

NDT Committee Minutes

Saturday, February 7, 2009 – Evanston, IL

Start Time: 10:45

Orrington, Cummings 9th floor

District 1: Dave Arnett
District 2: Aaron Hardy
District 3: Eric Morris
District 4: David Cram-Helwich
District 5: Will Repko
District 6: Michael Hester (Holbrook proxy)
District 7: Michael Hall
District 8: Dallas Perkins
District 9: Matthew Stannard (Crowe proxy)
AFA E: Tim O'Donnell
AFA W: Sarah Partlow Lefevre
AFA MW: Ron Stevenson
AFA S: Ed Lee

Meeting begins:

Motion to approve minutes from San Diego.
SPL moves to approve, DA, second. Approved.

TO: Chair's report

- 1) Communication: continue to be conduits to your districts: eligibility through coordinating with Sarah. Fire off those emails, drive people in district crazy.
- 2) Jon Brusckke does a great job on debateresults, will become an increasing tool to communicate about the National Tournament, will give info on how to access once beyond testing phase.
- 3) Eligibility: Anticipate putting all eligibility forms in database soon, put together my list as to who is eligible in the district soon. Date is a hurdle, 8th is a Sunday. Most important thing in my mind, mostly concerned that a student is academically eligible when trying to enter the National Debate Tournament. When the intent to declare the district tournament, must be eligible then. Should revisit language on academic eligibility, probably at NDT committee meeting in Austin. If a team is applying for a First Round, must be eligible by this Thursday, the 12th.
- 4) Debate Summit & Development Conference: Hosted by WFU, Louden is director. Begin with 4 general themes:
 - a. Professional Development
 - b. Innovation
 - c. Community & Building Organizations
 - d. Rationale and agenda for debate in 21st century.Working groups have outlined their tasks—leading up to and carrying through the Wake Forest meeting. Everyone should seriously consider attending and participating, summit won't succeed unless active coaches participate. Take some time and think about what

working group you'd like to participate in. Send an email to debatesummit@gmail.com, contact Loudon, or the chair of the subcommittee, a top priority of Loudon's.

Financing for conference: all of the groups have submitted \$15K to conference, provost's office is seeking to match that amount—good thing—gives Allan some flexibility and ability to publish the proceedings.

ShHa: Maybe doing stuff we were supposed to do on harassment at this meeting, or did we decide not the place for this?

TO: Kind of up in the air...might be relevant to what we do with the code, the governance working group.

Next thing take up as a discussion group: recording of results on bid sheets and the tabulation of points. Have been some concerns and issues that have come up. Questions about Jon Brusckke and Jim Hanson and lay out some relevant questions, where does the committee stand on these issues.

Question 1) If a debate doesn't happen for whatever reason, but a decision is awarded, should there be points?

Question 2) If the winner of a debate is determined by a coin flip, should that be indicated on the bid sheet?

DP: Back to question #1—where?

SPL: Final round of UNLV didn't happen...ISU student got sick, wanted to go home.

TO: Any additional information on the bid sheets? Would you like a little explanation in this instances. What if a director disagrees with the way the website tabulates?

DP: Example? Doesn't director report to Brusckke.

DP: Tournament director disagrees with the website? Example?

TO: Final round of UNLV example: if there is a future subsequent disagreement, how should it be resolved.

DP: With respect to the ranking?

TO: With the way bid sheets and the rankings are posted.

AH: If the tournament allowed a double-win, but Brusckke didn't display final round as a win, what is done?

TO: Yes, Jon & Jim are just looking for guidance on this issue.

WR: Second round process, could you write two sentences explaining?

DP: NO, it's been done, but it shouldn't be done.

WR: Not end of world to write on the bid sheet.

KS: Came from a time when the bid sheets contained lengthy arguments.

WR: Limited to the circumstances of why a debate didn't transpire.

DP: Director can comment on that—can comment separately—tournament director could comment to Brusckke.

WR: Tournament director might not care enough.

DP: If we have comments of that nature, must come from tournament director—No final round—plane had to be caught, forfeit.

WR: Tournament director doesn't care—apathy in process. People who police Brusckke's website for accuracy are people with an interest.

DP: Few days people complain about results—as a director of tournament that happens. Could statement attached be limited to the circumstances. Those circumstances should be limited to the tournament director—nothing in rules that prohibits communicating to the bid voters in another way, but not on the bid application—you could send an email, put up a poster, take out time on the radio. That's the precedent. Comments on what happened at a tournament are a warrant for changing it.

DA: Would like a designation that it didn't happen, not why it didn't happen. Could happen without writing comments.

ShHa: No place right now.

TO: Jon B. would do it, but JF has very serious reservations.

DP: Fact that no debate occurred.

ShHa: Why, what they did. No place for what they did.

ShHa: Board of Trustees Report

- 1) Endorsed the AFA code at San Diego.
- 2) Talked a great deal about the conference at WFU, agreed to provide \$5K, CEDA \$5K, and AFA \$5K
- 3) Endorsed the webpage project of Brusckke that allows the officers to communicate with the members of the committee. Important if you send a check—try to do that in real time. If people pay on the AFA website, and want a real-time confirmation—email that to me real-time adapt—otherwise have to wait Pratt to get it to me—substantial delay if you wait for Pratt to report to Sherry Hall.
- 4) Scott Seagal pledged law firm to provide \$3500 for the NDT this year, breakfast at the hotel on Friday and defray hotel expenses.

Issues related to the Treasurer:

- 1) Bid fees: collected checks here, help out in tracking down members of your district. Process of last year of district chairs of collecting second round bid money and then sending it to S. Hall works. Two ways: 1) Write a check to the NDT, or 2) collect all money and then send Hall a

check. Let S. Hall know on Monday after district tournament who paid you. S. Hall wants to push date on second round application up a bit so people can make hotel reservations and plane tickets. Count as it having been paid even if don't physically have the \$\$.

- 2) Hotel issues: Joel posted last night: total block of rooms at the main hotel is sold out, but they will increase and sell more rooms at \$109—double doubles sold out. Also have a contract with hotel across the parking lot—plenty of double-doubles, direct # of people Shelly Staff. Not a bad place, might be better for internet access, it is close, convenient, will have to move evidence over for Friday, but exactly same rate. Original contract underestimated amount who will stay on Monday, Theresa agreed to increase the block of double-doubles.
- 3) Tournament fees: \$100 per team (same as several years), \$50 per participant, 4 participants per team, minimum # of people per team \$300. Observer fee: \$115 any person over 4 person per team (represents actual costs to provide all the meals). Reception at hotel on Friday night, same thing as past years, light appetizers, cash bar on your own. Jim Hightower will be the speaker. B&Lunch at hotel on Friday—hotel came down on sandwiches at hotel on Friday. B&Lunch on Saturday & Sunday, banquet at hotel. Price is high: going to have to pay \$6500 for the competition rooms. Hotel will make the work space available all night—each school will have an area that is labeled. Announcements will be made and food served. Lunch at hotel between rounds 2 & 3. Socializing and gathering space. Also allow us to stay in the final round, not try to kick us out before the judges had made a decision. Participant mugs price of pewter about to go through the roof, last stock before price is going to jump dramatically. Chance to change—had the mugs as long as in debate. So something to go to, currently paying \$30 a mug—could give a bowl or something.
- 4) Tournament book: still don't have tournament book from last year—do we still want to spend the money from the tournament book—you could pay & print a copy out—save us a couple thousand dollars a year...could give us advice on that.

JF: Tournament Director's Report

Short report on where we are

- 1) Progress on 2009 tournament: important thing for district members—First Round at large bids are due February 12th...announcement is 16th. Submit by 5PM Thursday.
- 2) Dates for Second Rounds...applications due March 5, Voting March 7-8, Director announces March 9.
- 3) Progress on 2009 tournament-tabroom is getting set up, invited Gary Larson back in, hope he will be there, quite a bit of movement during the tournament—on Friday scheduled to be in the hotel, Saturday, three buildings, Sunday two buildings, try to let you know each night what building we will be in. Question we have: thought this for a while now—announcement of the round 2 pairing is the biggest delay in the tournament that is unreasonable, wait for the first round completed, make announcements, good moving again. Somehow release the second round pairings. Pairings be ready for each debate. Northwestern talked about releasing second round pairings, might give advantages to some schools. Fifteen minutes after the debate should have stopped, release the pairings, the time limit is 2:45, start the debate at 3 hours.

ShHa: Most debates will be on two floors. Will make extra elevators available.

DP: Maybe 3:15. At a one judge tournament—3 hours would work...

JF: In the past, read pairings right at 2:45. Half hour prep time, 40 minutes.

JW: Does this require a change of the rules?

JF: Technically, did do it at the Emory NDT.

JW: Change the rules, might affect accommodations.

ShHa: Round 2 issue is always there. Doesn't require waiting for results, an unnecessary break. One round for convenience sake could dispense with reading it out loud.

JF: Does anyone object to breaking the rule—could interpret it loosely—read it in the tabroom.

RoSm: AT your leisure read them.

SH: intention to let people know Thursday night what floors debating on?

JF: Yes, will talk with the hotel. In the past, as long as we have 8 debates in a location, let people know the night before, try to do on Friday and Saturday night as well.

Other issues:

- 1) Judging: 13 rounds per team: eligible judges committed for four debates.
- 2) Will do strike sheet in the last couple of years, with ordinal preferences, will use ordinal preferences with a couple of qualifications: still look at set minimum levels for each panels—each ranked 180 or something, not in debate. Overall total of panel will not decrease, but mutual preference will increase.
- 3) Scheduling of announcement of 1st/2nd Round bids, always dependent on the dates of the NDT. When Northwestern happens always depends on when NDT happens. 1) Could leave as it is, 2) Could leave time in the Second Round bids, submission of second round bids could be Monday—announcement of second round bids on Thursday, people could buy plane tickets, 3) another way of factoring it. Need help from the committee, wouldn't have the weekend to rank the second rounds anymore.

DP: Last year collected ordinal & converted it...

JF: Gonna use ordinal...try to make sure that panels don't go down...in the past Two A's & B...don't want worse individual panels.

RoSm: Use ordinal, make sure no worse than it would have been.

JG: Gary's algorithm to do that?

JF: Yes.

ShHa: Future hosts. UNLV had expressed some interest in 2010, when Berkeley decided to do it, interested in doing it 2011. Not sure where UNLV is. Chris Burk indicated an interest for 2011 or 2012, good cities with good hotels and lots of restaurants. Possible to hold the tournament East of Texas again? Anyone in your district who has expressed an interest or done a good job with it...Dallas has hosting document and what's needed to get going.

TN: Tournament host report:

Joel couldn't make it, need a master list to get internet access. University of Texas is charging a fee for that, put only people coming from your school. Information is posted on line as well.

ShHa: Did Joel say anything about parking?

TN: No, still working on that.

TO: Committee Reports

SPL: District Allocation Committee Report

1) Contact information passing around

2) District bid allocation instructions:

Deadline of intent to attend Feb. 17th ...are responsible for checking.

-Must have paid NDT subscription fees

-Must meet min. # of varsity debates

-At least six rounds, at least six teams, from six different schools

-In the email, team's name, number of rounds debated, names, # of rounds, win percentages

Notify Sarah if not the case.

Always called in any event to verify if it is the case.

Time Zone differential.

Bid allocations recalculated if that is the case.

3) Increase size of bid allocation committee to five, and deal with bid allocation issues

4) Addition: in case of emergency, may be allowed to change their allocation. If you had a huge snowstorm, unable to have a tournament, people who ranked would probably still have to meet 40% for bid allocation.

SPL: Urging to vote on this today.

TO: Any other committee reports.

DA: Sent out Hester's work on the Code of Conduct.

TO: Save that for discussion items.

EM: AFA Code consolidation under Discussion Items.

TO: Old Business—Hybrid Proposals

SPL: Moves to bring before committee

RS: Second.

VK: Discussion. Newest variation of the hybrid proposal. Distinguish the two and why we are in favor of it. Aimed at program development. Recognition of interaction between the drive to be at the NDT, post-merger...a number of districts de facto local tournament...overlaps with regional tournament schedule.

Ethical mandate: Program development is part of the NDT. Purpose is to encourage growth of programs. Fundamental principle of the NDT itself promote growth. CEDA didn't exist when the NDT started. How do all those institutions interact.

NY Coalition is not the example of this. U Mass, making choices about where to go to. 5 colleges up there generated from a student activities budget...not a simple world why don't we get. The NDT matters to certain institutions. Give an incentive to add a line-item to growing budgets.

Biggest issue is abuse, current amendment is over a page long. Way that it works current rules go through the conditions of which the hybrid would be accepted. Only way a hybrid is eligible is through the district tournament.

Have to have 2/3rds of member schools—if your district is an illegitimate hybrid—poor Jim Hanson has gotten more emails.

Existing program, already sending two teams, get one less team. Use favorite example.

Work together throughout the year.

Honestly don't think people would abuse this. Trying to coordinate school schedules, get from one campus to another. Not easy enough to become an incentive.

Possible for abuse, maybe, ethically do what we like it to do in tournament development.

Outside of the district is a district in violation.

Not a panacea, not the answer to program development...clearly there are programs that do it well. Northeast 10 of us have had some version of hybrid. 4 of institutionally bound to each other. Education doesn't operate in a vacuum. Only a select few, everyone should have the option should try.

Discussion wasn't started by me, don't have the NDT meeting minutes from last time, can come at a regular basis. Usually met with some explanation.

RoSm: Way you devised the structure, meets all the objections have ever been raised.

EL: One of the questions that came up, how does attending the NDT facilitates program development...successful programs local, ground up.

VK: Probably differ from a lot of people, what the NDT rules are preventing people from doing...NDT rules prevent local district & debate. Clearly an important value. Has to be representation. Second part, David Birdsell, director in Virginia, NDT who an administrator means something to do. Emerging CUNY program, 1st team CUNY to qualify for the NDT. Opportunity to create a baseline budget...NDT requires 13 rounds, process of rounds, assistant coach at some point. Starting point for discussion. Hey we qualified for the NDT, I qualified for the NDT with someone else. Colombia's big push to come to the NDT qualifier, don't actually exist on their campus. Qualified for the national championship. Local debate is always the answer, district qualifier is local, why the district qualifier.

EL: Impacts local decisions?

VK: Had double-octas in novice at local Binghamton tournament. Lots of novice and JV debaters. For us, sometimes allocation of budgets...hard for us to do that...leaving home other divisions and other teams. Can't coach all the teams that way. U mass and Rutgers, can't meet all the other NDT rules. Community aspect even though you are part of the community throughout the year.

RoSm: Boil it down...more than one way to develop local programs. Intact team that creates an incentive to get it together...link that only works in certain contexts...Doesn't incentivize fully developing programs. Only real objection is the abuse. Leaving people the choices of how to best develop programs in the regional local context.

VK: Great summary. Economy sucks now. New programs where will they get the money. Purely a financial mechanism. Some of us it's an institutional limitation. Ignores potential to never debate at a program
Unethical to say this, pick the college best for them, current economic situation, based on scholarships and economics. Other issues. Make the choices for mental, physical, health. Hybrids offer a better mentoring opportunity. Kids will sometimes be selfish. Why there is a limit on how many times you can qualify for the NDT...have to start developing program in junior and senior year.

MH: Our district is still against the proposal. Primary—still don't get this at a program development tool. Addresses super-team issue, never quite as big. Not seeing the link turn argument. 1) Some administrative support for the team...if NDT doesn't matter...2) If it does matter, funding the NDT on its own. Student ground up sort of thing, may be a disincentive, link turn the other direction, fairly strong possibility good debater at a given school, have to recruit a debater on the school.

VK: Student, charter, a constitutional to the activity, four officers, list of names, go off to the tournament. Recruiting a big pool of novices. Did it work at time...truthfully what I find it happens, can get novices and jv partners paired together, reality is hard choice for students to make, plus still not coaching, judging. Mentoring aspect through hybrids. Better options sometimes.

RS: At some institutions, even at most, it might be stronger chance of getting institutional support by not hybridizing. May not always be the case/very contextualized. Don't have a packet on how to develop a debate program. A number of schools that are doing well/having done it through the NDT. This person with that person. Hell of a lot of effort, put that into that. What will work at my institution. Might be a stepping stone to an institution. Link turn argument strongest over time. Assumes that the administrator supports debate to make that leap.

VK: Demonstrated success is better than theoretical success.

MH: Occurring at student level...apply up to 5 times, you are gone...graduated...make it to the NDT it's twice. You are a student, have a choice here, recruit other kids on campus, help us fund a team. Disincentive to do program.

RoSm: Liberty is not that nice...only seek someone else out...Winston-Salem state can't come to Wake Forest, two schools that are both kind of weak.

MH: People opposed to that...two new programs. Sending two.

VK: d7's objection—write it that way. Reality is that it would work out that way most of the time. Not about merely program development going up but also going down. It's an option for program's going down. Thinking about things going down. Require two new programs to spontaneously converge. Mentoring opportunity. Love the image of the debate. Sometimes people need that incentive to travel the debater. Fairness issue: someone is trying to debate four, five, eight tournaments a year, have to demonstrate success...from an administrator level. Bump up good jv debates—no options to go back. How to get them eligible...Rutgers other new program in New Jersey...how much effort Kurt Shelton...getting team to the U. Mass tournament.

ShHa: Two new programs. U mass isn't a new program/was a strong program when I debated...really hard to come up with an acceptable definition...isn't a one size fits all model.

AH: The rules give the district a veto. Some team would try to game the system.

RG: Not a gaming system argument, might squeeze out schools who are trying to get one team to the NDT because it alters district bid allocation slots.

MH: Not worried about the gaming of the system. Not helps another program. Rule should be written a different way.

VK: Is Swartmore a new program.

MH: Ross' response to an argument no disincentive...forced to get another program. Drexler-Swatmore, Drexel supports a program, Liberty/Lynchburg college, accepting that it's a net program winner, could be a net program disincentive. Net effect of the proposal might encourage decreasing. Way a lot of new programs get developed. Might not matter in most situations.

DP: Started up ground up, d7. In fact, can't name a single program in the district. Uniqueness to the turn is weak. Zero examples of success, no uniqueness to turn.

VK: Didn't have the NDT had CEDA, not to do with district qualifiers. Eliminate one of the regional tournaments. Feasibly easier, regional get to. Mooted out by ADA & NDT.

JW: NDT is expensive.

KS: Would support this.

MH: Our district would.

KS: Would it be possible to support this, neither of the teams could have sent a team under their banner to the NDT.

AH: Decline in funding over several years.

VK: Some teams like this, others do not, it would help some not others. NYU sometimes a team and sometimes doesn't. 11 to 18 team flux would probably level out. Some of those things, Bard and that flux. Some of those are programs. Worst-case scenario. Trying to get debater to do that. One of the reasons predictable numbers. Who would be left out? Best of the best.

DP: Motion & second for adoption rule as written.

AH: Second.

WR: want to discuss more.

All in favor of call to question:

DP

SPL

RoSt

Doesn't pass.

Lots vote against.

TO: Discussion continues for 15 minutes.

WR: Raise some threads that hadn't been discussed. Unique history with hybrids. 1994 we were arguably a one-debater town. One of the most accomplished in old school CEDA. Angered a lot of people, that success was administratively significant, moved us from being a club to a team, support the proposal in principle.

Two NDT's might be a lot to allowed to attend, five districts is a lot as well. Concrete hypothetical helped question two twins tournament. Both would love to debate and love to debate together. That teams meets this criterion, under Harvard & Yale, that team would qualify for the NDT. Two is enough, wouldn't try to indigenously develop at Yale. Some of the checks put on the table, not 100% sure they solve.

When my sister was a really good debater, Dallas would have to think long and hard about whether or not to take them up on the offer. There will be teams that emerge from this. Not that troubled by a super-team, but couldn't survive ad infinitum. Social pressure in place, not ensuing nationals. Hardy is very confident that 2/3rds majority would block this, wouldn't always see that be the case. Biza Repko was a popular debater, and in the interim interest of things. Proposal should be tweaked.

VK: Different thing, partnership.

WR: External events brought about the partnership. Two NDT's is a lot of good cracks at it. Just that part tweaked down to one. Olivia & Nick Rogan went to two, could win it. Are going to have really good debaters going to really good universities.

VK: Recognizing program development. A lot of good hs debaters going to institutions. Need the semester off, part of the growth process. Last incarnation of Bard/Vasser, part of that community. Second year to get some stability. Reason its over 5 districts, debaters don't graduate in four years. Made a commitment to get it working together, creating a premature deadline makes it worse in some ways.

WR: My experiences is different. Talented debater, how many cracks do I have to succeed. Two might not be enough.

VK: Valid concerns. Theoretical and particulars. Very, very particular perspective. More experience on the question. Pitfalls. Two cracks at the NDT itself.

AH: Olivia talked Dallas into going to the NDT and winning it.

WR: Pressure that's placed on Olivia at Yale.

AH: Can determine the way in which Yale developed/not developed. Alternative: most likely alternative is not debating at all. Get debater and gets her an opportunity to debate.

WR: Not a case between 2 versus 1.

JW: It is for program development.

AH: Other advantages not program development.

SH: It can be for both.

AH: Even if what Will describes happens, not an obvious red flag that it shouldn't happen.

WR: Two NDT's at some level not a full career. Not indigenously developed.

AH: Why is that a bad crack.

WR: Mike is expressing an argument that it is a little bit of pressure on the program. We got a taste of being in the final round of CEDA.

AH: Hybrids are hard, wouldn't do it.

WR: Why one?

AH: Can't do it for my senior year. Why determine wouldn't get another shot.

WR: Made an argument in favor of 10 appeals.

AH: Second chance is not such a negative. That is matters that much.

WR: Fairly complete career in college debate/creates reservations in program development.

VK: Single debater at a school: may or may not debate, may start a new program or may not, we have the opportunity in some cases chance—err on the side of getting a chance to work with them. Help out a program. Idea is it gives us a way to tap into those programs. A lot of cases that 1 wouldn't be sufficient, err on the side of inclusion. Does make the second school a member of the NDT. Better to have them in the debate community, then not in the community.

DP: I move recess 45 minutes

WR: Second.

Back from recess.

DP: Another hypothetical example of a potential disad that is fatally non-unique. No debate team at Yale stirring. Exclusion of her of being a hybrid has been empirically unsuccessful. Unsupported at level of uniqueness. Entire history of living memory in D7. Only example of student examples in history are in non-unique. Excluding the students from debating as hybrids haven't gotten start up. Entrenched resistance from Parli teams. Went to Wellsley, favored uni-sex schools. Sent her to Wellsley, spent a year to try to get a team started, and tried to debate for us. Dead end at Yale. It's true, that this might happen once in a while, I feel like that is very isolated, speculative and non-unique.

VK: Way NYU started was parli wouldn't share with us. Way NYU started, two novice teams, able to go to the student activities fund and ask for more money. Why the district qualifier is important to me.

DH: Agree with what Dallas said to exist. Program development ought to be the sole criteria. Princeton University would have gone to Harvard, not illegitimate to recruit students to come to school there, enough diversity of schools, give up the debate program for that, so be it. We need in the proposal is concrete evidence.

DCH: Criteria of the NDT chair. Needs to require evidence of program development. Evidence to the appeals committee. How the incentive structure works...situation that tends to happen one person with a lot of hs experience with a lot of debate experience. Need to recruit novices to recruit. For them to feel the competitive structure, need prospects to be able to debate varsity. NDT is the gold standard to measure success in debates. Sympathetic to Will's concern, but making people want to aspire to do it. Binghamton was started by one person who was self-motivated. If Joe Schatz was not that self-motivated, wouldn't have happened.

VK: Would not be the program it is, happened to come from Lakeland...happened to get two debaters in the same year. An incentive to be on that level competitively. Is a problem when you have to teach your partner and move forward. A lot easier at that institution, would still go to the school. If it's really the best family choice and other arguments.

DH: Where are the examples of this compelled?

VK: CUNY is the example. CUNY had not been debating a few years ago, started to gather together.

DH: Is there something wrong with going to CUNY.

VK: Nothing to go to a place with a Marshall scholarship. Tuition, \$2500/year. Make that choice, shouldn't lack that option. NY Coalition wasn't helping CUNY.

DP: Other kids who go to Iowa.

DH: Don't buy that at all. Other places where people can go and debate. A single student doesn't have to have the option to debate where they are.

EL: Individual student & program building—2 different goals. Way it is framed the district tournament is part of the problem—if they participated at the district tournament, could send the same signal to an administration.

VK: Doesn't allow it via district rules. D6 allows it, can't win that argument.

CB: If you can't win that argument in district, not going to win it 2/3rds here.

VK: No right to tell other districts.

CB: Can go back to the administration—would have been able to go.

VK: Number of teams taking ballots away. Strong personal belief that Army have the Powerpoint message at the NDT. In the world people think people abuse other rules—affects the outcome of the district tournament. Not enough teams to make it work. Not enough teams to make it work for them. Ballot counts. Sat there in a room...couldn't figure out a way to ethically imply to the NDT.

JW: NDT has a certain number of teams. Could exist on a national level.

VK: Competitive impulses become very important. Can't go to the NDT...becomes more amplified.

JW: Don't understand the difference at district level and at the national level...still exist.

SH: 8 districts have the rule...only teams.

Serious workability problem with non-eligible teams competing at the district tournament is what 8 districts believe.

VK: Couldn't come up with a way to phrase it...sign-up list.

DP: Present in the letter say what it was.

DCH: Don't have to specify the criteria of program building.

VK: Specifies for the purpose of program building. Document a budget. Document the lack of it, have to document.

DCH: Travel novices, prove it that way.

VK: Way I interpret that criteria it is there. 2/3rds of the district thought legit hybrid OK.

TO: Friendly amendment. Crucial subsection C. Can't create a loophole.

VK: Accept this as friendly amendment. If not covered.

DP: Word economy not important.

TO: Clarification...is this to be inserted into the standing rules as rule II A 2?

VK: II A 2 makes the most sense.

TO: Text to be inserted of amendment.

RoSt: Friendly amendment subsection D, and just one NDT. Changes the way I would vote on this issue.

VK: Started process...contingency working with. Host tournaments opposite this weekend, hard to be here. Can't think that far, done this without an NDT model. Take more than a year potentially. Other voices could add to that.

RS: Just to move to amend it...it's your motion.

VK: Is there anyone who has a problem one versus two. Willing to accept it.

TO: D of the rule change. "Schools may no longer petition for the waiver after qualifying for the NDT"

JW: A person who has qualified for the NDT through this process, may only qualify once. Rotation. Don't want to say an individual either.

VK: Just thinking through.

KS: "A school may no longer petition for the waiver after qualifying for the NDT through this process."

VK: Accept that wording.

JW: Would eliminate both schools.

DCH: Subsection 2f: [need text of friendly amendment referencing the idea that you have to try program development]

"The hybrid team provides evidence of substantial program development efforts at one or both of the team member's home institutions."

VK: Trying to gather all of the information...partial data when figuring this out. Don't want me emailing you nearly as much as I email Tim.

TO: Others?

EM: Subsection B. Amendment. "Otherwise, a team granted such a waiver is considered eligible to compete in the NDT if they qualify through the District Qualification process and will not count towards the total number of teams in the District for purposes of Bid Allocation."

(not added)

Different set of principles.

SH: Incredibly difficult and restrictive to make.

VK: Not enough hybrids to make that allocation shift.

CB: Happens a lot, one team.

EM: You're not comfortable as a friendly amendment, it is an amendment.

EM: Count as a hybrid, increases their allotment, has the potential.

DP: Point of order, no second on the committee.

EL: Second.

SPL: Count against the school.

AH: Team ends up qualifying through the process...should be counted.

RS: Anything that increases that increases the number of debate programs whether the hybrid or not, it is a zero-sum game. Schools that end up qualifying, depending on which districts do this.

AH: Hybrid has to be good enough to make it.

EM: References the University of Houston Debate Program. This program won't count toward bid allocation—try by fire—don't count for the district process. Actual progress toward program development. Significant funding. Don't count. Different set of rules. Seems to be odd: one purpose of program development model.

EM: Not enough rounds in open. Kind of gotten better over the year. It seems odd that this team doesn't count.

VK: Created the onus on the hybrid tournament to be a real team. Requiring 24 rounds in that sense.

SPL: Wouldn't meet the round qualification.

VK: Expensive b/c Cal Swing and Northwestern.

TO: Vote on the amendment

DP: Motion to vote

RoSt: Second

TO: Clear on what voting for.

TO: No's have it. Discussion continues on original amendment.

TO: Voting on it...Aye's have it.

TO: Have a vote on hybrid proposal:

In favor:

Roll call:

D1: Nay—Arnett

D2: Aye—Hardy

D3: Ermo—Aye

D4: DCH—Aye

D5: WR—Aye

D6: SaHo—No

D7: MH-No

D8: DP-Aye

D9: CC-Nay

AFA West: SPL-Aye

AFA MW: RoSt-Aye

AFA South: EL-Nay

Tournament Director: Abstain

Chair: Abstain

Aye: iiii iii

Nay: iii ii

7-5 two abstentions. Motion needs to pass at a second meeting.

DP: Bring to floor amendment in SPL's document regarding emergency situations.

SPL: District bid allocation committee thing went over. Intent of this.

DP: Second bringing to floor.

SPL: Purpose is to codify what isn't codified now.

DP: Standing rules of the committee.

SPL: Have ability to make emergency decision. Empower someone to make the amendment. Designed to take into account situations where there was an ice storm that shifted to rankings. Would have excluded participation from the district functionally, if hadn't been allowed to proceed with changing the format of the tournament.

TO: Can you be a member of this bid allocation committee and the appeals committee?

DP: Idea is to make it final authority on the questions of counting toward allocation.

DP: Can have some overlap. Wouldn't be an appeal from this.

SPL: Increasing the size of the committee creates accountability, and there may not be people available. Only change in the current rule would be to strike three and add five. Standing rules for the operation of the NDT, add this sentence at the end...may result in "a" lower number of bid allocation eligible teams from that district.

TO: Moved to question, DP moves, Ron seconds. Section C...changes

TO: Passes unanimously

Rules under 2: passes unanimously.

DP: Trying to construct a proposal for verification people who do really well were actually academically eligible. Everybody is a little too much, not sure how much applied to. What is the date: can you withdraw the next day...require the semester, 15th of April, add/drop dead line tuition. Other schools work. What dates would be appropriate. Is it good enough that the student is enrolled on elim day. Unclear to me. Any thoughts?

TO: How long do you expect the chair to keep eligibility records.

DP: Don't we maintain eligibility records forever now.

TO: No. Sensitive info, SSN #, student addresses together, shredded after the NDT, Karla did as well.

DP: What would happen if someone could or didn't. Stripped of awards—trophy back. Publications—public record, not in the semis anymore. How long later to be.

DP: Fairly soon...something bad could happen. Planning to go home to withdraw.

CB: Quarter may end.

DP: New quarter new student wouldn't have to enroll at all.

RoSm: Are you going after Dartmouth, do they have to be enrolled next semester. What if they graduated, March 15th, finished with all the credits they needed to graduate, have to enroll in an extra quarter?

DP: Happens now. Closer together completed all their course work. Spirit of the rule.

JW: Student graduated in winter wouldn't be eligible.

RoSm: Even though eligible for CEDA.

DP: Rule says not eligible. Maybe they could go debate. Could win the NDT, and never know they weren't eligible, I don't think so. Maybe we shouldn't verify that. Change the rule, not act out of ignorance.

TO: Discussion boards with districts.

SPL: Does that go into effect today?

DP: Jan 31st except for emergencies. Director's letter went out in January. Except in an emergency.

JF: Only if it snows.

DP: Think that's the rule. The director's rule must go out by January 15th. In the committee's rules.

RS: Following year's NDT.

TO: Looked at it.

VK: Can't pass things here.

KS: May be at the NCA.

RoSm: Standing rules of the operation of the tournament can be changed.

DP: Where is it at?

DH: Letter dated a certain number of days before the tournament. People withdraw from school for all kinds of reasons.

DP: Did they get a piece of paper?

DH: Bring a letter dated three days before the NDT duly enrolled.

DP: Three days before and after.

DH: Didn't come with the paper in advance, couldn't compete.

DP: Passed this deadline, so administratively difficulty for all these forms...once before they qualify and once before they come. Want them to verify before they qualify. Think about that.

VK: January 15th. Charter Article VI national tournament.

DCH: 10 days to get forms. 10 days to get one prior to. Bureaucratic hurdle.

CB: Our offices can't be open over Spring Break.

WR: After the fact not that cumbersome. Share some of the reservation. Not duly enrolled.

DH: Verifying what you were supposed to prove beforehand. Post facto someone enrolled for the rest of the semester.

WR: The day they debated their last debate. Don't care if paperwork takes place after the NDT, or that it is limited. All of the years of CEDA/NDT, after the fact not workable.

DH: Had to show in advance.

JW: Verification procedure

DH: Verifying what other people did beforehand.

SPL: The team that loses to the team to be ineligible?

WR: Rule in advance. Does that disagree with my motion.

SPL: Have to have it at arrival. Stripping it after the fact.

WR: With lots of people knowing, that it would create a massive deterrent value. That said, students hide behind an awful lot of shame, hope it would never come up. Huge burden to establish a 2nd time before the NDT. Became known that DP would come take your final round away, that'd be enough. Feb. 12th stamp works, gets involved in the students grades early. Cumbersome.

SH: Spring break/CEDA.

TO: Tough on directors.

CB: May be not possible. Campus not open, leave for CEDA, can't do it.

SPL: In advance put an exemption in there March 26th, or an institution closed for spring break.

DCH: NCAA enforcement can be post hoc.

TO: AFA Code, and Code of Conduct, Ranking director and Brusckhe

EM: Get feedback on 9 issues.

TO: Do district chairs have enough time to talk to district between 3/10 and 3/26.

DP: Can this get done before districts.

SH: How quickly we get back with feedback.

RS: People are likely to talk at the districts...email discussions are hit or miss.

SH: Language before districts to present at district tournaments.

TO: District chairs...yes

DP: If we don't talk about it at districts, we probably won't.

SH: Feedback now, language to discuss at districts. Get it at the NDT.

EM: 9 issues:

- 1) Section on distortion of evidence. Gender-modifying would be in violation of the current code, and electronic research, nature & type, URL, original page numbers, a lot more detailed than most evidence.
- 2) Sections on competitors doing own research. Enforcement section: conceive of AFA code, could be sanctioned if you have a hired gun, another section our committee reads as B team can't cut cards for the A team. Not the way practices work.
- 3) Equal affirmative & negative rounds: that's unethical for NU, and other tournaments.
- 4) Judge conflicts: Only spoke to college and not high school. Some clarification there. Ambiguous what constitutes conflict.
- 5) Judging someone more than once. Our district allows 4 times in a round.

SH: Probably written for IE's, not debate. Our read: unethical to judge in prelims & elims...

- 6) A lot of rules about tournament administration that limit experiments.
- 7) Full out written ballots, whole separate sections of ballots. Distinction between IE's & debate here.
- 8) For-profit tourneys are unethical (unclear if hs or college).
- 9) Section on electronic recording. Pretty much allows all recording, some tournaments that have put a limit on this are running afoul of the rules.

Ethics & practice are definitely correlated. Separate set of proposals—maybe go to the AFA.

TO: One intervening factor: when many people are all in the same room at Wake Forest. Making recommendations for the AFA. We don't have another formal opportunity. Thanks to the committee working on the AFA code.

DA: Code of Conduct working group. Proposal a couple of days ago. What he did was to modify the CEDA Code of Conduct—the change was to eliminate reference to laws: local, state, federal. Concern was that including reference to those laws were turn people into police—given that those laws already apply, not necessary to include in the code. Bolded version of the changes to clarify. Primary change is to expand the adjudication body: on issues of this significance, shouldn't be three individuals or one individual. Have each district appoint a responsible member. AFA language that could also be a perfectly acceptable replacement. Either the CEDA or AFA code modifications.

TO: Recommendation of your committee...adopt CEDA code of conduct recommendation with the exception of local, state, federal laws.

DA: Those laws already exist. Two proposals: chair also suggested that the AFA could be used as well.

DP: Certain advantage of using law—no one can say it's arbitrary.

TO: CEDA Code of Conduct as passed will change. CEDA actually has proofreaders.

Take this language to your districts.

SH: Anybody that wanted to have any of the input into the controversy areas? Cutting evidence and feedback on that now: wait for emails.

DP: Participation in a cooperative research effort is an important skill we are trying to teach, and the students have to participate in the process, but as long as they participate that it's OK. Other students OK.

SH: Shared backfile project would also be awful. A lot of small programs, high school handbooks, planet debate, etc. to stay competitive, and that this is unethical. How serious do we think. Every program/almost every program has people who cut cards who aren't students.

AH: Every single fall in the Northwest, there is a new school in the Northwest, send them a packet of evidence, give them some files. Not participating in a research project. Not a cooperative research effort—wanted to try it out.

SH: General feeling of just striking that whole part.

WR: Strike whole part out: Aye.

AH: Students can work this out on their own.

JF: Who will be taking this to the AFA. They will squawk about it. They have coaches writing poems and short stories under pseudonyms.

VK: Keep the written ballot rule.

SH: Expected that the judge provide a full reason for decision.

VK: Coach novice team, can't get feedback on the round. Used this to threaten people in this.

SH: Very draconian things if you don't write your ballots.

MH: Draft explicitly limits itself to the NDT and the NIET...are we going to write the rest of the code limited in the same way?

SH: Not trying to write the new part...trying to fix it and make it relevant.

TO: The only officially sanctioned tournaments are the national tournament and the district qualifier.

MH: Code of conduct...language implies that it's attempting to apply itself beyond the ndt.

SH: Some discussion that if your tournament wasn't in compliance, the bid process is an NDT process. NDT stamp of approval.

TO: Check the box that says AFA sanctioned.

DP: Even # of rounds at the tournament.

JF: Code of Ethics, and directors are members of the AFA, professional code for membership of the organization. There are certainly people that thing as an ethical code it should apply beyond.

MH: Incoherent to say that a professional standard only applies at the NDT, and not other tournaments.

TO: Anything else for the two working groups. Thankless task.

TO: Return to any question: bid sheets and tabulation of points.

- 1) If a debate doesn't happen, should you receive points for the national tournament.

MH: Punishes the team. Team that was there to debate.

TO: Conceded debate.

AH: Chooses not to hold a final, and neither teams. Different than a concession.

TO: When does that concession come.

AH: Concession and winning same thing, but if a debate didn't happen and no concession.

SPL: Asked for postpone the debate. Debaters begged. Miss the flight. If they're in semis we'll concede.

TO: Two months later concedes.

JW: Before tabulation.

CB: Fires that stop the tournament. Concession lots of different ways. 1-1 coinflip debate.

WR: Whether or not Brusckke or tournament director. Concession you get points, did not happen no points.

RS: Get points for the round you would lose in. Fire wipes out in the tournament, you at least get the doubles.

WR: Agree with Ross, not less points than the worst possible you could have done.

TO: Coin flip caused

SaHo: 1-1—asterick on the bid sheet question.

RS: Separate communication. Note that in this round. 1-1 peanut allergy attack.

TO: Directors of programs can send anything they want in any form.

RS: Send me something whining or not.

TO: Letters are prohibited as part of the bid application.

SaHo: Given the original intent.

WR: Looked it up/bye/closeout. Brusckke built in—special circumstance. Mechanism built in there. Distinct from West GA lost debate because of the close-out. Director of tournament is safest place. Slippery slope of sollilloquy's of first round bid bad.

AH: Tournament director had to make the call as to what to do. He made the call about the coin flip or what not.

WR: UNLV final round. Special circumstance, and it makes or breaks someone's ranking.

CB: Tournament messes up its results.

RS: Not in standing rules of what you submit. Tournament director might have sent this at some point.

TO: Jim & Jon, intent of the committee, reflected in minutes.

SaHo: Special circumstance.

SH: Special circumstance is sense of committee.

JF: Rules written in a time where the burden is on the director to put it together. Now the typos are falling on Brusckke, do we need to go back to the rules. What is the responsibility of the director who is applying. Accuracy...rules are out of date.

SH: We tell kids to check, email Brusckke, who is ultimately responsible.

JF: Think the rules for the application don't match what we do.

DP: Nothing about verifying the accuracy.

JF: Accompanying letter.

TO: Standing rules of the National Debate Tournament...must submit, without covering letters or other supplementary materials.

WR: What the spirit should be.

JF: I would recommend taking a look at the rule again...providing copies...not true in an email age, rather than just punching the button on the Brusckke site. One of the rules as technology changes, take a look at.

WR: Large standard on the director—final say should rest on the tournament director as to who won or lost and shouldn't rest with Brusckke or an individual school director—avoids overburdening Brusckke and partisanship.

SH: School that hosts the tournament decides.

WR: Yes, objective bright line. Not too many disputes with Brusckke. In the rare disputes, if they were a big deal, the community would convey what happened.

TO: Anything else for the committee.

SH: If you want to pay subscription fees for the next year when you pay the NDT fees. Invoices made up...let know that at that time. Will accept the money.

TO: Other announcements. Black & gold flyers. Spread the word, sign up for working groups.

KS: Who is in charge of scouting?

TO: Becky Opsata is in charge, and Ed Lee on the committee in charge of getting it done.

TO: Anything else. Appeals committee very briefly.

AH: Motion to adjourn

TO: Second.

Motion passes.

