

UCWDC® SCORING FORMAT:

HEATING, SCORING, & REPORTING RULES

(v16.9b, 2026©: to be used for the 2026-2028 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:

Heating Rules – Constructing Heats for Rounds of Competition:

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 ensure fairness in access to the arena floor. For those contestants that remain on the floor from one heat to another, again to ensure fairness, they should retire to the back of the floor and await their entrance until the Emcee calls their name from the randomized list for entry in each heat.
2. If a division requires more than 1 heat, then the difference in the total size of contestants per heat should be no more than 1. When multiple heats are required for a single division, the division, when necessary, may be ‘co-mingled’ with other divisions, providing the heats’ size difference relative to each division’s “co-mingled” contestants is still initially heated as no more than 1. When attempting to keep the contestants from a single division together in heats, this heating choice is called “*singular*” logic. For example, in ProAm competition: If there are 9 contestants competing in a single division, and a single Pro has 3 different contestants dancing in that division, then a primary heat of 7 contestants can be made, with 2 “outlier” entries to be heated before or after the heat of 7.
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 single division that have varied sizes, the lesser size shall precede the greater size as this can help facilitate scratches giving the Contest Coordinator the ability to move up contestants, if needed, 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 single division across the heats is recommended as being the fairest method of heating. When attempting to keep the contestants from a single division equal across multiple heats, this heating choice is called “*modular*” logic. For example: If there are 9 contestants competing in a single division, and a single Pro has 3 different contestants dancing in that division, then 3 heats of 3 contestants each can be made, filling out each heat with other divisions “co-mingled” in these 3 heats. Co-mingling divisions where the split of a division yields modules of no more than 1 difference is preferred. If not, see #6 below.
6. When “co-mingling” occurs because one Pro has multiple students in a single division, and the Contest Coordinator is trying to balance the total number of contestants in each heat, using compliments of contestants from other divisions, and it is found to be better to mix and match with unequal numbers across multiple heats, this heating choice is still called “*modular*” logic. For example, If there are 9 contestants competing in a single division, and a single Pro has 3 different contestants dancing in that division, then the 3 heats may be divided into 2, 4, and 3 contestants from that division, where there are respectively 5, 3, and 4 contestants from other divisions used to fill out the heats. For better balance, the greatest number of contestants would be placed in the middle heat (therefore, if 15 contestants are in a single division, then 3, 7, and 5 contestants should be placed in 3 successive heats).
7. Regardless of the divisional makeup for “co-mingling” for efficiency and/or fairness, where one or more of the divisions are heated in multiple heats, the difference in the total size of the heats containing a single division should be no more than 1 (to include the “co-mingled” contestants), and for each single division, the heats must still be run in a “contiguous” order.

Rule #1 – Preliminaries Rounds to determine Semi-Finalists (if using more than one Prelims Round), or Finalists (if using only one Prelims Round):

1. A Preliminaries Round, by definition, will “promote” contestants to the Semi-Finals, or Finals, Round rather than “retire” them. All remaining contestants may then be eligible to dance additional Preliminaries Rounds to again attempt to make the Semi-Finals. The Contest Coordinator may adjust the numbers accordingly for the Preliminaries leading to the next round depending on space and time considerations that may influence a particular division at a particular event. It is also important to note that a Prelims will be deemed appropriate by the Contest Coordinator in Couple Dance competition when there are more contestants than two heats of Finals can handle, thus avoiding judges assessment across three heats of contestants for a Finals. And, for Line Dance competition it will be deemed appropriate by the Contest Coordinator when there are more contestants than can be fairly judged beyond two lines of contestants, thus avoiding judge assessment across three lines of contestants for a Finals.
2. In a Preliminaries Round, a “callback” ballot will be used to determine which contestants will move on to the Semi-Finals, or Finals. Each judge may be asked to mark on the ballot a “Yes” for a set number of contestants they most wish to promote to the Semi-Finals, or Finals. Each judge may also be asked to additionally mark up to 5 alternates and rank them in order of preference from Alt #1 to Alt #’s 2, 3, 4, and 5. [The Contest Coordinator, or for Worlds, the Contest Director, may adjust the number of “Yes” marks and “Alt” ranks as the case may be for a particular contest.] A contestant can receive a value of **Yes** = 10.0 points, while an Alt

rank will receive the values: **Alt#1** = 5.0 points, **Alt#2** = 4.6 points, **Alt#3** = 4.3 points, **Alt#4** = 4.1 points, and **Alt#5** = 4.0 points. Totaling the points across this scale for each dance will be used to determine who moves on to the next round. [The Contest Coordinator will determine the dividing line between those contestants that are promoted from the first Preliminaries Round and those that retain the right to dance for promotion in a second Preliminaries Round, and so on, for any additional Preliminaries Rounds.] If more than one Preliminaries Round is used, than all who are promoted will next dance in a Semi-Finals Round.

3. A second Preliminaries Round may then be run for all contestants that did not make Semi-Finals in the first Preliminaries Round. This second round will be run with similar “callback” instructions as the first round. [The Contest Coordinator may adjust the callback numbers based on having “promoted” more or less than the initially targeted number of contestants from the first Preliminaries, with the next targeted number of contestants being determined by fulfilling a specific number of contestants to be selected for the Semi-Finals.] For example, if the original number of contestants was 50 or more, the field for Semi-Finals may now have been reduced to 20, with the remaining Preliminary Round contestants not selected, now being “retired” from further competition.
4. The most “valued” contestants voted by the panel of judges, based on a designated number of contestants determined by the Contest Coordinator (plus ties, if any occur) are promoted from each Preliminaries round until the targeted number for Semi-Finals, or Finals, is reached. Each round of Preliminaries will promote contestants thusly. Important to note is that each category where a contestant dances at least one Preliminaries Round still counts toward their Championship eligibility for the division being contested.
5. Promotion of contestants from one Round of competition to another will always be based on a single-dance format at regional UCWDC® events, where contestants make the next Round independently in each dance. However, at the Country Dance World Championships®, since all contestants are required to compete for an Overall Championship, promotion of contestants in each Round of will be based on the prescribed Overall multi-dance format for each division, where all dances are promoted together.

Rule #2 – Semi-Finals Rounds to determine Finalists (only if more than one Prelims Round was used):

1. A Semi-Finals Round, by definition, will “retire” contestants, with the remaining contestants perhaps dancing a second Semi-Finals Round, again “retiring” contestants, until the targeted number of contestants for the Finals Round is reached. The Contest Coordinator may adjust the numbers accordingly for the Semi-Finals leading to the next round depending on space and time considerations that may influence a particular division at a particular event. It is also important to note that a Semi-Finals will be deemed appropriate by the Contest Coordinator in Couples Dance competition when there are more contestants than two heats of Finals can handle, thus avoiding judges assessment across three heats of contestants for a Finals. And, for Line Dance competition it will be deemed appropriate by the Contest Coordinator when there are more contestants than can be fairly judged beyond two lines of contestants, thus avoiding judge assessment across three lines of contestants for a Finals.
2. In a Semi-Finals Round, a “callback” ballot will be used to determine which contestants will move on to a second Semi-Finals, or Finals. Each judge will mark on the ballot a “No” for for a set number of contestants they most wish to retire from competition. Each judge may also be asked additionally mark up to 5 alternates and rank them in order of preference from Alt #1 to Alt #s 2, 3, 4, and 5. [The Contest Coordinator, or for Worlds, the Contest Director, may adjust the number of “No” marks and “Alt” ranks as the case may be for a particular contest.] A contestant can receive a value of **No** = 10.0 points, while an Alt rank will receive the values: **Alt#1** = 5.0 points, **Alt#2** = 4.6 points, **Alt#3** = 4.3 points, **Alt#4** = 4.1 points, and **Alt#5** = 4.0 points. Totaling the points across this scale for each dance will be used to determine who moves on to a second Semi-Finals, or Finals. [The Contest Coordinator will determine the dividing line between those contestants that are retired from the first Semi-Finals Round and those that retain the right to dance in a second Semi-Finals Round.] The Semi-Finals Round(s) are used if two or more Prelims Rounds were danced.
3. After the Semi-Finals Round(s), the Contest Coordinator will determine the number of contestants who move on to the Finals, using the last callback values to fill the field of Finalists until the appropriate number of contestants is reached for Finals (for example: projected to be no greater than nine for one heat of Finals competition, but could be up to twelve contestants for two heats of six).
4. The least “valued” contestants voted by the panel of judges, based on a designated number of contestants determined by the Contest Coordinator (plus ties, if any occur) are retired from each Semi-Finals round until the targeted number for Finals is reached. Each round of Semi-Finals will retire contestants thusly. Important to note is that each category where a contestant dances at least one Semi-Finals Round still counts toward their Championship eligibility for the division being contested.
5. Promotion of contestants from one Round of competition to another will always be based on a single-dance format at regional UCWDC® events, where contestants make the next Round independently in each dance. However, at the Country Dance World Championships®, since all contestants are required to compete for an Overall Championship, promotion of contestants in each Round of will be based on the prescribed Overall multi-dance format for each division, where all dances are promoted together.

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” (Honorable Mention), “B” (Bronze), “S” (Silver), “G” (Gold), “GH” (Gold with Honors), “GG” (Gold Graduate). These medal designations are “thresholds”, or dividing lines for assessment, in the Judge Certification Methodology. For ProAm/ProPro Dance, after circling a “threshold” mark, it is not necessary to rank the marks as ties are acceptable. However, for ProAm or ProPro, when giving the mark, each judge may mark either of two additional assessments, a “plus” (+), or a “star” (★), per a specific medal (except for Honorable Mention), to signify an assessment higher than the “threshold” base medal designation, with the “plus” being higher than the base medal, and the “star” being higher than the “plus”. For Couple Dance or Line Dance, if a circled Medals mark is the same for more than one contestant, then the marks must be “ranked” within that specific Medal “threshold” standard, with the lowest

number ("1", or 1st) being the greater rank to the highest number being the lesser rank (this scoring methodology done within the "Medal" is the basis for it being called the "Group and Rank" process).

- Specifically, for ProAm/ProPro Dance, having a three-tiered marking (regular, plus "+", and star "★") within each Medal mark threshold per the UCWDC® Judge Methodology, the values for these marks shall be numerically assigned as follows:

In ascending order of assessment, **HM** = 26 / **B** = 25, **B+** = 24, **B★** = 23 / **S** = 22, **S+** = 21, **S★** = 20 / **G** = 19, **G+** = 18, **G★** = 17 / **GH** = 16, **GH+** = 15, **GH★** = 14 / **GG** = 13, **GG+** = 12, **GG★** = 11.

For ProAm/ProPro Dance, judges may tie contestants with "Medals" marks, meaning they can give the same mark multiple times.

- For Couples Dance, Line Dance, Teams, Spotlights, and AllStars, "Medals" marks per the UCWDC® Judge Methodology, the values for these marks shall be numerically assigned as follows:

In ascending order of assessment, **HM** = 6, **B** = 5, **S** = 4, **G** = 3, **GH** = 2, **GG** = 1.

"Medals" marks are converted to ranked 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 in a division, the marks are ranked by the judge from first ("1"), second ("2"), etc., to last. "Medals" marks with a lower number value always defeat the "Medals" marks with a higher number value (e.g., "G1" defeats "G2", or "G5" defeats "G10"). When "Medals" marks and their ranks are examined across Methodology standards, "G8" defeats "S1". Judges are not allowed to tie contestants in these dance contests.

- The majority mark of the judges, here in Rule #3, is the first determination of results for a "single-dance". To achieve the majority mark, we use the following two steps. Step #1 is to have the marks, or ranks, arranged in a pre-determined judge order that will remain the same in the columns of results for the entire divisional contest and will be known as the "raw" scores. The "raw" scores indicate each judge's marks, or ranks, continuously from one contestant to the next, one dance to the next. Also included in this order must be each judge's name so 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: with medals [13,11,12,15,14], or ranks [3,1,2,5,4], or will become re-ordered scores: [11,12,13,14,15], or [1,2,3,4,5], respectively).

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", or "13", respectively. 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.

- All 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 fully executed, then proceed to Rule #4.

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

- 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, [11,12,13,14,15] has "2" marks that are of a higher number value than the majority mark; [12,12,13,13,15] has "1" mark that has a higher number value than the majority mark; and [13,13,13,13,13] 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).
- The majority size for all the tied contestants is sorted in ascending order, from the smallest number value (which is the best "size") to the largest number value (which is the worst "size"). The lesser value represents a greater majority size, that is, less marks that are at a higher number value than the majority mark. 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 fully executed, then proceed to Rule #5.

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

- 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, [11,12,13,14,15] has a totaled value of "23"; [12,12,13,14,15] has a totaled value of "24"; [12,13,13,14,15] has a totaled value of "25"; and [13,13,13,14,15] has a totaled value of "26". Note that all four sample groups have the same majority mark of "3" (as determined by Rule #3) and the same majority size of "2" (as determined by Rule #4).
- 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 fully executed, 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, [11,12,13,14,14] has a *look-ahead* group of [14,14]; [11,12,13,14,15] has a *look-ahead* group of [14,15]; [11,12,13,15,15] has a *look-ahead* group of [15,15]. All three groups have the same *majority mark* of “3” (as determined by Rule #3); the same *majority size*, “2” (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 be compared. 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 left to right and sorted in ascending order from the smallest number value (which is the 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 fully executed, 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, [11,13,13,14,15] has a *look-behind* group of [11,13]; [12,12,13,14,15] has a *look-behind* group of [12,12]. Both groups have the same *majority mark* of “3” (as determined by Rule #3); the same *majority size*, “2” (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 be compared. 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 fully executed, 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 the same 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 indeed 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 contestant’s 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 not considered, but 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 of 4-3-0, which then is higher than the record of 3-4-0, where more wins are attained by the first contestant. A record of 11-7-4 is higher than the record of 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 *wins/losses/ties* records should be re-calculated.

While these above examples of contestant records are easy to comprehend, when the number of contests or “games played” is great and diverse, and ties are involved (with most likely 3 or more contestants tied, as sometimes happens in ProAm dance), then the placements can be visually difficult to determine. So, A numeric recording of *wins/losses/ties* will be done by computing either the “*win*” value, or the “*loss*” value, depending on whether the reporting is to show the “highest” or the “lowest” value as the best score in the reporting format.

For the **UCWDC® “Majority Rules” Scoring Format**, when the *wins/losses/ties* records of the tied contestants are compared, a new number based on “loss” value is computed from the total number of contests considered, or “games played”. [The reason we use

“loss” value rather than “win” value is because like all other scoring “rules” in the UCWDC® “Majority Rules” Scoring Format the lowest value number is considered the “best” score! All of these lower numbers will one day yield a single number called the *Vastel Value* which will be used to show a “single” value displayed electronically to determine the order of an event contest’s results].

To compute the true value of a contestant’s “loss” value, the total number of “losses” must be determined factoring in any ties that have occurred. In the event that there are ties to be considered in the wins/losses/ties records, for the purpose of arriving at the true “loss” value, each “tie” must be halved, yielding the values of $\frac{1}{2}$ (.5) for a “win” and $\frac{1}{2}$ (.5) for a “loss”. In the example above, a record of 11-7-4 is actually computed as though the contestant had 13 wins and 9 losses, thus yielding a true “loss” value of “9”, while the record of 11-8-3 is computed as 12.5 wins and 9.5 losses, for a true “loss” value of “9.5”. The loss value of 9 is lower than the loss value of 9.5, thus a better loss value. The contestant with the smaller loss value number 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 now 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 Rule #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 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 placement a value of “2”, a 3rd placement 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 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 “Multi-Dance” Championship formula, beginning at Rule #9.

Rule #9 – “Multi-Dance” Championship formulas, determining the aggregate value from Dance results:

1. All dances competed-in by a single contestant in their first round of competition within a division, whether that be a Preliminaries Round, a Semi-Finals Round, or a Finals Round, will earn a “points” value commiserate with their placement in the Finals Round. For a dance that was not competed-in for the Finals Round, the contestant will receive a “points” value that is 1 placement more than the total number of Finalists for that dance, if they made all rounds up to the Finals (thus 1 round removed from the Finals). For a contestant that is 2 rounds removed from the Finals, they will receive a “points” value that is 2 placements more than the total, number of Finalists for that dance; 3 rounds removed from Finals will earn 3 placements more; 4 rounds removed from Finals will earn 4 placements more; and so on, until all who competed-in a pre-Finals Round are accounted for the the Overall Championship. Please note that these additional placements to the Finals may result in duplicated, thus tied, placements.
2. To determine the “Multi-Dance” Championship division winners, each contestant receives a carry-forward value from each dance as determined by Rule #8, and any “add-on” values as described above. These values now remain unaltered, with each dance carrying the same weight as another dance in the “Multi-Dance” 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 Championship criteria). [For these divisions just listed, the dances for Partner Dance: Waltz and Two Step, and the dances for Line Dance: Slow (adagio) and Fast (allegro), will each be counted as 30% of the final score, and in all cases the Solo Medley will be counted as 40% of the score.]

The first determination in scoring for any "Championship" title is to notate whether the division has a 1-dance championship, a 3-dance championship, a 4-dance championship, a 5-dance championship, a 6-dance championship, or an 8-dance championship (for example, an 8-dance ProAm Championship or ProPro Championship). For all Championships (except the 1-dance championship), this determines how many *carry-forward* values from pre-designated dance groups are to be added together to arrive at a contestant's aggregate value for a division's "Multi-Dance" Championship. [Other divisional "Championships" can occur when dances different than each division's "Grand Championship" formula are considered to create a 'mini' or 'maxi' set of dances that are contested for a differently titled, specialized award other than the division's major "Grand Championship".]

For example, to determine each contestant's Rule #9 aggregate value for a 5-dance Championship, total the *carry-forward* values for all qualifying dances, hence, *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, Waltz and Two Step values for Partner Dance, and Dance A (Slow) and 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, hence, *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".

- Sort the aggregate values of all contestants, computed from all Championship 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 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 Championship placement. If a tie persists after Rule #9 is fully executed, then proceed to Rule #10.

Rule #10 – 1st Tiebreaker for "Multi-Dance" Championship, determining Head-to-Head results computed as (wins/losses/ties) from placements across all commonly competed-in dances, with each Championship placement requiring re-visitation:

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

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 'championship' group formula. These include all dances that were commonly competed-in, even those that were not part of the 'championship' group formula computed in Rule #9.

- 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 were 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 for 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 not considered, but 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 of 5-3-0, which then is higher than the record of 3-5-0, where more wins are attained by the first contestant. A record of 4-2-2 is higher than the record of 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 wins/losses/ties records for Rule #10 should be re-calculated.

While these above examples of contestant records are easy to comprehend, when the number of contests or "games played" is great and diverse, and ties are involved (with most likely 3 or more contestants tied, as sometimes happens in ProAm dance), then the placements can be visually difficult to determine. So, a numeric recording of wins/losses/ties will be done by computing either the "*win*" value, or the "*loss*" value, depending on whether the reporting is to show the "highest" or the "lowest" value as the best score in the reporting format.

For the UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format, when the wins/losses/ties records of the tied contestants are compared, a new number based on "loss" value is computed from the total number of contests considered or "games played". [The reason we use "loss" value rather than "win" value is because like all other scoring "rules" in the UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format the lowest value number is considered the "best" score! All of these lower numbers will one day yield a single number called the *Vastel Value* which will be used to show 1 value displayed electronically to determine the order of an event contest's results].

To compute the true value of a contestant's "loss" value, the total number of "losses" must be determined factoring in any ties that have occurred. In the event that there are ties to be considered in the wins/losses/ties records, for the purpose of arriving at the true "loss" value, each "tie" must be halved, yielding the value of ½ of a "win" and ½ of a "loss". In the example above, a record of 11-7-4 is actually computed as though the contestant had 13 wins and 9 losses, thus yielding a true "loss" value of "9", while the record of 11-8-3 is computed as 12.5 wins and 9.5 losses, or a true "loss" value of "9.5". The loss value of 9 is lower than the loss

percentage of 9.5, thus a better “loss” value. The contestant with the smaller loss value number is awarded the higher placement, if a tie for the best record does not persist. This is the only placement within the Championship awarded at this time. After awarding the best record, or if a tie persists, then proceed to Rule #10, part #3.

3. 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 Championship placement. If the initial tie in question exists for more than two contestants for the same Championship placement and the tie for the highest Championship placement is broken at Rule #10, part #4, the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Championship 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 Championship placement had not competed in those dances. If there were ‘new’ commonly competed-in dances to be considered, then those dances become part of a ‘new’ computation for that next lower Championship 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 Championship placement (as now 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 Championship 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 Championship 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 “Multi-Dance” Championship, determining Head-to-Head results computed as (wins/losses/ties) from individual judges’ marks across all commonly competed-in dances, with each Championship placement requiring 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 without regard to the ‘championship’ group formula. These include all dances that were commonly competed-in, even those that were not part of the ‘championship’ 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, a 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 not considered, but only whether it was a *win*, or a *loss*, or a *tie*. Now each dance’s record of wins/losses/ties from *judge’s marks* 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 for wins/losses/ties for each tied contestant. The wins/losses/ties records, once computed from *judge’s marks* here in Rule #11 (rather than *dance’s placements* in Rule #10), are valued and compared respectively (see comparative examples of records like listed in Rule #10, part #2). 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 wins/losses/ties records for Rule #11 should be re-calculated.

While the examples of contestant records (shown in Rule #10) are easy to comprehend, when the number of contests or “games played” is great and diverse, and ties are involved (with most likely 3 or more contestants tied, as sometimes happens in ProAm dance), then the placements can be visually difficult to determine. So, a numeric recording of wins/losses/ties may be done by computing either the “win” value, or the “loss” value, depending on whether the reporting is to show the “highest” or the “lowest” value as the best score in the reporting format.

For the **UCWDC® “Majority Rules” Scoring Format**, when the wins/losses/ties records of the tied contestants are compared, a new number based on “loss” value is computed from the total number of contests considered or “games played”. [The reason we use “loss” value rather than “win” value is because like all other scoring “rules” in the **UCWDC® “Majority Rules” Scoring Format** the lowest value number is considered the “best” score! All of these lower numbers will one day yield a single number called the *Vastel Value* which will be used to show 1 value displayed electronically to determine the order of an event contest’s results].

To compute the true value of a contestant’s “loss” value, the total number of “losses” must be determined factoring in any ties that have occurred. In the event that there are ties to be considered in the wins/losses/ties records, for the purpose of arriving at the true “loss” value, each “tie” must be halved, yielding the value of ½ of a “win” and ½ of a “loss”. In the example above, a record of 11-7-4 is actually computed as though the contestant had 13 wins and 9 losses, thus yielding a true “loss” value of “9”, while the record of 11-8-3 is computed as 12.5 wins and 9.5 losses, or a true “loss” value of “9.5”. The loss value of 9 is lower than the loss percentage of 9.5, thus a better “loss” value. The contestant with the smaller loss value number is awarded the higher placement, if a tie for the best record does not persist. This is the only placement within the Championship 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 Championship placement. If the initial tie in question exists for more than two contestants for the same Championship placement and the tie for the highest Championship placement is broken at Rule #11, part #2, the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Championship 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 Championship 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 Championship placement, executing Rule #11, part #2 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 Championship placement (as now it is essentially considered a 'new' head-to-head competition between the remaining tied contestants).

Unlike Rules #8 or #10, where any 'new' computation for the remaining tied contestants is a 're-visitation' within Rules #8 or #10, respectively, for a Rule #11 tie, the 're-visitation' must go all the way back to Rule #10, where part #2 is re-applied and re-calculated, and where the 're-visitation' will yield new wins/losses/ties records to be compared. For this 're-visitation', if there is still a tie after Rule #10, part #2, is executed, then the tie-breaking process moves on to Rule #11, part #2. When and if this 're-visitation' finally breaks the tie, first computing wins/losses/ties from Rule #10, part #4, and then, if needed, computing wins/losses/ties from Rule #11, part #2, there is then a successive awarding of a next lower Championship 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 Championship 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 Rule #11, part #4.

4. The contestants with a final tie share the Championship placements for which they are actually tied (for example, a 2-way tie for 2nd place is 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 Championship placement only, with the other shared Championship 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 Championship placement announced and awarded would then be 5th place. This is similarly done for all tied placements in a final tie.

General Information and Requisite Reporting – Pre- and Post- Competition Requirements:

For any reason, if there is concern or lack of comprehension about the **UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format**, please contact the Scoring Sub-Committee chair, Anthony Lee, at bigaplllee@aol.com or text him at +1 551-265-8388 (where text is also available internationally via "WhatsApp" at the same number). Realize that the Scoring Sub-Committee operates under the direction and supervision of the UCWDC Rules Committee, where the UCWDC Vice President of Rules, Beth Emerson, can be contacted at rules@ucwdc.org or text her at +1 405-535-3073 (where text is also internationally available via "WhatsApp" at the same number).

Any Scoring System, Scoring Director, Scrutineer, or Auditor that operates within the **UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format**, must maintain contact with the UCWDC® Rules Committee, and its Scoring Sub-Committee, to stay current with any adjustments or additions to the Scoring Format algorithms. Any Scoring System, or personnel that see or touch contest scoring during an event must be trained and tested by an assigned UCWDC® Scoring Examiner that will authenticate accuracy, thus authorizing their work for use by any UCWDC® Sanctioned Event. Additional conditions or mandates for Scoring Systems or Scoring Crew may occur over time, that must be addressed and completed by a declared date to retain their "license" to operate scoring within the UCWDC®. If there are questions that need to be answered, please contact the UCWDC® Scoring Committee at your convenience.

For Scoring Systems' programmers, an approved Divisional Scoring Analysis, or DSA (sometimes referred to as the CC Report for use by Contest Coordinators to quickly review or audit a specific division's results as the case may be when results are questioned). The DSA format, formalized in 1999, is updated within the **UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format**, and for the 2026-2028 UCWDC® Rules cycle, must be available to the following persons: Contestants to have access for all divisions they dance at a UCWDC® Event; Adjudicators to have access for all divisions they judge at a UCWDC® Event; Contest Coordinators to have access for all divisions they coordinate at a UCWDC® Event; the VP of Judge Certification, the VP of Rules, and the Chairman of the Scoring Committee to have access to all DSA Reports from every UCWDC® Event, including any UCWDC® Championship event.

For UCWDC® event awards presentation, the hired Scoring Systems, vetted to use **UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format**, must produce awards reports to be read to the public during any awards ceremony, and only this report can be used for Awards. Event results cannot be re-written to another document and then used to unveil event placements and event winners. If additional information is wanted or warranted, then that information must accompany the original awards report provided by Scoring Systems. If Event Awards certificates, plaques, or trophies are offered to contestants, whether produced whole or in part by the Scoring Systems for ProAm/ProPro contests, then only the Medal "threshold" title derived by the actual results will be read from or displayed on awards paraphernalia. Such "threshold" titles, without use of the plus "+" and star "★", shall be solely announced or awarded.