



OCA MODEL RULES & SCORING

# Competitive Overexplaining

Model Rules & Scoring for timed explanatory performance

**MODEL RULE PRINCIPLE**

The winner should elaborate magnificently without ceasing to make sense.

OCA-MR-COE-1 • Version 1.0 • August 2026

**PUBLIC MODEL RULESET**

# 1. Scope and Purpose

Competitive Overexplaining is a timed speaking competition in which entrants receive a simple prompt and attempt to explain it with deliberately excessive detail while remaining coherent, responsive, and intelligible. The competition rewards disciplined elaboration, not random verbosity.

These Model Rules are designed for live individual competition. Organizers may adapt them for recorded, team, or written variants if all material changes are disclosed in advance.

## 1.1 The Five Core Questions

| Question           | Competitive Overexplaining Answer                                                               |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| What is evaluated? | A timed explanation of a simple assigned prompt.                                                |
| Against what?      | A disclosed rubric rewarding elaboration, coherence, structure, commitment, and responsiveness. |
| How expressed?     | Five rubric scores from each judge.                                                             |
| How combined?      | Weighted judge totals; five-judge trimmed average recommended.                                  |
| What happens next? | Highest final score wins; ties use the published hierarchy.                                     |

# 2. Definitions

| Term                  | Meaning                                                                                                                      |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Prompt                | The ordinary subject, object, question, or task the competitor must explain.                                                 |
| Explanation Time      | The official timed period during which scoring occurs.                                                                       |
| Elaboration           | Additional detail, qualification, context, analogy, substructure, or technical framing that remains connected to the prompt. |
| Nonresponsive Content | Material with no defensible relationship to the prompt or the explanation being built.                                       |
| Judge Total           | One judge's weighted total before panel aggregation.                                                                         |
| Panel Score           | The official aggregate of valid judge totals before penalties.                                                               |

# 3. Eligibility and Divisions

- Open Division: all eligible adult competitors unless the organizer publishes additional divisions.
- Youth Division may be offered only with age-appropriate prompts and safeguarding controls. Age is determined on the first day of competition.
- A competitor may enter once per division unless the event announcement explicitly permits multiple entries.
- Officials and prompt writers may not compete in a division for which they had prior access to the competition prompt pool.

# 4. Prompts and Competition Procedure

## 4.1 Prompt Standard

- Prompts must be simple enough that an ordinary person can understand the underlying subject without specialized preparation.
- Prompts should support elaboration but should not require disclosure of private, medical, sexual, criminal, traumatic, or otherwise sensitive personal information.
- Prompts must not target a real person or protected group for ridicule or degradation.
- All competitors in the same round must face prompts of reasonably comparable complexity.

## 4.2 Recommended Round Structure

| Stage       | Time | Prompt Method                              | Advancement                            |
|-------------|------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Preliminary | 2:00 | Random draw from approved pool             | Top N by score or published percentage |
| Semifinal   | 3:00 | New random prompt                          | Top 6 or published cut                 |
| Final       | 4:00 | Common prompt or equivalent sealed prompts | Final placement                        |

## 4.3 Preparation

- Organizer-selectable preparation time: 0, 30, or 60 seconds. The selected option must be published before competition.
- No external notes, devices, or research may be used after the prompt is revealed unless the event specifically adopts an “open reference” variant.
- Competitors may organize thoughts silently during preparation.

## 4.4 Timing

Official time begins when the competitor starts the explanation after being released by the timekeeper. A visible or audible 15-second warning should be provided. The explanation ends when the competitor clearly yields, time expires, or the chief official stops the performance for rule or safety reasons.

# 5. Officials

- Recommended final panel: five judges plus one timekeeper/scorekeeper.
- A three-judge panel is permitted for preliminary rounds if disclosed in advance.
- Judges score independently and may not discuss provisional marks before submission.
- A judge with a material conflict must recuse from that competitor; the organizer should provide an alternate whenever feasible.

# 6. Judging Criteria and Weights

| Criterion                  | Weight | What is rewarded                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Coherent Elaboration       | 30%    | Depth, layers, qualifications, subpoints, examples, distinctions, and detail that remain connected to the prompt.                 |
| Structure & Control        | 25%    | The explanation has an intelligible architecture, navigable transitions, and sustained command rather than uncontrolled rambling. |
| Clarity                    | 20%    | Despite its excess, the explanation can still be followed and its claims can be understood.                                       |
| Commitment & Delivery      | 15%    | Confidence, pacing, vocal control, seriousness of purpose, and sustained performance commitment.                                  |
| Responsiveness / Relevance | 10%    | The content actually explains the assigned thing rather than escaping into unrelated material.                                    |

## 6.1 Scoring Scale

| Score | Anchor                                                                                             |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9–10  | Exceptional; the competitor is gloriously excessive while maintaining control and intelligibility. |
| 7–8   | Strong; sustained overexplanation with clear organization and only minor lapses.                   |
| 5–6   | Competent; recognizable overexplanation but uneven depth, clarity, or structure.                   |
| 3–4   | Weak; substantial repetition, drift, or underdevelopment.                                          |
| 1–2   | Minimal; little meaningful elaboration or explanation.                                             |
| 0     | No scoreable attempt or criterion not demonstrated.                                                |

## 7. Scoring and Ranking

Each judge scores every criterion from 0–10 in whole numbers. Judge Total =  $\Sigma$  (criterion score  $\times$  criterion weight  $\times$  10). With five judges, the highest and lowest Judge Totals are dropped and the remaining three are averaged. With three judges, all three totals are averaged.

### WORKED EXAMPLE

Scores of 8, 9, 8, 7, and 9 across the five criteria yield:  $(8 \times 30) + (9 \times 25) + (8 \times 20) + (7 \times 15) + (9 \times 10) = 820$  weighted points / 10 = 82.0 Judge Total.

## 8. Penalties and Invalid Performance

| Violation                                                 | Consequence                                                                       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Finishing more than 5 seconds early                       | –2.0 from Panel Score for each full or partial 10 seconds under time.             |
| Continuing after time is called                           | –1.0 for 1–5 seconds; –3.0 for more than 5 seconds.                               |
| Use of prohibited notes/device                            | Disqualification from the round.                                                  |
| Prompt substitution or refusal to address assigned prompt | Score as performed; may become no valid attempt if no meaningful response occurs. |
| Targeted harassment, hate, or degrading content           | Immediate stop; disqualification may follow under event conduct policy.           |

## 9. Ties

- Higher panel average in Coherent Elaboration.
- Higher panel average in Structure & Control.
- Higher median Judge Total among all valid judges.
- If still tied for first place, tied competitors receive a 60-second common-prompt tiebreak scored only on Coherent Elaboration and Clarity.
- If still tied after the authorized tiebreak, the placement is shared.

## 10. Results, Corrections, and Records

- The official record must retain prompt, competitor order, judge marks, penalties, panel calculation, tie procedure used, and certified placement.
- Arithmetic, transcription, or wrong-competitor errors may be corrected before or after announcement when documented.
- Good-faith qualitative judge scores are not re-scored merely because a competitor disagrees.

- Final results are certified by the designated scorekeeper or chief official.

## 11. Organizer-Selectable Options

---

- Round count and advancement cut.
- Preparation time: 0, 30, or 60 seconds.
- Three- or five-judge panels in non-final rounds.
- Common final prompt vs equivalent random final prompts.
- Separate Audience Favorite award, provided it does not alter official placement unless a hybrid format is expressly published.

## Appendix A. Document Control

| Field            | Value                                                                                   |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Document         | OCA Model Rules: Competitive Overexplaining                                             |
| Publisher        | Open Competition Alliance                                                               |
| Ruleset ID       | OCA-MR-COE-1                                                                            |
| Edition          | Version 1.0                                                                             |
| Publication date | August 2026                                                                             |
| Status           | OCA Public Model Ruleset                                                                |
| Purpose          | Voluntary model competition standard intended for adoption or adaptation by organizers. |

### Adoption Statement

An organizer adopting this model ruleset should identify the exact edition in the event announcement and disclose every organizer-selectable option before the applicable entry deadline. Material changes should be published as event-specific modifications rather than applied informally during competition.

## Appendix B. Pre-Event Rules Check

---

- ☐ Eligibility and divisions are published.
- ☐ Organizer-selectable options are declared.
- ☐ Officials are assigned and briefed.
- ☐ Equipment, prompts, materials, or course layout have been checked for equivalence.
- ☐ Scoring or measurement procedure has been tested.
- ☐ Tie procedures are understood by the scorekeeper.
- ☐ Safety, safeguarding, accessibility, and incident-response arrangements are in place.
- ☐ Results can be reconstructed from retained official records.