



COLORADO STATE HIGH SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL 2010 MODIFIED SWISS POWER MATCHING PROCEDURES

Pairings using this modified Swiss power matching shall be in the sole discretion of the State Tournament Coordinator (or the regional tournament coordinator at a regional tournament). The Tournament Coordinator’s decisions are not appealable.

This is a descriptive explanation of how modified Swiss power matching for the State Tournament. While the CBA encourages regional tournaments to use this modified Swiss power matching and will train regional tournament coordinators on this procedure, regional coordinators may vary from this power matching system and have been advised to notify their region’s teams of these deviations in advance of their tournament. The CBA does not have any control over the decisions made by the regional coordinators and cannot command control over how these procedures are handled in the regional venues.

Mock Trial Power Matching

The change to modified Swiss style pairings is being made for several reasons. First, under the previous system the highest ranking winner of the first round had a significant advantage by playing the weakest teams in the top grouping the rest of the way. In this modified Swiss power matching system, the top teams will have proved they’re the best by defeating the best teams. Swiss pairings should also make the experience more enjoyable and challenging for all teams as they will be playing teams of similar skill. Second, the Swiss pairing system will also significantly reduces the occasional need for teams to play the same side (plaintiff or defense) 3 times in a 4 round tournament.

First Round

Regional—Full random pairing

State—Partial Seeding.

Teams are randomly matched with a blind draw from a hat with some exceptions. The teams advancing from each of the regions are not matched against each other; additionally, #1 seeds from each region are not matched against each other. To make later pairings easier, the #1 seeds will be alternated by role, plaintiff and defense. We don’t want the statistically probable winners to have played the same side.

Second Round

Using the results of the 1st round, teams are ranked 1 through n (n is the # of teams in the tournament; for example, for State n=22). Ranking is based first on wins, second on ballots, third on point difference/score and fourth total points.

Example: At state tournament, 11 teams will win the first round, having one win each; the teams are then ranked by the number of ballots they received. If teams tie with ballots, then the team with the greater point difference in Round 1 is ranked higher, and finally, if any teams tie in point difference, the team with the most points earned in the round ranks higher.

Teams are then paired up against the next lower ranking team, 1 vs. 2, 3 vs. 4, 5 vs. 6 and so on for as many teams as are available at the tournament; at State this will typically end with 21 vs. 22. These are the pairings for the second round.

Two things can change this straight numerical matching.

1) It is highly desirable to swap plaintiff and defense roles for the second round from the first. If a pairing would occur where both teams performed the same role in the first round, change the higher ranked team's opponent to the next available team that played the opposite role. Simply go down the list to the next team that needs to play the opposite side.

Example: After ranking round one we have a list of teams that looks like this:
1P, 2D, 3D, 4D, 5P, 6P, 7D, 8P (the letter is the side they played in the first round, P for plaintiff, D for defense).

Second round pairings would look like this:

1D vs. 2P, 3P vs. 5D, (since 4 was D in the first round, they switch to be P in the second round, if possible), 4P vs. 6D (6 is the next highest team that needs to be defense) and 7P vs. 8D.

2) Teams will not be matched against each other if they've already played each other. (Exception: In smaller tournaments it may be required to have two teams go against each other again; however, the coordinator should do this only if the plaintiff-defense roles can be swapped.)

Example: From the above example, perhaps teams 3 and 5 had already played each other in the first round; then we would look for the next highest team instead, so round 2 would look like:

1D vs. 2P, 3P vs. 6D, 4P vs. 5D, 7P vs. 8D

With modified Swiss pairings, it will now be possible to **guarantee** that every team plays both sides twice in a 4 round tournament.

Third Round

Using the combined results of the 1st and 2nd rounds, teams are ranked 1 through n (n is the # of teams in the tournament; for example, for State n=22) again based on the same criteria explained above: wins, ballots, point difference and then total points.

Pairings are done the same as round 2 except that since both teams will have already played both sides you should be able to simply alternate P/D match-ups straight down the list. More care will have to be taken to verify that teams have not already played each other.

If the tournament consisted of eight (8) teams or less, one clear winner will emerge at the end of the 3rd round. If there are more than 8 teams it is strongly recommended that there be a fourth round. If this IS the end of a regional tournament, rank the combined results to determine the top finishers as if you were setting up to start the next round.

Head to Head Exception – If there is a tie in Wins and Ballots, then Head to Head results will be used as the third tie-breaker in place of points differential to determine the team in the final State berth.

Example: Only 2 teams will advance from Region B to State. After the rankings, Team A, Team B, and Team C are in the top 3 spots in that order; however, teams B and C are tied with 2 wins and 5 ballots. Check to see if B and C played each other during the tournament and grant the winner of that head to head match the State berth. If they did not play each other, then rank by points differential normally. Only check head to head, if Wins and Ballots are tied.

In the unlikely event of a three way tie for the final berth at State, and each team has beaten one of the other two, default back to points differential for the tie breaker.

(Note: The number of teams invited to State depends upon the region's number of participants proportional to the total state wide participants and could be 1, 2 or more.)

Fourth Round

The fourth round match-ups proceed very much like round 2 as well by continuing to flip P/D rolls and watching out for the increasing chance that pairs have already played each other.

If this is the end of a regional tournament, rank the combined results to determine the top finishers as if you were setting up to start another round. Use the head to head exception if there is a Wins/Ballots tie for the final State entry.

Fifth Round (Regional or State Championship)

After the final rankings are complete, the top two teams face off against each other for the State championship (and possibly also at the regional level—if a region uses a fifth round). For example, when 2 teams advance to State from a region, it is possible that the 2nd spot in the finals could be tied with 3 wins and x ballots between two or more teams. Therefore, the head to head exception will be checked and applied here as well.

The plaintiff/defense roles for the State championship round will be decided by coin toss per Rule 8.4.

All pairings using this modified Swiss power matching (including, but not limited to, interpretations of these procedures and decisions when a situation is not expressly covered by these procedures) shall be in the sole discretion of the CBA Mock Trial Committee and/or State Tournament Coordinator (or the regional tournament coordinator at a regional tournament) and are not appealable.