.

Students must:

- Be full-time undergraduate or graduate students at one of Arizona's public universities at the time of the Regents' Cup.
- Have a 2.5 or higher cumulative GPA.
- Adhere to the Arizona Board of Regents' Student Code of Conduct policies.

## **Student team recruitment philosophy and promotion**

The goal of Regents Cup is to promote and highlight civil discourse and diversity of thought on Arizona university campuses. To do this, our goal is to have a diverse array of voices and experiences represented among the students who take part in this competition. Each university should gather, train, and bring to the competition students who represent their home institution across many factors. Our goal is not to bring only our already-established academic or debate superstars to this event, but to purposefully recruit, include, and train teams of students who might not initially see themselves as part of an event like this. We want to bring multiple voices to contribute to this discussion.

To enrich the pool of applicants, ABOR along with the universities will promote Regents' Cup applications when they open to the time they close. University leadership will send out emails to students telling them about Regents' Cup and encouraging them to apply.

Once applications close, the university coaches then review each application and possibly interview applicants if they determine it to be necessary. Once they have a team of between 14-16 students, the teams will be announced, and students will begin their preparation.

## **Student team selection and preparation**

Once students are selected to take part in Regents' Cup, they will spend approximately 3- 5 months preparing for the competition with training from the Regents' Cup coaches – leading faculty members who have significant expertise in debate and storytelling formats. University coaches will set practice schedules with their teams. Team members may specialize in either oxford or storytelling.

Each university will have two teams.

- The oxford team will have 8 students.
- The storytelling team will have 4 students.
- Plus: 2-3 alternate students

## **Student application timeline**

The application portal typically opens is late August to early September. Students are invited to submit their applications via a portal on the Arizona Board of Regents' website for Regents' Cup. The application period typically closes in late October to early November, with teams chosen by the universities and announced by the board prior to the December holiday break.

## **Scholarships**

The board awards generous scholarships to first, second and third place winners. All other team members receive a \$500 scholarship. The scholarships are made available by generous donations from community donors who support Regents' Cup. The scholarship funds can be used at a student's discretion to support and advance their education.

The funds are issued in whole to the student. The universities may not access these dollars to pay for any outstanding balance on an awarded student's account, if any balance exists.

### **Storytelling:**

- First place student \$15,000 scholarship
- Second place student \$12,000 scholarship
- Third place student \$5,000 scholarship

### **Oxford-Style Debate:**

- First place team \$15,000 scholarship each
- Second place team \$12,000 scholarship each
- Third place team \$5,000 scholarship each

## **Internship and course credit**

Students selected to take part in the Regents Cup will receive either internship or course credit for their work, depending upon the institution and the faculty member involved.

All work will be done under the faculty mentor's supervision, who will track hours spent and work completed.

## **Adherence to Student Code of Conduct**

The Regents' Cup is a board and university-sanctioned event. As such, students who participate are required to adhere to the ABOR Student Code of Conduct (ABOR Policy 5-308).

Under Arizona law, the Arizona Board of Regents is responsible for the control and supervision of the state universities and their properties and activities. The board is authorized to enact ordinances for the governance of the universities and the maintenance of public order upon all property under its jurisdiction. The board has promulgated this Student Code of Conduct to meet these responsibilities under Arizona law. Enforcement of this Student Code of Conduct is subject to applicable law, including constitutional protections for speech, association and the press. The presidents are authorized to enforce the Student Code of Conduct.

## **Tournament judges**

The board invites a diverse group of local and national leaders to serve as judges for the Regents Cup tournament. These individuals represent a wide range of professional backgrounds and ideological perspectives, reflecting the spirit of free speech and civil discourse. Previous judges have included elected officials, judges, community leaders, policymakers, media, industry leaders, business leaders and more. Typically, 40-50 judges participate in the tournament.

To ensure consistency and fairness in scoring, all judges are required to complete a series of training modules prior to the event. These trainings emphasize objective evaluation and reinforce the importance of setting aside personal beliefs while assessing student performances. Judges are provided with digital and written materials to view before judging and are offered personalized training as well.

## **Judge recruitment timeline**

The board extends invitations to judges typically in October preceding the tournament event. Judge positions are by invitation only.

## Tournament theme and prompts

The Regents' Cup is rooted in a broad celebration of free speech and civil discourse. These tenants frame the overarching theme of the event. Each year, however, the Arizona Board of Regents selects a specific tournament theme to guide both the storytelling and Oxford-style debate events. This theme is announced in the tournament application and provides a foundation for team preparation. Previous tournament themes included: The Government and the People: The Social Contract; Democracy, Justice, and the Rule of Law; Liberty, Prosperity and the Constitution; and the Preservation of Democracy.

In addition to setting the theme, the board offers overarching direction on the debate and storytelling prompts, ensuring they reflect the theme of the tournament and the mission of the Regents Cup. Once prompts are developed, university team coaches play a vital role in refining and adapting them for practice.

## Tournament format overview

This debate tournament is designed to showcase both rigorous argumentation and creative persuasion through two distinct styles of debate. Each round will highlight the skills of structured reasoning, rhetorical agility and compelling storytelling, allowing participants to engage in multiple forms of democratic discourse. The tournament includes two types of formats:

### Oxford-Style Debate

- **Structure:** A formal, team-based format rooted in the tradition of the Oxford Union. Two teams - affirmative and negative - present structured cases, rebuttals, and closing arguments before the audience and judges. Each team has two members.

### Storytelling

- **Structure:** Students compete through narrative performance, telling a story that is true and offers personal reflection on the theme of the tournament.

Storytelling will have Round 1, Round 2, Semifinals and Finals. Oxford Debate will have Round 1, Round 2, Quarterfinals, Semifinals, Finals. The finals will showcase the most successful teams in Oxford Debate and Storytelling.

## Regents' Cup venue and schedule of events

The annual celebration and tournament is held at Arizona's public universities and rotates location each year. The events begin with a Friday evening reception by the hosting university president. In addition to leadership and staff from the board and universities, the reception includes the student teams, coaches, judges, sponsors and community guests. All participants can mingle and meet during this reception to get familiar with each other before the competition the next day.

The tournament is a full-day event, ending with a celebratory awards ceremony. The typical run-of-show is as follows:

6:45—7:40 a.m.	Judge Orientation
7:45 – 8:30 a.m.	Welcome and Kick-off Event
8:45 – 9:45 a.m.	Storytelling and Oxford Rounds 1
10:15 – 11:15 a.m.	Storytelling and Oxford Rounds 2

11:15 – 1:30 p.m.	Lunch/Tours
1:30 – 2:45 p.m.	Oxford Quarterfinals
2:55 – 3:55 p.m.	Storytelling Semifinals
4:05 – 5:05 p.m.	Oxford Semifinals
5:10 – 6:05 p.m.	Storytelling Finals
6:15 – 7:15 p.m.	Oxford Finals
7:20 – 8:30 p.m.	Awards Reception

## Event Structure/Location/Costs

The event will rotate between the universities each year. The hosting university absorbs all costs associated with staging the event, from space usage to catering and IT. Each participating university is responsible for reimbursing students and coaches for per diem costs associated with mileage, lodging and food.

## Detail and scoring for event formats

### Storytelling format

Storytelling is a format in which an individual student presents a true and memorable story on a specific topic inviting the audience into their personal experience. One storytelling prompt is given for the tournament, and all storytelling students use this prompt to develop one story they will share during the competition. Advancing students, therefore, may tell the story multiple times. Each storyteller earns points toward the team total. Stories run no longer than 10-11 minutes. Moderators introduce the students and monitor the time.

- Students will compete in a storytelling competition consisting of four rounds.
- Students will use the same story for each round.
- Each university team will consist of four students.
- The opening round will consist of four rooms with one student from each university in each room.
- The order of student speakers is to be drawn randomly (but each school should go last at least once). The order for speakers will be drawn three weeks in advance of the tournament by a random draw process conducted by the board as it develops the tournament grid.
  - The opening round will be 60 minutes and will proceed as follows:
    - Student introduction: 1 min
    - Story: 10 min
    - Judging: 8 min
    - Transition to next student: 1 min
- Rounds 1 and 2 have three judges and the semifinals have five judges. The moderator introduces students and judges in the event, recites the prompt, indicates the order of speakers. At the end of each speaker's presentation, judges will have 8 minutes to record their scores on their scorecard and submit them all after the final speaker. The round will then move on to the next student until judges have heard from all 3.
- Below are the Storytelling Training Materials for judges:

# STORYTELLING TRAINING FOR JUDGES

## STORYTELLING OVERVIEW

Storytelling promotes ideas in an engaging way. Successful stories appeal across cultures and to all ages. Storytelling is a format in which an individual student presents a true and memorable story on a specific topic inviting the audience into their experience.

Students are provided with a statement and respond. Each storyteller earns points toward the team total, and stories run no longer than 10 minutes.

## STORYTELLING FORMAT

Each story should be developed, organized and delivered to meet the needs of the story. Story content, how it is organized and the way in which the story is shared are crucial components of impactful stories. Judges should score each story considering the following factors:

### Story Development:

- Content of the story should relate to the overall event theme
- Speaker should take audience point of view into consideration
- Story context
- Characters and plot
- Call to action that is reasonable

### Story Organization:

- Use of tension, resolution and surprise that makes sense
- Perceived truthfulness
- Movement of the story
- Relevant details
- Journey of the story that is enjoyable and exciting

### Story Delivery:

- Emotions in the story used effectively
- Vivid language
- Nonverbal communication used to reinforce the story
- Fluidity of the storyteller that combines non-verbal with verbal language

### Keep in mind for storytelling:

- True stories have personal meaning.
- Organized with a clear beginning, middle and end. (This doesn't preclude starting action to set the stakes before flashing back to the beginning.)
- Details are crucial, but stories should also be succinct and on point.
- Stories need physical and vocal variety for emphasis and to increase pathos.
- Storytellers should avoid memorization, lecturing or ranting.

## TIPS FOR JUDGES: QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- Does the story relate to the audience while considering the overall theme of the event?
- Does the story contain memorable characters or relevant details?
- Does the story sound truthful and contain appropriate tension, movement and surprise?
- Is the story artfully organized with a beginning, middle and end?
- Does the storyteller deliver the story in a way that is vivid and fluid?
- Is there some lesson or call to action in the story?

### Guidelines for Storytelling Participants

- Students may include one small prop in their storytelling, but no presentational aids such as PowerPoints, pictures on screens, audio or video.
- Students are to approach their story content and storytelling in the spirit of the Regents' Cup with civility and respect.
- Stories will be original work adhering to university academic integrity standards.



Welcome, PRACTICE SCORECARD. Thank you for serving as a judge during the Regents' Cup. During **1**, you will be judging the competition between these participants:

PARTICIPANT 1	PARTICIPANT 2	PARTICIPANT 3
Omar Aljubouriy	Devin Adamson	Alina Bozhko
		

[Begin Scoring](#)

## Storytelling Score Card - 1



Student name:  
Omar Aljubouriy

### Story Development

(40 points - 8pts/ea.)

Score between 1 to 8, 8 being the highest score.

Audience Centered - Considers audience point of view.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Framework (clear start and end point, inciting incident, logical narrative, etc)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Focuses context (fits appropriately to the topic at hand)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduces us to characters - memorable and relevant

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Story has a call to action, moral, or lesson; resonates with audience

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_



# Story Delivery

**(30 points - 6pts/ea.)**

Score between 1 to 6, 6 being the highest score.

Uses vivid language and rich description

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

\_\_\_\_\_

Emotional level appropriate for subject matter

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

\_\_\_\_\_

Emotional language moves, alters, or motivates the audience

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

\_\_\_\_\_

Nonverbal communication supports (not detracts from) story

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

\_\_\_\_\_

Delivery is fluid and extemporaneous

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

\_\_\_\_\_

Back

Next Participant

# Storytelling Score Card - 1



Student name:  
Devin Adamson

## Story Development

(40 points - 8pts/ea.)

Score between 1 to 8, 8 being the highest score.

Audience Centered - Considers audience point of view.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Framework (clear start and end point, inciting incident, logical narrative, etc)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Focuses context (fits appropriately to the topic at hand)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduces us to characters - memorable and relevant

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Story has a call to action, moral, or lesson; resonates with audience

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

# Story Organization

(30 points - 6pts/ea.)

Score between 1 to 6, 6 being the highest score.

Utilizes elements of tension and resolution

0 1 2 3 4 5 6   0

Takes the narrative in unexpected directions

0 1 2 3 4 5 6   0

Story rings true and relevant

0 1 2 3 4 5 6   0

Story organization assists audience understanding of plot

0 1 2 3 4 5 6   0

Story appropriately expands or narrows for allotted time

0 1 2 3 4 5 6   0

# Story Delivery

**(30 points - 6pts/ea.)**

Score between 1 to 6, 6 being the highest score.

Uses vivid language and rich description

0 1 2 3 4 5 6  0

Emotional level appropriate for subject matter

0 1 2 3 4 5 6  0

Emotional language moves, alters, or motivates the audience

0 1 2 3 4 5 6  0

Nonverbal communication supports (not detracts from) story

0 1 2 3 4 5 6  0

Delivery is fluid and extemporaneous

0 1 2 3 4 5 6  0

Back

Next Participant

# Storytelling Score Card - 1



Student name:  
Alina Bozhko

## Story Development

(40 points - 8pts/ea.)

Score between 1 to 8, 8 being the highest score.

Audience Centered - Considers audience point of view.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Framework (clear start and end point, inciting incident, logical narrative, etc)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Focuses context (fits appropriately to the topic at hand)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduces us to characters - memorable and relevant

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

Story has a call to action, moral, or lesson; resonates with audience

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

\_\_\_\_\_

# Story Organization

(30 points - 6pts/ea.)

Score between 1 to 6, 6 being the highest score.

Utilizes elements of tension and resolution

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Takes the narrative in unexpected directions

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Story rings true and relevant

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Story organization assists audience understanding of plot

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Story appropriately expands or narrows for allotted time

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

# Story Delivery

(30 points - 6pts/ea.)

Score between 1 to 6, 6 being the highest score.

Uses vivid language and rich description

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Emotional level appropriate for subject matter

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Emotional language moves, alters, or motivates the audience

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Nonverbal communication supports (not detracts from) story

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Delivery is fluid and extemporaneous

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Back

Next Participant

## Storytelling Score Card - 1

### Final Score Summary

PARTICIPANT 1	PARTICIPANT 2	PARTICIPANT 3
Omar Aljubouriy	Devin Adamson	Alina Bozhko
		
43	59	55

This will be the **final score**.

Use the section links below to make any changes before your final submission. **Scores cannot be changed once submitted.**

#### Scoring Sections

[Omar Aljubouriy](#)

[Devin Adamson](#)

[Alina Bozhko](#)



FINAL SUBMISSION

## Storytelling Score Card - 1

The score has been submitted.  
Thank you.

## Oxford debate format

The Oxford debate features a resolution, or provocative statement, that is supported by one team and opposed by the other. Arguments are aimed at a general audience with participants assuming what a mainstream audience would think as the status quo. There are two teams - an affirmative team and a negative team. Each team will be comprised of two members.

- One team will be designated affirmative, and one team will be designated negative.
- The affirmative team's job is to provide evidence and support for the proposed Resolution.
- The job of the negative team is to provide evidence and support against the Resolution.
- Students will be judged on their ability to make and support a clear and persuasive argument.
  - To facilitate this, judges will be given a scorecard to submit their scores when the round is complete.
- Rounds 1 and 2 there will be 3 judges and the Semifinals and Finals 5 judges. The moderator will introduce everyone to the competition, recite the prompt, explain, and introduce the order of speakers and judges and then the round will start.
- Oxford Debate format has three rounds: Opening Statements, Cross Examination, and Closing Statements.
- Opening Statements run for 7 minutes per team (moderators warn at 6 minutes, cut off at 7 minutes). The affirmative team goes first.
- Cross Examinations run for 25 minutes per team (moderators warn at appx. 22 minutes for last question, cut off at 25 minutes).
- Closing Statements run for 5 minutes per team (moderators warn at 4 minutes, cut off at 5 minutes). The Affirmative team goes first.
- Below are the Oxford Training Materials for judges:

# OXFORD-STYLE DEBATE TRAINING FOR JUDGES

## OXFORD-STYLE DEBATE OVERVIEW

Oxford-style debate features a resolution, or provocative statement, that is supported by one team and opposed by the other. Arguments are aimed at a general audience with participants assuming what a mainstream audience would think as the status quo. There are two teams, an affirmative team and a negative team.

## OXFORD-STYLE DEBATE FORMAT

The debate style has three rounds:

1. **Opening statement:** The affirmative team generally argues against the status quo, for example by stating why a change is needed and why the status quo should be challenged.

The negative team argues in favor of the status quo, for example by poking holes in the affirmative team's argument and explaining why the status quo should stay the way it is. Teams are able to research and prepare their opening statements in advance.

Opening statements should contain an explanation of the topic, acknowledgment of the opposing team's concerns and directly address those concerns.

2. **Cross-examination:** The moderator of the debate will ask questions to both the affirmative team and the negative team. Questions are based on opening statements and the teams are able to spar with each other during this round.

Speakers should provide clear and convincing answers, refer to points made during opening statements, engage respectfully and not offer pre-planned answers or pivot to other subjects.

3. **Closing statements:** Each team makes closing statements based on the comments made during the debate. Whereas opening statements are researched and finessed, closing statements are seldom prepared and are more impromptu.

Speakers should clarify any statements that weren't clear in previous rounds and not introduce new information. It should be clear that speakers have noted their opponents' case, refer to these points and rebut any points that have not been fully refuted.

The winner is determined by judges who vote according to which team made the best argument. As judges consider their vote, they may reflect on what they thought at the beginning of the debate compared to what they thought at the end.

## TIPS FOR JUDGES:

- Avoid bias on how you personally feel about the subject of the debate and keep an open mind. Your job is to vote on who made the best argument and not whether you personally are on board with the resolution. For example, if you are against the affirmative side, you can still vote for them if you feel they made the stronger argument.
- A judge should feel as though students are making their argument to you and communicating directly to you.
- Factors to consider when deciding which team is making the better argument include:
  - Performance and if the participants are strong orators who make eye contact, enunciate words, and put emphasis and personality behind what they are saying.
  - Look for a thread of logic in their argument and ask if they are building a case for their argument.
  - Consider if it seems as if the team has researched their opening statements well and have evidence to support their statement.
  - Make sure the team members are working in tandem with each other with a lot of teamwork and partner chemistry.



Welcome, PRACTICE SCORECARD. Thank you for serving as a judge during the Regents' Cup. During **Round 1**, you will be judging the competition between these two teams:

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko	Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi
 	 

Begin Scoring

## Oxford Score Card - Round 1

Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko  
Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi

### Opening Statements

Scoring key: 1 = Ineffective; 10 = Most effective/persuasive

#### Clear Case/Thesis

- Interpretation of the resolution is well-communicated
- Approach to the resolutions makes sense
- Controversy sufficiently explained to audience
- Speaker transitions clearly between points

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**AFF**  \_\_\_\_\_

**NEG**  \_\_\_\_\_

#### Support

- Speaker avoids baseless claims
- Offers support for points made
- Includes sources for external information
- Points are based on logical steps from one point to the next/avoids logical fallacies
- Speaker transitions clearly between points

## References to Opposition

- Speaker directly addresses opposition's concerns (or anticipates them if speaking first)
- Logically rebuts these concerns
- Respectful of opposition's points
- Offers relevant questions regarding opposition
- Speaker transitions clearly between points

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

AFF  \_\_\_\_\_

NEG  \_\_\_\_\_

## Public Speaking

- Speaker orates at a reasonable pace and volume
- Stance (posture, body language) is appropriate and professional
- Inflection reflects the tone of the argument
- Speaker transitions clearly between points

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

AFF  \_\_\_\_\_

NEG  \_\_\_\_\_

## Audience Analysis

- Speaker has a clear sense of the audience to whom he or she is speaking
- Addresses a general audience and avoids esoteric language
- Addresses both those who might disagree and those who might be undecided or ill-informed

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

AFF  \_\_\_\_\_

NEG  \_\_\_\_\_

Back

Review Section

## Opening Statements Score Summary

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko	Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi
 19	 13

Is this how you want to score this section?

No

Yes

## Oxford Score Card - Round 1

Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko  
Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi

### Cross Examination

Scoring key: 1 = Ineffective; 10 = Most effective/persuasive

#### Q&A

- Listens to moderator/audience questions before answering
- Does not stray from the subject in question
- Tone is respectful of the question being asked

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**AFF**  \_\_\_\_\_

**NEG**  \_\_\_\_\_

### Knowledge of Opposition's Case

- Refers to points made in opposition's opening statement
- Refers to notes taken during opening statements
- Refers to claims made by opposition during cross examination

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**AFF**  \_\_\_\_\_

**NEG**  \_\_\_\_\_

## Dialogue

- Listens carefully to opposition's point before responding
- Respectful of opponents - avoids interruptions or outbursts
- Asks relevant questions in response to opposition's claims

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**AFF**  \_\_\_\_\_

**NEG**  \_\_\_\_\_

## Case

- Points align with case outlined in opening statement
- Speakers work as a team/allow for equal time/are on the same page
- Answers are concise
- Answers are supported by research
- Case is persuasive

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**AFF**  \_\_\_\_\_

**NEG**  \_\_\_\_\_

Back

Review Section

## Cross Examination Score Summary

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko	Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi
 19	 8

Is this how you want to score this section?

No

Yes

## Oxford Score Card - Round 1

Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko  
Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi

## Closing Statements

Scoring key: 1 = Ineffective; 10 = Most effective/persuasive

### Audience Analysis

- Addresses those who might be on the fence or do not agree
- Speaker has a clear sense of the audience in the room



## Practical Application

- Makes a convincing case for how the topic might affect the audience in the world outside this room
- Offers credible scenarios to this effect
- Supports claims

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**AFF**  \_\_\_\_\_

**NEG**  \_\_\_\_\_

## Clarification

- Acknowledges information that may have gotten confused
- Offers a compelling explanation for these confusions
- Supports claims

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**AFF**  \_\_\_\_\_

**NEG**  \_\_\_\_\_

## Rebuttal

- Speaker has taken diligent notes regarding the opposition's case during the debate
- Refers directly to opposition's arguments
- Refutes these arguments convincingly
- Speaker supports rebuttals
- Speaker is respectful of opposition's case

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**AFF**  \_\_\_\_\_

**NEG**  \_\_\_\_\_

Back

Review Section

## Closing Statements Score Summary

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko	Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi
 12	 13

Is this how you want to score this section?

No

Yes

## Final Score Summary

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko	Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi
	
50	34

This will be the **final score**.

Use the section links below to make any changes before your final submission. **Scores cannot be changed once submitted.**

### Revise Scores?

[Opening Statements](#)

[Cross Examination](#)

[Closing Statements](#)



FINAL SUBMISSION

## Oxford Score Card - Round 1

Omar Aljubouriy and Alina Bozhko  
Devin Adamson and Hayder Alainizi

The score has been submitted.  
Thank you.

## Scoring calculations

### Storytelling Scoring:

- Students win the round based on the number of judges they win. The judge has to say who they think won the round by using their scorecard. The number of points the student earns should be used to determine tiebreakers and seeding as necessary.
- The semifinal round will be seeded based on the number of wins, and then by the total score. A 1-win student will never be seeded higher than a 2-win student even if they have a higher total score.
  - Seed #1 will compete against Seed #4.
  - Seed #2 will compete against Seed #3.
    - The lower seed will go first (top seeds always go last!).
    - The top two students will compete in a final round. Seeding will be the same as the semifinal round.
      - Winner of final round takes 1st place.
      - Loser of final round takes 2nd place.
      - Losers of the semifinal round tie for 3rd place.
        - There should not be ties; however, both of the two semifinal losers get third place.

### Oxford-Style Debate Scoring:

Teams win the round based on the number of judges they win, and their seeding is determined by number of wins and scores awarded.

- Opening Rounds – Teams win the opening rounds based on the number of points they receive, who has more.
  - Six rooms
  - Two teams in each room
  - Teams will be assigned by random draw, but a team should not face teams from their own schools.
  - Each round will be 55 min as follows:
    - Welcome and Student Introductions: 3 min
    - Opening statements: 14 min (7 min for each team)
    - Moderated Debate: 25 min
    - Closing statements: 10 min (5 min for each team)
    - Exit time: 3 min
      - The team arguing the affirmative position will go first for the opening and closing statements.
      - ABOR will assign which side each team will argue.
      - Forfeitures:
        - If a single player from one team withdraws, the remaining player may continue as a single member team.
        - If the full team withdraws, the competing team is awarded the round win. The winning team's score for the forfeited round will be the same score as their other round.
- Quarterfinal - Teams win the round based off the number of judges they win. Their scores can further help determine seeding.
  - Eight teams will compete in the second round.
  - Teams will be seeded based on the number of wins from the opening rounds.
    - Teams seeded 1, 3, 5, 7 argue the negative and teams seeded 2, 4, 6, 8 argue the affirmative.

- OR: tabulation room flips a coin to determine which side even teams will argue, and which side odd teams will argue. All odd seeds should be on the same side, and all even seeds should be on the other side.
  - Ties with respect to seeding will be broken by the total score from the opening rounds. Not in terms of winning the debate. The following is an example:

#### Two-win teams

1. Highest score of two-win teams
2. Second highest score

#### One-win teams

1. Highest score of one-win teams
2. Second highest score
3. Third highest score
4. Fourth highest score

#### Zero-win teams

1. Highest score of zero-win teams
2. Second highest score

- The second round will be high seed vs low seed 1-8. No exceptions. (No artificial reseeding will occur to avoid the teams from the same university competing.)
- Rounds will be 55 min and will follow the same pattern as the opening rounds.
- Forfeitures
  - If a single player from one team withdraws, the remaining player may continue as a single member team.
  - If the full team withdraws, the competing team is awarded the round win. The winning team's score for the forfeited round will be the average score of their opening rounds.
- Semifinal
  - Head-to-head winners from the second round will advance to the semi final
    - A coin flip in the tabulation room will determine who argues pro.
  - Seeds should've been assigned in the quarterfinals so the winners of the quarterfinals will assume the seed they won. Teams will be seeded based on scores from the semi-final round
    - So, 1 v 8, 2 v 7, 3 v 6, 4 v 5
    - The winner, which was determined by the number of judges they won, retains or obtains the better seed.
  - Rounds will follow the same pattern as the opening round.
    - Winner of 1 v 8 goes into the Semifinal as the 1 seed.
    - That creates 1v4 and 2v3 in the semifinals.
    - The winner of the 1v4 is 1, the winner of 2v3 is 2.
  - Losing teams tie for 3rd place
  - In the event of a forfeiture, the competing team will be awarded the win.
- Final Round
  - Head-to-head winners will advance from the semifinal to the final round.
  - Seed 1 will argue the positive side.
    - Winner of 1 v 8 goes into the Semifinal as the 1 seed.
    - That creates 1v4 and 2v3 in the semifinals.
    - The winner of the 1v4 is 1 seed in Finals, the winner of 2v3 is 2 seed in finals.
  - Winner takes 1st place; loser takes 2nd place.

## Awarding of the Regents' Cup

The Regents Cup will be awarded to the university with the highest total score. Points will be awarded as follows:

### Storytelling

	Total Points Available:	
Opening Round winners:	2 points	8 points
Semifinal Round winners:	3 points	6 points
Final Round winner:	5 points	<u>5 points</u>
Total Storytelling:		19 points

### Oxford

Opening Round winners:	2 points	24 points
Quarterfinal winners:	3 points	12 points
Semifinal round winners:	3 points	6 points
Final round winners:	5 points	<u>5 points</u>
Total Oxford		47 points

Total Available Points 66 points

University with the most points will win the Cup.

## Tournament attire

Students should wear professional attire for the event. Appropriate university-related dress is allowed and welcome. Judges, coaches, and staff should wear business-casual attire.