UCWDC® SCORING FORMAT:
HEATING, SCORING, & REPORTING RULES

For all UCWDC® contests, the ***UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format*** must be used. All contest practices and procedures, to include heating, balloting, scrutineering, scoring, auditing, and reporting of this format will be supervised by a UCWDC®-"certified" Contest Coordinator, with UCWDC®-"verified" Scoring Director(s) and/or UCWDC®-"verified" Scrutineer(s), using a vetted and verified UCWDC®-"authorized" Scoring System, according to the following rules:

Rule #0 – Heating Rules:

1. If space, time, and circumstance allow, a heat of competition will be comprised of only those contestants that are in the same division. Each division's contestants must be randomized by the scoring system to insure fairness in access to the arena floor.

2. If a division requires more than 1 heat, then the difference in the total size of contestants per heat shall be no more than 1. When multiple heats are required for a singular division, the division when necessary may be 'co-mingled' with other divisions, providing the heats size-difference remains no more than 1.

3. When a division requires multiple heats, those heats must be run in a 'contiguous' order, one right after another.

4. Whenever possible, multiple heats for a singular division that have different sizes, the lesser size shall precede the greater size as this helps facilitate scratches giving contest officials the ability to move up contestants to continually re-balance the heats for fairness.

5. If space, time, and circumstance require, all heats may be "co-mingled" with multiple divisions in a heat. In each case of "co-mingling" heats, balancing each singular division across the heats is recommended as being the fairest method of heating.

6. At times, "co-mingling" occurs in the case of ProAm, because one instructor, or Pro, has multiple students in a singular division. If the singular division cannot "house" these multiple students within its heats, then some of those students may then be heated as "outliers" in other heats beyond their parent division, providing they are heated contiguously.

7. Regardless of the divisional makeup for "co-mingling" for efficiency, were one or more of the divisions are heated in multiple heats, the difference in the total size of the heats containing a singular division shall be no more than 1 (to include the "co-mingled" contestants), and for each singular division, the heats must still be run in a "contiguous" order.

Rule #1 – Preliminaries Rounds to determine Semi-Finalists:

1. A Preliminary Round, by definition, will "graduate" contestants to the Semi-Final Round rather than eliminate them. All remaining contestants are then eligible to dance one or more additional Preliminary Rounds to again attempt to make the Semi-Finals.

2. In a Preliminary Round on the ballot, each judge must circle a "Medals" mark for each contestant they seek to graduate to the Semi-Finals, with marks given in ascending order: "HM" (or "M" on some ballots), "B", "S", "G", "GH" (or "H" on some ballots), or "GG". [Marks hereafter are designated and called as such: HM is "Honorable Mention"; B is "Bronze"; S is "Silver"; G is "Gold"; GH is "Gold with Honors"; and GG is "Gold Graduate".] All contestants need not be accounted for in these marks. Contestants not receiving a mark will automatically be given the lowest mark, an "HM". It is not necessary to rank these marks as ties are acceptable.

3. Rules #3 through #8 (the single-dance rules) are used to determine each contestant's placement in the dance category for this round of competition. Once the contestants are ranked by the marks in each dance, the overall formula for the division in question will be used to graduate contestants to the next round. The top-ranked contestants, based on a designated number determined by the Contest Coordinator (plus ties, if any), are immediately placed into the Semi-Finals. Each category in which a contestant dances at least one Preliminary Round counts toward his or her Overall Championship eligibility.

Rule #2 – Semi-Finals Rounds to determine Finalists:

1. A Semi-Final Round, by definition, will "eliminate" contestants, with the remaining contestants dancing either another Semi-Finals Round, until the number of contestants remaining according to the Contest Coordinator can constitute the Finals Round.

2. In a Semi-Final Round on the ballot, each judge must circle a "Medals" mark for each contestant they seek to send to the Finals, with marks given in ascending order: "HM" (or "M" on some ballots), "B", "S", "G", "GH" (or "H" on some ballots), or "GG". All contestants need not be accounted for in the marks. Contestants not receiving a mark will automatically be given the lowest medal, an "HM". It is not necessary to rank these marks as ties are acceptable.

3. Rules #3 through #8 (the single-dance rules) are used to determine each contestant's placement in the dance category for this round of competition. Once the contestants are ranked by the marks in each dance, the overall formula for the division in question will be used to eliminate contestants from the next round. The bottom-ranked contestants, based on a designated number determined by the Contest Coordinator (plus ties, if any) are eliminated from Finals consideration. Each round of Semi-Finals will eliminate contestants from the bottom of the placement rankings. Each category in which a contestant dances at least one Semi-Finals Round counts toward his or her Overall Championship eligibility.

Rule #3 – Finals Round, determining the results from the *majority mark*:

1. In the Finals Round on the ballot, each judge must circle a "Medals" mark for each contestant, with marks given in ascending order: "HM" (or "M" on some ballots), "B", "S", "G", "GH" (or "H" on some ballots), or "GG". For ProAm Dance, after circling a mark, it is not necessary to rank the marks as ties are acceptable. For Couples Dance or Line Dance, if a circled mark is the same for more than one contestant, then the mark must then be ranked, with the lowest number ("1", or 1st) being the higher rank.

2. "Medals" marks are converted to placements as follows: A higher "Medals" mark always defeats a lower "Medals" mark (for example, "G" always defeats "S"). If the same "Medals" mark is used more than once on a ballot, the marks are ranked by the judge from first ("1") to last. A "Medals" mark with a lower number value always defeats the same "Medals" mark with a higher number value (for example, "G3" defeats "G4"). When "Medals" marks and their ranks are examined together, "G9" defeats "S1". Judges must not tie contestants in Couples Dance or Line Dance contests.

3. "Medals" marks for Couples Dance and Line Dance are converted to designated number values as follows: "GG" = 1; "GH" = 2; "G" = 3, "S" = 4, "B" = 5, "HM" = 6. However, "Medals" marks for ProAm have "+" (plus) values for marks within the skill level (as determined by Judge's Methodology), that is, "GH" (Gold with Honors), "G" (Gold), and "S" (Silver). Therefore, for ProAm Dance, "Medals" marks are converted thusly: "GG" = 1; "GH+" = 2; "GH" = 3; "G+" = 4; "G" = 5; "S+" = 6; "S" = 7; "B" = 8; and "HM" = 9. For ProAm Dance, judges may tie contestants with their "Medals" marks, meaning they can give the same mark multiple times.

4. The *majority mark* of the judges, here in Rule#3, is the first determination of a single-dance's results. To arrive at the *majority mark*, we use the following two steps. Step #1 is to have the marks arranged in a pre-determined judge order that will remain the same in the chart of the results for the entire divisional contest and will be known as the "*raw*" scores. The "*raw*" scores indicate each judge's marks consistently from one contestant to the next, one dance to the next, and included in this order, must be each judge's name as revealed. Step #2 then re-arranges each contestant's marks so they become "*re-ordered*" scores by sorting them in ascending order from the best score to the worst score (*raw* scores: [3,1,2,5,4] will become *re-ordered* scores: [1,2,3,4,5]). The *majority mark* is always the *middle* mark (where a contestant gains their "*majority*") when using an odd number of judges. In the examples above that had 5 judges, the *majority mark* is "3". In the case of 7 judges the 4th mark is the *majority mark*, and for 9 judges the 5th mark is the *majority mark*, and for 11 judges the 6th mark is the *majority mark*. If an even number of judges is used for contingency or emergency purposes, then the *majority mark* is always one mark more than half the marks. For 6 judges, half the number of judges is 3 (which is not a "majority"), but the 4th mark would then represent the *majority mark*. In the case of 8 judges the 5th mark is the *majority mark*, and for 10 judges the 6th mark is the *majority mark*.

5. The *majority marks* where each contestant gains their "*majority*" are then sorted in ascending order, from the smallest number value (best "*mark*") to the largest number value (worst "*mark*"), from first, "1", to last. The smallest number value (or highest score) is the best *majority mark* and receives 1st place. The next larger number value (or lesser score) will be awarded 2nd place, and on and on, until all contestants in a dance are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #3 is executed fully, then proceed to Rule #4.

Rule #4 – 1st Tiebreaker, determining the *majority size* (to the 'right' of the *majority mark*):

1. In the case of a tie at Rule #3, the *majority size* for each contestant is determined by counting the number of marks to the 'right' of the *majority mark* that have a larger number value (or lesser score), for example, [1,2,3,4,5] has 2 marks that are of a higher number value than the *majority mark*; [2,2,3,3,4] has 1 mark that has a higher number value than the *majority mark*; and [3,3,3,3,3] has 0 marks that have a higher number value than the *majority mark*. Note that all three sample groups have the same *majority mark* of "3" (as determined by Rule #3).

2. The *majority size* for all the tied contestants is sorted in ascending order, from the smallest number value (best "*size*") to the largest number value (worst "*size*"). The smaller number value represents a greater *majority size*, that is, more marks at the *majority mark* or better. The contestant with the smaller *majority size* number value is awarded the higher placement. The contestant with the next larger number value will be awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all tied contestants are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #4 is executed fully, then proceed to Rule #5.

Rule #5 – 2nd Tiebreaker, determining the *majority sum* (to the 'left' of the *majority mark*):

1. In case of a tie at Rule #4, the *majority sum* for each contestant is determined by totaling the marks that are to the 'left' of the *majority mark*, for example, [1,2,3,4,5] has a totaled value of 3; [2,2,3,4,5] has a totaled value of 4; [2,3,3,4,5] has a totaled value of 5; and [3,3,3,4,5] has a totaled value of 6. Note that all four sample groups have the same *majority mark* of "3" (as determined by Rule #3) and the same *majority size* of "3" (as determined by Rule #4).

2. The *majority sum* for all the tied contestants is sorted in ascending order, from the smallest number value (best "*sum*") to the largest number value (worst "*sum*"). The smaller number value represents the better *majority sum*, given that the *majority mark* is the same and the *majority size* is the same. The contestant with the smaller *majority sum* number value is awarded the higher placement. The contestant with the next larger number value will be awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all tied contestants are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #5 is executed fully, then proceed to Rule #6.

Rule #6 – 3rd Tiebreaker, determining *look-ahead* columns (to the 'right' of the *majority mark*):

1. In case of a tie at Rule #5, each contestant's *re-ordered* marks that are to the 'right' of the *majority mark* create a *look-ahead* number 'group' to be compared, column by column, for example, [1,2,3,4,4] has a *look-ahead* group of [4,4]; [1,2,3,4,5] has a *look-ahead* group of [4,5]; [1,2,3,5,5] has a *look-ahead* group of [5,5]. All three groups have the same *majority mark* of "3" (as determined by Rule #3); the same *majority size*, "3" (as determined by Rule #4); and the same *majority sum*, "3" (as determined by Rule #5).

2. When looking at each column of the _look-ahead_ 'group' (with each successive mark so indicated as separated by a comma) from left to right, the first mark of each tied contestant creates a column of number values to compare. The next mark in the _look-ahead_ sequence creates a second column, with the next mark (if there is one) a third column, and on and on, until all marks (to the 'right' of the _majority mark_) for all tied contestants are each placed in a column of values. Each column is considered one at a time from left to right and sorted in ascending order from the smallest number value (best _"mark"_) to the largest number value (worst _"mark"_). When the first column of the _look-ahead_ is compared, if the tied contestants have the same mark, the next column is then compared. If the marks are still the same, the next column (if there is one) is compared, until each column of values to the "right' of the _majority mark_ has been compared after finding the previous column's marks to be the same. When looking at any single column of values and comparing marks in sequence, the contestant with the smaller _look-ahead_ number value is awarded the higher placement. The contestant with the next larger number value is awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all tied contestants are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #6 is executed fully, then proceed to Rule #7.

Rule #7 – 4th Tiebreaker, determining **look-behind** columns (to the 'left' of the *majority mark*):

1. In case of a tie at Rule #6, each contestant's _re-ordered_ marks that are to the 'left' of the _majority mark_, create a _look-behind_ number 'group' to be compared, column by column, for example, [1,3,3,4,5] has a _look-behind_ group of [1,3]; [2,2,3,4,5] has a _look-behind_ group of [2,2]. Both groups have the same _majority mark_ of "3" (as determined by Rule #3); the same _majority size_, "3" (as determined by Rule #4); the same _majority sum_, "4" (as determined by Rule #5); and the same _look-ahead_ of "4,5" (as determined by Rule #6).

2. When looking at each column of the _look-behind_ group (with each successive mark so indicated as separated by a comma) from left to right, the first mark of each tied contestant creates a column of values to compare. The next mark in the _look-behind_ sequence creates a second column, with the next mark (if there is one) a third column, and on and on, until all marks (to the 'left' of the _majority mark_) for all tied contestants are each placed in a column of values. Each column is considered one at a time left to right and sorted in ascending order from the smallest number value (best _"mark"_) to the largest number value (worst _"mark"_). When the first column of the _look-behind_ is compared, if the tied contestants have the same mark, the next column is then compared. If the marks are still the same, the next column (if there is one) is compared, until each column of values to the 'left' of the _majority mark_ has been compared after finding the previous column's marks to be the same. When looking at any single column of values and comparing marks, the contestant with the smaller _look-behind_ number value is awarded the higher placement. The contestant with the next larger number is awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all tied contestants are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #7 is executed fully, then proceed to Rule #8.

Rule #8 – 5th Tiebreaker, determining "Head-to-Head" results (that is, **wins/losses/ties** records) from individual judges' marks (with **re-visitation**); and if a **final tie**, determining a **carry-forward** value:

1. The final proof of a tie at Rule #7 is when the _re-ordered_ marks for a single-dance initially (determined in Rule #3) yields a result where the tied contestants have identical judges' marks. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and the previous rules must be re-calculated. If the marks are identical, a tie still exists.

2. In case of a tie at Rule #7, only the tied contestants are now compared for _wins/losses/ties_ between each contestants' marks on each judge's ballot. Within the group of tied contestants, a judge's mark for a specific contestant when compared with the mark for another tied contestant will either yield a _win_, or a _loss_, or a _tie_ between the two contestants for that specific judge. That in turn will yield a record of _wins/losses/ties_ across all tied contestants, each contestant against each other contestant in each judge's marks. Please note, in _wins/losses/ties_ the "numeric" difference in the marks is now not considered, only whether it was a _win_, or a _loss_, or a _tie_. Like in other sports, the number of wins, losses, and ties against the competition reads like a record for the contestant in question, that is, 4 wins, 3 losses, and 0 ties reads as a record, 4-3-0, which then is higher than the record, 3-4-0, where more wins are attained by the first contestant. A record of 11-7-4, is higher than the record, 11-8-3, where fewer losses and more ties are attained by the first contestant. In all cases the total number of wins, losses, and ties for each contestant in the tied contestant group should be the same. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and the _wins/losses/ties_ should be re-calculated. (A numeric recording of _wins/losses/ties_ may be done by computing either the _"win"_ percentage, or the _"loss"_ percentage, depending on whether the reporting is to show the "highest" or the "lowest" value as the best score in the reporting format. Reporting is shown as a 3-place decimal value [".xxx"], either as a _"win"_ percentage or a _"loss"_ percentage that when, for audit purposes, they are added together equals a total of "1.000". Where considering the highest _"win"_ value, a ".667" is better than a ".600", and where considering the lowest _"loss"_ value, a ".333" is better than a ".400". When computing either _"wins"_, _"losses"_, and _"ties"_ into a numeric values, note that _"ties"_ are a numeric 'push' between contestants and are therefore computed as _"half of a win"_ or _"half of a loss"_ depending on whether _"win"_ percentage or _"loss"_ percentage is being used respectively. When a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point ["xxx.5"] being rounded up.) The contestant with the best record of _wins/losses/ties_ is awarded the higher placement, if a tie for the best record does not persist. This is the only placement within the Dance awarded at this time. After awarding the best record, or if a tie persists, then proceed to Rule #8, part #3.

3. If the initial tie in question from Rule #7 was only between two contestants, then the second contestant with the lesser record will be awarded the next lower Dance placement. If the initial tie in question exists for more than two contestants for the same Dance placement and the tie for the highest Dance placement is broken at Rule #8, part #2, the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Dance placement. At this time, a 'new' computation must be done for the remaining tied contestants, executing Rule #8, part #2 once again, thus negating the 'group' effect of the contestant that received the previous higher Dance placement (as it is essentially considered a 'new' head-to-head competition between the remaining tied contestants). This 'new' computation for the remaining tied contestants is a _'re-visitation'_ of Rule #8, where part #2 is re-applied and re-calculated, and where the '_re-visitation_' will yield new _wins/losses/ties_ records to be compared. This _'re-visitation'_ process must be computed

using Rule #8, part #2, with each successive awarding of a next lower Dance placement from the original 'group' of tied contestants, where there are still tied contestants that remain to be considered. Basically, if the original 'group' of tied contestants numbers 3, there will be 1 *'re-visitation'* process used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 4, there will be 2 *'re-visitation'* processes used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 5, there will be 3 *'re-visitation'* processes used, and on and on, until all tied contestants from the original tied 'group' are assigned, each in turn, the next lower Dance placement. If a tie persists for any 'group' of contestants that have the same exact *wins/losses/ties* record after Rule #8 is executed, then the tie between those contestants is considered 'final', therefore proceed Rules #8, part #4.

4. The contestants with a *final tie* share the Dance placements for which they are actually tied (for example, a 2-way tie for 2nd place are actually sharing the placements of 2nd and 3rd, and a 3-way tie for 5th place are actually sharing the placements of 5th, 6th, and 7th). However, in spite of the shared placements in the *final tie*, the contestants are officially announced as being awarded the higher Dance placement only, with the other shared Dance placements not announced or awarded (for example, if 2 contestants are tied for 3rd, thus sharing 3rd and 4th placements, they are both announced and awarded "3rd place", with the "4th place" not announced or awarded). The next placement announced and awarded would then be 5th place. This is similarly done for all tied placements in a *final tie*.

5. Each single-dance placement that applies to a division's defined Overall Championship formula, equates to a *carry-forward* value used in Rule #9 (the first rule for determining results in a multi-dance contest). For example, a 1st place award receives a value of "1", a 2nd place a value of "2", a 3rd place a value of "3", and on and on, until all placements are assigned a *carry-forward* value**.**

6. If there is a *final tie*, calculate the *carry-forward* value for the tied contestants as follows: Total the shared placements of the tied contestants, and divide that total by the number of tied contestants, for example, if 2 contestants are tied for 3rd and 4th, the placements add up to "7", which is then divided by 2 (the number of tied contestants) to get a value of "3.5" to *carry-forward* as each of their placements for that dance in the division's Overall Championship formula. If 3 contestants are tied for 3rd, 4th, and 5th, the sum of the placements is "12", divided by 3, which equals a *carry-forward* value of "4" for each tied contestant. If 4 contestants are tied for 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th, the sum of the placements is "18", divided by 4, which equals a *carry-forward* value of "4.5" for each tied contestant. In this way, tied contestants in a single-dance format are computed a *carry-forward* value that is the "average" of all placements under consideration for the tied contestants. The tied contestants, while being announced with the top placement under consideration, will only be awarded this "average" of placements in the Overall Championship formula, beginning at Rule #9.

Rule #9 – Overall Championship formulas, determining the ***aggregate value*** for Overall results:

1. To determine the multi-dance Overall Championship division winners, each contestant receives a *carry-forward* value from each dance as determined by Rule #8**.** These values now remain unaltered, with each dance carrying the same weight as another dance in the Overall Championship format (except for the "ascension" divisions of Showcase Masters, Showcase Crown, SuperStars, RisingStars, and Line Crown, where the value from each dance is multiplied by the 'weighted' formula according to the division's Overall criteria). The first determination for Overall Championship in scoring is to notate whether the division has a 3-dance overall, a 4-dance overall, a 5-dance overall, a 6-dance overall, or an 8-dance overall (that is, for 8-dance ProAm and ProPro Championships). This determines how many *carry-forward* values from pre-designated dance groups are to be added to arrive at a contestant's *aggregate value* for a division's Overall Championship. For example, to determine each contestant's Rule #9 *aggregate value* for a 5-dance Overall Championship, total the *carry-forward* values for all qualifying dances, that is, *carry-forward* values of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 have an *aggregate value* of "15", or *carry-forward* values of 1, 2.5, 4, 5.5, 7 have an *aggregate value* of "20". In the weighted format for listed "ascension" divisions above, the Two Step and Waltz values for couples dance, and the Dance A (Slow) and the Dance B (Fast) values for line dance, will be multiplied by a factor of 3, while the Solo Medley in all cases will be multiplied by a factor of 4, that is, *carry-forward* values of 1 and 2 for the first two dances will be "3" and "6", respectively, while a *carry-forward* value of 3 for the Solo Medley will be "12", yielding an *aggregate value* of "21".

2. Sort the *aggregate values* of all contestants, computed from all Overall qualifying dances for that division of competition, in ascending order, from the smallest number to the largest. The smaller number represents the best *aggregate value* (therefore the better average placement) for the qualifying dances included in the Overall and is awarded the higher placement. The next larger number is awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all contestants in a division are assigned a unique Overall placement. If a tie persists after Rule #9 is executed, then proceed to Rule #10.

Rule #10 – 1st Tiebreaker for Overall Championship, determining Head-to-Head results (***wins/losses/ties***) computed from placements across all ***commonly competed-in*** dances (with ***re-visitation***):

1. In Rule #9, the first determination for Overall Championship, according to the division's 'overall' group formula, note that the results were computed equally across all contestants in that division. Now in Rule #10, in the event of a tie in the results, it is to be considered a competition only between those tied contestants, and the 'overall' group formula is no longer to be in consideration. All dances that are 'mutually' performed by the tied contestants are now considered no matter their inclusion, or exclusion, in the 'overall' group formula.

2. Only *commonly competed-in* dances will be used in Rule #10. *Commonly competed-in* dances are defined as those dances where the tied contestants mutually danced against each other for placements without regard to the 'overall' group formula. These include all dances that were *commonly competed-in*, even those that were not part of the 'overall' group formula computed in Rule #9.

3. For historical reference, here in Rule #10 was defined and used a set of rules (called the *Vastel Rules*) that adhered to the 'overall' group formula that helped determine which dances were chosen to be considered for Rule #10 when the dances themselves were tied and had the same *carry-forward* value used in calculating a specific contestant's *aggregate value*. This used to be Rule #10, part #3, with sub-parts a, b, c, d (denoting Vastel rules #1, #2, #3, #4, respectively). *Vastel Rules* are no longer to be considered part of Rule #10, since these tied dance choices are no longer in play, and all *commonly competed-in* dances are now used.

4. In case of a tie at Rule #9, only the tied contestants are now compared for _wins/losses/ties_ between the contestants' placements in dances that are _commonly competed-in_. Within the group of tied contestants, a dance's placement for a specific contestant when compared with the placement for another tied contestant will either yield a _win_, or a _loss_, or a _tie_ between the two contestants for that specific dance. That in turn will yield a record of _wins/losses/ties_ across all tied contestants, each contestant against each other contestant in each dance's placements. Please note, in _wins/losses/ties_ the "numeric" difference in the placements is now not considered, only whether it was a _win_, or a _loss_, or a _tie_. Like in other sports, the number of wins, losses, and ties against the competition reads like a record for the contestant in question, that is, 5 wins, 3 losses, and 0 ties reads as a record, 5-3-0, which then is higher than the record, 3-5-0, where more wins are attained by the first contestant. A record, 4-2-2, is higher than the record, 4-3-1, where fewer losses and more ties are attained by the first contestant. In all cases the total number of wins, losses, and ties for each contestant in the tied group should be the same. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and the _wins/losses/ties_ should be re-calculated. (A numeric recording of _wins/losses/ties_ may be done by computing either the _"win"_ percentage, or the _"loss"_ percentage, depending on whether the reporting is to show the "highest" or the "lowest" value as the best score in the reporting format. Reporting is shown as a 3-place decimal value [".yyy"], either as a _"win"_ percentage or a _"loss"_ percentage that when, for audit purposes, they are added together equals a total of "1.000". Where considering the highest _"win"_ value, a ".667" is better than a ".600", and where considering the lowest _"loss"_ value, a ".333" is better than a ".400". When computing either _"wins"_, _"losses"_, and _"ties"_ into a numeric values, note that _"ties"_ are a numeric 'push' between contestants and are therefore computed as _"half of a win"_ or _"half of a loss"_ depending on whether _"win"_ percentage or _"loss"_ percentage is being used respectively. When a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point ["yyy.5"] being rounded up.) The contestant with the best record of _wins/losses/ties_ is awarded the higher Overall placement, if a tie for the best record does not persist. This is the only Overall placement awarded at this time. After awarding the best record, or if a tie persists, then proceed to Rule #10, part #5.

5. If the initial tie in question from Rule #9 was only between two contestants, then the second contestant with the lesser record will be awarded the next lower Overall placement. If the initial tie in question exists for more than two contestants for the same Overall placement and the tie for the highest Overall placement is broken at Rule #10, part #4, the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Overall placement. At this time, the remaining tied contestants may have additional _commonly competed-in_ dances that were not considered before because the previous contestant that was now awarded a higher Overall placement had not competed in those dances. If there are 'new' _commonly competed-in_ dances to be considered, then those dances become part of a 'new' computation for that next lower Overall placement, executing Rule #10, part #4 once again. Regardless of whether 'new' _commonly competed-in_ dances exist between the original tied contestants, this 'new' computation must be done for the remaining tied contestants, thus negating the 'group' effect of the contestant that received the previous higher Overall placement (as it is essentially considered a 'new' head-to-head competition between the remaining tied contestants). This 'new' computation for the remaining tied contestants is a _'re-visitation'_ of Rule #10, where part #4 is re-applied and re-calculated, and where the _'re-visitation'_ will yield new _wins/losses/ties_ records to be compared. This _'re-visitation'_ process must be computed using Rule #10, part #4, with each successive awarding of a next lower Overall placement from the original 'group' of tied contestants, where there are still tied contestants that remain to be considered. Basically, if the original 'group' of tied contestants numbers 3, there will be 1 _'re-visitation'_ process used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 4, there will be 2 _'re-visitation'_ processes used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 5, there will be 3 _'re-visitation'_ processes used, and on and on, until all tied contestants from the original tied 'group' are assigned, each in turn, the next lower Overall placement. If a tie persists for any 'group' of contestants that have the same exact _wins/losses/ties_ record after Rule #10 is executed, then proceed to Rule #11.

Rule #11 – 2nd Tiebreaker for Overall Championship, determining Head-to-Head results (_**wins/losses/ties**_) computed from _individual judges' marks_ across all _**commonly competed-in**_ dances (with _**re-visitation**_):

1. Only _commonly competed-in_ dances, that created the tie in Rule#10, will be used in Rule #11. _Commonly competed-in_ dances are defined as those dances where the tied contestants mutually danced against each other for placements. These include all dances that were _commonly competed-in_, even those that were not part of the 'overall' group formula computed in Rule #9.

2. In case of a tie at Rule #10, only the tied contestants are now compared for _wins/losses/ties_ between the _individual judge's marks_ in all dances that are _commonly competed-in_. Within the group of tied contestants, the judge's mark for a specific contestant for a specific dance when compared with the judge's mark for another tied contestant will either yield a _win_, or a _loss_, or a _tie_ between the two contestants for that specific judge. That in turn will yield a record of _wins/losses/ties_ across all tied contestants, each contestant against each other contestant in each _individual judge's marks_. Please note, in _wins/losses/ties_ the "numeric" difference in the _individual judge's marks_ is now not considered, only whether it was a _win_, or a _loss_, or a _tie_. Now each dance's record of _wins/losses/ties_ for each of the tied contestants is totaled across all _commonly competed-in_ dances that created the tie in Rule#10. This will yield an aggregate record of _wins/losses/ties_ for each tied contestant. The _wins/losses/ties_ records, and/or percentages, once computed from _individual judge's marks_ here in Rule #11 (rather than dance placements in Rule#10), are valued and compared respectively (see comparative examples of records listed in Rule #10, part #4). In all cases the total number of wins, losses, and ties for each contestant in the tied group should be the same. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and the _wins/losses/ties_ should be re-calculated. (A numeric recording of _wins/losses/ties_ may be done by computing either the _"win"_ percentage, or the _"loss"_ percentage, depending on whether the reporting is to show the "highest" or the "lowest" value as the best score in the reporting format. Reporting is shown as a 3-place decimal value [".zzz"], either as a _"win"_ percentage or a _"loss"_ percentage that when, for audit purposes, they are added together equals a total of "1.000". Where considering the highest _"win"_ value, a ".667" is better than a ".600", and where considering the lowest _loss_ value, a ".333" is better than a ".400". When computing either _"wins"_, _"losses"_, and _"ties"_ into a numeric values, note that _"ties"_ are a numeric 'push' between contestants and are therefore computed as _"half of a win"_ or _"half of a loss"_ depending on whether _"win"_ percentage or _"loss"_ percentage is being used respectively. When a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point ["zzz.5"] being rounded up.) The contestant with the best record of _wins/losses/ties_ is awarded

the higher Overall placement, if a tie for the best record does not persist. This is the only Overall placement awarded at this time. After awarding the best record, or if a tie persists, then proceed to Rule #11, part #3.

3. If the initial tie in question from Rule #10 was only between two contestants, then the second contestant with the lesser record will be awarded the next lower Overall placement. If the initial tie in question exists for more than two contestants for the same Overall placement and the tie for the highest Overall placement is broken at Rule #11, part #2, the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Overall placement. At this time, the remaining tied contestants may have additional _commonly competed-in_ dances that were not considered before because the previous contestant that was now awarded a higher Overall placement had not competed in those dances. If there are 'new' _commonly competed-in_ dances to be considered, then those dances now become part of a 'new' computation for that next lower Overall placement, executing Rule #10, part #4 once again. Regardless of whether 'new' _commonly competed-in_ dances exist between the original tied contestants, this 'new' computation must be done for the remaining tied contestants, thus negating the 'group' effect of the contestant that received the previous higher Overall placement (as it is essentially considered a 'new' head-to-head competition between the remaining tied contestants). This 'new' computation for the remaining tied contestants is a _'re-visitation'_ of Rule #10, where part #4 is re-applied and re-calculated, and where the '_re-visitation'_ will yield new _wins/losses/ties_ records to be compared. If there is still a tie after Rule #10, part #4, then this _'re-visitation'_ must move on to compute _wins/losses/ties_ by using Rule #11, part #2, with each successive awarding of a next lower Overall placement from the original 'group' of tied contestants. This _'re-visitation'_ process must be computed using Rule #10, then Rule # 11 (if needed), with each successive awarding of a next lower Overall placement from the original 'group' of tied contestants, where there are still tied contestants that remain to be considered. Basically, if the original 'group' of tied contestants numbers 3, there will be 1 _'re-visitation'_ process used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 4, there will be 2 _'re-visitation'_ processes used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 5, there will be 3 _'re-visitation'_ processes used, and on and on, until all tied contestants from the original tied 'group' are assigned, each in turn, the next lower Overall placement. If a tie persists for any 'group' of contestants that have the same exact _wins/losses/ties_ record after Rule #11 is executed, then the tie between those contestants is considered 'final', therefore proceed to part #4 of Rule #11.

4. The contestants with a _final tie_ share the Overall placements for which they are actually tied (for example, a 2-way tie for 2nd place are actually sharing the placements of 2nd and 3rd, and a 3-way tie for 5th place are actually sharing the placements of 5th, 6th, and 7th). However, in spite of the shared placements in the _final tie_, the contestants are officially announced as being awarded the higher Overall placement only, with the other shared Overall placements not announced or awarded (for example, if 2 contestants are tied for 3rd, thus sharing 3rd and 4th placements, they are both announced and awarded "3rd place", with the "4th place" not announced or awarded). The next Overall placement announced and awarded would then be 5th place. This is similarly done for all tied placements in a _final tie_.

Rule #12 – Determining the _Vastel Value_ for each contestant, computing a combined-value, 'single-number' for comparison purposes of competitive results for single-dance and multi-dance results:

1. For the purposes of creating a 'single-number', with which to post electronically on an overhead screen, and compare competitively, the results for either a single-dance, or a multi-dance, contest, the following step-logic is used to thus create, or 'compute', that comparative number. The number shall be known as each contestant's _Vastel Value_ and will be sorted in ascending order to produce the "final results" of a contest, where each 'part' of the number represents a 'scoring rule' as defined in this document, the **_UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format_**. Please understand that percentages of _wins/losses/ties_ are computed accordingly in Rules #8, #10, and #11, and are respectively notated in order, as ".xxx", ".yyy", or ".zzz", when each 'scoring rule' is executed.

2. The _Vastel Value_ in a single-dance format for each contestant shall be arrived at thusly: a) the first set of 3 "numbers" (in contiguous order from left to right) shall be the 2-digit _majority mark_ computed from Rule #3, followed by 1-digit _majority size_ computed from Rule #4; b) the second set of 3 "numbers" shall be the _majority sum_ computed from Rule #5; c) the third set of 3 "numbers" shall be the first column of placements to the 'right' of the "majority mark", reading the columns from left to right (with each additional column of placements consisting of a 3-digit number), as ordered from the _look-ahead_ computed from Rule #6; d) after all columns of the _look-ahead_ are factored into the _Vastel Value_, the next set of 3 "numbers" shall be first column of placements to the 'left' of the "majority mark", reading the columns from left to right (with each additional column of placements consisting of a 3-digit number), as ordered from the _look-behind_ computed from Rule #7; and, e) the final set of 3-digit "numbers" shall be expressed in 'thousandths' with a point (".xxx") followed by the "loss" percentage computed from Rule #8 (where when a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point (".5") being rounded up). For example, a contestant having the judges' marks of [5,6,7,8,9,10,11] will have a _Vastel Value_ of "083,018,009,010,011,005,006,007.333", where the "loss" percentage was computed as one-third of the total marks compared. This number for that contestant, along with each number from all other contestants in a single-dance format, shall be sorted in a column from top-to-bottom in ascending order, from 'lowest' numeric value to 'highest' numeric value, with the 'top' number in the column receiving the highest, or 1st placement in the dance. The second number in the column will then receive the 2nd placement, and the third number in the column will receive the 3rd placement, and on and on, until all contestants in the column are assigned appropriate placements (even if there is a "final tie", having the exact same _Vastel Value_ in Rule #8, and Rule #8 is executed giving the "announced" values of the placements versus the _carry-forward_ values per Rule #8, part #5). A "final tie" will occur when each tied contestant's _Vastel Value_ is the same. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and this rule must be re-calculated.

3. However, in computing the _Vastel Value_ in a single-dance format, if there is an initial tie for more than two contestants for the same Dance placement and the tie for the highest Dance placement in the "first visitation" of scores is broken at Rule #8, part #2, then the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Dance placement. At this time, a 'new' computation must be done for the remaining tied contestants, executing Rule #8, part #2 once again. For the "numeric" integrity of the _Vastel Value_ on the "second visitation" of scores, which will produce new _"loss"_ percentages, for all remaining tied contestants only, the "first visitation" of 3-digit "loss" percentages needs to be replaced by the 3-digit number "999", to clear the slate of "loss" percentages for the "second visitation". The _Vastel Value_ will then read for the tied contestants as the decimal value of ".999aaa", where "aaa"

represents the new "loss" percentages computed for the "second visitation". Also, for this "second visitation", the contestant that was awarded the highest Dance placement in the "first visitation" will have a second "loss" percentage value added on with a 3-digit number "000", which will then read as a decimal value of ".xxx000", where "xxx" was the best score in the "first visitation". Once the "second visitation" produces a winner for the next lower Dance placement, there may still be tied contestants, and therefore a "third visitation" may be required. With the "third visitation", the *Vastel Value* will now read "999999bbb", where "bbb" represents the new "loss" percentages for the "third visitation". Additionally, for the contestant that was awarded the next lower Dance placement after the "second visitation", that contestant's *Vastel Value* for the "third visitation" will read ".999aaa000". If a "fourth visitation" is required, then the *Vastel Value* for the tied contestants when computed, will likewise compute sequentially as ".999999999ccc", where "ccc" represents the new "loss" percentages for the "fourth visitation", with the winner of the "third visitation" reading ".999999bbb000" for the "fourth visitation". Additionally, the winner of the "first visitation" will read ".xxx000000000", and the winner of the "second" visitation will read ".999aaa000000". This logic for "loss" percentages will continue to extrapolate thusly in the *"re-visitation"* process for single-dance ties, until all contestants from the initial tie have been awarded a final *Vastel Value*.

4. The *Vastel Value* in a multi-dance format ("Overall Championship") for each contestant shall be arrived at thusly: a) the first set of 4 "numbers" (in contiguous order from left to right) shall be the *aggregate value* computed from Rule #9 (multiplied by a factor of "10", to account for any decimal value of ".5" that can occur in Rule #9 results, thus moving move the "5" to the left of the decimal for the purpose of the *Vastel Value*); b) the second set of 3 "numbers" shall be expressed in 'thousandths' ("yyy"), placed to the right of the decimal point (".yyy"), notating the "loss" percentage computed from Rule #10 (where when a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point ["yyy.5"] being rounded up); and, c) the third set of 3 "numbers" shall be expressed in 'millionths' ("zzz"), placed to the right of the decimal point beyond the 'thousandths' from "b" of this rule #12, part #3, (".yyyzzz"), notating the "loss" percentage computed from Rule #11 (where when a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point ["zzz.5"] being rounded up). For example, tied contestants having the *wins/losses/ties* records of 7-3-0, 6-3-1, 6-4-0 would, respectively, have "win" percentages of .700, .667, .600, when computing highest value first, and "loss" percentages of .300, .333, .400, when computing lowest value first (please note that a particular record's "win" and "loss" percentage when added together will always equal 1.000, and if it does not, then an error has occurred, and percentages must be re-calculated). If a specific contestant has an aggregate value of "9" from Rule #9, plus a "loss" percentage of ".500" from Rule #10, and a loss percentage of ".333" from Rule #11, then this contestant would have a *Vastel Value* of "0090.500333". Likewise, if a specific contestant has an aggregate value of "118.5" from Rule #9, plus a loss percentage of ".200" from Rule #10, and no loss percentage from Rule #11 (shown as ".000"), then this contestant would have a *Vastel Value* of "1185.200000". The *Vastel Value* for any contestant, along with each *Vastel Value* from all other contestants in a multi-dance format, shall be sorted in a column from top-to-bottom in ascending order, from 'lowest' numeric value to 'highest' numeric value, with the 'top' number in the column receiving the highest or 1st Overall placement in the division. The second number in the column will then receive the 2nd Overall placement, and the third number in the column will receive the 3rd Overall placement, and on and on, until all contestants in the column are assigned appropriate placements (even if there is a "final tie" in Rule #11, and Rule #11 is executed giving the "announced" values of the placements per Rule #11, part #4). A "final tie" will occur when each tied contestant's *Vastel Value* is the same. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and this rule must be re-calculated.

5. However, in computing the *Vastel Value* in a multi-dance format ("Overall Championship"), if there is an initial tie for more than two contestants for the same Overall placement and the tie for the highest Overall placement in the "first visitation" of scores is broken at Rule #10, part #4, or Rule #11, part #2 (if needed), then the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Overall placement. At this time, a 'new' computation must be done for the remaining tied contestants, executing Rule #10, or Rule #11 (if needed), once again. For the "numeric" integrity of the *Vastel Value* on the "second visitation" of scores, which will produce new *"loss"* percentages, for all remaining tied contestants only, the "first visitation" of 3-digit "loss" percentages needs to be replaced by the 3-digit number "999", to clear the slate of "loss" percentages for the "second visitation". The *Vastel Value* will then read for the tied contestants as the decimal value of ".999aaa", where "aaa" represents the new "loss" percentages computed for the "second visitation". Also, for this "second visitation", the contestant that was awarded the highest Overall placement in the "first visitation" will have a second "loss" percentage value added on with a 3-digit number "000", which will then read as a decimal value of ".xxx000", where "xxx" was the best score in the "first visitation". Once the "second visitation" produces a winner for the next lower Overall placement, there may still be tied contestants, and therefore a "third visitation" may be required. With the "third visitation", the *Vastel Value* will now read "999999bbb", where "bbb" represents the new "loss" percentages for the "third visitation". Additionally, for the contestant that was awarded the next lower Overall placement after the "second visitation", that contestant's *Vastel Value* for the "third visitation" will read ".999aaa000". If a "fourth visitation" is required, then the *Vastel Value* for the tied contestants when computed, will likewise compute sequentially as ".999999999ccc", where "ccc" represents the new "loss" percentages for the "fourth visitation", with the winner of the "third visitation" reading ".999999bbb000" for the "fourth visitation". Additionally, the winner of the "first visitation" will read ".xxx000000000", and the winner of the "second" visitation will read ".999aaa000000". This logic for "loss" percentages will continue to extrapolate thusly in the *"re-visitation"* process for multi-dance ties, until all contestants from the initial tie have been awarded a final *Vastel Value*.