

# AMERICAN MOCK TRIAL ASSOCIATION

## Tabroom Manual

&

## Step-by-Step Pairing Guidelines

2008-2009 Revised Edition

### Table of Contents

Introduction	1
History of the Manual	2
Overview as to Interpretation	3
Overview of the 2008-2009, 2007-2008, 2006-2007, and 2005-2006 Revisions	4
Overview of the 2004-2005 and 2003-2004 Revisions	5
General Tabroom Rules and Procedures and the 30-Minute Review Period	6
Procedures for Checking In Ballots	8
Procedures for Tabulating Ballots	9
Procedures for Recording Results on Pairing Cards	11
Procedures for Determining Teams' Ranks During the Tournament	11
Procedures for Identifying Impermissible Matches	12
Procedures for Resolving Impermissible Matches	13
Procedures Regarding Individual Attorney and Witness Awards	16
Procedures Regarding the Spirit of AMTA Award	17
Procedures Regarding ByeBuster Teams	18
Procedures Regarding Forfeits	19
Pairing Round 1	20
Tabroom Responsibilities During Round 1	21
Tabroom Responsibilities After Round 1 (but Before Round 2)	21
Pairing Round 2	22
Tabroom Responsibilities During Round 2	23
Tabroom Responsibilities After Round 2 (but Before Round 3)	23
Pairing Round 3	24
Tabroom Responsibilities During Round 3	26
Tabroom Responsibilities After Round 3 (but Before Round 4)	26
Pairing Round 4 at Regionals and Opening Round Championship Sites	27
Pairing Round 4 at the National Championship Tournament	33
Tabroom Responsibilities During Round 4	34
Tabroom Responsibilities After Round 4	35
Tiebreaking Procedures	36
Tiebreaking Illustration and Examples	42
Frequently Asked Questions About Tabbing and Pairing	46

## **Introduction**

This Manual was created by Brad Bloch, revised by David Nelmark and currently revised by Kristofer Lyons.

The current 2008-2009 version was adopted by the AMTA Board based upon revisions voted upon at our board meeting in July of 2008.

When referring to the manual it is crucial to have the most current version. The edition number appears on the upper left hand corner of every page as 08-09. If any changes are made by the AMTA Board at the Mid-Year Meeting in November, a new version of the manual will be posted with the header 08-09 and the date of the update.

The authors of the manual would like to stress that there is no need for AMTA coaches, hosts, or competitors to memorize the procedures contained in this manual. There is no information in it that is crucial, or even particularly useful, for competing in a tournament.

Although teams are allowed to have a representative in the tournament tabroom, it is not required. Each tab room has multiple neutral observers and many procedures are in place to help ensure fairness and accuracy.

Do not be concerned if the procedures described herein seem difficult to grasp. It is much easier to understand them when you are seeing a tabroom in action. Additionally, at most tournaments, you can find a willing volunteer to help you learn the process.

Please direct any questions or comments about this manual to Kristofer Lyons, the AMTA Tabulation Director. Please email him at [kristofer.lyons@gmail.com](mailto:kristofer.lyons@gmail.com) and place "AMTA" in the subject line to avoid being accidentally deleted as spam.

During a tournament, the best person to contact regarding this Manual is also Kristofer Lyons. He will provide his contact information to all AMTA Representatives before the regional tournament season begins. In the event that he will be unavailable for inquires (or cannot be reached for an unforeseen reason) questions should be directed to one of the Assistant Tabulation Directors who has been designated as such by the Tabulation Director. These individuals may answer questions and issue rulings. In the areas of tabulation and pairing, their rulings may only be overturned by the Tabulation Director.

## **History of the Tabroom Manual**

by Brad Bloch

AMTA's step-by-step tabroom procedures were introduced, somewhat out of necessity, during the 7th National Season of 1990-1991. AMTA "sanctioned" invitational tournaments for the first time that season. The first sanctioned invitational was hosted by Bellarmine College in November of 1990. With a few more sanctioned invitationals scheduled for the season, Brad Bloch authored a manual for invitational hosts sharing Bellarmine's tournament-related materials as well as the power-pairing and tabulation summary procedures that Brad introduced while serving as Bellarmine's "tabroom."

The invitational manual was revised the following season when AMTA inaugurated regional qualifiers. At the time, AMTA's supply of tournament administrators was quite limited. Novice administrators needed the procedures detailed in the simplest manner possible. As a result, most of AMTA's now veteran corps of tournament administrators "cut their teeth" using the "Step-by-Step Guidelines."

The Guidelines exist to best assure consistency in the procedures used in the tournaments AMTA hosts. The Guidelines have never been binding on invitational hosts, although participants generally presume that invitational hosts will follow the Guidelines unless they are told otherwise. AMTA's observers make a diligent effort to follow the procedures in order to reach our objective of procedural consistency. However, the Guidelines also must be interpreted recognizing that we have predicted and therefore have addressed only some of the weird scenarios that arise in tournament life. As the unpredictable surfaces, AMTA has reserved the right to have the Tabulation Director, or his or her designate for a particular tournament, make ad hoc procedural rulings consistent with the spirit and strategies of our procedures.

The Step-by-Step Guidelines have been revised annually to reflect changes and additions adopted by the Board of Directors. The most recently ratified version of the Manual is available on the AMTA website at [www.collegemocktrial.org](http://www.collegemocktrial.org).

## **Overview as to Interpretation**

Based on its ratification by the AMTA Board, this Manual is considered official AMTA policy. If the procedures described in this Manual conflict with policies listed on AMTA's website or any other source, this Manual takes precedence on all issues related to scoring, tabulating ballots, or breaking ties.

We have attempted to be complete in what our guidelines address. We have also tried to make the directions as simple as possible. Simplicity may have bred some ambiguity. As a result, AMTA has long maintained a policy that concerns or "issues" are to be timely raised to AMTA's official tournament representatives. Should that representative's decision not satisfy those raising the "issue," the decision may be immediately reviewed through contact with the Tabulation Director or his or her designate. This person's decision is final.

The Tabulation Director will not necessarily view inconsistencies with the Manual's procedures to be grounds for post-tournament protest or relief of any kind. At review meetings, different views may be discussed, explained and debated. These procedures may be referenced and review may require revision of calculations, pairings and other tabroom products. Those are matters expected to be resolved at the event and not after the event. Those who do not attend review meetings and those who are not aware of what may be reviewed and when it is timely reviewed proceed at their own peril.

It is emphasized that the official AMTA Representatives assigned to Regional and postseason tournaments have no authority to ignore or overrule these procedures, even when they appear to produce an undesirable result in a given situation. The AMTA Board has had a full analysis of advantages and disadvantages of different procedural options. It is also imperative from a fairness perspective that all tabrooms at Regional and National Tournaments follow identical procedures.

### **Overview as to 2008-2009 Revisions**

The 08-09 Manual has a number of significant changes. Of those, the most noteworthy are:

- A significant change in how rounds 2, 3 and 4 are paired at Regional and Opening Round Championship Sites.
- An alternative fourth round pairing procedure used solely for the National Championship tournament.
- The Elimination of “Frank’s Rule” in resolving impermissible matches.
- The ceasing of the practice of allowing captains to choose sides going into round 3, and a new procedure governing how sides in Round 3 are selected.

As always, there were a number of small changes to clean up language and provide consistency in our change over to a unified national system.

### **Overview as to 2007-2008 Revisions**

There were a number of changes in the 2007-2008 manual, which involved the following changes in how we tabbed rounds: using Combined Strength (“CS”) to rank teams in Rounds 3 and 4 rather than Point Differential (“PD”). Considering whether new impermissible matches will be created as a step in the process of resolving impermissible matches; tweaking the “All Loss” penalty; clarifying the discretion given to AMTA Representatives regarding the correction of errors in tabulation or pairing.

### **Overview as to 2006-2007 Revisions**

The most significant change for the 2006-2007 season is that impermissible matches will now be resolved from the top down rather than from the bottom up.

This season’s version of the Manual also includes new language to address situations regarding ByeBuster teams, forfeits, and ballots that were not scored according to the numbering system laid out in the Judges’ PowerPoint Presentation. This latter issue refers to a judge’s failure to use the 1-10 point scale, not, for example, an improper assessment of whether a closing argument really deserved a “6.”

This version also clarifies when a Tabroom is to be open or closed and when protests regarding pairings must be lodged.

### **Overview as to 2005-2006 Revisions**

There are a number of key changes in the 2005-06 manual. These changes include:

1. The reincorporation of the Round 2 side constraint.

2. A new method of “dealing” team cards that can impact the order in which impermissible matches are resolved.
3. Switching the order of the Combined Strength and Strength of Opposition tiebreakers.

*Note that in June 2005, the AMTA Board adopted a rule that allowed previous meeting matches in certain circumstances. This rule was repealed by the Board in November 2005. Also, in November 2005, a clarification was also added to better explain how SOO is calculated.*

### **Overview as to 2004-2005 Revisions**

Changes in actual pairing or tiebreaking policies for the 2004-05 Manual are minimal. The Manual has, however, been extensively reformatted. Most significantly, procedures for a number of activities not directly related to the tabroom (such as assigning judges or conducting Captains’ Meetings) have been removed.

### **Overview as to 2003-2004 Revisions**

In 2003-04, we incorporated four significant changes.

At the 2003 Board Meeting the Board adopted Motions R and S which established specific recourse for those who do not comply with AMTA’s rules regarding tournament service. Our rules require that coaches accept judge assignments. Should a coach fail to complete a judging assignment, the Board has directed the tabroom to remove from the field the highest ranking team of that coach’s program. Similarly, our rules require that teams, with more than six students scoring for the team over the course of a tournament, provide personnel to man ByeBuster teams. The Board has directed the tabroom to remove from the field the highest ranking team from any program that fails to supply ByeBuster team members.

The Board also adopted Motion I I regarding the use of open tabrooms as well as limitations as to matters which may be raised during the 30 minute final verification period.

The Board adopted Motion Z which restored our traditional practice of pairing all brackets high-low. This reversed a change adopted the previous year which dictated variance in pairing depending on whether a bracket was “pure” or “impure.”

Finally, the Board adopted Motion Y which ended side constraints in (pairing) Round 2 while preserving the requirement that each team perform two plaintiff trials and two defense trials. This change means that it will be permissible, and likely common, that teams may have the same side assigned for both Rounds 1 and 2 or any other pair of consecutive rounds. The change affects our procedures for both Rounds 2 and 3.

## 1 **General Tabroom Rules and Procedures and the 30-Minute Review Period**

2  
3 The Tabroom is the nerve center for a mock trial tournament. As the name implies, it is where  
4 ballots are brought to be tabulated at the end of a round.

5  
6 The Tabroom should be kept open for the majority of the tournament. When a Tabroom is open,  
7 the official Tabroom Representative for each competing team is allowed to be in the Tabroom.  
8 When a Tabroom is closed, it is only accessible to the AMTA Representatives and any other  
9 individuals that the Representatives allow into the Tabroom for the purposes of tabulating ballots  
10 or otherwise assisting in the administration of the tournament.

11  
12 If a competing team has an educator or attorney coach that has accompanied the program to the  
13 tournament, that coach is the program's official Tabroom Representative. If and only if no coach  
14 has accompanied a program, the program may designate one person to serve as its Tabroom  
15 Representative. This person should give his or her name to the AMTA Representatives at the  
16 Round 1 Captains' Meeting. A program's non-coach Tabroom Representative must stay the  
17 same for the duration of the tournament. Should a team report at the Round 1 Captains' Meeting  
18 that it will have no representative participate in open Tabroom reviews, the program will have  
19 delegated its authority to the Tabroom.

20  
21 Coaches may visit the Tabroom to study the ballots following Rounds 1, 2, and 3. However, no  
22 educator or attorney coach or other individual affiliated with a competing team shall be permitted  
23 at any time to review pages 1 – 4 of the ballots of any competing team other than his or her own  
24 team(s). However, team-affiliated persons may review page 5 of other teams' ballots.

25  
26 AMTA's Tabrooms were opened years ago in order to allow teams fair and equal access to  
27 ongoing tournament results. Tournament efficiency requires that Tabrooms may be closed to  
28 permit tabulators the concentration needed to complete their work with accuracy. It is not  
29 unusual for Tabrooms to be bastions of silence at times and the fori for reasonable discussion at  
30 other times.

31  
32 Opening Tabrooms has also afforded additional checks for accuracy. Errors discovered by  
33 Tabroom Representatives are expected to be reported regardless of whether one deems the error  
34 to be favorable or unfavorable to the team represented. Errors may be merely suspected yet  
35 should be reported. For instance, it is common for judges to initially write a score for a function  
36 only to change the score later. We'd prefer the judges cross out the original score and plainly  
37 write the final score but we often see numbers written over other numbers. Determining the  
38 actual score is a matter of interpretation.

39  
40 In our era of open Tabrooms, it is important that visitors learn from the outset that the  
41 environment changes depending on where we are in the procedure. In the interest of accuracy,  
42 the tabroom should be quiet while ballots are being tabulated. Once team cards are dealt, quiet is  
43 not enough. Silence must be demanded. Resolving impermissible matches can be so intricate  
44 that diversion from concentration cannot be tolerated. Then comes the 30-minute review where  
45 the free exchange of concerns and questions should be encouraged. This is more often than not a  
46 teaching session. We want the Representatives to satisfy themselves that the process is  
47 standardized and is fair to all teams regardless of the tournament at which they compete.

1  
2 The only time that a Tabroom must be closed is from the period when the first Round 4 ballot is  
3 received until the end of the awards ceremony. It is permissible, but not required, for a Tabroom  
4 to be closed when the ballots for any round are being tabulated or when initial pairings are being  
5 conducted. During these periods, whether the Tabroom is open or closed is at the sole discretion  
6 of the AMTA Representatives. AMTA Representatives are encouraged to keep the Tabroom  
7 open to the maximum extent that they are comfortable as it allows AMTA participants to better  
8 understand the inner workings of a tournament. AMTA Representatives may also exclude  
9 specific individuals from the Tabroom if those individuals fail to follow the instructions of the  
10 AMTA Representatives regarding things such as remaining quiet during tabulation.

11  
12 If a Tabroom is closed during the pairing process, it will remain open for a minimum of 30-  
13 minutes following the completion of the pairings. The 30-minute review period may commence  
14 despite the absence of a representative from a program or a team. Tabroom Representatives are  
15 obligated to report errors as soon as they are discovered whether the error was to the benefit or  
16 detriment of their team(s). Errors are also to be reported even if they do not involve a Tabroom  
17 Representative's own team(s).

18  
19 AMTA Representatives have the discretion to correct errors, including those in pairing,  
20 tabulation or recording, provided that such errors can be corrected without undue tournament  
21 schedule disruption. Record errors shall be corrected if discovered within the 30-minute review  
22 period for each round. Pairing errors discovered within the 30-minute review period shall be  
23 corrected if such correction can be made without undue tournament schedule disruption. In  
24 making this decision, the AMTA Representatives should bear in mind the timing of the  
25 discovery of the error, the need to keep the tournament on schedule, and the degree of difficulty  
26 of correcting the error. The AMTA Representatives shall not correct any errors discovered after  
27 the expiration of the 30-minute review period unless pairings can be redone without undue  
28 tournament schedule disruption.

29  
30 Any errors not raised during the 30-minute review period shall not be solely sufficient grounds  
31 for awarding an Act of AMTA bid.

32  
33 The next round may start before the 30-minute review period is over. If a complaint is raised  
34 within the 30-minute period following the finalization of the next round's pairings, it will be  
35 deemed timely even if the next round has started.

36  
37 Complaints regarding a tournament's final round must be made within 30 minutes following the  
38 distribution of the ballots at the close of the awards ceremony. If a complaint is raised within the  
39 appropriate 30-minute period it shall be deemed timely even if the issue is not resolved within  
40 the 30-minute period. Complaints must be voiced to an AMTA Representative to be deemed  
41 official. Talking to the tournament host or a judge is not sufficient.

42  
43  
44  
45

1 **Procedures for Checking In Ballots**

2  
3 Each tabroom should assign one person to “check in” the ballots being brought to the tabroom by  
4 students at the conclusion of each round.

5  
6 This person’s primary responsibility is to make sure that the Blue Ballots are complete before  
7 allowing the student to leave. If the Blue Ballot is incomplete, the student should immediately be  
8 sent back to the courtroom to have the judge fill in the missing information.

9  
10 To be complete, the Blue Ballot needs to have all 28 functions scored and have four students  
11 listed for individual attorney and witness award ranks. Be sure that there are scores for both  
12 closing arguments as this is the most commonly forgotten score.

13  
14 It is important to check to make sure that the judge has used the students’ names for witness  
15 awards rather than the character names. If character names have been used, it is permissible to  
16 ask the students who brought the ballots to the Tabroom who played particular witnesses in that  
17 round. It is also permissible to ask the students whether a particular person was on the plaintiff  
18 or defense side in that round if the judge failed to circle “P” or “D” on the ballot. When asking  
19 such questions, it is advisable to ask the questions in a random order (rather than reading the  
20 witnesses’ or students’ names in the order they appear on the ballot) so as not to indicate who  
21 won the round.

22  
23 The person checking in ballots should also keep track of which trials have not yet been  
24 completed and be prepared to send warnings if a trial is approaching the All Loss time. If a  
25 ballot is returned to a judge after submission it cannot result in an All Loss penalty as long as  
26 closing arguments were completed and the ballot was in the hands of a tournament official prior  
27 to the All Loss time.

28  
29 If a round is not completed prior to the All Loss time, both teams involved in the round shall  
30 have their records reduced by one ballot before the final ranking of teams occurs. The actual  
31 record of each team (before the penalty is imposed) shall be used for the purposes of pairing and  
32 tiebreakers.

1 **Procedures for Tabulating Ballots**

2  
3 Each ballot must be tabulated for point differential. Many tabulators find it useful to determine  
4 the total number of points scored by each team, although these raw numbers are not used in  
5 determining team rankings.

6  
7 Policies in Calculating Point Differential

8  
9 Fractions and digits right of decimals are ignored.  
10 Plus or minus signs are ignored.  
11 Only scores from 1 to 10 count.  
12 Any score of “0” shall be changed to a “1” unless that function of the trial did not occur.  
13 Illegible or otherwise unclear scores and any missing scores require rulings:

14  
15 If the judge can be located at the tournament site, the judge may clarify.

16  
17 If the judge cannot be readily located, an AMTA Representative may appoint a  
18 committee of three neutrals with agreement of two sufficient to reach a ruling. “Neutrals”  
19 may include an AMTA Rep, tabroom staff and/or others.

20  
21 The committee may refer to commentary ballots in its discretion and/or individual award  
22 rankings.

23  
24 AMTA Representatives decisions as to whether a committee must be formed are final  
25 and may be based on a fair assessment of the difference in time between receipt and  
26 tabulation of ballots as well as the likelihood that the questioned score may be  
27 determinative of the differential decision. Tournaments are not to be delayed in efforts to  
28 track down the judge.

29  
30 Sometimes a score that is illegible on a carbon copy may be legible on the original ballot.

31  
32 If a judge has departed significantly from the instructions for scoring (e.g. has scored  
33 everyone on a 20-pt. scale) the AMTA Reps should attempt to locate the judge to correct  
34 the error. If it is not feasible to locate the judge, the AMTA Reps should attempt to  
35 replicate as best as possible the judge’s understanding of each team’s performance (e.g. if  
36 it is obvious that each team was scored on a 20 point scale, all scores could be halved to  
37 get back within the 140 point total maximum.)

38  
39 If a team runs out of time for direct examination before all three of its witnesses are called to the  
40 stand, that attorney who was slated to direct any witness who did not testify shall receive no  
41 points for the direct examination. The witness shall receive no points for direct examination.  
42 The opponent may choose to have the witness take the stand for cross examination. If the  
43 opponent chooses to exercise this option the witness will receive a cross examination score and  
44 the crossing attorney will also receive a score. No re-direct examination is allowed. If the  
45 crossing attorney declines to have the witness take the stand, the witness will not receive a cross  
46 examination score and the crossing attorney will receive no score.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

The point differential on each ballot must be confirmed by at least two tab room officials. The first person who tabulates a ballot should list the point differential of the winning team on that team's side of the Blue Ballot. **This step is extremely important.** If the margin of victory is inadvertently written on the wrong side of the ballot, it is difficult for other tab room officials to notice the error. If the point differential is zero, the word "Tie" should be written in the middle of the ballot.

If the second person tabulating the ballot reaches the same result, he or she should circle the point differential. If he or she comes up with a different number, he or she should write that number on the winning team's side of the ballot and then give the ballot to a third person to tabulate. No ballot is official until at least two tab room officials have agreed on the differential and indicated as much by circling the number. If three people are tabulating each ballot, the second person reaching the same total should indicate this by placing a check mark next to the number. The circle should be reserved for the final tabulator that makes the result "official."

In the event that any judge's ballot must be discarded for any reason, the co-judge's ballot shall be doubled for all aspects of the trial, including individual awards.

## 1 **Procedures for Recording Results on Pairing Cards**

2  
3 After each round, a team's results should be recorded on its Pairing Card. The Card is formatted  
4 to include both Round totals (for ballots won, point differential, and—in later rounds—combined  
5 strength) and for a running total. A positive differential is a win. A negative differential is a loss.  
6 Ties are one-half win and one-half loss. Whenever a team receives its second tie, team cards  
7 should reflect the equivalent record. For instance, if a team has 4 wins and 2 ties, its equivalent  
8 record is 5 wins and 1 loss.

9  
10 Every tabroom needs to have at least two sets of independent pairing cards. After results are  
11 recorded, the two sets of cards should be compared before the pairing process begins for the next  
12 round as it is much easier to resolve any discrepancies before pairing begins. This confirmation  
13 is typically completed by having one tabulator read data from one set of cards as other tabulators  
14 compare the data to the additional sets of cards.

## 15 **Procedures for Determining Teams' Ranks During the Tournament**

16  
17  
18 Heading into Round 2, teams' ranks are determined first by record (ballots won) and then by  
19 running point differential. In Rounds 3 and 4, teams' ranks are determined by record (ballots  
20 won), then by Combined Strength (the combined total of the ballots won by all of the teams'  
21 opponents thus far in the tournament), and then by running point differential. In the case of a tie,  
22 remember to honor the tabroom's coin flip as described on page 21 line 14.

### 23 After Rounds 1 and 3

24  
25  
26 All teams are side-constrained going into Rounds 2 and 4. Accordingly, after the results for  
27 Rounds 1 and 3 are recorded on the team cards, the cards are broken into two separate stacks  
28 before being ranked. One stack consists of all those teams that "Need Plaintiff" in Round 2/4.  
29 The second stack consists of those teams that "Need Defense" in Round 2/4.

30  
31 Each stack should now be ranked independently. In a 32-team tournament, the stack of Needs  
32 Plaintiff teams should be ranked P1 through P16. The stack of Needs Defense teams should be  
33 ranked D1 through D16.

### 34 After Round 2

35  
36  
37 There are no side constraints in Round 3. Thus, teams' ranks are simply recorded as R1, R2, R3,  
38 etc. All of the teams in the tournament are ranked consecutively. So, if there are 32 teams, they  
39 are ranked R1 through R32.

### 40 After Round 4

41  
42  
43 Teams are once again ranked as a large group (from 1 through 32 in our ongoing example).  
44 After Round 4, however, ties are broken using official AMTA tiebreakers (explained on pages  
45 35-39) rather than the results of the aforementioned coin toss.

## 1 **Procedures for Identifying Impermissible Matches**

2  
3 Check each dealt pair of cards for impermissible Previous Meeting and Same School matches.  
4 Impermissible matches must be resolved and their resolution requires changing the pairings from  
5 the way the cards were dealt.

### 6 7 *Previous Meeting*

8  
9 A previous meeting match occurs only when the same two teams have met in a previous round of  
10 the current tournament. For instance, if UCLA 964 met Bellarmine 852 in Round 1, 964 and 852  
11 cannot meet again during that tournament. If 852 were dealt to meet a different UCLA team, that  
12 is not an impermissible previous meeting match.

13  
14 Occasionally, we hear a team say “we, 612, are paired to meet 576 at our qualifier but we, 612,  
15 met 576 previously at the Loras Tri-State Invitational.” That is not an impermissible previous  
16 meeting match.

17  
18 Teams are not allowed to meet each other a second time even if they can swap sides. A rule that  
19 allowed this was adopted in June 2005, but repealed in November 2005.

### 20 21 *Same School*

22  
23 A same school match occurs whenever two teams from the same AMTA institution are dealt to  
24 meet. Same school matches are always impermissible. That impermissibility is not resolved even  
25 if the two teams agree that they would like to meet or are willing to meet.

### 26 27 *Side Constrained*

28  
29 Rounds 2 and 4 are side-constrained. Ranking the two sets of cards (needs P and needs D)  
30 separately should prevent any impermissible side-constrained matches.

31  
32 Assuming that Round 2 is paired correctly, every team will have gone once on each side of the  
33 case going in to Round 3 so there are no side constraints to be concerned with in that round.

34  
35

## 1 **Procedures for Resolving Impermissible Matches**

2  
3 Impermissible matches will be resolved from the top of the pairings to the bottom of the pairings.  
4 The AMTA Board has determined that this procedure produces pairings that are more “pure”  
5 than the old system of going from the bottom up.

6  
7 Before beginning to resolve any impermissible matches, prepare a Pairer’s List to record each  
8 swap that is made in resolving an impermissible match and ensure that, in pairing a given round,  
9 no two cards exchange ranks more than once. The Pairer’s List should indicate all sets of cards  
10 swapped with the lower team number listed first such as:

11 368-840

12 514-608

13  
14 If an anticipated trade already appears on the Pairer’s List, the exchange will not occur as it is an  
15 “impasse.” Without the use of the Pairer’s List, trades can become circular making it impossible  
16 to pair the round.

17  
18 When you are resolving an impermissible match, never swap the ranks of the two teams that are  
19 involved in the impermissible match. You do however make the swap with the next closest team  
20 (not involved in the impermissible match) even when this creates one or more new impermissible  
21 matches. The only exception is that you cannot swap two teams more than once in any round (as  
22 described above).

23  
24 The first step in resolving impermissible matches is to compare the W-T record of each  
25 impermissibly matched team to those teams having the next closest ranks. Generally, this will  
26 involve looking at four additional teams.

27  
28 Example: If R5 is impermissibly matched against R8, R5’s record is compared against R4 and  
29 R6, while R8’s record is compared against R7 and R9.

30  
31 There are only three situations where less than four teams are involved in a comparison. The first  
32 is when a team is at the “edge” of the rankings. Example: R1 is impermissibly matched against  
33 R4. R1 can only be compared against R2. The second situation occurs when the two teams  
34 impermissibly matched have consecutive ranks. Example: R11 is impermissibly matched against  
35 R12. R11 would be compared only to R10 and R12 would be compared only to R13. The third  
36 situation occurs when a team has already “swapped ranks” with another card that is involved in a  
37 comparison. Example: R8 and R9 have already swapped ranks in pairing the current round. If  
38 the “new” R9 is involved in another impermissible match, and the “new” R8 has not yet changed  
39 ranks again, R9 is compared only to R10 because it cannot swap ranks with the same other card  
40 twice.

41  
42 For Rounds 2 and 4, which are side constrained, before pairing the teams are ranked  
43 independently into P1, P2, etc. and D1, D2, etc. In resolving impermissible Round 2 and Round  
44 4 matches, only compare cards to other that need the same side of the case. Example: P3 is  
45 impermissibly matched against D5. P3 is compared against P2 and P4 while D5 is compared to  
46 D4 and D6.

1 The next closest record is a difference of zero, followed by one-half a ballot, a full ballot, etc.  
 2 Remember that two ties are considered one win. If more than one comparison has the closest  
 3 record difference, then you will have to look at additional factors to determine which cards to  
 4 swap.

5  
 6 This step of considering new impermissible matches is just a stage in the process, much like a  
 7 particular step in breaking a tie. Remember, if there are multiple swaps possible, determine  
 8 which of those comparisons has the least difference in Combined Strength. Note that Combined  
 9 Strength is only calculated for Rounds 3 and 4, so you do not use combined strength for  
 10 resolving impermissible matches in Round 2. For Round 2, proceed directly to Point  
 11 Differential. A team's Combined Strength is always a positive number. It is a maximum of 8  
 12 going into Round 3, and a maximum of 18 going into Round 4.

13  
 14 If you are resolving a Round 2 impermissible match or if comparing Combined Strength does not  
 15 provide the next closest match, compare the point differentials of those teams who are still in the  
 16 running for the swap. Note that when comparing point differentials, a card with a differential of  
 17 +8, has the same difference in point differential with cards that have differentials of +4 or +12  
 18 (four points in differential up or down). Be extra careful to consider whether a running point  
 19 differential is positive or negative. When +8 is compared to -4, the PD is 12, not 4.

20  
 21 Where more than one comparison has the closest record difference *and* there are multiple swaps  
 22 that have identical least differences in combined strength *and* point differential, there are special  
 23 rules to determine which card to use in resolving the impermissible match. The pairer must  
 24 choose the trade where the sum of the ranks is the higher number. For instance, if the  
 25 impermissibly tied team is R6 and R5 and R7 compare identically as to both differences with R6,  
 26 R6 must trade with R7. ( $6 + 7 = 13$  is a higher sum than  $6 + 5 = 11$ .)

27  
 28 If, in a side constrained round, the best swap that can be made involves identically ranked teams  
 29 on each side, the swap occurs on the defense side. Example: P12 and D12 are impermissibly  
 30 matched. The teams with the closest records and point differentials to these teams are P13 and  
 31 D13. If the records and point differentials are identically close, the swap occurs between D12  
 32 and D13.

33  
 34 Having determined the team with the "next closest record" you then trade the ranks of the two  
 35 teams (one of which is in the impermissible match) with the "closest record." For instance, when  
 36 P7 and P8 are determined to have the closest record, the original P7 becomes P8 and the original  
 37 P8 becomes P7. Each team's card will have the rank space revised to the new rank (and written  
 38 on its card) and the team cards switch places in the brackets.

39  
 40 Note that making this swap can, and often will create a new impermissible match. You must  
 41 swap the teams with the closest records even if this creates a new problem. The new problem, or  
 42 problems, are resolved, using the same process, from the top down.

43  
 44 To prevent swaps from becoming circular, no two cards can exchange ranks with one another  
 45 during the pairing of a single round. Note that these cards can change ranks with other cards  
 46 during the round, or with each other in a subsequent round.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

If the teams involved in an impermissible match have already swapped with other teams, the options available to resolve the impermissible might be limited, or there may even be only a single option available for moving a team with another team that has the next closest rank.

When comparing teams to swap to resolve an impermissible, the first criteria is *always* next closest rank. So, if a “needs P” team has already been swapped with both teams that have the next closest rank, the swap will necessarily occur on the defense side (unless, of course, it too has already swapped with both teams with which it is consecutively ranked), even if the “needs P” team could swap with another team that is a “closer match” based on record and point differential, but that involves a team that is more than one spot away in “rank.”

It is extremely rare, but it is possible to have a situation where no teams that have the closest rank can be swapped because every team involved has already swapped ranks. (And, as noted, no two teams can swap ranks more than once.) If this occurs, leap over to the next closest ranks and run the same “closest record” comparisons.

Example: If R5 is impermissibly matched against R8, but R5 has already swapped ranks with the specific teams currently ranked R4 and R6 and R8 has already swapped ranks with the teams currently ranked, R7 and R9, R5 would have its record compared to R3 and R7, while R8 would have its record compared to R6 and R10.

Continue resolving impermissible matches, recording each on the Pairer’s List until you believe that no impermissible matches remain. Compare both separate sets of team cards as to the pairings generated. Pairings must be identical before they are posted and the 30-Minute Review period begins.

## 1 **Procedures Regarding Individual Attorney and Witness Awards**

2  
3 Ranks are calculated on the basis of a single side of the case. Thus, the maximum number of  
4 individual award points someone can get is 20 (2 rounds, times 2 judges, times the maximum 5  
5 points from each). Students can earn both an attorney and a witness award during a tournament.  
6 Students who score enough points to win two attorney or two witness awards only receive one  
7 piece of hardware, but it is customary to acknowledge their accomplishment at the awards  
8 ceremony by announcing the number of points earned on each side of the case.

9  
10 The backs of the Pairing Cards are formatted into quadrants: attorney-plaintiff, attorney-defense,  
11 witness-plaintiff, and witness-defense. Be sure to record the individual's name and points earned  
12 in the appropriate quadrant.

13  
14 The person recording the individual award info does not have to be the same person who  
15 recorded team results onto the card. Each set of Pairing Cards should have its individual awards  
16 recorded by a separate person to ensure accuracy. As individual award information is being  
17 recorded onto cards, it is important to develop a system to ensure that each ballot's information  
18 is only recorded onto a given card once.

19  
20 If an extra set of cards is available, individual awards should be recorded on a set of cards that is  
21 not being used for pairings. This allows a third individual to focus solely on individual awards.

22  
23 After a team has completed two rounds on the same side of the case, it is customary to highlight  
24 the names of the students on that side of the case who are in contention for an award. This helps  
25 make it easy to prepare the Individual Award worksheets described on page 33, line 5.

26  
27 Outstanding Attorney Awards and Outstanding Witness Awards are presented to the top ten-  
28 ranked attorneys and witnesses at Regionals and to the top ten ranked attorneys and witnesses at  
29 each Opening Round Championship Site. Ties in qualifier ranks are not broken. Additional  
30 plaques are ordered. Please distribute plaques on hand first to those whose program will not  
31 advance to a later event to save postage. All-American designations are awarded only at the  
32 National Championship Tournament and are guaranteed for any student who secures 18 or more  
33 ranks on one side of the case. Should there not be 10 All-American Attorneys and/or 10 All-  
34 American Witnesses guaranteed designations in a division, the two divisions' tabrooms will  
35 compare to determine whether there are 20 All-American Attorneys and/or 20 All-American  
36 witnesses guaranteed designations in the two divisions combined. If not, all with the next highest  
37 rank or ranks will be added to the list of All-Americans until the 20th ranked attorney/witness  
38 and all others with the same role assignment and ranks are designated All-Americans.

39  
40 In the unlikely event that a round has a single judge or a judge's ballot must be discarded, the  
41 individual award rankings on the single ballot shall be counted double.

**1 Procedures Regarding the Spirit of AMTA Award**

2  
3 At the Round 3 Captains' Meeting, distribute the Team Spirit of AMTA Surveys. These surveys  
4 should already have each team's opponents from Rounds 1-3 recorded on them.

5  
6 Remind team captains that return of the completed survey is required at the Round 4 Captains'  
7 Meeting; captains failing to return surveys will not be dismissed to start their Round 4 trials until  
8 the survey is completed.

9  
10 The moderator of the Round 3 Captains' Meeting should not accept a purportedly completed  
11 survey at or soon after that meeting. The time for all captains to return surveys is the Round 4  
12 Captains' Meeting. Collection is best organized when all surveys from the field are collected at  
13 the same time. We expect our captains to be organized, disciplined and responsible leaders.

14  
15 During Round 4 the tabroom should add the scores each team receives (by looking at the Surveys  
16 from each of the three teams a team faced). The maximum number of points is 30.

17  
18 Should a tie result, consult the order rankings - the team with the best combined ranking wins.  
19 Order rankings are the portion of each Spirit of AMTA Survey where a team ranks its opponents  
20 1-3, from most civil to least civil.

21  
22 Since the best score (3) would be a team ranked first (most civil) by each of the opposing teams,  
23 the lowest combined score wins. For example, a team ranked 1-1-3 (total 5 ) would be better than  
24 a team ranked 2-2-2 (total 6).

25  
26 If this also results in a tie, consult the questions on the survey and determine which teams receive  
27 the most favorable comments (quantitative indicator); if a tie still results, evaluate the quality of  
28 the comments (qualitative indicator.) While this is highly subjective, one team's comments may  
29 be more glowing in the judgment of the person charged with determining the award winner. If  
30 that is the case, the team that received more glowing praise should win.

31  
32 If, in the mind of the outside observer or someone charged by the outside observer to tabulate the  
33 Team Spirit of AMTA Award winner, there is no way to break the tie, it is acceptable to name  
34 more than one award winner. A second plaque will be prepared.

35  
36

1 **Procedures Regarding ByeBuster Teams**  
2

3 Except under extremely rare circumstances, there are no “byes” in AMTA tournaments. When  
4 there are an odd number of teams competing, the AMTA Representatives shall create a  
5 “ByeBuster” team. In Round 1, the ByeBuster team is paired randomly as are the other teams in  
6 the competition.  
7

8 In creating a ByeBuster team, the AMTA Representative shall consider the following criteria in  
9 order of importance in choosing who participates on the team:  
10

- 11 1. Current undergraduates are preferred to alumni or coaches.
- 12 2. Team members who attend the school opposing the ByeBuster team in a given round shall not  
13 compete on the ByeBuster in that round if it can be avoided.
- 14 3. Students who will be competing or who have already competed in another regional  
15 tournament are not to be used when possible.
- 16 4. Team members who can compete for all four rounds are preferred to those who cannot.  
17

18 If a ByeBuster team substantially changes composition from round-to-round it shall be ranked as  
19 a team with a record of “-1” for the purposes of pairing, bracketing, and resolving impermissible  
20 matches. For example, in a 24-team tournament a ByeBuster team that substantially changes  
21 composition will always be ranked either 12<sup>th</sup> (in a side-constrained round) or 24<sup>th</sup>. However, the  
22 actual record of a bye buster team is always used for calculating the CS of its opponents.  
23

24 If a ByeBuster team maintains substantially the same composition during the course of a  
25 tournament, it shall be paired as normal.  
26

27 Whether a ByeBuster team “substantially” changes composition is within the discretion of the  
28 AMTA Rep(s). The Rep shall deem a ByeBuster team to substantially change composition if the  
29 roster changes made to the team significantly alter the competitive strength of the team in the  
30 mind of the AMTA Rep. In all cases where four or more members of the ByeBuster’s roster  
31 change, the team shall be deemed to have substantially changed composition.  
32

33 A ByeBuster team may be involved in a high-low swap.  
34

35 For the purposes of resolving impermissible matches, the ByeBuster’s rank is compared to find  
36 the next closest match before record and point differential are considered.  
37

38 ByeBuster participants may receive individual awards, but a ByeBuster team may not “place,”  
39 earn any team awards, or receive a postseason bid.  
40

41 The team number assigned to ByeBuster teams shall be designated by the Tabulation Director  
42 after full registration has taken place.  
43

1 **Procedures Regarding Forfeits**

2

3 If a team cannot compete in a round for any reason and a ByeBuster team cannot be organized in  
4 a timely fashion, that team's opponent shall be given a one-point win on both ballots. The  
5 individual award points for the victorious team shall be doubled from the other round in which  
6 that team competed on the same side of the case.

7

8 If the team arrives at a tournament after it has missed a round or rounds, it is paired as if it lost  
9 all ballots by a single point prior to its arrival. If a team departs early, the ByeBuster assumes  
10 the record of the departing team and is paired accordingly, regardless of whether or not it  
11 changes composition.

12

13 If a team leaves a tournament early or arrives late and a ByeBuster team is needed for one to  
14 three rounds, the ByeBuster's wins shall be added to the later-arriving or early-departing team's  
15 record solely for the purposes of determining that team's opponents' combined strength and  
16 strength of schedule (as well as for the opponents of the short-lived ByeBuster team).

17

18 For determining team awards and postseason bids, only ballots actually won by the team can  
19 count. The team whose late arrival and/or early departure made the ByeBuster necessary does  
20 not get credit for any wins by the ByeBuster on its own win-loss record.

21

**Pairing Round 1**

Randomly assign teams for side and opponent using any method of randomness including pulling numbers into a preset, shuffling team cards, or other method. Do not intentionally assign all teams from a school to the same side of the case. Not only would such a procedure be “not random” but it would also have a negative impact on the pairings in later rounds.

Note that the random draw should be used to determine the sides that each team will represent in addition to the pairings themselves. There are no coin flips for sides in Rounds 1.

AMTA policies allow an AMTA Representative to pre-determine a team’s Round 1 side only in very limited circumstances. If the AMTA Representative has previously granted a team’s request to perform a specific side in Round 1, if that team is randomly chosen to perform the non-requested side, that team and its opponent shall switch sides. In the extremely unlikely event that two teams have had requests granted to perform the same side and those two teams are randomly paired against one another, that pairing shall be altered as if it were a same-school match as described below.

Teams from the same school may not meet. Should a draw cause a same school match, the second team drawn shall be returned to the pool of team cards and a replacement draw will fill in the pair. Should a same school match occur in the final pairing, swap the last team drawn with the most recently drawn team that will resolve the same school match, without creating a new same school match. Note that this is very different from the pairings method in later rounds. Because this final pairing could impact other recently assigned pairings, teams’ representatives should not be dismissed until all pairings are completed and reviewed to make sure no same school matches exist.

Because pairings for Round 1 generally have to be completed before the assignment of judges (since some judges are affiliated with particular teams and cannot judge them), this should be one of the first steps conducted after registration is closed. Although it is possible to assign teams prior to registration, this is not advisable because pairings would have to be altered if one or more teams failed to arrive for the tournament. If pairings are conducted prior to registration, the time/place of the pairings should be communicated to teams in advance so team representatives can observe the assignments of pairings if they desire.

1 **Tab Room Responsibilities During Round 1:**

2  
3 1. Post the “All-Loss” Time on the door of the tabroom and other readily observable places, like  
4 above water fountains and on bathroom door. That time is three hours after the last panel of  
5 judges for the round arrived at its assigned courtroom.

6  
7 2. Update all of the teams’ Pairing Cards with their side and opponent in Round 1.

8  
9 3. Fill in Round 1 opponent’s numbers on teams’ Spirit of AMTA surveys.

10  
11 4. Verify that at least two separate sets of team cards have been prepared for simultaneous use in  
12 the tabulation and pairing processes.

13  
14 5. Flip a coin to determine whether the higher or lower team number will initially receive the  
15 better rank in circumstances where two teams have identical equivalent records and identical  
16 running point differentials.

17  
18 Example: Tabroom decides that heads is higher and tails are lower. Heads comes up. If teams  
19 981 and 348 are being ranked and each has an equivalent record of 4 and a running differential of  
20 +15, the flip dictates that 981, the higher team number, would receive the better initial rank. R3  
21 is better than R4. P3 is better than P4.

22  
23 If more than two teams are tied for a rank, order their cards by team number and assign ranks as  
24 dictated by the tabroom’s flip. Same example but 981, 348 and 392 are all tied for the same rank,  
25 say R3. With higher team numbers prevailing on the flip, correct ranks would be 981 ranked R3,  
26 392 ranked R4 and 348 ranked R5.

27  
28 Since tab room officials generally do many tournaments during the course of a season, a sign  
29 indicating the results of this tournament’s coin toss should be posted in the tab room, such as  
30 “Higher Number Gets Better Rank”.

31  
32 **Tab Room Responsibilities After Round 1 (but Before Round 2)**

33  
34 1. Check-In Round 1 Ballots as Described on Page 8.

35  
36 2. Tabulate Round 1 Ballots as Described on Pages 9 –10.

37  
38 3. Record Round 1 Results on Teams’ Pairing Cards as Described on Page 11.

39  
40 4. Rank the Teams as Described on Page 11.

41  
42 5. Pair Round 2 as Described on Page 22.

## 1 **Pairing Round 2**

2  
3 The second round is side-constrained. Each team represents the prosecution/plaintiff once and  
4 the defense once during the first two rounds.

5  
6 1. Prepare two stacks of cards, separated based on the side teams need to represent in Round 2.

7  
8 Each team will be a different side of the case than they were in Round 1. Cards should be  
9 ordered with the highest ranked team on the top of each stack. “Ranks” in Round 2 are  
10 determined by a team’s W-L record, and then by its point differential. Count each pile to assure  
11 that they are equal in number.

12  
13 2. Deal out the cards.

14  
15 Beginning with the 2008 – 2009 season, Round 2 and Round 3 at Regional Tournaments and  
16 Opening Round Championship sites will be paired “high/high.” That is the initial pairings will be  
17 laid out simply as they are without “protection”, without creating brackets, and without doing a  
18 “high/low” swap.

19  
20 Assume you have a 10-team tournament, and the teams in each stack are as follows:

<u>Needs Plaintiff:</u>	<u>Needs Defense:</u>
P1 501 2-0	D1 403 2-0
P2 702 2-0	D2 609 2-0
P3 604 2-0	D3 705 1-0-1
P4 518 2-0	D4 723 1-1
P5 602 1-0-1	D5 112 1-1

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 Because of the “High/High” pairing, you can immediately begin to deal out the cards, with the  
30 “Needs Plaintiff” teams laid out on the left side of the table, and the “Needs Defense” teams laid  
31 out on the right side of the table.

32  
33 3. Identify All Impermissible Matches as Described on Page 12.

34  
35 Note that there should be no Side Constrained impermissible matches because the cards were  
36 dealt so that Needs Plaintiff teams had to face Needs Defense Teams.

37  
38 4. Resolve All Impermissible Matches as Described on Page 13-15.

39  
40 All Round 2 trials are side constrained so there are no coin flips in Round 2.

41  
42 Compare the pairings separately generated by the pairers of both sets of team cards. The pairings  
43 must be identical.

44  
45 5. Conduct a 30-Minute Review as described on Pages 6-7.

46

1 **Tab Room Responsibilities During Round 2**

- 2
- 3 1. Post the “All-Loss” Time.
  - 4
  - 5 2. Update all of the teams’ Pairing Cards with their side and opponent in Round 2.
  - 6
  - 7 3. Fill in Round 2 opponent’s numbers on teams’ Spirit of AMTA surveys.
  - 8
  - 9 4. Record Round 1 ranks for attorney and witness awards as described on page 16.
  - 10
  - 11 5. Fill in the Tabulation Summary with Round 1 results.
  - 12
  - 13 6. Split ballots to teams’ result envelopes.
  - 14

15 White commentary ballots go to the plaintiff envelope. Yellow commentary ballots go to the  
16 defense envelope. Each team receives a copy of the blue ballot. Save the top blue ballot as the  
17 tournament’s copy.

18

19 **Tab Room Responsibilities After Round 2 (but Before Round 3)**

- 20
- 21 1. Check-In Round 2 Ballots as described on Page 8.
  - 22
  - 23 2. Tabulate Round 2 Ballots as described on Page 9-10.
  - 24
  - 25 3. Record Round 2 Results on Teams’ Pairing Cards as described on Page 11.
  - 26
  - 27 4. Rank the Teams as described on Page 11.
  - 28
  - 29 5. Pair Round 3 as described on Page 24.
  - 30
  - 31 6. Fill in Round 3 opponents on teams’ Spirit of AMTA surveys.
  - 32
  - 33 7. Conduct a 30 minute review period, as described on Pages 6-7.
  - 34

35 This needs to happen prior to Round 3 because the Survey forms (with all of a team’s first three  
36 opponents’ numbers included) are distributed to teams at the Round 3 Captains’ Meeting.

1 **Pairing Round 3**

2  
3 1. Rank the Teams.

4  
5 In Rounds 3 and 4, teams are ranked first by their W-L record, then by their Combined Strength  
6 (or CS), then by their point differential. Because Round 3 is not side constrained, all teams are  
7 ranked together. In a 24-team tournament, the ranks for Round 3 would be 1-24.

8  
9 A team's CS is the total number of ballots won by all of that team's opponents. The maximum  
10 CS of a team going into Round 3 is 8. To have a CS of 8 going into round 3, each of a team's  
11 two opponents would have won two ballots in each of their two rounds. (Note that this is  
12 somewhat unlikely as it means the team went 0-2 in Round 1 but was paired with a 2-0 team in  
13 Round 2.) The maximum CS for a team that is 4-0 entering Round 3 is four. In that scenario,  
14 both of the team's opponents lost both ballots when they faced the team at issue, but then won  
15 both ballots in their other round. Each opponent would then be 2-2. Two teams times the 2-2  
16 record equals the CS of four.

17  
18 A team's CS generally, though not always, increases after each round. It cannot decrease.

19  
20 2. Deal the Cards

21  
22 Deal the cards so that Rank 1 is at the top of the left side of the bracket, Rank 2 is directly to the  
23 right of Rank 1, so Rank 3 is underneath Rank 1, and so that Rank 4 is underneath Rank 2 and so  
24 forth until all cards are dealt.

25  
26 After dealing the cards, but before resolving impermissible matches, the cards for Round 3, at a  
27 10 -team tournament should look like the illustration below.

28  
29 R1 v. R2  
30 R3 v. R4  
31 R5 v. R6  
32 R7 v. R8  
33 R9 v. R10

34  
35 Note that it is important to deal the cards as described above, rather than any of the other  
36 methods employed in previous years. The manner of dealing could affect which impermissible  
37 matches are resolved first and thus can change the final pairings for a round.

38  
39 3. Identify All Impermissible Matches as Described on Page 12.

40  
41 4. Resolve All Impermissible Matches as Described on Page 13.

42  
43 Because of the second round side constraint, there is no longer a need to resolve "side-  
44 constrained" impermissible matches in Round 3. All teams will have already gone once as P and  
45 once as D.

1 Since Round 2 is once again side constrained, a coin flip will take place according to point 6  
2 below.

3  
4 5. Compare the pairings separately generated by the pairers of both sets of team cards. The  
5 pairings must be identical.

6  
7 6. Before the review period begins and before Captain's Meetings for Round 3, One AMTA  
8 Representative shall flip a coin to determine sides for Round 3. If the result is heads, all teams  
9 on the left side of the pairings shall be plaintiff/prosecution. If the result is tails, all teams on the  
10 left side of the pairings shall be defense.

11  
12 This is a significant change to the previous policy of allowing Captains to flip the coin, at  
13 Captain's Meetings, and select their own side. This change was implemented to decrease the  
14 random element of chance, along with the accompanying strategy coupled with it, that could  
15 greatly advantage one team over another.

16  
17 7. Conduct a 30-Minute Review Period as described on Pages 6-7.  
18

1 **Tab Room Responsibilities During Round 3**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1. Post the “All-Loss” Time.
2. Update all of the teams’ Pairing Cards with their side and opponent in Round 3. The side that each team needs to perform in Round 4 should also be recorded.
3. Record Round 2 ranks for attorney and witness awards as described on page 16.
4. Fill in the Tabulation Summary with Round 2 results.
5. Split ballots to teams’ result envelopes.

**Tab Room Responsibilities After Round 3 (but Before Round 4)**

1. Check-In Round 3 Ballots as described on Page 8.
2. Tabulate Round 3 Ballots as described on Page 9-10.
3. Record Round 3 Results on Teams’ Pairing Cards as described on Page 11.
4. Rank the Teams as described on Page 11.
5. Pair Round 4 as described on Page 27 if at a Regional or Opening Round Championship Site.  
Pair Round 4 as described on Page 32 if at the National Championship Tournament.

## 1 Pairing Round 4 During Regionals and Opening Round Championship Sites

2  
3 1. Prepare two stacks of cards, separated based on the side teams need to represent in Round 4.

4  
5 Cards should be ordered with the highest ranked team on the top of each stack. Remember to  
6 rank the teams using record, then CS as described at the top of page 24, then point differential.  
7 Because the teams are side constrained in Round 4, there are two sets of ranked teams—one set  
8 that needs Plaintiff and one set that Needs Defense.

9  
10 Count each pile to assure that they are equal in number.

11  
12 2. Make a Determination as to who is “In” and who is “Out”.

13  
14 In a change of policy, and beginning in the 2008/2009 season, it was determined that as part of  
15 the change over to the unified national system, we would implement a new Round 4 pairing  
16 system. The reasons for that change are based on the belief that our old system was a hybrid  
17 system, meant to determine both a “Winner” and the next best “group of teams”. While that  
18 system did have that effect, for a good number of years, the rise in parity, coupled with the  
19 change in post season qualifying, make necessary a change to the system that seeks to determine  
20 the “best” group of teams, rather than seeking both goals. Essentially, the teams will ultimately  
21 be divided into a "Fighting for Spots Bracket" and a "Not Fighting for Spots Bracket."

22  
23 In order to determine who is “In” and who is “Out” you must begin by finding out what the  
24 record is of the team in the place that if the tournament ended after the first three rounds, would  
25 carry the last bid, this will be referred to as the “Last Bid Record.” At a regional, this would be  
26 8<sup>th</sup> place, at an Opening Round Championship Site, this would be 6<sup>th</sup> place. You find this record  
27 regardless of point differential or tie breakers. In other words, you are not trying to determine  
28 what team is currently in 6<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> place, rather, you are trying to determine which record would  
29 be the record of the team in that place.

30  
31 Example:

Needs Plaintiff:	Needs Defense:
P1 6-0	D1 6-0
P2 6-0	D2 5-0-1
P3 5-1	D3 4-1-1
P4 4-2	D4 4-2
P5 4-2	D5 3-3
P6 3-2-1	D6 3-3
P7 3-3	D7 2-3-1
P8 2-3-1	D8 2-4
P9 2-4	D9 2 - 4
P10 1-4-1	D10 1-5
P11 1-5	D11 0-6
P12 0-6	D12 0-6

1 If the above scenario took place at an Opening Round Championship Site, the team in 6<sup>th</sup> place  
 2 would have a record of 4-1-1, and if the above took place at a Regional site, the team in 8<sup>th</sup> place  
 3 would have a record of 4-2.

4  
 5 All those teams that have records 2.5 ballots or more greater than the “last bid record” are  
 6 deemed "already in," meaning they are mathematically guaranteed to advance to the next level.  
 7 These teams are removed and placed into Bracket Two.

8  
 9 All those teams that have records 2.5 ballots or fewer than the “last bid record” are deemed  
 10 "already out," meaning they are mathematically eliminated from advancing to the next level.  
 11 These teams are removed and also placed into Bracket Two.

12  
 13 If the Needs Plaintiff and Needs Defense sides of Bracket Two are uneven, additional teams shall  
 14 be added to fill out this bracket, creating even numbers of Needs P and Needs D teams in each of  
 15 the two brackets. The teams that are pulled down from Bracket One and added to Bracket Two  
 16 shall be the lowest ranked teams that are not yet in the bracket. It is possible, but unlikely, that  
 17 the entire field could be contained within a single bracket.

18  
 19 In the above example, you would follow the below procedure, in a 6 bid Tournament:

20		
21	Needs Plaintiff:	Needs Defense:
22	P1 6-0	D1 6-0
23	P2 6-0	D2 5-0-1
24	P3 5-1	D3 4-1-1
25	P4 4-2	D4 4-2
26	P5 4-2	D5 3-3
27	P6 3-2-1	D6 3-3
28	P7 3-3	D7 2-3-1
29	-----	
30	P8 2-3-1	D8 2-4
31	P9 2-4	D9 2 - 4
32	P10 1-4-1	D10 1-5
33	P11 1-5	D11 0-6
34	P12 0-6	D12 0-6

35  
 36 Step two is to identify who is “in” and who is “out.” Since no team is more than two ballots  
 37 better than 4-1-1, which is the record of the 6<sup>th</sup> place team, there is no need to pull teams out of  
 38 the top bracket. Bracket Two would then have an uneven number of teams, as the team ranked at  
 39 D8 is 2-4 which is more than two ballots lower than the 4-1-1 team. As such, you would pull the  
 40 P8 down into Bracket Two. This does not mean that P8 is ineligible to advance into the  
 41 postseason, they are merely pulled down, into Bracket Two.

42  
 43 In the above example, you would follow the below procedure, in an 8 bid Tournament:

44		
45	Needs Plaintiff:	Needs Defense:
46	P1 6-0	D1 6-0

1	P2 6-0	D2 5-0-1
2	P3 5-1	D3 4-1-1
3	P4 4-2	D4 4-2
4	P5 4-2	D5 3-3
5	P6 3-2-1	D6 3-3
6	P7 3-3	D7 2-3-1
7	P8 2-3-1	D8 2-4
8	P9 2-4	D9 2 -4
9	-----	
10	P10 1-4-1	D10 1-5
11	P11 1-5	D11 0-6
12	P12 0-6	D12 0-6

13  
14 Since no team is more than two ballots better than 4-2, which is the record of the 8<sup>th</sup> place team,  
15 there is no need to pull teams out of the top bracket. Bracket Two would also have even number  
16 of teams, so, there is no need to pull down any teams from Bracket One.

17  
18 3. High/Low the two brackets you have created, on the Needs Defense side. When we use the  
19 term "High/Low" we mean that, within the bracket you have created, swap the order of the cards  
20 on the Needs Defense side, so that, the lowest cards appear in order, top down, on the Needs  
21 Defense side. This is, in a way, a power protection, so that, within brackets, the highest ranked  
22 team on a particular side within the bracket will face the lowest ranked team on the opposite side,  
23 within that same bracket.

24  
25 The above example, in an 8-bid tournament, would look like this, after you did the high/low:

26		
27	Needs Plaintiff:	Needs Defense:
28	P1 6-0	D9 2-4
29	P2 6-0	D8 2-4
30	P3 5-1	D7 2-3-1
31	P4 4-2	D6 3-3
32	P5 4-2	D5 3-3
33	P6 3-2-1	D4 4-2
34	P7 3-3	D3 4-1-1
35	P8 2-3-1	D2 5-0-1
36	P9 2-4	D1 6-0
37	-----	
38	P10 1-4-1	D12 0-6
39	P11 1-5	D11 0-6
40	P12 0-6	D10 1-5

41  
42 4. Identify All Impermissible Matches as Described on Page 12.

43  
44 Note that there should be no Side Constrained impermissible matches because the cards were  
45 dealt so that Needs Plaintiff teams had to face Needs Defense Teams.

46

1 Teams are not allowed to face an opponent twice in the same tournament. A rule that allowed  
2 this was adopted in June 2005, but repealed in November 2005.

3  
4 5. Resolve All Impermissible Matches as Described on Page 13, with the below caveat.

5  
6 "In resolving impermissible matches in Round 4, at regionals and opening round championship  
7 sites, it is necessary to not invade bracket one, when resolving impermissible matches in bracket  
8 two, and vice versa. This is because, under the new system of bracketing round 4 we are placing  
9 a higher value on maintaining the bracket, than we have in the past.

10  
11 As such, in resolving the impermissible match, closest rank comes first, however, if the closest  
12 rank is in a different bracket, that particular closest rank is ignored.

13  
14 In the event that an impermissible match cannot be resolved, without invading the other bracket,  
15 then reset all the cards, as if no second bracket was created, then, high – low that entire one  
16 bracket.

17  
18 When resolving impermissible matches for Round 4 at Regionals and opening round  
19 championship sites, begin with Bracket Two, rather than Bracket One. This is because it should  
20 be the smaller of the two brackets. You do not want to resolve all impermissibles in Bracket  
21 One, only to find that it is impossible to resolve impermissibles in Bracket Two, which would  
22 then require your to reset all the cards. It is theoretically possible, but extremely unlikely, that  
23 impermissibles within Bracket One would not be able to be resolved without invading Bracket  
24 Two.

25  
26 Note that all trials in Round 4 are side constrained so there are no coin flips before Round 4.

27  
28 Compare the pairings separately generated by the pairers of both sets of team cards. The pairings  
29 must be identical.

30  
31 6. Conduct a 30-Minute Review as Described on Pages 6-7.

32  
33 7. Remind the Tab Room Representatives that Team Captains must bring a completed Team  
34 Spirit of AMTA survey to the Round 4 Captains' Meeting.

35  
36 Further Example of the new procedure:

37  
38 In the below scenario, we are working with a 6 bid Tournament:

39		
40	Needs Plaintiff:	Needs Defense:
41	P1 6-0	D1 6-0
42	P2 6-0	
43	-----	
44		D2 5-0-1
45	P3 5-1	D3 3-3
46	P4 3-2-1	D4 3-3

1	P5 3-3	D5 3-3
2	P6 3-3	D6 3-3
3	P7 3-3	D7 2-3-1
4	P8 2-3-1	D8 2-3-1
5	P9 2-4	D9 2 - 4
6	P10 1-4-1	
7	-----	
8		D10 1-5
9	P11 1-5	D11 0-6
10	P12 0-6	D12 0-6

11  
12 Step one is to determine what the last bid record is, which in this case is 3-2-1.

13  
14 Step two is to identify who is “in” and who is “out.” Three teams are more than two ballots  
15 better than 3-2-1, which is the record of the “last bid record,” as such; you would pull all three of  
16 those teams out of Bracket One and put them into Bracket Two.

17  
18 There are five teams that would get pulled out of the bottom, as there are 5 teams that have a  
19 record greater than two ballots from the 6<sup>th</sup> place record, as such, they would also be placed into  
20 Bracket Two.

21  
22 As such, Bracket One would look like:

23		
24	Needs Plaintiff:	Needs Defense:
25	P3 5-1	D2 5-0-1
26	P4 3-2-1	D3 3-3
27	P5 3-3	D4 3-3
28	P6 3-3	D5 3-3
29	P7 3-3	D6 3-3
30	P8 2-3-1	D7 2-3-1
31	P9 2-4	D8 2-3-1
32	P10 1-4-1	D9 2 - 4

33  
34 Bracket Two would look like:

35		
36		
37	P1 6-0	D1 6-0
38	P2 6-0	D10 1-5
39	P11 1-5	D11 0-6
40	P12 0-6	D12 0-6

41  
42  
43 You would then High/Low the two brackets you have created, on the Needs Defense side, and  
44 continue on.

45  
46 It looks and seems odd that you are putting 6-0’s in a bracket with 0-6’s, however, the goal at

1 this point is to determine, in the middle of the bracket, who is competing for those 'final' 3 slots.  
2 That is because, since all three 6-0's cannot possibly drop below 6<sup>th</sup> place, they have 'locked' up  
3 three slots.

4  
5  
6

1 **Pairing Round 4 at the National Championship Tournament.**

2  
3 1. Prepare two stacks of cards, separated based on the side teams need to represent in Round 4.

4  
5 Each team will be a different side of the case than they were in Round 3. Cards should be  
6 ordered with the highest ranked team on the top of each stack. “Ranks” in Round 4 are  
7 determined by a team’s W-L record, and then by CS, then by its point differential, as described at  
8 the top of page 24. Count each pile to assure that they are equal in number.

9  
10 2. Deal out the cards.

11  
12 Beginning in the 2008-2009 season, Round 4 at the National Championship Tournament is  
13 paired “High/High,” with no bracketing. That is the initial pairings will be laid out simply as they  
14 are without “protection”, without creating brackets, and without doing a “high/low” swap.

15  
16 Assume you have a 10-team tournament, and the teams in each stack are as follows:

<u>Needs Plaintiff:</u>	<u>Needs Defense:</u>
P1 501 5-1	D1 403 6-0
P2 702 5-1	D2 609 5-0-1
P3 604 4-1-1	D3 705 5-1
P4 518 4-2	D4 723 4-2
P5 602 4-2	D5 112 4-2

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Because of the “High/High” pairing, you can immediately begin to deal out the cards, with the  
25 “needs prosecution” teams laid out on the left side of the table, and the “Needs Defense” teams  
26 laid out on the right side of the table.

27  
28  
29 3. Identify All Impermissible Matches as Described on Page 12.

30  
31 Note that there should be no Side Constrained impermissible matches because the cards were  
32 dealt so that Needs Plaintiff teams had to face Needs Defense Teams.

33  
34 6. Resolve All Impermissible Matches as Described on Page 13.

35  
36 All Round 4 trials are side constrained so there are no coin flips in Round 4.

37  
38 Compare the pairings separately generated by the pairers of both sets of team cards. The pairings  
39 must be identical.

40  
41 7. Conduct a 30-Minute Review as Described at Pages 6-7.

1 **Tab Room Responsibilities During Round 4**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

During Round 4: Repeat all steps described in “During Round 3” at page 26 plus:

1. Prepare an “Outstanding Attorneys Worksheet.”

This is nothing more than a list that says “half of the attorney candidates have completed their two trials on one side and these are the top rated individuals thus far.” This list should include the top ten ranked attorneys and any students tied for tenth place. This list helps determine how many points will be necessary to receive an individual award and thus which students need to have their ranks recorded after Round 4.

2. Prepare “Outstanding Witnesses Worksheet,” precisely as you created an “Outstanding Attorneys Worksheet”.

3. Prepare a “Tiebreaker Worksheet” on a sheet of legal pad:

At the far left edge of the page, list in numerical order the team numbers of all of the teams in the field.

Immediately to the right of the team numbers, record a column with the team’s W-T record after Round 3.

As Round 4 ballots are tabulated, you will create a third column to the immediate right of the second column adding in the W-T results of Round 4. As Round 4 progresses, this worksheet is a ready reference for ballots not received and for ties that will need to be broken. With the three columns easily fitting in the left margin, you have the rest of the page to calculate the tiebreakers.

4. Tabulate the Team Spirit of AMTA Award winner as Described on Page 17.

5. Fill in the Tabulation Summary with Round 3 Results.

1 **Tab Room Responsibilities After Round 4**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1. Check-In Round 4 Ballots as described on Page 8.
2. Tabulate Round 4 Ballots as described on Pages 9-10.
3. Record Round 4 Results on Teams' Pairing Cards as described on Page 11.
4. Rank the Teams Using the AMTA Tiebreakers Described on Page 35 and imposing any applicable penalties, such as the All Loss penalty as described on Page 8.
5. Determine Which Teams Receive Trophies and/or Receive Bids to the Postseason
6. Fill in Tab Summary with Round 4 results.
7. Determine the Individual Awards Winners as described on Page 16.
8. Add the Results of Steps 5 and 6 to the Official Tab Summary
9. Make Copies of the Tab Summary for Teams' Results Envelopes
10. Split Round 4 ballots and distribute to ballot packets.

## AMTA Tiebreaking Procedures

After four rounds of competition, all teams are ranked by their Win-Loss Record. The tiebreaking procedures come into play if and only if two or more teams have identical records. Break only ties that matter. There's no need to break every tie in the field

As of the 2002-2003 Season, there is a special rule for tiebreaking: where two, and only two, teams are tied and those teams have met in trial in this tournament, a team awarded either a superior (W-W) or a majority (W-T) decision in that trial wins the tiebreaker regardless of the result of the Strength of Opponent Tiebreaker. Note that this rule is only in play when two and only two teams had identical records. It is not used in cases where more than two teams had identical records but only two remain tied after a particular stage of the tiebreaker.

As of the 2005-2006 Season the order of the first two tiebreakers was swapped.

Additionally, specific tiebreakers were adopted for "championship rounds" at postseason tournaments where two teams, generally from two different divisions, face off in a fifth round of competition to determine the tournament champion. These procedures appear at the end of this section.

### AMTA Tiebreakers in Order of Priority

1. Combined Strength (higher is better... the best possible CS is 32)
2. Strength of Opposition (lower number is better... the best possible SOO is 2)
3. Total point differential (a.k.a. margin of victory)
4. Total point differential after dropping each team's most and least favorable ballot differentials.
5. Total point differential after dropping each team's two most and two least favorable ballot differentials.
6. Total point differential after dropping each team's three most and three least favorable ballot differentials.
7. Total raw points earned. (140 points x 8 ballots = 1120 points maximum.)
8. Total raw points after dropping each team's highest and lowest raw point ballots.
9. Total raw points after dropping each team's two highest and two lowest raw point ballots.
10. Total raw points after dropping each team's three highest and three lowest raw point ballots.
11. Flip of a United States coin.

### *Determining a Team's Combined Strength*

For each team involved in the tiebreaker, make a list of that team's four opponents. Next to each of those opponents, list the number of ballots won by that team. Add these four numbers to determine the total number of ballots won by a team's opponents, a.k.a its "combined strength."

Example:	<u>Team 509</u>	
	Opponents	Record
	519	8 ballots won (8-0)
	323	1 (1-7)
	414	4 (4-4)

1	<u>778</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>(5-2-1)</u>
2	Total:	18.5	

3  
4 Note that while the term “combined strength” represents the same thing as in years past, the  
5 number that represents a team’s CS will now be lower. The old method doubled the record of  
6 each opponent (because there are two ballots per round). The results of calculating CS should be  
7 exactly the same under both systems. If a team has a larger CS number it is more likely to prevail  
8 in the tiebreaker.

9  
10 *Determining a Team’s Strength of Opposition*

11  
12 1. Make a T-chart for each team involved in the Tiebreaker.

13  
14 For each team that has the identical record of ballots won (meaning all of those teams that you  
15 calculated CS for, not just those that remain tied), make a large capital T on the tiebreaker  
16 worksheet. On the horizontal of the T write the tied team’s team number. Note that a team that  
17 had a CS that was not tied with other teams cannot have its ranking changed through SOO.  
18 However, it must be included in this step to get an accurate SOO for those teams that did have a  
19 tied CS.

20  
21 For the first team in the tie, grab its team card. To the left of the vertical of the T, record all of  
22 the team numbers of the teams the instant team has faced. Record each opponents team number  
23 twice, indicating that there were two scoring ballots for each round. [See illustration at page 40.]  
24 A list of the instant team’s opponents can be quickly obtained from the instant team’s Pairing  
25 Card.

26  
27 Next to each opponent’s team number, record that team’s overall # of ballots won.

28  
29 There are six different ways this number can be recorded depending on the results of the team’s  
30 round against the instant team (which is the team you are constructing the T-chart for).

31  
32 Assume for the illustrations below that the opponent in Round 1 (“101”) had a record of 5-3-0.

33  
34 1. Instant team (“456”) won a superior (W-W) decision over 101.

35  
36 Record the opponent’s # of ballots won two times on the left side of the T-Chart.

37

38	<u>456</u>
39	101 5
40	101 5
41	202
42	202
43	303
44	303
45	404
46	404

47

1 2. Instant team won a majority (W-T) decision.

2

3 Record the opponent's # of ballots won one time on the left side of the T-Chart.

4

5 Then, divide the opponent's number of ballots won by 2 and write this number on both  
6 the left and the right side of the chart

7

8 
$$\begin{array}{r} \underline{\hspace{1cm}456\hspace{1cm}} \\ 101 \quad 5 \end{array}$$

9

10 
$$\begin{array}{r} 101 \quad 2.5 \quad 2.5 \end{array}$$

11

12 3. Instant team had a split (W-L) decision.

13

14 Record the opponent's # of ballots won one time on the left side and one time on the right  
15 side of the T-Chart.

16

17 
$$\begin{array}{r} \underline{\hspace{1cm}456\hspace{1cm}} \\ 101 \quad 5 \end{array}$$

18

19 
$$\begin{array}{r} 101 \quad \quad 5 \end{array}$$

20

21 4. Instant team tied both ballots

22

23 Record the opponent's # of ballots won one time on the left and one time on the right of  
24 the chart. (This is equal to a split W-L ballot as each tie is considered a  $\frac{1}{2}$  W and a  $\frac{1}{2}$  L.)

25

26 
$$\begin{array}{r} \underline{\hspace{1cm}456\hspace{1cm}} \\ 101 \quad 5 \end{array}$$

27

28 
$$\begin{array}{r} 101 \quad \quad 5 \end{array}$$

29

30 5. Instant team lost a majority decision (T-L).

31

32 Record the opponent's # of ballots won one time on the right side of the T-Chart.

33

34 Then, divide the opponent's number of ballots won by 2 and write this number on both  
35 the left and the right side of the chart

36

37 
$$\begin{array}{r} \underline{\hspace{1cm}456\hspace{1cm}} \\ 101 \quad \quad 5 \end{array}$$

38

39 
$$\begin{array}{r} 101 \quad 2.5 \quad 2.5 \end{array}$$

40

41 6. Instant team lost a superior (L-L) decision.

42

43 Record the opponent's # of ballots won two times on the right side of the T-Chart.

44

45 Repeat the above steps for all four rounds for all teams involved in the tie.

46

1 2. Calculate the Strength of Win and Strength of Loss for Each Team.

2  
3 Add for each team involved in the tie the numbers to the left of its vertical. This is the “strength  
4 of win” total.

5  
6 Add for each team involved in the tie the numbers to the right of its vertical. This is the “strength  
7 of loss” total.

8  
9 3. Rank the Strength of Win and Strength of Loss for Each Team.

10  
11 Rank 1 goes to the team with the highest total SOW number. Rank 2 the next highest, etc. If the  
12 “strength of wins” total for two or more teams in our tie are the same, their “strength of win”  
13 rank reflects that tie. For instance, if there are two teams in the tiebreaker with “strength of win”  
14 totals of 34 and those are the two high totals for the teams in the tie, each team with 34 total  
15 receives a rank of “R1.5.” If three teams in the tie all share the top “strength of wins,” each is  
16 ranked “R2,” the average of R1, R2 and R3. Calculate the SOL rankings the same way.

17  
18 4. Add the Strength of Win and Strength of Loss for Each Team.

19  
20 The resulting number is a team’s Strength of Opposition or SOO. A lower number is better.  
21 An “SOO 2” is optimal reflecting a team with both the best “strength of win” and the best  
22 “strength of loss.” The “SOO” also dictates orders of finish for all others within our tie. The  
23 second lowest SOO has earned the next place in the order of finish. If teams have identical  
24 SOOs, proceed to the next tiebreaker.

25  
26 The total of the combined numbers in a team’s SOW and SOL columns should always be exactly  
27 double its CS total which was calculated as the first tiebreaker.

28  
29 It is rare indeed to have a tie not broken by “CS” and “SOO” but it has happened. If it does,  
30 proceed down the list of tiebreakers contained on page 35, line 21.

31  
32 *Tiebreaking in “Championship Rounds”*

33  
34 The winner of a championship round in a postseason tournament is the team that wins the most  
35 ballots being scored. If all ballots are tied or if each team wins the same number of ballots, the  
36 team that has the better margin of victory in the championship round shall be declared the  
37 winner.

38  
39 If the tie is still not broken and the presiding judge did not score the round, the presiding judge  
40 shall answer the question, “What team put on the better performance,” with the team picked  
41 being declared the champion.

42  
43 If the presiding judge has already scored a ballot that was counted or if the judge refuses to break  
44 the tie, the team that won more ballots in the tournament’s initial four rounds shall be the winner.

1 If the tie is still not broken, each team’s highest and lowest total team scores (the team’s total  
2 points on the ballot added together) in the championship round shall be discarded and each  
3 team’s total points earned shall be added with the team that scored the most points being  
4 declared the champion. If the tie is still not broken, each team’s second highest and second  
5 lowest team scores in the championship round will be discarded with the team that scored the  
6 most points being declared the champion.

7  
8 If none of these procedures breaks the tie, co-champions will be declared.

9  
10  
11 *Final Thoughts from Re: Tiebreaking*

12  
13 The first rule of the tabroom is “RELAX!!!” There are no time limits. Accuracy is more  
14 important than speed.

15  
16 It pays to study the task before it is performed.

17  
18 Do not be concerned if the tiebreaking procedures are difficult to understand at first. They are  
19 much easier to grasp when a seasoned tabulator can walk you through the process.

20  
21 For more insight, review the tiebreaker illustration and examples on the following page.

22

### Tiebreaker Illustration & Examples

<u>Team No.</u>	<u>Record After Rd. 3</u>	<u>Rd. 4 Ballots Won</u>	<u>Total Record After 4 Rounds</u>
416	1	1	2
417	0	0	0
456	4	2	6
457	2+	2	4+
468	2	1	3
496	4	0	4
497	3	0	3
498	2	0	2
524	6	0	6
525	4	2	6
708	6	2	8
709	1	2	3
776	4	2	6
777	2	0	2
778	4	0	4
924	4	0	4
925	3	2	5
926	2	2	4
980	2	2	4
981	3+	0	3+

The first two columns of this worksheet were created during Round 4. As Round 4 was tabulated, the ballots won by each team in Round 4 were added to the sheet and each team's total record was compiled.

Team 708 won this tournament with a record of 8-0. There was a four-way tie for second place with the teams of 456, 524, 525, and 776 each with records of 6-2. To break this tie, a T-chart for each team was created.

<u>456</u>		<u>525</u>		<u>524</u>		<u>776</u>	
776	6	709	3	708	8	456	6
708	8	777	2	980	4	925	5
525	6	456	6	926	4	926	4
496	4	924	4	494	4	981	3+
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
24		15		20		18+	

The top number on each chart represents the team involved in the tiebreaker. The numbers on the left represent each opponent. The smaller numbers (which can range from 0 to 8) represent the number of ballots won by each team. The totals at the bottom each chart represent that team's CS—the first tiebreaker.

In this example, Team 456 (with CS of 24) wins the tiebreaker, followed by 524, 776, and 525.

If CS completely breaks the tie there is no need to continue on. If, however, there are two or more teams in a tiebreaker that have the same CS, you must calculate the Strength of Opposition (SOO) for each of those teams.

If the 4 teams in our example above had the same CS (which was not the case) the method of calculating SOO would proceed as described below.

Create new T-Charts for each team involved in the tiebreak, but this time list each opponent twice on the leftmost column. The number for each opponent is listed twice to reflect the fact that there were two judges' ballots for each round.

_____456_____	_____525_____	_____524_____	_____776_____
776 6	709 3	708 8	456 6
776 6	709 3	708 8	456 6
708 8	777 2	980 4	925 5
708 8	777 2	980 4	925 5
525 6	456 6	926 4	926 4
525 6	456 6	926 4	926 4
496 4	924 4	494 4	981 3+
496 4	924 4	494 4	981 3+

Note that the "+" symbol in this example represents a ½ ballot. Some tabulators use the plus symbol rather than ".5" because the latter can sometimes be confused with a "5".

Once the results of each round are recorded on the T-charts (using a team's pairing card to determine its opponents and the Tiebreaker Worksheet to determine each opponent's final record) then each team's Strength of Win (SOW) and Strength of Loss (SOL) are calculated by adding the numbers on each side of each team's T-chart.

_____456_____	_____525_____	_____524_____	_____776_____
776 6	709 3	708 8	456 6
776 6	709 3	708 8	456 6
708 8	777 2	980 4	925 5
708 8	777 2	980 4	925 5
525 6	456 6	926 4	926 4
525 6	456 6	926 4	926 4
496 4	924 4	494 4	981 3+
496 4	924 4	494 4	981 3+
SOW: 32 SOL: 16	SOW: 18 SOL: 12	SOW: 24 SOL: 16	SOW: 25 SOL: 12

Each team's SOW and SOL is then compared to determine the ranking of each team's SOW (recorded as WR) and SOL (recorded as LR).

This part is somewhat tricky. Although higher numbers are better for SOW and SOL (and Combined Strength for that matter) a team's chance in the tiebreaker are better if its WR and LR are lower.

<u>456</u>		<u>525</u>		<u>524</u>		<u>776</u>	
776	6	709	3	708	8	456	6
776	6	709	3	708	8	456	6
708	8	777	2	980	4	925	5
708	8	777	2	980	4	925	5
525	6	456	6	926	4	926	4
525	6	456	6	926	4	926	4
496	4	924	4	494	4	981	3+
496	4	924	4	494	4	981	3+
SOW: 32 SOL: 16		SOW: 18 SOL: 12		SOW: 24 SOL: 16		SOW: 25 SOL: 12	
WR: 1 LR: 1.5		WR: 4 LR: 3.5		WR: 3 LR: 1.5		WR: 2 LR: 3.5	

The WR and LR totals are then added to determine each team's Strength of Opposition (SOO).

<u>456</u>		<u>525</u>		<u>524</u>		<u>776</u>	
776	6	709	3	708	8	456	6
776	6	709	3	708	8	456	6
708	8	777	2	980	4	925	5
708	8	777	2	980	4	925	5
525	6	456	6	926	4	926	4
525	6	456	6	926	4	926	4
496	4	924	4	494	4	981	3+
496	4	924	4	494	4	981	3+
SOW: 32 SOL: 16		SOW: 18 SOL: 12		SOW: 24 SOL: 16		SOW: 25 SOL: 12	
WR: 1 LR: 1.5		WR: 4 LR: 3.5		WR: 3 LR: 1.5		WR: 2 LR: 3.5	
SOO: 2.5		SOO: 7.5		SOO: 4.5		SOO: 5.5	

This was a 6-2 tie where Team 456 met and defeated two of the additional tied teams. The special tiebreaker rule did not apply because there were more than two teams in tiebreaker. Suppose that only 456 and 776 were tied at 6-2 but with the same data. The tabulator would save time by declaring 456 the winner without producing the data.

Additionally, in this example, SOO, the second tiebreaker successfully determined the rank of all four teams in the tiebreaker. The highest rank went to 456 (SOO=2.5), then 524 (SOO=4.5), 776 (SOO=5.5) and 525 (SOO=7.5).

The example happens to show a worksheet where every decision was a superior (W-W) decision. Suppose instead that 525 split decisions (W-L) in two trials. Then its T-chart would look like:

525	
709	3
709	3
456	6
456	6
777	2
777	2
924	4
924	4

SOW: 20 SOL: 10

The most confusion occurs when the team you are making a T-chart for tied against a team that also tied against another team during the tournament and ended up with a “half” in its record. Here’s how it looks when 457 had a (W-T) against 981 which went 3-4-1 in the tournament:

457	
981	3+
981	(3+/2) (3+/2)
708	8
708	8
925	5
925	5
778	4
778	4

3+/2 is equal to 1.75 ballots.

Thus the SOW for 457 is 18.25 and the SOL is 22.75.

Under the new definition of CS, a team’s CS should always be equal to one-half of the combined total of SOW and SOL. Here, 457’s CS is 20.5.

## **Frequently Asked Questions About Tabbing and Pairing**

### **How can I learn AMTA's procedures?**

Using any tabulation summary, procedures can be reconstructed. With Round 1 results, one can reconstruct brackets for Round 2 and pair that round. Any difference in reconstructed pairing and the pairing used likely reflects that cards as dealt included an impermissible match. Of course, one learning through reconstruction must be sure that the tab summary used was governed by the same procedures.

### **Why did the Board go back to having a Round 2 side constraint?**

Because the case is not always evenly balanced it is beneficial to have each team compete once on each side in the first half of the competition and once in the second half, rather than possibly going the same side in Round 1 and Round 2. Additionally, the side constraint also provides some certainty in that teams immediately know which side they represent in Round 2 and can dress accordingly, prepare that side's exhibits, etc.

### **Aren't there tournaments that have eliminated the two-of-each-side rule?**

Yes, but those were invitational tournaments. With fair advanced warning, invitational hosts can experiment. The Step-by-Step Guidelines govern AMTA's qualifiers and national events where the objective is consistency in procedures between tabrooms.

### **Where there are three or four teams from the same program in a field, doesn't it make sense to assign them to the same side in Round 1?**

The practice of same-siding for Round 1 has seemed to be popular at some invitational tournaments, but AMTA's rule has always been random pairing for teams and sides in Round 1. There's nothing random about assigning all four teams from a program to one side. Might it happen in a random draw? Sure! But it is not an objective or achievement one should seek.

### **If I've resolved impermissible matches for many - or at least several - tournaments, why should I use that Pairer's List?**

The overwhelming majority of rounds will pose little challenge in resolving impermissible matches. We can go an entire long season without coming upon the occasional truly difficult configuration to resolve. The truly difficult ones are tough to identify until you're in the midst of them and then it seems too late to create the Pairer's List you wish you had.

The Pairer's List is such an easy device to create from the outset and such an efficient tool to develop that it makes sense to protect a tournament schedule from the outset. We've seen rounds requiring more than 30 trades in rank. No one can remember accurately that number of trades and any error by trading two teams twice means you undo what you've just done. One really doesn't appreciate a nightmare until the nightmare is experienced!

**Since using two separate sets of team cards doubles the work, is the increase in accuracy worth the double effort required?**

We have seen substantial increases in accuracy with the introduction of use of two separate sets of team cards. In turn, reports of material errors have drastically declined. The same is true for our policy of double - and sometimes triple - checking the calculation of scores or point differential. Every tabroom experiences at least a dozen episodes of talented tabulators reaching different totals or differentials on the same ballots.

The value of separate sets of team cards might best be appreciated by thinking about what we really do in tabrooms. Our job is to repeat and repeat and repeat the same tasks. Our job is often conducted with the pressure to meet a demanding tournament schedule. The best tabulators are those who are comfortable repeating the tedious. Some seem to place value in their completing the task before others do. This “in-a-race” mentality might well stem from the fact that most in tabrooms these days are competitive folks by nature.

What’s terrific these days is that tabrooms seem to gather increasing numbers of staff. There’s little for those numbers to do productively when only one set of cards is employed. So, in a real sense, we buy increased accuracy by using the volunteers who arrived to serve. Of course, nothing says that only two sets can be used. We’re seeing tabrooms where a less experienced pairer adds a third set and practices the procedures. That just promises that more are prepared to serve AMTA’s ever-growing numbers.