

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association

## Minutes

September 10, 2016

Best Western Milwaukee Airport

**Voting Schools represented:** Marquette, Appleton East, Middleton, Madison Memorial, Madison West, SPASH, Waukesha South, West Bend, North Division, Janesville Parker, Muskego, Sheboygan North, Sheboygan South, Homestead, Golda Meir, Mukwonago, Madison East, Milwaukee Hamilton, Alliance, Milwaukee Riverside, Brookfield East

The meeting was called to order by President Miloran Robinson at 9:35 a.m.

### Secretary

Brian Devine moved the approval of the spring meeting minutes, and the motion was seconded. The motion **passed by voice vote**.

Brian then asked for discussion of the calendar. One change was announced. Sheboygan South will not host on December 17. Instead, Marquette and North Division hope to co-host a meet on that date.

Marquette will host the southern NSDA. West Bend will host the southern CFL.

The calendar was reviewed:

September 10—Fall meeting  
September 17—Lakeland University  
September 24—Rufus King  
September 30/October 1—Waukesha South  
October 8—Mukwonago  
October 15—Brookfield East  
October 22—Golda Meir  
October 28-29—La Crosse/Appleton West?/Open MDL  
November 5—West Bend  
November 11/12—Badgerland (Middleton/Madison Memorial)  
November 19—No Frills  
December 2/3—Appleton East  
December 10—Sheboygan North  
December 17—Nomad (Marquette/North Division)  
January 6-7—NSDA qualifiers\*  
January 14—CFL qualifiers\*  
January 21/22—Wisconsin State Debate Tournament in West Bend

## Treasurer

Previous Treasurer Nick Bubb referred us to the one-year summary he had posted.

Treasurer Tim Scheffler reported that the transition is slowly getting taken care of. Ballots are available if tournament hosts need them.

Tim reported that we have about \$7400 to \$7500 at this point. He reminded coaches to renew their memberships before the December deadline to avoid extra costs to participate in the state tournament.

Doris Sexton asked if outstanding fees had been collected, as had been discussed at the spring meeting. Tim responded that it had not occurred. Miloran asked the membership what ought to be done about schools that still have not paid fees. Mike Traas said as a tournament host, he would not allow a school to enter if he were notified they were delinquent on fees. Steve Sexton pointed out that so much time has elapsed since alleged violations that it is not fair to try to collect from the affected coaches now.

Nick pointed out that he had expressed the feeling at the spring meeting that it was too late to collect the fines, but that the membership had disagreed. Mike asked whether—if we do dismiss the fines—whether we can post the names of judges who have missed rounds. Spencer Fretschel pointed out that new coaches do not know what may have happened with their schools' judges in previous years. In response to a question from David Umstot, Tim responded that all tournament fees were paid, and that the fees in question relate to judge-related violations.

Mike moved to eliminate fines that occurred in the state tournament and to clearly delineate in the invitation what the violations and fines are. The motion was seconded. In response to a suggestion from John Knetzger, Nick responded that the current fee for this is \$35, and that there is a \$15 penalty for being late to a round. Spencer asked whether ballots are checked as they are turned in. John responded that there would be staff checking ballots including online ballots. Miranda Ehrlich spoke in favor of keeping the fees at their current level. John and Mike agreed to keep the amounts for missing a round and being late to a round at \$35 and \$15, respectively, at the discretion of the tournament director. **The motion passed by voice vote.**

Nick suggested that we need a better way of making financial decisions. He pointed out that we spent more than planned on sending Stephanie King to the topic selection meeting, and that by having an annual report the membership will be better able to judge what should be done relative to spending money. Annie Robinson asked for the context of how the topic selection trip was funded in the past, and Nick gave the background. Nick explained that it is important that whatever we are going to do be reflected in the budget.

Tim indicated that by applying to be a non-profit organization, some of our procedures (such as the way we award scholarships) may need to be changed. After discussion,

Miloran recommended that he go ahead and file and that we can then make any changes that may be required.

## **Past-President**

Nick reported that all WDCA forms are available on the web site (membership, scholarships, etc.).

## **President**

Miloran reported that the Executive Committee meetings are paid for by the organization but that she makes it a point to economize in this.

## **TPP**

John proposed:

### **2016 TPP Clean up**

#### **200.50 Topics**

Current: (1) The topic for policy debate shall be the current national high school policy debate topic. The topic for Public Forum and LincolnDouglas debate shall be the current National Forensic League topic.

Proposed: Replace the above with: (1) The topic for policy debate shall be the current national high school policy debate topic. The topic for Public Forum and LincolnDouglas debate shall be the current National Speech and Debate Association topics.

Rationale: The NFL changes their names. PF and LD have different topics

#### **240.10 Technology Use**

Current (1)B. All evidence read must be available to both teams and the judge at the time of presentation. If a team cannot produce a copy of the evidence read in the round, that piece of evidence is forfeited and dropped from the round.

Proposed: B. Replace the above with: All evidence read must be available in to both teams at the time of presentation and/or the judge and the conclusion of the round. If a team cannot or will not produce a copy of the evidence read in the round, the procedures and consequences for an evidence violation as outlined in 210.10 must be followed.

#### **310.10**

Current: (1) Organization and Responsibilities

A. The Wisconsin State Debate Tournament will be run by a three person committee consisting of a Tournament Director, who is the chair of the Tournament Practices and Procedures Committee, the Host, and the Operations Director, who is appointed by the Tournament Director with consultation from the Executive Board and the Wisconsin High School Forensics Association.

Proposed: Strike “and the Wisconsin High School Forensics Association”

#### **330.20 and others**

(2)A. Current: On the night before the tournament begins, all coaches must telephone confirm their student entries and judges. Those who fail to comply will be charged a \$30 fine and may be given a loss as a penalty.

Proposed:

(2)A. Replace the above with: During a time announced by the WSDT Director, all coaches must telephone or register in person to verify their entries, judges and preferences/strikes. Those who fail to comply may be given a loss in round 1 as a penalty.

This rule change is offered for all divisions.

### **Tie breakers**

330.30 LincolnDouglas

Debate and 330.40 Public Forum Debate

Current: (2)D, iii. Tiebreakers for seeding used by the computer program should be used in the following order: wins, total points, highlow points, double highlow points, triple highlow points, opposition wins, a random variable.

Proposed: iii. Replace the above with: Tiebreakers for seeding used by the computer program should be used in the following order: wins, total points, highlow points, double highlow points, opposition wins, and a random variable.

Rationale: a Triple H/L with 6 rounds is always a zero. This tiebreaker won't ever break a tie.

He moved the adoption of the changes, and the motion was seconded. Steve S. asked clarifying questions regarding tie breakers and technology use. John explained regarding copies of evidence, that an electronic copy is acceptable. **The TPP clean up was passed by voice vote.**

John then moved the adoption of

### **340.10(2)A Novice 2 Speaker**

Current: The novice two person division will be a two day, six round tournament. Teams will compete as individual teams and not as a school. Teams from a school, however, may not meet another team from that school. The novice tournament shall consist of three randomly paired rounds, followed by three powerpaired rounds.

Proposed: Replace the above with: The novice two person division will be a two day, six round tournament. Teams will compete as individual teams and not as a school. Teams from a school, however, may not meet another team from that school. The novice tournament shall consist of two randomly paired rounds, followed by four powerpaired rounds.

Rationale: In tandem with moving to a quarterfinal cap on elimination rounds, this ensures the champion has one additional paired round and moves all division to 2 preset and 4 paired rounds.

**The change was passed by voice vote.**

John proposed

### **340.10(2)C (Novice 2 Speaker)**

Current: C. All teams with a winning record are eligible to participate in elimination rounds.

Proposed: Replace the above with: C. All teams with a winning record are eligible to participate in elimination rounds, up to a full quarterfinal round.

Rationale: A novice division can still crown a champion with 3 elimination rounds. This also preserves the need for a winning record to compete in elimination rounds.

In response to a question from Steve Goetsch, John indicated this would save time and would be a fair way to award a novice championship. Steve G. expressed concern that the use of speaker points in this process is not a good idea. Steve S. expressed agreement with this and also stressed that this makes the division too much different from other divisions and is not fair. Dave Henning also expressed a view that all teams with winning records should break. Mike spoke in support of the change, and pointed out that without it, the novice finals could occur after the varsity finals. Additional comments were shared and questions were asked to clarify the background of this issue and the impact of the proposed change. Nick pointed out that when this division was created, the decision was made to have all winning teams break. Mike responded that at that time there were 4-person divisions which no longer exist. The question was called, and the motion was seconded. **The motion failed 8-12-2.**

John proposed:

### **310.2. TAB ROOM**

Current: (1) The elected officers shall each serve as a tab chair for a division of the tournament with the appointed members of the Tournament Practices and Procedures Committee and at least three other persons assigned to assist in the tab room.

Proposed: Replace the above with: (1). The Executive Committee ~~should~~ will serve in the tab room in a capacity determined by the Tournament Director, as well as others chosen by the Tournament Director with the consent of the President.

Rationale: Having close to a dozen people in the tabroom is not our practice and is no longer necessary. We also have more officers than divisions. This change empowers the WSDT Director to assign people by their strengths and follows our current practices

Nick pointed that this is a change from the current practice where the Executive Board members (elected officers) headed up divisions, rather than the entire Executive Committee. John responded that this follows our current practice of having Executive Committee members help in the tab room and that the new wording allows for some flexibility. John amended his own motion to “will” rather than “should” to clarify that there is an expectation (though not a requirement) for Executive Committee members to assist. **The motion passed 14-4-2.**

John proposed:

### **TRPC**

Change all references to TRPC with the following: “Electronic tabulation software as determined by the tournament director will be used.”

**The motion was passed by voice vote.**

John proposed:

### **4 Divisions**

Strike all references and sections pertaining to the 4 speaker novice and varsity policy divisions. Renumber remaining sections as appropriate. Rename the NSS division, Novice Policy Debate and the VSS division Varsity Policy Debate

Steve G. asked what would happen if four-person were to return. John explained that it is unlikely and that this eliminates uncertainty. **The motion was passed by voice vote.**

John proposed:

### **Speaker Awards**

Add PF speaker awards to the top ~~5~~ **10**.

Change all speaker awards to the top ~~5~~ **10** speakers.

The current rule says speaker awards to the top 4.

Insert the following: Speaker placement based on the following tiebreakers in PF and LD: ~~Total points~~, Highlow points, **total points**, and double highlow points. If a tie still exists, duplicate awards will be given.

In Policy debate insert the following: ~~Total points~~, Highlow points, **total points**, double highlow points, ranks, highlow ranks, and double highlow ranks. If a tie still exists, duplicate awards will be given.

John responded to questions regarding speaker awards to clarify state tournament practices and costs. Steve S. recommended that we not break ties. John amended his proposal to place high-low before total points. John accepted a friendly amendment to change top 5 to top 10. **The motion was passed by voice vote.**

The President Elect (Matt Cekanor) temporarily assumed the chair.

John proposed to strike standing rule 240.10 sections B and D and to relabel C. Further, to add 240.20 as follows:

1. Paperless teams must have at least one working USB flash drive that is compatible with both mac and PC computers. This drive should be located before the first speech or time to look for it will be considered prep time. The paperless team has an obligation to provide a copy of the evidence read in the round to their opponents. The paperless team can provide this copy on a viewing computer, a hard copy if available, or a jumped electronic file, provided the jumped file is acceptable to the opposing team and they have a computer from which to access it. A viewing computer is defined as an extra device with at least a 7" screen that the document can be viewed on or the speaker giving their opponents the computer used during the speech. If the latter is executed, the laptop must be handed to their opponents at the conclusion of each of their speeches.
2. In policy debate, if all planned pieces of evidence are not be jumped before the speech/provided on a viewing computer, then the time to facilitate this transfer after the speech will be deducted from the speaking team's prep time. The additional evidence must be jumped immediately after the conclusion of the speech.
3. A USB drive is the only approved method of file sharing permitted by the WDCA. Wireless communication between teams and/or judges is not an approved practice.
4. Only pieces of evidence that the debater reasonably plans to read in the speech should be jumped (no jumping of entire aff or neg files). This evidence should be jumped in the order the debater intends to read it. Egregious violations of this rule may be grounds for the judge to decrease the weight given to that

- team's arguments. It is also grounds for the opposing team to make a formal allegation of nonexistent evidence. Failure to share read evidence is also grounds for a formal allegation of nonexistent evidence.
5. Evidence flashed to the opposing team must contain full citations, in MLA format. Any evidence that does not conform to this expectation is subject to a claim of falsification as outlined in the standing rules.
  6. It is not required that paperless teams share the text of their case with the other team. However, any evidence utilized, whether by quotation or parenthetical reference must have proper citations available. It is strongly suggested that each narrative case includes a works cited page.
  7. In policy debate, time to jump speeches is a part of the prep time allotted to each time. The WDCA does not recognize "off time prep" as a valid, appropriate, acceptable, or actual practice. Prep time ends when the USB drive is given to the other team.
  8. At the end of the debate, debaters may not save anything jumped to them by their opponents without explicit permission. Violation of this rule may result in disqualification from the tournament upon an allegation made to the WSDT Director by the coach of either team.
  9. If the viewing computer malfunctions in some way, both teams have the responsibility of using reasonable steps to rectify the situation without prep time being utilized. If necessary, the paperless team must supply a different viewing computer.
  10. If a paperless debater has a technical failure during their speech, the debater may request the speech be paused and prep time be used to rectify the situation. The speech time will resume from the paused time when the speech resumes.
  11. When evidence is requested by the opposing team, the full article and/or complete URL must be made immediately available per rule 210.0
  12. A violation of these rules follows the procedures laid out in the evidence guidelines.

In response to a question from Dave, John indicated that these rules apply to debaters and not to judges. Further, he explained that the reference to MLA format is in keeping with our current rules. Nick commented that this applies specifically to policy rather than the other divisions, and that by passing this, we would be making it a standing rule that would apply to all divisions, which is not warranted. Extensive discussion occurred regarding this. John accepted amendments to #2 and #7 to add "In policy debate," to the beginning of the paragraph. **The motion passed by voice vote.**

John proposed

### **New Evidence Standards Proposed Fall 2016 Replacing rule 210.10**

(1) Definitions:

A. Evidence is any statistic, idea, example, conclusion, etc., that is attributable to another person or persons.

B. Source Citation. Debaters must, at a minimum, orally provide the author's last name and date when introducing evidence in a round. After introducing the evidence, students may reference the evidence by using the author's name and year, or argument position within the contention (or a combination thereof) to specifically indicate which arguments are attributed to which author. Full written citations must be available and presented if requested by the opponent and/or judge.

C. Written source citation. A written source citation must contain all information provided in the original source material, including but not limited to:

Full name of the primary author(s) and qualifications

Publication Date

Source

Title

Date accessed (if digital evidence)

Full URL if applicable

Page number(s)

D. Paraphrasing. If a debater chooses a parenthetical reference for evidence, the same evidence standards apply to quoted evidence.

(2) Types of Violations

A. Distortion occurs when the evidence contains added and/or deleted words that substantially alters the original conclusions of the author(s).

B. Nonexistent evidence is one or more of the following:

a. The debater citing the evidence is unable to produce it when requested by the opposing team, judge or tournament official.

b. The source provided does not contain the evidence cited.

c. The evidence is referenced parenthetically but lacks an original source to verify the information.

d. The debater has the original source but refuses to provide it to their opponent, the judge or a tournament official, in a timely fashion as outlined in these rules.

e. The debater fails to present a full citation when requested.

C. Clipping. When a debater claims to have read more of a piece of evidence than was actually read in the round.

D. Straw Argument. Intentionally reading evidence that argues a position that the primary author(s) presents for the purpose of refuting it, while, in fact, advocating for a different position.

(3). Penalties

A. The penalty for an evidence violation is loss of the round. In the case of a violation of rule (2), B (nonexistent evidence), the violating team has 10 minutes to produce the evidence for the WSDT Director or their designee upon notification of the violation. If the team does not produce the evidence in that time period, that team will be disqualified from the tournament.

a. In the case of an inadvertent violation of (D) (Straw Argument) above, the judge must disregard the evidence presented, however the offending team does not forfeit the round.

B. Results from previous rounds will not be reversed if an evidence violation results in a loss/disqualification to a team.

C. A second evidence violation in a subsequent round during the WSDT will result in an automatic disqualification for that team.

(4). PROCEDURES

~~A. If a team believes its opponent has committed an evidence violation, it must raise the issue to the judge during the round, during a speech, by stating it is making a formal allegation. The judge MAY NOT end the round prematurely. If the judge finds that a violation has occurred, he/she must indicate that on their ballot and report the violation to the WSDT Director before submitting their ballot on paper or electronically. The judge must complete an RFD as if no violation occurred.~~

~~1. A team may make an allegation following the final speech only if that speech was given by the opposing team. In that case, the judge must evaluate the allegation.~~

~~B. Any and all evidence that is presented during the round must be made available to the opponent(s) and/or judge. When requested, the original source must be made available to the opponent before the requesting team's next speech. If time is required to locate the evidence, it will be deducted from the requested team's allotment of prep time. If no prep time remains, time is to be deducted from that team's next speech. If no speech time remains, the team is guilty of a violation of (2) B as stated above. When requested by the judge, at the conclusion of the round, the original source must be made available to the judge within 5 minutes.~~

~~(1) If the issue is raised following rule 4 (A) (1) above, the evidence should be made available within 5 minutes of the request.~~

C. Rounds with panels of multiple judges

In a round heard by multiple judges, the same rules apply. Each judge should evaluate the violation independently and render a decision. Judges may not consult each other during this process. If a majority



~~of the panel decides that a violation has occurred, the penalties for the violation will be enforced. If a majority of the panel decides a violation has not occurred, then the majority decision of the panel will stand.~~

~~D. The WSDT Director will notify coaches of both teams when an allegation has been made in a round as soon as possible.~~

(5). Appeals

A. Coaches may only appeal a decision on the grounds that the judge has ignored, misapplied and/or misinterpreted a rule in deciding an evidence violation raised in the round.

B. Coaches may not make an allegation of a violation that was not made by the debaters in the round.

C. Upon notification of a violation from the WSDT Director, coaches have 10 minutes to submit an appeal in writing.

~~D. An appeals committee comprised of the WSDT Director, Judging Standards and Ethics Committee Chair and the~~ **WDCA President, Past President, and President Elect** will read the appeal and interview all related parties (coaches, judge(s) and teams) as soon as possible and render a decision before the conclusion of the next round. The appeals committee's sole responsibility is to decide if the judge ignored, misapplied and/or misinterpreted the evidence violation rules.

~~a. When a judge's decision is overturned:~~

~~i. An original decision of no violation becomes a forfeit loss for the offending team and bye win for their opponent~~

~~ii. An original decision of a violation uses the decision on the ballot as outlined in rule 4(A) above.~~

E. If the evidence violation and appeal happen during elimination rounds, a final decision must be made before the next elimination round may begin.

F. If the evidence violation occurs in the final round, all debaters, coaches and judges are asked to remain for 10 minutes following the announcement of the decision in case an appeal is filed.

G. The decision of the appeal committee is final and binding.

H. If any member of the appeals committee has a conflict of interest (coach of one of the teams, hiring coach of the judge, etc.), members of the Executive Committee will be substituted in this order:

~~President Elect, Past President,~~ Secretary, Treasurer, New Coaches Committee Chair, Novice Packet Committee Chair, Media and Communications Committee Chair, WSDT Operations Director.

and the motion was seconded. He explained the problems with our current procedures and that the NDSA rules were consulted in fashioning these proposed rules. John then moved to amend the motion by the substitution of the following for section 4:

1. A team may make a formal allegation of an evidence violation during any of their speeches by indicating to the judge(s) that they are making an allegation and state the specific violation(s) they believe the other team to be guilty of. The following procedures must be used by the judge.
  - a. **Once a team has made a specific allegation the judge must stop the round. Novice judges that those making a formal allegation understand the possible results of doing so.**
  - b. **After verifying that a formal allegation is being made,** the judge must examine the evidence in question and render a decision regarding the allegation.
  - c. If the judge determines that the allegation is legitimate and a violation has occurred, the team committing the violation receives a loss by forfeit.
  - d. If the judge determines that the allegation is not legitimate and no violation has occurred, the team making the allegation receives a loss by forfeit.

- e. After rendering a decision on the ballot, the judge must inform both teams of the decision as well as the WSDT Director.
2. A team may question the credibility or value of a piece of evidence without making a formal allegation. These informal allegations do not require the judge to end the round and are evaluated the same way as any other argument presented.
3. A team or coach may make a formal allegation following the round if one was not raised during the round only for nonexistent evidence. This allegation must be made to the WSDT Director within 10 minutes of the collection of the last ballot of the round in that division. The judge(s) will be required to evaluate the formal allegation if at all possible. If the judge(s) are not available, the appeals committee (WDCA President, Past President, and President Elect) is authorized to decide if the allegation is legitimate by majority vote. The team losing the challenges receives a loss by forfeit.

and the following for section 2 D a:

If a judge's decision is overturned and a formal allegation upheld, the challenged team receives a forfeit loss. If a judge's decision is overturned and a formal allegation is not upheld, the challenging team receives a forfeit loss.

and the motion was seconded.

The President resumed the chair.

John explained that the amendment raises the stakes for making an accusation. John fielded questions as to how this procedure would work. John made a friendly amendment "After verifying that a formal allegation is being made," and accepted a friendly amendment "Novice judges should verify that those making a formal allegation understand the possible results of doing so."

### **The amendment passed by voice vote.**

Discussion moved on to the main motion. John accepted a friendly amendment from Tim to replace the membership of the appeals committee with "WDCA President, Past-President, and President-Elect" in both Section D and in subparagraph 3 of the amended paragraph 4 and that President-Elect and Past-President be eliminated from the substitution list in Section H. John also asked that this addendum for E be included:

Original source(s) defined. Understanding that teams/individuals obtain their evidence in multiple ways, the original source for evidence may include, but is not limited solely to, one of the following:

- a. Accessing the live or displaying a copy of a web page (teams/individuals may access the Internet to provide this information if requested).

- b. A copy of the pages preceding, including, and following or the actual printed (book, periodical, pamphlet, etc.) source.
- c. Copies or electronic versions of published handbooks (i.e., Baylor Briefs; Planet Debate, etc.).
- d. Electronic or printed versions or the webpage for a debate institute or the NDCA sponsored Open Evidence Project or similar sites.
- e.. Regardless of the form of material used to satisfy the original source requirement, debaters are responsible for the content and accuracy of all evidence they present and/or read.

and the motion was seconded.

### **The addition of the addendum for E passed by voice vote.**

The President-Elect assumed the chair.

John moved the addendum of the following to 210.4 (B) (2):

In Public Forum debate, teams have a reasonable time, to produce the evidence in accordance with 210.10 (1) E. The time required to find the evidence is not counted as prep time and should not be excessive.

and the motion was seconded.

### **The addendum passed by voice vote.**

John moved to add to the procedural rules for each division the requirement that when pairing rounds, an incomplete bracket is filled by drawing from the middle of the bracket below, which may pull up a team multiple times during a tournament. There was discussion and responses to questions. **The addendum passed by voice vote.**

Discussion proceeded to the main motion. **The main motion passed by voice vote.**

The invite to the state tournament will be out in a couple weeks. There will be online speed balloting this year. Doris would like feedback on the possible food options. It was decided that results will be available to coaches right after rounds, even though ballots will not be obtainable until later.

### **Judging Standards and Ethics**

Mike reported that WFCA will be adopting a judge's oath with a number of expectations in it, and which judges will be asked to sign. Something like this might be advisable for us as well.

Matt passed along that Miloran wanted all coaches to be reminded that coaches/judges and students may not fraternize because of the seriousness of sexual harassment and legal considerations.

### **Novice Packet**

Miranda has sent out the packet to novice policy coaches, and it will go up on the website today, including a printable copy for paper. Any comments or concerns should be directed to her. Minor changes would need to be made right away. She has already gotten feedback that more topicality violations being included would be a good idea.

### **New Coaches**

Steve G. invited new coaches or anyone who knows of possible new coaches to contact him. He will get in touch with these people.

### **Old Business**

We need to vote again to amend constitutional bylaws Article III Section VII to read:

Any coach or assistant coach, **as indicated on the membership registration form**, whose school holds a voting membership shall be eligible to hold an elected position.

Nick noted this has already been changed on the form. **The change passed on a voice vote.**

### **New Business**

Matt announced the appointment of a Technology Study Committee, with himself as the Chair. Other coaches wishing to join the committee should talk to him.

Matt mentioned that Stephanie has expressed the value of applying the current PF practice of allowing first-year-out judges to all divisions—with a notation of who the first-year judges are—in light of our limited judging pool. There was discussion. Matt moved to change the standing rules to eliminate 220.10 K and re-letter the other paragraphs.

~~K. No judge who completed his or her high school studies during the previous academic year may be used to judge any varsity policy or Lincoln Douglas round at the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament.~~

The motion **passed by voice vote.**

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 12:32 p..m

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Devine  
WDCA Secretary