

Consolidating Debate Governance: Working Group Recommendations

Gordon Stables, University of Southern California (chair)

Andrew Barnes, Georgia State University, Dan Cronn-Mills, Minnesota State University, Mankato, Terri Easley, Johnson County Community College (KS), Vik Keenan, Baruch Debate, City University of New York, Eric Morris, Missouri State University, ML Sandoz, Vanderbilt University

Introduction

The governance working group was asked to explore the status of intercollegiate policy debate associations and recommend improvements in organizational structure. Our working group solicited input the range of debate organizations and included participation from leadership of several organizations, and perspectives drawn from the conference participants. This document presents our conclusions.

Our report offers a summary on the state of organizational governance, looking across the policy debate landscape and suggests longer-term recommendations concerning systemic change. The report also contains a series of short-term action items that could help the community function better in the near-term. More importantly we hope the report can spur community deliberation regarding fundamental changes in how debate administers the activity.

Status of Organizational Governance – How do we govern?

The challenge of ‘governing’ intercollegiate debate is frustrated by the decentralized, fragmented, and often overlapping nature of the activity, with authority divided among several organizations. Each policy debate program decides which policy debate organizations to join, typically on an annual basis. The mix and match system finds most programs joining some or all of the following organizations: The American Forensics Association (AFA), The National Debate Tournament (NDT), The Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA), The American Debate Association (ADA), and Phi Ro Pi. Moreover, these memberships collectively are not inclusive of all schools that participate in policy debate, and fail to integrate with many other organizations who deal with non-policy debate.

Each organization has its own emphasis and expertise; self-defining as fulfilling unique purpose. The memberships define its function with emphases ranging from broad novice participation or selecting a national champion. Yet collectively the memberships combine to form the larger policy debate community with shared interests.

The structure is characterized by organizational traits that differentially motivate rules and regulations, resulting in disparate statutes across overlapping functions and jurisdiction. Basic student eligibility standards, for example, are generally set by the American Forensics

Association, but many of the other organizations also contain clauses that allow them to directly follow or adjust those AFA standards. This ensures that even when one organization acts it often has a direct influence on the activities of the others. For example, when the AFA moved away from an academic time block method to determining competitive eligibility this resulted in each policy organization needing to revisit their rules even as they are often not consulted before the change. Technological developments are also making linkages more apparent. For example, as the recording and publication of debate videos are becoming more common organizations often look to each other to determine fair use standards without logic for who decides.

When organizations attempt to synchronize, coordination is often ad hoc. Each organization was designed to perform certain basic functions for its members (provide regional representation, collect dues, often host a national tournament, determine the rules and standards for its specific competitions, etc.) and each of these functions is repeated in various committees and officer corps across organizations. As organizations mature other responsibilities are added other (anti-discrimination officers, press committees, website management, etc.) exacerbating fragmentation and overlap. The end result is patchworks where committees and officers often motivated to cooperate are nonetheless charged with specific responsibilities and ‘turf’ that compete.

This system might be viewed as benign, an inefficient system without material harm. Yet there are costs. The number of policy debate program, while arguably stable, also has a declining number of full time forensics professionals who are asked to shoulder these responsibilities. The term “forensics professional” intentionally identifies the historical concept where tenure-track personnel were expected to engage professional responsibilities as part of their tenure. Certainly non-tenure coaches do provide such service, often filling the gaps with non-faculty coaches. Over time, absent institutional commitment from professional directors we increasingly rely on the goodwill and benevolence of very busy coaches who are not rewarded for such service. There is also a distortion in the nature of volunteer service where the greater numbers of coaches gravitate to jobs directly related to competition related activities, leaving professional development issues in search of leadership

Generally debate organizations are situated to perform their core functions of managing competition yet poorly organized to anticipate and prepare for overarching issues. For example, the media environment requires that debate organizations play a significant role in managing the *brand* of policy debate with outside organizations. Yet it is also apparent when too many organizations “represent” policy debate with larger audiences, the voice lacks reach, authority, or coherence. For these reasons, we believe that the policy debate community should consider greater organizational coordination.

Status of Organizational Governance – Signs of Interest in Greater Coordination

There are several indicators suggesting that there is interest in greater coordination, admittedly in an uneven manner. The 1996 ‘merger’ of the NDT and CEDA is one important sign that the community recognized the problems of dividing governance among our organizations. Ending a split that had lasted over a quarter century, the two organizations agreed to a common annual topic. The merger produced substantial changes on the debate community, from altering regional travel patterns to influencing the ongoing dynamic of which programs defined themselves as interested in ‘policy debate.’

Upon closer inspection, the CEDA/NDT “merger” represented the first step to bring together institutions who shared community values about the nature of academic debate. It brought schools together that might be regionally proximate, but who did not typically compete against one another. The adoption of a joint topic might be considered the *1.0 version of an organizational merger*. The accommodation, however, did not make any effort to streamline how the organizations functioned. Each organization continues to mark its own regional boundaries and elect its own national and regional officers. Even though the member schools are almost an inclusive overlap they continued to elect two regional representatives, with similar (but not identical) boundaries. In the southwest, this created unique issues where schools like UNLV and Arizona State were part of the Southern California CEDA region, but part of the Rocky Mountain (District 9) NDT district. While some regions informally took steps to coordinate their efforts, the organizations continued to use two different maps to represent the same programs until 2009. In the spring of 2009 the first efforts to coordinate the regions took place in Southeast and across the west. Currently the organizations still elect two officers for each region, but these are the first steps toward a single set of regional governance. It is this idea, that each school would have one regional representative assigned to look after its national interests that underlies the concept of a 2.0 merger or a truly integrated national organization.

Jointly hosting national tournaments is another area where greater coordination is needed and there are small signs of progress. Each spring the NDT, CEDA, ADA, PRP each host a national championship. Several regions host championships for novice and JV students. Even before considering regional end of the season tournaments or national qualifiers, there are at least seven ‘national’ tournaments that take place from the end of February until mid-April. At present there is no mechanism to coordinate the scheduling or hosting of these events. Because most of these tournaments rotate hosts, the question of when and where a tournament is hosted can have a tremendous influence on the turnout and composition of the event. This dilemma is even more pronounced because several of the tournaments require so many classrooms that they can often only be hosted during the host school’s spring break.

In 2000 (the 4th year following the CEDA-NDT merger), both national tournaments were hosted in Kansas City. Different institutions hosted each tournament (UMKC hosted the NDT and JCCC hosted CEDA Nationals) but schools could attend both events consecutively in the same city. This has not been replicated and the two tournaments are often now scheduled on consecutive weekends in very distinct locations. In 2009, for example, many schools made the 1500 mile trip from Pocatello, Idaho to Austin, Texas in one and a half days to compete at both CEDA and the NDT. This is the result of a difficult process of coordinating hosting bids and organizational needs. Again, there are limited signs of progress. In 2010, The University of California at Berkeley will play host to both tournaments, using the same campus and hotel facilities, across an eight-day period. There are certainly advantages and problems of a joint tournament, but the current process has not generally been able to coordinate these tournaments, to say nothing of how these tournaments influence all of the other national and end of the year tournaments.

Another important moment in the recognition of a greater need for organizational coordination took place in 2008. The controversy surrounding a confrontation that took place at the 2008 CEDA Nationals tournament forced the entire policy debate community to consider its shared

linkages. The incident and the distribution of a video of the incident created a media frenzy that exposed policy debate to a great deal of scrutiny. The incident took place at CEDA Nationals, and thus CEDA was thrust into the role of responding to media and institutional inquiries. Understandable were concerns by the AFA, NDT, PRP, and ADA as to CEDA being the lead organization discussing the matter with national media, and administration of member institutions. Simply drawing distinctions between that event and organization or tournament are nuances that fail to resonate in the larger academic and media conversation.. Even within CEDA there was tension about who and how the organization should release public statements.

A year after these events it is apparent that despite pedagogical differences we all share a common brand of policy debate. The passage of a CEDA *code of professional conduct*, now being modeled by the AFA and by other non-policy debate organizations, can be seen as recognition that every coach, student and program is interconnected with each other, aware that our problems cannot be limited to just one tournament or program or organization.

The final sign of recognition of a need for greater institutional coordination is the conference that has produced this report. The conference grew out of the ideas by the Chair of the National Debate Tournament and the leadership of the Cross-Examination Debate Association, but it could not have been produced so much energy and effort, to say nothing of its large turnout, without a collective sense that debate professionals wanted this event. It was significant not just because it had been so long since the last professional development conference, but also because debate professionals gathered not to talk about the upcoming topic or to have a competition. This larger gathering of professionals, many paying their own ways because of limited organizational funding, took place because debate professionals saw the need to move beyond just the traditional ways that we gather at tournaments.

Status of Organizational Governance – Interacting with larger communities

The 2008 CEDA Nationals controversy is not then only venue for problems of how the debate community communicates with the larger world. Increasingly there are occasions when outside communities reach out to the policy debate community and when the policy debate community wants to speak in larger settings. This next section addresses the nature of this challenge in our current model of governance.

Historically debate professionals have resisted efforts to speak in collective voices, preferring instead to have their own distinct communication strategies, with individual programs preferring autonomy. We are comfortable with selecting champions and relating to individual administrative, community and alumni support. How one program chooses to explain its rationale for its efforts may be different than its neighbor and debate coaches have long respected those differences.

At the same time, this decentralized model creates problems when an outside actor comes to ‘policy debate.’ If the actor is only interested in a specific tournament it is easier to direct that inquiry, but how does one answer the question if the actor is interested in the larger community? These are not hypothetical questions. In the last few years debate coaches and organizations have been approached by media, documentary filmmakers, college sports television networks, network studio writers, organizations seeking the expansion of debate in Historically Black

Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), and multimedia companies seeking to expand online debating. Some segments may be hostile to outside overtures but it would be folly to believe that our well-respected community of higher learning institutions should be institutionally incapable of even considering such arrangements.

We are currently not legally or organizationally constituted to easily provide answers to a simple question of providing consent forms for filming. We do not retain regular counsel to review contracts. Our organizations are incorporated in states across the union and have varying levels of insurance needed to consider these questions. We are not yet comfortable answering questions about our obligations to our home institutions intersects with our collective actions. We also take for granted that just about any member can compete against any other member at a given tournament, but this may not be assured in a world of exclusive contracts. Perhaps more fundamentally, most of our governing documents are almost exclusively focused on managing our competitions.

We are not positioned even really to consider such questions as: who speaks for us? Simply put, we do not have a procedure for the collective to enter these relationships. Many will remember the several-year relationship that the NDT developed with College Sports Television. Even in this situation where an outside media organization came to an organization with a specific goal to cover their national tournament, the procedures for acceding to a contacted relationship were difficult.

Examples like the CSTV documentaries should be understood as an example of a larger trend. As our information age makes simpler the distribution of information we see a growing interest in activities that teach the skills of making reasoned conclusions. Outside actors are unlikely to be sympathetic to claims that we are institutionally incapable of making collective judgments and signing contracts. It is not difficult to imagine that if our institutions fail to provide the channels for our member schools to negotiate greater visibility and access to emerging communication technologies, then our member schools will likely negotiate such deals on their own and without collective deliberation.

None of this requires debate programs and institutions to abandon the unique facets that make each distinct. If an organization is primarily concerned with maximizing opportunities for students who do not have forensics experience in high school, that can certainly be reconciled with another organization that primarily is interested in determining a national varsity champion. We must find ways to acknowledge our differences, even as we recognize the benefits of enhanced coordination.

What's Next? Moving toward Greater Coordination

That college policy debate community is interested in taking the needed steps toward greater organizational coordination is far from guaranteed. Each of the above mentioned steps have been marked by controversy, and are only the beginning of substantive change. As much as we endorse the short-term action items contained in this report, they alone cannot resolve our governance problem. If the community were truly willing to move in this direction we would need to accept significant institutional reform of each organization and a redistribution of certain core responsibilities

At a fundamental level, the community would need to accept the essential principle that 'we' are willing to recognize these common linkages in the legitimacy of a single primary organization. This effort will likely involve a delicate balance of a federalist model of organization, where each of the current organizations clearly defines itself by its core mission and then agrees to function as part of the larger structure. Each organization should retain its core identity, a process that could be enhanced by the removal of legislative tasks. As the central part, we need to move core functions, such as eligibility, tournament scheduling, questions of educational climate and conduct, publicity, and legal incorporation into some central organization.

The committee was heartened by the response of the full assembly of coaches at the development conference to this basic question. Far from dismissing the importance of taking these steps toward coordination, the assembly encouraged even greater centralization going as far as recommending, to strong support, the creation of a full-time Executive Director and staff for this new organization. Ross Smith of Wake Forest University noted the success that other debate organizations, including the National Forensics League and the National Association of Urban Debate Leagues, have employed with this model.

Our working group strongly supports the role that a full-time Executive Director and staff can play in this new structure. When this suggestion has been raised several times within the individual organizations over the past few years, the question has generally turned to the feasibility generating the funding for salary, benefits and office needs. This important suggestion would necessitate changes in our basic financial model. At present, most of the debate organizations generate revenue to provide for some annual expenses (such as summer business meetings and annual awards) but the overwhelming economic model is built upon using annual dues to defer the costs of the national tournaments. At present none of the organizations pay full-time staff and when one considers the difference between even the combined budgets of all of the national tournaments and what would be needed for a full-time director, intercollegiate policy debate organizations will need to pursue a different business model. Rich Edwards of Baylor University noted that the National Forensics League has a much larger base of members, events and competitors; this broader base allows them to support full-time leadership.

The question of national leadership would require the community determine who would hire this staff, another reason to determine the location of central governance. At present none of the organizations are well situated to this task. As we surveyed past and present leadership from across each of the organizations, it was remarkable how much individual experience with a specific organization led officers to conclude that some *other* organization was better suited to this task. Theoretically the challenge is simply gaining consent of the members to make the appropriate legislative changes. In reality, there are two sets of barriers that closely resemble what used to be understood as inherency: structural and attitudinal barriers. Without the tool of fiat, the college community will need to decide how best to overcome these challenges.

To build a unified structure, the college community must be willing to empower the leadership of the AFA, NDT, CEDA, ADA and other related organizations to begin building these common foundations. The unified structure will also require identifying individuals willing to serve as transition leadership, especially until a sustainable revenue stream develops.

Each organization has some of the necessary institutional components and all must be willing to cede some of their responsibilities. All of the organizations, for example, build upon on sections of the AFA code including questions of competitor eligibility. Every institution is incorporated and has officers devoted to organizing their records and to collecting dues. Most of the organizations have some form of tournament sanctioning procedure, even if many have evolved into perfunctory exercises. Both CEDA and the NDT contain legislative assemblies that provide for local representation. These are tasks that relate to each specific organization, but they also identify areas where a common system would serve the larger community. At the very least, this could work as a federalized system where the central organization provided clear standards for matters such as competitor eligibility.

To make the needed changes these organizations would revise their governing documents in accordance with a larger organizational blueprint. This would eliminate duplicate positions, committees, and it may necessitate a new nomenclature to describe the inter-organizational relationships. It may be instructive to consider each organization functioning as a caucus entity within the larger structure ensuring that specific interests and preferences are preserved for likeminded members, but allowing uniformity where it makes sense. ADA sanctioned tournaments would therefore still be able to generate and operate within specific rules to govern their competitions, even as much of the rule making would flow from the unified national system of regional representatives.

It is also not obvious which organization should become the new organizational hub. The NDT would need a major overhaul of its infrastructure and it would be forced to be responsible for a great many aspects of debate that it currently has no involvement. CEDA would need to change cultures, from an organization that has been historically defined in opposition to other models to a baseline structure. The AFA would need to establish ties to communities of coaches that no longer have historical ties with the organization. The AFA and PRP would need to be dramatically restructured to represent all of intercollegiate debate. Alternatively, the community could choose to create a new organization. This enjoys some cognitive simplicity, but it very clearly possesses the danger to magnify all of the current coordination problems.

Conclusion: Empower the Organizational Leadership to Start Working

It is far less important what name the central organization uses than that the membership bestows it with the legitimacy to truly represent intercollegiate policy debate. The final action step recommended by this committee is to empower the leadership of each of the policy debate organizations to function as a working group to begin examining and drafting the specific steps that would be needed to represent policy debate in a single entity. These steps should be developed in active coordination with the membership and provide the ability to identify a specific, and near-term timeline, for the introduction of specific legal and legislative changes.

If each of the organization played an active role in developing new guidelines, with a process involving membership, change could be possible. The scale of the task is daunting, but the importance of this effort requires such action. Without a coordinated voice, the community will continue to fragment and a weakened presence when engaging outside entities. There is surprising consensus regarding the advantages of consolidating governance but without the license to exercise leadership, changes will remain hostage to full schedules and inertia.

Finally, only a unified membership has the possibility to reach out to the larger forensics community. There are substantial pedagogical differences among the programs that define themselves as 'policy debate' programs, but we continue to compete against one another. There are many other institutions that also support forensics but have specific pedagogical goals. In a world with a unified structure there is the possibility of allowing these kinds of disagreements to naturally function and indeed to provide a healthy means of discourse. Imagine how differently high school speech and debate organizations like the NFL would have evolved if member schools were told that their interest in new forms of debate, such as Lincoln-Douglas or Public Forum, would require them to leave the 'policy debate' community. This is the history of the last few decades of intercollegiate policy debate and it has not made us stronger, just more divided.

It is an exciting thought to imagine a future world of intercollegiate debate where disagreeing about how our students should engage each other doesn't require leaving one community or one organization. These kinds of changes are possible with greater organizational coordination.

Action Item: Assessment in Forensics

The educational foundation of forensics is well established. Numerous scholars have expounded on the co-curricular nature of the activity (e.g., Bartanen, 1998; Church, 1975; Millsap 1998; Stenger, 1999). And as Dreher (2008) notes, “forensics is at its core an educational activity” (pg. 26).

Yet, forensics both in debate and individual events is taking little heed of contemporary educational practices. In particular, forensics is not participating on a regional or national level with contemporary educational assessment practices in either debate or individual events. Educational assessment should be second-nature to directors of forensics. As Pellegrino, Chudowsky, & Glaser (2001) contend, “assessment is always a process of reasoning from evidence” (pg. 2). Reasoning from evidence is a core principle and practice underlying policy debate and individual events.

The request for forensics to engage in assessment practice is not new. Two decades ago, Mills (1979) argued:

“If the area of forensics is to regain its former academic and co-curricular prominence, directors of forensics need to adjust to changing philosophies and needs. They must clarify the aims and goals of forensics programs, *establish the significance of co-curricular offerings in forensics*, and demonstrate that forensics deserves a place of prominence in speech communication departments” (emphasis added).

Bartanen (2006) reiterated the need for forensics to engage in programmatic assessment. The need is clear, yet the forensic community has largely failed to engage in rigorous assessment of its practices and standards.

Educational assessment serves a number of specific goals including validating how well students are learning, justifies the effectiveness of educational practices, establishes high academic standards, and measures progress of students, programs, and organizations in meeting high academic standards (Pellegrino, Chudowsky, & Glaser, 2001).

Zelna and Cousins (n.d.) identify seven reasons to engage in assessment:

- Reinforce or emphasize the mission of your unit
- Modify, shape, and improve programs and/or performance (formative)
- Critique a program’s quality or value compared to the program’s previously defined principles (summative)
- Inform decision making
- Evaluate programs
- Assist in the request for additional funds from the university and external community
- Assist in meeting accreditation requirements, models of best practices, and national benchmarks

All seven reasons provided by Zelna and Cousins should resonate with members of the forensic community (especially pt. 6 on requesting additional funds).

Forensics is not at the forefront of contemporary education, but has fallen behind on a very practice at which it excels— reasoning from evidence.

Proposals:

The Governance working group addressed the issue of the forensics community engaging in educational assessment. The working group believes that both intercollegiate policy debate and individual events primarily defends itself through anecdotal evidence. Forensics must participate in the same practices as the rest of the educational community and establish national assessment profiles. The Governance working group offers two specific proposals:

Proposal 1

Forensic organizations participate in the development of national assessment profiles for intercollegiate policy debate and intercollegiate individual events. Rationale: The profiles need to be on a national level rather than owned/controlled by any one forensic organization. Individual forensic organizations may add to the profiles to address components that are unique for the particulars of their debate and/or individual event programs, but the basic foundation should remain stable across all organizations.

Proposal 2

State, regional and national forensic organizations contribute funding for the purpose of supporting scholar(s) to undertake the task of developing the assessment profiles. Rationale: The creation of the documents will be time intensive, requires particular knowledge sets, and will require testing before national distribution/implementation. Such a task is beyond the scope of a volunteer and deserves the time and attention of a funded scholar.

Proposal 3

The creation of an online database for collecting and sharing data gathered from individual programs that use the national profiles. Rationale: A national database allows for the coordinating of scholarly efforts based on the national profiles. The data may be used for local programs, and state, regional, and national associations.

On both the formative and summative level, forensics needs to step to the forefront and engage in systematic educational assessment of student learning outcomes.

In 1990, Kay posed a question that the forensic community has yet to answer: “Are we a value-added educational experience for the departments whose budgets support our activities?” (Kay, 1990). Assessment profiles will provide forensics with the evidence to answer the question.

References

- Bartanen, K. M. (1998). The place of the forensics program in the liberal arts college of the twenty-first century: An essay in honor of Larry E. Norton. *The Forensic*, 84, 1-16
- Bartanen, M. (2006). "Rigorous program assessment in intercollegiate forensics: Its time has come. *The Forensic*, 91, 33-45.
- Church, R. (1975). The educational value of oral communication courses and intercollegiate forensics: An opinion survey of college prelegal advisors and law school deans. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 12, 49-50.
- Hinck, E. A. (2008). Overcoming obstacles to scholarly engagement. In D. Cronn-Mills (Ed.), *Published Proceedings of the National Developmental Conference on Individual Events* (pp. 1-7). Mankato, MN.
- Klumpp, J. F. (1990). Wading into the stream of forensics research: The view from the editorial office. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 77-86.
- Mills, N. H. (1979). The role of forensics in speech communication: Reassessment toward the future. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 169 596).
- Millsap, S. (1998). The benefits of forensics across the curriculum: An opportunity to expand the visibility of college forensics. *The Forensic*, 84, 17-26.
- Pellegrino, P. W., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (Eds). (2001). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Stenger, K. (1999). Forensics as preparation for participation in the academic world. *The Forensic*, 84, 13-23.
- Zelna, C. & Cousins, P. (n.d.). Assessing student learning outcomes in student conduct. Retrieved June 16, 2009 from http://www.ncsu.edu/assessment/presentations/student_affairs/stu_con_assessing_outcomes.pdf.

Action Item: Coordinate Community College Nationals and CEDA Nationals

For decades, Phi Rho Pi has been the designated tournament to crown a community college national debate champion. Despite continued support for the tournament division, schools that primarily compete in policy debate have been declining for the past five years. In the past couple Phi Rho Phi tournaments, there have been only 3 schools in the policy debate division.

Phi Rho Pi is a week-long tournament that is held entirely in a hotel and hosts various debate events as well as individual events. A school that exclusively competes in policy debate must commit to an entire week since the schedule divides prelim debates through several days to coordinate with the other events.

With the economy taking a downturn recently, it is not manageable for many schools to afford to attend the tournament. The costs of travel to the location, tournament fees, paying for hotel rooms for 8-9 days, and meals culminates to a huge chunk of a program's budget.

Discussion amongst community college directors has recently sparked in efforts to coordinate a championship tournament that would facilitate more participation. The idea to find a way to offer a shorter and more cost-efficient championship policy debate tournament is not meant deter programs from Phi Rho Pi. Programs that offer individual events and various debate models attend Phi Rho Pi because it is designed for a program that does multiple events. The discussion to find an alternative for policy debate programs is motivated by cost and increasing participation.

The governance working group thus offers several proposals:

Proposal 1:

The Cross-Examination Debate Association National tournament should host a community college breakout at the 2010 CEDA Nationals held at Berkeley. Many community college programs are on the west coast and more community college programs attend CEDA Nationals than Phi Rho Pi in the past 5 years. Adding an additional day to a tournament most community college programs already attend provides more opportunities at a much lower cost. After the breakout, feedback and conversations will be solicited about long-term possibilities for a community college national championship.

Proposal 2:

The Cross-Examination Debate Association should create a Vice President of Community College Affairs. This officer would serve on the executive council as a consistent voice for community college programs. Additionally, this position would coordinate future possibilities for a community college championship tournament.

Action Item: Positive Video Content

While occasional audio and video recording of debates is a long standing practice, recent events have directed additional community attention to the question. Through the 2004-6 CSTV coverage of the NDT, there were several disputes over the availability of particular contestants for video coverage. The most notable event was the 2008 posting on YouTube of a post-round argument between two coaches which brought undesired negative publicity to our community and other forensic communities. Reaction to that argument, and the publicly posted debate which preceded it, led to the cancellation of a program and challenges for other programs.

Since 2008, many tournament invitations have included policies on videotaping. The most common policy is to allow video recording by all participants for educational use, including private sharing, but to impose barriers to the public posting of such video. While such policies have certainly reduced the number of rounds publicly available, many remain publicly available. While 2008 vividly demonstrated the ability of one person with a video camera to impact the entire community, the process of determining what is acceptable practice varies by the situation.

Just as video of a negative moment created negative publicity, such technologies have many potentially positive benefits as well. Videotapes of the better debates could accelerate the learning curve for younger debaters, provide a positive image for external communities, help include those in the community who cannot afford to attend every tournament (or remain through finals!), and provide a richer sense of community (Morris, 2006).

Furthermore, the external benefits of video are not limited to formal debates. Many tournament moments, and in particular awards assemblies, provide a positive window into the community. Anyone who has dealt with external actors knows that certain questions recur (Why do they speak so fast? Why do they work so hard?), and having a public, video-based FAQ might provide a useful resource to communicate effectively with external audiences.

Public display of video is a balancing act. Students have legitimate concerns about public use and misuse of their images. Preserving a forum where students can make arguments that they might not want tied to their future careers is important. Those who invest time and energy in video recording have reasons for doing so, and those reasons are also an important part of the dialogue. All of these concerns will be balanced inevitably, so balancing them in an open and deliberative process is more likely to lead to agreements about how the community should handle such questions. Clarification of such norms might help the community if there is a future incident comparable to 2008.

The governance working group thus offers several proposals:

Proposal 1:

The policy debate community should authorize and endorse, either through current organizations or newly emerging structures, the creation and distribution of positive video content about policy debate. This content might include answers to commonly asked questions, particular presentations at assemblies, educational presentations from particular camps and coaches, synopses celebrating particular tournaments, etc. Such video need not be filmed

exclusively by community members – it may be possible to encourage amateur filmmakers to get involved through creation of contests with either recognition or small monetary prizes.

Proposal 2:

The policy debate community should develop a more unified community position about private efforts to videotape and distribute debate contest rounds. Such a discussion could include consideration of the following: a process for widespread intra-community private sharing of video content, clarification of whether tournament competitors have a right either to avoid being recorded or request that recordings not be made available to others, a process for selecting the high quality debates for public publication, a centralized process of managing permissions for public use of recorded video, including opt-in or opt-out processes for particular students or programs, etc.

References

Morris, E. (2006). Argue into the camera, please: An exploration of the prospects and drawbacks of comprehensive digital recording in policy debate. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 27, 148-156.