

**Item I**

**Proposal to Change District Qualifying to State number system.**

**Replaces:** **6.12.1-6.12.4** (and potentially other related language in our handbook)

**New language for 6.12.1:**

*Speech State Championships Entries. The number of entries from each event for the State Championship shall be based on the following schedule:*

<i>1-3 entries at District</i>	<i>District qualifies 1 entry to state championship</i>
<i>4-6 entries at District</i>	<i>District qualifies 2 entries to state championship</i>
<i>7-9 entries at District</i>	<i>District qualifies 3 entries to state championship</i>
<i>10-12 entries at District</i>	<i>District qualifies 4 entries to state championship</i>
<i>13-15 entries at District</i>	<i>District qualifies 5 entries to state championship</i>
<i>16 or more entries at District</i>	<i>District qualifies 6 entries to state championship</i>

**Rationale.** We are living in a system created over 20 years ago. Times have changed. We have fewer programs. Most of our state qualifying lines are out of reach for districts. Conversely, we have differing lines for debate and speech with no rationale. Despite the safety net of Proven Excellence, we leave some of our state's best speakers behind at districts. How many districts can easily reach the 18 entry line for even a popular event such as Prose to clear 4 entries to state? Few. None? On the same day, 12 LD entries will get you 4?! 12 CX entries will get you 6?! Huh? This new system makes it simple and equitable. Observation: I work under the premise that each event has equal value to our community.

J. Patrick Gonzales  
Cleveland High School

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More students could participate</li><li>• More equitable</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Will make the tournament larger</li><li>• More students do not equal better competition</li><li>• More inexperienced speakers may be drafted to inflate district entries benefitting larger districts</li></ul>

**Item II**

**Proposal to change the Order of Topic Strike in Parliamentary Debate**

**current rule:**

13.3.3.4

(d) The proctor shall ask the **Proposition** to strike first, then the Opposition. The remaining topic shall be debated.

**Change:**

(d) The proctor shall ask the **Opposition** to strike first, then the Proposition. The remaining topic shall be debated.

**Justification:** the affirmation should have the final choice of what to defend, rather than negation choosing what they want to attack.

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allows Affirmative to pick burden</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduces the already limited scope of Negative ground</li><li>• Current striking order provides an inherent check to the Affirmative Advantage</li><li>• The negative prep time is currently speculative</li><li>• Since the Affirmative has secrecy the Neg should have final say on topic</li><li>• Procedure is consistent with other levels of Parli Debate and lead to confusion with judges</li><li>• How is the current system a problem and how does this solve?</li></ul>

**Item III**  
**Proposal to change LD entries**

Current Rule- OSAA Speech & Debate Handbook

6.6. Number of Individual Event Entries at District Tournaments. Each school may have a maximum of **29 entries, including Lincoln-Douglas Debate**, at the District Tournament. A maximum of three entries may be placed in any one event. Each Dual Interpretation entry counts as a single individual events entry.

6.7. Number of Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Entries at District Tournaments. Each school may enter a maximum of three Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Teams at the District Tournament.

6.8. Number of Public Forum Debate Entries at District Tournaments. Each school may enter a maximum of three Public Forum Debate Teams at the District Tournament.

6.9. Number of Parliamentary Debate Entries at District Tournaments. Each school may enter a maximum of three Parliamentary Debate Teams at the District Tournament.

6.10. Number of events per student. Any student may enter a maximum of two Individual Events and one Debate event at the District or Speech State Championships. No student may participate in more than two Individual Events or more than one Debate event. Although counted as an individual event for the purpose of team entry limitations, **Lincoln-Douglas Debate is considered a debate event for the purpose of student entry limitations; a student entered in LD may not enter another debate event.**

Proposed change-

Treat Lincoln-Douglas Debate as debate event for all purposes and not within the 29 IE limit for team entries for District.

Rationale-

- a. It is a debate form- Lincoln-Douglas Debate is a debate form that takes a different level of preparation and in round work which differentiate it from standard Individual Events. Therefore, it should be treated as a debate format for State entry limits to be consistent and not to minimize the importance of LD debate.
- b. Guaranteeing three LD spots encourages/supports debate- If LD is treated like PF, CX and PARLI, then coaches don't have to pit IE's against LD Debate for limited District spots. Then, coaches have more options and students have more chances for competing in varied events.
- c. This change is unlikely to change the actual number of competitors at State-Most students who qualify for State in LD debate also qualify in other events. Therefore, this change should not add significantly more people to the Championship nor generate much additional cost. Furthermore, each District will remain limited by the number of LD debaters it can send to State under the provisions of 6.12.3.

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consistency in debate entries</li><li>• Ease of ensuring district entries</li><li>• Less confusing</li><li>• Makes it easier to understand that students can enter LD and 2 IEs</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increase number of IE entries at state</li><li>• </li></ul>

**Item IV**

**Proposed rule change regarding oral critiques in debate.**

**Current Rules and Ballot Language:**

12.10. Critiques. Judges may not provide oral critiques. All critiques including specific comments about the round and general comments about debate strategies and philosophies shall be written on the ballot. A description of the judge's paradigm by the judge prior to the round shall not be considered an oral critique.

Ballot Language: "Oral critiques are *not* allowed."

**Proposed Changes:**

12.10 Critiques. Judges may not provide oral critiques until after they have decided the round and signed their ballot. A description of the judge's paradigm by the judge prior to the round shall not be considered an oral critique. Oral critiques are not intended to replace all written ballot comments, but to create an educational dialogue. Oral critiques and subsequent discussion should be kept very brief. Judges are permitted, but not required, to deliver oral critiques and competitors are not required to participate in them.

Ballot Language: "The judge *must* render the decision and sign the ballot before choosing to disclose the decision and/or provide brief oral critiques."

**Rationale (sorry it's so long! Rationale for both critiques & disclosure covered, as well as concerns):**

I think we all agree that Speech and Debate is all about education. However, rules against oral critiques have severely limited the feedback students receive and can use to improve in debate. There are multiple bad habits that manifest among students—across the state—including thinking that judges “don’t understand” debaters’ arguments if they fail to win and resisting changing one’s debate strategies, behavior, and argumentation. When students get incomplete feedback, they slip into these bad habits because they have few alternative explanations and limited outside perspectives. Even when students get amazing, detailed ballots, they do not get them until after the tournament, and so go for several rounds repeating the same mistakes without being able to improve, recognize, or learn from them. Oral critiques prevent the debaters from making the same mistakes across rounds of a tournament due to a simple lack of awareness, which is both counterproductive to the competitive nature of tournaments and the education of students.

Oral critiques provide immediate, validated reasons why the judge made whatever decision they made—even if disclosure is not passed, these oral critiques will allow a student to better understand and contextualize the results when they do see them. They allow for post-round discussions which can go more in-depth and achieve more than any paper ballot ever could. They allow the competitors to inquire about how they can improve, and give everyone an opportunity to examine what habits they need to change and skills they need to improve, as well as receive validation when something new that they’re trying is working or making sense to a judge and tips to make it work even better. Paper ballots are often burdensome to judges because of the time it takes to fully develop thoughts about the round; oral critiques could serve as the nuanced feedback that debaters need, while the very brief paper ballot functionally serves as “the main takeaways of the round.” Far too often, paper ballots have either been lost or are too underdeveloped/illegible to have any educational value; this kills the nature of debate. The impact of oral critiques on in/out-of-round education is huge. When I have taken students to out-of-state tournaments that allow disclosure, they often say that they learn more from one tournament there than they have from years of competition in Oregon. This is not based on the quality of competition or judges, but on the transparent, open oral critiques they have benefitted from. Afterwards, I see remarkable improvements in not only their skills, but also their understanding of debate and other points of view, and their motivation to continue improving based on this feedback. These educational benefits should not be limited to teams or individuals who have the resources to travel out-of-state.

## OHSSLS-CA Rule Change Proposals 2017 (draft)

Current rule language: All critiques including specific comments about the round and general comments about debate strategies and philosophies shall be written on the ballot.

--This rule is not currently followed by the vast majority of judges. Ballots are incomplete--it is more efficient and educational to give this information in round. This rule change will do two things: align rules with practice and provide for better education (more detail on both below).

Current rule language: Further, judges shall not discuss the performance of students they have judged with those students at any time during the tournament.

--This rule is not followed by many judges/coaches, especially in CX debate. The rule as it stands forces coaches to choose between following the rule or providing education for the specific debater and the debate community as a whole. Many judges (especially in CX) violate the rule because they want to improve discourse, transparency, and education—and truly enjoy the post-round educational discussions they can have with competitors. This change would allow them to do so without violating rules and would (hopefully) allow this same freedom for coaches/judges across debate forms and begin changing norms in other forms of debate. This would also eliminate the current inequity in which a few students receive critiques because their judges ignore the rules, while other students do not because their judges follow the rules.

Concern expressed at the Fall Meeting: Critiques will take too much time and cause tournaments to run late: It will not add time to the RFD; most judges take longer to write a thorough and complete critique than they would take to deliver one orally. The primary time crunch at tournaments is not due to judges giving feedback or anything related to the proposed rule change. Much bigger causes of delays include necessary time for tabulating, kids/judges not arriving promptly to their rounds, and—importantly—judges spending lots of time writing on their debate ballots. The last point is solved through the proposed rule change. There are multiple options to ensure tournaments continue to run smoothly. One idea is that ballots are to be collected/dropped off before oral critiques begin (either through Tabroom online or in person), allowing for tab to begin the tabulation process.

Concern expressed at the Fall Meeting: Competitors, parents/judges, and coaches might not want to participate in oral critiques or disclosures:

1) The proposed changes to the two related rules and ballot language wouldn't REQUIRE every judge to give oral critiques, it would just make it "legal" to do so if they believe it is most educational. Further, it does not FORCE competitors to participate in the oral critique or disclosure; if they feel uncomfortable with this discussion, competitors may decline to participate or leave at any time with no penalty, as the ballot has already been completed. The majority of judge's habits won't change, at least initially.

2) While this solves the issue for coaches who argued at the Fall Meeting that they don't want to have to be forced to stand behind their decisions or critiques to a kid's face—they and any inexperienced parent judges will never be required to—there is one additional argument about this. Coaches and other experienced judges should put the level of thought into their decision that makes them feel comfortable saying it to a kid's face; the level of thought should be the same in a written ballot, but often is not (as noted above). Knowing that a kid won't like it if you tell them they lost is different than feeling like, as a judge, you cannot adequately explain why you saw the strengths and weaknesses of particular arguments as you did. If kids spend hours on their cases, and they get a coach or experienced judge to argue in front of, don't they deserve to have that judge put enough thought into his/her decision or critique that the judge feels comfortable enough to deliver it? We as coaches and adults should not be held to a lower standard than our students. Judges often disagree on decisions—and most kids come to understand that—but not wanting to explain what worked and what didn't work in a round (the critique aspect, rather than the decision aspect) to a kid's face is unfair to our students who spend so much time on this activity. Debate education should not just be before and in a round, but also in the brief discussion of specific arguments and responses after the round.

## OHSSLS-CA Rule Change Proposals 2017 (draft)

3) An informal survey of parent judges showed that the majority supported having the ability to speak their critiques rather than write them all. Particularly, parent judges for whom English is a second language expressed that they felt they could give both better and quicker oral feedback than written feedback.

--Eliza Haas

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allows students to adapt mid tournament</li><li>• Immediate feedback</li><li>• Some judges are better at oral commentary than at written commentary</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Slows down the tournament</li><li>• Now Creates an unfair playing field where some will know record and some won't</li><li>• The advice given is not filtered through the education model and may not be helpful</li><li>• This destroys our ability to put lay judges in debate rounds. It is intimidating for inexperienced judges.</li><li>• Shifts from education/competitive activity to competitive events</li><li>• Judges may not take into consideration students' skill level or emotional maturity.</li><li>• Some judges may abuse</li><li>• Students may want to argue with the judge</li><li>• The length of time between signing the ballot and turning it in is not defined.</li><li>• Shuts the coach out of the process</li><li>• It only takes one abusive oral critique to undermine months of education,</li></ul>

## Item V

### Proposed change to allow notes in Extemp

**Current Rule:** 13.8.6. Notes. No notes may be used during the delivery, and no promptings are allowed

**Proposed change:** Hand written notes, on one 3.5" by 5" note card, that originate in the preparation room may be used for recording citations including source, author, date, and quotation.

**Justification:** The current rule encourages students to lie about citations in the round. In addition, extemporaneous is an event that encourages research and analysis of the research, the lack of encouraging accurate citations goes against the spirit of a research oriented event. Also, speeches would be more effective if students don't have to worry about memorizing dates and sources and instead can focus their brain power on analysis of the research. Finally, when translated to the "real world" the ability to memorize (read: make up) citations and sources is hardly ever required in formal presentations.

Presented by Beau Woodward

Arguments in Favor <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Could promote more accurate citation</li><li>• </li></ul>	Arguments Against <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Who monitors the card to be sure it is just citations?</li></ul>
--	--

## **Item VI** **Proposal to Add POI to State Championships**

Rule Change Proposal: Add Programmed Oral Interpretation to the State Tournament

### **13.18 Program Oral Interpretation**

**13.18.1. Purpose:** POI is a program of oral interpretation of thematically-linked selections chosen from two or three genres: prose, poetry, drama (plays). At least two pieces of literature that represent at least two separate genres must be used. Unlike the other interpretation events, Program Oral Interpretation may use multiple sources for the program. All selections must be verbally identified by title and author. Competitors are encouraged to devote approximately equal times to each of the genres used in the program. This distinction pertains to these two or three genres as a whole, not types of literature within a genre (such as fiction/nonfiction). Prose expresses thought through language recorded in sentences and paragraphs: fiction (short stories, novels) and non-fiction (articles, essays, journals, biographies). Poetry is writing which expresses ideas, experience, or emotion through the creative arrangement of words according to their sound, their rhythm, their meaning. Poetry may rely on verse and stanza form.

**13.18.2. Contest:** The use of a manuscript during the performance is required. Common practices include the use of a binder or folder. Reading from a book or magazine is not permitted. The intact manuscript may be used by the contestant as a prop, so long as it remains in the contestant's control at all times. No costumes or props other than the manuscript are permitted. The contestant must address the script; however, introduction and transitional material may be memorized.

**13.18.3. Length:** The time limit is 10 minutes with a 30-second “grace period.” If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period. The ranking is up to each individual judge’s discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.

**13.18.4. Publication Rules:** All literature performed must meet the publication rules of the Association. All online material must first be vetted and approved through the NSDA national office. Approved material and/or sites will be listed on the NSDA website. Song lyrics may be used if the performer has an original, hard copy of the lyrics such as sheet music or a CD jacket. Lyrics may only be used from online sources that appear on the approved websites list.

**Rationale:** This event is a main event at the national tournament and has been offered at many tournaments throughout the year. It has generated enough interest to make it a popular option at the state level. An increase in POI entries may decrease the number of poetry and prose entries. If an event needs to be deleted in order to include this event, then LIBIELL, the least populated event at the state tournament, would have the least impact on the community.

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• That would give us 7 interpretation events for students</li><li>• Aligns State events with National events</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We would need to eliminate an event.</li></ul>

## Item VII

### Proposal to Move voting responsibilities to OHSSL-CA Secretary

Proposed Rule Change regarding the election of the State Championship Committee; the proposal would shift the election responsibility from the President to the Secretary and adding a deadline.

#### Current Rule

##### 4.3.

The duties of the President shall be to preside at all association and Executive Committee meetings; to call Executive Committee meetings when necessary; to prepare and publish agendas for association and Executive Committee meetings; to be responsible for seeing that all association and Executive Committee directives are carried out; to update Coaches membership lists on a timely basis; to serve as a member of the Coaches Workshop Committee and assist with location selection, preparation of the program, and registration at the site; **to be in charge of the election of the first five members of the Speech State Championships Committee;** and to assist the Speech State Championships Committee at the Speech State Championships Workday.

##### 9.2.

The OHSSLCA President shall call for Speech State Championship Committee nominations at the Fall and/or Winter Coaches Meeting. Once the President has the roster of candidates, the **President** shall distribute ballots to the Executive Committee (OHSSLCA Officers and OSAA District Directors). The President shall collect and tally the ballots, then send the results, including all nominations, to the OSAA.

#### Proposed Changes

##### 4.6:

The duties of the Secretary shall be to keep minutes of all meetings of the association and its Executive Committee and distribute those minutes in a timely fashion to the President for distribution to the membership; to publish the agenda for all meetings; to prepare and count all ballots; to assist the President in the creation of a Coaches membership list; **to be in charge of the election of the first five members of the Speech State Championships Committee;** and to assist the Treasurer with registration at the Speech State Championships.

**9.2.** The OHSSLCA President shall call for Speech State Championship Committee nominations at the Fall and/or Winter Coaches Meeting (**prior to March 1**). Once the President has the roster of candidates, the **Secretary** shall distribute ballots to the Executive Committee (OHSSLCA Officers and OSAA District Directors). The President shall collect and tally the ballots, then send the results, including all nominations, to the OSAA.

#### Rationale

Moving the responsibility to an office position that is a multiple year position would make it more consistently executed than being the responsibility of a position that shifts annually.

#### Jane Berry-Eddings

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The task would be given to a multiple year office position</li><li>• It makes the process easier to manage year after year if it is part of the routine of a specific job</li></ul>	

## Item VIII

**Proposed rule** change regarding Memorized Humorous, Memorized Serious, and Dual interpretation

### Current rule

The events are currently called Memorized Humorous, Memorized Serious, and Dual interpretation throughout the OSAA handbook

### Proposed changed

**Change the names to Humorous Interpretation, Dramatic Interpretation, and Duo Interpretation**

### Rationale

NSDA uses Humorous Interpretation, Dramatic Interpretation, and Duo Interpretation to refer to the events that the OSAA refers to as Memorized Humorous, Memorized Serious, and Dual interpretation. It would be good to align the names. Most tournaments use these names already.

Ameena Amdahl-Mason

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is the name most tournaments already use</li><li>• This increases consistency between OSAA and NSDA</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• OSAA is not required to have the same names for events as NSDA</li></ul>

## OHSSLS-CA Rule Change Proposals 2017 (draft)

**Proposed rule change** regarding disclosure in debate.

### Current Rules and Ballot Language:

12.11. Disclosure. Except on the ballot, judges shall not disclose the outcome of a round with the participants in the round. Further, judges shall not discuss the performance of students they have judged with those students at any time during the tournament.

Ballot Language: “Oral critiques are *not* allowed.” (Generally interpreted to also mean that judges cannot disclose decisions)

### Proposed Changes:

12.11 Disclosure. Judges shall not disclose the outcome of a round with the participants in the round until *after* the decision is rendered and the ballot is completed and signed. Any disclosures and subsequent discussion should be kept very brief. Judges are permitted but not required to disclose decisions.

Ballot Language: “The judge *must* render the decision and sign the ballot before choosing to disclose the decision and/or provide oral critiques.”

### Rationale:

Rationale is essentially the same as for “proposed rule change regarding oral critiques in debate.” Given that debate is a competitive activity in which we attempt to achieve education through winning a ballot, understanding judges’ rationales for reaching specific decisions will best allow competitors to put feedback into action and learn from the results of previous rounds. Most of our students are competitive enough that knowing they lost a round will drive them to try harder in the next round, whether to win the next time, improve over the previous round, or go for a speaker award despite not breaking. For students whom we know might not react well, it’s a coaching/teaching issue rather than a rules issue to teach our students how to continue trying their best even when results aren’t going their way, just like we do in between tournaments.

--Eliza Haas

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Allows students to adapt mid tournament</li><li>Immediate feedback</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Slows down the tournament</li><li>Now Creates an unfair playing field where some will know record and some won’t</li><li>This destroys our ability to put lay judges in debate rounds. It is intimidating for inexperienced judges.</li><li>Shifts from education/competitive activity to competitive events</li><li>Some judges may abuse</li><li>Students may want to argue with the judge</li><li>The length of time between signing the ballot and turning it in is not defined.</li></ul>

## OHSSLS-CA Rule Change Proposals 2017 (draft)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If students understand matching they can figure out who they will hit</li></ul> |
|--|---|