Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association

**Minutes**

June 7, 2020

Online Meeting

**Voting schools represented:** Rufus King, Janesville Parker, La Crosse Central, Brookfield East, Homestead, Marquette, West Bend, Fort Atkinson, Sheboygan North, Bradley Tech, Brookfield Central, Waukesha South, Cudahy, Madison West, Middleton, Madison Memorial, Verona, Neenah, Madison East, Reagan

The meeting was called to order by President Ben Hamburger at 1:08 p.m.

**President**

Ben H. made note of the difficult times in which we are meeting and read the WDCA statement on issues related to race and violence, which has also been posted on our web site. Ernest Chomicki pointed out that he hoped this would also be directed to all coaches and students of color, and that sentiment was agreed to by Ben H.

Ben H. also expressed thanks for the opportunity to have served in the position of President for the past year and for the support and help all have given him.

**President Elect**

Ben Sauer had no report.

**Secretary**

Brian Devine moved to approve the minutes, and the motion was seconded. **The motion passed by voice vote.**

The calendar was then presented.

Tournaments marked “confirmed” have been confirmed as “traditional weekends” as defined in the WDCA Standing Rules 200.10 (1) A., based on the 2019-20 season.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **September** | | |
| 5 | Fall Meeting |  |
| 12 | Marquette University HS (confirmed) | Milwaukee, WI |
| 19 | MDL at Marquette  Madison (place TBD) | Milwaukee, WI |
| 26 | Rufus King (confirmed) | Milwaukee, WI |
|  | | |
| **October** | | |
| 3 | Brookfield East HS (confirmed) | Brookfield, WI |
| 10 | Fort Atkinson (confirmed) | Fort Atkinson, WI |
| 17 | Neenah (confirmed) | Neenah, WI |
| 24 |  |  |
| 31 | Reagan/ La Crosse Central (confirmed) | Milwaukee, WI |
|  | | |
| **November** | | |
| 7 | West Bend (confirmed) | West Bend, WI |
| 13-14 | Badgerland (confirmed) | Middleton/Madison, WI |
| 21 | Sheboygan North (confirmed) | Sheboygan, WI |
| 30 | Thanksgiving Break - no tournament |  |
|  | | |
| **December** | | |
| 4-5 | Hoecherl Challenge @ Appleton East | Appleton, WI |
| 12 | Brookfield Central (confirmed) | Brookfield, WI |
| 19 | MDL Open @ Marquette | Milwaukee, WI |
| 26 | Winter Break - no tournament |  |
|  | | |
| **January** | | |
| 2 |  |  |
| 9 | NSDA Southern Quals\*  Madison PS Tournament |  |
| 16-17 | Wisconsin State Debate Tournament |  |
| 23 | MCFL Qualifier likely date\*  MDL Season Championship\* |  |
| 30 |  |  |

\* tournament not hosted or sanctioned by the WDCA; date is provided for information and is subject to change by the hosting organization.

Ben Morris offered to host a Madison meet on September 19. Ben S. mentioned that MDL will also be hosting their opening meet on that date at Marquette but had no objection to a meet in Madison.

We would still like to fill the October 24 date.

Ben Sauer indicated the MDL season championship will be on February 6.

Appleton East has indicated that the Hoecherl challenge will not be happening this year, so December 5 is now an open date.

Annabelle Arney moved to approve the calendar, and the motion was seconded. **The motion passed by voice vote.**

**Treasurer**

Dan referred the membership to a typed report that the membership could review. He walked us through those documents. Former Treasurer Miloran Robinson made one payment toward the money that WDCA had lost during her tenure and then declared bankruptcy, so other avenues are being pursued. Doris Sexton was thanked for a temporary loan that helped us get through that time. The loan has now been repaid.

In response to a question posed by Ernest, Annabelle indicated that Miloran was denied the opportunity to coach or judge for Marquette.

Ernest asked what steps are being taken to prevent a similar thing from occurring in the future. Dan responded that the statements are being reviewed monthly and that the Secretary can always check the account online. He pointed out that the best practices recommendations from John Tao continue to be a point of reference for this.

Dan said he would like to wait until September to establish a year’s worth of good records and then apply for tax exempt status. In response to a question from Ben M., Dan explained the 501c(3) status will also make us federal tax exempt.

In response to a question from Pam Brown, Dan explained that WDCA has been re-incorporated by the state of Wisconsin following the fall-out from the Miloran matter. Ben H. further explained that our status prior to that time had been undefined and not official, and this is why the state did not take an interest in us up to that time. John pointed out that a primary reason for WDCA’s existence is to host the state tournament, which is designed to be revenue neutral. If we want to take in money from donors, we would want to have the appropriate tax-deductible status.

**TPP**

John explained that for the first time, we had equity officers at state. Brian, Brittany Newman, and Ben S. filled these roles. Brittany said that there are parts of the procedure that need to be worked on but that overall it is a beneficial program. In response to a question from Ernest, Brittany explained that the ad hoc committee felt that equity officers would be good to have at state, as they have been used at NSDA and other national organizations’ tournaments.

Dan mentioned that we have the financial resources to pay outside people to serve as equity officers next year.

Ben S. indicated that he felt the process worked very well particularly in the case of Kedrick Stumbris, who has been banned from West Bend School District property and will not be allowed to participate in WDCA events. He recommended that people with professional experience in these matters should hold these positions.

Ernest questioned why everyone was not notified about the Kedrick incident at the time. Ben S. responded that those who needed to be notified were notified, and that the confidentiality of the process did need to be observed for the sake of the privacy rights of the parties involved. He further indicated that this is a good reason for the equity officers to be well versed in all these topics.

Maceon Downer responded that he felt it was a problem that he did not know why police were at the state tournament and that some limited information should have been shared with coaches.

Annabelle suggested that a separate committee be established to focus on these issues behind the scene. Ben S. agreed with this and pointed out that the ad hoc committee was not intended to have that wide of a focus beyond the equity process.

Ben H. pointed out that we will be discussing this very thing when we get to the business of the proposed constitutional amendment.

Becky Hansen explained the background of her efforts in pursuit of equity in the WDCA. She expressed several examples of frustrations that led to the establishment of equity officers at state. She related that she felt that the equity process at state this year was successful. She asked that the ad hoc committee be listened to when these issues are brought to the Executive Committee. Annabelle added that she felt that a number of female coaches and students experienced problems with toxic masculinity that should also be addressed. Becky asked that the committee present numbers as to what types of issues have been brought before it.

Brittany responded that a total of seven complaints were received by the equity officers at this year’s state tournament.

Ernest questioned why more could not be shared regarding the nature of ethics complaints. Ben S. responded that we have to respect the wishes of those bringing these things forward. He pointed out that ethical issues have personal implications beyond those of WDCA procedural violations. Ben S. said, however, that it might be possible to provide more aggregated data in the future.

Isaac Dorn responded that this places a lot of responsibility on the shoulders of students and that we should consider what our institutions are required to do under Title IX. Ben S. responded that we are not under Title IX and that students are given many options about how they want equity officers to proceed. Isaac pointed out that all of our schools are subject to Title IX, and Ben S. responded that that is why all information is given to coaches and they are involved in the process along with their student.

In response to a question from Pam, Ben H. and Becky both indicated that coaches are in a position of looking out for the best interest of their student as that individual pursues an ethics complaint. Ben S. said that students were encouraged to have someone—whether parent, coach, assistant coach, volunteer, or other—to assist them.

There was then considerable discussion about confidentiality, the progress of equity issues, and how we can move forward. There was also extensive airing of views regarding the police presence in dealing with the Kedrick situation and how that type of thing can be handled in a way the reduces any tension that might be caused.

Tim Scheffler expressed concern about a ban on Kedrick from WDCA events since he anticipates schools may want to hire him for Badgerland, and he is concerned about the legality of preventing him from being hired. Ben S. recommended having a list of persons who are not allowed to judge at tournaments. There was then considerable debate over whether the WDCA can effectively do this and what the legal ramifications might be.

Stephanie asked if our legal counsel could advise on this, and Ben S. agreed to consult them.

John Knetzger then presented his report on the running of the tournament. He presented a written report made available to all coaches. The main issue that came up was a problem with preferencing. He plans to work with several coaches to resolve this problem. Stephanie plans to consult with NSDA tournament staff who might have ideas for fixing this as well.

**Novice Packet/New Coaches**

Todd Le thanked the members of his committee. He will not be chair next year but will be available for consultation. Committee members will look into NDCA and other efforts for a national novice packet.

**Media/Communications**

David Umstot indicated that the uncertainty regarding Covid-19 may require us to use more online resources for tournaments. He encouraged coaches to let him know about anything that might work.

A Facebook page has been created, along with the already existing Facebook group. The group is open to coaches, the page to everyone.

**Judging Standards and Ethics**

Stephanie explained that she will write up notes for judges for things to be sensitive to in the format of online judging. She discussed the few issues that she had to address with individual judges. She also explained the reasons for providing the speaker points data and asked for any questions coaches would like answered.

Ernest suggested bringing back the old style ballots that have a breakdown rubric for speaker points.

Stephanie mentioned that several students had taken the online quiz, and that this is fine, although it is not required. She shared additional information about results from judges’ quizzes, although

**Old Business**

We need to vote on the constitutional amendment proposed last spring regarding. John moved its passage, and the motion was seconded. **The amendment passed by voice vote.**

**Officer Elections**

Nominations were opened for the office of President Elect. Stephanie nominated Anabelle Arney, and she accepted. Annabelle addressed the membership about her candidacy. **Annabelle was elected by voice vote.**

Nominations were opened for the office of Treasurer. John nominated Dan Hansen. **Dan was elected by voice vote.**

Nominations were opened for the office of Judging Standards and Ethics Chair. John nominated Stephanie King. **Stephanie was elected by voice vote.**

**New Business**

A Constitutional Amendment was presented from the ad hoc committee for voting in the fall. Brittany explained the intentions of the amendment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Current | Proposed |
| Constitution Article VI | **Article VI – Committees**    The WDCA shall have the following standing committees: Executive, Judging Standards and Ethics, Media Communications, New Coaches/Novice Packet/Middle School, and  Tournament Practices and Procedures/Handbook. | **Article VI – Committees**    The WDCA shall have the following standing committees: Executive, Judging Standards and Ethics, Media Communications, New Coaches/Novice Packet/Middle School,  Tournament Practices and Procedures/Handbook, and Equity. |
| Add to Constitution Article VI |  | Section VI – EQUITY    The Equity Committee shall consist of a chairperson, appointed by the President, and at least two other members appointed by the chairperson. The committee shall encourage coaches with diverse backgrounds to join the committee, research equity concerns within debate and standards implemented across the nation. The committee shall provide ongoing resources and recommendations to WDCA schools. By the deadline set by the WDCA President, the Equity Committee shall provide recommendations to the WDCA Executive Board regarding equity practices to be implemented at WDCA sanctioned events. |
| Section III of Article IX | B. Upon determination by at least one coach and the tournament director that a violation has occurred, the accused student will be prevented from further participation in that day's tournament including awards. All pertinent information and documentation will then be sent to the Ethics Committee Chairperson for review and further action. | B. Upon determination by at least one coach and the tournament director that a violation has occurred, the accused student will be prevented from further participation in that day's tournament including awards. All pertinent information and documentation will then be sent to the **Equity** Committee Chairperson for review and further action. |

Ernest raised the issue of how the chair of this committee would be chosen, stressing that coaches of color should be strongly considered. He related some of the issues he had dealt with this last year. Annabelle suggested making materials available to that chair as well as to other chairs and other coaches who might need more information on this issue. Maceon spoke of his students’ needs and pleaded with all coaches to work to help students facing these issues.

It was decided to post a poll of coaches to get input on proceeding with such a committee even before it is formally adopted as a constitutional provision.

We moved on to a set of standing rules changes proposed by Dan, and Dan summarized his reasons for this proposal to provide for Novice PF and Novice LD at state.

Change One:

Current - 300.20 Eligibility

(1) Schools whose dues are up to date in the WDCA as of December 1 and have met the qualification procures for any of the WDCA sanctioned divisions of competition (Policy Debate: Varsity and Novice; Lincoln Douglas Debate; and Public Forum Debate) are eligible to compete in the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament.

Proposed:

             300.20 Eligibility

(1) Schools whose dues are up to date in the WDCA as of December 1 and have met the qualification procedures for any of the WDCA sanctioned divisions of competition (Varsity Policy Debate, Novice Policy Debate, Varsity Lincoln Douglas Debate, Novice Lincoln Douglas Debate, Varsity Public Forum Debate, and Novice Public Forum Debate) are eligible to compete in the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament.

Change Two:

Current - 300.22 Student Participation

(1) Any debaters who qualifies for the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament in the varsity policy division and has competed in the varsity policy division at three or more tournaments during the season is not eligible to compete at any other policy division of the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament.

(2) Debaters may enter into a division higher than the division they earned a qualifying record in.

Proposed:

300.22 Student Participation

(1) Any debater~~s~~ who qualifies for the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament in a varsity division and has competed in that varsity division at three or more tournaments during the season is not eligible to compete at the corresponding novice division of the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament.

(2) Debaters may enter into a division higher than the division they earned a qualifying record in. Debaters that have exactly one qualification from a novice division and one qualification from a varsity division may enter either state division.

Change Three:

 Current - 330.10  Divisions

(1)  Varsity divisions are offered in Policy, Lincoln-Douglas, and Public Forum.

(2)  Novice divisions are offered in Policy. Novice is defined as a high school student debating their first high school resolution. Students with identified exceptional educations needs may remain in the Novice division beyond their first high school resolution at the discretion of the coach. Should this rule be invoked, the coach must notify the WSDT Tournament Director by the registration deadline.

Proposed:

330.10  Divisions

(1)  Varsity and Novice divisions are offered in Policy, Lincoln-Douglas, and Public Forum.

(2)  ~~Novice divisions are offered in Policy.~~ Novice is defined as a student debating in their first high school season. Students with identified exceptional education~~s~~ needs may remain in a Novice division beyond their first high school resolution at the discretion of the coach. Should this rule be invoked, the coach must notify the WSDT Tournament Director by the registration deadline.

Change Four:

Add the following as (3) above [in 330.10 Divisions]:

(3) In the event that the State Tournament Director, in consultation with the Executive Board, decide that a division is not viable due to a low number of entries or teams, they may combine the novice and varsity divisions of a type of debate. In such a situation, separate trophies may be given to the top ranked novice teams if deemed appropriate.

Change Five:

Current - 330.40   JUDGING OBLIGATIONS

D.      Judges in the novice or varsity policy division must submit their ballot and conclude any comments given to debaters within two hours of the announced start time for preliminary rounds, or two hours and fifteen minutes for elimination rounds. Judges in the Lincoln Douglas or Public Forum division must submit their ballot and conclude any comments given to debaters within one hour of the announced start time for preliminary or elimination rounds. Schools whose judges do not abide by this rule are subject to a fine of $15. A judge may be removed from the judging pool for repeated violations, following the procedures in the adjudicator guidelines.

Proposed:

330.40   JUDGING OBLIGATIONS

D.      Judges in the ~~novice or varsity~~ policy divisions must submit their ballot and conclude any comments given to debaters within two hours of the announced start time for preliminary rounds, or two hours and fifteen minutes for elimination rounds. Judges in the Lincoln Douglas or Public Forum divisions must submit their ballot and conclude any comments given to debaters within one hour of the announced start time for preliminary or elimination rounds. Schools whose judges do not abide by this rule are subject to a fine of $15. A judge may be removed from the judging pool for repeated violations, following the procedures in the adjudicator guidelines.

Ernest also spoke to the opportunity this offers for expanding and promoting debate.

Tim asked for clarification about whether any changes would be made regarding qualification for novices partnered with varsity debaters at invitationals. Dan said that at this time he is not proposing a change in this, but someone could initiate that if they wanted to.

Tim spoke in opposition, explaining that it is a better incentive for students to work their way up to varsity before going to state. He pointed out that it might create a large school/small school skew.

Dan responded that there is already a skew, and that this change is partially in response to the requests of small schools.

Justin Flynn indicated that 17 out of 19 of his students that were polled opposed this. They expressed concern about varsity members prepping the novices, generating a skew.

Doris liked that this would increase the number of kids involved but said she does not think this is the way to do it. She suggested having a separate novice event. Maceon expressed agreement with that sentiment but stressed that novices should have some way of being recognized. Ernest noted this is done in some other states with a separate novice tournament.

Dan expressed openness to this but said we should still pass his changes to make such a separate meet possible.

Sam Larson said he was leaning against the change because of the large school/small school skew.

Doris argued against passing the rules prior to deciding on the separate novice tournament.

Ben H. suggested it made more sense to just have a non-sanctioned invitational for novices that could be an unofficial novice state tournament.

Doris pointed out West Bend is already close to capacity for the state tournament.

Annabelle pointed out that the novice tournament will get the reputation as a tournament that is less legitimate.

Tim suggested break-out novice brackets or awards to recognize their success rather than a separate division.

Annabelle expressed a concern that we should consider what is best for all schools and not only think from a position of privilege.

Brittany supported Tim’s suggestion of special awards for novice within the overall division at state.

Ernest indicated a concern that he has is that judges are switched between PF and LD too often. He further expressed concern about equity between big and small schools, given the camaraderie big schools and may lead to more wins.

Dan posited that this is big schools telling small schools they are doing fine and nothing needs to change.

Isaac suggested having a junior varsity division to ease the transition from novice to varsity. Dan opposed this because it would unequal for the three styles of debate. Kaija pointed out that the divisions are already very unequal and this introducing JV would make them more similar.

Annabelle supported the notion of having novice for policy, but JV for PF and LD.

Dan will write up a new proposal for the fall and withdrew his current motion.

Dan moved the following change to the standing rules, and the motion was seconded:

Current - 200.51 Novice Policy Debate Argument Limits

(1) Plan texts in the novice division are restricted to those in the official packet. Until a date determined by the Executive Committee, the counterplan and kritik may not be run. Negative teams may use only one counterplan and kritik in a round, even when multiple counterplans or kritiks are contained in the novice packet. Negative teams may not alter the text of the counterplan, the concept being kritiked, nor the alternative of the kritik. The penalty for reading two counterplans or two kritiks in the same debate round is a loss per (2) below.

Proposed:

200.51 Novice Policy Debate Argument Limits

(1) Plan texts in the novice division are restricted to those in the official packet. Until a date determined by the Executive Committee, the counterplan and kritik may not be run. Negative teams may use only one counterplan and kritik in a round, even when multiple counterplans or kritiks are contained in the novice packet. Negative teams may not alter the text of the counterplan, the concept being kritiked, nor the alternative text of the kritik. The penalty for reading two counterplans or two kritiks in the same debate round is a loss per (2) below.

Dan explained the reason for this clarifying change. A few clarifying questions were answered. **The motion was passed by voice vote.**

Dan moved the following change to the standing rules, and the motion was seconded:

- 200.51 Novice Policy Debate Argument Limits

(2) In the event that a negative counterplan text or kritik is presented from outside the novice packet, the judge should not consider that argument in their decision, regardless of whether the issue is raised in the debate. If the affirmative team presents a plan text that is not found in the novice evidence packet they should receive a loss. It is not required for the opposing team to make this claim to the judge. Judges must notify the ~~WSDT~~ Tournament Director who will enter the appropriate result into the computer system. The ~~WSDT~~ Tournament Director or Novice Packet committee chair will notify all involved coaches.

~~(3) Tournament directors at sanctioned tournaments should enforce these novice evidence packet restrictions.~~

             Renumber (4) as (3).

Note: (3) is not needed as section 200 rules apply to sanctioned tournaments.

- 210.10. Evidence Standards, (3) Penalties, Letter A

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~~ Tournament 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.

- 210.10. Evidence Standards, (3) Penalties, Letter E

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

-210.10. Evidence Standards, (4) Formal Allegation, letter e

e.   After rendering a decision, the judge must inform both teams of the decision as well as the ~~WSDT~~ Tournament Director. The ~~WSDT~~ Tournament Director will enter the appropriate result into the computer system; the judge should not enter a result on the ballot. The coaches of both teams will be notified of the decision before the start of the next round.

-210.10. Evidence Standards, (5) Appeals, letter C

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

210.10 Evidence Standards, (5) Appeals letter D and H  [requires restructuring]

Current:

D. An appeals committee comprised of 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. 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.

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: Secretary, Treasurer, New Coaches Committee Chair, Media and Communications Committee Chair, WSDT Tournament Director.

Proposed:

D. A three-person appeals committee 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. 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.

b. At the WSDT, the appeals committee is comprised of the WDCA President, President Elect, and Chair of the Judging Standards and Ethics Committee

 H. At the WSDT, 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: Secretary, Treasurer, New Coaches Committee Chair, Media and Communications Committee Chair, WSDT Tournament Director.

-230.10 Ethics and Grievance Procedure, (1) and (2)

(1) The concerned parties shall discuss the problem fully and settle the issue with the aid of the ~~WSDT~~ Tournament Director, if necessary, regarding issues not addressed within the Evidence Standards section.

(2) If the issue cannot be settled in accordance with the above, then the concerned parties and the ~~WSDT~~ Tournament Director shall file written statements with the WDCA Executive committee. The committee shall evaluate the issue, contact the concerned parties, and mediate a settlement. The committee shall then draft written documentation of the mediated settlement and issue copies to the concerned parties involved and the WDCA Executive Committee.

-240.10 Technology Use, (1) (A)

             Current:

A. Once the debate has begun, a team may not receive assistance, suggestions, or coaching from anyone while the round is in progress. This does not prevent debate partners from helping one another, but does prevent outside persons from helping a team during the course of a debate. Debaters may not receive electronic assistance from outside sources or perform electronic research during the course of a debate. If the judge is able to determine that a violation has occurred, the judge should notify the tournament director. Following notification, the WSDT Tournament Director will convene with the WDCA President and Judging Standards and Ethics Chair. This committee will then determine whether or not the team using the digital communication technology shall receive a warning, lose the round or be disqualified from the tournament. A second violation results in immediate disqualification. After rendering a decision, both coaches of the teams involved and the judge will be notified of the decision.

a. If any members have a conflict of interest (coach of one of the teams, hiring coach of judge, etc) members of the Executive Committee will be substituted in this order: President-elect, Secretary, Treasurer, New Coaches Committee Chair, Media and Communications Chair.

Proposed:

A. Once the debate has begun, a team may not receive assistance, suggestions, or coaching from anyone while the round is in progress. This does not prevent debate partners from helping one another, but does prevent outside persons from helping a team during the course of a debate. Debaters may not receive electronic assistance from outside sources or perform electronic research during the course of a debate. If the judge is able to determine that a violation has occurred, the judge should notify the tournament director. Following notification, the ~~WSDT~~ Tournament Director will convene with the three-person appeals committee. This committee will then determine whether or not the team using the digital communication technology shall receive a warning, lose the round or be disqualified from the tournament. A second violation results in immediate disqualification. After rendering a decision, both coaches of the teams involved and the judge will be notified of the decision.

a. At the WSDT, the Tournament Director’s committee will consist of themselves, the WDCA President, and Judging Standards and Ethics Chair. If any members have a conflict of interest (coach of one of the teams, hiring coach of judge, etc) members of the Executive Committee will be substituted in this order: President-elect, Secretary, Treasurer, New Coaches Committee Chair, Media and Communications Chair.

Ben H. raised the question of enforcement, and Dan acknowledged that was an ongoing debate. But he recommended at least clarifying the rules in the meantime. **The motion passed by voice vote.**

John moved the following change to the standing rules, and the motion was seconded:

330.20 QUALIFICATION PROCEDURES

A. Debaters shall qualify for the WSDT by obtaining a better than

.500 record in the preliminary rounds at two or more sanctioned tournaments in one division. If a student obtains a better than .500 record at two sanctioned tournaments in one division, they cannot attend the WSDT in a different division unless they are moving from novice policy to varsity policy. Schools must compete at three or more sanctioned tournaments, only one of which may be a local tournament [as provided in 300.20(2)]. Qualification runs with the debater, not the pair, in partnership events.

B.  Schools may qualify an unlimited number of debaters.

C.  Schools who have not qualified at least two entries for the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament in a particular division may qualify two entries for that division (each comprised of the same two students) by each student obtaining an even (.500) win/loss record or better at any two WDCA sanctioned tournaments in the division.

Proposed:

A. Debaters shall qualify for the WSDT by obtaining a better than

.500 record in the preliminary rounds at two or more sanctioned tournaments in one division. Qualification is not transferable to a different style of debate (e.g., PF to LD).  A qualifying leg in a Varsity Division may not be used in a novice division.  A qualifying leg in a Novice division may be used to earn qualification in a Varsity division (A debater may always “debate up”.)  Schools must compete at three or more sanctioned tournaments, only one of which may be a local tournament [as provided in 300.20(2)]. Qualification runs with the debater, not the pair, in partnership events.

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

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Devine

WDCA Secretary