### NDT Committee Minutes

#### Called to order 1pm 3-21-2019

1 Jake Proxy

2 DCH Proxy

3 Vega

4 DCH

5 Repko

6 Herndon

7 Brovero

9 Keenan

East-Kat, LT-middle, Gerber-south, West- (Jake)

Minutes from Evanston – Panetta name fix (Brovero, Repko), Unan approved

### Reports

#### 1 BOT – Sherry Hall – next 2 years of NDT hosts

JMU 2020 is set, contract is signed, Mike Davis fundraising with a free to participants goal, hotel $94/room night (offset transportation costs) – great venue.

2021 NDT bid from Wake Forest (75th) – may be hosted in D.C. due to travel restrictions, seeking a single hotel model, site visit – Marriott Westfield Chantilly VA near Dulles, $75k committed, fundraising with a free to participants goal. Some observer fees. 37 appropriate rooms + 2 converted guest suites (no beds), contract is ready to sign when approved. March 26-29, 2021). Hotel can accommodate all – over 500 rooms, 200 doubles, 135k cancel clause so we are locked in. Internet not free in competition space, will discount 75% and Wake will cover it. Rapidly developing area, and many restaurants in 5 miles. $135/night hotel rate. Free parking. Attrition policy is $75k food-beveridge, some other nearby hotels. (Repko, Vik) Unam approved

BOT discussion on ideas to save NDT, will have discussion here later – happy to chime in later. Have a solution for plaques losing space.

Tabroom options – working with Marc Wilson to explore options. Some initial work last year. Several others are helping to draft a request for proposals for platform options – having the functionality that the NDT wants. Question is whether a lesser cost from an alumni and Gary’s role in it. Phil Voight (PKD) might be willing to collaborate on this

#### 2 SPL Director Report

Dates proposed (Repko, Jake) Unan approved

Feb 8 eligibility, FRALB Feb 5 @ noon, Vote due 9th, Announced Feb 10

Declare Feb 11, Prelim 13th

Districts Feb 15 & Feb 22

Mar 25rd SRALB, March 1st vote, March 2nd announced

Registration March 26, Tournament March 27-30

Thank you to Wichita for 2018 NDT and Jarman’s 2019 help

If District Tournament is ranking, get in by the beginning of the 2nd weekend, making it late makes the 2nd round process hard. Friendly request to get by Sunday night of 2nd weekend (or when District tournaments end – March 1st, 2019)

District 1 – it was just another tournament, also considered those results in ranking.

You can reach SPL 208-293-0036 texting is best, voice works (google voice) – may contact outbound from here as well.

Texas ends on Feb 3rd in 2019. No vote taken

#### 3 Appeals – Brovero

One appeal went through all – waiver for a team one round below 50% - have to be 50% so denied waiver request. Ongoing discussion on changing the 50% number.

Withdrawn appeal on medical emergency waiver – language not flexible, appeal not concluded

4 Ranking – none, Jackie not here

5 Host – DCH

Let us know if things needed

Gen. Williams tonight RE dietary

Building monitors (T Cram running ruvisks hall)

Judges need to leave early to start on time

6 Chair reports – Dallas

All teams here are eligible. Top 10 + quarters must re verify after tournament

Working groups later – old business voting first

7 Bid Allocation Report – Vega

Some declaration what is happening (tournament or other) – must be declared prior to bid allocation, hybrid or whatever – would clear things up.

D2 rankings – once submitted eligible, that counts as participation. Decide not attending, the bid goes to the 2nd round pool, which is how we did it. Don’t get to re-do rankings, or would not have participated in the district process. Allocated means declare to participate, don’t submit if not intending to attend NDT.

Vik - WHERE do district rules live? They live in district, should be held by the NDT. Posted on CEDA forums.

Vega – I can share a google folder, post anything changed before January 1.

SPL – We can make a place on the new NDT website.

### OLD BUSINESS

#### 1 Ignoring Round Robins for 50% (Herndon, Vik)

1n, 2a, 3y, 4a, 5y, 6y, 7n, 8y, Ey, Wn, MWy, Sy

Passes 7-4 (must pass again) – 2020 NDT if passed again

Non-invitational tournament idea – Jake – not friendly – no 2nd

Proposal as it stands:

c. Second Round At-Large process.

(1) Any teams not selected for participation in the NDT through the First Round At-Large or district processes may apply for a Second Round At-Large bid.

(2) All teams selected through the Second Round At-Large process must have a 50% or greater preliminary round win-loss record in rounds at open-invitation tournaments, or the combination of open-invitation tournaments and NDT district-qualification tournaments, on the fall CEDA topic or its NDT topic parallel immediately prior to the District tournament or at the time of submission for second round bids. The team's record for every tournament attended prior to submission must be reported on the application form.

#### 2 Medical waivers

Updates – J subpoint, etc

Passed unan (Super Majority, into effect for 2020 - without further action)

Vik drafted. Is there a motion to adopt? (Vega, Gerber)

Discussion – a couple of typos – “of” approved. Strictest standards.

Vik – term of art also a clarification, similar to T9 or SH reported – share with those who need due process vs confidentialy means not share

**Rule II: PARTICIPANT QUALIFICATION. In compliance with Article VI, Sections E and F of the NDT Charter:**

A. GENERAL REGULATIONS.

1. Schools who have an institutional membership in the AFA, or whose director has an individual membership in the AFA, and who are subscribers to the NDT may qualify up to three teams of two student-debaters for participation in the National Tournament through three selection processes: First Round At-Large selection, District Qualification and Second Round At-Large selection. A maximum of seventy-eight (78) teams shall qualify for participation in the National Debate Tournament as follows: sixteen (16) through the First Round At-Large selection, forty-six (46) teams through the District process, and the remaining teams through the Second Round At-Large process. A maximum of six subscribing schools may qualify a third team of two student-debaters for participation in the National Tournament through Second Round At-Large selection: these teams must follow the current procedures for selection, and must meet the 50% or greater preliminary win-loss requirement for Second Round At-Large Bids. However, notwithstanding the foregoing

a. Any student in compliance with the eligibility definitions of the AFA Debate Program and Debate Tournament Standards is eligible to represent his or her school, except that no student who has previously served as a judge at the NDT shall be eligible to participate as a debater.

b. A team is composed of two eligible debaters from a single subscribing institution. Any team of students from a subscribing institution who qualify for the NDT and who are restricted from attending the tournament by state or municipal travel restrictions shall be allowed to attend as an unaffiliated team, barring any objections from their subscribing institution. [Adopted 3-23-2017 in force for the 2018 NDT]

c. The composition of any team qualifying for the National Debate Tournament must remain intact. If one member should, for any reason, be unable to fulfill the commitment, the subscriber loses its invitation for that team.

d. A debater may qualify for and attend the NDT a maximum of four times.

e. For the purpose of determining eligibility to participate at the National Debate Tournament, the number of time blocks in which a student has competed will include all intercollegiate debate competition. The counting of years of eligibility shall begin in the fall of 1996.

f. In addition to AFA eligibility standards, participation in any debate tournament in more than ten semesters or five academic years renders a debater ineligible to attend the NDT unless a student is granted a medical waiver for one semester or year of debate participation through the Subcommittee on Appeals as per Rule II. A. 1. j below.

g. To be an eligible debater for the National Debate Tournament, a student must provide, by February 8th to the NDT committee chair, an official document from appropriate university officials verifying that he/she is registered as an undergraduate **degree-seeking** student and is in good standing at the school, for which he/she is participating, as of February 1st immediately preceding the NDT in which he/she wishes to participate. **The degree-seeking requirement does not apply to any student enrolled in a junior college or a community college.**The Chair of the NDT Committee shall promptly notify the applying program director of any application which does not meet the above criteria. The program director may then appeal the eligibility of the debaters by contacting, and submitting all relevant documentation to, the NDT Committee Chair not later than one week from the date of notification. The appeal will then be forwarded to the Appeals Committee. The Appeals Committee may conduct the appeal by means of telephone calls, email or conference calls. The Appeals Committee may grant an exemption when the student's school provides written documentation explaining why a student may be officially enrolled but may not be in good standing, for example, if the university/college defines "in good standing" by criteria other than satisfactory academic performance.

h. Within two weeks of the conclusion of the tournament each year, all students who received one of the top ten speaker awards or who participated in the quarterfinal round of the tournament shall submit an official document similar to that specified in rule “g” above, attesting to their enrollment in good standing as of the date the tournament concluded.  The NDT Chair shall promptly report to the membership the results of the verification process.  Violations of the duty to verify eligibility may be subject to review and sanction by the NDT governing bodies.

i. No school which has refused or neglected to pay any fees or assessments associated with past national debate tournaments shall be allowed to register teams for the tournament, and no individual who has refused or neglected to pay fees or assessments associated with past tournaments will be allowed to attend or serve as a judge at the NDT.

j. A medical waiver request to the Subcommittee on Appeals for one additional semester or year of eligibility may be requested BY NOVEMBER 1 immediately prior to the next National Debate Tournament for which the student is attempting to qualify if: (1) a student has not competed previously in the NDT in more than 3 years, and (2) if the student did not compete in an intercollegiate tournament past the sixtieth percent (60%) census point of the Fall Semester or First Quarter, or no later than Feb 8th in the Spring Semester or respective quarter, for a period of enrollment in their undergraduate career, and (3) the student transcript indicates that the period of enrollment either does not academically count for their undergraduate career or was retroactively withdrawn for medical reasons approved by their institution. The student will waive any remaining eligibility to qualify to the National Debate Tournament after the next time the student qualifies for and attends the National Debate Tournament.

1. This appeal requires both Academic Documentation and Medical Documentation to be evaluated.

2. Academic Documentation requires a minimum of a student’s official college transcript with an indication of a “Leave of Absence” (also known as “Total Withdrawal”, “Matriculation of Maintenance”, or other documented institutional term for non-continuous enrollment within the institution) indicated for the semester or year that is the period of enrollment for the basis of the Appeal. The student may supplement this documentation by providing a copy of their original LOA request or approval within their institution to clarify transcript notations, which may include institutional forms, letters, or electronic communications. Supplemental documentation must be clearly dated and no later than the sixtieth percent (60%) census point of the Fall Semester or First Quarter; or no later than Feb 8th in the Spring Semester or respective ~~quarter or~~ period of enrollment SUCH AS 3RD QUARTER. The total number of days of Leave of Absence or approved non-matriculation/enrollment documented in the transcript, request, or approval may not exceed 180 days.

3. Medical Documentation requires either a copy of the original medical documentation submitted for the Leave of Absence AND the original institutional communication approving this documentation for leave during the period of enrollment, OR the student may submit original medical documentation from during the period of enrollment the Leave of Absence took place AND a current institutional letter indicating the Leave of Absence ~~of~~ was approved.

4. A student requesting a medical waiver cannot have been enrolled in any other institution of higher education during the period of Leave of Absence or non-matriculation identified in their appeal.

#### 3 Change the min round count from 6 prelims to 4 prelims

Moved and 2nd (Vega, Jake) – 1y, 2a, 3y, 4a, 5y, 6a, 7a, 8y, Wy, Ey, Ca, Sy (7-0, 4 abstention, supermajority into effect)

Language forthcoming

Brovero – why not 5

Vik – 4 is considering CEDA rules on elims and such

Vega - NFALD game – you can game about anything TBH, the benefits are worth it.

Vik – there are entrance barriers, academic obligations on Friday, flexibility is good, you still need many tournament however.

Jake – Does this contradict any AFA rules, I recall looking something up once on this

Vik – Maybe a 4 schools requirement, even vs odd numbers

Brovero – 4 rounds of debate or 2 rounds of IE, 4 schools

SPL – cutting daily expenses matters, there are great benefits to allowing short tournaments

Vik – Online debating and using online formats, what if a tournament is 2 days on Tues-Wed, elims on Thursday, people without a travel budget right now could do that. Part of the issue is convincing people to try this format, not just current practices.

**Rule II: PARTICIPANT QUALIFICATION. In compliance with Article VI, Sections E and F of the NDT Charter:**

A. GENERAL REGULATIONS.

B. DISTRICT QUALIFICATION.

1. The 46 district bids will be allocated to districts according to a proportional system:

b. Eligible teams: To submit for the bid allocation process, a team must have paid their NDT subscription fee and have either (1) a minimum of 18 intercollegiate preliminary rounds on the fall CEDA topic or its NDT topic parallel either both as individuals or as a team of varsity or open debate in at least three tournaments, each consisting of a minimum of 4 preliminary rounds with at least 6 teams from at least four different schools in varsity or open division, or (2) one member of the team with a minimum of 32 intercollegiate preliminary rounds on the fall CEDA topic or its NDT topic parallel in at least four tournaments, each consisting of a minimum of four preliminary rounds, with at least six teams from at least four different schools in varsity or open division (i.e., if one member of the team has at least 32 rounds satisfying the above requirements, no minimum number of rounds is required of the partner in order for the team to be eligible for the bid allocation process).

#### 4 Emergency Waivers for SRALB (Tabled)

Unfinished appeal business was Harvard

Brovero – it took us 4 years with medical waiver – part of the committee was outraged we lack language, I researched the NCAA language, not satisfied if optimal, review if effective, on the table for the future, also included EQ’s, student or immediate family, airline cancellations may as well.

Dallas – what about the idea of medical waivers here

Jake – Based on the rational for medical waiver, this seems common sense

DCH – current rules produce unjust results

Sherry Hall – Does the Flu count, what does not count, can all agree a serious medical condition should not prevent. Disease

Kat – Serious flu is a good reason.

Smale – Physician documentation creates class issues, keep in mind. Can’t always see a doctor in my experience, DSS has to deal with this often.

Vik – Disability documentation plus the time component, ongoing process. The TF might be the Univ Student Health Center and may not provide documentation, NYU will not do that, must provide the actual medical records instead. They don’t want to violate HIPAA absent a full medical records release process.

Jyleesa – Receipts matter, maybe, Dr. Harris will know and is my liaison on behalf, maybe the Director can verify vs the committee, assume integrity. Would not lie on my behalf.

Jake – NCAA rules not really similar because they have medical staff.

Tripp – The Harv medical office will not assist because it is not a class.

Repko – there will be some harmony, we have to figure this out for the NDT. We need to do some metalwork on the proposal, what counts as certification of illness.

Vik – the university has a process for medical leave of absence process – not punish for not attend despite cont enrollment rule. There is usually some process, the office can review the materials, we approve for these reasons. Mental and physical health processes are different as well. This is different, actual process in university is LONG.

Audience – Example of a student signed waiver presented to professors. Not OK with a director would verify on their behalf, I would ask – documentation, if they are lying, make the student sign in, and protect directors at the same time. Flu can be enough.

Jyleesa – Student lying, extreme example, prevents you structurally.

Vik – Also don’t bring the flu to the districts

Smale – student self determination plus some accountability attached to it. Not an external doctor validation. Some kind of accountability mechanism.

Jake – If student has access, or if a note of excuse, then required. Maybe exceptions limited unless we have to do that.

Dallas – Let’s study and think for the NCA meeting for the fall.

Vik – Suggestion is do research and report the wording by a specific date in October for discussion in the fall. Or before season starts. Can be in effect for 2020.

#### 5 Eliminate the 2nd rounds

Dallas - Probably fairly radical for a vote today, but let’s talk about it. Might be nice if the districts were more equal in size, but not capable to do this today. One could not give away the bids.

Jake – The Dallas proposals, perhaps an opt-in districts, would this change implicate that?

Dallas – if all had to have 10 and were competitive, this would be a good proposal. My reservation does not apply to D3, but it might not work in D1 so much right now. Perhaps radically under 50% records ahead of teams that are over – might be 3rd or 4th teams as well.

Vega – I really like the 2nd rounds – one more than initial bids this year – this is the last incentive for regional travel, and that is the most important thing.

Vik – The fear of the one bad loss is deterring regional travel – the appeal team has a regional loss argument, could not stay even in the district. Also the h2h against others.

Vega – there will be exceptions, but the best way is the stronger competition. Large scope.

Herndon – all the small programs disliked this idea, immediately.

Smale – Only qualified out of the 2nd round, and D5 is super hard to handle.

Dallas – with more bids you might make it out of districts.

Smale – a Bad tournament but a good season, especially if a newer program less relationship or reputation, not that it might go away.

Dallas – Those who get them, like them.

Vik – We are all emotionally and logically tied, at some point we need a hard look at the math practice for teams. There might be a 2nd round process sweet spot. There are reasons we like or dislike, there are specific instances. Regional tournament is hard when it means travel 9 hours, we need a systematic working groups. No specific proposals to work with.

Jyleesa – More data is good, but easy to see why some like it and some dislike it. Lots of conversation, it will be an ongoing one, but you can also move toward more immediate action. How much info do you need to understand why like/dislike the rounds.

Dallas – Will revisit this in Baltimore.

### NEW BUSINESS

#### 1 Decision Time Limits

No move is required just yet

Jake – Kentucky decision time was 2:15, 2:30 elims

Brovero – all majors but Wake used this, TR can show you the “last ballot in” timestamp, only 1-2 past the time usually. The NDT would have record for 2018 & 2019 – would not exist prior but could recreate indirectly. A tournament admin – Hardy, Manuel, SPL, Gary – I will put together instructions to find this.

Jarrod – We will change at Wake if the NDT changes

Vega – If most of the majors have a shorter decision time, we should mirror the rest of the year.

Repko – Wake has 4 prelims and the NDT only have 3. The original rationale was to keep the days from getting out of hand. Unpack the rationale here. There are downsides.

Vega – the content of the last rebuttals implicated how debaters make decisions, but making it half an hour longer – it should more closely follow community practices to be more consistent with the rest of the year. No real dog in this fight. Wake wanted judges to practice decisions similar to how the NDT does it. Will the NDT ever change theirs, I would propose, like elims at majors @ 2:30.

Dan Stanfield – It needs like 2:15/2:30, but this is a new change and it is too early for the NDT – I also have early decision time concerns.

Vega – Let’s not vote yet, keep in mind.

Dallas – No limits on elims, is that a good idea? The elim is the last debate for somebody, so be extraordinarily careful.

Brovero – Would like non for elims, shorter is great for prelims, I don’t support changes on elim, but no district FB.

Gerber – The prelim is a career ender for many, err on side of caution.

SPL – Director problems? Elim day can run pretty late, but really much pushing on prelim days, a bit more in round 7-8.

DCH – Is it harder to get people to judge the really late debates? (SPL prob not, will ask Gary)

SPL – Gary would like an elim day deadline, even if it was longer

Sherry – I give hotels a schedule but it could be very far off, would like a bit more certainty.

Zive – the 3 hour decision time discourages people from coming in early

Sherry – Have not had this problem

Jylessa – As a young judge, I want to get it right, the unlimited decision time is nice, the imposition of decision time, it is nice, different level of anxiety about this, young people like the unlimited – get it right, write it out vs “off the dome” decision – longer and with thought to people who appreciate it.

Repko – Good to err on the side of LONG, blaming decision time is a frustrating outcome. Probably you aren’t pushing the coin flip too hard.

Jake – Ever flipped a coin? Never, but we have threatened to do so.

### Working Groups & Sustainability (2:55pm)

*Some things forwarded…*

#### 1 Development (Vik)

Program development historically not NDT focus, more a focus for CEDA. Someone from NDT Comm should join the CEDA one – there can be rules in conflict. Also people should be looking at the other working groups, such as the Repko online debating with a low cost initiative. Can gain entry into places which do not exist.

Recent alumni can donate time vs money – just a FRALB as a local judge at a regional tournament, could help a regional program or a tournament. Also, inst the idea of alumni SERVICE – more than just care about the NDT. It is more how to save this format of debate, requires working with the other organizations.

CEDA is also rebuilding their website, making a space on their website, but held off until the CEDA committee emerged. Can also benefit from case studies of programs, and what has worked and not worked – Binghamton, Rutgers, what things have worked and why.

Dallas – any idea of how we would deliver info to prospective programs?

Vik – Web documentation, and some standardized letters, certain benchmarks, one tailored, NDT is not the ONLY metric – the inst hierarchy of people who are DOF’s – their reference to NDT before 1994 say you need a 50k budget to chase the bids, create different forms of local access points and metrics, can also be novice or JV debaters. Some work better with novices – will be happy to do the paperwork, but a nice history of HS debate and lacking RS access or travel access. But many think NDT is too daunting, and explaining that college policy debate is more than attending the NDT – they want to hear from the NDT chair that things have changed from before 1994. I was lucky to have a Dean who understood this and modified these program goals.

#### 2 Public Relations & Crisis Response (Latonya Starks)

I have noted for after the tournament.

The overarching thing is to create and fund – the media and PR brand, no brand awareness at all, very important. There are five goals.

1 How do we leverage strengths

2 Actual vs perceived BF

3 differentiation from other forms of debate

4 Deliverability of the promise

5 Sustainable to deliver on the promise over time

Need someone to build a strategic and integrated marketing plan – every document ever done, read it all, distill into a list of recommendations, how can we answer those, and come up with a media strategy, publicity on every type of platform, but this takes times and money.

Also noted in the emails, the alumni participation – three sectors – by the sectors of age. Went with the Nielson minus the 18 and below. Targeted media campaigns for EVERY group. Most popular social media strategies for each group.

Youngest – make it your social cause to save this activities – produce and use content. Dedicated group of young alums – producing and consuming content for us. Putting up unofficial pics for the NDT, etc. Can we mine the algorhytym, and we have alums who can do this.

If we had reps from each age group, could make a professional org of debate alumni – can promise a deeply personal thing, return to why they did debate in the first place, and also easier because everyone wants pro organization on LinkedIn, and maybe some dues.

Older people – we can pair with schools beyond their alma mater, recruitment competition to create fundraising opportunities for this school who needs your help – offer to watch practice debates, make people bid, competitions are sweet.

Policy debate brand ambassadors – people who can explain why debate is great for you and other people, focus on diversity and inclusivity, and we want honest experiences.

FB groups targeted at three sectors – go viral in ways which are NOT an embarrassment. Caitlyn O’Hashi did elite gymnastics, she wanted to bring back the joy – this floor routine to make people happy. Got 30m views and went on the talk shows. This gave college gymnastics, and it ties a face you want out there. [Ermo – speed read the Gettysburg Address) (Also showing people the colored highlighting stuff)

This needs to start with 2-3 people, and it will take some money. Add agencies trying to increase the numbers, we do not have 250k to pay a consulting firm to do this, we do have the knowledge and know-how of a smart group. Incumbent on this committee to make it happen, but we need to take steps, we need media and brand recognition.

Vik – there is a media coverage committee, have not done much since documentaries, suff to const the questions, membership including the activity and organizational. The fact that I did not know if a problem

Dallas – it was limited to NDT media coverage, just not the charge, just not what the committee IS as of today. Ditto with organizational analysis.

Jyleesa – This sounds really dope and you can do it for less or no cost, if young. Need to make an intentional move to do this. Lots of joy for debate, a lot are disillusioned – if you think people don’t you to be here – cannot use labor and joy. I am not the only reason. I am glad, this space is not accessible and transparent, it does not feel inclusion, cannot capture the joy of people. There is a spice of interaction with the NDT Committee – there is a very large disconnect, make it for literally everyone, does it pertain to me. That fractures and does not bring us together,togethere way we relate to each other.

Bee Smale – the dangers of the alt-right, people are getting doxxed in HS

Karla Leeper – Consider the focus on the segments of the audience and there are many things you are trying to solve, may need different kinds of arguments targeted. Institutions need data driven arguments – should be compared to alternatives in how they could spend their money – the deployment needs to be very strategic to get into the space of people. The same would be true for alumni – engagement and money are distinct sorts of appeals, and make arguments to them to trigger a particular response. Every institution these days wants to avoid WI and IL – where state legislators get involved in higher education, ugly moment in US politics, want to preserve the funding and avoid awkward situations, and we need to be mindful.

Latoya – take the initial thoughts of your segments, and find data driven ways to do that. We need some data.

#### 3 Research Group

DCH, Foley, T Cram, Groven, Gerber, maybe Rob Glass too – some suggestions to make grants available for honors thesis. To do some quan research on various degrees of debate. KS and Baltimore, crunching the numbers, if had done debate. Getting the data is a high priority.

The MILWAUKE UDL did a pre and post test on reading skills.

Vik – student affairs tool, the ways HE education student speaking skills for populations, would be a good experiment, control groups with college novices, and etc. This idea of ind study RS, decided the perfect template, the time crunch and choices, and RC is distinct.

LT – If we lack a metric, what are we gathering data now

SH – what people do after debate, not gathering on those IN debate.

DCH – many groups have decided assessment is important, the ST is pilots on various and reporting results at NFA. Ability to ask is alive, can easily ask students to provide data and react to it. Should want to generate a template or such, reading comprehension, anecdotal explanations to administrators, branching into soft and social skills, 4-5 year grad rates, CR skills, etc. Push in on using those, studies will similar methods

Gerber – CAD is dying and no one submits.

Dallas – How much grant does it require to get a grad student to do this.

Jylessa – I would do for free if the TL works for school. A couple thousand, a thousand is a LOT of money, backed by a spirit, I value your labor, we need you to do this small part, that part is missing. Buy some stat package subscriptions, perhaps. Have a license, costs hundreds.

Danielle Leek – You also need some mentoring to help with this, outside of cash.

Karla – AFA has a pool of resources, not tied to a specific amount.

Vega – think a bit bigger on the breadth, will it be a surprise that 200k can improve 8 students, what does it do for the rest of the students? Be flexible and creative.

Dallas – I have spoken at length about taking the WSJ rankings, make the debate team argument, not controllable, the stat. Having a big team probably rubs off on the roommates. Would be a lot easier….

Smale – More publicized info about publishing avenues.

Turner – The athletics analogy – the closest was the CC ski coach – there are a limited number of problems, small but intensely dedicated community. Hard to explain the mechanics. Despite differences, there are similarities. Largely centered in LS questions. What are you providing to a smaller set vs largest participation. Speaking to the aggregators, they assume wanted a booth at the student activities fair. The language of LS, the intensity and depth of commitment. The athletics analogy has some dangers, worth following up on the language of leadership, there are some very real limits on what it would actually look like – smaller segment of students. The messaging and branding. Metric of leadership training success – just saying this is an obsession. I would describe the way I hear as mostly BS, as I cannot tell you what they want for real. Politically useful vocabulary. Student affairs vs COM Department are different needs, but most is setting expectations and using a vocab. Some of the messaging may not be the RS messaging. Incorp in the strategy. They count ONLY people. If you cannot count the number, find a different vocab. I hate the vocab. (Ermo – student video arguments as the 1AC for a debate)

DCH – What are the frontlines we need for these kinds of institutions.

LT – that is right, we need to write the script that you must USE.

Turner – the peer institution concept is really important. Founding new programs – want to found a program at this institution, now what are the closest peer competitors, all of them have debate programs so we need one as well. That set of FL should be about compete on this metric or activity, etc.

Brovero – panels of no one at NCA – Set up a dropbox folder would be nice – the ADA has panel notes, we had two panels on assessment, some of it exists and not sharing it with Gerber. So many FB calls, pile of stuff without an archive, we need a standing reserve on this, and some of them exist and are not used.

Vik – Quick question – the survey to assess the NDT each year. Do we have the survey for this year? Can we do one, I can do it. Why is your school AT the NDT. What about THIS experience is fueling or tied. What metric does YOUR institution use to measure the impact of debate? Perhaps alumni benefits, or press benefits, etc.

Jyleesa – Responses highly varied (Vik – that is the point, different metrics and MV factors) – How to tie in the joy and the excitement, the reasons for me, the NDT is meaningless to my school, not mean would continue with other metrics or goals, why meaningful or important, creates symbols, some assume 10 years ago, with a bunch more schools doing it.

DCH – I will do a survey, if people will fill it out. Vik, DCH, JH, we need a RS program.

Weise – Only if total internal problems – ask for assessment for the organization.

#### 4 Virtual Debate Maybe

Dallas – I am not good at strategies to ask for money, instead try to earn it. We could sponsor a digital tournament, encourage everyone, make 20k, could develop a system of sustaining subscribers, SH would spend 1k, perhaps some others, dangle a carrot for the sustainer. Only a 3rd team if SS – lot of money, can afford, no costs on others without ambition. We generate bid fee money to spend, perhaps. Danielle – could sell instructional content online to college who lack COM and want to teach it, try to assist in developing, and invite to the DDT for nearly free. Maybe a couple of kids, program building in that way. Enough to support some PR and some research. Not sure lf can afford a BIG PR campaign. If we had a plan, could do some cash. We need an election next, and can speak informally, not past 4pm though.

#### 5 Alumni Report

I was impressed and I send out the list. Kat had a different thing. I will take pictures of some old coaches, and we will post it on the NDT website.

We need to do this, could we get schools to cooperate.

Herndon – my takeaway is that you should contact development office immediately.

#### Chair Election for the NDT Committee

Brovero (Herndon, Jake) I spoke with Neal about the resolution, and Alex Lennon, wanted to know the rules situation, that is who I ask. Not always agree about stuff.

Jarman (Vega, Vik) – he said he would do it, not have to be an existing coach as the chair, objectivity, led an organization in CEDA for decades, has done RS on why it is good, and he is a Dean as well. Very good at that, did during the Shanahan issue. I like separation from the daily competition of the tournament and information. Objectivity if outside of that role.

Debate potentially considered – I like the AB, knowing the rules and following the rules, litigation is we don’t do that?

Jake – we need an insider who is a good technocrat. I don’t know Jarman’s organization style.

Gerber – he will be running Wichita State?

DCH - We need to be on task, I like Adrian in that regard.

SPL – There are two roles here. AB is an amazing technocrat, follow and manage the roles. Jeff as an outside media crisis person. Had the role of interacting with people no longer doing debate.

KD – Need a single person in charge, Jeff will get the responses.

Dallas – A crisis IV front person is a great idea.

Jake – It is a different position, not the one Vega nominated.

Vik – Dallas perspective of someone tied distinctly. Jarman produced the single most useful program development document ever. We need the broader lens.

DCH – The BOT is potentially reconfigure and enhance the mission statement to get internal external relations and crisis management. Some of those tasks are better suited to the BOT, for the Vega reasons, no stake in comp outcomes vs run the NDT.

Vega – Powerful role

Dallas – Always been a debate coach, lack of objectivity, except in my case.

Vega – Sustainability

AB – Should I leave, I can step out? I will do lots of things in a timely fashion. Not as much crisis communication experience, did not feel that was the primary, would work with others for advice on that situation.

Repko – There is a slow shift in the charter, worry about the NDT itself. What do you say to someone who says Dallas position should only keep an eye.

AB – The charter says encourage IC debate, this weekend, no one left if we don’t do the other parts. Network and PR all matter.

JH – Liaison and reach out to people. Your assessment of being able to speak from different parts of debate and arg structure and alumni status. Something important to lots of people, not really rep BC, how represent the concerns are not as well connected to?

AB – Part of this, I try to pay lots of attention to district reps, but not the full array of what is going on in all the districts. I know intimidate some, and I want this more transparent. When people not know rules and documents, get more comfortable asking question, that is my starting point – cannot OC reputation, be able to engage or feel included.

Vega – I think Jarman has been doing this for 15 years as the CEDA person. Single handedly developed the website, archived the edebate listservs, etc etc. He is a CEDA champion and very dedicated to the NDT. I think this is almost envisioning the job in two ways, did not nominate defensively. Jarman is not a self promoter, be here providing service to the tournament.

Kat – Get lots of stuff done in a tight TF, like the eligibility forms, appoint people to which committees, etc etc

Repko – How important was tournament travel and the vibe from it (not zero)

Vega – only some tournaments, nearly every team at this tournament was present.

Vote by paper ballot. Vote is for Brovero.

#### Closing notes – Dallas

We have some good momentum for considerable progress in the next 6 month

Kat - Thank you to Dallas.