



2026 Board Meeting Agenda

Toronto, Canada

July 11-12, 2026



American Mock Trial Association
Meeting of Board of Directors
Toronto, Ontario
July 11–12, 2026
Agenda

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call**
- II. Welcome and Remarks (D’Ippolito)**
- III. Approval of Agenda**
See Appendix A for an explanation of the agenda.
- IV. Approval of 2025 Mid-Year Meeting Minutes**
See Appendix E.
- V. Committee Reports**
Most committees will deliver their reports to the Board via email prior to the meeting.
- VI. Tabled Motions**
See Appendix A for an explanation of tabled motions.
See Appendix D for a list of motions tabled by committee.
- VII. Approval of Consent Calendar**
See Appendix C for the motions on the consent calendar.
- VIII. Elections and Appointments**
- IX. Motions**
The full text of motions advanced for debate appears in Appendix B. The shortened titles here are for reference only. Designations in **green** were advanced by the committee with a positive recommendation. Designations in *blue italic* were advanced by the committee with no recommendation.

Number	Description
BUDGET-02	Creates ad hoc hosting compensatory fund
BUDGET-03	Amends travel policy to increase AMTA representative daily food stipend
CIC-01	Authorizes the CIC to impose a sanction of forfeiture of a number of ballots that is less than the total number of ballots in the round
CIC-02	Requires teams complaining of improper invention to provide their own video footage

Number	Description
<i>CIC-05</i>	Limits in-tournament review policies for NCT to the championship round
EC-01	Amends NCT host bid rules to extend host bid to programs that earn an open bid to ORCS
EC-02	Establishes an exploratory committee on expansion and host-site model for AMTA championship series
EC-04	Increases the regional tournament registration fee for teams beyond a program's third ("C") team
EC-06	Provides for induction process into Coaches' Hall of Fame
EC-07	Authorizes and directs the President and Treasurer to sign the management representation letter regarding the FY25 audit
EC-08	Authorizes a three-year contract with Nichols Accounting Group to conduct audits for FY26, FY27, and FY28
<i>EC-11</i>	Makes in-tournament review at NCT permanent
EC-12	Removes reference to executive summary as material to be provided by hosts
<i>EC-16</i>	Removes ability of criminal defendant to invent facts outside of case materials
<i>EC-21</i>	Allows participation of accelerated high school students in AMTA-sanctioned competitions
EC-23	Requires consultation of the Executive Committee regarding the judges of the NCT championship round
EC-24	Establishes an AMTA archive at Furman University
EC-25	Requires timely submission of full text of motions
RULES-01	Amends rules regarding substitution in the case of illness or emergency to clarify hierarchy of substitution preference
RULES-07	Authorizes AMTA Representatives to pre-determine blue ballots to discount if there are more judges than scoring ballots
RULES-09	Establishes procedures for announcing that time has expired

Number	Description
RULES-12	Allows teams to seek interventions to provide a clarification of the rules
RULES-15	Enters committee as a whole to discuss scouting ban at regionals
RULES-18	Requires that an error be by AMTA for Act of AMTA relief
RULES-19	Clarifies what students must do to raise allegations of bad judging
TAB-01	Requires 23 minimum ranks to earn an individual award at AMTA-sanctioned tournaments with three blue ballots
TAB-03	Swaps OCS and PD in the tiebreaker order
TAC-07	Amends regional waitlist process to address geographic considerations in waitlist process
TAC-09	Reduces the number of teams per school that are guaranteed to compete at regional tournaments to two
TAC-10	Revises regional assignment waitlist procedures to bring into conformity with current TAC practice
TAC-11	Revises regional assignment waitlist procedure to prioritize a limited number of late-registered “A” teams over “D”, “E”, and “F” teams
TAC-12	Streamlines criteria for assignment to regional tournaments
TAC-15	Provides TAC discretion to remove tournament hosts without needing to wait two years
TAC-16	Selects 2028 NCT host

X. Report of Treasurer / Budget Committee (Randels Schuette)

XI. Approval of 2026-27 Budget

XII. Unfinished / New Business

XIII. Adjournment



Appendix A

Agenda Explanation



American Mock Trial Association
Meeting of Board of Directors
Toronto, Ontario
July 11–12, 2026
Appendix A: Explanation of Agenda

Pursuant to [AMTA Rule 15.7\(2\)](#), the Executive Committee referred each motion to a Board committee based on the subject matter of the motion. All motions are referenced numerically by the abbreviation of the committee to which the motion was referred (e.g., EC-02, TAB-03).

Each committee had the option of (1) advancing the motion to the Board with a positive recommendation, (2) advancing the motion to the Board with no recommendation, or (3) tabling the motion. Further, each committee had the option to make amendments to each motion prior to advancing it to the Board, and to make further revisions following a two-week review-and-comment period by the Board.

Advanced Motions (Appendix B)

Motions advanced by committee with a positive recommendation do not require a second. These motions are indicated by a designation in green—e.g., **TAC-01**. Motions advanced by committee with no recommendation do require a second. These motions are indicated by a designation in blue italics—e.g., *TAB-02*.

Consent Calendar (Appendix C)

The Consent Calendar comprises motions advanced by committee that, in the determination of the Executive Committee, are of a technical or non-controversial nature such that they may be adopted by the Board without further debate. Three Board members may ask that a motion be removed from the Consent Calendar; such a motion would then be subject to separate debate and action.

Tabled Motions (Appendix D)

These motions are designated in red with underlining—for example, EC-09. No action will be taken on any tabled motion unless five board members ask that a vote be held to untable the motion and the Board subsequently votes to untable. If the vote to untable the motion is successful, the untabled motion will then be subject to debate and action on its merits.

Voting Standards

For a motion to be adopted, it must receive a majority of the votes cast at a meeting where a quorum is present. AMTA Bylaw 4.10. Motions to amend the Bylaws require an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Voting Directors. AMTA Bylaw 8.02.



Appendix B

Full Text of Motions



American Mock Trial Association

Meeting of Board of Directors

Toronto, Ontario

July 11–12, 2026

Appendix B: Full Text of Advanced Motions

SUMMARY OF ADVANCED MOTIONS

The full text of motions advanced are provided below. The shortened descriptions here are for reference only. Designations in **green** were advanced by the committee with a positive recommendation. Designations in *blue italic* were advanced by the committee with no recommendation.

In cases where existing rules are being amended, rule language to be deleted is shown ~~in red strikethrough~~, and new language to be created is shown in blue underline.

Number	Description	Page
BUDGET-02	Creates ad hoc hosting compensatory fund	<u>4</u>
BUDGET-03	Amends travel policy to increase AMTA representative daily food stipend	<u>5</u>
CIC-01	Authorizes the CIC to impose a sanction of forfeiture of a number of ballots that is less than the total number of ballots in the round	<u>6</u>
CIC-02	Requires teams complaining of improper invention to provide their own video footage	<u>7</u>
<i>CIC-05</i>	Limits in-tournament review policies for NCT to the championship round	<u>8</u>
EC-01	Amends NCT host bid rules to extend host bid to programs that earn an open bid to ORCS	<u>9</u>
EC-02	Establishes an exploratory committee on expansion and host-site model for AMTA championship series	<u>10</u>

Number	Description	Page
EC-04	Increases the regional tournament registration fee for teams beyond a program's third ("C") team	<u>11</u>
EC-06	Provides for induction process into Coaches' Hall of Fame	<u>12</u>
EC-07	Authorizes and directs the President and Treasurer to sign the management representation letter regarding the FY25 audit	<u>13</u>
EC-08	Authorizes a three-year contract with Nichols Accounting Group to conduct audits for FY26, FY27, and FY28	<u>14</u>
EC-11	Makes in-tournament review at NCT permanent	<u>15</u>
EC-12	Removes reference to executive summary as material to be provided by hosts	<u>16</u>
EC-16	Removes ability of criminal defendant to invent facts outside of case materials	<u>17</u>
EC-21	Allows participation of accelerated high school students in AMTA-sanctioned competitions	<u>18</u>
EC-23	Requires consultation of the Executive Committee regarding the judges of the NCT championship round	<u>20</u>
EC-24	Establishes an AMTA archive at Furman University	<u>21</u>
EC-25	Requires timely submission of full text of motions	<u>23</u>
RULES-01	Amends rules regarding substitution in the case of illness or emergency to clarify hierarchy of substitution preference	<u>24</u>
RULES-07	Authorizes AMTA Representatives to pre-determine blue ballots to discount if there are more judges than scoring ballots	<u>26</u>
RULES-09	Establishes procedures for announcing that time has expired	<u>28</u>
RULES-12	Allows teams to seek interventions to provide a clarification of the rules	<u>29</u>

Number	Description	Page
RULES-15	Enters committee as a whole to discuss scouting ban at regionals	30
RULES-18	Requires that an error be by AMTA for Act of AMTA relief	32
RULES-19	Clarifies what students must do to raise allegations of bad judging	33
TAB-01	Requires 23 minimum ranks to earn an individual award at AMTA-sanctioned tournaments with three blue ballots	34
TAB-03	Swaps OCS and PD in the tiebreaker order	35
TAC-07	Amends regional waitlist process to address geographic considerations in waitlist process	37
TAC-09	Reduces the number of teams per school that are guaranteed to compete at regional tournaments to two	38
TAC-10	Revises regional assignment waitlist procedures to bring into conformity with current TAC practice	39
TAC-11	Revises regional assignment waitlist procedure to prioritize a limited number of late-registered “A” teams over “D”, “E”, and “F” teams	41
TAC-12	Streamlines criteria for assignment to regional tournaments	42
TAC-15	Provides TAC discretion to remove tournament hosts without needing to wait two years	44
TAC-16	Selects 2028 NCT host	45

BUDGET-02

Motion by Schuett to add Rule 10.25:

Rule 10.25 Compensatory funds for hosts.

In the event that tournament facilities are damaged by AMTA competitors during a sanctioned tournament, the host may petition AMTA for compensatory funds to reimburse the host for any costs incurred in repairing damage caused by AMTA competitors to the host's tournament facilities.

Upon receipt of a complaint from a host under this section, the AMTA's Executive Committee shall review the host's petition and may issue compensatory funds as required. The host must clearly demonstrate damage occurred at the host's tournament facility because of an act of an AMTA competitor during a sanctioned tournament.

***Rationale:** Our entire competitive model relies on volunteer hosts to provide quality tournament facilities. Many hosts incur expenses beyond the host stipend provided by AMTA. Forcing our volunteer hosts to incur added and unexpected expenses because AMTA competitors damage the tournament facilities will undoubtedly create a chilling effect that will result in fewer volunteer hosts applying to provide quality facilities for sanctioned tournaments. AMTA should annually maintain no less than \$2500 in its Ad Hoc Hosting Compensatory Fund. Hosts bear the burden of requesting compensatory relief and proving such relief is owed. The fund should not create a financial burden for AMTA and likely will not need to be replenished on an annual basis but only as needed.*

BUDGET-03

Motion by Sohi (as amended by Committee) to amend the Travel Policy to read as follows:

Meals will be reimbursed up to ~~\$50.00~~ \$75.00 per day, inclusive of taxes and tips. Itemized receipts must accompany reimbursement requests for meals, including room service. No meal will be reimbursed without an itemized receipt. A maximum of 20% should be used when calculating tips. AMTA will not reimburse costs for alcoholic beverages.

***Rationale:** This reflects inflation and increasing food costs in many of the cities where AMTA Representatives are assigned.*

CIC-01

Motion by Olson to amend Rule 9.10(2) to read as follows:

Rule 9.10 Penalties for Invention of Fact.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) AVAILABLE PENALTIES. Penalties for invention of fact violations may include the following, in order of severity: verbal or written warning, forfeiture of [one or more](#) ballots, forfeiture of individual awards, team or individual probation, or loss of bids. In rare cases, generally limited to repeated or flagrant violations of this rule, penalties may include suspension of an individual, team, or program from future competitions. [Verbal or written warnings,](#) forfeiture of ballots (any forfeited ballot shall be awarded to the other team with a +1 point differential), and loss of bids may be issued either mid-tournament or post-tournament. Forfeiture of individual awards, probation, and suspensions for invention may only be issued post-tournament.

[Subdivisions (3)-(4) omitted]

Rationale: *This edit clarifies that the CIC can indeed sanction a team by forfeiting one or more, but less than all, ballots won by that team.*

CIC-02

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 7.21(6)(b)(i) to read as follows:

Rule 7.21 Invention of fact.

[Subdivisions (1)-(5) and (6)(a) omitted]

(b) Procedures for Filing and Responding to Improper Invention Complaints.

i. Video or Audio Required. Any allegation of egregious Improper Invention must be supported by ~~an~~ [the complaining team's own](#) audio or video recording of the round unless recording is prohibited by the venue. [This rule requires any team bringing an allegation of egregious Improper Invention to have its own recording. Teams may not rely on other teams for the recording. The Competition Integrity Committee may, in its discretion, seek a recording from the responding team, but only in extraordinary circumstances.](#)

[Subdivisions (6)(b)(ii)-(vi) and (6)(c) omitted]

Rationale: Our CIC rules for NCT already require teams to provide their own recording. This rule makes clear to teams they are responsible for recording on their own and should not rely on the other team's recording.

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 9.11 to read as follows:

Rule 9.11 In-Tournament Investigation.

~~For the 2025-2026 season,~~ The Competition Integrity Committee may in its discretion investigate allegations of violations of Rules 6.11 and 7.21 during the [championship round at the National Championship Tournament](#) and, where appropriate, issue penalties in accordance with Rule 9.10. The committee need not be physically present ~~at a tournament at the championship round~~ to issue an in-tournament finding and/or penalty. In-tournament investigations and penalties require participation from at least three committee members. Committee members are not disqualified from this process by serving as an AMTA Representative at the tournament in question. The Competition Integrity Committee may [establish procedures for submitting a request for in-tournament review, which must be explained to the championship round participants prior to the start of the round.](#) ~~establish deadlines and procedures for submitting requests for in-tournament review, which must be publicly posted on AMTA's website no later than the date on which the National Championship Tournament Case is released. The Competition Integrity Committee may impose sanctions, including refusal to consider future requests, if it determines that a request for in-tournament review was frivolous. See Rule 9.28.~~ The Competition Integrity Committee may defer complaints raised in-tournament to post-tournament review. ~~Other than complaints raised in-tournament and deferred to post-tournament review, there shall be no~~ [The Competition Integrity Committee will otherwise follow its regionals and ORCS procedures for post-tournament review for violations of Rules 6.11 or 7.21.](#)

Rationale: *In-tournament review for Rounds 1 through 4 at NCT is extremely time-consuming for the CIC panelists conducting in-tournament review, and in recent years has not provided students with helpful guidance during the tournament. Allowing a group, including AMTA Reps, to adjudicate during the final round will prevent what we are all most worried about.*

EC-01

Motion by Gelfand to amend Rule 12.7(2)(a) to read as follows:

Rule 12.7 National championship bids

[*Subdivision (1) omitted*]

(2) HOST BID.

(a) General rule for host bid. The host institution at the National Championship Tournament, in the event that only one school is hosting, shall be guaranteed at least one bid to its own National Championship Tournament, provided that said host school had at least one team which qualified, **by a direct bid or an open bid**, to an Opening Round Championship Series Tournament. In no event shall a host receive a second bid to the National Championship Tournament under this rule if it has already received one bid out of an Opening Round Championship Series Tournament to the National Championship Tournament.

[*Subdivisions (2)(b)-(c) and (3) omitted*]

Rationale: *Gone are the days when most five-win teams at regionals are receiving open bids to ORCS. Of the 18 open bids that were awarded, 16 were given to teams that had 5.5 wins or more at regionals. The two five-win teams that received open bids had CS's of 20 and 19 respectively. Indeed, one of the 2026 NCT host's own teams stood at the top of the open bid list at 6.5. Clearly, open bids have become sufficiently difficult to obtain that the teams that receive them have, that there is no rational reason to deny a host bid to a team that receives one.*

EC-02

Motion by Olson (as amended by committee) to establish an exploratory committee on expansion and host-site model for AMTA Championship Series

Motion to establish an Exploratory Committee to evaluate various proposals for restructuring the NCT and ORCS structure. The Exploratory Committee should consider proposals related to expanding the Championship Series, proposals related to managing capacity in AMTA-sanctioned tournaments, and other proposals related to ensuring sustained and manageable operation of AMTA tournaments.

The Committee is authorized to seek feedback from stakeholders, including teams, coaches, hosts, alumni, and judges. The Committee shall produce a written report that includes a feasibility analysis (including budget impacts, stakeholder impacts, and necessary rule changes) for any proposals considered in-depth, as well as a list of proposals that were not considered in-depth and brief explanations for why.

The Committee shall include representatives with experience across the tournament pipeline and host operations, such as current or recent AMTA leadership; TAC and TAB Committee participation; ORCS hosts (or individuals with tournament operations experience); individuals with budgeting/finance expertise; and individuals with judge recruitment expertise.

Rationale: *The American Mock Trial Association (“AMTA”) tournament series has experienced sustained growth. Under the current structure, a large number of teams compete at Regionals, a smaller fraction advance to the Opening Round Championship Series (“ORCS”), and an even smaller fraction advance to the National Championship Tournament (“NCT”). At the same time, hosting the NCT is consistently described as burdensome, and the annual selection of a new host limits the development of institutional knowledge and repeatable best practices in venues, staffing, and judge recruitment.*

This motion would facilitate the development of proposals to ensure the sustained and manageable operation of AMTA-sanctioned tournaments, especially the Championship Series. The amended version of this motion provides greater flexibility for the Committee rather than cabining it to specific proposals, while still focusing its efforts on expansion and capacity issues.

EC-04

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 2.4(2) to read as follows:

Rule 2.4 Registration Fees.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) REGIONAL TOURNAMENT FEE PER TEAM.

(a) The first team from each school shall pay a regional tournament registration fee of \$125. ~~Each additional team shall pay a registration fee which increases by \$50, so that the second team's fee is \$175, the third team's fee is \$225, etc.~~ The second and third team shall pay a registration fee which increases by \$50, so that the second team's fee is \$175 and the third team's fee is \$225. Each additional team shall pay a registration fee which increases by \$100, so that the fourth team's fee is \$325, the fifth team's fee is \$425, etc.

(b) A New School shall pay no regional tournament registration fee for the first team it registers for Regionals. Additional teams from that school shall pay regional tournament fees at a 50% reduction from the schedule in subsection 2(a) above.

[Subdivisions (3)-(7) omitted]

Rationale: *Programs with more than three teams already have the funds to keep their more than three teams competing. This may dissuade some programs from adding a D or E or F team, which will make regionals team assignments easier and potentially relieve hosts, who are frequently asked to if they can take on teams beyond their cap. And for the programs that still register D, E, and F teams, their increased registration fees will provide AMTA with more funds with which to provide all member programs with the AMTA experience.*

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 15.16 to read as follows:

Rule 15.16 Coaches' Hall of Fame.

(1) PURPOSE. AMTA will recognize outstanding coaches by inducting them into a Coaches' Hall of Fame., ~~with inductees to be unanimously selected by the 12 most recently inducted member of the Coaches' Hall of Fame. Judges'; Hall of Fame Awards will be presented at the awards ceremony at the Championship Tournament.~~

(2) NOMINATIONS. Nominations shall be open and announced publicly no later than January 15th annually, and nominations shall have a deadline of March 15th annually.

(3) VOTING MEMBERS. The voting members shall consist of the 12 most recently inducted members of the Coaches' Hall of Fame and three Board Members appointed by the AMTA President. The most recently elected member of the Coaches' Hall of Fame shall serve as the organizer annually.

(4) PROCESS. The hall of fame need not have a new inductee yearly. All nominations are to be considered by the voting members and at their discretion, the voting members may solicit additional input from the community. Any inductee must obtain twelve out of the fifteen possible votes in order to be selected as an inductee. The inductee shall be announced no later than the conclusion of the annual National Championship Tournament, with the speaker for the announcement being selected by the AMTA President in consultation with the voting members.

***Rationale:** The process for induction into the Coaches' Hall of Fame is currently pretty shrouded in mystery and I think it's due for a bit of an update. It's not clear that the current voting members can, should, or do take public nominations or if they're proposing inductees only among themselves. Changing to a model that better tracks the Neal Smith may open up the Hall of Fame to individuals who the current voting members are unaware of. Additionally, changing the process from unanimous to 12/15 with 3 of the 15 being current board members may prevent situations in which one or two voting members prevent an otherwise qualified coach from being inducted every year for decades. This rule also currently references the Judges' Hall of Fame, which now falls under 15.24.*

EC-07

Motion by Halva-Neubauer to sign the management representation letter regarding the FY25 audit:

Whereas Board Members are in receipt of the preliminary audit for FY2025 (five documents shared with the Secretary (Ryne Cannon) on June 30, 2025: (1) Audited Financial Statement; (2) Communication with those charged with governance during communication letter; (3) Management Representation letter; (4) Recommendation letter; and (5) Significant Deficiencies letter prepared by Nichols Accounting Group, Nampa, Idaho, the Audit Committee moves that AMTA Board members acknowledge receipt and review of these documents.

Additionally, the President (Michael D'Ippolito) and Treasurer (Maggy Randels Schuette) are authorized and directed to sign the management letter, and the executive team to take steps to continue to remove the significant deficiencies identified in the audit.

Upon adoption of this motion, Director Halva-Neubauer, in his capacity as Audit Committee Chair, will direct the auditors at Nichols Accounting Group to remove the watermark from the draft report and issue a final report to the Board.

EC-08

Motion by Halva-Neubauer to authorize a three-year contract with Nichols Accounting Group to conduct audits for FY26, FY27, and FY28

The Audit Committee recommends that the Board authorize a three-year contract with Nichols Accounting Group, Nampa, Idaho, to conduct audits for FY26, FY27, and FY28.

***Rationale:** The Audit committee is in agreement that the Board should reengage Nichols under the terms of the attached quote (distributed to Directors as a separate document). The prices are in line with what Nichols has charged in the past, and all who have worked with the Nichols team have been most pleased with their work, professionalism, and desire to really understand our organization through the auditing process.*

Looking into the future, however, the Audit Committee also believes that we should probably engage a new auditor after FY28 to secure the independence that is necessary for a non-profit that is following best practices. There is a rhythm and regularity that Nichols has established with us over the past two years, and that is going to be even more pronounced when they complete six of our audits. That's a good thing, but the coziness and easy of that relationship is why switching auditors after a few audits is a good thing. The Audit Committee does not think that the time is now, but it likely will be time to seek a new auditor in two more years, beginning with FY29..

EC-11

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 9.11 to read as follows:

Rule 9.11 In-Tournament Investigation.

~~For the 2025-2026 season,~~ The Competition Integrity Committee may in its discretion investigate allegations of violations of Rules 6.11 and 7.21 during the National Championship Tournament and, where appropriate, issue penalties in accordance with Rule 9.10. The committee need not be physically present at a tournament to issue an in-tournament finding and/or penalty. In-tournament investigations and penalties require participation from at least three committee members. Committee members are not disqualified from this process by serving as an AMTA Representative at the tournament in question. The Competition Integrity Committee may establish deadlines and procedures for submitting requests for in-tournament review, which must be publicly posted on AMTA's website no later than the date on which the National Championship Tournament Case is released. The Competition Integrity Committee may impose sanctions, including refusal to consider future requests, if it determines that a request for in-tournament review was frivolous. ~~See Rule 9.28.~~ The Competition Integrity Committee may defer complaints raised in-tournament to post-tournament review. Other than complaints raised in-tournament and deferred to post-tournament review, there shall be no post-tournament review for violations of Rules 6.11 or 7.21.

Rationale: *This year made clear in tournament review is necessary and needs to be permanent. Also, this just removes a reference to Rule 9.28, which does not appear to exist.*

EC-12

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 10.21 to read as follows:

Rule 10.2 Information for judges.

All handouts to be given to judges at sanctioned tournaments must be approved by the Board or the Executive Committee. In advance of the tournament, the tournament host may provide (in hard copy or electronically) access to the PowerPoint presentation, Midlands Rules of Evidence, and the ballot. Upon request, a host may provide ~~the Executive Summary~~, the case summary, the Rulebook (in whole or in part), and/or access to the case in accordance with case access procedures.

***Rationale:** I don't think I've ever seen an "Executive Summary," so this just removes reference to something that does not exist.*

EC-16

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend the requirement that every witness have an affidavit, with the exception of a criminal defendant. A criminal defendant may either have an affidavit or not. If a criminal defendant does not have an affidavit, she shall be permitted to build her testimony using only facts contained within other pieces of the case, but shall not be permitted to invent facts outside the case materials.

***Rationale:** Invention witnesses create the most confusion among teams, particularly new teams. This change would continue to allow creativity from students and promote the reality that a criminal defendant is not likely to give a sworn statement, but also provides guardrails and allows somewhat more predictability for teams (and the CIC).*

Motion by Smiley to amend Rule 3.6(2) to read as follows:

Rule 3.6 Student eligibility requirements.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) QUALIFIED STUDENT DEFINED. “Qualified students” include and are limited to the following:

(a) Current undergraduate. This includes an individual who

- i. is not still enrolled in high school or any equivalent,
- ii. has not received a Bachelor’s degree or equivalent (unless otherwise specified in subsection (2)(c)(ii) of this rule),
- iii. is enrolled at a registered school, and
- iv. is enrolled at least on a part-time basis.

[Subdivision (2)(b) omitted]

(c) Accelerated program students. ~~This includes an individual who~~

i. Accelerated Undergraduate Programs. This includes an individual who

- A. has ceased enrollment in the undergraduate division because they have completed the coursework necessary for obtaining their undergraduate degree; and
- B. competes for a school that permits such continued participation; and
- C. is enrolled in a graduate or professional program, other than law school, that permits the student to complete the requirements of a master's or professional degree during the student's fourth academic year of college.

ii. Accelerated High School Programs. This includes an individual who

- A. has ceased all high school coursework; and
- B. competes for a school that permits such participation; and

C. is enrolled in a program that permits the student to complete undergraduate level coursework during the student's fourth academic year of high school.

[Subdivisions (2)(d)-(e) and (3)-(5) omitted]

Rationale: *More students are pursuing dual-enrollment, early college, and similar programs that allow them to complete high school coursework early while beginning undergraduate coursework before formally receiving a high school diploma. Many of these programs also provide students with a more affordable path to earning college credit.*

This season, three member schools contacted AMTA with requests to allow students in these programs to compete. In each case, the students had completed their high school coursework and were carrying a full college-level course load. They were also participating in the college's extracurricular activities in the same manner as other first-year college students. The key distinction was that, although they were functionally participating as college students, they remained technically enrolled in high school and had not yet received their high school diplomas.

Under our current rule, these students were not allowed to compete in our competitions. The proposed change would allow those students to be eligible for our competitions. This change does not open eligibility to all high school students taking college-level courses. Rather, it would apply only to students in dual-enrollment or early college programs who have completed their high school coursework and are functioning as full-time college students.

Although this issue has arisen occasionally in the past, the number and similarity of the requests received this season suggest that these programs are becoming more common. Allowing eligibility for this narrow category of students would allow AMTA's rules to account for these evolving educational pathways while preserving the general distinction between high school and collegiate competition.

To the extent there are concerns about these students being minors, the proposed change still does not affect our existing eligibility rules. AMTA's rules do not currently exclude students who are under the age of 18, and many students begin college before turning 18. If a member school has admitted the student, permits the student to participate in its extracurricular activities, and is willing to roster the student as part of its mock trial program, then the student's age alone should not make them ineligible for AMTA competition. The proposal would still require approval from the member school, consistent with AMTA's existing eligibility rules.

EC-23

Motion by Harper to amend Rule 14.14 to read as follows:

Rule 14.14 Judges for the national championship trial.

Judges of the National Championship Round shall be assigned by the tournament host in consultation with the Tournament Administration Committee Chair [and the Executive Committee](#). The national championship trial shall be scored by an odd number of at least three. The presiding judge should not score if possible.

***Rationale:** The NCT Final Round is AMTA's crown jewel event. AMTA's leadership should be involved in the process of recruiting and assigning the judges for that trial.*

EC-24

Motion by Halva-Neubauer to establish Furman University as the site for the physical and digital archive of the American Mock Trial Association.

Rationale:

Why is it in the interest of the American Mock Trial Association (AMTA) to establish an archive?

Below is a summary of the reasons offered for non-profit organizations, such as AMTA, to establish an archive by archivists at Northeastern University in a paper published in 2000.

Demonstrating Impact: Archives provide evidence of an organization's work over time, which is crucial for proving effectiveness to donors and stakeholders.

Organizational Memory: Archives keep records of past activities, decisions, and successes accessible, ensuring continuity as staff or board members change.

Legal Compliance and Risk Management: Maintaining records helps manage liability and comply with legal requirements for retention.

Marketing and Branding: Historical materials are strong assets for marketing, public relations, and celebrating anniversaries.

Operational Efficiency: Organizing inactive records improves efficiency and frees up space, while protecting the organization's legacy, particularly if merging or closing.

Protecting Identity: Archives help secure the organization's unique story and place in history.

Why Furman University?

At present, many important documents are being held in Professor Halva-Neubauer's office at Furman University in Greenville, South Carolina. During the past year, he has held two conversations with Dr. Jeffrey Makala, who manages the special collections at Furman and serves as the University archivist. Makala has made a commitment to house AMTA's papers, and he has experience in working with organizations such as AMTA. For example, Furman is site for the papers of the Southeastern Theatre Arts Association, which has long been associated with Furman Theatre Professor Maegan Azar. Makala sees hosting these papers as an opportunity to preserve the story of important non-profit organizations that are attached to an academic community. Our conversations over the last year have led to a recent commitment to host the archive.

Dr. Makala has provided a standard deed of gift document, which is sent to Directors as a separate document.

Devil in the Details

Glen Halva-Neubauer remains committed to gathering materials for this project and encouraging others who have papers to send them to Furman so that more papers become part of the collection.

To my knowledge, there is no cost that Furman would impose on AMTA for serving as host for its papers, but that can be clarified with Dr. Makala.

I would envision that AMTA's papers would look much like those preserved at other archives. There would be a listing of the artifacts that would be public, and future scholars and other interested parties who wished to look at the papers would be allowed to do so, in accordance with AMTA's wishes.

Some materials might be considered controversial if released at the present time, so we could negotiate a seal on those papers so that they would be come public at a time certain in the future.

These details could be negotiated by the Executive Board with Dr. Makala and Furman. Makala is willing to appear via Zoom at the Toronto Board meeting if AMTA Board members would like to ask questions or seek clarification.

EC-25

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 15.7(1) to read as follows:

Rule 15.7 Meeting agendas.

(1) FILING. A motion shall be filed with the Secretary no later than May 15, for motions for the Summer meeting, or October 15, for motions for the Midyear meeting. ~~Whenever possible,~~ Motions should contain the operative text to be added or amended as well as a statement of rationale for the motion. Motions may be filed only by a voting Director. A motion is deemed filed at the time it is emailed to the Secretary.

[Subdivisions (2)-(8) omitted]

Rationale: *Rule 15.7(8) already provides an avenue for new business motions, which are subject to a heightened voting threshold. Directors should not be able to circumvent the intent of this heightened standard by submitting placeholder motions, which cause more work for the Executive Committee and for the Committee(s) to which these motions are assigned.*

RULES-01

Motion by D'Ippolito on behalf of Hinckley to amend Rule 3.16(2) to read as follows:

Rule 3.16 Substitutions in case of illness or emergency

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) PERMISSIBLE SUBSTITUTES DEFINED. Permissible substitutes are:

- (a) other persons on the roster of the affected team who are not competing in that trial;
- (b) a person on the roster of a team that is from the same school as the affected team, but not competing in that particular round, only if there is no person meeting the requirements of 3.16(2)(a);
- (c) ~~a person on the roster of the opponent's team who is not already competing in that trial, but only if there is no person meeting the requirements of 3.16(2)(a);~~
- (d) any other person on the roster of any team competing in the tournament but not in that particular round, but only if there is no person meeting the requirements of 3.16(2)(a), and (b).
- (e) ~~a person on the roster of the opponent's team who is not already competing in that trial, but only if there is no person meeting the requirements of 3.16(2)(a), (b), and (c);~~

[Subdivision (3) omitted]

Rationale: *Although this rule is rarely utilized, there should be more of a hierarchy to it at a minimum. As the rule currently reads, the first step is to search for a permissible substitute that is already rostered on the team that is affected. After that, the rule technically allows for either (b) or (c) to be invoked with no clear deference to either one, which means it would be at the discretion of the AMTA reps to either pull from the roster of the opponent's team or pull from anyone else at the tournament. At a minimum, this should be clarified to provide a specific hierarchy for reps to go through so this rule is consistently applied at all tournaments.*

Although there is no clear deference to (b) or (c), one of my students' teams had an experience this year when the current (b) subsection was invoked, where an opponent's team member was pulled to compete with them. I would suspect that most reps choose to invoke the rule this way because (b) falls above (c) in the list, meaning reps are pulling from an opponent's team first, and if they can not, looking to the rest of the field to pull from. I don't think this is the best result for either team that is involved. For the team that is below six members, they must work with someone brand new to them who has an incentive to "tank" against their opponent since it is the team they are rostered on. For the team that is providing the member to compete, they are running the risk of their own teammate causing them to lose ballots.

Further, the teams that need this rule invoked have essentially had a semi-crisis occur during regionals weekend. They have lost one (or more) team members due to illness, injury, or personal emergency. That can be tantalizing for many teams, especially when they know the person they are getting to fill is from their opponent, and new every round. My students had this experience, and when debating whether they would return for the round the next day, consistently said they would've felt better about continuing if they knew they could compete with familiar faces during a stressful evening. It would be a better result for students to give them someone from their own school, or at least a neutral party.

The revision to rule 3.16 (2) would implement a clearer hierarchy that preferences students from the same school competing together. If a team has two schools at a tournament, pulling from the other team first minimizes conflicts of interest: the student added to compete for that round can never compete against their own school, and they have low odds of facing the other team again in future rounds. They also have a reason to support the team they are joining: it is their own school. If the new (a) is not an option, then the reps would then attempt to fill the spot with another rostered competitor at the tournament, giving the best "neutral party" option, and if that is not feasible, then the reps fill with someone from the opposing team as a last resort.

RULES-07

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 10.19 to read as follows:

Rule 10.19 Assignment of judges.

[Subdivisions (1)-(7) omitted]

(8) RECOMMENDED CONSIDERATIONS FOR DETERMINING THE PRESIDING JUDGE. To the extent any information about the judges is known to the person assigning judges:

(a) Judges are volunteers who bring their knowledge and skill to us free of charge on their days off from practicing, teaching, or studying law. Above all else, we offer them our gratitude.

(b) AMTA embraces diversity and understands our students benefit when they see themselves reflected in their judges. To the extent that judges are equally qualified and willing to preside, AMTA representatives may, in their discretion, break the tie by selecting as a presider a judge whose presence enriches the diversity of the judging pool unless such decision would deprive the students of that judge having a scoring ballot.

(c) The assigned presider should be willing to preside.

(d) ~~If it will not take a ballot out of their hands,~~ The most qualified willing judge should preside, subject to [the following](#) exception ~~d(i):~~

~~(e) In a situation in which not every judge will receive a blue ballot, so long as the less qualified judge is willing to preside, the most qualified judges should be holding blue ballots. There are two exceptions to this rule.~~

i. The presiding judge, in an ideal world, is someone unlikely to interfere with the outcome of a qualifying determinative round. If a judge is known to interfere with student performance such that it could affect the scoring judge's ability to accurately differentiate, the AMTA Representatives have discretion to consider this when assigning presiding judges to qualifying determinative rounds. This principle should be invoked sparingly by the AMTA Representatives.

~~ii. A round in the out bracket of round 4, or an 0-4 versus 0-4 round in round 3 becomes a "teaching" round. To advance the educational goal of the activity, the most knowledgeable judge should preside even if this means the most qualified judge will not hold a blue ballot.~~

(f) An actual or perceived failure to abide by these advisory principles is not a basis for seeking relief of any kind.

(9) RECOMMENDED CONSIDERATIONS FOR DETERMINING THE JUDGES WITH BLUE BALLOTS. The most qualified judges in the round should receive blue ballots. This may result in instances where a non-presiding judge's ballot is not counted. The AMTA Representatives may, in their discretion, decide to provide additional blue ballots for all judges in a round so that judges and students are not aware which blue ballots will not be counted. In that event, the AMTA Representatives shall predetermine which blue ballots will not be counted before the conclusion of the round and shall dispose of those blue ballots. Additional comment sheets may be provided to teams at the end of the tournament.

(10) NO RELIEF. No team may claim relief of any sort on the grounds that a judge was not assigned in accordance with these guidelines.

***Rationale:** The practice of giving all judges blue ballots and pre-determining based on judge qualifications which ballots to count has become common practice at invitationals and AMTA-sanctioned tournaments. This ensures that the most qualified judges both preside and score the round. It also avoids judges feeling like their time is wasted if they do not score. This motion would merely codify that practice.*

RULES-09

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 6.18 to read as follows:

Rule 6.18 Duties of timekeepers.

Each timekeeper shall accurately monitor the time elapsed. In order to assist their team in complying with Rules 5.4 and 5.5, the timekeeper may unobtrusively indicate to their team the amount of used or remaining time. The timekeeper shall announce ~~aloud~~ to the court when the time for any part of the trial has expired by visually displaying a “STOP” card. Timekeepers shall not announce aloud time has expired until at least ten seconds have passed after expiration of the allotted time. Timekeepers for opposing teams shall cooperate with and assist each other to ensure accurate timekeeping and to eliminate any interruption of the trial due to errors in timekeeping.

***Rationale:** Timekeepers announcing time aloud when someone is finishing speaking is one of the rudest things that happens during our trials. There is often gamesmanship on when to say “time.” This codifies a clear practice that enforces limits, but allows for slight discrepancies between timekeepers and keeps trial disruptions to a minimum.*

RULES-12

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 9.2(2)(b) to read as follows:

Rule 9.2 Interventions.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) WHEN INTERVENTIONS ARE PERMITTED. Interventions are permissible in the following circumstances:

- (a) to prevent the application of the all-loss penalty under Rule 5.5;
- (b) to provide clarification of rules ~~upon request of the judges~~;
- (c) to address a major and flagrant violation of AMTA rules (for example, if a judge decided a witness could not take the stand because the witness is irrelevant; or, that there is no need for a defense close because the plaintiff has not begun to meet its burden).

Rationale: *Often judges don't know they need clarification of the rules. Teams should be able to request this intervention as well (and I think in practice that is already happening, so this just conforms the rule to practice).*

RULES-15

Motion by Holstad (as amended by Committee) to amend Rule 5.13(2) to read as follows:

Motion to enter Committee of the Whole to discuss the issues of scouting at Regional tournaments, including whether a change to the rules is needed and the scope of any potential rule change.

***Committee Rationale:** The Rules Committee recognizes the rising frequency of scouting at Regionals before ORCS. In principle, many committee members agreed that a rule change may be needed to address this issue. However, the committee had concerns about the exact language of the original motion.*

The scouting ban for ORCS and beyond was created relatively recently and getting that language right required much discussion and multiple amendments. For that reason, the specific language of any rule change in this area matters greatly. Additionally, committee members did not reach consensus on how a scouting ban at Regionals should be structured, including whether it should apply to all four rounds or only certain rounds, and how to account for people who may want to observe rounds for educational purposes rather than scouting purposes.

Because this is a far-reaching issue that affects multiple areas of AMTA competition, the Committee believes it would be most beneficial to have a discussion with the full Board about the nature of the problem and whether, or how, it should be addressed through changes to our scouting rules. The intent is to receive guidance from the Board so that the Rules Committee can wordsmith the exact language for any rule change and present it at the mid-year meeting for review by the full Board.

[Language of the original motion is below]

Rule 5.13 Open and public trials.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) EXCEPTIONS.

(a) During [regionals and](#) the first two rounds of any post-regional tournament, the only persons permitted to enter a courtroom to observe the round are 1) members of the judging panel; 2) official courthouse staff (deputies, etc.); 3) individuals affiliated with the teams competing in that round; or 4) AMTA Representatives or their official designees. Tournament hosts and their volunteers are prohibited from observing rounds unless they are affiliated with one of the teams competing in that room.

(b) AMTA Representatives or their official designees are permitted to limit observers in a courtroom due to health concerns related to the COVID-19 pandemic. A team member or

anyone affiliated with a team's refusal to obey an AMTA Representative's request to leave a courtroom is subject to tournament penalties as set out in Rule 9.3 and/or sanctions under Rule 9.6.

(c) Nothing in this rule prevents competing teams from authorizing individuals ~~from teams not competing at that tournament~~ (“non-affiliated individuals”) to observe any round ~~their first and second round of post-regional tournaments~~. To observe a round otherwise prohibited under this rule ~~the first and second round of post-regional tournaments~~, non-affiliated individuals must obtain permission from the two competing teams in that round. Non-affiliated individuals cannot disclose the contents observed during those rounds to any other school until the conclusion of the Opening Round Championship Series Tournaments ~~during the tournament weekend~~.

Rationale: *This rule would extend the scouting ban to regionals.*

RULES-18

Motion by Harper to amend Rule 12.9(1) to read as follows:

Rule 12.9 Act of AMTA Relief.

(1) ACT OF AMTA DEFINED. An Act of AMTA is an error [by AMTA](#), beyond a team's control, that appears to have prevented that team from earning a bid or placement on the Open Bid list that the team otherwise would have earned. Allegations of "bad judging" shall not be deemed acts of AMTA. Acts of God which are beyond the control of the teams, AMTA, and tournament hosts shall also be considered, but shall result in the awarding of bids only in rare circumstances.

[Subdivisions (2)-(5) omitted]

Rationale: *That seems to be the intent of the rule and if so, it should be clarified.*

RULES-19

Motion by Harper (as amended by Committee) to amend Rule 6.20 to read as follows:

Rule 6.20 Fairness and Impartiality.

(1) Every mock trial judge shall strive to be absolutely fair and impartial in all evidentiary rulings, in scoring and in all other judging activities. In order to assure impartiality, school names shall not be used nor disclosed in any manner during a round. However, a judge or spectator, after submitting the scoring ballot, may inquire about the identity of the schools represented by the teams competing in any round.

(2) Allegations of “bad judging” or any other complaint regarding a specific judge should be brought to the attention of the AMTA Representatives who may, in their discretion, discuss the issue with the Tournament Host and may, in their sole discretion, take appropriate action consistent with these rules and the fair administration of the tournament, including but not limited to asking the judge to not return for future trials. These rules provide no additional relief for allegations of “bad judging.”

***Rationale:** The Act of AMTA rule makes clear that there is no Act of AMTA relief for bad judging, but our rules should make clear that there is no relief, other than what the Reps decide is appropriate in the moment, based on allegations of bad judging - period. We want students to have a positive experience, and certainly judges whose behavior falls below the standard of what can reasonably be expected should be brought to the attention of the host. But, AMTA should not provide relief under its rules because of an allegation that a judge performed poorly. And to the extent that relief is required, it should be addressed on site by the AMTA Representatives (who may, as with any issue, consult with other parties within AMTA including the TAC Chair, Tabulation Director, and President, among others).*

***Committee Rationale:** The Rules Committee agrees that there should be some clarity in what teams can do should they face a scenario where a judge’s conduct is clearly unfair or fails to show the appropriate impartiality for this activity. How this has typically been handled is by the AMTA Representatives. Ballots can and have been thrown out on the basis of improper judging or unfair judging. This rule change codifies the process we are already using. Further, it puts teams on notice that speaking to the AMTA Reps is the path forward to deal with the issue. The reason why the Rules Committee moved the language from the proposed rule in the original motion to 6.20 is that the most student facing rules are in Chapters 6 and 7, as they contain the format and in-round competition rules. Therefore, we wanted this to be more visible to students rather than in Chapter 10 which has more to do with tournament Administration. This rule also seems to tie nicely to what we are trying to prevent, which is unfairness in judging.*

TAB-01

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 13.10 to read as follows:

Rule 13.10 Opening round championship tournament individual awards.

Each opening round championship tournament shall award at least ten outstanding attorney and ten outstanding witness awards. Additional awards shall be given to students tied for tenth place. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no individual award shall be given to a student who has not attained at least 16 rank points [at tournaments with two blue ballots per round or 23 rank points at tournaments with three blue ballots per round](#). If ties create the need for additional individual plaques, the AMTA Representatives shall contact the AMTA office within one week of the tournament with the name, address, and award needed. When distributing the available plaques at the tournament, AMTA Representatives should withhold plaques from students whose teams are advancing to the national championship tournament or from students whose teams are coached by an AMTA director or officer.

***Rationale:** 16 ranks at a two-blue-per-round tournament equates to 24 at a three-blue-per-round tournament. This last year, different ORCS used different cut offs, which led to disparities between the number of awards given out at different ORCS. We should have something written into our rules that clarifies the cutoff, which I'm proposing at 23, not 24, because it is EXTREMELY difficult to get to 24 ranks and we should be giving out approximately 10+ awards, not 4 or 5.*

TAB-03

Motion by Cannon to amend the Tabulation Manual to read as follows:

The tiebreakers, in order of application, are:

1. Head-to-Head victory (see above)
2. Combined Strength (“CS”) (greater sum is better)
3. Total point differential (“PD”) (greater positive differential is better)
4. Opponents’ Combined Strength (“OCS”) (greater sum is better)
5. Total PD after dropping each team’s most favorable and least favorable ballot differentials
6. Total PD after dropping each team’s two most and two least favorable ballot differentials
7. Total PD after dropping each team’s three most and three least favorable ballot differentials
8. (In a 3-ballot tournament only) Total PD after dropping each team’s four most and four least favorable ballot differentials
9. (In a 3-ballot tournament only) Total PD after dropping each team’s five most and five least favorable ballot differentials
10. Total raw points earned (140 points x 8 ballots = 1120 points maximum; 1680 points in a 3-ballot-per-round tournament)
11. Total raw points after dropping each team’s highest and lowest raw point ballots
12. Total raw points after dropping each team’s two highest and two lowest raw point ballots
13. Total raw points after dropping each team’s three highest and three lowest raw point ballots
14. (In a 3-ballot tournament only) Total raw points after dropping each team’s four highest and four lowest raw point ballots
15. (In a 3-ballot tournament only) Total raw points after dropping each team’s five highest and five lowest raw point ballots
16. Flip of a United States coin: “heads” results in the team with the greater team number winning; “tails” results in the team with the smaller team number winning.

Rationale: *This motion was submitted last year and referred to the Analytics Committee. To my knowledge, there has been no follow-up on this motion from that committee. When I proposed*

this motion last year, I did so not motivated in any way by data. Rather, I was motivated by the two arguments below, which I think still hold true and do not require testing by the Analytics Committee. This motion is ripe for a full Board discussion and vote.

1. Once normalized for strength of schedule, point differential means something. *If one team has a PD of +75 and another has a PD of +40 and they have the same strength of schedule, the team with the higher PD actually did perform better against teams of comparative strength. (By contrast, if one team has a PD of +75 and a CS of 12, and the other has a PD of +40 and a CS of 17, it would be impossible to use PD to meaningfully differentiate those teams--that's why this proposal keeps CS as a second tiebreaker.) Using PD as a tiebreaker only when teams have the same record and strength of schedule limits the use of PD to situations where it means something. Indeed, this is consistent with how running PD is used when pairing Rounds 3 and 4; it is a secondary tiebreaker after running CS.*

2. Point differential is more intuitive on several levels. *For one, students (and coaches) understand what PD is, while many are unfamiliar with OCS. As a follow-on to that, students' performance in-round directly contributes to their PD: if they score one point higher on their direct examination or closing argument, their PD is one point higher. OCS, by contrast, is not tied at all to students' actual performance in-round. This is one reason why students may get frustrated at the use of OCS as a tiebreaker; they have effectively no control over their OCS. (Though the same argument is arguably true of CS, students at least know that if they perform better in early rounds, they hit teams with better records in later rounds, and thus end up with a higher CS. OCS does not work that way, and even if it did, it's too remote to follow.) Finally, OCS has little if any competitive value even in isolation: OCS is a combination of sixteen teams' records, and given that most tournaments have around twenty-four teams, there is usually lots of overlap in which teams' records factor into the OCS math. It is not clear why Team A should outperform Team B just because Team A's R1 opponent faced a 6-win team in R3 while Team B's fourth-round opponent faced a 4-win team in R2.*

TAC-07

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 11.4(2) to read as follows:

Rule 11.4 Waitlist.

[Prefatory language and subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) WAITLIST ADMINISTRATION:

(a) The waitlist shall be administered at the discretion of TAC Chair.

(b) Teams on the waitlist will be offered open regionals spots that are within 625 miles from the school's campus, unless they have stated that they are willing to travel a greater distance, in which case they may be offered a regionals assignment greater than 625 miles from the school's campus. ~~The first team on the waitlist will be offered its choice of any open regional tournament slot, regardless of geography.~~ Remaining slot(s) will be offered to the next team on the waitlist until available slots are exhausted. However, the standard rule that no more than two teams from a school may attend a single regional tournament remains in effect.

(c) If a team declines all available regional tournament slots, the team shall remain on the waitlist in its present position, and remains "first in line" for new slots as they become available.

(d) All teams accepting a regional assignment under this procedure do so understanding that, if they accept a geographically distant regional assignment, their bid to the opening round championship site may also be geographically distant, based on the current feeder assignments.

(e) An offer of a regional tournament slot shall expire if acceptance is not received within 48 hours after the offer is made.

(f) If AMTA is unable to offer a team on the waitlist a spot in a Regional Tournament within 400 miles from that school's campus as measured by distance from campus to the tournament site via Google Maps or a similar program designated by the Team and Feeder Subcommittee by 14 days before the start of the latest scheduled tournament, and that school does not choose to compete at a more distant regional, then the school will be entitled to a refund of the Regional Tournament fee and late registration fees paid for the team in question. The school shall not be entitled to a refund of the School Registration Fee. This subsection does not apply and no refunds will be paid to teams placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 2.10(3)(e).

***Rationale:** This change brings this rule in alignment with current TAC practices. We do not offer the first team on the waitlist every available open slot for them to pick from, if we operated under that model, assigning teams off of the waitlist would take weeks. Instead, we offer open spots based on geography, but we also check with teams on the waitlist to gauge their availability and interest in traveling farther than 400 miles.*

TAC-09

Motion by Cannon to amend Rules 3.2 and 3.3 to read as follows:

Rule 3.2 School registration.

Any School, as defined in Rule 1.2(a), may register to compete in AMTA sanctioned tournaments. Timely AMTA registration, along with payment of team registration fees under Chapter 2, guarantees that there will be space in Regional Tournament(s) for at least ~~two~~ ~~three~~ teams from a participating school, unless the school's participation has been limited under Rule 9.6(3). A school shall not be allowed to participate in any sanctioned tournament if the school has any unpaid fines, penalties, or fees, unless written permission for an alternative deadline is received from the Tournament Administration Committee Chair, who should consult with the Treasurer on such decisions.

Rule 3.3 Number of teams eligible for regional competition.

Each school may register an unlimited number of teams for regional tournaments. However, no more than ~~two~~ ~~three~~ teams from a program will be guaranteed a space in a regional tournament. All additional teams from a program will be placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 11.4. No more than two teams from any given school may compete at any single regional tournament. During the 2022 competitive season only, the Chair of the Tournament Administration Committee can allow more than two teams from one school to compete at the same tournament, only if that tournament is a regional being held online and not in-person.

***Rationale:** In the 2025-2026 season AMTA was less than 50 teams away from capacity across 32 regionals when assigning the first three teams from every timely registered school. While this rule change is unlikely to matter immediately, it preserves AMTA's flexibility in case there is another year of unexpected growth. Rule 13.10 Opening round championship tournament individual awards.*

TAC-10

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 11.4 to read as follows:

Rule 11.4 Waitlist.

[Prefatory language omitted]

(1) PRIORITY OF TEAMS WITHIN TIERS:

(a) As between teams in the “tiers” described above, priority will be given based upon the date when registration is complete, with earlier dates taking precedence.

~~(b) As between any teams still tied based on the above criteria, priority will be given based on geographic factors. In other words, if California A and New York A are both on the waitlist, and both payments were received on the same date, California A has priority for available regional slots on the west coast; New York A has priority for available regional slots on the east coast.~~

(b) As between any teams still tied based on the above criteria, the TAC chair shall make open regional tournament slots available simultaneously. The first team to accept a slot is the recipient.

(2) WAITLIST ADMINISTRATION:

(a) The waitlist shall be administered at the discretion of TAC Chair.

(b) Teams on the waitlist will be offered open regionals tournament spots that are within 625 miles from the school’s campus, unless they have stated that they are willing to travel a greater distance, in which case they may be offered a regionals tournament assignment greater than 625 miles from the school’s campus. Spots that are declined will be offered to the next team on the waitlist. ~~The first team on the waitlist will be offered its choice of any open regional tournament slot, regardless of geography. Remaining slot(s) will be offered to the next team on the waitlist until available slots are exhausted.~~ However, the standard rule that no more than two teams from a school may attend a single regional tournament remains in effect.

(c) If a team declines all offered available regional tournament slots, the team shall remain on the waitlist in its present position, and remains “first in line” for new slots as they become available.

(d) All teams accepting a regional assignment under this procedure do so understanding that, if they accept a geographically distant regional assignment, their bid to the opening round championship site may also be geographically distant, based on the current feeder assignments.

(e) An offer of a regional tournament slot shall expire if acceptance is not received within 48 hours after the offer is made, unless otherwise expressed to the team in writing.

(f) If AMTA is unable to offer a team on the waitlist a spot in a Regional Tournament within ~~400~~ 625 miles from that school's campus ~~as measured by distance from campus to the tournament site via Google Maps or a similar program designated by the Team and Feeder Subcommittee~~ by 14 days before the start of the latest scheduled tournament, and that school does not choose to compete at a more distant regional, then the school will be entitled to a refund of the Regional Tournament fee and late registration fees paid for the team in question. The school shall not be entitled to a refund of the School Registration Fee. This subsection does not apply and no refunds will be paid to teams placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 2.10(3)(e).

Rationale: *This change brings this rule in alignment with current TAC practices. It also maintains consistency with how TAC considers geography (i.e., updating 400 miles to 625 miles, consistent with the three-team-per-regional rule).*

TAC-11

Motion by Cannon to amend the prefatory language to Rule 11.4 to read as follows:

Rule 11.4 Waitlist.

Due to factors beyond AMTA's control, teams may be placed on a waitlist for a regional assignment. Teams that register after the expiration of the annual registration deadline as defined by Rule 2.8, will be placed on a waitlist. They will be removed off of the waitlist as spots become available using the criteria listed herein:

(a) The "A" team from any New Schools that register by the priority registration deadline;

(b) Any "B" or "C" team that registers on or before the priority registration deadline that was placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 3.3.

(c) Any "A" team that registers before Thanksgiving.

(d) All remaining teams on the waitlist shall be divided into whether the waitlisted team would be the first, second, third, fourth, etc. team from that school. Priority shall be given in that order; in other words, Alaska A has priority over Hawaii B, which has priority over Montana C.

Rationale: *This change allows TAC to prioritize assigning more programs over assigning additional teams from schools that already have three teams assigned at regionals. Historically, there is enough room for both the (b) and newly proposed (c) categories above, but as the activity continues to grow, my view is that we should prioritize access to regionals for a more diverse array of programs.*

TAC-12

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 11.3(1) to read as follows:

Rule 11.3 Regional assignment criteria and procedure.

(1) ASSIGNMENT CRITERIA. The Tournament Administration Committee will assign every Member School's registered team(s) to one or more regional tournaments. Assignment of schools and teams to regional tournaments will be made after the close of registration. Assignment of teams to regional tournaments will be based on factors including, but not limited to, geography (including minimizing travel for New Schools), preferences of regional tournament hosts, balance of competitive power, and regional tournament size and capacity. Special requests by schools, including to travel outside their region or to compete on specific weekends, will be considered at the discretion of the Tournament Administration Committee if made prior to the registration deadline. Special requests by schools made after regional assignments have been published will be considered only in extenuating circumstances. ~~using the criteria listed below. The below-listed criteria are examples of factors that AMTA will consider; they are not listed in any particular order, and no one factor is singularly determinative regarding how AMTA will assign teams to regional tournament:~~

- ~~(a) assigning schools to a location within five hours of driving distance (according to Google Maps or a similar program designated by the Team and Feeder Subcommittee) when possible (not necessarily the closest geographic region). A school may voluntarily choose to travel further; however, this may result in the school's teams being assigned to any regional tournament or opening round championship tournament, regardless of distance and expense, even if there are tournaments closer to the school which do not conflict;~~
- ~~(b) implementing Board policy to equalize the number of teams at all regional tournament sites;~~
- ~~(c) assigning AMTA Representatives in such a fashion as to ensure that teams of the AMTA Representatives are not competing on the same weekend as their AMTA Representative assignments;~~
- ~~(d) considering requests for specific dates made prior to the registration deadline;~~
- ~~(e) assigning specific teams from a school (i.e. A team, B team, etc.) to better balance power among regional tournament sites;~~
- ~~(f) minimizing travel for schools new to AMTA; and~~
- ~~(g) accommodating schools who wish to move outside their region, only if doing so assists AMTA's Tournament Administration Committee Chair in implementing the criteria in subs. (a)-(f).~~

[Subdivisions (2)-(7) omitted]

Rationale: *The current rule is confusing as to how much weight should be given to the various criteria listed, and whether the criteria are exhaustive. For instance, competitive strength is arguably not a factor that is currently weighed except as mentioned in subdivision (e) with respect to team designations. It is also confusing as to whether these factors are dispositive--for instance, the five-hour driving limitation is artificial (both under- and overinclusive, as many teams cannot drive five hours while some can easily drive six or seven). This rule change brings the rule more in line with current TAC practice.*

The reference to special requests by schools is necessary because these requests have proliferated in recent years, and many of the requests ignore AMTA Rule 11.3(3), which clearly states that "AMTA does not recognize winter, spring, quarter, or other breaks, recesses, or exam periods as conflict dates" unless there is a school policy prohibiting participation in sanctioned tournaments during these periods. Many teams also do not make timely requests, but instead seek changed assignments only once their assignments are released; these requests are often impossible to accommodate or at least require significant adjustments to multiple tournament sites.

TAC-15

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 11.9 to read as follows:

Rule 11.9 Regional tournament evaluations.

Each regional tournament will undergo a site evaluation process that includes (a) a report from the AMTA Representatives and (b) evaluations from all teams at that site. This information will be provided to the Tournament Administration Committee Chair, who, in consultation with the Tournament Administration Committee, will make a recommendation about the quality of all sites. The reports will be shared with each regional tournament host. ~~If a site has significant problems, the host shall be informed in writing by the Tournament Administration Committee about the nature of the deficiencies and given one year to remove them. If the host fails to remove the deficiencies for two years in row, the Tournament Administration Committee Chair, in consultation with the Tournament Administration Committee, may remove that school as a regional site.~~ The Tournament Administration Committee may, in its discretion, remove any host based on evaluations.

***Rationale:** We shouldn't have to wait two years to remove a host who is not hosting a quality tournament. This just gives TAC discretion to take action.*

TAC-16

Motion by Yeomelakis to propose for the board to vote on the 2028 NCT host.



Appendix C

Consent Calendar



American Mock Trial Association
Meeting of Board of Directors
Toronto, Ontario
July 11–12, 2026
Appendix C: Consent Calendar

SUMMARY OF CONSENT CALENDAR MOTIONS

The full text of motions on the consent calendar are provided below. The shortened descriptions here are for reference only. All motions on the consent calendar were advanced by the committee with a positive recommendation and are designated in **green**.

In cases where existing rules are being amended, rule language to be deleted is shown ~~in red strikethrough~~, and new language to be created is shown in blue underline.

Number	Description	Page
BUDGET-01	Amends travel policy to provide lump sum for travel expenses	<u>4</u>
CIC-03	Amends the CIC review procedures to recognize that the CIC can choose not to require a response	<u>5</u>
CIC-04	Amends the rule regarding penalties for invention of fact to recognize forfeiture of individual awards as an available penalty	<u>6</u>
EC-03	Authorizes the EC to determine whether and when to sanction standalone tournaments	<u>7</u>
EC-05	Removes language requiring physical mail delivery of sanctions letters	<u>8</u>
EC-12	Removes reference to executive summary as material to be provided by hosts	<u>9</u>
EC-14	Removes requirement to set time of following year's board meeting at preceding summer board meeting	<u>10</u>

Number	Description	Page
EC-22	Requires that NCT hosts strive to provide at least three judges per round	<u>11</u>
RULES-03	Removes language regarding online tournaments from rule regarding the number of teams competing at regional tournaments	<u>12</u>
RULES-04	Amends rules to correct use of “insure” vs. “ensure”	<u>13</u>
RULES-05	Removes language regarding printing of tab summaries	<u>14</u>
RULES-06	Removes rules related specifically to the 2020-2021 season	<u>15</u>
RULES-13	Removes rule allowing judges to rule on the merits	<u>16</u>
RULES-16	Removes reference to COVID-19 from open trials rule	<u>17</u>
RULES-17	Codifies AMTA Reps’ discretion whether to contact a judge after a trial has completed	<u>18</u>
TAC-01	Amends the definition of “New School” to be based on whether a school competes at a regional tournament rather than pays a regional tournament registration fee	<u>19</u>
TAC-02	Authorizes a new school to roll over fees for up to two years.	<u>20</u>
TAC-03	Amends the process by which a team must notify AMTA to withdraw from a championship series tournament to require notification only of the TAC Chair	<u>21</u>
TAC-04	Amends rules regarding team confirmation of regional placement to remove reference to registration forms	<u>22</u>
TAC-05	Amends rule regarding student membership to reflect Tournament Manager registration process	<u>23</u>
TAC-06	Authorizes AMTA-sanctioned tournament hosts, with permission from the TAC chair, to collect information from teams	<u>24</u>

Number	Description	Page
TAC-08	Clarifies that AMTA does not provide contact information for all rostered students and coaches to tournament hosts	<u>25</u>
TAC-13	Removes reference to written agreements between AMTA and hosts of AMTA-sanctioned tournaments	<u>28</u>
TAC-14	Codifies requirement that hosts of AMTA-sanctioned tournaments be reselected every year	<u>29</u>

BUDGET-01

Motion by Randels Schuette (as amended by Committee) to amend the Travel Policy to combine the allowances for airfare, rental car, mileage, and rideshare into a single \$700 transportation allowance, with exceptions allowed only in extreme circumstances.

***Rationale:** This policy allows more flexibility in travel without having to seek treasurer approval, while also eliminating some duplication of expenses that is occurring under our current policy. For example, currently it would be permissible to claim both a rental car and rideshares during the same trip. This also allows reps more choice in flights, if they choose to spend more there instead of spending on a car or rideshares.*

CIC-03

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 7.21(6)(b)(iii) to read as follows:

Rule 7.21 Invention of fact.

[Subdivisions (1)-(5), (6)(a), and (6)(b)(i)-(ii) omitted]

(b) Procedures for Filing and Responding to Improper Invention Complaints.

i. Review of Complaints. If the allegation is raised timely, the Competition Integrity Committee shall investigate the allegation. The Competition Integrity Committee may decline to review further based only on the Complaint. If the Competition Integrity Committee elects to proceed with review, it shall request a response and issue a decision following ~~upon~~ its collection of a complete investigative file. A complete investigative file shall include (i) the Complaint filed through the online Competition Integrity Committee Form; (ii) the Response filed through the online Competition Integrity Committee Form (and submitted no more than 48 hours after request, which may be extended upon request and for good cause); and (iii) any supplemental materials requested of the parties by the Committee Chair or the Chair's designee. The Chair or the Chair's designee shall have discretion to receive additional supplemental materials, including, but not limited to, trial recordings, ballots and comment sheets, statements from others including the AMTA Representatives, and amicus briefs. The parties shall work in good faith to provide any requested supplemental materials. Any amicus briefs must be received by the relevant party's filing deadline and must total no more than 500 words. The Chair or the Chair's designee shall also have discretion to set word or page limits for any additional supplemental materials.

[Subdivisions (6)(b)(iv)-(vi) and (6)(c) omitted]

Rationale: *The rule previously did not contemplate the scenario in which the CIC elects not to request a response. This just codifies that scenario to make clear to teams a response may or may not be requested.*

CIC-04

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 9.10 to read as follows:

Rule 9.10 Penalties for Invention of Fact.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) AVAILABLE PENALTIES. Penalties for invention of fact violations may include the following, in order of severity: verbal or written warning, forfeiture of ballots, forfeiture of individual awards, team or individual probation, or loss of bids. In rare cases, generally limited to repeated or flagrant violations of this rule, penalties may include suspension of an individual, team, or program from future competitions. Forfeiture of ballots (any forfeited ballot shall be awarded to the other team with a +1 point differential), [forfeiture of individual awards](#), and loss of bids may be issued either mid-tournament or post-tournament. ~~Forfeiture of individual awards~~, Probation, and suspensions for invention may only be issued post-tournament.

[Subdivision (3) omitted]

(4) APPEALS PROCESS. Verbal or written warnings may not be appealed. Penalties of ~~point deduction on ballots~~, ballot forfeiture, [forfeiture of individual awards](#), probation, loss of bids, or suspension may be appealed only by the penalized team or individual to the Executive Committee and will be reviewed under an abuse of discretion standard. [Decisions of the Executive Committee regarding](#) suspensions may be appealed to the AMTA board of directors. The appellate decision of those bodies regarding penalties is final. Notwithstanding this section, in-tournament penalties applied at the Championship under Rule 9.11 shall be subject to review or appeal only under the procedures specifically instituted for in-tournament review under Rule 9.11.

Rationale: *This is really just clean up of the rule based on what we passed last year.*

EC-03

Motion by Olson to amend Rule 10.23 to read as follows:

Rule 10.23 Stand-alone tournaments.

AMTA may, from time to time, sanction stand-alone tournaments outside of the traditional regional, opening round championship, and national championship round tournament structure. Such tournaments may be hosted either by AMTA or by an institutional host. The Executive Committee is empowered to determine [whether and when to sanction a stand-alone tournament](#) [and](#) the mission and parameters of each stand-alone tournament.

***Rationale:** The existing rule allows AMTA to sanction stand-alone tournaments but does not specify who exactly sanctions such tournaments for AMTA. While the EC can establish the mission and parameters of a stand-alone tournament that doesn't quite extend to establishing the existence of the tournament.*

EC-05

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 9.7(5) to read as follows:

Rule 9.7 Sanctions Procedures.

[Subdivisions (1)-(4) omitted]

(5) DELIVERY OF FINAL SANCTION. Upon either the expiration of the time to appeal a sanction to the Executive Committee or the decision of the full Board imposing a sanction, the Secretary shall reduce the sanction to writing and cause such sanction to be sent via e-mail ~~and in hard copy via mail or courier~~ to the school's primary contact person, to the person who signed the school's letter of institutional support, and to any individuals subject to an individual sanction.

***Rationale:** It's 2026, I don't think we need to be communicating anything via USPS these days.*

EC-12

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 10.21 to read as follows:

Rule 10.2 Information for judges.

All handouts to be given to judges at sanctioned tournaments must be approved by the Board or the Executive Committee. In advance of the tournament, the tournament host may provide (in hard copy or electronically) access to the PowerPoint presentation, Midlands Rules of Evidence, and the ballot. Upon request, a host may provide ~~the Executive Summary~~, the case summary, the Rulebook (in whole or in part), and/or access to the case in accordance with case access procedures.

***Rationale:** I don't think I've ever seen an "Executive Summary," so this just removes reference to something that does not exist.*

EC-14

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 15.8 to read as follows:

Rule 15.8 Meeting schedules.

The Board will set the ~~time and~~ place of the annual summer meeting at the preceding summer meeting.

***Rationale:** Conforming the rule to practice. We set the place, but never the time, at the board meeting each summer.*

EC-22

Motion by Harper to amend Rule 14.7 to read as follows:

Rule 14.7 Judges for the national championship tournament.

AMTA National Championship Hosts must strive to provide at least three scoring judges per trial at the National Championship Tournament. The host of the national championship tournament shall be authorized, but not required, to recruit sufficient judges so as to permit the use of three, four, or five scoring judges in every non-final round trial at that tournament. The AMTA Tabulation Director shall make the final decision as to whether two, three, four, or five ballots per round will be used. When possible, the decision will be made prior to the start of the tournament's opening ceremony, but if not, it must be made and announced to all Teams prior to the start of the first round. The decision will be made prior to the start of the tournament's opening ceremony. Should the AMTA Tabulation Director make such a decision, they will modify the rules as necessary to adapt to a tournament with three, four, or five scoring judges per round.

***Rationale:** Three judges per trial appears to be the expectation for NCT at this point - AMTA should make that clear.*

RULES-03

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 3.3 to read as follows:

Rule 3.3 Number of teams eligible for regional competition.

Each school may register an unlimited number of teams for regional tournaments. However, no more than three teams from a program will be guaranteed a space in a regional tournament. All additional teams from a program will be placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 11.4. No more than two teams from any given school may compete at any single regional tournament. ~~During the 2022 competitive season only, the Chair of the Tournament Administration Committee can allow more than two teams from one school to compete at the same tournament, only if that tournament is a regional being held online and not in-person.~~

***Rationale:** It seems an appropriate time to remove a reference that is now 4-5 years out of date from this rule, and this would also not be implicated in a tournament being transitioned to a Zoom tournament due to inclement weather, for example, as no more than two teams from the school would have been assigned to a tournament impacted by inclement weather, anyway.*

RULES-04

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rules 5.1 and 15.12(5)(c) to read as follows:

Rule 5.1 AMTA Representatives at sanctioned tournaments.

Two AMTA Representatives shall be assigned to each sanctioned tournament. If a tournament has divisions, at least two AMTA Representatives shall be assigned to each division. More AMTA Representatives may be assigned to any given tournament at the discretion of the Tournament Administration Chair in consultation with the Treasurer. Each Representative shall be an AMTA director or officer, candidate director, or other individual approved by the Tournament Administration Committee. No Representative may have a team in competition at the tournament to which they are assigned. The AMTA Representatives shall oversee the tabulation room, resolve disputes, and ~~insure~~ ensure compliance with all AMTA rules and procedures. A tournament may proceed with one AMTA Representative if necessary as determined by the AMTA President, Tournament Administration Committee Chair, Tabulation Director, or their designee.

Rule 15.12 Case Committee duties and procedures.

[Subdivisions (1)-(4) and (5)(a)-(b) omitted]

(c) The Case Committee is responsible for clarifying the burden of proof to be used in cases involving an affirmative defense. The Committee will also specify the order of witness selection and will ~~insure~~ ensure that affidavits contain the statement in Rule 7.15 under affidavits. The Committee will pay close attention to matters involving authentication of documents.

[Subdivisions (5)(d)-(h) omitted]

Rationale: *The use of “insure” in both rules is incorrect.*

RULES-05

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 10.6 to read as follows:

Rule 5.18 Tab summaries.

Each sanctioned tournament shall produce a tabulation summary, which shall be distributed to participating teams and ~~forwarded to the AMTA office for~~ posting on the AMTA web site. ~~Whenever possible, d~~ Distribution of the tab summaries to participating teams shall be by e-mail to all coaches and captains at each tournament, to be sent immediately upon the conclusion of the awards ceremony. ~~In such cases, printed copies of the tab summary need not be provided.~~ When the tab summary is distributed electronically, the AMTA Representatives shall make the original tab summary file available for viewing during the 30- minute review period. No tabulation summary may include the trademark of any school or business unless AMTA receives appropriate proof of its license to use the trademark.

***Rationale:** We don't print tab summaries anymore and most hosts wouldn't have access to a printer to print 120 pages of tab summaries even if the AMTA Reps lacked sufficient internet access to send an email.*

RULES-06

Motion by Yeomelakis to delete Rules 8.4 through 8.7 from the AMTA Rulebook:

Rule 8.4 Registration deadlines.

For the 2020-2021 Season, the AMTA Priority Registration is November 16th, 2020, and the Final Registration Deadline remains January 15th, 2021. This supersedes language set out in Rule 2.4.

Rule 8.5 Registration fees.

For the 2020-2021 Season, the First Regional Team Registration shall be \$75, and the Late Fee (for registrations after November 15th, 2020 but before January 15th, 2021) shall be \$75. This supersedes language set out in Rule 2.8.

Rule 8.6 Host stipends.

For the 2020-2021 Season, the Regional and ORCS Host Stipend shall be \$1,000, with the Host Fee Waiver of \$450 unchanged. This supersedes language set out in Rule 11.8.

Rule 8.7 Timing.

- (1) TIME LIMITS. For virtual AMTA Regional, ORCS, and NCT competitions, Opening Statements and Closing Arguments shall be 12 minutes total per side, and Direct and Cross Examination shall be 38 minutes total per side.
- (2) TIME SELECTION. At captain's meeting, each team must announce, in whole minutes, how much of the 38 minutes it designates for direct examination. The direct examination time selection must be 20, 21, 22, 23, or 24 minutes. The remainder of the 38 minutes will be the team's cross examination time. For example, if a team designates 23 minutes for direct examination, the team will have 15 minutes for cross examination. A team may not carry over unused time from direct examination to cross examination or vice versa. For example, if a plaintiff team designates 24 minutes for direct examination but only uses 19 minutes on direct examination, the team's total cross examination time remains unchanged at 14 minutes.
- (3) ALL LOSS. The all-loss time is reduced to 150 minutes.
- (4) PRIOR RULE. Rule 8.7 supersedes language set out in Rule 5.4.
- (5) EXCEPTION. Subject to the approval of the Chair of the Tournament Administration Committee, a tournament that is forced to be moved from in-person to online competition will follow the timing rules for in-person competitions as set out in Rule 5.4 and 5.5.

Rationale: While the 2026 season has clarified that some of our Zoom rules should remain in the rulebook, it no longer makes sense to have these rules in the rulebook.

RULES-13

Motion by Gelfand to remove Rule 6.32:

Rule 6.32 Ruling on the merits.

After the scoring judges have completed their blue scoring sheets, the court may render a verdict on the merits. The judges need not agree. Each judge may offer an explanation of their decision. The decision on the merits of the case should not affect the outcome of a trial or the tournament.

***Rationale:** This rule serves no purpose and contradicts a longstanding slide in our judges presentation that literally states: "You're not reaching a verdict."*

RULES-16

Motion by Harper to amend Rule 5.13(2)(b) to read as follows:

Rule 5.13 Open and public trials.

[Subdivisions (1) and (2)(a) omitted]

(2) EXCEPTIONS.

(b) AMTA Representatives or their official designees are permitted to limit observers in a courtroom due to health concerns ~~related to the COVID-19 pandemic~~. A team member or anyone affiliated with a team's refusal to obey an AMTA Representative's request to leave a courtroom is subject to tournament penalties as set out in Rule 9.3 and/or sanctions under Rule 9.6.

[Subdivision (2)(c) omitted]

Rationale: *The COVID-19 pandemic has concluded and references in our Rules are no longer necessary.*

RULES-17

Motion by Harper to amend Rule 5.19(2) to read as follows:

Rule 5.19 Contacting judges.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) BY AMTA REPRESENTATIVES. After a judge has left the tournament site, the AMTA Representatives may, in their discretion, contact a judge only:

- (a) To obtain a missing numerical score or ranking or clarify an illegible score or ranking;
- (b) To discuss a highly unusual or extraordinary situation occurring during the trial. Routine complaints about scoring and improper invention complaints are not “highly unusual or extraordinary.”
- (c) When the AMTA Representatives agree that sufficient facts exist to warrant inquiring whether the judge made an error in completing the judge's ballot;
- (d) To discuss matters unrelated entirely to the competition.

Rationale: *AMTA Representatives are not required to contact judges after they have left a tournament. To the extent that the Representatives determine that under these rules it would be prudent to do so, fine. But the decision whether to contact the judge in the first instance should rest with the Reps. This proposal makes that clear.*

TAC-01

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rules 1.2(i) and 2.5(4) to read as follows:

Rule 1.2 Definitions.

Unless given a different meaning in a particular Rule, the following words and phrases shall have the following meaning:

[Subdivisions (a)-(h) omitted]

(i) “New School” means any school that has not competed at a regional tournament ~~paid a regional tournament registration fee~~ during the previous five academic years.

[Subdivisions (j)-(l) omitted]

Rule 2.5 Refunds.

[Subdivisions (1)-(3) omitted]

(4) SCHOOLS THAT HAVE NOT COMPETED FOR FIVE OR MORE SEASONS. If a school has not ~~registered~~ competed at regionals in the previous five seasons (or longer), any fines or penalties owed by the program to AMTA are voided and the school can begin with a clean slate.

***Rationale:** The current definition of “new school” prevented the EC this year from allowing a school to be considered a new school when they had registered and paid for Regionals once out of the last five years (and four or five years ago), but did not compete during the prior five years. Competing at Regionals feels like a better metric for a school being a new school than if the school has paid the registration fee. Curiously, the heading of Rule 2.5 (4) already refers to competing, not registering, but this change to Rule 2.5 would bring the rule in alignment with my proposed change to Rule 1.2 and would also clear up the confusion between the heading and the text of 2.5 (4).*

TAC-02

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 2.5(3) to read as follows:

Rule 2.5 Refunds.

[Subdivisions (1)-(2) omitted]

(3) EXCEPTION FOR NEW SCHOOLS. A new school, as defined in Rule 1.2(i) that has paid fees of any kind but does not compete at a regional tournament may roll any fees paid over to the next year. [New schools may roll over fee for a maximum of two consecutive years.](#) This does not apply if the school withdraws from regional competition within 28 days of the start of the tournament.

[Subdivision (4) omitted]

Rationale: *Tammy and I have struggled with the application of this exception. I think providing programs with two years of rolling fees over balances the competing goals of providing new schools with as much support as we can as they get their programs off the ground and ensuring that AMTA's rules are straightforward for programs to understand/for Tammy to administer.*

TAC-03

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 2.7(4) to read as follows:

Rule 2.7 Withdrawal penalties for the championship series.

[Subdivisions (1)-(3) omitted]

(4) PROCEDURE FOR DROPS. To properly withdraw a bid after acceptance, a team must notify ~~both the tournament host and~~ the Tournament Administration Committee Chair. The time of notification of withdrawal does not occur until ~~both parties are notified.~~ the Tournament Administration Committee Chair is notified.

***Rationale:** Our current rule requires that teams also notify the host and that the time of withdrawal doesn't happen until both are notified. For purposes of issuing fines, we should streamline this down to one notification (so that Tammy or TAC are not trying to get hosts to tell us exactly what time a program notified the host they were withdrawing, etc.) TAC also notifies hosts of every withdrawal.*

TAC-04

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 2.10 to read as follows:

Rule 2.10 Team registration required after assignment.

(1) **TEAM REGISTRATION FORMS.** The Tournament Administration Committee shall post to Tournament Manager assignments ~~create online “Team Registration Forms”~~ for each regional tournament, which shall be posted online no later than the Monday following Thanksgiving.

(2) ~~COMPLETION OF TEAM REGISTRATION FORM~~ **CONFIRMATION OF REGIONAL PLACEMENT.** Within 30 days of assignment to a regional tournament, whether via the original assignments (Rule 11.3) or assigned from the waitlist (Rule 11.4), each school must ~~complete the “Team Registration Form” for each team at~~ confirm placement at each regional to which the school is assigned to verify its attendance at each regional tournament.

(3) **FAILURE TO COMPLETE TEAM REGISTRATION FORM CONFIRMATION OF REGIONAL PLACEMENT.** Failure to ~~complete the “Team Registration Form”~~ confirm a regional placement within 30 days of assignment may result in administrative removal of the school from each regional tournament to which it has not ~~registered~~ confirmed placement.

(a) The Tournament Administration Committee Chair will communicate a warning and reminder to register five business days prior to administrative removal from a regional tournament to the “Official Contact” for the school.

(b) Failure to register after warning will result in the removal of the team from its regional tournament.

(c) Under no circumstances will any team receive any refund or credit for any registration fees following an administrative removal.

(d) If a team is administratively removed within the penalty periods outlined in Rule 2.6(1), the school will be responsible for the appropriate penalties under that rule.

(e) If a team that has been administratively removed requests to be reassigned to a regional, that team will be added to the waitlist pursuant to Rule 11.4 with the date of requesting reassignment serving as the registration date for the purposes of Rule 11.4.

***Rationale:** These changes bring our Rules into alignment with current practice. We haven’t had registration forms in years, and this rule can be confusing to new programs.*

TAC-05

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 3.5 to read as follows:

Rule 3.5 Student membership required.

All students participating in sanctioned tournaments must be registered with AMTA. Each student must ~~complete an online registration form on or before the Monday preceding the first AMTA sanctioned tournament for that year~~ register via Tournament Manager no later than 21 days before their assigned regional tournament. Each student must register with AMTA once per academic year. Individual information about students will not be released to any organization outside AMTA pursuant to AMTA's Privacy Policy. ~~The Tournament Administration Committee shall create the registration form and enforce this rule.~~

***Rationale:** AMTA has not had students individually register via a form in years and this rule can be confusing under our current system. I've proposed "no later than 21 days before their assigned regional tournament" because 21 days prior to the tournament is when rosters are due, and students have to have created or confirmed their accounts before they can be added to rosters.*

TAC-06

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 10.6 to read as follows:

Rule 10.6 Information for hosts.

Hosts will receive contact information on assigned teams and are responsible for contacting assigned teams and confirming date, time, place, number of teams, and other tournament details. AMTA will make available to hosts of all sanctioned tournaments a standardized set of forms, signs, materials, and a “how-to” manual. Hosts shall not gather additional information regarding student rosters not contained on the AMTA roster form [without express approval from the Tournament Administration Chair](#).

***Rationale:** We have some hosts who need to collect additional information, particularly for security purposes. That is, of course, totally fine, but our current rule doesn't allow for it. I think that the TAC Chair should review all additional requests for information.*

TAC-08

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 15.23 to read as follows:

Rule 15.23 Proposal to host a sanctioned tournament.

Requirement to submit proposal: Proposals must be submitted by any institution seeking to host a sanctioned tournament for the first time. Current hosts must submit a proposal if the tournament received an unfavorable AMTA Representative evaluation during the prior academic year or upon the request of the Tournament Administration Committee (TAC).

Selection Procedures: The TAC shall review the proposals and present formal recommendation(s) to the Board at its annual meeting. The TAC will notify prospective hosts of the TAC's decision. The TAC shall employ the following criteria, in no particular order, in evaluating the requests:

- Overall quality of the proposal
- Cost-effectiveness for participants
- Location
- Experience and reliability of organizers

Eligibility to Host: ~~a~~Any member institution, other institution of higher learning or non-profit organization, may submit Proposals. Non-member institutions should have a contact person or 92 Last revised: September 15, 2025 organizer who holds individual membership in the American Mock Trial Association.

Proposal Requirements: Proposals must be submitted typewritten and include a cover letter summarizing the proposal. Essential requirements include:

Facilities: Please demonstrate that the host can secure the following rooms. The proposal should include the proposed site and should list any costs associated with the site. If using a courthouse site, the proposal should review any special requirements imposed by the courthouse for security and insurance. The proposal should list any costs associated with the facilities with the understanding that AMTA National Hosts receive a fixed budget, regardless of costs. Photographs of the facility should accompany the proposal.

- Trial rooms sufficient to host at least 48 teams (24 rooms appropriate for trials, with tables and chairs. Student desks are not acceptable).
- A room that can safely seat all participants and is appropriate for an opening assembly and awards ceremony.

- A meeting room in each division for judges, equipped with a power point projector and screen, with appropriate space for refreshments.
- A meeting room in each division appropriate for captains' meetings (it is acceptable to use the same room as is used for the opening assembly and awards ceremony).
- Wheelchair access.

Judges: The proposal should address the need to recruit at least three individuals per trial per round to serve as judges. These individuals should be actual judges, attorneys or advanced law students. The proposal should contain the following information.

- A recruitment plan for judges, including a timeline.
- Information regarding the judging pool (size, resources, contacts made by the organizers, access to Bar Association electronic mailing lists, etc).
- Information on past recruitment efforts (judge turnout at invitational tournaments, past regional tournaments, or prior national tournaments).
- Amenities provided for judges and approximate costs.

Proposed Dates: The proposal should indicate the probable dates of the tournament and provide confirmation of the availability of facilities, if possible. Too, the proposal should indicate if there are any dates in March that would be problematic. If formal confirmation is not available, the proposal should indicate when such confirmation would become available.

Organizers: The organizers should have experience in organizing a tournament or conference and should list such experience in the proposal. Proposals from tournament organizers that are experienced will receive preference.

Lodging and Food: List the local lodging and restaurant accommodations to meet the needs of your estimated number of participants.

Transportation: List the transportation (airport, trains, buses, trolleys, taxis, etc.) that is available in the area. Include distance and available transportation from the nearest international airport.

Institutional Support: A letter from a faculty member or administrator of the affiliated institution or organization should accompany the proposal, confirming institutional support for the tournament. The letter should be written on official letterhead and signed.

Budget: Although the budget is fixed, AMTA must verify that the prospective host is prepared to meet all of the financial obligations. The proposal should identify other

financial resources the prospective host has beyond what AMTA will be providing. This may include commercial and private donations in cash or in kind. Describe how the prospective will secure these resources in a timely manner. Include a budget outlining the costs associated with the event.

Proposed Schedule: The proposal should include a preliminary schedule of events.

AMTA Assistance: The American Mock Trial Association will provide the following:

- The on-site assistance of two AMTA Representatives per division during the tournament to conduct meetings, to perform tabulation, to verify results, to award national tournament bids and to ensure compliance with AMTA rules and policies. AMTA will cover the expenses associated with providing AMTA Representative assistance.
- Ballots, tabulation cards and trophies.
- Contact Information for ~~all rostered students and coaches.~~ [each team assigned to the tournament.](#)
- A stipend to the host based upon the budget for the tournament passed at the annual meeting of the AMTA Board of Directors.

Deadlines and Submission Procedures: The proposals should be submitted in electronic format to AMTA. The Tournament Administration Committee shall provide and announce the deadlines and instructions for submitting proposals for tournaments to be held in a given year.

Rationale: *A couple of these are typo fixes. The only substantive fix is that TAC doesn't provide contact info for all rostered students and coaches. Instead, we provide contact info of the primary contact and then phone numbers for coaches/captains appear on the roster forms.*

TAC-13

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 10.2 to read as follows:

Rule 10.2 Requirement of hosts.

All hosts of sanctioned tournaments must be approved by AMTA. Hosts may recruit volunteers to assist them with running the event; however, the host assumes responsibility for these volunteers subject to the host's ~~written~~ agreement with AMTA.

***Rationale:** My understanding is there are no written agreements between hosts and AMTA, so this just removes reference to something that does not exist.*

TAC-14

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 11.6 to read as follows:

Rule 11.6 Regional host selection.

Regional tournament hosts are selected through a process determined by the Tournament Administration Committee. Nothing in this rule shall be interpreted to require current regional tournament hosts to go through a bid process, [but nothing shall entitle current hosts to continue hosting. Hosts must be reselected each year.](#)

***Rationale:** Current hosts should not feel entitled to rest on their laurels. We should make sure we have the most qualified and motivated hosts.*



Appendix D

Tabled Motions



American Mock Trial Association
Meeting of Board of Directors
Toronto, Ontario
July 11–12, 2026
Appendix D: Tabled Motions

SUMMARY OF TABLED MOTIONS

The full text of motions that have been tabled by committee are provided below. The shortened descriptions here are for reference only.

In cases where existing rules are being amended, rule language to be deleted is shown ~~in red strikethrough~~, and new language to be created is shown in blue underline.

Number	Description	Page
<u>EC-09</u>	Reduces the number of teams eligible to compete at regional tournaments to two per school	<u>3</u>
<u>EC-10</u>	Permits twelve members to compete on a single team	<u>4</u>
<u>EC-17</u>	Requires AMTA to pay for venue damage during official AMTA tournaments	<u>5</u>
<u>EC-18</u>	Provides NCT host bid to any host regardless of whether they earned a bid to ORCS	<u>6</u>
<u>RULES-02</u>	Expands the circumstances in which Act of AMTA relief can be requested and granted	<u>7</u>
<u>RULES-08</u>	Bars coaches from communicating with teams regarding demonstratives during captains meeting	<u>8</u>
<u>RULES-10</u>	Eliminates pretrial and sets a five-minute maximum on mid-trial breaks	<u>9</u>
<u>RULES-11</u>	Requires the written disclosure of demonstrative aids during captains meetings	<u>11</u>
<u>RULES-14</u>	Creates category of non-lawyer, non-law-student judges	<u>12</u>

Number	Description	Page
<u>TAB-02</u>	Applies ORCS pairing system to Regionals	13

EC-09

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 3.3 to read as follows:

Rule 3.3 Number of teams eligible for regional competition.

~~Each school may register an unlimited number of teams for regional tournaments. However, no more than three teams from a program will be guaranteed a space in a regional tournament. All additional teams from a program will be placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 11.4. No more than two teams from any given school may compete at any single regional tournament. During the 2022 competitive season only, the Chair of the Tournament Administration Committee can allow more than two teams from one school to compete at the same tournament, only if that tournament is a regional being held online and not in-person.~~ No more than two teams per school may participate at regional competitions.

***Rationale:** After yet another year of significant growth in the number of teams that registered to compete and ultimately did compete at regionals [Ryne to crunch numbers if possible], an aggressive approach to AMTA's looming capacity problem is warranted. At the outset, it is worth clarifying that this proposal would not prevent schools from fielding more than two teams through invitational season. Less experienced students on C, D, and lower teams would still be able to attend tournaments and develop skills as part of the activity. They would simply not be assigned to regional tournaments.*

This would give AMTA the flexibility that we need (1) when selecting regionals hosts (e.g., we would not need to be as strict about finding hosts that can accommodate 24 teams); (2) when assigning teams (e.g., most if not all teams could have both of their teams assigned to the same tournament, there would be no need to artificially balance C teams' power, etc.); and (3) when deciding regionals-to-ORCS feeders (e.g., it would no longer be possible for schools to earn more than 2 ORCS bids, or for schools to earn bids from lower teams to different ORCS sites).

EC-10

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 3.7 to read as follows:

Rule 3.7 Number of members on a team.

A team shall consist of no fewer than six members and no more than ~~ten~~ twelve members. No one may sit at the attorney table in the role of plaintiff or defendant unless that person is on the team's six to ten person roster. Any team fielding more than ten scoring team members will be disqualified from eligibility for team awards, individual awards and bid consideration. The record of the disqualified team will remain as initially recorded for tabulation and pairing purposes. No student may compete on more than one team for their school, unless the student is given permission to do so under Rule 3.10 by the AMTA Representatives at the tournament.

***Rationale:** Often newer teams need more members to effectively function. Most teams will not use this rule, but it will be beneficial to make competing more accessible to all, while also allowing more complicated cases.*

EC-17

Motion by Schuett (on behalf of Eldridge) to amend Rule 10.7 to read as follows:

Rule 10.7 Tournament facilities.

(1) HOST’S RESPONSIBILITY. The host will provide facilities that are adequate for the tournament. Each trial should have a separate room. The tournament host is not responsible for providing lecterns, podiums, easels or other special props and equipment. Each team should bring the equipment it needs.

(2) PERMISSION REQUIRED TO VISIT FACILITIES BEFORE EVENT. No student eligible to compete in any Sanctioned tournament (as defined in Rule 3.6) is permitted to contact, visit, or otherwise enter any tournament facility during the seven days preceding the Opening Ceremony of a Sanctioned tournament without the express permission of the Tournament Host, in consultation with TAC. This rule specifically prohibits visiting or entering any otherwise publicly available spaces (i.e. courthouses or campus buildings) during the seven-day window without the 58 Last revised: September 15, 2025 Host’s express permission. No Host shall be required to grant permission if requested, and the decision to grant such permission shall rest with the Host, in consultation with TAC. Violations of this Rule shall be subject to investigation by the AMTA Executive Committee as governed by Chapter 9 in this Rulebook.

(3) HOST RULES FOR VENUES. Hosts are responsible for identifying and communicating site specific rules to all teams participating in AMTA sanctioned tournaments. Teams are expected to adhere to all site specific rules including those that may otherwise impact other AMTA rules related to demonstrative aids.

(4) AMTA RESPONSIBILITY FOR SITE SPECIFIC RULES. In the event a participant (or their spectators) violate host rules for venues and such violate results in monetary damage, AMTA shall reimburse the Host the costs of repairing damage provided the host can clearly demonstrate such damage occurred during the tournament.

***Rationale:** Tournament hosts have enormous responsibility for securing venues, including promising that competitors will treat these spaces with respect and follow all host rules. At invitational tournaments, this often includes signed contracts to adhere to venue rules and threats to revoke future invitations. At AMTA tournaments, hosts are not empowered to similarly enforce rules. Additionally, multiple venues this year were damaged during AMTA tournaments with hosts left responsible for paying the costs to the venue or risk professional reputational damage. The first rule codifies what has been standard practice at AMTA tournaments. As to the second, AMTA is in a much better position to track down teams and impose fines for venue damage.*

EC-18

Motion by Holstad to amend Rule 12.7(2)(a) to read as follows:

Rule 12.7 National championship bid.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) HOST BID.

(a) General rule for host bid. The host institution at the National Championship Tournament, in the event that only one school is hosting, shall be guaranteed at least one bid to its own National Championship Tournament, ~~provided that said host school had at least one team which qualified, by a Direct Bid (i.e. not an Open Bid) to an Opening Round Championship Series Tournament.~~ In no event shall a host receive a second bid to the National Championship Tournament under this rule if it has already received one bid out of an Opening Round Championship Series Tournament to the National Championship Tournament.

[Subdivisions (2)(b)-(c) and (3) omitted]

Rationale: Allow more schools to bid to host NCT with the knowledge that they will get to compete even if they don't qualify to ORCS. This will incentivize more NCT host applications.

RULES-02

Motion by Olson to replace Rule 12.9(1) to read as follows:

Rule 12.9 Act of AMTA Relief.

[Current Rule]

(1) ACT OF AMTA DEFINED. An Act of AMTA is an error, beyond a team's control, that appears to have prevented that team from earning a bid or placement on the Open Bid list that the team otherwise would have earned. Allegations of "bad judging" shall not be deemed acts of AMTA. Acts of God which are beyond the control of the teams, AMTA, and tournament hosts shall also be considered, but shall result in the awarding of bids only in rare circumstances.

[Proposed Rule]

(1) ACT OF AMTA DEFINED. An Act of AMTA includes (a) an error beyond a team's control; (b) other extraordinary circumstances where principles of justice and fair play warrant relief to avoid a materially inequitable result; and (c) in rare circumstances, Acts of God and other force majeure events beyond the control of the teams, AMTA, and tournament hosts, all where such instance appears to have prevented that team from earning a bid or placement on the Open Bid list that the team otherwise would have earned. Allegations of "bad judging" shall not be deemed acts of AMTA.

Rationale: *The existing Rule 12.9 is insufficiently flexible to allow for relief to be granted where extraordinary circumstances occur that nevertheless do not arise from an error on the part of AMTA.*

Committee Rationale: *There were dueling motions regarding the Act of AMTA bids and what AMTA should do regarding allegations of "bad judging." For anyone who is unfamiliar, any request for an Act of AMTA Bid is reviewed and determined by the Rules Committee. Almost every year we have one or more requests for Acts of AMTA. In the last 5 or so years, none have been granted. Many, if not most, relate to allegations of unfair judging. After review and discussion of all of the motions on this topic, the Committee's recommendation is that the Act of AMTA bids should only be limited to situations in which AMTA committed an improper action. Every time an Act of AMTA bid is given, that takes away a bid from a team who is on the open bid list. Therefore, the Committee recommends that AMTA stick with its current practice of allowing AMTA Reps, who are on the ground at the tournament, to review any allegations of judging misconduct and handle those issues within the tournament itself. That will provide the most efficient relief and allows for decision makers much closer to the situation to make a determination. As a result, the Committee tabled this motion in favor of advancing Rules-18 and Rules-19 (as amended) with positive recommendations.*

RULES-08

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 5.11 to read as follows:

Rule 5.11 Role of coaches in captains' meeting.

Coaches may not participate in or represent a team at captains' meetings. Once a captains' meeting has begun and until it is complete, coaches may not communicate directly or indirectly with their students attending the captains' meeting. However, nothing in this rule shall prohibit a coach from attending or observing a captains' meeting, nor shall it limit communication between coaches and students who are not attending the captains' meeting. [Coaches may not communicate with team captains regarding demonstratives prior to the conclusion of captains meetings. Coach communication with captains regarding demonstratives shall bar any challenge to demonstratives.](#)

***Rationale:** I believe this is the current spirit of the rule, but it is not codified, and we should make clear that coaching on demonstratives before bringing a challenge to the reps is not allowed.*

RULES-10

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rules 7.4 and 7.5 to read as follows:

Rule 7.4 Trial order.

(1) PRE-TRIAL MATTERS. ~~Within the confines of these Rules and any instructions expressly stated within the case packet, teams are permitted to conduct pre-trial matters, including but not limited to making appearances, introducing case materials for judicial reference, and asking the judge's preference on courtroom etiquette and procedure.~~ Other than introductions and presenting documents to the Court for review, no pretrial matters shall be permitted. The presiding judge shall run trial with the preferences as set forth in Rule 7.5.

(2) OPENING STATEMENTS. Both plaintiff/prosecution and defense opening statements must occur at the beginning of the trial, with the plaintiff-prosecution team going first followed by the defense team. A defense team shall not forego or defer its opening statement until the beginning of its case-in-chief.

(3) PLAINTIFF/PROSECUTION CASE-IN-CHIEF. The plaintiff/prosecution team shall conduct each direct examination (and any redirect examination(s)) of its three witnesses, with the defense team conducting its three cross examinations (and any re-cross examination(s)) of the plaintiff/prosecution witnesses. The plaintiff/prosecution team may present all other evidence as permitted by the case materials. No plaintiff/prosecution witness may be re-called later in the trial. No plaintiff/prosecution witness may be deferred until during or after the defense case-in-chief.

(4) BREAK. Within the discretion of the judge and within the confines of Rule 5.5, teams may take a brief recess or break between the plaintiff/prosecution case-in-chief and the defense case-in-chief. Any break shall not exceed five minutes.

(5) DEFENSE CASE-IN-CHIEF. The defense team shall conduct each direct examination (and any re-direct examination(s)) of its three witnesses, with the plaintiff/prosecution team conducting their three cross examinations (and any re-cross examination(s)) of the defense witnesses. The defense team may present all other evidence as permitted by the case materials. No defense witness may be re-called later in the trial. No defense witness may be called prior to the conclusion of the plaintiff case-in-chief.

(6) BREAK. Within the discretion of the judge and within the confines of Rule 5.5, teams may take a brief recess or break between the defense case-in-chief and the closing arguments. Any break shall not exceed five minutes.

(7) CLOSING ARGUMENTS. Both plaintiff/prosecution and defense closing arguments must occur at the end of the trial, with the plaintiff-prosecution team going first followed by the defense team. The plaintiff/prosecution team may give a rebuttal if permitted in accordance with Rule 5.4(2).

Rule 7.5 Manner of Examination.

Whenever possible, counsel will stand when speaking to the court, to opposing counsel, or to a witness, and shall maintain a respectful demeanor. Students should address a jury if there is a jury present and address the bench if there is no jury. ~~Unless directed otherwise by the court, counsel will ask permission to approach the court or a witness or to use an exhibit or demonstrative aid.~~ Counsel shall have permission to use the well freely, including to set up demonstrative aids and move to see use of demonstrative aids. Counsel shall ask permission to approach the bench and the witness. Witnesses shall be constructively sequestered pursuant to Rule 615, except parties and party representatives. Witnesses shall be presworn pursuant to Rule 603.

Comment to Rule 7.5: Mock trials have elements that resemble both a jury trial and a bench trial. Students should adapt their presentations to the situation they confront in individual rounds.

Rationale: *Our trials are long. Pretrial is excessive, and unnecessary as it is not scored. Eliminating most of the things addressed in pretrial could get trials moving faster and eliminate a lot of time. Breaks also do not need to be longer than five minutes.*

RULES-11

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 7.20(3) to read as follows:

Rule 7.20 Demonstrative aids.

[Subdivisions (1)-(2) omitted]

(3) PROPOSED DEMONSTRATIVE AIDS MUST BE DISCLOSED AT CAPTAINS MEETING; PROCEDURE FOR CHALLENGING PROPOSED DEMONSTRATIVE AIDS. At the pretrial captains meeting, teams must show their opponent any demonstrative aid intended to be used during trial. [Demonstratives disclosed must be recorded with a description on the form provided by AMTA.](#) Any demonstrative aid that is not shown to opposing counsel [and disclosed on the form](#) before the conclusion of the captains meeting may not be used during the following round. If a team believes a proposed demonstrative aid violates this Rule, it must raise the issue with an AMTA Representative before the conclusion of the pretrial captains meeting. Once alerted, the AMTA Representative must determine whether the challenged demonstrative aid complies with Rule 7.20.

Comment: Consistent with the definition of “demonstrative aid”, this Rule does not apply to any unaltered materials that are part of the case packet (i.e. affidavits and exhibits supplied with the case do not need to be shown to opposing counsel if neither their size nor their content have been altered in any fashion).

[Subdivisions (4)-(5) omitted]

Rationale: *Having a record of which demonstratives were disclosed is beneficial to the teams and to the AMTA Representatives in the case of a dispute.*

A proposed form could look like (with a full page of rows):

Demonstratives Disclosed in Round _____:

Description	Disclosed by (P/D)	Initials of Captains

RULES-14

Motion by Heytens to amend Rule 10.18 to:

- Create a new category four consisting of all judges have neither graduated from nor are currently attending law school
- Provide that use of category four judges is discouraged at all AMTA tournaments unless necessary to create two-judge panels
- State that if category four judges are used, they should be assigned after all judges who have JDs, are currently in law school, or are active coaches (including judges who are coaches or otherwise affiliated with a team at the tournament)

Rationale: *Unlike current undergraduates (who Rule 10.17 already forbids from judging at ATMTA tournaments), I recognize it will sometimes be necessary to use non-JD, non-law student, non-coach judges. That said, I think such judges should be used as rarely as possible and that we should do what we can to keep them away from rounds likely to affect bids or placements.*

Committee Rationale: *When the Committee reviewed the current categories against this proposed change, the change would require that all coaches—including those actively coaching at the tournament—be assigned before any non-attorney AMTA alumni, law students, or other non-lawyers. The Committee does not recommend that coaches actively coaching at tournaments be assigned before neutral AMTA alumni. The proposed change also raised logistical questions, including whether all coaches would need to report to the tab room and fill out judging assignments before any proposed Category 4 judges could be used. The Committee was also concerned about potentially alienating recent AMTA alumni, especially since they cannot serve as AMTA Reps until two years after they graduate. Judging is therefore one of the primary ways AMTA alumni can give back and remain connected to the active AMTA community. The Committee also noted that AMTA has many excellent alumni, including alumni who do not attend law school or are not currently in law school, who can provide fantastic feedback to students.*

TAB-02

Motion by Holstad to change Regionals pairing system to utilize the same system used at ORCS.

***Rationale:** If we believe that the ORCS pairing system is fair, why aren't we doing the same thing at Regionals?*



Appendix E

2025 Mid-Year Meeting Minutes



American Mock Trial Association
Mid-Year Meeting of Board of Directors
Via Zoom
December 14, 2025
Agenda

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Members Present: Ben-Merre, Bernstein, Cannon, D'Ippolito, Detsky, Garson, Gelfand, Halva-Neubauer, Harper, Haughey, Hauser, Henry, Heytens, Jahangir, Langford, Leapheart, Leckrone, Michalak, Olson, Ouambo, Parker, Pickerill, Randals Schuette, Smiley, Sohi, Thomason, Walsh, Warihay, Wilson, Woodward, Yeomelakis, Zarzycki (32)

Members Not Present: Hogan, Holstad, Schuett, Watt (4)

Candidate Members Present: LaPrade, Nolte, Selcov (3)

Candidate Members Not Present: Kerwin (1)

II. Welcome and Remarks (Sohi)

III. Approval of Agenda

See [Appendix A](#) for an explanation of the Agenda.

Motion by Cannon to approve the Agenda. Seconded.

Agenda approved.

IV. Committee Reports

Most committees delivered their reports to the Board via email prior to the meeting.

- A. Academics Committee (Leapheart): Written report.
- B. Analysis Committee (D'Ippolito): Written report.
- C. Audit Committee (Halva-Neubauer): Written report.
- D. Competition Integrity Committee (Thomason): Written report.
- E. Content and Campaigns (Selcov): Written report.
- F. Criminal Case Committee (Schuett): Written report.
- G. Development Committee (Bernstein): Written report.
- H. Disciplinary Committee (D'Ippolito): Written report.
- I. Diversity and Inclusion Committee (Harper): Written report.
- J. New School Recruitment and Mentorship
- K. Operational Excellence Committee (LaPrade): Written report.
- L. Rules, IP, and Ethics Committee (Smiley): Written report.
- M. Student Advisory Board Committee (Wilson): Written report.
- N. Tabulation Advisory Committee (Michalak): Written report.
- O. Tournament Administration Committee

V. Tabled Motions

See [Appendix A](#) of the Agenda for an explanation of tabled motions.
See [Appendix C](#) of the Agenda for a list of motions tabled by committee.

VI. VII. Motions

The full text of motions advanced for debate appears in [Appendix B](#) of the Agenda and below. Designations in **green** were advanced by the committee with a positive recommendation. Designations in ***blue italic*** were advanced by the committee with no recommendation. Designations in **red with underlining** were tabled by the committee.

Overview of Motions

All motions are hyperlinked by number to their full text, Board discussion, and outcome.

Motion	Description	Outcome
EC-04	Selects Arizona State University as the 2027 NCT Host.	Passed

EC-04:

Motion by Leckrone to select Arizona State University as the 2027 National Championship Host.

This motion would select Arizona State University in Phoenix, Arizona as the 2027 National Championship Host.

***Rationale:** ASU is a longtime regional host and occasional ORCS host, and they will be hosting an ORCS tournament this year. They always put on a strong tournament and came up with a strong proposal for a 2027 NCT. ASU hosting NCT would bring the National Championship back to the West Coast for the first time since 2017.*

EC-04 passes.

VIII. Unfinished/New Business

IX. Adjournment

Motion by D'Ippolito to adjourn. Seconded. **The Board adjourned on Sunday at 12:30 p.m. CST.**



American Mock Trial Association
Mid-Year Meeting of Board of Directors
Via Zoom
December 14, 2025
Appendix A: Explanation of Agenda

Pursuant to AMTA Rule 10.2.1, the Executive Committee referred each motion to a Board committee based on the subject matter of the motion. All motions are referenced numerically by the abbreviation of the committee to which the motion was referred (e.g., EC-02, TAB-03.)

Each committee had the option of (1) advancing the motion to the Board with a positive recommendation; (2) advancing the motion to the Board with no recommendation; or (3) tabling the motion. Further, each committee had the option to make amendments to each motion prior to advancing it to the Board.

Advanced Motions (Appendix B)

Motions advanced by committee with a positive recommendation do not require a second. These motions are indicated by a designation in green, e.g., **TAB-02**.

Tabled Motions (Appendix C)

These motions are designated in red with underlining, e.g., **TAC-09**. No action will be taken on any tabled motion unless five Board members ask that that a vote be held to untable the motion and the Board subsequently votes to untable. If the vote to untable the motion is successful, the untabled motion would then be subject to debate on its merits and action.

Voting Standards

For a motion to be adopted, it must receive a majority of the votes cast at a meeting where quorum is present. AMTA Bylaw 4.10. Motions to amend the Bylaws require an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Voting Directors. AMTA Bylaw 8.02.



American Mock Trial Association
Mid-Year Meeting of Board of Directors
Via Zoom
December 14, 2025
Appendix B: Full Text of Motions

SUMMARY OF ADVANCED MOTIONS

The full text of motions advanced are provided below. The shortened descriptions here are for reference only. Designations in **green** were advanced by the committee with a positive recommendation.

In cases where existing rules are being amended, rule language to be deleted is shown ~~struck through~~ and new language to be created is shown **in red**.

Motion	Description	Page
EC-04	Selects Arizona State University as the 2027 NCT Host.	<u>2</u>

EC-04: Advanced with a positive recommendation

Motion by Leckrone to select Arizona State University as the 2027 National Championship Host.

This motion would select Arizona State University in Phoenix, Arizona as the 2027 National Championship Host.

***Rationale:** ASU is a longtime regional host and occasional ORCS host, and they will be hosting an ORCS tournament this year. They always put on a strong tournament and came up with a strong proposal for a 2027 NCT. ASU hosting NCT would bring the National Championship back to the West Coast for the first time since 2017.*



American Mock Trial Association
Mid-Year Meeting of Board of Directors
Via Zoom
December 14, 2025
Appendix C: Tabled Motions

SUMMARY OF TABLED MOTIONS

The full text of motions advanced are provided below. The shortened descriptions here are for reference only.

In cases where existing rules are being amended, rule language to be deleted is shown ~~struck through~~ and new language to be created is shown **in red**.

Motion	Description	Page
EC-01	Provides for a delayed motion submission deadline for motions impacting internal Board operations.	<u>2</u>
EC-02	Adopts proposal from Non-Core Tournaments Working Group.	<u>3</u>
EC-03	Adopts proposal from Board Longevity Working Group.	<u>4</u>

EC-01:

Motion by Sohi to amend Rule 15.7 of the AMTA Rulebook as follows:

Rule 15.7 Meeting agendas.

(1) FILING. A motion **generally** shall be filed with the Secretary no later than May 15, for motions for the Summer meeting, or October 15, for motions for the Midyear meeting. **A motion that only impacts internal Board operations shall be filed with the Secretary no later than June 15, for motions for the Summer meeting, or November 15, for motions for the Midyear meeting.** Whenever possible, motions should contain the operative text to be added or amended as well as a statement of rationale for the motion. Motions may be filed only by a voting Director. A motion is deemed filed at the time it is emailed to the Secretary.

Rationale: *The May 15 and October 15 dates are designed to provide time for both committee review and public comment. Internal Board operations don't require public comment, so having a later deadline provides more flexibility in an already busy time to propose useful motions.*

EC-02:

Motion by Sohi to adopt the proposal from the Non-Core Tournaments Working Group

Rationale: PLACEHOLDER.

EC-03:

Motion by Sohi to adopt the proposal from the Board Longevity Working Group.

Rationale: PLACEHOLDER