

At all WDCA sanctioned events, the following expectations will be met in addition to those detailed within the Constitution and Bylaws of the WDCA. (As taken from Article A., Section III.)

1. Any judge who finds him/herself in a conflict of interest including, but not limited to, judging a student from a school with which the judge is affiliated, shall notify the tournament director immediately.
 2. A judge is not to ask or seek information as to the identity of the schools participating in the round he/she is about to judge.
 3. A judge shall neither shorten rounds nor render a decision on the ballot until the completion of the round. The judge shall listen to the entire round in a fair and impartial manner before making a decision.
 4. The judge should decide the round based upon the arguments presented in the round and not upon his/her personal beliefs or biases.
 5. The review of evidence by a judge is not allowed unless there is a dispute by the opposition regarding the meaning, context, or validity of the evidence. A judge may review evidence at his/her discretion only if there is suspicion of falsification.
 6. A judge is expected to adapt expectations and award speaker points appropriate to the level of debate being judged. No minimum point total is required, but constructive discretion should be maintained. No judge may award zero speaker points in any category for any reason (i.e., a speaker who fails to read evidence or cross-examine should still be awarded a "1").
 7. A judge shall fill out the ballot completely. A written justification for the decision shall be provided. Comments on ballots are to be instructive and constructive. The school of any judge that does not provide a written justification for decisions, as prescribed by the Tournament Director, will be required to pay \$15 to the WDCA Scholarship Fund for each round where no written justification was provided. The first notice would be sent by the tournament host to the coach of said school. Failure to respond and remit payment within one month will result in a letter being sent to the school's principal by the WDCA President.
- Repeated violations could result in disqualification from WDCA sponsored tournaments by Executive Committee decision.
8. While oral critiques may be of educational value, oral critiques are unacceptable. A judge should, therefore, fully communicate his/her decision on the ballot and allow the tournament to proceed as close to the scheduled time as possible.
 9. The WDCA does not recognize "Games Playing" as a legitimate and educational paradigm by which a debate round may or should be judged. A judge may not, therefore, employ a "games player" paradigm to render his/her decision.
 10. During the course of a tournament, coaches and judges shall not provide other schools with information, flows, and evidence pertaining to any other teams in the tournament.
 11. No high school student may be used to judge any round at the State Tournament of Champions nor at any WDCA sanctioned tournament.
 12. No judge who completed his/her high school studies during the preceding two years (college sophomore) may be used to judge any varsity round at the State Tournament of Champions nor at any WDCA sanctioned tournament without the expressed approval of the tournament host/director.
 13. Approved as a Statement of Practice: A speaker, questioner, or respondent shall receive no assistance beyond time signals. Violation shall result in forfeiture of that point or argument.
 14. If while judging a round, the judge leaves to go and confer with his/her team, the team conferred with takes a loss. Any judge who leaves a round for any other reason than ones listed shall be fined \$20 per round.
 15. Debaters shall not leave a debate round for any non-emergency reason or else they shall forfeit the round.
 16. Novice limited topics and a no counterplan/kritik rule are in effect for all WDCA sanctioned events throughout the entire season including the State Tournament of Champions.