

Proposed Rule Changes

Proposed rule change regarding priorities for advancing debate teams from preliminary rounds to elimination rounds.

Current Rule

- 9.10. After the four preliminary rounds, teams shall be selected to advance to a single elimination tournament using the following criterion in the order listed:
- 9.10.1. Higher number of wins.
 - 9.10.2. Higher speaker points.
 - 9.10.3. Higher quality of competition in preliminary rounds.

Proposed Change

- 9.10. After the four preliminary rounds, teams shall be selected to advance to a single elimination tournament using the following criterion in the order listed:
- 9.10.1. Higher number of wins.
 - 9.10.2. Higher quality of competition in preliminary rounds.**
 - 9.10.3. Higher speaker points.**

Rationale

In the past, speaker points were an easier metric to track than opposition strength. Today however, debate programs effortlessly track opposition wins as well as speaker points. The proposed change reflects the value that wins and losses ought to take precedence over speaker points. We all know how subjective, and unreliable speaker points are. By making both the first and second priorities linked to wins and losses, we reduce the randomness that speaker points add to the mix. Teams that faced tougher competition ought to advance over teams who were lucky enough to have judges who awarded overly favorable speaker points.

Michael Curry

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Easy to accomplish with a computer● Rewards students in challenging rounds.● Eliminates the subjectivity of speaker points● Eliminates the discrepancies among the various ballots● Win/Loss records are the most important qualification● Students feel they can manipulate judges into giving them high speaker points● We don't use speaker points in IEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● We would need to clarify a process of determining strength of competition for small tournaments using cards● Quality of competition is no less arbitrary than speaker points. The only difference is that with speaker points at least students have some control. Changing it to strength of schedule makes the tiebreaker <i>completely</i> arbitrary. I would hate to deny students breaking at state – who had really high speaker points – simply because they <i>randomly</i> faced inferior competition in prelims. They had no control over that, and that's not fair.● Without a computer it is harder to determine● Subjectivity emerges when Quality of Competition is determined● Win Loss records are double weighted

Proposed rule change to omit the line “This is not a contest in acting” from HI/DI/DUO ballots.

Current Rule

The current “instructions to the judges” on the ballot sheet cover states:

The responsibility of the speakers is to entertain the audience with the material used. The speakers should suggest the characters, moods, and changes of situation largely through their voices. Characterizations should be confined to facial expressions, postures, and character placement. Limited movement is allowed. This is a contest for the interpretation of a play, a cutting from a play, narrative poetry or prose. This is not a contest in acting.

Proposed Rule

The line “this is not a contest in acting” would be removed. The new instructions would read:

The responsibility of the speakers is to entertain the audience with the material used. The speakers should suggest the characters, moods, and changes of situation largely through their voices. Characterizations should be confined to facial expressions, postures, and character placement. Limited movement is allowed. This is a contest for the interpretation of a play, a cutting from a play, narrative poetry or prose.

Courtney Walsh

Arguments in Favor

- It is not in the rules
- This line can be misleading to some judges, potentially resulting in a restricted view of what movement is considered acting and what is not. It may lead to judge bias against liberal platform movement, pantomiming props, and grandiose gestures.
- It’s an unnecessary distinction to put on the ballots.
- This line dates back to when state and national competition restricted platform movement and duo was a scripted event.
- Natural talent in interpretation can be indecipherable from acting, and some judges may end up trying to stick to the letter of the law, penalizing competitors for creative choreography.
- This line is somewhat contradictory to the the phrases “facial expressions, postures, and character placement,” all of which are considered aspects of acting.

Arguments Against

- House-keeping issue. Not in the rules. Executive committee can change at any time.
- It is an inconsistency.
- To my knowledge this line hasn’t hindered or penalized competitors’ for their interpretation or choreography choices in the past.
- This line provides a bright line for distinguishing a theatrical performance from an interpretation event.

Proposed rule change to prevent the same speech in multiple events.

Current Rule

There is currently no rule preventing a student from using the same speech/sections across different events.

Proposed Rule

Speeches shall not contain more than 150 words of quoted material from another speech, including a student's original works.

Rationale

Students may compete using substantially similar speeches in platform events. They are not allowed to do so in interpretation events. It is unethical to not cite works, even if they are the students' own work.

The wording will need some modification to make sure it avoids the following situations:

- The same topic is possible across events, but not the same speech in two different events at the same tournament.
- Not applicable to speeches morphing over the year (radio into oratory) or a one time issue (a duo partner without a partner who can be an HI/DI entry).

“Students may not use the same material in any other prepared speech at the tournament. “

Sponsored by Jennifer Conner

Arguments in Favor

- This already exists in Interpretation events
- We should have consistency in events
- This is plagiarism. As student presenting a current speech as new and using material from a prior speech.
- Students may repeatedly cash in on rehashing similar ideas or “catch-phrases” in subsequent years.
- This rule would prevent students from competing with the same topic and research in radio and oratory at the same tournament, or using the same poem in poetry and POI at a tournament.

Arguments Against

- Existing language is unclear.
- Authors and motivational speakers steal lines from their own work and use parts or shades of it in other pieces fairly regularly (ever read any Shakespearean plays?)
- There are other instances where a student might “morph” a speech idea into a more appropriate venue than the two aforementioned exceptions: *Not applicable to speeches morphing over the year (radio into oratory) or a one time issue (a duo partner without a partner who can be an HI/DI entry)*. For example, a student might start an informative, try it out at a few tournaments and ultimately decide that the topic and content are better suited to ADS or Oratory. Or maybe his/her coach says after getting ballots back from a few tournaments, “This speech isn’t getting the results you want, but it’s a great idea, why don’t you turn this into a ...” Another example is that students who compete in Washington or California for one or two tournaments a year might take part of an existing poetry or prose speech and turn it into a POI, IR (Washington), or TI (California). This rule would prohibit this minor modification to used existing prep work in a different event.

--	--

Proposed rule change to require manuscripts at the State Tournament in Interpretation Events.

Current Rule

Currently, there is no rule requiring students bring an original copy/photocopy of their cut scripts to state.

Proposed Rule

Interpretation events (Prose, Poetry, DI/III, Duo) must bring an original, electronic, or photocopied version of their script(s) to State.

Rationale

Should there be a question of whether a script is accurate, or if there is too much dialogue, the Protest Committee may have no way to ascertain if the protest has merit. Because there is no requirement to have a script present, there would be nothing to which the scripts can be compared.

The rule needs to address following concerns:

- Should it be a full copy (book) or a copy of the pages used?
 - Lengthy original manuscripts may be difficult
- Language should address variety of sources
 - E.g. a prose from a web blog, how would that need to be worded to be included?
- OSAA could help with the uploading of scripts as an option in the future

Sponsored by Jennifer Conner

<p>Arguments in Favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This is required at the National Tournament it would bring it into compliance. ● We require all original speeches to be available; it would provide consistency ● Protests about content would be more easily evaluated. ● It has been common practice for some coaches to have scripts available at state in case of a protest anyway. ● Helps coaches make sure they are familiar with the pieces and cuttings their competitors are using at competition. ● Ensures that students are not switching interp pieces between district and state. 	<p>Arguments Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We don't have the same publication requirements that the National Tournament has in all interp events ● Getting an original copy of a poem or prose piece may pose quite a challenge. <i>E.g. a prose from a web blog, how would that need to be worded to be included?</i>
--	--

.,**Proposed rule change** to allow the use of phones as electronic retrieval devices.

Current Rule

13.8.4 (b) Electronic retrieval devices are defined as laptop computers, netbooks, iPads or other portable electronic retrieval equipment. Secondary devices such as flash drives or external hard drives are allowed as well. Cell phones or smart phones are prohibited from being used while preparing or before speaking at competitions.

Proposed Rule

13.8.4 (b) Electronic retrieval devices are defined as laptop computers, netbooks, iPads or other portable electronic retrieval equipment. Secondary devices such as flash drives or external hard drives are allowed as well. Cell phones or smart phones that are verified in “Airplane Mode” (no data transmission) can retrieve articles stored offline.

Rationale

Students may have access to smart phones but not computers. Articles filed in Dropbox, for instance, can be retrieved offline. Phones would be subject to the same rules for electronic retrieval (students would consent to having phone searched.)

Offered by Jenny Owen; synthesized by Jennifer Conner

<p>Arguments in Favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Most students have access to a phone●	<p>Arguments Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Mandatory reporting laws may come into play upon searching a student phone● Proctors would have to be very diligent, omniscient, omnipresent to see all the phones. Computers and other equipment are difficult enough.● Not enforceable● Not feasible.
--	---

Proposed rule change to change Proven Excellence use at Districts.

Current Rule

6.13.2. Qualification Process: Each school may add a maximum of two Speech State Championships entries which did not qualify to participate at the Speech State Championships in the designated event to that district’s report form to the OSAA if all the following conditions have been satisfied for each student:

(a) The student participated at the district speech tournament in the event in which the student had previously proven excellence, but did not qualify for participation at the Speech State Championships in that event.

Proposed Change

Eliminate 6.13.2 a and add the following at the bottom of the lettered sub points:

(f/e) A student is not required to participate at the district tournament, although may choose to do so. Either way, that student counts toward (a) the team’s total overall entry in that event and (b) toward the total number of teams competing at the district tournament in that event.

Rationale

Students give up many many weekends for debate tournaments -- weekends they could be doing any number of other activities besides "being present" for a small tournament that doesn't really matter to them. If a student has earned an alt qual, and their coach wants to designate them as one of the alt quals before the start of the tournament and reward that student with a weekend off, individual teams should be allowed that option. (Meeting note: it could be coaches’ discretion whether this is determined before district.)

Rob Bingham

<p>Arguments in Favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● We try to develop well rounded students and this would help reduce conflicts with other activities	<p>Arguments Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Undermines the purpose of the district tournament● No other OSAA event would allow non participants to participate at the state level● Students choose to participate in tournaments● Creates a quality of elitism on teams● Tactically coaches must make decisions that may be subjective● We try to develop well rounded students and this would help reduce conflicts with other activities●
--	--

--	--

Proposed rule change to allow automatic bids to State.

Current Rule

There is currently no rule providing automatic bids to State.

Proposed Change

Students who place first in their event(s) at the State Speech Championship automatically qualify for the State Speech Championships the following year in that event. In partner events, both partners must return in that event. Students are not required to participate in the event they won.

Rationale

We should be encouraging continuing participation and rewarding students who excel.

Offered by Keith Eddins; Sponsored by Jennifer Conner

(Keith offered a version of this as a rule; he was unsure about proceeding with it, based on reaction at the Coaches' meeting. I think it should be examined as a rule and am happy to offer it under my name if he doesn't want to.)

<p>Arguments in Favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NSDA allows it and we have worked to align with their rules.,	<p>Arguments Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Qualifies with a different speech that may not be tried and proven• No other OSAA event allows that exemption
---	---

Proposed Rule Change to amend Divisions at Districts for Policy Debate

Current rule

13.1. Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate

13.1.1. Divisions

(a) At the District contest, schools shall be divided based upon OSAA size classification. Debate teams representing 1A, 2A, 3A and 4A schools shall compete in the "Small School" division; Debate teams representing 5A and 6A schools shall compete in the "Large School" division.

(b) At the State contest, all teams shall be combined into a single division regardless of the division in which they competed at the District level.

Proposed Rule

Delete 13.1.1

Rationale

I don't believe any districts are doing this and there is no such provision for any other style of debate or speech event.

Ameena Amdahl-Mason
Clackamas High School

<p>Arguments in Favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Would make it consistent to all other events at state●	<p>Arguments Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Districts would lose the ability to acknowledge small, middle, and large schools.
---	--

--	--

Proposed rule change for Tear-apart ballots

Current rule:

6.4. Tear-apart ballots shall be used at District competitions

Proposed rule:

6.4. Tear-apart ballots shall be used at District competitions, or photocopies of state ballots may be used when tear-apart ballots are not available. When photocopies are used, copies shall be made for both debate teams.

Rationale:

Tear-apart ballots may not always be readily available for district tournaments.

Ameena Amdahl-Mason

<p>Arguments in Favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Cost of NCR paper is prohibitive● Photo Copiers exist	<p>Arguments Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Photo copy qualities vary● The district director may not have a copier●
--	--

Proposed rule change on Evidence Exchange During Rounds

Current Rule

12.8. Evidence Exchanges during the Round. It is recommended that evidence not be exchanged by debaters during debate rounds. Judges shall limit their requests for evidence to checks for accuracy and authenticity

Proposed rule

12.8. Evidence Review by Judges. Judges shall limit their requests for evidence to checks for accuracy and authenticity.

Rationale

I believe that evidence exchange during rounds is appropriate in order to check for accuracy and internal warrants. Also, this rule appears to be in conflict with “12.12.6. Availability of Evidence: Contestants electing to use computers have the responsibility to promptly provide a copy of any evidence read in a speech for inspection by the judge or opponent. Printers may be used. Evidence may be printed in the round or produced electronically, but must be provided in a format readable by the opposing team and the judge.”

Ameena Amdahl-Mason
Clackamas High School

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none">● It is in conflict with 12.12.6● Students should be able to see evidence used against them● Authenticity of evidence is a valuable part of the debate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Could lengthen the debate

A Proposed Rule Change to amend General Debate Rules

Current Rule

There is no current rule defining debate.

Proposed Rule

12.1 Debate Definition A "debate" shall be defined as a structured contest in oral advocacy on the assigned topic or resolution that follows the basic time constraints and rules of that particular event. Debaters are free to interpret the resolution any way they wish, and to advocate for the legitimacy of that interpretation, but contestants who choose instead to abandon the basic constraints of debate instead engage in activities/behaviors which could not be reasonably defined as "oral advocacy" shall not be eligible for a win in the round. In the event that both teams engage in a "non-debate" a double loss may be awarded by the TAB room.

Rationale

Debaters who choose to abandon the basic constraints of the activity ("structured oral advocacy") should not be rewarded with a win by doing something that is clearly not debate. This is an increasing problem with the rise of "performative positions," performative critiques, students who choose to walk out in protest of the resolution, students competing to see who has the best pirate voice, who is the best at hacky sack, etc.

Rob Bingham
Ashland High School

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Will focus the debate on the topic or resolution, critical thinking● Will preserve the dignity of the debater and not put them in situations that may demean or humiliate them.● It will eliminate the coercion of students into doing things they do not wish to do● Establish standards for an academic debate that include reasoning, argumentation, common, sense and teaching the fundamentals that are essential to debate.● On the high school level academic debate is a curriculum driven learning experience and competition. OSAA would not allow a solo music performer to sing with a band at the State Solo Contest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Double loss will make matching difficulties or re-run rounds● It gives too much power to the judge● Decisions should be made in the round.● If a judge believes that a rule has been violated they have a means to convey that● Judges can stop this without a rule change● Can limit the creativity of debate● Some of the examples of oral advocacy are not oral advocacy so the bright line is not clear.● Is this a student issue or a judge issue? If it is a judge issue instruction in what is appropriate to high school students will solve it.

A Proposed Rule Change to allow speaking conflicts in Individual Events

Current Rule

9.7.1. To the extent possible, there shall be no speaking, district or selection / subject conflicts in individual events during the preliminary rounds. Rounds shall be scheduled at enough different times to prevent conflicts.

Proposed Rule

Eliminate speaking conflicts.

9.7.1. To the extent possible, there shall be no district or selection / subject conflicts in individual events during the preliminary rounds. Rounds shall be scheduled at enough different times to prevent conflicts.

Rationale

Students spend the entire year being double-entered; now they possibly spend hours waiting for their rounds. I'm not sure what we're protecting them from. Removing speaking conflicts and/or establishing patterns could allow more schedule changes or at least give students consistency for when they are speaking.

Jennifer Conner
Forest Grove High School

Arguments in Favor	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none">● We would be able to pattern events● We could use computers to run the state speech tournament IEs● The state tournament schedule can be confusing to new students and coaches●	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● This will cause students to have to choose between events● The state tournament is not a traditional tournament● Students should not feel pressured to get to two rounds in the same time periods● It is really important for students to have an audience; students should remain in their rounds to learn the aspects of being a good audience and be respectful of all speakers● What advantage is there to the students at the state speech tournament to do this?● There are not enough judges● An appropriate computer program has not been designed that would follow current state rules●

A Proposed Rule Change to allow multiple judge use in CX

Current Rule

Not sure if there's technically a rule for this or more common (sense) practice, but judges may only judge a team once.

Proposed Rule

Allow judges in CX to see a team again in elimination rounds.

Rationale

CX suffers from a small, willing pool of judges. Instead of relying on potentially less experienced judges in CX to decide elimination rounds, judges should be treated as having a clean slate. There are already procedures in place to protest judges, but strikes could be a future option.

Mark Little
OES

(Meeting note: this was proposed at the meeting, not sure if he wants to pursue it.)

<p>Arguments in Favor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Allows us to use qualified judges in late CX debate judges	<p>Arguments Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Every coach should judge every event● It should be for every event not just CX● Creates a greater stigma for CX● Flip for sides means the judge could judge them on the same side● Common practice, doesn't need a rule change
--	---