

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Minutes

September 21, 2024

Online Meeting

Voting schools represented: Rufus King, Brookfield Central,

Homestead, r, Brookfield East, Fort Atkinson, Sheboygan South, Vel Phillips Memorial, Madison West, La Crosse Central, SPLASH, West Bend, Marquette

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by President Jaya Sims.

Secretary

Justin Flynn indicated the spring minutes had been posted. It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes. **The motion carried.**

Treasurer

Dan Hansen presented the following information:

WDCA Spring 25 Treasurer's Report

Current: \$4505.07

Overview - We started the season in the fall \$1000 over the previous year. While this meant we had enough money in the account to run in the red somewhat this year, we will have to adjust in the future to ensure the stable availability of funds. The organization continues to take in less money at state (down 1000 from 2023 and down 1500 from 2021) and have fewer paying dues (in 2021 we had 26 teams compete at state; 21 in 2023; 18 in 2025).

State Tournament Accounting

Income = 6164

Running Tournament Expenses = 6403.41

- Trophies (Rutig) 1844.83
- Trophies (Crown) 1227.29
- Equity and Judges 1000
- Directors 1198
- NSDA 98
- Food 1035.29

Essential operating margin = 6164 - 6403 = -239.

Other expenses - 765.71

- Banner and Frame (one-time cost) = 288.57
- 236.30 Vistaprint
- 52.27 Frame
- Swag 477.14

2025 Tournament total = 6164-6403.41-765.71 = -1005.12

Non-state accounting

Income from dues this year = 1425

Expenses = 1815.

- Google 250
- Office supplies, registration, etc. 65
- Scholarships 1500

Non-tournament total = 1425 - 1815 = -390

We also fund Stephanie's trip to the policy topic meeting. Depending on travel, 600-1000.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - we'll lose about \$1,400 this year even if we don't fund the policy topic meeting. Over \$2,000 if we fund that. In the absence of other income, recommendations are to cut swag, one scholarship, and the policy topic meeting.

Dan Hansen mentioned with current projections we need to budget better and recommend we save 1000, dollars by cutting a scholarships, or CX meeting .

Stephine King asked Dan about awards cuts if we pass proposal regarding awards.

Dan said he would look into it, later he mentioned it would save 200-300 dollars.

President-Elect

There was no report.

President

Jaya Sims mentioned that a student from Golda Meir is looking for a coach.

Stephine mentioned that she will help with the MPS bureaucracy when they get on their feet.

Judging Standards and Ethics

Stephanie discussed new judges and training and that new judges are very receptive, she overviewed state and that it went well, and only one issue with Wifi that will be brought up later.

TPP

John Knetzger mentioned that the state tournament went well, he stated one issue where Judge intervention was present, and we worked through our processes we have available and awarded a double win.

He talked about new rules in an overview and adapting to numbers with hopes of being financially independent.

Media and Communications

David Umstot has nothing to report.

Novice Packet

Stephanie mentioned we will use the same process as last year and if you want to help with the packet or have feedback to talk to her.

New Coaches

Dan talked about how 6 new coaches/ team prospects requesting info but all 6 did not follow through.

Dan asked the question what we can do to retain people.

Dan had the idea of having a team packet to guide the new teams through the new coaches curve.

Stephanie mentioned making a calendar of steps of what to do during what times, Dan mentioned the packet would work like that and what he is going for.

Chris Roe mentioned the time commitment and administration hurdles; most new coaches have. He stated that some schools like his have student run programs with parent admins, and it works well.

David Henning talked about a co-op team making said hurdles a little easier and is something Sheb South is considering.

DEI

Becky Hansen stated we had less issues than last year. As for State, we only had one issue with judge wording to students and it was handled well.

Becky stated that she has concerns about the future of DEI in the nation It was mentioned about changing the name so the language can be more accommodating to the process and provide better equity to students.

Stephine mentioned NSDA updates with DEI and they have yet to see any updates on the new process or update with the status of DEI.

State Tournament

John talked about the deficit and the option of judge's food cuts, and possibly simplifying and budgeting food like done in the past. The pros and cons were laid out.

John mentioned about narrowing divisions possibly, the rest will be talked about new business.

Old Business

o Elections

▪ President elect

David Henning was nominated and won.

▪ Secretary

Justin Flynn was nominated and won.

▪ JSE chair

Stephene King was nominated and won.

▪ DEI chair

Becky Hansen was nominated and won.

Jaya handed the President role to Chris and thanked her.

New Business

Dan "Cleanup" Rule Changes and other Tweaks to the standing rules

1. 220.10 (G) A judge shall fill out the ballot completely. Comments for individual speakers and a written justification for the decision shall be provided. Comments on ballots are to be instructive and constructive. The school of any judge that does not provide a written justification for decisions, as prescribed by the Tournament Director, will be required to pay \$15 to the WDCA Scholarship Fund for each round where no written justification was provided. The first notice would be sent by the tournament host to the coach of said school. Failure to respond and remit payment within one month will result in a letter being sent to the school's principal by the WDCA President. Repeated violations could result in disqualification from WDCA sponsored tournaments by Executive Committee decision.

Rationale - We don't have a separate fund. Nor have we ever increased scholarships by the exact number of fines.

Dan disused this and It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried.

2. 300.23 (3) The WSDT Director shall be responsible for maintaining a list of certified judges and publishing that list by the WSDT entry registration deadline
[Delete and renumber the remaining]

Rationale - We don't publish a list and why would we?

This was redrawn and will be talked about in the fall when more info is present

Scot brought up judge hiring and resources, the team brought up the Facebook group and various hiring options.

Dave U. mentioned putting the link on the website and we all agree this was a good idea.

Ben Hamburger talked about modernizing the channels in which we reach out to people.

The group overall talked about the methods/channels/ organizations we all use.

3. 300.23 (4) The Executive Committee shall decide, by majority vote, on the method of

assessment for certification before the Fall Meeting each year .

Rewrite as "If the Executive Committee desires to change the method of assessment for certification, it may do so by majority vote prior to the Fall Meeting each year."

Rationale - As written, we'd have to vote to do nothing every year.

Dan disused This and it was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried.

4. 430.10 (1)

A. Each year, the WDCA shall bestow upon three two or more worthy recipients a post-secondary scholarship award.

Rationale - We may not have the money to fund three. Alternatively - we could give less. I'm happy to go with board guidance here but why are we rules-obligated to three?

Dan disused this and it was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried.

5. 330.30 (G) Individual trophies will be presented to all teams who participated in the

elimination rounds. In addition, trophies will be presented to the top five speakers in each division: if the division had thirty or more entries at the previous year's state tournament, trophies will be presented to the top ten speakers.

Rationale - If we have 12 competing students, 10 speaker awards are too many.

Dan disused this and how it works with John proposal

The group talked about the value of knowing beforehand how many trophies we need, so we can get them on sale. It was also brought up to have the state chair have flexibility in awards to accommodate said rule, to make the tournament run better.

John made a friendly amend to state below and Dan accepted this

5. 330.30 (G) Individual awards will be presented to all teams who participated in the elimination rounds. In addition, awards will be presented to the top five speakers in each division; if the division had thirty or more individual competitors **by the registration deadline, awards** will be presented to the top ten speakers.

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried.

John's proposals

1.Change Equity Advocate Requirement.

Current Rule:

200.70 - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

(1) All sanctioned WDCA tournaments are required to name one or more DEI/BIA advocates that will act in that capacity for their tournament. Tournament directors may not operate as advocates. It is preferable if advocates have completed the NSDA BIA certification course.

Propose Rule (change in italics)

200.70 - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

(1) All sanctioned WDCA tournaments are required to name one or more DEI/BIA advocates that will act in that capacity for their tournament. Tournament directors should not operate as advocates. It is preferable if advocates have completed the NSDA BIA certification course.

Rationale:

Over the last few years there have been few reported concerns. This change allows

tournament directors to utilize resources better, especially in small tournaments.

John discusses his rationale.

Becky thinks this should be a separate person since tournament directions have a lot on their plates.

Dan seconds Becky's thoughts this

Stephanie asked if schools had issues with requiring a coach to be in charge of DEI. She asked Justin about an issue that happened in 2020.

Justin clarified this issue, and clarified his school is now cool with whoever is in DEI if the BEHS coach is in the loop.

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried. on a vote of 8-1-2

2. Change The Number of Speaker Awards

Current Rule

330.30 (1)

A. Individual trophies will be presented to all teams who participated in the elimination rounds. In addition, trophies will be presented to the top ten speakers.

Proposed Rule:

A. Individual trophies will be presented to all teams who participated in the elimination rounds. In addition, trophies will be presented to the top five speakers.

Rationale:

Divisions are not large enough to support 10 speaker awards while making those awards meaningful. Nearly half of the VPF pool received a speaker award and all NCX debaters received the speaker award at the 2025 WSDT.

John rescinded this in favor of Dan's piece of legislation.

3. Preliminary Rounds in LD and PF

New rule inserted as 330.30 (1) E. v., renumbering below

If entries from one school comprise at least 36% of a division at the close of registration, the

WSDT director may opt to lift school protection for some or all preliminary rounds. Should school protection be lifted, it is lifted for all entries in the impacted division. In case of debates With teams from the same school the coach maintains the right to choose a winner (coach over) or have the round debate. In the case of a coach over, the decision must be submitted to the

Tabroom within 15 minutes of notification. In case of a debated round, the tabulation program will assign a judge as normal.

Rationale: Competitive equity is severely compromised when one school dominates a division.

Lifting school protection, for at least some prelim rounds, ensures that tournament champions are tested against equal competition. Currently school protection overrides brackets and results in teams being pulled up multiple brackets.

OR

In Lincoln-Douglas and Public Forum, if entries from a school comprise at least 36% of a

division at the close of registration, and/or a division has 20 or fewer entries, the tournament committee (WSDT Director, President, JSE Chair) may opt to combine JV and Varsity divisions. Should divisions be combined, the top 4 JV non-advancing JV entries will advance to breakout rounds based on preliminary round seeding.

Rationale:

Our post covid numbers have not produced robust divisions. In VPF this year we had to pull a JV judge into a prelim round in order to make the debate possible. In both LD and PF we are frequently dealing with the reality of one or two schools with large numbers in a division.

Maintaining school protection means that every other school has most of their debates against the large school. This is bad for education and competitive equity. Small judge pools also make preferences far less meaningful and make judge placement much more challenging.

John discusses his rationale and what the magic number should be.

Stephine talks about option B and it might still have problems with large schools.

Dave H. thinks perm do the tournament should have flexibility.

Tim likes the second proposal.

Dan likes the first and hates the second for equity issues.

John brought up coach overs and how the issues and concerns people had with option 2 would still be present,.

David H. talked about eliminating coach overs.

Stephanie talked about how students still can throw rounds,

John 330.10.5 needs to adjust and he is going to redraw his motion due to conflicts.

It will be brought up again in the fall.

4. Modify the Evidence Appeals Process

Current Rule: 210.10 (1) (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 appeal committee's sole responsibility is to decide if the judge ignored, misapplied, and/or misinterpreted the evidence violation rules.

Proposed:

A three-person appeals committee will read the appeal and interview all related parties

(coaches, judge(s), and teams) the judge as soon as possible and render a decision before the conclusion of the next round within 10 minutes of beginning the interview. If the appeals committee cannot render a decision in that timeframe, the judge's decision will stand. The appeal committee's sole responsibility is to decide if the judge ignored, misapplied, and/or misinterpreted the evidence violation rules. The appeals committee may, at their sole discretion, choose to interview teams (with coaches).

Rationale:

Since the appeal is based on the judge's process, not on the conclusion they made, interviewing the judge should most often yield the necessary information to determine if the correct process was followed. The appellant coach has the opportunity to list all their reasons in the appeals form. In the 2025 WSDT, judges completed a form following an allegation that captured the information and steps they took in reaching a decision.

New text added in bold italics.

John states his rationality.

Dan worries about clarifications with judges and coaches and request a large time limit

Stephine agrees with time increase.

Dan mentioned a friendly amendment to add 20 minutes but delete the last line.

John did not accept the friendly amendment.

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried. on a vote of 10-1-0

5. Modify the makeup of the evidence appeals

committee

Current Rule: 210.10 (1) (D) (ii)

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

Proposes Rule:

At the WSDT, the appeals committee is normally composed of the WDCA President, President Elect, and Chair of the Judging Standards and Ethics Committee. Should those officers be unavailable within a reasonable period of time, the WSDT Director may appoint three coaches, including himself, to serve as the appeals committee.

Rationale:

There were 4 appeals in a row during the 2025 WSDT and that's been the norm. Allowing others to hear appeals makes the tournament run more efficiently and doesn't place an overwhelming burden on three people.

John mentions his rationale.

Stephine wonders how the timetable of the last bill will affect this.

John withdraws this motion until the fall, when things said change can be adjusted.

6. Penalties for Evidence Allegations:

Current Rule 210.10 (3) (A)

The penalty for evidence violation is loss of the round and zero speaker points. Proposed Rule: The penalty for evidence violation is loss of the round and zero speaker points.

Add to rules (4) iii below and (4) iv below... loss by forfeit and zero speaker points. Rationale. First, the penalty is listed in 2 places. This change makes the rule clearer. Second, the penalty should be the same. This disincentives teams making a challenge when they perceive they are losing the round.

John mentions his rationale

Time talks about punishing bad evidence allegations prevent abuse

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried. on a vote of 6-5-0

7. Mandate Evidence Sharing

Current Rule 240.20

EVIDENCE VIEWING

(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.

(2) Time to provide speeches is a part of the prep time allotted to each entry.. The 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 or when the next speaker is ready to begin their speech.. 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.

(3) Wireless communication to file share with individuals in the round is acceptable between teams and/or judges. Other use of wireless communication shall be considered a violation of

240.10 Technology Use Guidelines. Violations of this rule will be treated with the same methods outlined in 240.10.1

(4) 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.

(5) It is not required that paperless teams share the text of their plan (if applicable) with the other Team. However, any evidence utilized, whether by quotation or parenthetical reference, must have proper citations available and follow all evidence rules . It is strongly suggested that each narrative case includes a works cited page.

(6) Any computer, including viewing computer, malfunction and any technical failure shall immediately cause speech or prep time to stop. If the malfunction or failure is not resolved within five minutes, then the affected team may decide whether to

(1) continue to attempt to resolve said issue while using speech or prep time; (2) resume the round without the use of such malfunctioning device (in the event of a malfunctioning viewing computer, a replacement viewing computer would satisfy this requirement); or (3) forfeit the round.

Proposed: Deletions w/ strikethrough, additions in italics

EVIDENCE VIEWING

(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 in which the evidence is presented and/or discussed. If the latter is executed, the laptop must be handed to their opponents at the conclusion of each of their speeches.

(2) Time to provide speeches is a part of the prep time allotted to each entry.. The 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 or when the next speaker is ready to begin their speech.. 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.

(3) Wireless communication to file share with individuals in the round is acceptable between teams and/or judges. Other use of wireless communication shall be considered a violation of 240.10 Technology Use Guidelines. Violations of this rule will be treated with the same methods outlined in 240.10.1

(4) 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 before the round or speech begins. 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. At a minimum, evidence should be shared before the speech in which it is read. Evidence may be shared before the round begins. If evidence is not shared before the speech, the time required to compile and share evidence shall be deducted from the speaking team's allotment of

preparation time.

(5) It is not required that paperless teams share the text of their plan (if applicable) with the other team. It is not required that a team share texts of plans, logical or analytical arguments, analysis or anything other than evidence. However, any evidence utilized, whether by quotation or parenthetical reference, must have proper citations available and follow all evidence rules . It is strongly suggested that each narrative case includes a works cited page.

(6) Any computer, including viewing computer, malfunction and any technical failure shall immediately cause speech or prep time to stop. If the malfunction or failure is not resolved within five minutes, then the affected team may decide whether to

(1) continue to attempt to resolve said issue while using speech or prep time;

(2) resume the round without the use of such malfunctioning device (in the event of a malfunctioning viewing computer, a replacement viewing computer would satisfy this requirement); or

(3) forfeit the round.

Rationale: If evidence is shared before the round or speech, questions as to the validity of sources can be more easily ascertained. This change not only makes the round more educational, it decreases the likelihood of evidence allegations.

John once again speaks on his rationale

Chris and Dave H. asked how this functions.

Justin brings paper manipulation, that has happened in the past.

Dan talks about paper copy trends on his team.

Ben talks about policy norms, and that Justin's concerns rarely happen,

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried. on a vote of 10-1-0

8. Technology Use

Current Rule

240.10 TECHNOLOGY USE

(1) Computers and similar digital technology may be used in all rounds by both judges and debaters with the following:

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. 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.

i) At the WSTD, 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. ii) Student may access the internet and research to verify the validity of their opponent's evidence if the student is preparing to make an evidence violation allegation.

Proposed Rule:

240.10 TECHNOLOGY USE

(1) Computers and similar digital technology may be used in all rounds by both

judges and debaters with the following:

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. If the judge is able to determine that a violation has occurred, the judge should notify the tournament director. Following notification by the judge that a competitor has received outside assistance, 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.

i) At the WSTD, 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.

ii) Student may access the internet and research to verify the validity of their opponent's evidence if the student is preparing to make an evidence violation allegation.

Rationale:

In 2025, internet access is ubiquitous, and files are often located online.

John explains the rule changes.

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried.

9. Qualification for the WSDT

Current Rule:

330.20 QUALIFICATION PROCEDURES

(1) Debaters shall qualify for the WSDT by competing in two or more sanctioned tournaments in that season. 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.”). In PF and LD, a debater must meet any other requirements defined for that division (see section 330.10). Qualification runs with the debater, not the pair, in partnership events.

(2) B. Schools may qualify an unlimited number of debaters.

(3) 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 by each student attending any two WDCA sanctioned tournaments in the division.

Proposed Rule:

330.20 QUALIFICATION PROCEDURES

(1) Debaters shall qualify for the WSDT by competing in two or more sanctioned tournaments in that season. 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.”). In PF and LD, a debater must meet any other requirements defined for that division (see section 330.10). Qualification runs with the debater, not the pair, in partnership events.

(2) B. Schools may qualify an unlimited number of debaters.

(3) 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 by each student attending any two WDCA sanctioned tournaments in the division.

Rationale:

Cleaning up language. The current edition of the standing rules no longer requires 2 winning records. This change will make registration much easier for coaches and the WSDT Director.

John sates the mentioned above

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried.

10.Change Minimum Rounds Required

Current rule:

300.23 JUDGE PARTICIPATION

(9) Judges in LD and PF must have judged a minimum of 5 rounds in the style of debate they are registered to judge at the WSDT. Judges in Policy debate Divisions must have judged a minimum of 3 rounds to be eligible to be registered. Rounds must be judged in WDCA sanctioned tournaments. This requirement is met by judging rounds and not by being entered into a judge pool. Under extraordinary circumstances, the WSDT Director may waive this requirement for a single judge from a school.

PROPOSED RULE

(9) Judges in LD and PF must have judged a minimum of 5 rounds in the style of debate they are registered to judge at the WSDT. Judges in Policy debate Divisions must have judged a minimum of 3 rounds to be eligible to be registered. Rounds must be judged in WDCA sanctioned tournaments. This requirement is met by judging rounds and not by being entered into a judge pool. Under extraordinary circumstances, the WSDT Director may waive this requirement for a single judge from a school. Tournament hired judges are not subject to this requirement.

Rationale: We often hire judges from other places who are highly qualified but lack rounds in the WDCA. This rule makes it easier to utilize them at state.

John sates the mentioned above.

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried.

11. Further Defining Evidence Allegation vs. Protest

Current:

(1) Appeals

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

Proposed:

(1) Appeals

A. Coaches may only appeal a decision on the grounds that the judge has ignored, misapplied and/or misinterpreted a rule in deciding evidence violation raised in the round. If there is an appeal based upon something specific to the host site or technical failure, that should follow the protest process and/or be taken to the Tournament Director. An evidence violation appeal should not be filed.

Rationale: There was an instance of evidence accessibility being related to an internet access issue that was very specific to the tournament Wi-Fi. As many programs utilize google docs/drive or use the internet to verify the legitimacy of evidence, this should not be an evidence violation appeal. In the instance from 2025 WSDT, the judge technically made the correct decision based upon the evidence rules, but it was due to a structural issue with the host Wi-Fi NOT the team's inability to produce the evidence.

Stephine discusses this rationale.

It was moved and seconded to approve this rule change.

The motion carried.

The following calendar was presented

Date	Location	Live/Online
September		
13	Fall Meeting	
20		

27	Rufus King	
October		
4	La Crosse	online
11	Neenah	
18	Fort Atkinson	
25	West Bend	
November		
1	Reagan	
8	Homestead	
14-15	Badgerland	
22	Brookfield East	
29	Thanksgiving	
December		

6	Marquette	
13	Whitefish Bay	
20		
27		
January		
3	End of Break (Madison West)	
10	MCFL Qualifier/Last Chance	
17-18	Wisconsin State Debate Tournament In West Bend, WI	
24	NSDA Southern District Qualifiers *not sanctioned	
31	Mlk is 1/19*	

John asked for the fall meeting on the 13th.

It was moved and seconded to approve this the calendar.

The motion carried.

Adjournment

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 12:07 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin Flynn

Secretary

Voting Overview

Old Business

President elect

David Henning was nominated and won

Secretary

Justin Flynn was nominated and won

JSE chair

Stephene King was nominated and won

DEI chair

Becky Hansen was nominated and won

New business

Dan's Changes

1. 220.10 (G)

Pass by unanimous consent

2. 300.23 (3)

Motion withdrawn

3. Preliminary Rounds in LD and PF

Pass by unanimous consent

4. 430.10 (1)

Pass by unanimous consent

5. 330.30 (G) Individual trophies

Pass by unanimous consent

John's Changes

1.Change Equity Advocate Requirement.

8-1-2 this does pass

2. Change The Number of Speaker Awards

Motion withdrawn

3. Preliminary Rounds in LD and PF

Motion withdrawn

4. Modify the Evidence Appeals Process

10-1-0 this does pass

5. Modify the makeup of the evidence appeals

Motion withdrawn

6. Penalties for Evidence Allegations

6-5-0 this does pass

7. Mandate Evidence Sharing

10-1-0 this does pass

8. Technology Use

Pass by unanimous consent

9. Qualification for the WSDT

Pass by unanimous consent

10.Change Minimum Rounds Required

Pass by unanimous consent

11. Further Defining Evidence Allegation vs. Protest

Pass by unanimous consent