

National Debate Tournament Committee Meeting  
New Orleans, LA  
November 6, 2011

**Attending:** 4, 5, AFA south not here. Jarrod = d6 proxy, Davis = d7 proxy

**NDT Host Report - M Wade** – Emory will be hosting the 2012 NDT, it will be at the Guinnette Convention Center. She reports that it will be awesome.

S Hall - Notes that we will be able to go to the NDT without needing a car. We can shuttle from the airport to the hotel and there are plenty of food options near the hotel. So, even if the fees for the BDT are a bit higher than normal, this helps teams save money.

S Hall - She also notes that she has seen the hotel with Fritch and both think it will be a good “hotel NDT.” There are large suites and plenty of conference rooms. Rooms are bigger than at the GSU Marriott. Hotel has not had debate experience but they have rented the entire hotel out to college students and are used to demand for higher numbers of T-lines than previous hotels. Sherry feels good about the stability of connectivity. No charge for parking. Internet free. There are other local hotel options.

M Wade – Melissa notes that reservations will be available asap. She also reports that Emory is still working to raise money from alums.

E Morris – Net in competition rooms? S Hall – Yes...also says can work outside rooms and get net.

S Hall – Downside is that you need room key to access the elevators. Tournament will have an Emory person to run for those without a key...Tournament will be concentrated on 2 floors...

M Wade – look forward to having you

**Treasurer’s Report – S Hall report**

Board heard from Weber on 2013 NDT...will wait to comment until Omar’s report but is encouraged

Handed out budget document – made \$6910 at the 2011 NDT but the Director’s receipts are still to be calculated...Expects about 5000 to come under receipts

A few other expenses – paid \$10,000 to UTD to help defray costs – goal as treasurer is to prevent hosts from paying more than anticipated – bulk of 10k is meals, already agreed to do, observers not figured into host calculations so we pay

Difference from past practices – host money used to not be part of document but was inaccurate representation of costs for the NDT...started adding and show all input/output of monies – UTD put up 20,000 and they spent 20,000 (after the 10k reimbursed – note: response to question from Dallas)

Asks if questions about budget – no

11-12 proposed budget – Emory fundraising is still up in the air due to institutional regulations, at 12,000 hope to get to 17,000 from the institution...Shooting for 5000 from alums...District VI will have a contribution but is in the early stages –rough guess of 5000 – budget numbers are conservative and hope better numbers will bring numbers down – \$50 Participant fee (4 per team: 2 debaters and 2 judges), Observer fee is true cost \$135/per....this is a doubling of participant fee over last year if numbers hold, hope to improve

Another issue for Board – Dispense with hard copy of book and just go to pdf? Spend lots on paper copies and not sure if it makes sense – could save 1000 and redirect to get a better website for the NDT – some say that the current website lacks functionality, attractiveness, etc....Louden is going to explore interest from people to do this.

Awards...Said in past there is a goal to try and name an award after Deatherage for outstanding debater - this has fallen dead in water due to Baylor/Northwestern – Board still feels need, George Ziegelmueller Award is limited to communication professionals and academics so there may be a need to add another award – Board would like to redirect effort to name a new coaching award after Deatherage – distinct from Smith/Ziegelmueller awards - Weise is going to work on creating distinctions and raise money – if can do before the NDT there would be a call to award at the 2012 NDT, but if not, announce the development of the award at the NDT if close to ready and then start to award it in 2013

**2013 NDT Bid Report from Weber State – O Guevara** – Had John Fritch and Sherry Hall visit for on-site inspect, ready with budget proposal – we are excited (we = entire school, University President, Provost, etc) – Totally aware that the cost of flying to Utah is high and are working to reduce costs – Hotel will be \$79/night, no parking/internet fees, no hidden fees, rail is coming which eliminates the need for car – Will be able to meet \$20,000 and drive towards \$30,000 in fundraising, want to eliminate participant fees as per the 2008 Fullerton NDT – 18 months to drive to 30k but will set figure to close to zero as possible – Utah economy is strong, campus renovated over last 5 years, will be in 2 state of the art buildings – Rooms high tech, big, etc – Big ball room – Provide lunch/break/snack everyday

S Hall – Notes that if 20% ride light rail then the tournament will run a bus to eliminate total need for car rentals

S Hall – Clarifies that there still will be team and observer fees but no Participant fee

Omar – Notes Ogden has been revitalized

S Hall – Will be date compliant (last March/1<sup>st</sup> April weekend - approximately m28-ap2)

S Hall – Notes CEDA is working to get CEDA Nats somewhat close – Arizona State?

O Guevara – Due to the Easter overlap, working to offer a non-denominational service on Saturday – maybe have Lundberg offer a service on Sunday if he is willing

S Hall - notes that Easter weekend helped get rate reductions for hotel - total savings of \$16000 for entire tournament for housing – was too hard to find alternate dates that were date compliant and also didn't create problems for Weber – Sherry says that this weekend is based on her input – she supports bid, says strong bid, and urges committee to approve bid

S Partlow-Lefèvre – says they did a good with hosting the topic meetings

D Perkins moves to approve, SPL seconds - Unanimous approval

T O'Donnell – If the tournament meets half of the enthusiasm then it will be great

**Director's Report – J Fritch** - Visited both tournament sites (2012 & 2013)– Notes that the Weber war room was set up for visit and the staff was outstanding – Emory, the only issue is the elevator situation but it has been addressed

2011 NDT went well – CAT was shadow tab, plan for 2012 is to use CAT and shadow with Rich Edward's program to allow move – issue last year was the ability to move back and forth – question is whether Brushke will be in tab if he has teams competing

D Perkins -Asks about points – Fritch notes will try to use tents

G Stables - Brusckke position should not be an issue

J Fritch – We want the people responsible for the software there to make sure all is good even if it means a slight bump to fees

J Fritch - Other changes due to tab switch – community and programs are ready for tents – other issue is the use of online ballots – sense is that there will be some form of online balloting but there will be back up with paper document – 1 document for the panel to complete for double-check purposes

D Perkins – key issue is that the low point win is not marked and then have to seek out

D Perkins - other issue is a difference between what is announced and entered – question is how to decide which outcome counts

J Fritch – says this is why we need paper – panel document will be filled out 1<sup>st</sup> - it counts over electronic

T O'Donnell - asks if can have 3 electronic ballots that kick back to the chair

J Fritch – issue is how to deal with a judge listening to the other judges and then changing their result

S Bauschard – Doesn't the universal ballot have the same effect of last minute changes

T O'Donnell – Asks why do people want online

S Hall – faster and if we don't mess it up then it is more accurate

S Bauschard – tenths increase error risks when translating from paper to software

J Fritch - notes online can reduce the tab staff size

D Perkins – other concern – Gary will agree that this works except when the CSU-F server goes down and it is 76% reliable – paralysis has occurred – people working to fix the situation but in the short-term we have the Fullerton server – talk to Gary ‘cause he says this occur lots – need to be ready to hand out ballots and compensate

J Fritch – notes the time saved is only the time it takes to hand deliver the final outstanding panel

T O’Donnell – thinking of doing but not set?

J Fritch – Yes, inclined but need to double-check – decide if release ballots

J Fritch – Won’t release speakers – Dallas notes that it is good to leave mystery about the top speaker

T O’Donnell - asks if the system can email students results – Sherry/Dallas says Brushke cant do – people will check debateresults a lot to see ballot counts

J Fritch – judges will need to live with errors

S Hall – notes you need to enter info 2x so that helps create double-check

E Morris – notes that most tenths tournaments also do not allow ties

J Fritch – asks if the community backs – Sherry says all do

E Morris moves and Omar seconds - the sense of the community is that the tournament should use tenths without ties - Unanimous consent

S Bauschard – notes that it can be useful to include ranks on the paper ballot just to resolve writing issues regarding ties – we don’t need to record ranks but it helps solve interpretation issues

J Fritch – how we pair rounds 1 and 2 – In the past it went the top 16 and then the district winners...Fritch makes a personal judgment about team quality for overall ranks but doesn’t re-rank within district

J Fritch – notes that this can create a slightly lower rank if the district outcome was a bit upside down

**Topic committee Report – G Stables** – Notes that the committee wants to reinstate the cycling of topic areas (international, domestic, legal) – this will be discussed this summer

**Website Update – S Bauschard** – notes he will talk to Sherry

## New Business

### Weather proposal – E Morris - 2 proposals

E Morris - 2<sup>nd</sup> proposal - eliminates the incentivizing of tournaments over ranking – solves weather and gives flexibility – our district generally supported – doesn't mean we want to kill tournament – but the tournament has been a financial concern – thinks the rankings would be same teams trying to qualify (in terms of bid allocation) – notes concern hesitation is that we will discuss without a vote on this – would like to see a resolution to situation where a tournament is penalized for doing the right thing relative to weather

S Hall – what if a particular school can't make it – not just if a school can host but issue if specific schools can't come

D Perkins – proposal doesn't help if this is the case

E Morris – does the other amend solve this? – Sherry says no, they didn't cancel the tournament

E Morris – ideal solution?

D Perkins – cant fix all, your proposal fixes the disincentive to rank and gives flexibility if there is no tournament

S Partlow-Lefèvre – Says there may be an incentive to cancel the tournament if 1 team can't make it

D Perkins – Says this is not necessarily true – people will weigh specifics about the team in question

J Atchison – Notes that in District VI the conversation is that if a win percentage of 40% is required to attend, why eliminate?

S Partlow-Lefèvre – some people don't achieve 40% but then want to try and qualify

J Atchison – What would stop a team from pushing the lesser team to the district for ranking and then put better team in as 3<sup>rd</sup> team

E Morris – intent of amend is to give district flex

D Perkins – says rankers could manipulate

J Atchison – pro-amend 1 not 2

S Hall – Poses the idea of having an additional district to rank in the event of the weather issue?

E Morris – asks if people like to have an incentivized tournament?

E Morris – withdraws #2 – down to good-faith effort proposal

S Hall – notes that she is not not sure if there no support for #2

#### Discussion of Proposal #1

T O'Donnell – what is a “good faith effort” (GFE) and who decides?

E Morris – GFE requires documentation of an attempt to attend, 2<sup>nd</sup> part is evidence of weather – If dispute then could go to appeals committee – Assumes documentation of a weather advisory is sufficient evidence that weather inhibited travel

T O'Donnell - who provide evidence to?

E Morris – presumption should be that GFE exists – A challenge means that you then give the evidence

S Hall - notes last year shows that it is easy to ID weather concerns given total university closures

S Hall - asks if Appeals is the right body to address

E Morris - Bid Committee is not the group to decide – just counts numbers

S Partlow-Lefèvre – would be fine in face of evidence to give the bids

E Morris – presumption of legitimacy is important to make sure we address weather concerns appropriately

O Guevara – says maybe not bad to keep the appeals committee in the loop

E Morris agrees but notes Appeals doesn't decide in hours

J Fritch – notes there may be need to share info to make sure people know for 2<sup>nd</sup> round voting

E Morris - seeks clarification from Partlow-Lefèvre that Bid Allocation wants jurisdiction – notify the committee, presume decision good, then if challenge move forward with evidence

S Hall – chair could post results

T O'Donnell - asks if there should be a date to challenge the result by

E MORRIS – if put an end date on then need to put a requirement on that forces initial notification

S Hall – objection needs to occur before final bids announced (posted to CEDA Forums)

E Morris – thinks could go til 2<sup>nd</sup> round process starts

D Perkins – no, they will have already missed ability

D Perkins – says don't make it appealable – bid allocation committee can do – challenge not likely

E Morris – says Bid Allocation makes the decision, but must be public

S Hall – notes if Bid Allocation goes the other way then people will want to appeal

T O'Donnell – do we need a replacement member for the committee if a member has direct involvement in the challenge?

S Partlow-Lefèvre – says bring in someone else

D Perkins – NDT chair will appoint – historically justified

T O'Donnell agrees – says include in language for future guidance

EM language- (get language from Tim)

G Stables – include that GFE includes evidence of planning, economic commitment

S Partlow-Lefèvre – make sure there is an evidence requirement

E Morris moves, O G seconds – T O'Donnell calls for discussion

D Perkins – will encourage people cancel in lieu of exclude the school

D Perkins calls the question, Morris seconds – unanimous, District VII abstains 8-0-4 (3 not here and D7).

### **Other New Business – Paperless Issues**

S Hall - St. Marx had a handout to provide guidance on how to assess paperless prep time – HS seems to be discussing – we have moved (90%) but haven't discuss ethics, prep, etc – think there will come a moment of crisis and there won't be norms – not sure if NDT committee is the right body to decide but we are a body and need to discuss with CEDA/ADA – lots of issues, question of acceptability of using jumped evidence

Areas: prep use (how interact with running clock), response of judge/opponents with regards to evidence, cheating – dropbox in middle of debate (and intentionality as sub-issue)

G Stables - thinks CAD should have a forum on this – will help influence practices

O Guevara – sees a pattern with jump abuse – then get to panel and argue over how to address different interps

J Katsulas – if wrong flash, what to do

S Partlow-Lefèvre – people can't open files, what to do

D Perkins – standing practice was to get evidence as read - get after = new rule and dynamic

S Hall – some judges are asking for the speeches as we go – is this a good idea?

D Perkins – Hardy has a new tech that allows macro to private website where all inside a debate will have – this will reduce crash but means all will have the evidence

T O'Donnell – asks what we think the rules-based questions are besides issues of ethics

S Hall – time issues, who/where prep

D Perkins – no outside assistance, evidence – coaching

J Lyle – seeks clarification that Dallas just means coach-based assistance, not research done by the debaters competing in the round? DP – yes

S Hall – also should be a rule addressing others on team if there is dropbox sharing

G Stables – not sure how well we can enforce and lots evolving quickly

D Perkins – not sure the lost evidence practices have changed

G Stables & S Hall – need to speak with CTD

T O'Donnell – interest in working on this? Ermo/Jarrold/Dallas/Gordon says yes...Gordon says bring A Hardy into fold – T O'Donnell will assemble working group

D Perkins – notes no elim decision-time for NDT, eliminate the time limit will impact how people act

S Hall – think it is important to consult with debaters – especially younger debaters as they know more about these issues

M Hall – unsure how time influences specific debate practices in real world – in the real world debaters are always acting to enhance their time

S Hall – saw debaters smoke less, and judges felt compelled to be there

M Hall- yes but no sure how this impacts paperless

**Other - New**



J Fritch – gives his interpretation of the rule about alternate use time – speaking after speech time ends counts as prep time but not additional speech time – outcome of Trinity effort to use time

T O'Donnell – pay AFA dues, Board is seeking additional AFA money but we need to make sure all have paid dues 1<sup>st</sup> – go to AFA meeting at 4pm then reception

Adjourn – G Stables moves, E Morris seconds – unanimous agreement

Submitted: J. Lyle, secretary