

Pedoman
**National University
Debating Championship**
Tahun 2021



PEDOMAN
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY DEBATING CHAMPIONSHIP
TAHUN 2021

Diterbitkan oleh:

Pusat Prestasi Nasional
Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan
Kompleks Kemendikbud Gedung C Lantai 19, Senayan, Jakarta

Pengarah:

Asep Sukmayadi, M.Si.
Muslih, S.Sos, M.Si.
Rizal Alfian, S.Kom., M.A.

Tim Penyusun:

Rachmat Nurcahyo, S.S., M.A.
Dora Angelina Aruan, S.Pd., M.Hum.
I Nyoman Rajin Aryana, S.Pd., M.Hum.

Tim Kontributor:

Staf Pokja Dikti Puspresnas

Penyunting:

Farah Fitriana
Luthfia Amalia Dewi

Desain Sampul:

Bagas Aditya

Tata Letak:

Sidik Mulyana

Cetakan pertama, April 2021
©2021 Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan
Hak cipta dilindungi Undang-Undang.

KATA PENGANTAR

Kompetisi debat berbahasa Inggris menjadi bagian penting dari pengembangan kompetensi mahasiswa di era global. Kegiatan ini menuntut pemahaman terhadap isu-isu terkini, kemampuan mengolah informasi, kemampuan berkomunikasi efektif dengan bahasa Inggris dan kemampuan berargumentasi. Kemampuan-kemampuan tersebut dibutuhkan mahasiswa untuk membuat keputusan berdasarkan analisis yang rasional dan berterima, dan berinteraksi dengan masyarakat internasional.

Menyadari pentingnya kompetisi debat bagi peningkatan kualitas lulusan dan pendidikan tinggi, Pusat Prestasi Nasional, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan mengembangkan kegiatan melalui kegiatan *National University Debating Championship* (NUDC) sejak tahun 2008. Kegiatan tahunan ini telah menjadi ajang positif bagi mahasiswa se-Indonesia untuk menunjukkan kemampuan terbaiknya dalam berpikir kritis dan berkomunikasi dalam bahasa Inggris, meningkatkan kepercayaan diri, mengembangkan jejaring antar perguruan tinggi, dan memupuk rasa kesatuan dan kebanggaan terhadap kebinekaan bangsa dan budaya.

Pedoman ini disusun agar penyelenggaraan NUDC di tingkat perguruan tinggi, tingkat wilayah maupun di tingkat nasional dapat terlaksana dengan baik.

Kepada semua pihak yang membantu tersusunnya pedoman umum ini kami mengucapkan terima kasih.

Jakarta, April 2021

plt. Kepala Pusat Prestasi Nasional



Asep Sukmayadi

NIP 197206062006041001

DAFTAR ISI

KATA PENGANTAR.....	iii
DAFTAR ISI.....	iv
BAB I PENDAHULUAN.....	1
A. Latar Belakang.....	1
B. Tujuan.....	1
C. Sasaran.....	2
D. Pengertian.....	2
BAB II SISTEM LOMBA.....	3
A. Tahapan Lomba.....	3
B. Tingkat Nasional secara Daring.....	5
C. Kategorisasi NUDC Nasional.....	6
D. Format <i>British Parliamentary</i>	7
BAB III PENDAFTARAN PESERTA.....	9
A. Syarat Peserta.....	9
B. Proses Pendaftaran.....	9
BAB IV JURI/ADJUDICATOR.....	10
A. Dewan Juri.....	10
B. Akreditasi dan Alokasi Juri.....	10
C. Mekanisme Penilaian.....	11
BAB V SUSUNAN ACARA DAN JADWAL KEGIATAN.....	12
A. Acara dalam NUDC Tingkat Nasional.....	12
B. Jadwal Kegiatan.....	12
BAB VI PENGHARGAAN.....	14
BAB VII PENUTUP.....	15
LAMPIRAN LAMPIRAN	
Lampiran 1 - <i>British Parliamentary System Adapted From WUDC</i>	16
Lampiran 2 - Pedoman <i>Scoring</i> NUDC (Didasarkan pada Pedoman Debat WUDC 2019)..	25
Lampiran 3 - <i>Novice Rule National University Debating Championship 2021</i>	26

BAB I

PENDAHULUAN

A. Latar Belakang

Dalam konsep kampus merdeka, pendidikan tinggi pada dasarnya tidak hanya menyediakan tenaga kerja tapi juga menciptakan calon intelektual yang mampu berpikir jernih, kritis dan mendasar untuk pengembangan ilmu. Perguruan Tinggi sudah selayaknya memberikan peran nyata ke masyarakat. Mahasiswa mendapat amanah untuk selalu mengembangkan potensi dirinya. Kemerdekaan belajar mahasiswa menjadi inti dari pengembangan kualitas perguruan tinggi. Mahasiswa yang merdeka dalam belajar diharapkan mampu menyumbangkan keahlian mereka bagi masyarakat. Kegiatan kemahasiswaan berperan besar dalam mewujudkan kampus merdeka.

Dengan demikian, pembinaan kegiatan mahasiswa diarahkan pada berkembangnya potensi mahasiswa agar menjadi manusia yang beriman dan bertakwa, berakhlak mulia, berilmu, cakap, kreatif, terampil, kompeten dan berbudaya. Salah satu usaha pembinaan tersebut adalah melalui kompetisi debat, yang telah dirumuskan dalam *National University Debating Championship (NUDC)*.

NUDC tahun 2021 mempertemukan 112 tim terbaik se-Indonesia. Dengan menggunakan format debat parlemen, NUDC menuntut mahasiswa tidak hanya mampu mengungkapkan ide dalam bahasa Inggris, tetapi juga mampu menguasai pengetahuan global, menganalisis, membuat *judgement*, dan meyakinkan publik.

Di dalam debat, mahasiswa akan dihadapkan pada persoalan-persoalan nyata yang dialami suatu masyarakat atau bangsa. Mahasiswa harus mampu berposisi dan meyakinkan publik bahwa posisi mereka benar dan tepat. Oleh karena itu, debat merupakan media yang tepat dalam melatih kemampuan negosiasi dan argumentasi mahasiswa dalam skala internasional.

Institusi pendidikan di Indonesia sudah selayaknya melaksanakan kompetisi debat antar mahasiswa dalam rangka internalisasi semangat kompetisi positif yang bermuatan tuntutan kemampuan komunikasi dan argumentasi. Sejalan dengan perkembangan zaman yang menuntut kecepatan, fleksibilitas, dan kemampuan beradaptasi dengan berbagai kondisi, NUDC dilaksanakan secara daring.

B. Tujuan

1. Meningkatkan daya saing mahasiswa dan lulusan perguruan tinggi melalui media debat ilmiah.
2. Meningkatkan kemampuan bahasa Inggris lisan, dan menciptakan kompetisi yang sehat antar mahasiswa.
3. Meningkatkan kemampuan mahasiswa untuk berpikir kritis dan analitis, sehingga mahasiswa mampu bersaing di tingkat nasional maupun internasional.
4. Mengembangkan kemampuan mahasiswa dalam menyampaikan pendapat secara logis dan sistematis.
5. Memperkuat karakter mahasiswa melalui pemahaman akan permasalahan nasional dan internasional beserta alternatif pemecahannya melalui kompetisi debat.

C. Sasaran

Sasaran NUDC adalah semua mahasiswa aktif Program Sarjana atau Diploma di Perguruan Tinggi di lingkungan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan yang terdaftar di Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi (PD-Dikti).

D. Pengertian

1. *Debater* adalah 2 (dua) orang peserta debat yang mengikuti perlombaan;
2. *Convener* adalah orang yang mengatur keseluruhan acara dalam NUDC;
3. *Tournament Director* adalah orang yang mengatur jalannya perlombaan.
4. *Core Adjudication panels (CAP)* adalah panel juri yang mengatur mekanisme penjurian;
5. *N1 Adjudicator* adalah calon juri yang dikirim oleh oleh universitas dan melekat pada tim untuk diikutkan dalam akreditasi;
6. *Invited Adjudicator* adalah juri yang diundang oleh Direktorat Jenderal Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan atas dasar kompetensi.
7. *Tabulator* adalah orang yang bertanggungjawab terhadap tabulasi penilaian dalam perlombaan;

BAB II SISTEM LOMBA

A. Tahapan Lomba

1. Seleksi Perguruan Tinggi

Perguruan tinggi melaksanakan seleksi untuk menentukan 1 (satu) tim terbaik. Satu tim terdiri atas 2 (dua) mahasiswa sebagai *debater* dan 1 (satu) mahasiswa/dosen di perguruan tinggi tersebut sebagai N1 *adjudicator* yang selanjutnya berhak untuk mengikuti seleksi tingkat wilayah.

2. Seleksi Wilayah

a. Pembagian wilayah

Terdapat 16 wilayah dengan pembagian sebagai berikut.

1)	Wilayah I	1.	Sumatera Utara
2)	Wilayah II	2.	Sumatera Selatan
		3.	Bangka Belitung
		4.	Bengkulu
		5.	Lampung
3)	Wilayah III	6.	DKI Jakarta
4)	Wilayah IV	7.	Jawa Barat
		8.	Banten
5)	Wilayah V	9.	Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (DIY)
6)	Wilayah VI	10.	Jawa Tengah
7)	Wilayah VII	11.	Jawa Timur
8)	Wilayah VIII	12.	Nusa Tenggara Barat
		13.	Bali
9)	Wilayah IX	14.	Sulawesi Selatan
		15.	Sulawesi Utara
		16.	Sulawesi Tengah
		17.	Sulawesi Tenggara
		18.	Sulawesi Barat
10)	Wilayah X	19.	Sumatera Barat
		20.	Riau
		21.	Kepulauan Riau (Kepri)
		22.	Jambi

11)	Wilayah XI	23.	Kalimantan Selatan
		24.	Kalimantan Barat
		25.	Kalimantan Timur
		26.	Kalimantan Tengah
		27.	Kalimantan Utara
12)	Wilayah XII	28.	Maluku
		29.	Maluku Utara
13)	Wilayah XIII	30.	Aceh
14)	Wilayah XIV	31.	Papua Barat
		32.	Papua
15)	Wilayah XV	33.	Nusa Tenggara Timur
16)	Wilayah XVI	34.	Gorontalo

b. Kuota Tim per Wilayah

Kuota tim per wilayah untuk mengikuti NUDC nasional adalah sebagai berikut.

Wilayah	Kuota
LLDIKTI Wilayah I	8
LLDIKTI Wilayah II	8
LLDIKTI Wilayah III	10
LLDIKTI Wilayah IV	10
LLDIKTI Wilayah V	8
LLDIKTI Wilayah VI	8
LLDIKTI Wilayah VII	10
LLDIKTI Wilayah VIII	6
LLDIKTI Wilayah IX	8
LLDIKTI Wilayah X	8
LLDIKTI Wilayah XI	6
LLDIKTI Wilayah XII	6
LLDIKTI Wilayah XIII	5
LLDIKTI Wilayah XIV	5
LLDIKTI Wilayah XV	3
LLDIKTI Wilayah XVI	3

c. Pola Seleksi Wilayah (daring)

Seleksi tingkat wilayah tahun 2021 menggunakan sistem daring. Mekanisme seleksi wilayah adalah sebagai berikut.

- i. Tim delegasi Perguruan Tinggi mendaftarkan diri secara daring ke Pusat Prestasi Nasional.
- ii. Tim harus merekam penampilan debat secara individu dan tim.
- iii. Pembicara pertama merespon mosi yang diberikan, dengan cara merekam penampilan debatnya sebagai *Prime Minister* (Pembicara pertama *Opening Government*).
- iv. Pembicara kedua merespon video pidato yang diberikan, dengan merekam penampilan debatnya sebagai *Leader of Opposition* (Pembicara Pertama *Opening Opposition*).
- v. Kedua *debater* merespon video debat antara tim *Opening Government* melawan tim *Opening Opposition* dengan merekam penampilan debat mereka sebagai tim *Closing Government* (*Member of Government* dan *Government Whip*).
- vi. Penilaian memiliki bobot 20% untuk video *Prime Minister*, 20% untuk video *Leader of Opposition*, dan 60% untuk video tim.

3. Tingkat Nasional

Seleksi tingkat nasional akan diikuti oleh tim-tim terbaik di masing-masing Wilayah I s.d. XVI yang berjumlah 112 Tim. Seluruh tim berjumlah 336 orang yang terdiri atas 224 mahasiswa *debaters* dan 112 orang N1 *adjudicators*.

4. Tingkat Internasional

Empat tim terbaik di *Grandfinal* kategori *Open-Draw* diprioritaskan untuk mewakili Indonesia mengikuti debat tingkat dunia *World University Debating Championship* (WUDC) tahun 2021 di Zagreb, Kroasia.

B. Tingkat Nasional secara Daring

1. Jumlah peserta

Peserta NUDC Daring tingkat Nasional berjumlah 112 tim yang merupakan wakil dari 16 wilayah di Indonesia. Daftar peserta didapatkan dari hasil seleksi daring tingkat wilayah.

2. Babak Penyisihan

- i. Semua peserta mengikuti 5 babak penyisihan.
- ii. *Matching* peserta di babak penyisihan mengikuti aturan dalam sistem *British Parliamentary*.
- iii. Terdapat 28 ruang dalam setiap babak penyisihan. Ruang tersebut dibagi dengan platform debat daring yang digunakan.

iv. Masing-masing ruang akan mempertemukan 4 (empat) tim. CAP menggunakan sistem *tabby cat* untuk mengatur pertemuan tim di babak penyisihan.

3. Babak Eliminasi

Terdapat dua kategori babak eliminasi, yakni *Open-Draw* dan *Novice*. Di kategori *Open-Draw*, 32 tim terbaik di babak penyisihan akan mengikuti babak eliminasi *Octofinals*, *Quarterfinals*, *Semifinals*, dan *Grand final*. Di kategori *Novice*, tim mengikuti babak eliminasi *Quarterfinals*, *Semifinals*, dan *Grandfinals*. Pengaturan babak eliminasi mengikuti tata aturan di WUDC.

4. Penjurian dan Tabulasi

Penjurian dilakukan secara daring.

C. Kategorisasi NUDC Nasional

Terdapat dua kategori lomba dalam NUDC, yakni *Open-Draw* dan *Novice*.

1. *Open-Draw*

Kategori *Open-Draw* merupakan kategori utama dalam NUDC.

Open-Draw terdiri atas babak-babak berikut.

i. *Preliminary Rounds* (Babak Penyisihan)

Terdapat 5 babak penyisihan di NUDC tingkat nasional.

ii. *Partial Double Octo* (PDO)

Babak ini mempertemukan tim yang berada pada peringkat 17 s/d 48 untuk bertanding di delapan ruang debat. Dua tim pemenang di masing-masing ruang debat akan mengikuti babak *Octofinals*.

iii. *Octofinal Rounds*

Babak ini mempertemukan tim yang berada pada peringkat 1 s/d 16 hasil babak penyisihan dan 16 tim pemenang di PDO. Tim-tim tersebut bertanding di delapan ruang debat. Dua tim pemenang di masing-masing ruang debat akan mengikuti babak *Quarterfinals*.

iv. *Quarterfinal Round* (Babak Perempat Final)

Babak ini mempertemukan enam belas tim pemenang di babak *Octofinals*. Tim-tim tersebut bertanding di empat ruang debat. Dua tim pemenang dari masing-masing ruang debat akan mengikuti babak *Semifinal*.

v. *Semifinal Round* (Babak Semi Final)

Babak ini mempertemukan delapan tim pemenang di babak *Quarterfinals*. Tim-tim tersebut bertanding di dua ruang debat. Dua tim pemenang di masing-masing ruang debat akan mengikuti babak *Grand final*.

vi. *Grand Final Round* (Babak Final)

Babak ini adalah babak puncak yang mempertemukan empat tim terbaik dari babak semifinal untuk menentukan Juara 1, 2, 3, dan 4

2. **Novice**

Kategori *Novice* merupakan kategori babak eliminasi khusus yang bisa diikuti oleh peserta yang memenuhi kriteria *Novice*. Kriteria tim *novice* adalah:

- i. Kedua *debater* belum pernah menjuarai, baik secara individu atau tim, lomba debat tingkat nasional dan internasional.
- ii. Kedua *debater* telah mengikuti lomba debat baik lokal maupun nasional maksimal dua tahun.
- iii. Kedua debaters mendaftarkan diri ke *Chief Adjudicator* pada saat NUDC dilaksanakan.
- iv. Kategori *Novice* terdiri atas babak *Novice Quarterfinals*, *Novice Semifinals*, dan *Novice Grandfinal*.
- v. Terdapat juara 1,2,3, dan 4 di babak *Novice Grandfinal*.

D. **Format *British Parliamentary***

Sistem yang digunakan dalam NUDC adalah sistem *British Parliamentary* (BP). Sistem ini adalah sistem yang digunakan dalam *World Universities Debating Championship* (WUDC) atau lomba debat antar perguruan tinggi tingkat dunia.

1. Jumlah *debaters*

Satu tim terdiri atas dua *debaters*. Dalam satu babak debat, terdapat empat tim yang berdebat dalam satu ruangan. Keempat tim tersebut mendapatkan posisi sebagai *Opening Government*, *Opening Opposition*, *Closing Government*, dan *Closing Opposition*.

2. Mosi

Mosi debat dalam sistem BP bersifat *impromptu*, yakni mosi diberikan menjelang perdebatan dimulai. Setiap tim mempunyai masa penyiapan kasus selama 15 menit.

3. Tabulasi

Tabulasi sistem BP dilakukan secara terbuka dan daring. NUDC menggunakan *tabbycat2* untuk menabulasi semua babak. Semua informasi tim, skor, nama juri, ranking tim, mosi dan proses perlombaan tercatat di tabulasi dan diberikan kepada peserta.

BAB III

PENDAFTARAN PESERTA

A. Syarat Peserta

1. Peserta NUDC adalah Warga Negara Indonesia (WNI) yang dibuktikan dengan Kartu Tanda Penduduk (KTP).
2. Satu tim terdiri atas 2 (dua) *debaters* dan 1 (satu) *N1 Adjudicator*.
3. *Debater* adalah mahasiswa aktif Program Sarjana (maksimal semester sepuluh) atau Diploma (maksimal semester enam untuk D-3 dan semester delapan untuk D-4), yang terdaftar di Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi (PD-Dikti) pada laman <http://forlap.dikti.go.id>.
4. *N1 Adjudicator* adalah mahasiswa aktif/ dosen dari perguruan tinggi asal *Debater* yang dibuktikan dengan Surat Tugas yang ditandatangani oleh pimpinan perguruan tinggi.
5. *Debater* wajib mengikuti *Seminar on Debating*.
6. *N1 Adjudicator* wajib mengikuti *Seminar on Adjudicating*, dan *Adjudicator Accreditation*.
7. *Anggota tim* tidak boleh diganti dengan alasan apapun.

B. Proses Pendaftaran

1. NUDC Wilayah

Peserta seleksi wilayah mendaftarkan diri ke Pusat Prestasi Nasional dengan mengisi data di laman <https://pusatprestasinasional.kemdikbud.go.id>.

2. NUDC Nasional

Tim yang lolos dari seleksi wilayah mendaftarkan diri ke Pusat Prestasi Nasional melalui laman <https://pusatprestasinasional.kemdikbud.go.id>. Selanjutnya, Pusat Prestasi Nasional akan mengirimkan undangan untuk mengikuti NUDC Nasional.

BAB IV JURI/ADJUDICATOR

A. Dewan Juri

1. Dewan juri terdiri atas *Core Adjudication Panels (CAP)*, *Invited Adjudicators* dan *N1 Adjudicator*
2. *Core Adjudication Panels (CAP)* terdiri atas tim pembina debat di Pusat Prestasi Nasional dan empat juri utama yang dipilih oleh Pusat Prestasi Nasional.
3. *Invited adjudicators* ditetapkan melalui mekanisme *open recruitment* atau penunjukkan sesuai dengan kriteria tertentu.
4. *Accredited Adjudicators* adalah juri yang telah terakreditasi.

B. Akreditasi dan Alokasi Juri

1. Akreditasi Juri

Chief Adjudication Panels (CAP) melaksanakan akreditasi juri NUDC dengan mekanisme sebagai berikut.

- i. *Invited adjudicators* dan *N1 Adjudicators* diwajibkan mengikuti *seminar on adjudicating*.
- ii. CAP membuat soal (tes) untuk *N1 Adjudicators*. CAP kemudian menentukan batas nilai tertentu yang harus didapat oleh juri N1. Juri N1 yang tidak mampu memenuhi batas nilai tersebut mendapat predikat *Trainee*. Juri *Trainee* masih harus ikut dalam penjurian di babak penyisihan.
- iii. Akreditasi Juri N1 didasarkan pada: Nilai tes dan akumulasi skor yang didapatkan selama babak penyisihan.
- iv. Ketua juri di ruang debat akan dinilai oleh peserta. Penilaian didasarkan pada kemampuan juri tersebut menangkap esensi perdebatan, memberikan skor, dan mengomunikasikan hasil penjurian.
- v. Juri N1 akan mendapatkan skor dari ketua juri ruangan setiap setelah selesai babak penyisihan.

- vi. Hasil akumulasi skor yang didapat para juri akan menentukan kategorisasi juri terakreditasi atau *trainee*.
2. Alokasi Juri
- Alokasi juri didasarkan pada pertimbangan berikut.
- i. Nilai tes yang diperoleh juri tersebut.
 - ii. Asal institusi. Juri tidak boleh menjuri peserta yang sama institusinya dengan juri tersebut.
 - iii. Afiliasi. Juri tidak boleh menjuri tim yang berafiliasi dengannya. Afiliasi tersebut berupa ikatan alumni, ikatan kepelatihan, ikatan persaudaraan, dll. Juri wajib mengisi daftar afiliasi pada saat *seminar on adjudication*.

C. Mekanisme Penilaian

Penilaian ditentukan berdasarkan aturan dalam sistem BP (*British Parliamentary*). Penjelasan lebih lanjut terkait mekanisme debat dan penilaian terdapat di Lampiran.

BAB V

SUSUNAN ACARA DAN JADWAL KEGIATAN

A. Acara dalam NUDC Tingkat Nasional

1. Upacara Pembukaan
2. *Seminar on Debating* berisi penjelasan teknis tentang sistem dan strategi perlombaan kepada tim peserta.
3. *Seminar on Adjudicating* berisi penjelasan teknis tentang penjurian dan tata cara penilaian, dan diakhiri dengan *Adjudicator Accreditation* bagi N1 *adjudicator*. Seminar ini diadakan bersamaan waktunya dengan *Seminar on Debating*.
4. *Preliminary Rounds*.
5. *Octofinals/ Novice Quarterfinals*
6. *Quarterfinals/ Novice Semifinals*
7. *Semifinals*
8. *Novice Grand Final*
9. Grand Final

B. Jadwal Kegiatan

NO	KEGIATAN	APR	MEI	JUN	JUL	AGS	SEP	OKT	NOV	DES
1.	Sosialisasi NUDC		I							
2.	Seleksi tingkat masing-masing perguruan tinggi.		I-IV							
3.	Pendaftaran			I-II						
4.	Verifikasi Berkas			III						
5.	Pengumuman Hasil Verifikasi			III						
6.	Seleksi Tingkat Wilayah			IV						
7.	<i>Dummy Round</i>				I					
8.	Pelaksanaan NUDC Tingkat Nasional					IV	I			

NO	KEGIATAN	APR	MEI	JUN	JUL	AGS	SEP	OKT	NOV	DES
9.	Laporan dan Evaluasi							I		
10.	Pendaftaran delegasi ke WUDC						II			
11.	Pembinaan Tahap 1 delegasi ke WUDC							III		
12.	Pembinaan Tahap 2 delegasi ke WUDC								II	
13.	Pengiriman Delegasi ke WUDC									IV

BAB VI PENGHARGAAN

Penghargaan NUDC tingkat nasional adalah sebagai berikut:

1. Sertifikat Elektronik diberikan kepada peserta (*Debaters* dan *Adjudicators*).
2. Medali diberikan kepada lima belas (15) *Best Speakers Open-Draw* dan lima belas (15) *Best Speakers Novice*.
 - Medali emas diberikan kepada *Best Speakers Open-Draw* dan *Best Speakers Novice peringkat 1-5*.
 - Medali Perak diberikan kepada *Best Speakers Open-Draw* dan *Best Speakers Novice peringkat 6-10*.
 - Medali Perunggu diberikan kepada *Best Speakers Open-Draw* dan *Best Speakers Novice peringkat 11-15*.
3. Piala diberikan kepada Juara 1, 2, 3, dan 4 *Open-Draw* serta Juara 1, 2, 3, dan 4 *Novice*.
4. Bantuan Dana Pembinaan diberikan kepada Juara 1, 2, 3, dan 4 *Open-Draw* serta Juara 1, 2, 3, dan 4 *Novice*.
5. Juara 1, 2, 3, dan 4 *Open-Draw* diprioritaskan untuk diberangkatkan ke WUDC.

BAB VII PENUTUP

Pedoman ini digunakan sebagai acuan pelaksanaan *National Univeristy Debating Champinship* (NUDC) Tahun 2021. Pelaksanaan NUDC dapat berjalan dengan lancar dengan dilaksanakannya tata aturan yang sudah tertuang dalam Pedoman ini. Pembinaan dalam aspek sikap dan teknis kompetisi semakin dirasa penting dalam membangun karakter peserta. Pedoman NUDC ini diharapkan mampu memberikan informasi yang memadai terkait kompetisi. Dengan selalu mematuhi aturan kompetisi, peserta diharapkan mampu menyerap keterampilan dan nilai-nilai pendidikan dalam NUDC.

BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM

Adapted from WUDC

Part 1 - Introduction

1.1 The format of the debate

1.1.1 The debate will consist of four teams of two persons (persons will be known as "members"), a chairperson (known as the "Speaker of the House" or "Mister/Madam Speaker" and an adjudicator or panel of adjudicators.

1.1.2 Teams will consist of the following members:

1.1.3 Members will deliver substantive speeches in the following order:

- (1) Prime Minister;
- (2) Opposition Leader;
- (3) Deputy Prime Minister;
- (4) Deputy Opposition Leader;
- (5) Member for the Government;
- (6) Member for the Opposition;
- (7) Government Whip;
- (8) Opposition Whip.

Opening Government:

"Prime Minister" or "First Government member" and
"Deputy Prime Minister" or "Second Government member";

Opening Opposition:

"Leader of the Opposition" or "First Opposition member" and
"Deputy Leader of the Opposition" or "Second Opposition member";

Closing Government:

"Member for the Government" or "Third Government member" and
"Government Whip" or "Fourth Opposition member";

Closing Opposition:

"Member for the Opposition" or "Third Opposition member" and
"Opposition Whip" or "Fourth Opposition member".

1.1.4 Members will deliver a substantive speech of seven minutes duration and should offer points of information while members of the opposing teams are speaking

1.2 The motion

- 1.2.1 The motion should be unambiguously worded.
- 1.2.2 The motion should reflect that the National University Debating Championship is a national level tournament.
- 1.2.3 The members should debate the motion in the spirit of the motion and the tournament.

1.3 Preparation

- 1.3.1 The debate should commence 15 minutes after the motion is announced.
- 1.3.2 Teams should arrive at their debate within five minutes of the scheduled starting time for that debate.
- 1.3.3 Members are permitted to use printed or written material during preparation and during the debate. Printed material includes books, journals, newspapers and other similar materials. The use of electronic equipment is prohibited during preparation and in the debate.

1.4 Points of Information

- 1.4.1 Points of Information (questions directed to the member speaking) may be asked between first minute mark and the six-minute mark of the members' speeches (speeches are of seven minutes duration).
- 1.4.2 To ask a Point of Information, a member should stand, place one hand on his or her head and extend the other towards the member speaking. The member may announce that they would like to ask a "Point of Information" or use other words to this effect.
- 1.4.3 The member who is speaking may accept or decline to answer the Point of Information.
- 1.4.4 Points of Information should not exceed 15 seconds in length.
- 1.4.5 The member who is speaking may ask the person offering the Point of Information to sit down where the offeror has had a reasonable opportunity to be heard and understood.
- 1.4.6 Members should attempt to answer at least two Points of Information during their speech. Members should also offer Points of Information.

1.4.7 Points of Information should be assessed in accordance with clause 3.3.4 of these rules.

1.4.8 Points of Order and Points of Personal Privilege are not permitted.

1.5 Timing of the speeches

1.5.1 Speeches should be seven minutes in duration (this should be signaled by two strikes of the gavel). Speeches over seven minutes and 15 seconds may be penalized.

1.5.2 Points of Information may only be offered between the first-minute mark and the six-minute mark of the speech (this period should be signaled by one strike of the gavel at the first minute and one strike at the sixth minute).

1.5.3 It is the duty of the Speaker of the House to time speeches.

1.5.4 In the absence of the Speaker of the House, it is the duty of the Chair of the Adjudication panel to ensure that speeches are timed.

1.6 The adjudication

1.6.5 The debate should be adjudicated by a panel of at least three adjudicators, where this is possible.

1.6.6 At the conclusion of the debate, the adjudicators should confer and rank the teams, from first place to last place. (see Part 5: The Adjudication).

1.6.7 There will be verbal adjudication of the debate after the first six preliminary rounds of the tournament. The verbal adjudication should be delivered in accordance with clause 5.5 of these rules.

Part 2: The Definitions

2.1.1 The definition should state the issue (or issues) for debate arising out of the motion and state the meaning of any terms in the motion which require interpretation.

2.1.2 The Prime Minister should provide the definition at the beginning of his or her speech.

2.1.3 The definition must:

- (a) have a clear and logical link to the motion - this means that an average reasonable person would accept the link made by the member between the motion and the definition (where there is no such link the definition is sometimes referred to as a "squirrel");
- (b) not be self-proving - a definition is self-proving when the case is that something should or should not be done and there is no reasonable rebuttal. A definition is may also be self-proving when the case is that a certain state of affairs exists or does not exist and there is no reasonable rebuttal (these definitions are sometimes referred to as "truisms").
- (c) not be time set - this means that the debate must take place in the present and that the definition cannot set the debate in the past or the future; and
- (d) not be place set unfairly - this means that the definition cannot restrict the debate so narrowly to a particular geographical or political location that a participant of the tournament could not reasonably be expected to have knowledge of the place.

2.2 Challenging the definition

2.2.1 The Leader of the Opposition may challenge the definition if it violates clause of these rules.

2.2.2 The Leader of the Opposition should clearly state that he or she is challenging the definition.

2.2.3 The Leader of the Opposition should substitute an alternative definition after challenging the definition of the Prime Minister.

2.3 Assessing the definitional challenge

2.3.4 The adjudicator should determine the definition to be 'unreasonable' where it violates clause 2.1.3 of these rules.

2.3.5 The onus to establish that the definition is unreasonable is on the members asserting that the definition is unreasonable.

2.3.6 Where the definition is unreasonable, the opposition should substitute an alternative definition that should be accepted by the adjudicator provided it is not unreasonable.

- 2.3.7 Where the definition of the Opening Government is unreasonable and an alternative definition is substituted by the Opening Opposition, the Closing Government may introduce matter which is inconsistent with the matter presented by the Opening Government and consistent with the definition of the Opening Opposition.
- 2.3.8 If the Opening Opposition has substituted a definition that is also unreasonable, the Closing Government may challenge the definition of the Opening Opposition and substitute an alternative definition.
- 2.3.9 If the Closing Government has substituted a definition that is also unreasonable (in addition to the unreasonable definitions of the Opening Government and Opening Opposition, the Closing Opposition may challenge the definition of the Closing Government and substitute an alternative definition.

Part 3 - Matter

3.1 The definition of matter

- 3.1.1 Matter is the content of the speech. It is the arguments a debater uses to further his or her case and persuade the audience.
- 3.1.2 Matter includes arguments and reasoning, examples, case studies, facts and any other material that attempts to further the case.
- 3.1.3 Matter includes positive (or substantive) material and rebuttal (arguments specifically aimed to refute the arguments of the opposing team(s)). Matter includes Points of Information.

3.2 The elements of matter

- 3.2.1 Matter should be relevant, logical and consistent.
- 3.2.2 Matter should be relevant. It should relate to the issues of the debate: positive material should support the case being presented and rebuttal should refute the material being presented by the opposing team(s). The Member should appropriately prioritize and apportion time to the dynamic issues of the debate.
- 3.2.3 Matter should be logical. Arguments should be developed logically in order to be clear and well-reasoned and therefore plausible. The conclusion of all arguments should support the member's case.
- 3.2.4 Matter should be consistent. Members should ensure that the matter they present is consistent within their speech, their team and the remainder of the members on their side of the debate (subject to clauses 2.3.4, 2.3.5 or 2.3.6 of these rules).

3.2.5 All Members should present positive matter (except the final two members in the debate) and all members should present rebuttal (except the first member in the debate). The Government Whip may choose to present positive matter.

3.2.6 All Members should attempt to answer at least two points of information during their own speech and offer points of information during opposing speeches.

3.3 Assessing matter

3.3.1 The matter presented should be persuasive. 'The elements of matter' should assist an adjudicator to assess the persuasiveness and credibility of the matter presented.

3.3.2 Matter should be assessed from the viewpoint of the average reasonable person. Adjudicators should analyze the matter presented and assess its persuasiveness, while disregarding any specialist knowledge they may have on the issue of the debate. Members should not be discriminated against on the basis of religion, sex, race, color, nationality, sexual preference, age, social status or disability.

3.3.3 Points of information should be assessed according to the effect they have on the persuasiveness of the cases of both the member answering the point of information and the member offering the point of information.

Part 4 - Manner

4.1 The definition of manner

4.1.1 Manner is the presentation of the speech. It is the style and structure a member uses to further his or her case and persuade the audience.

4.1.2 Manner is comprised of many separate elements. Some, but not all, of these elements are listed below.

4.2 The elements of style

4.2.1 The elements of style include eye contact, voice modulation, hand gestures, language, the use of notes and any other element which may affect the effectiveness of the presentation of the member.

4.2.2 Eye contact will generally assist a member to persuade an audience as it allows the member to appear more sincere.

4.2.3 Voice modulation will generally assist a member to persuade an audience as the debater may emphasize important arguments and keep the attention of the audience. This includes the pitch, tone, and volume of the member's voice and the use of pauses.

- 4.2.4 Hand gestures will generally assist a member to emphasize important arguments. Excessive hand movements may however be distracting and reduce the attentiveness of the audience to the arguments.
- 4.2.5 Language should be clear and simple. Members who use language which is too verbose or confusing may detract from the argument if they lose the attention of the audience.
- 4.2.6 The use of notes is permitted, but members should be careful that they do not rely on their notes too much and detract from the other elements of manner.

4.3 The elements of structure

- 4.3.1 The elements of structure include the structure of the speech of the member and the structure of the speech of the team.
- 4.3.2 The matter of the speech of each member must be structured. The member should organize his or her matter to improve the effectiveness of their presentation. The substantive speech of each member should:
 - (a) contain a consistent approach to the issues being debated; and
 - (b) allocate positive matter to each member where both members of the team are introducing positive matter; and
 - (c) include: an introduction, conclusion and a series of arguments; and
 - (d) be well-timed in accordance with the time limitations and the need to prioritize and apportion time to matter.
- 4.3.3 The matter of the team must be structured. The team should organize their matter to improve the effectiveness of their presentation. The team should:
 - (a) contain a consistent approach to the issues being debated; and
 - (b) allocate positive matter to each member where both members of the team are introducing positive matter; and
 - (c) include: an introduction, conclusion and a series of arguments; and
 - (d) be well-timed in accordance with the time limitations and the need to prioritize and apportion time to matter.

4.4 Assessing manner

- 4.4.1 Adjudicators should assess the elements of manner together in order to determine the overall effectiveness of the member's presentation. Adjudicators should assess whether the member's presentation is assisted or diminished by their manner.
- 4.4.2 Adjudicators should be aware that at a World Championship, there are many styles which are appropriate, and that they should not discriminate against a member simply because the manner would be deemed 'inappropriate Parliamentary debating' in their own country.
- 4.4.3 Adjudicators should not allow bias to influence their assessment. Members should not be discriminated against on the basis of religion, sex, race, color, nationality, language (subject to Rule 4.2.4), sexual preference, age, social status or disability.

Part 5 - The Adjudication

5.1 The role of the adjudicator

5.1.1 The adjudicator must:

- (a) Confer upon and discuss the debate with the other adjudicators;
- (b) Determine the rankings of the teams;
- (c) Determine the team grades;
- (d) Determine the speaker marks;
- (e) Provide a verbal adjudication to the members; and
- (f) Complete any documentation required by the tournament.

5.1.2 The adjudication panel should attempt to agree on the adjudication of the debate. Adjudicators should therefore confer in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect

5.1.3 Adjudicators should acknowledge that adjudicators on a panel may form different or opposite views of the debate. Adjudicators should therefore attempt to base their conclusions on these rules in order to limit subjectivity and to provide a consistent approach to the assessment of debates.

5.2 Ranking teams

5.2.1 Teams should be ranked from first place to last place. First placed teams should be awarded three points, second placed teams should be awarded two points, third placed teams should be awarded one point and fourth placed teams should be awarded zero points.

5.2.2 Teams may receive zero points where they fail to arrive at the debate more than five minutes after the scheduled time for debate.

5.2.3 Teams may receive zero points where the adjudicators unanimously agree that the Member has (or Members have) harassed another debater on the basis of religion, sex, race, color, nationality, sexual preference or disability.

5.2.4 Adjudicators should confer upon team rankings. Where a unanimous decision cannot be reached after conferral, the decision of the majority will determine the rankings. Where a majority decision cannot be reached, the Chair of the panel of adjudicators will determine the rankings.

5.3 Grading and marking the teams

- 5.3.1 The panel of adjudicators should agree upon the grade that each team is to be awarded. Each adjudicator may then mark the teams at their discretion but within the agreed grade. Where there is a member of the panel who has dissented in the ranking of the teams, that adjudicator will not need to agree upon the team grades and may complete their score sheet at their own discretion.
- 5.3.2 Marking the members 5.4.1 After the adjudicators have agreed upon the grade that each team is to be awarded, each adjudicator may mark the individual members at their discretion but must ensure that the aggregate points of the team members is within the agreed grade for that team.

5.4 Verbal adjudications

- 5.4.1 At the conclusion of the conferral, the adjudication panel should provide a verbal adjudication of the debate.
- 5.4.2 The verbal adjudication should be delivered by the Chair of the adjudication panel, or where the Chair dissents, by a member of the adjudication panel nominated by the Chair of the panel.
- 5.4.3 The verbal adjudication should:
- 5.4.4 The verbal adjudication should not exceed 10 minutes.
- 5.4.5 The members must not harass the adjudicators following the verbal adjudication.
- 5.4.6 The members may approach an adjudicator for further clarification following the verbal adjudication; these inquiries must at all times be polite and non-confrontational.
- (a) identify the order in which the teams were ranked
 - (b) explain the reasons for the rankings of team, ensuring that each team is referred to in this explanation; and
 - (c) provide constructive comments to individual members where the adjudication panel believes this is necessary.
- 5.4.7 The verbal adjudication should not exceed 10 minutes.
- 5.4.8 The members must not harass the adjudicators following the verbal adjudication.
- 5.4.9 The members may approach an adjudicator for further clarification following the verbal adjudication; these inquiries must at all times be polite and non-confrontational.

Lampiran 2.

Pedoman Scoring NUDC (Didasarkan pada Pedoman Debat WUDC 2019)

Skor	Keterangan
89-91	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Argumen yang cemerlang, memiliki kaitan yang sangat erat kepada isu utama yang menjadi diskursus dalam ronde;• Argumen dijelaskan dan terilustrasikan dengan baik, dibutuhkan tanggapan yang cemerlang untuk mematahkan argumen;• Masalah logika sangat minim, walaupun ada, tidak mengurangi klaim utama yang sedang disampaikan.
86-88	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Argument memiliki kaitan yang sangat erat kepada isu utama yang menjadi diskursus dan menarik;• Tidak ada lompatan logika, dibutuhkan tanggapan yang cemerlang untuk mematahkan argument;• Hanya terdapat masalah yang minor dalam argumentasi
83-85	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Argumen memiliki kaitan sangat erat dengan isu yang diangkat mosi;• Argumen memiliki penjelasan yang kuat;• Masih terdapat kekuarang dalam merespon ke argument yang kuat; tetapi kekurangan dalam berargumentasi sangat minim
79-82	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Argumentasi relevan dan berkaitan dengan mosi;• Argument dibuat dengan baik tanpa lompatan logika dan dijelaskan dengan baik;• Argumentasi rentan jika memperoleh serangan yang baik.
76-78	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Argumen terkadang relevan, menunjukkan eksklusifitas, dan memiliki kaitan dengan isu utama;• Terkadang argumentasi dapat masuk ke katagori: i) kurang penjelasan ii) argumentasi simplistik iii) argumentasi kadang irelevan• Mudah untuk diikuti
73-75	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Argumen hampir selalu relevan, tetapi tidak menyentuh isu utama yang menjadi diskursus dalam debat;• Argument logis, tetapi terkadang sederhana dan mudah dipatahkan• Jelas dan mudah diikuti
70-72	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Beberapa argumen memiliki relevansi;• Argumentasi tidak selalu lengkap, dan terkadang memiliki lompatan logika;• Beberapa poin tersampaikan, tetapi secara keseluruhan susah diikuti sehingga materi sulit dinilai
67-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Beberapa argumen tidak terlalu relevan;• Argumentasi tidak selalu lengkap, dan seringkali memiliki lompatan logika;• Poin tersampaikan tanpa logika yang jelas dan secara keseluruhan sangat sulit diikuti untuk mengerti.
64-66	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Seringkali argument tidak relevan;• Argumen memiliki penjelasan tetapi memiliki lompatan logika yang signifikan;• Secara keseluruhan sangat tidak jelas, terdapat banyak pengulangan, sangat sulit untuk diikuti.

NOVICE RULE

National University Debating Championship 2021

This Novice Rule for National University Debating Championship 2021 (“Rule”) is prepared by the Novice Committee (as defined below) of the National University Debating Championship 2021.

1. Article 1 - Definitions

For the purpose of this Rule:

“Adjudication Core” means the panel of adjudicators appointed to lead the adjudication process of NUDC 2021; “Novice Break” means an advanced round in NUDC 2021 exclusively for qualified Novice Teams to determine the novice champion of NUDC 2021, subject to the provision of Article;

“Novice Committee” means a committee appointed by the Adjudication Core of NUDC 2021 to prepare and enforce this Rule in NUDC 2021;

“Novice Speakers” shall have the same meaning as described in Article 4 of this Rule, subject to the provision of this Rule;

“Novice Speaker Awards” means individual awards and acknowledgement made to a number of Novice Speakers with the highest speaker score in NUDC 2021;

“Novice Team” shall have the same meaning as described in Article 3 of this Rule, subject to the provision of this Rule;

“NUDC 2021” means the 2021 National University Debating Championship;

“Open Break” or “Main Draw” means the an advanced debate rounds in NUDC 2021 open for all qualified teams to determine the champion of NUDC 2021;

“Open Speaker Awards” or “Main Draw Speaker Awards” means individual awards and acknowledgement made to a number of speakers with the highest speaker score in NUDC 2021;

“Preliminary Rounds” are the general debate rounds participated by all speakers of NUDC 2021.

2. Article 2 - Interpretation

- 2.1 The Novice Committee maintains exclusive right to interpret this Rule.
- 2.2 In interpreting this Rule, the Novice Committee may consult with the Adjudication Core or any individuals deemed necessary for such purpose.

PART II QUALIFICATION OF NOVICE TEAM AND NOVICE SPEAKERS

3. Article 3 - Novice Team

- 3.1 Novice Team is a team comprised of 2 (two) Novice Speakers.
- 3.2 For the avoidance of doubt a team comprised of 1 (one) Novice Speaker will not be considered as a Novice Team.

4. Article 4 - Novice Speaker

- 4.1 Novice Speaker is a speaker who:
 - (a) has never advanced into the Elimination Round of any Varsity Level, National or International Debating Competition; and
 - (b) has never been awarded as Speaker Awards in any national or international debating competition.
- 4.2 For the avoidance of doubt, a Novice Speaker which is a member of a team comprised of 1 (one) Novice Speaker will be considered as a Novice Speaker.

5. Article 5 - Debating Competition

- 5.1 For the purpose of this Rule, "Debating Competition" means any debate competition conducted in English and using any of the following debate format:
 - (a) British Parliamentary System; or
 - (b) Asian Parliamentary System; or
 - (c) Australasian Parliamentary System.
- 5.2 Other debate formats not stipulated in Article 5.1 may be considered as a Debating Competition for the purpose of this Rule only upon the discretion of the Novice Committee.

6. Article 6 - Varsity Level Debating Competition

- 6.1 A Debating Competition will be considered as Varsity Level if:
- (a) such Debating Competition limits participation (as a debater) to students of university or other similar tertiary education; or
 - (b) any other Debating Competition in which at least one-third of the participants are either: (i) students of university or other similar tertiary education; or (ii) former students of university or other similar tertiary education.
- 6.2 Without prejudice to Article 6.1, a Debating Competition will not be considered as a Varsity Level Debating Competition if it limits participation based on major or debate experience.

7. Article 7 - National Debating Competition

- 7.1 For the purpose of this Rule, "National Debating Competition" means any Debating Competition which:
- (a) is conducted in Indonesia; and
 - (b) is joined by at participants from at least 3 (three) different provinces of Indonesia; and
- 7.2 at least one-third of the participants of such Debating Competition is domiciled outside from the province where such Debating Competition is conducted.
- 7.3 Without prejudice to Article 7.1, a Debating Competition will not be considered as a National Debating Competition if it limits participation based on province, region, or island.

8. Article 8 - International Debating Competition

For the purpose of this Rule, "International Debating Competition" means any Debating Competition which

- (a) is joined by at participants from at least 3 (three) different states; and
- (b) at least one-third of the participants is domiciled outside from the state where such Debating Competition is conducted.

9. Article 9 - Elimination Round

- 9.1 Elimination Round refers to any advanced debate rounds in a Debating Competition participated only by qualified teams after the preliminary rounds, as determined by the adjudication core of such Debating Competition.

9.2 Without prejudice to Article 9.1, any advanced round in which not all official participants of the relevant Debating Competition is eligible to participate shall not be considered as an Elimination Round (including but not limited to, novice break), except, only in the case of International Debating Competition, advanced debate rounds which are exclusive for team with certain language qualifications (including but not limited to, advanced debate rounds for teams which speak English as a second or foreign language)

10. Article 10 - Speaker Awards

10.1 Speaker Awards refers to any individual awards or acknowledgement which is publicly announced, either verbally or electronically, by the adjudication core of a Debating Competition.

10.2 For the avoidance of doubt, in the event that no formal announcement is made by the adjudication core of such Debating Competition as contemplated in Article 10.1, the Speaker Awards is considered to have been given to the ten individuals (or any such number deemed appropriate by the Novice Committee in the event of tie-scores) who received the highest speaker score in that competition.

10.3 Without prejudice to Article 10.1, any individual awards or acknowledgement which not all official participants of the relevant Debating Competition is eligible for shall not be considered as a Speaker Award (including but not limited to, novice speaker awards and gender-based speaker awards), except, only in the case of International Debating Competition, individual awards or acknowledgement which are exclusive for speakers with certain language qualifications (including but not limited to, individual awards or acknowledgement for speakers who speak English as a second or foreign language)

PART III DETERMINATION OF NOVICE STATUS

11. Article 11 - Determination of Status

Participants of NUDC 2021 shall only be eligible for the Novice Break and/or Novice Speaker Awards upon being granted Novice Team status and/or Novice Speaker status by the Novice Committee.

12. Article 12 - Application for Novice Status

12.1 The participating speakers of NUDC 2021 may individually apply for Novice Speaker Status by filling an online application form given by the Novice Committee.

12.2 Such application contemplated in Article 12.1 must be made before the date and time determined by the Novice Committee ("Registration Deadline"). Any application made after the Registration Deadline will not be processed, except for special circumstances decided by the Novice Committee.

12.3 For the avoidance of doubt:

(a) There is no independent application form to apply for Novice Speaker status, and such status shall be granted automatically if such team fulfills the requirement of Novice Team as described in Article 3 above.

(b) Adjudicators cannot apply for Novice Speaker Status in NUDC 2021.

13. Article 13 - Interim Status

13.1 After the Registration Deadline, the Novice Committee will review all eligible application and publish a temporary status of the application ("Interim Status"). The Interim Status is not the final result of the application, and shall not be construed as such.

13.2 Speakers may be granted either of the following Interim Status:

(a) "Approved"; or

(b) "Rejected"; or

(c) "Subject to Interview".

14. Article 14 - Interview

14.1 Applicants which are granted the "Subject to Interview" status shall answer several questions from the Novice Committee before their status is finalized.

14.2 Applicants may start the interview by contacting and requesting for interview to any members of the Novice Committee before the date and time determined by the Novice Committee ("Interview Deadline").

14.3 Any request for interview made after the Interview Deadline shall not be entertained, and the Novice Committee may process and finalize the relevant applications with hearing to results of such interview.

14.4 For the avoidance of doubt, the completion of an interview contemplated in this Article does not automatically grant Novice Speaker status to the applicant conducting such interview. Such status will be granted upon deliberation by the Novice Committee, taking into consideration the information obtained through such interview.

15. Article 15 - Appeals

- 15.1 Appeals can be made by any individuals against any Interim Status granted to any applicants, subject to the provision of this Article.
- 15.2 Such appeal may be made by contacting and requesting for appeal to any members of the Novice Committee before the date and time determined by the Novice Committee ("Appeal Deadline").
- 15.3 Any request for appeal made after the Appeal Deadline shall not be entertained, and the Novice Committee may process and finalize the relevant applications without hearing the appeal.
- 15.4 For the avoidance of doubt, the completion of an appeal contemplated in this Article does not automatically change the Interim Status or the eventual finalized result. Such decision will be made upon deliberation by the Novice Committee, taking into consideration the information obtained through such appeal.
- 15.5 The Novice Committee shall maintain the identity of the individuals submitting an appeal confidential, unless required otherwise due to special circumstances.

16. Article 16 - Final Status

- 16.1 After the Interview Deadline and Appeal Deadline, the Novice Committee will publish the final status of the application ("Final Status"). The Final Status represent as the final decision of the Novice Committee.
- 16.2 Speakers may be granted either of the following Final Status:
 - (a) "Approved"; or
 - (b) "Rejected".
- 16.3 Speakers who obtained the "Approved" status shall be considered as a Novice Speaker in NUDC 2021.
- 16.4 Teams who fulfill the Novice Team criteria pursuant to Article 3, after the Final Status is published shall be considered as Novice Team.
- 16.5 Novice Committee shall not entertain any appeal or complaints regarding the Final Status after the Final Status is published.

PART IV
DETERMINATION OF NOVICE BREAK AND NOVICE SPEAKER AWARDS

17. Article 17 - Participation in the Preliminary Rounds

- 17.1 Novice Teams and Novice Speakers shall participate in the Preliminary Rounds along with the all other speakers and teams in NUDC 2021.
- 17.2 For the purpose of the Preliminary Rounds, all Novice Teams and Novice Speakers will be treated equally with and shall not be differentiated from any other teams or speakers in NUDC 2021.
- 17.3 The rules and regulation regarding the debate and the Preliminary Rounds will be determined further by the Adjudication Core.

18. Article 18 - Novice Break

- 18.1 The number of the Novice Teams who will be participating in the Novice Break will be determined by the Adjudication Core after the Final Status is published.
- 18.2 The Novice Teams who will advance the Novice Break shall be determined after the Preliminary Round of NUDC 2021.
- 18.3 Novice Teams who advanced as the Top 32 Teams of NUDC 2021 or to the Open Break of NUDC 2021 shall not qualify and is therefore ineligible to participate in the Novice Break.
- 18.4 The rules and regulation for the Novice Break shall be determined further by the Adjudication Core.

19. Article 19 - Novice Speaker Awards

- 19.1 The number of the Novice Speakers who will receive the Novice Speaker Awards will be determined by the Adjudication Core after the Final Status is published.
- 19.2 The Novice Speakers who will receive the Novice Speaker Awards shall be determined after the end of the Preliminary Round of NUDC 2021.
- 19.3 Novice Speakers who is:
- (a) not a member of a Novice Team; or
 - (b) a member of a team that advanced as the Top 32 Teams of NUDC 2021 or to the Open Break of NUDC 2021; is eligible to receive Novice Speaker Awards.

19.4 Novice Speakers who qualifies to receive the Open Speaker Awards is also eligible to receive Novice Speaker Awards. For the avoidance of doubt, in such case the relevant Novice Speaker shall receive two speaker awards.

19.5 The rules and regulation for the Novice Speaker Awards shall be determined further by the Adjudication Core.

PART V CLOSING PROVISIONS

20. Article 20 - Applicability

This Rule shall only be applicable for NUDC 2021 and expressly stated otherwise in other competitions, does not constitute the novice rule of other competitions.

21. Article 21 - Amendments to the Rule

The Novice Committee may change, add, or remove any provisions of this Rule at its own discretion. The Novice Committee shall make any necessary announcements or notification to enact such changes, additions, or removal.

22. Article 22 - Closing

Matters relevant to this Rule but not regulated herein shall be regulated further by the Novice Committee.

Pusat Prestasi Nasional

Gedung C, Kementerian Pendidikan
dan Kebudayaan, Republik Indonesia
Jl Jendral Sudirman, Senayan, Jakarta Pusat

