

TCFL President Notes from CHSSA meeting Sept. 5-6, 2014

Meeting took place in Oakland. Well attended with every league in the state represented.

Re: States April 4/17-4/19/2015 at Vista Murietta HS

Vista Murietta HS is in a “sleepy suburb.” Area 4 Chair and Nermin describe it as a BEAUTIFUL school, fairly new (opened in 2003) and quite large (68 acres!). Nearest bigger city is Temecula (basically Southern California’s wine country)—hotels there too expensive, so tournament hotels will be at least a 20-minute commute. There is virtually no commerce around the high school campus, so the host coach, Kristine LaPierre, assures us that everything we need in terms of food will be brought in. But she warns that once we are on campus, we probably won’t be leaving (no quick jaunts to take kids back to the hotel to change, etc.) so kids should bring their tournament attire with them, even if they have several hours before they compete—or lots of down time between rounds.

There may be a **scholarship** offered to **Expos** speakers this year. In the neighborhood of \$500-\$750. Offered by the California Library Assn. Expos qualifiers would be invited to submit an essay; winner would be announced at the award ceremony. As more details become available, I’ll let you all know.

Reminder about **States 2016**: will be mid-April, earlier than usual due to Easter and Passover holiday conflicts. We will have to adjust our 2015-16 league tournament calendar to meet the earlier entry deadlines. 2016 will be in Area One (Northern Calif).

States 2017 will be back in our Area, hosted by SCDL. Likely site is Arcadia HS. As the Host Area, we will have extra duties, including an increased judging commitment (increased judging commitment for host leagues and Areas was just approved in a new bylaw by the CHSSA council—see my notes under **New and Revised Legislation**).

Rita Pritchard, the curriculum chair, announced that the **Parli DVD** will be ready for distribution in January. All paid up CHSSA members will receive a complimentary copy. I will pick up our league copies at the January CHSSA meeting in San Diego. It will be a 2-DVD set. It will be available for purchase in April at States for \$30. We watched a preview—it looked great. Saw footage of league champs **Milan Armitraj and Mia Ehrenberg from Campbell Hall**—yay!!

Next 2 projects for curriculum committee is to put together a **judging instruction DVD** and to update the first DVD CHSSA made—the 2005 Expos DVD. They are thinking they will replace the sample speeches at the very least with current speakers.

New and Revised Legislation

Re-use of Literary Work

There was a motion regarding **Interps** that was remanded to IE committee, so it will come up again in January, but I want all of us to be on alert about it. Literary works used in previous years may NOT be re-used by the same speaker, even if the speaker is using a different cutting or even if the speaker is entering a different event. That is and always has been the rule. It is a disqualifiable offense. The proposal now is that the same speaker in different events within the same year may NOT use the same literary work in those events. In other words, it would be illegal to use the same literary work, *even if the cuttings are completely different*, in multiple events, such as DI and HI, or DI and TI, or HI and Duo, or any combination thereof. This will likely pass, so if you have strong feelings about it, contact me so I can represent your point of view at the next meeting.

MORE IE LEGISLATION THAT PASSED

Happy to report that **both of my motions passed** unanimously! **See my separate attachment** for the exact wording, but basically **Timing in Expos** is now codified, and substantially quoted outside material in original speeches must now be orally attributed in addition to submitted manuscript citations. This curtails the practice of **Oral Plagiarism** in the delivery of all original speeches, including OPP. So as your kids write their original speeches this year, make sure they build in oral attributions for their quotations that exceed 50 words from a single source. We will be looking for that when we check scripts this year.

Passed: **Proof of OI Sourcing**: The new language reads: “The student will submit with their manuscript published/reputable evidence that the speech *originated* as a public address . . . This can be from the forward to a book, a magazine/newspaper article etc. This evidence shall be placed directly following the coversheet in the completed manuscript.”

So now you have to *document* that the text actually ORIGINATED as a public address. This bylaw is a reaction to the very popular “To This Day” piece that kids up and down the state were doing in OI last season. Last year I brought this piece to CHSSA’s attention because despite being performed at a TED conference, it originated as a slam poem and had been published in an anthology of slam poetry 2 years before the TED conference, making it ineligible to be entered in OI. Even though CHSSA flagged this piece and sent out warnings, some people never got the message. 3 kids were DQ’d at States for doing this piece in OI. Their submissions got past their coaches, their league presidents, and their area chairs. But they paid the price with their DQ’s, AND their leagues lose qualifying slots in OI for this year as punishment. Bottom line: double check the source of your OIs; make sure they originated as public addresses and provide the proof.

Passed: **OPPs Need Not Be Thematic**: restores language specifying that an OPP may be comprised of unrelated stories and/or poems. They do not need to have a unifying theme.

Failed: a motion to eliminate **face-to-face positioning in Duo**. Failed because most of us agreed it would be too hard to adjudicate in the event of a protest. But, tell your duos this year to be careful; if they face each other straight on, even if they are not making eye contact, they are taking a big risk. Make it clear to the judge that they are not making eye contact.

DEBATE LEGISLATION THAT PASSED

Passed: Civil conduct required during **Public Forum Crossfire**. The new language reads: “The format is intended to be question and answer and comments by debaters are restricted to advancing questions or answering an opponent’s question. Students should conduct themselves in a civil and professional manner during the cross-fire—cross-fire is intended to help clarify the debate for the judge and is not intended to be a verbal brawl.”

Passed: change in the timing of **Point of Order interruptions in the final rebuttal speeches of Parli**. The new language reads: “Once a Point of Order is raised, time should be immediately stopped. The debater that raised the Point of Order must make a concise statement *lasting no more than fifteen seconds* that clearly identifies the new argument or offense alleged to have been committed by the speaker. The speaker will then be granted the opportunity to respond to the Point of Order with a statement, *lasting no more than fifteen seconds*, that either directly responds to the offense brought up in the Point of Order, or accepts the Point of Order. No other arguments may be brought up while time is stopped due to a Point of Order. Once the speaker has responded to the Point of Order, time officially restarts.”

I’m going to include the author’s rationale for this motion as I think all our parli kids should be aware that judges are tired of the gamesmanship that we are seeing too often in parli. Teams should

win on the merit of their arguments, not on their underhanded attempts to sabotage their opponents. This motion was authored by the Lowell coach, Terry Abad; it passed unanimously:

Terry's rationale:

*While Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph B.3.h establishes a POO as a charge that shouldn't be used "as a tactic to disrupt the opponent's speech," many Parliamentary Debate teams have been using a Point of Order as a way to continuously break a speaker's momentum, or to waste the speaker's final seconds of time. Specifically, whenever a speaker discusses an argument that could potentially win the round, the opposing team is more inclined to call a Point of Order, despite there being no violation (the opposing team would simply just call the point a "new argument") in order to break the momentum the speaker was creating prior to the Point of Order. Points of Order have also been called during the last few seconds of speeches by opposing teams to simply waste the concluding lines of the speaker. Instead of finishing off the speech (and debate, in Affirmative cases) with a strong closing statement, many speakers instead find themselves responding to a Point of Order, which not only breaks the overall momentum of the speech (as mentioned earlier), but also gives the judge(s) a fairly negative opinion overall of the speaker (instead of a strong conclusion, the speaker has to spend the last few seconds simply saying, "No, this was not a new point, I brought it up in the first speech . . .") which simply detracts away from the speech as a whole. **The new language aims to rectify this issue by allowing Points of Orders (and their respective responses) to briefly stop time**, giving the team responding to the Point of Order a chance to respond to the accusation without detracting from his/her own speech time (and thus avoiding a very rushed, incoherent response to a Point of Order to preserve time), and allowing the speech to continue right where it left off before the Point of Order without any penalty.*

 Passed: **Codifying penalties for deviating from the rules in all debate events.** The new language reads: "Debaters may not agree among themselves or with the judges to modify the rules in any round. Judges should not direct students to deviate from these rules or encourage students to violate them. In ruling on protests for violation of debate rules set forth in Article XI, the Protest Committee shall consider the total facts and circumstances associated with the violation including whether it was intentional or unintentional, whether it was unethical and/or dishonest, whether it would be considered abusive, whether it was intended to obtain an unfair advantage in the debate, whether it violates the purpose behind a rule in addition to its express language, and the degree of prejudice resulting to the opponent from the violation. Unless another penalty is included as to any specific rule, the Protest Committee is empowered to impose any of the following penalties or take any of the following actions: 1) Impose a loss on the debater(s) in violation, 2) require the round be repeated under terms considered fair and just by the Committee, 3) disqualification, 4) warning and/or reprimand, including a statement of clear consequences for a repeated violation."

For practical purposes, repeating the round would never happen at the state tournament.

 Passed: **Final round debate judging panel reduced from 7 to 5.** Self-explanatory—needs no further explanation, thank goodness.

GENERAL LEGISLATION PASSED:

☐ Passed: **Time limit to make corrections on state qualifying scripts.** I was the ONLY “Nay” on this one; I think the **72 hour window** is too short and the repercussions for failing to meet it too severe. But I was the lone voice howling in the wilderness. I *was* able to get the original modified however. In our Friday IE committee meeting, I pointed out to Nermin that sometimes an Area Chair informs the coach that the entire script is illegal. 72 hours to come up with a whole new script is not reasonable. Nermin agreed and extended the deadline for submission of an entirely new script to 5 days. Here’s the new rule, and we better all check our e-mails several times a day once our scripts have qualified in case Jennifer finds out there are corrections that need to be made:

“Any correction of entry fees, forms and/or scripts requested by the Area Chairperson shall be made within 72 hours by the coach and sent to the Area Chairperson with delivery confirmation. If a student is found to have qualified with an illegal script, the school will be given 5 days to submit a new (legal) script to the area chair. The Area Chairperson shall notify the coach via the email address provided on the state entry form. It will be the coach’s affirmative duty to check said email address for requested corrections and provide the corrections within the 72-hour (or 5 day) deadlines. Failure to meet the deadlines will result in the entry being declared ineligible and the appropriate alternate being moved into their spot.”

☐ Passed: **Increased fines for missing deadlines.** The fine for missing either the online entry deadline or the fee & forms postmark deadline is currently \$150 per missed deadline. **This bylaw now assesses a \$150 fine for sending in a partial entry**—i.e. a check without the signed forms, or forms without a check, or forms that are missing signatures, or an incomplete set of forms. Way too punitive, if you ask me, but again, I was in the minority. Here’s the new rule:

“Failure to meet state entry deadlines (online or post mark) will result in a \$150 fine for the offending school per deadline. Sending in a partial online entry or mailing partial entry forms or payments may be fined up to \$150.

In addition, failure to send notification of entry as required on or before the designated due dates (online and/or postmark) shall result in disqualification of entrant(s). The Area Chairperson shall then be authorized to substitute alternates. Both the coach of the disqualified entrant(s) and the alternate(s) shall be notified by telephone and email immediately.

In extenuating circumstances, monetary fines may be appealed in writing to the state tournament committee within 72 hours of notification of fine.”

☐ Passed: **Instead of \$500 scholarships awarded to each event champion, \$500 cash honorariums will be awarded instead.** This one I voted for!

☐ Passed: **Competitive Year redefined.** The new language reads: “The CHSSA competitive year shall be defined as the year beginning the day following the state tournament in a given year to the final day of the following state tournament. So a competitive year is from one state tournament to the next.” **Rationale:** *Our bylaws currently ask students not to perform scripts that they did in a previous year, but the bylaws lack a definition of when a year begins and ends. Since schools begin and end at different times, this definition creates the clearest “year” for competitive purposes.*

Finally, we passed a bylaw that will provide a plaque to the Hall of Famer’s school, recognizing the coach so honored (this is in addition to the individual **Hall of Fame plaque** that the coach receives).

Sorry these notes are so long, but as you can see, it was a productive meeting, even if I did not agree with all of the council’s decisions. That’s democracy for you! *Sincerely, your co-prez, Kathy.*