

NDT Committee Meeting @ Wake

Minutes were accepted.

Bill talks about NDT in Emory '12
Board unanimously approved the bid

Sherry:

Feels positive about the venue, hotel wants our business. Substantial accommodation of our needs. Convinced group to move the weekend. Negotiated and came down to \$3K. Hotel is incredibly willing to negotiate with us. Same woman has been there 20 years. Will be there through the NDT. Knew where it was hosted in the past, no one has done that in the past. Very, very easy to work with, and has been accommodating to us. Board recommends this bid and wishes it would be approved.

Ermo: Hotel for all days? Is internet going to reach into meeting areas.

Sherry: Yes, won't have to pay \$5K to make sure internet. Agreed to put internet into conference rooms, they do frequently host college students. Give 400 college students who study for the MCAT. Have sufficient internet for that group. Twice capacity of the internet system @ the Dallas hotel.

Will be internet @ all the competition spaces and the grand ballroom.

Emory bid accepted unanimously.

Tim O'Donnell:

Normal reporting system:

Chair's report: Post-tournament eligibility. On or about May 1st, all schools met the requirements of post-tournament eligibility. Two schools that were a bit slow, worked with them.

Rule requires that I report outwardly: committee clarify what promptly means, and means of communication.

Scott Seagal: chair of the BOT

NDT document, what are the types of things we ought to have in bids. Made some recommended changes in the document. Just emailed it to everybody. More sensible about what current needs are.

Clear out what was done at the board meeting.

Alterations to awards:

Ziegemueller award: Steps to place the Zig award in a sounder fiscal position. Interest on the principal hasn't been enough to fund it. Mechanism to seek to put in place. Essentially, we have a recommended target for what the level ought to be. Match what Wayne alumni ought to be.

Deathage award: Purpose of the award is to recognize a debater for outstanding achievement. Other than that to note, alumni of NU and Baylor wish to work together to raise the funds for the award. Heisman trophy of debate. Substantial discussion with both groups. At this year's NDT, we will announce the award. Nominations open from the debate community at large. Students will choose, then the BOT will choose. Criteria:

4 pillars: Character, teamwork, hard work, commitment.

Strong sentiment: actually a physical award, actually something we would have some pride in displaying, very nice. If fundraising targets, also a modest cash award. Nice and fitting honor to Scott.

Crisis response: Community beset by occasional crises. Coordinated, not top down, but coordinated approach, undertake a substantial interest in defending the franchise. Just being coordinated in case of crisis. Debate community may be related to how it monitors itself, but that may be too bold.

Healthy debater's initiative. On agenda here. Sherry will report.

Best practices for fundraising for programs: Much like the healthy debate initiative. Peer context to help program administrators. Healthy debate initiatives, posting what their best practices might be.

Congressional Debate Caucus: Go into discussion after the midterms—will come back afterwards.

Bill will authorize one or more centers of debate education. Was adopted into the law about 10 years ago. Had discussions with Senator Lemieux, and the help committee, on the Senate side. May be introduced slowly. When it is introduced, it will be introduced. Will have cool findings about how awesome debate is.

Wonderful speaker for the NDT: Proviso of 15 minutes. One request into one political leader. Request to Senator John Cornyn. See what he says.

Questions:

DP: Criteria/committee for Deatherage award?

Sherry: Still talk to reps at NU as to how to implement this award.

DP: Board institutionally isolated from the decision.

Sherry: Plan to have a nomination form for the CEDA Forums cite. Nomination form would include a paragraph for why nominating the person. A month before NDT due, so people on the Board had the ability to investigate and/or research these people. If groups from the institutions like to be involved, the BOT doesn't want to take away.

DP: Broader approach?

SH: Didn't want it to be a popular vote/not a popularity contest, not something people lobbied for. Doesn't work very well in ADA, popularity contest, don't want that. Not wedded.

SSegal: Minimize electioneering. Not the number of nominations.

DP: Some level of student involvement...

SH: Nomination is open to everybody.

SS: A bifurcated process of selection. The other thing we reacted to, is that what the Baylor contingent said.

SH: Board wants to leave the decision to decide up to the NU/Baylor folks.

Congressional Debate Caucus Questions:

DCH: Keith Ellison—daughter debating for MN.

SS: Any ideas of connections to Congress would help.

JA: Cornyn is a Trinity alum as well.

Budget (SH):

Main thing differently on the budget, looks like this year's tournament is way more expensive. Budget for the tournament should include what the host puts in. Added a line in revenue of UTD contribution. Added a line of expenses for 20 dollars.

Second page is how UTD will spend this.

Since Chris and I got the numbers of budget—can use outside caterers. Do anticipate the price of campus meals will come down. Proposed budget.

Proposed team fee: \$25 participant. \$135 observer fee—actual costs of the food at time. Observer fee will come down—better deal on the fee. Leave participant fee @ \$25. Reasonable rate almost ½ what it was last year. More revenue for the debaters.

Provide limited breakfast at the hotel—that kind of thing not included in the budget now, but not dropping the participant fee below \$25. Final fee proposals at the Feb. meeting, observer fee probably lower.

Banquet right now is \$67 a person/includes a 22% service charge. I'm going to see if I can get them to come down a little. Get them to come down \$10 on the price of the banquet.

Chris Burk on UTD NDT:

2011 host:

Sherry has covered a lot of it. Document is there for review. Sherry huge help in guiding process. Westin, use previous numbers against them.

Thursday, pics, etc at the hotel. Were able to get promises for the rooms @ the campus.

Guest speaker is Lindsay Harrison, has immigration experience. One case to the US Supreme Court, one to the Jamacian Supreme Court. Dallas native.

Campus construction is complete. Have maps. Sherry visited the campus and walked through it. Not much walking. University willing to host the event.

Already have 29 rooms under reservation. Provost gets their way—time out of schedule for us. Commitment to run smoothly. Executive MBA program.

School of management building: all of varsity rounds on Sunday—varsity division of regular tournament.

Gym is biggest area on campus, not just a gym.

Internet service, UTD tech savvy place. A lot of contributors are Texas Instruments.

Log on, no problem with a slow connection.

Will be kind of spread out—a bit like the Gonzaga NDT, consolidate more and more as the weekend.
How and when people can make hotel reservations.
Westin been there many many times.

SH: Buildings at Westin are very new, plugs at every table, nice outside space in the renovated areas, internet works outside and inside, really enjoy this location.

Tournament Director's Report:

Wants to move up and make the application process a little earlier, so he can work harder on judge commitments.

DP: Still shadow CAT?

TO: Believe that is the plan.

Sherry Hosts Report: hosts—next two years are set—2013 Weber State like to put a bid in. Marriott hotel \$79 preliminary rate. Trying to make tournament free from food part.

Substantive Item of Business:

Ready to vote on this today: hosting document

Committee document Board has taken it and worked very hard to make some changes, finished changes in meeting this morning. Is a committee document. Sherry sent it out at the beginning. Discuss the changes. Have this document as up to date as possible. Agreement on places where there are questions?

Document is not moveable. Lexis/Nexis hardwire connection.

TO: Take 5 minutes to review it now. Send the committee back to this. Vote email.

DP: February vote good enough.

SH: Omar wants something. Not a lot of controversial.

SS: Authorize the BOT to clean it up. Nothing controversial.

SH: Couple of questions like feedback: 2012 contract. Language right now date compliant last weekend in March first weekend in April. 2012 NDT overlaps last weekend in March or weekend in April. Language not specific enough. First weekend and last weekend seem to be the same. Need feedback on this.

DP: Changing the hosting document. Standing rules need to be clarified, hosting document insufficient.

Standing rule says this and try to abide by it.

SH: A few places the host is supposed to provide four people, unpack the trophy. No one does that anymore. Highlighted in blue. Reworded as goals, not requirement. Host having people collect ballots. I don't have 50 people for all the people calling for.

SS: Document to be a bit more user-friendly, make appropriate and reasonable decisions. Tick-list of what they decide, what can be appropriate and reasonable.

SH: Entry fees, A through I. Since this document was written, divided the costs, don't know if we need to change this to reflect this. Additional expenses must be approved. Work on a more updated process of entry fees. Host collected the entry fees. Decreases the financial obligation.

Kelly Young: A lot of things, under advisement of the Board. If spread out, find the personnel.

SH: In reality, we do a lot of these things.

Any new business before litany of discussion items:

SH: Healthy Debate Initiative

CEDA Forums. Have a website up. Did it quickly.

Welcome statement.

Pleasantly surprised, 4 threads going.

Multiple replies on each one. Working pretty well.

A lot of good ideas generated. WFU has implemented a lot of suggestions. Healthier breakfasts.

Read through the threads: getting a lot of replies.

One issue of committee.

Non-controversial items, reduce smoking, exercise at tournaments, eating healthier.

Start a thread about drinking at tournaments, binge drinking, reluctant to start the thread. Concerned open forum. See that and freak out. Mecca of debauchery.

I have replied to people that we should have the open discussion. Careful about how to write things. Not to mention names.

College administrators not surprised that drinking is a problem. Not for everyone on the community.

DP: Couldn't quit smoking till quit debate, couldn't lose weight till quit debate.

SS: Is this web presence moderated?

GS: CEDA organization retains ability to moderate it. And you have to have an account to post.

SS: Signal concern is if people identified by name. Every person administrator. Not as concerned about abstract discussion.

Motivation is to take responsible action. By name creates liability.

GS: Start it with some of this. Pull a comment down and backchannel an individual. Way to encourage the post to continue.

Openness without some of the concerns.

SS: Exercise in responsibility. Problem is not unique to the community, but turn intellectual powers to solve. Framing message to see before the thread.

GS: Sub-thread, sensitive matter, responsible educators can discuss it.

SH: Very threads on questions.

SS: Respected medical professional.

5th year discussion: Will Repko

Begin to think about the fifth year rule

Not looking to ban five years

Completion on the campus is important to people on campus

Looking to keep ahead of academic trends

Keep this committee ahead of academic trends

OECD Report

For the first time in US history the current generation are going to be less well-educated than parents' generation. Becoming an issue on a lot of college campuses.

Where do states from your district rank?

Where do the public schools stand. Michigan is ahead of Luxembourg

Want to have a feel for where the public schools are.

2010-2011 very interesting year.

NGA uses 50 state FIAT have agreed to work together to develop a common set of college completion metrics.

Completion metrics. Make the transparent measures metric.

If you are a public school, watch out for an internal assessment of your completion rates on the horizon.

A lot of debaters are in a four year majors completed in 5 years.

Tie appropriations to college retention.

Institutions want to stay ahead of the curve.

Argument about 5 year rule, argue differently. Need to be smart and deal with the enemies on campuses.

Administrators, more expensive to educate. Not taking large undergraduate courses. Cost individual colleges more to educate.

Our scholarship budget is not designed to fork out money.

Make that argument in that way, not a terrible persuasive appeal.

Most undergrads now take 5+ years, so debate's five-year rule makes sense.

Fine argument to make in 2006.

Completion norms required to change. Don't want to be the one program on the campus. Volleyball team looks bad, b/c of GPA. Metric is finishing at good rate relative to the rest.

5 or more years to complete. STEM programs, 5 programs, campus to campus, 5 year education program. Students who are education majors, 5 year rate of completion can be argued differently. Point is not to complain, teach debaters and coaches to make arguments.

Uncontroversial recommendations:

Teach directors to sell fifth year students

Arrived without much notice: Study with data about trends

(Literacy about arguments good).

It is appropriate to consider with data, with data inclusive of competitive interests. How the five year rule will represent us in the academic community more broadly.

Put a clock on it that it is only five years (allow exceptions military service, pregnancy, etc). Clock start ends at 5 years. Vince Binder, debated dropped out, make an appeal. Sherry Hall, successfully came back. Debate came back and into grad school.

Kelly had a debater come to them, student was eligible, no clock at all.

Keep five years but allow Adriana Midence to complete and compete, frame ourselves as incentivizing completion. Strange predicament, able to graduate 3 ½ years, so stretched out her graduation, went to the ensuing NDT. Market ourselves for completion. Gotta stop at five. Complete early. Only ensuing the NDT. Not delaying Adriana, might help by going to the NDT.

Anecdotes of full 5th year, one of the problems of current rule, four NDT's to compete in. Creates awkward incentives. Don't want to green light five.

RG: Community colleges.

EM: Seems reasonable to me. How broadly about an exception to this. Don't want to give an exemption to drop out.

SH: Debate brought back to school.

EM: Proactive.

KY: A couple of years afterwards.

DP: Really quit school. Not honing debate skills.

After a study:

Clock after the first NDT.

Clock that starts after a certain number of varsity elim rounds (people who start as novices, situated differently than TOC debaters). Get after some people might need to take 5 years, as a way to incentivize as well as they possibly could at final NDT. Phased in, and have some exceptions policy. (Grandparents' clause).

Jonah Feldman:

Ross idea of Chronicle of Higher Ed. Do you have suggestions to where to read about this stuff. Concern over delayed completion. Conflated completion and delayed completion.

WR:

Taking more of 'x' number of years beyond program designed is relevant. My opinion is delayed completion.

JF:

Learn more?

WR:

Not just about completion. Big college completion data. Don't know of a lot of anecdotes be on the horizon. Kind of watch out for that and speak to that.

Steve Pointer:

Graduation metric is on the six year clock. Whether or not to decrease that metric from 5 to 4.

JF:

What is said?

SP:

Is five or six a better metric?

DP:

Extra year is dead weight costs.

GS:

Anyone is interesting helping, both of completion rates. The most difficult part of debateresults.

Widely disparate programs

Harvard: 88% completion rates

Some 25% completion rates.

Returning students—possible opportunity that our academic programs are exceeding standards.

NCAA analogy shouldn't be used. Different comparisons. A lot of member schools, we are better. If we are better than we champion the rule.

Data: the 5 year rule makes a lot of sense for a vast majority of students.

Best of our best, 32 students, getting a BA in humanities, that degree takes 4 years, where are there in comparison to that.

What is the difference of first round bid.

DP:

Our enemies will take advantage of 5th year debaters.

SH:

Should be the top students in the field, takes 5th year, not as much on the ball.

GS:

When you have that first conversation. 40 years of AP credit, 5 years to get a political science BA. First rounds, these students are different. In an arms race, best practices, if data validates this. What incentive do you have to not attend the 5th year track.

Coaches' strategic disincentive to try to get graduate. If a student can debate for four years, and someone picks up the tab, is because we win more trophies, we encourage that. Look at a director, and look to success.

WR:

Metrics make it more difficult to fly under the radar screen. Metrics pay a lot more attention to that. Debate directors to say, political science, average undergrad takes 4.2 years, don't want the debaters numbers to radically differ from that.

DP:

Does it affect graduate or law school admissions.

JF:

Not sure if it is on face a problem. Not sure if four is a magic number. Bad for students bad for relations.

DP:

Not graduate in four years. It is rare to have the walk-on. It is rare for the first round bid to not a college degree. Six years, drop a bunch of classes, and have a degree. Big elephant in the room, competitive equity issues. If it makes our students less attractive to grad students and law schools, that's a terrible thing. If it makes them look like less serious students. It sounds bad, but breaking it down, not sure if I am stone cold certain they will graduate with honors.

GS:

Data won't blow us away. Hard part in all of it, reason why we are having a problem with 'x.'
A lot of schools can use this as a benefit, way over matriculation, a lot of opportunity.

KY:

Wayne State is on the low end of this issue, heavily involved in the retention issue. Learning community, a lot of organizations peer mentoring, and encourage in a timely fashion—hopefully getting to five in broader university. A lot of external concern, but problems to increase retention and graduation. Sell ourselves as part of that movement. NGA: pressures concern me. External pressure for four years, because of some of the studies at Wayne, a lot of internal pressure to re-define four year programs. Killing themselves by saying something is a four year program. Movement internally, that might help us for five years, metric concerns.

JA:

Data collection for competitive collection. Copeland 5th year. Get your 5th year if you have a certain GPA. Culpepper graduated summa cum laude.

DP:

Grades matter.

SH:

Equity problem. Not full academic caseload. Fifth year, basically finished courses in the fourth year.

DP:

Equity concerns.

SH:

Equity issue.

Sarah Partlow:

Depends on what high grades are.

DCH:

An engineering student. Meritus fifth year.

CB:

Fourth year students take year.

DP:

Four year clock, four NDT consecutive. Things we could consider doing. Four versus five is the comparison. Identified the policy comparison.

DF:

Generally, this particular, it sets the incentive structure a goal that we graduate students with great grades. No clock or age cap, empowers people who are making purely competitive, no academic connection, to take advantage of that. Incentive structure of the present situation, didn't tie it to outcomes, done it haphazard way. Allow people to make non-academic choices to game the system. Getting that incentive structure right. If you agree with me, don't be afraid to make a normative educational decision. Proxy of a potential political motivation. Dodges the competitive equity questions. We are all professional educators. Shouldn't we be afraid of educational outcomes, norms in the classrooms.

SH:

Going to be couched as we as educators think, example of Vince is something we need to think about. Decision to come back and debate. That decision is what saved him academically. Didn't come back to game the system, kinda lost, Jim called him up and got him back into debate. For some people, it is important. Not a way to write that in.

WR:

How broadly we define exceptions.

GS:

West Georgia program in an honors college. Non-traditional students at WGA good. No hesitation of education mission.

DP:

Rule that says you can't debate that year. You can participate in four academic years. Can do it when eighteen or thirty-five. Maybe we are proposing running clock in a five year world. Four year world, much less problem with a running clock.

Three proposals:

Four year clock

Five year clock

Four years, no clock

WR:

Golden to participate if you drop out of school for a year. Delayed completion versus completion. Drop out is bad.

SH:

Interest to not incentivize this. Anomaly, they had their chance, need to be aware to craft these rules.

WR:

Presumption to appeal to a committee. Can't legislate for every contingency. Pregnancy, military service, their case would be favorably looked appeal by the committee. Do what they want to do. At least before the committee.

SH:

39 year old debater for George Washington, and going to debate tournaments. A little bit longer time, not the only time. Not the only detour.

GS:

Most of it is not malevolence. Longer it develops. Grades or other things, trend in higher education. Empower directors to incentivize graduation. Director has the opposite

WR:

Clock: trading five years for three and a half

Clock on five years.

Are there any of the pro-five year people who don't want to see a clock.

DCH:

A year or more, four years, CC degree. Only one year on their clock left.

WR:

Community college.

DP:

Intermittent schooling. Is a complicated issue, the causes of the intermittency are so diverse. Gordon is saying incentivizing don't get out of step out of step with ethics. Heavy incentive, allowing participation, doesn't interfere with that. Hard to create a regulatory schedule intermittency, but still incentivizes the coach to not delay. Committee that looks at, can maybe tell the difference. Hard to write a rule that will accomplish on its face.

KY:

Darren's input: helpful in completion. Step 1 condition, have other sort of requirements.

GS:

Look at the data. Broad student population and the wanna be first round possibility. Easier to craft: 70 to 80 students max. Easier way to manage it. Track every student, every year, tracking the first round students. First round record, has it slowed down the matriculation rate.

DCH:

Structural factor to consider. A lot of students, 4 year 50 credits. Should graduate in 3, they have a big competitive incentive. Can't compete after you graduate requirement. Decided to not debate because of competitive factor. Complicating factor.

DP:

Parents who tell them they only get four. Substantial disadvantage, where nearly everybody else gets five. A lot of people who can't spend their lives in college. It is a disadvantage.

JF:
Clock idea. Clarify a little bit. Vince situation, leave, for not good reason. Come back later, and debate gets you back in. Not health, or anything.

SH:
Wouldn't say yes. Medical reason. Wanted to drop out.

WR:
Incentivize completion.

DP:
Two years off.

SH:

WR:
Way more people stretching out completion.

GS:
Age gap, complicating factors. Large percentage of member institutions. Street cred for WGA. Isn't true for institution.

MH:
What do we have the authority to do?

DP:
Incentivizing this. Not fair to have students competing versus professional debaters.

MH:
Start at a graduate program.

DP:
Can't relax the requirement.

GS:
No changes in the AFA code. Eligibility for the NDT.

JA:
Gets to debate at CEDA Nationals, NDT.

GS:
Not a liberalization requirement, everything else is a tightening.

CB:
Committee for appeals. Let it slide. Academic eligibility. University determine for a good reason. No other role, no parallel or precedent.

JF:
How could they be upset about a student they've let back in. How could that be a reason why the school be upset.

DP:
As long as you only debate four years, taking a couple off is not awful. As Will says, terrible incentive structure for dropping out.

TO:
You get four academic years of debate.

DF:
Debate for five years, college for five years go, can only go to school with debate scholarships.

EM:

Are five years programs out there.

WR:

Can't complete academic program because of this. Case by case judgment. Why does debate have to be your undergraduate experience. Case by case judgment. Operate on the assumption, if you are undergrad, did not admit you to be on the debate team. Very sensitive to the student who needs debate scholarship \$\$, that are in five year academic programs.

CB:

Easier way to prove. Deliver a degree program, that says five years. Not going to rewrite. No other proof. I don't believe you. Dean of engineering saying five year program.

CB:

Sign up for chemical engineering, probably not doing that for the first round.

DP:

Didn't change the time they would graduate. Adapted debate career. At least debate five year.

JF:

A university who let a student comes back would be upset if they debated.

WR:

Did you need to debate.

JF:

Not great students, to come back to complete education. Find it true.

WR:

A lot of people who involved in debate. Arguments about why budgets need to expand. Readmit to the university. Shouldn't say that debate should be part of undergraduate experience.

JF:

Administration upset about a re-admitted student.

WR:

Case by case basis.

SP:

Hypothetical world.

WR:

Not legislate in advance. Stage of the conversation. * a little bit ahead of ourselves. Structure in place, appeal to that committee. Minimizes delays in conversation. Particularly worried about students, falling apart academically. Not afraid to jump in on the committee. Appeals persuasive. Stretching out debate careers. Not representatives as well. Appeal attempt to debate. Not unwilling to discuss sticking points between the two. Too much potential for abuse.

DP:

Going to school and debating. Not worried about debate.

WR:

Fourth different school transferred all over the place, don't represent as well as be represented.

SP:

How does one person transfers a bunch of different places, administrators at MSU.

JF:

Transfer students.

DP:

Not where they went to school.

WR:

Redlands the whole time, not where.

GS:

Limited look at the data.

DP:

Five consecutive years.

MH:

Clearly see the rationale of the committee acts. Debate standing at individual school. So many factors in an individual direction. Not finishing at all, or debate scholarship, other than the competitive issue. Help individual directors, how helps their students. As directors we should incentivize those programs.

GS:

Cap or in general? We have rules now. Directors only have their ethics vs. competitive pressures. Expanding the norm for first round bids. I can continue my degree. Director has as rationale.

DP:

Why don't you take three classes. Why don't you not graduate so fast?

GS:

What is intrinsic to the debate program. Who is paying and how they are paying. What is the academic rationale to do this.

MH:

Affects ability to make the argument.

GS:

Short term versus long term. Speculate, what evidence do we have. Not athletic coaches.

DCH:

Been asked by assistant dean to provide the rationale. Ranking reasons.

MH:

Absent a uniform rule.

DCH:

In order to comply with university mandate. Students can stick around longer.

DP:

Is it bad for the students? Could you put away the childish games.

JF:

Different case by case, average at six years. Dean didn't have an issue with five years, and people staying on. Not everything. Case by case basis.

EM:

Will change.

MH:

Overall graduation rate, completion more important than timely completion. Just sees that the individual.

DP:

The clock is not controversial. The number of years may be less controversial than the clock, for good reasons.

GS:

Case by case. If they go to an academic advisor, they can weigh competing perspectives. What incentive do they have to graduate career.

DF:

Ethics?

JF:

Telling the student they should take longer. Best interest in 4 years, best interest in 5 years, hands of the students. Coach manipulating the students.

SH:

Part of this is, competitive pressures come into play. Copeland, the NDT, debating for five years, schools that promote that model. Create some inequity, think it is in the best interest.

DP:

Easy for debate coaches to tunnel vision. We would immensely profit, they will soon go on to do other bigger things. Ethics are a little influenced by competitive pressures.

JF:

Categorical rule, exceptions policies.

TO:

Categorical rule, you can go four times.

SP:

Drop out of school, pregnant, is that a legitimate reason. Take time to go and study abroad.

WR:

Is the logical extension.

DP:

Logical extension, yes it is that the logical extension is an argument for the status quo. Jonah is a powerful argument for the status quo. It is going to be tough to sell the clock. Intermittent education is important to some students.

WR:

Intermittent education is being manipulated...

DP:

Intermittent education isn't being manipulated. Intermittent debate can be problematic, intermittent education is good. Tough to sell if it is just a function of education. An appeals process if isn't credible, have to define the exceptions. I repeat, the clock is more controversial than the number of years.

EM:

Appeals process provides a check. If they say yes, mostly the end of the story. May be dialogue about debating or not debating, not sure, don't trust an appeals process.

DP:

No yes/no on the clock. More controversial than the number of years.

SH:

97% of Harvard students.

Post the Recess:

TO:

Where we are at?

Other discussion items.

SH:

Specific examples of Vince, Hester. Having Hester talk a little a bit about Hester at WGA.

WR:

Addressed some of my questions. Vince was drawn being up on as an example, OK whether or not.

SH:

Running clock, argument against that. Do return because of debate.

Mike Hester:

Close to a half dozen that come back after some sort of break, and find that people wouldn't come back because of debate.

WR:

Want to incentivize completion.

MH:

Scholarship is for you to get your degree. Even without degree, completion. Functioning as undergraduate assistants. Helps us and helps them. As far back as Bonilla, and Lundeen, and Derby, and Jim, Adam Grellinger, in all instances some sort of break because of debate, and got their degree. All but Adam and Jim leaving. Simply didn't have money to stay in school, because of scholarship.

TO:

How many debated in more than 4 academic years.

MH:

Sarah didn't, left eligibility on the table, Bonilla did, Geoff did, Vince did, Adam will not. Most of them didn't end up competing the whole time. Incentive was, didn't have a great experience on a college campus, mostly because of their own experiences, second time around, got around to doing better. Incentive to debate offsets going to classes you don't like. Trying to create debate coaches. Produce a lot of educators, create debate coaches, too.

SH:

What is the proposal, where do we go from here?

WR:

Study data about what Jarrod proposed, delayed completion rates for debaters, study that extends beyond debate as per Stables.

SH:

Committee charged with doing some specific proposals.

TO:

Gordon, Will, D. Cram, and Jarrod to sit on the committee.

GS:

Goal was to have data that leads in directions, a lot of consensus building on these proposals. Anything we do would have to pass twice, produce the data.

TO:

History breaking presentation (first powerpoint), weave tech in.

Next item on agenda:

GS:

Not a proposal. Document sent to Tim, attached to the minutes, version at the CEDA/AFA meetings. Brief synopsis, sum total of experiences of debate governance, fundamentally broken model. What's the central relationship of governance and what we do. Governance is what we don't want to do. Try to do in the discussion, a little bit of the trajectory.

Why do we have things the way we do? Should be a positive part of more than speech comm.. professionals. AFA business meeting and coaches not the same population. Discussion of completion rates, educational role of competition and other ideas. Even the AFA can't function in the new model. It's a hard job, but it isn't a strong organization, not pro-active areas. What are the roles that we want?

Strategic planning, some of what Scott was alluding to, crisis communication. When crises happen, NDT part of discussion. Whose responsibility is it for immediate response, how do we generate what we want college debate to be in five or ten years. Institutionally incapable of doing. Aspirational documents. What would it take to have different schools. Number was in the 80s. Low 100 and upper 90s. Talked about document, try to draft a charter under the AFA, chartered AFA organization. A lot like the NDT, broader goal.

Better under the AFA than not. Legislative structure. We have someone in the neighborhood of 25 regional representatives, people are way over-committed, don't have quorums. What is the purpose, what matters? Executive director. Debate summit. Create a near term interim strategy, or alum of the community for a part-time capacity. Go for the buy-out.

Having an executive director, and a strategic direction, interested in broader direction, different dynamic in the conversation. Paperless, healthy debate initiative. Even beyond the visionary parts of what we want this to be. Who signs the CSTV contract? When Richmond announces trouble in debate, who's responsibility is it? There is resonance with this.

Model we sent there is an AFA charter, work with the affiliate organizations, that's CEDA, ADA, and NEDA, brand discussion.

Two things, not a vote, public google doc. 1) Craft a charter over the next few months. 2) If there was a larger superstructure what would the other organizations do. The NDT is the gold standard, longest running, qualification, essential core. What are the other parts of the organization.

DP:

Is eligibility streamlining?

GS:

Discussion this morning could CEDA and NDT have different structures, ultimate arbiter of the process. If it is only about the topic, is the topic part of this. Media relations...

DP:

Eligibility rules jointly, ethical evidence standards jointly. Pretty obvious that are advantages to not combining on eligibility. Is there much to streamline?

GS:

Right now, eligibility in concert. For now, operate together. Big thing, representative structures don't make sense, too many regional reps focus on the NDT, don't focus on the way debate works. NDT doesn't manage all parts of debate.

DP:

What functions of this committee would be moved elsewhere?

GS:

Tournament products. Basic natures of regional structure. Do you want the reps.

DP:

Abandoning the argument because we have a bunch of streamline...we might do public media someplace else, in terms of governance, no proposal, no substantive item that this committee not control. Am I right?

GS:

Hard to say, technically talk about things we can't govern. NDT eligibility versus broad eligibility.

DP:

Why would it be better to call this promotion and not governance. Executive director of agency that promotes debate, but they wouldn't necessarily regulate or govern. The ADA could still make it rules about kritiks. The NDT could still say Topicality is a voter at the NDT. Why is governance related to media?

GS:

If we came to the discussion that the NDT has a public forum division, if it becomes promotion than governance. Relationship of revenue. Not unrelated to functionality of debate. We have a PR agency and then debate is over there. Executive director we begin with our contacts and lobbying. Can't mandate by FIAT what it is.

SH:

Crisis reaction: the topic committee example just for media relations. Like we have a topic committee, we could have a PR media relations committee, official voice that is staffed by reps of organizations of both—value in that. Prevents conflicting and contradictory messages. Not sure what beyond that this body do...

GS:

Proactive versus reactive. What the executive director of NAUDL, fund research that validates the economic model. We need to be able to do that kind of data. Lobbying and research funding, everything you said is a better strategy than what we have right now. Proactive changing the landscape, no one ever be able to be time capable. Growth strategy requires not just reactive. Have a crisis mechanism much better. A couple of fault lines. Has some real consequences. Grant generation could be something we combine. Education lit proves we should play in revenue strategies. Generate \$25K a year. NAUDL's bread and butter right now. We would really benefit from this design.

DP:

Don't have the revenue.

GS:

NFL can be bigger because they have a paycheck, they have nationals. We like that we are particular about our discussion. If part of discussion what could we do as part of the bigger entity, and ability to do outward things.

MH:

Issues of professional conduct under the NDA?

GS:

CEDA and NDT has similar professional conduct standards, ADA has one too. There are jurisdictional questions—who is hit, whose liability insurance is better. Don't be reactive, go to the positive. Turning out debate teachers. Largely under-write what a debate coach is. How do we validate what a debate coach is. How do we grow. 96 subscribers last year.

Not in a total failure stage. We get successes...

DP:

Is this funded initially by grants?

GS:

Grants would be an important way to generate.

DCH:

Funding for education is really competitive. Private donors is a way to do this.

GS:

Grant capacity, exec director is an academic, would the center for Excellence in Intercollegiate Debate. Does that provide an incentive, it is super-competitive. The NFL would love to have someone in concert, they don't have a parallel partner, a lot of appeals. Kind of entertaining enterprise. More pragmatic than generating money next year.

SP:

Ties in with tenure & promotion issues. Service is on its way out, as a way to evaluate people for T&P. Why do we have an important function, if it could be lessened, committee could get a seed grant, and a product for submitting for T&P. Had an actual product, some money associated with. Encouraging and creating.

GS:

Will's discussion this morning, the digital media literacy world, a big item in academic circles, struggling for metrics. Growth field in these environments. Right now we can't convince our institutions of what we are, and competing organizations have a better evaluation method, hurts resources within universities. Measuring that as a learning technique. Pre-test post-tests on ideas.

DCH:

At our university it is citizen engagement. Concretely, the importance to conduct research about the value of what we do. People who research minority outcomes, that research was worth \$50K. Don't have anyone whose responsibility it is to facilitate it. Metrics = money.

MH:

Warrant for the new structure. New people who have the energy to do this?

GS:

Some other person in this room can do these kinds of things. Part of the idea is working of buying people's teaching out. Idea of bringing and identifying people in the interim. Part of the interim person is to write the plan. Near term interim plan.

TO:

Increase entry fees to generate seed money.

SH:

Hard to increase fees...community sentiment

TO:

Not much if you had \$500 increase...

DP:

Couldn't raise the money to build the website. Got Brusckke to build one for free, still never went out to do it.

SH:

Get complaints from schools that can't pay \$50. Can't tack on \$500 entry fees. Funding for debate conference, came from a lot of different sources. ADA, CEDA, NDT. Division of jurisdiction is to make it to the board.

DP:

Thought experiment about the public forum tournament to raise money.

GS:

How do you generate a tournament with 600 entries...

SH:

Don't run the tournament to make money. Projecting a loss for this year, not a goal for the tournament.

GS:

Ethically right thing, is the NDT should be functioning. Exec director has to be more than a PR person. Has a vision not in congruence inconsistent with others—need a vision of growth.

TO:

Why aren't gold standards expensive?

DP:

All other organizations that have this are expensive. We do in the long run, need a way to make money than just chipping in. We could have everyone chip in.

SH:

That the gold standard meeting, is the only thing they ask money for. Hard with schools with budgets for everyone for that. \$500 is a make or break point.

CB:

Tiny increases of fees for fees.

TO:

NCA membership is expensive.

DCH:

\$1000 entry fee to the organization can justify.

Scott Harris:

Charge more to wealthier schools.

DCH:

Research money is worth it, need the data.

DP:

Public good, and the Linda Collier study, seized on the study, got on the research. Big job, everyone benefits from.

SH:

NDT is in good financial shape. If this is something the committee thinks should be done. We think you should spend money on research. We make money some times, donations than anticipated. We're in good financial shape and could afford to put money into it.

DP:

Might be some deep pockets.

EM:

Different membership levels.

SH:

Like that a lot better.

DP:

Need to attach a service or benefit.

PM:

First option at ability to do research, people/universities could help house this.

GS:

Get people to think that is what the organizations do. What would we want and what could they do. That is the question, be proactive.

DP:

Almost nothing. Most of what we are thinking about.

RG:

Some of it is accountability, who does what.

GS:

CEDA discussion what would the essential roles of the committee. The major organizational goal of CEDA is the topic now, but what it is really about is growth in the activity. Like minded members can coordinate structures. ADA is an educational philosophy and an organization.

SH:

Appeal to other organizations.

DP:

List of organizations includes some people who don't trust us.

ScHa:

Structural things that promote the NDT, not other debate organizations.

GS:

At least the idea of growth or sustainability, not a magic way to do merging. Parli has more institutional concern than we have as a community. Part of the way to open the door and engage. Rather than being reactive, we can sustain it, Richmond is the example of how different models can hurt policy debate. There is a value in including broader community. Educational research can bolster the activity. Broader goals institutionally. Tuna pushes the international angle. If you think about the NCA and the AFA almost killed off the CIDD, policy debate has its roots in CIDD, some rationale, visibility, etc.

TO:

Vision for where we are going next?

GS:

The charter could be written by those who write the charter, people who are willing to agree to it.

ScHa:

The charter needs to be directed toward what it means for policy debate, CEDA sponsors a tournament. Create something that bridges though. Working on the achievable, work with a focused charter.

GS:

Policy debate is the name of the activity. A lot of it is research, think about IDEA, we have a commonality and a difference.

ScHa:

Policy debate on our campuses, would like help with on campus debate organizations. Inspired by Brusckke's grant proposal. Create visibility. Things we can do. Oriented toward policy debate that is useful. Charter could be a little narrower.

GS:

Only chartered part of an AFA committee is the AFA. Charter proposal is an amendment to the AFA governing documents. Strong component. NDCA and the hs community. Why the AFA?

ScHa:

Dan Lingel hs rep of the AFA, unclear role, interested in carving out a relationship and a role. Creates more interaction.

DCH:

NFL is invested in expanding the NFL, growth strategy is around Public Forum debate.

GS:

Need to offer public forum or an alternative, engaging the NFL. NFL structure is a great example, ads and articles about policy debate. Scholarships as an important part of eligibility. Work on individually, does separate us from other debate forums. How do you want to get a college scholarship for debate. Charter discussion, who's involved.

TO:

Charter group. Does the group include the affiliates?

GS:

The ADA, CEDA, different relationships. What if the NDT and ADA created the structure.

DP:

NDCA might...

GS:

They are an AFA affiliate. DSR-TKA. Just email me if you want to get involved/make it transparent. If you want to be on the committee.

TO:

Last agenda item, pitch to start to take a look at the rules. Clean up some things figments of an earlier era. Lagging behind. Homework assignment. How much time you have. Highly prioritize. Divide into working group. Changes work on as early as February.

DP:

Most of what I saw uncontroversial adaptations to modern reality, than changing anything we do. Bringing rules into conformity. Extensive set of provisions of judging obligations. No hired judging pool doesn't exist, or not provide at all, which we don't do. Clarify the hired judging rules. Ask Fritch a couple of questions to make sure my version of reality correct. Non-controversial adaptations to reality.

SH:

Last weekend in March, etc.

TO:

Break the rules down and work in small groups. See what we come up. Bulk of work Rule 1, 3, 4, 5, maybe 6 with awards.

DP:

Judging: Rule 3, I'll work on it.

TO:

Rule 1: General regulations, where date falls.

SH:

Rule 1: Dates of tournament, not when the calendar makes the weekends the same.

DP:

Research thing says the researcher has to make a proposal to the director, the question we ask. Are the archives still at Utah?

ScHa:

Gerry Sanders is in charge of the archives. Semi-transitioning into retirement, and Klumpp is taking over. Have money available and want to stimulate research. No discussion of moving them. Lists of what's available.

DP:

Participant eligibility, the number of time blocks, 8 time blocks. Maybe still accurate. Not sure eligibility is up to date.

TO:

General regulations: 2 people, Dallas & Gordon

Participant qualification: Mike Hall & Ron Stevenson.

Judges: Dallas & Fritch.

General tournament procedures: Eric Morris & David Cram Helwich.

Tournament scheduling: Tim O'Donnell & Fritch working on it.

Awards: Sherry.

Evaluation & Appeals: Evidence and stopping the rounds, not deployed. Dallas & Eric Morris & D Cram.

Topic selection: Will & Gordon.

Draft by around the first of the year, so members of districts can have their January meetings. A month to vet with districts.

DP:

Trivial considerations.

TO:

Not unreasonable to be by beginning of year.

SH:

Matter of jurisdiction, spending money, the Board of Trustees. Not sure why this in here, since it is addressed in the BOT rules.

TO:

One last remaining item. Completed a one year experiment to moving this meeting to this date & time. Especially since we have AFA president in the room. In New Orleans next year.

ScHa:

Discussion of the timing of the rule. Looking for next year. Pool of panels to be competed for. Ties to the topic, which is voice. What I am looking for, how do we create panels. Try to be competitive in the pool, Urban Debate, panel does debates, different than presenting papers. Innovative and fun to do.

ShHa:

Approving the NDT host for the following year, traditionally been doing at this meeting, report on budget, both require that the board meet first. Makes logical sense that the BOT needs to meet first. However, if you get better participation at this meeting. A permutation is done and that stuff can be presented to the board. Here's what the budget looks like. Probably work around problems if here.

ScHa:

Rich expressed some concern about separating the meeting from NCA.

ShHa:

Warren Decker also expressed concern, said some of AFA didn't like giving slots if we don't meet there. BOT wants there.

GS:

Meeting should be at NCA as the default, professional ties. Didn't vote on anything. If we need a couple hours to deliberate, important institutionally to function.

ShHa:

Big discussion on items here, then the business got conducted at NCA. Best meeting we've had at spirited discussion.

TO:

Meeting very short in past.

ShHa:

No quorum. Too early Wednesday, can't get to NCA that quickly after WFU. Fly straight from here, people can't do that or not willing. Number of people were present. Number of people on the committee useful.

TO:

No strong voices to keeping it here.

GS:

Good discussion, could pull aside.

ShHa:

Vote at NCA, send proxies if there. Talk about big issues, extra meetings at Wake when discussing merger, etc.

WR:

Jarrod will sign up every time, let's do the Perm.

ShHa:

BOT makes the decisions about spending money. Awards not specified, keep the language, and just amend it.

TO: Motion to adjourn.

Motion passes.

