

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association

Minutes

April 28, 2018

Vilas Hall, UW-Madison

Voting schools represented: West Bend, Fort Atkinson, Brookfield East, Golda Meir, Janesville Parker, Middleton, North Division, Homestead, Marquette, Rufus King, LaCrosse Central, Madison West, Madison Memorial, Brookfield Central, Sussex Hamilton, Appleton East

The Secretary received a communication from Appleton East appointing Miloran Robinson their proxy for today.

The meeting was called to order by President Matt Cekanor at 9:16 a.m.

President

Matt expressed appreciation for his experience as President and for all in the debate community.

President-Elect

Kedrick Stumbris was unable to be with us today due to a work commitment.

The floor was opened for nominations for President-Elect. John Knetzger nominated Dan Hansen. Dan accepted. Miloran nominated Ashveer Singh. Ashveer accepted but then withdrew. Matt nominated Ben Hamburger, and he accepted.

It was moved that we close nominations, and it was seconded. There being no objection, nominations were closed.

The three nominees were invited to address the organization, and each did so. **Ben Hamburger was elected President-Elect.**

The floor was opened for nominations for Treasurer. David Umstot nominated Miloran Robinson. Miloran accepted the nomination. Doris Sexton nominated Stephanie King. Stephanie declined to run. Brittany Newman nominated Tim Scheffler, and it was reported by his proxy that Tim accepted. It was moved that nominations be closed. There being no objection, nominations were closed.

Steve Sexton expressed strong disapproval of Tim's service as Treasurer. Doris, Stephanie, and Matt added specific concerns about checks not being deposited, scholarships not being paid, and the like.

Peter Yang spoke in Tim's defense, saying that an address issue was the likely explanation. He said that Madison Memorial's debate finances have gone well for years. He reminded us that Tim is a lawyer and can best handle working with the IRS. Miloran responded that she was not paid for months for judging for Tim at a tournament and then was finally paid in cash.

It was moved to end discussion, and the motion was seconded. **The motion to end discussion was approved by voice vote.**

Miloran Robinson was elected Treasurer.

Past President

Miloran thanked those who stepped in to organize the choosing and awarding of scholarships.

Dan Hansen was inducted into the Hall of Fame.

Secretary

Brian Devine moved to approve the minutes from the Fall and Special meetings, and the motion was seconded. **It was approved by voice vote.**

The following schedule was proposed:

September 8	Fall Meeting
September 15	Marquette H.S.
September 22	Madison (at either East or UW)
September 29	Golda Meir
October 6	Rufus King
October 12-13	La Crosse Central (Friday/Saturday)
October 20	Brookfield East

October 27	Open MDL
November 3	West Bend
November 9-10	Badgerland
November 17	No Frills
November 30-December 1	Appleton East Challenge
December 8	Fort Atkinson
December 15	North Division
January 5	NDSA at Marquette (plus last ditch)
January 12	Southern CFL at West Bend
January 18-19	WSDT at West Bend

It was moved and seconded to approve the calendar, and **the motion was approved by voice vote.**

Treasurer

Miloran will prepare a report for the fall meeting or maybe even during the summer.

New Coaches/Novice Packet

Miranda Ehrlich was not able to be with us.

Judging Standards and Ethics

Ben suggested we discuss these issues under the New Business heading.

TPP

We likely made about \$2,000 from the state tournament. John mentioned a few judge issues he dealt with. He thanked Doris for hosting.

John moved the following change to the standing rules:

Current:

200.30 TOURNAMENT RESULTS

- (1) Tournament Directors are required to send the Tournament Director's Form and a copy of the results to the WSDT Tournament Director within one week following his or her tournament.
- (2) Returning these forms is required to retain sanctioned status for the following year

Proposed:

200.30 TOURNAMENT RESULTS

- (1) Tournament Directors are required to post a list of debaters earning a leg to the WSDT within one week following his or her tournament in a manner prescribed by the WSDT Director.
- (2) Completing this step is required to retain sanctioned status for the following year.

and it was seconded and **passed by voice vote.**

John moved the following change to the standing rules:

Current:

300.21 PARTICIPATION

- (1) The Tournament Director shall post registration information and forms on the Web site by November 1.

Proposed:

300.21 PARTICIPATION

- (1) The Tournament Director shall post registration information and forms on the Web site by December 1.

and it was seconded and **passed by voice vote.**

John moved the following change to the standing rules:

Current:

- (3) Host A. The responsibilities of the Tournament Host include providing: the site, shuttles, food service, hospitality for coaches and judges at all sites (near the tab room), tab room, computer room, results consolidation room (stuffing envelopes), duplication services, computer set up, room availability with clear labeling, medical service, registration area, a list of local motels and tournament rates, a list of qualified judges from the local area, and hall monitors runners.

Proposed:

- (3) Host A. The responsibilities of the Tournament Host include providing: the site, shuttles, food service, hospitality for coaches and judges at all sites (near the tab room), tab room, computer

room, results consolidation room (stuffing envelopes), duplication services, computer set up, room availability with clear labeling, medical service, registration area, a list of local hotels and tournament rates, a list of qualified judges from the local area, and hall monitors/runners.

and was seconded and **passed by voice vote.**

John moved the following change to the standing rules:

Current:

340.10 NOVICE POLICY DIVISION

(2) WSDT Operations A. The novice 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 v-r powerpaired rounds. An incomplete bracket is filled by drawing from the middle of the bracket below

Proposed:

(2) WSDT Operations A. The novice 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 in preliminary rounds. The novice tournament shall consist of two randomly paired rounds. Rounds 3-6 are paired high-low in brackets as determined by the tie breakers in the order established in the rules. An incomplete bracket is filled by drawing from the middle of the bracket below.

It was seconded and **passed by voice vote.**

New Business

John moved the following change to the standing rules:

300.23 Judge Participation (New section)

Proposed:

1. In order to be eligible to judge during the WSDT, a judge must be certified in the division they are registered to judge in., e.g., a judge in PF must complete PF certification, even if they have completed LD certification previously.
2. Training and assessment will be developed and maintained by the TPP and Judging Standards and Ethics committees.
3. The WSDT Director shall be responsible for maintaining a list of certified judges and publishing that list by the WSDT entry registration deadline
4. The Executive Committee shall decide, by majority vote, on the method of assessment for certification before the Fall Meeting each year .
5. Once a judge is certified, their certification shall not expire except as provided below.
 - a. A judge violating the adjudicator guidelines during a sanctioned WDCA tournament may be required to be recertified in order to judge at the WSDT.
 - b. The Judging Standards and Ethics Committee shall be responsible for evaluating judge violations and determining if certification should expire as a consequence.

6. Any uncertified judge registered for the WSDT will not be permitted to judge until they are certified. The school of such a judge will incur a fine equal the missing judge fee for each round the judge is unable to judge.
7. A judge may complete certification during the WSDT and be eligible to enter the judging pool at that point.
8. Head and assistant coaches must be certified.

The motion was seconded. John explained the rationale. Considerable debate over the advisability of this approach then occurred. John and Stephanie fielded questions as to the logistics of the certification process. One area of particular focus was whether those who have been involved in the activity for many years should need to comply with the certification requirement. The debate continued for an extended time. Ben and Steve both suggested that the certification process only be used for those with complaints registered. Stephanie proposed adding:

9. Any individuals who have been a part of the division they are judging, either as a competitor, judge, or coach for two years or more are automatically certified and do not need to complete certification unless they have been sanctioned.

John accepted this as a friendly amendment.

In response to a question from Ashveer, Stephanie explained this will not deal with paradigm preferences, only the actual requirements of judging the round.

The question was called, and this motion was seconded. The motion to call the question **passed by voice vote**. The main motion then **passed by voice vote**.

Dan moved to make the following change to the standing rules.

Copy 3 B and C from the section on LD and apply to the corresponding sections dealing with novice policy.

and the motion was seconded. There was considerable discussion about the value of doing this as well as what the logistics for it would be.

The question was called, and the motion was seconded. The motion to call the question **passed by voice vote**. The main motion then **passed by voice vote**.

Brian moved the following change to the standing rules:

~~C. 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 my majority vote. The team losing the challenges receives a loss by forfeit.~~

and the motion was seconded. Debate proceeded over whether this change would remedy the problems that occurred at the state tournament over allegations of nonexistent evidence. This debate went on for some time.

The question was called and this was seconded. The motion to call the question **passed by voice vote**. The motion **passed by voice vote**.

John withdrew his “proposal 3” until a future date.

Stephanie moved the following change to the standing rules:

200.20

Current:

While mavericks are disallowed at the WSDT, directors of invitational tournaments may allow mavericks to compete. However, such debaters are not eligible to win any rounds debated as a maverick.

Proposed:

Maverick debaters in team events may be permitted to debate by the tournament director and may also win the round they debate in. These debaters may not, however, earn a qualifying leg to the WSDT when debating alone and may not debate maverick during the WSDT.

and it was seconded. The motion **passed by voice vote**.

John moved the following change to the standing rules:

240.20

Current Language	Proposed Language
(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	(1) Paperless teams have 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 provided electronic file, if the provided 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.

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

(2) In policy debate, if all planned pieces of evidence are not provided before the speech, 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 provided immediately after the conclusion of the speech.

The entirety of (3) has been removed from the proposed standing rule change and the numbered sections have shifted up one number. For the sake of this document, similar language rather than numbers have been aligned.

(3) Only pieces of evidence that the debater reasonably plans to read in the speech should be provided (not entire aff or neg files). This evidence should be provided 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.

(4) Evidence flashed to the opposing team must contain full citations, including if applicable: author name, author qualifications, date of publication, title of publication, title of article, page number and URL. Any evidence that does not conform to this expectation is subject to a claim of falsification as outlined in the standing rules.

(5) 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.

(6) In policy debate, time to provide speeches is a part of the prep time allotted to each time. The

<p>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.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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</p>	<p>WDCA does not recognize “off time prep” as a valid, appropriate, acceptable, or actual practice. Prep time ends when the evidence is given to the other team.</p> <p>(7) At the end of the debate, debaters may not save anything provided 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.</p> <p>(8) 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.</p> <p>(9) 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.</p> <p>(10) When evidence is requested by the opposing team, the full article and/or complete URL must be made immediately available per rule 210.0</p> <p>(11) A violation of these rules follows the procedures laid out in the evidence guidelines.</p>
--	--

and it was seconded.

John pointed out that it would make sense to permit the use of email chains for the viewing of evidence, so this will be addressed more specifically as well. Stephanie suggested additional rule adjustments could be made for the fall meeting to consider.

The question was called, and this was seconded. The motion to call the question was **passed by voice vote**. The main motion was **passed by voice vote**.

Dan withdrew his “Proposal 8.”

Stephanie moved that for the 2019 WSDT, we suspend the standing rules regarding judge preferencing in varsity policy and LD and pilot the following system:

1. Teams will have the opportunity to rank all judges in order of preference, where 1 is their most preferred judge, through all judges in the pool.
2. When judges are placed into rounds, the computer will select the judge based on the ordinals assigned them by each team, using the best possible match.

The motion was seconded.

There was discussion about tournaments where this is being used and how it works. In response to a question from Brian, Stephanie agreed that if it is the will of the group, this could be made a part of the standing rules when we meet a year from now.

The motion **passed by voice vote**.

Dan moved the following change to the standing rules:

220.10 (l): *In preliminary rounds, observers are allowed unless one of the teams objects. A coach of one of the teams may always observe. Active participants cannot observe a round in their division. Once a school has no active teams in the division, its students are always allowed to watch any elimination rounds.*

and the motion was seconded. There was some discussion about the perceived advantages and disadvantages of implementing this change.

The question was called, and this was seconded. The motion to call the question passed by voice vote. The main motion **passed by voice vote**.

Dan moved that we adopt preferencing for novice policy by copying the language over from varsity and also include novice policy in the ordinal preferencing pilot.

The motion was seconded. John explained that adding preferencing for novices the judging obligations for novice would need to shift to match those in varsity. Stephanie pointed out it would also make assignment of judges for elim rounds more difficult. Ben pointed out it make impact the quality of the novice judging pool. Dan responded that at least all those judges could then be preferenced.

The motion **passed by voice vote**.

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Devine
WDCA Secretary

