

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association

Minutes

September 9 2023

Online Meeting

Schools Represented: Brookfield East, Brookfield Central, Homestead, Fort Atkinson, Janesville Parker, LaCrosse, Madison West, Marquette, Middleton, Rufus King, Regan, Sheboygan South, West Bend, Vel Phillips Memorial

The meeting was called to order by Casey Hutchenson at 9:12 a.m.

Secretary Report

Justin Flynn moved the approval of the Spring meeting minutes, and the motion was seconded.

Fall minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Justin Flynn showed the accurate calendar on the web page, and pointed people to the website's location if they had questions

Jaya Sims said Homestead will take the no frills weekend, seeing as it was vacant weekend

Treasurer's Report

Dan Hansen gave his report

Current Balance: 3699.77 as of 9/8

Bills by end of month: 539.40 web hosting, 40 DFI registration. (Balance to 3120.37)

Dan mentioned that the treasurer will get a credit card so he can buy things that require a Credit Card like web hosting fees

Actions from spring - dues increased to stop slow drain on account

Actions in fall - credit card to pay web hosting

Dan showed

Program Finances Survey Results

- 8 coaches participated.
- Avg salary for head coaches that had a non-zero salary was approx 3,000
- If assistant coaches were paid, average salary was 1500. Just under half of respondents indicated a paid assistant.
- Average team budget was 2,231 (after having tossed out the one outlier of 26k)
- Schools that fundraised typically raised between 1500 and 3000.

- Many teams didn't charge dues. Those that did charge between 15 and 50 or were subject to an umbrella school extracurricular charge above that amount.
- Students paying for hotels or travel is common.
 - About half of teams do overnight travel/hotel for state only. The rest included nationals and one other (Glenbrooks or Blake typically)
- Judges were paid between 75 and 125. 100 was the most common rate.
- Summer camp experiences were not common - zero was the most common answer; one was the highest answer.

David Henning asked if he sent said info, Dan replied yes.

Interim President Elect's Report (no new info)

No report was made

President's Report

Casey mentioned the focused group with new recruitment

Judging Standards and Ethics

Stephanie King talked about pass rates of state judging quizzes, and a basic overview just like in the spring.

Stephanie talked about the policy meeting , and gave an basic overview of her experience

Tournament Practices and Procedures

John Knetzger explained that things went well with state qualification because of the help he got from Becky Hansen, thus he thanked her respectfully

Fees for State are increased to cover food and host costs.

Novice Packet/New coaches

Stephine says the Novice packet is going well and should be done soon

New Coaches

Dan has no new coaches info

New Recruitment

Casey talked about target groups and updating the website to branch out with debate to new schools

Stephanie talked about an old coach from Milwaukee maybe starting a team

Brain Devine talked about his sister school was interested in starting a new team

Jaya talked about how Golda needed help, starting back up again

David Umstot talked about another old coach interested in making a team

Ben talked about reaching out to other schools in the west part of the state

Casey talked about using brief sets for community resources with help from the WDCA, Becky reminded copyright rules might not allow us to do that

Daid Henning brought up prices for yearly subscriptions for said briefs.

Dan and Casey mentioned about yearly subscriptions are not ideal and it would be just one month gift if the WDCA was to help out with said resources

DEI

Becky explained her summer work with CFL/NSDA DEI committees and the hot topics such as power dynamics, mis-labeling, political issues. She also said they are making a form for DEI for intake

State tournament

John said the State Tournament is happening, and it will be great.

Media/communications

David U. says he will be updating the website.

Old Business

Paywall update

Dan explained the rules are good and uphold the concerns he had with paywalls in the spring.

Removal of Elected Committee Chairs

To be added to Article III Section VIII of the WDCA Constitution

Committee chairs who are elected may be removed by a majority vote of the Executive Board.

Rationale: Appointed committee chairs serve at the pleasure of the President. There's no process in Robert's rules to deal with removal of an elected chair.

John explained this allows the board to removed people if needed to be removed

Rule was called to a vote and passes by unanimous consent

Gendered Language

Constitutional language changes would include:

SECTION II – PRESIDENT-ELECT

The President-elect shall assume the duties of the President in case of the absence of the President. The President-elect shall assist the President in ~~his/her~~ their duties. and shall issue meeting announcements.

SECTION VIII – SUCCESSION AND RESIGNATION

In the event that an Executive Board Member wishes to resign ~~his/her~~ their position, a written statement shall be sent to the Executive Board.

SECTION III – DEBATERS’ CODE OF CONDUCT

A. No debater shall engage in behavior that violates ~~his/her~~ their school's code of conduct for athletes and/or participants in extra-curricular activities.

Rational: Our standing rules and constitution contain gendered language throughout, which is exclusionary, unnecessary, and occasionally inaccurate. The singular “they” is both simpler and more inclusive.

Casey discussed this beforehand and we all agree

Rule was called to a vote and passes by unanimous consent

New Business

AI – Dan Hansen

Change to 210.10 - E

E. 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:

- i) Accessing the live or displaying a copy of a web page (teams/individuals may access the Internet to provide this information if requested).
- ii) A copy of the pages preceding, including, and following, or the actual printed (book, periodical, pamphlet, etc.) source.
- iii) Copies or electronic versions of published handbooks (i.e., Baylor Briefs,

- Planet Debate, etc.).
- iv) Electronic or printed versions or the webpage for a debate institute or the NDCA- sponsored Open Evidence Project or similar sites.
 - v) 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.
 - vi) Generative artificial intelligence cannot be cited as a source. While it may be used to guide students to articles, ideas, and sources, the original source of any quoted or paraphrased writing must be available if requested.**

Rationale: I borrowed almost all this language from the NSDA's rules for nationals this year. This rule allows AI as a tool, but makes it clear that students are not to quote it directly, nor use that as an excuse for distorted or nonexistent evidence. I understand catching AI use is currently problematic. At the very least it makes clear students are still responsible, may not plagiarize, etc. And if students are not careful with their use of AI, the enforcement mechanisms of this

Dan explained the above

Ben expressed his thought on the quality debate vs ethics

Stephine talks about how policy is different and sees where Ben is coming from, However, she thinks this is more for other forms of debate.

Brain thanks Dan for waiting until the fall and agrees with what this rule change would do

David U agrees that this is a good way to use AI as a tool and not as cheating

Rule was called to a vote and passes by 14-1-0 this does pass

Sweepstakes Awards – Stephanie King

Sweepstakes Awards: Open to suggestions where this goes.

Proposed Rule:Schools with fewer than 10 active entries as of the start of Round 1 will be eligible for team sweepstakes awards. There will be two categories of sweepstakes awards – small school and medium school. A small school is defined as schools with one or two entries. A medium school is defined as schools with three to nine entries. These should be the default categories, but the WSDT Tournament Director may redivide the categories as need for a balanced division amongst the schools with fewer than 10 entries.

Wins will be worth 6 points, Byes will be worth 3 points, and Losses will be worth 2 points. Each category will have a 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place trophy awarded to the school based upon the average points earned per entry across preliminary rounds only.

Stephine explains the above

Ben ask about large schools

Justin brings up the idea of an friendly amendment for large schools and is worried about kids getting cut, but does pursue it

Daniel brings up that 2 large teams would be like a participation award.

Ben brings up caps on team entries to help with Daniel points.

Becky brings up big teams are in almost always place in state and this is for small schools

Daniel sports the amendment and all the above for anything we can put on the principal's desks to increase support

Dan brings up equity vs equality

Casey voice concerns with being equal across the board

Tim talks about the past with sweepstakes and the issues it brings up just like with his thoughts on JV

Brain talks about the name being changed as sweepstake feeds into the bad points of school prestige vs helping new programs

An amendment for name change the name to raising school

Schools with fewer than 10 active entries as of the start of Round 1 will be eligible for Rising Program awards. There will be two categories of Rising Program awards – small school and medium school. A small school is defined as schools with one or two entries. A medium school is defined as schools with three to nine entries. These should be the default categories, but the WSDT Tournament Director may redivide the categories as needed for a balanced division amongst the schools with fewer than 10 entries.

Wins will be worth 6 points, Byes will be worth 3 points, and Losses will be worth 2 points. Each category will have a 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place award to the school based upon the average points earned per entry across preliminary rounds only.

Amendment was passed

Rule was called to a vote and passes by 11-2-0

§240.10(1)A Deletion – Stephanie King

240.10 (1) A -- Delete sentence that no longer makes sense.

- A. Once the debate has begun, Debaters may not receive electronic assistance from outside sources during the course of a debate. This includes performing electronic research during the course of a debate unless both entries in the round have reliable

internet access, a device for accessing the internet, and agree to allow internet research prior to the round beginning when in the presence of the judge. Either entry may request that research not be allowed (without explanation or justification), which should be enforced by the judge. 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.

Stephine discussed above

Rule was called to a vote and passes by unanimous consent

Judge Preferencing – John Knetzger

Current Rule:

330.50 Judge Preferencing Contingency

When a school compromises 40% of the teams in any division and the tournament director determines that judge preferencing for that division to be unworkable, the tournament director, with the approval of the executive board, may replace judge preferencing with a judge strike system for that division at the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament.

Proposed Rule: When the WSDT Director determines that judge preferencing for that division to be unworkable, the tournament director, with the approval of the executive board, may replace judge preferencing with a judge strike system for that division at the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament.

Rationale: We've had small divisions the past few years and needed to make alterations to Judge Preferencing. This codifies the flexibility needed and offers the opportunity for some level of preferencing/strikes in small divisions.

John explains this rule as seen above

Rule was called to a vote and passes by unanimous consent

Protest Committee – John Knetzger

Establish a Protest Committee

New Rule added as 330.70

Proposed Rule: Only coaches or an adult designated by the coach before the tournament begins may protest the decision of a round. Evidence allegations are handled with separate rules and not subject to this rule.

Within 15 minutes of the conclusion of the round, a protest may be submitted to the WSDT Director, following a process published before the start of the tournament. The protest should be in writing/digital format.

A decision may only be protested on grounds that the judge violated one or more adjudicator guidelines in a way that rendered their decision impartial. The protesting coach must identify the guideline they believe was violated and indicate why they feel a change in the decision is merited.

The WSDT director will convene a protest committee of 3 adults to evaluate the protest and render a decision to uphold the original decision, reverse the decision, or award a double win. A double win may not be awarded in an elimination round. Members of the WDCA Executive Committee should be utilized first, to the extent possible. Unless conflicted, the WSDT Director chairs the protest committee.

The decision of the Protest committee is final, binding, and may not be appealed.

The Protest Committee should attempt to complete their work within 30 minutes of receiving the protest.

John expresses why state was tough, and how this rule would make things run better

Daniel ask for if this is for state only, and John said it is

David H explains one typo and it is fixed regarding grammar

Stephine says this will make coaches concerns get addressed quicker we also brought up 18+ language to not allow high school students to participate

Discussion was made on wording to be grammatically correct

Rule was called to a vote and passes by unanimous consent

Judge Placement – John Knetzger

Current rule 330 (1)E, iii

Judge selections for all preliminary rounds should be solely determined by the computer program. If the computer leaves a judge slot blank, the next possible judge on the list should be selected and placed in that round

Proposed Rule: Judge selections for all preliminary rounds should be solely determined by the computer program. If the computer leaves a judge slot blank, the next possible judge on the list

should be selected and placed in that round. If a higher preferred judge is available, that judge should be utilized.

Rationale: Sometimes the computer leaves a more preferred judge out of a round. We've made a practice of changing C-C judges whenever possible, following our longstanding best practices. This rule codifies that practice and makes it more transparent.

John explains why this rule is old and needs to be changed,

John talks about where to find tournament info.

Rule was called to a vote and passes by unanimous consent

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin Flynn

WDCA Secretary

Voting overview

Old Business

Removal of Elected Committee Chairs

Pass by unanimous consent

Gendered Language

Pass by unanimous consent

New business

AI – Dan Hansen

14-1-0 this does pass

Sweepstakes Awards

11-2-0 this does pass

§240.10(1)A Deletion

Pass by unanimous consent

Judge Preferencing

Pass by unanimous consent

Protest Committee

Pass by unanimous consent

Judge Placement

Pass by unanimous consent