

**National Christian College Forensics Association
Business Meeting Agenda – Spring 2008**

Call to Order/Prayer 7:15am

Attendance:

Belmont

Bethel

Cedarville

Concordia-Seward

Concordia-Irvine

George Fox

Howard Payne

John Brown

Malone

Northwest Nazarene

Pt. Loma Nazarene

William Carey

Others also in attendance but did not sign sheet

Reports from Officers

TD: Seem to have enough judges to use them only 4-5 rounds.

Reports from Committees (other than action items)

Report from Brooke Adamson about electronic use that the committee discussed the issues and decided to allow live Internet use for parliamentary debate preparation only. Extemporaneous speaking should be data bases and hard copy use only. It is the opinion of the Chair that a decision should be made to allow or disallow electronic use for next year's NCCFI in advance [sent out with tournament invitation] so teams can prepare.

New Business:

- 1) Proposed Amendments to Constitution and Bylaws ([*These are included on the NCCFA website*](#)) [PASSES]

- A. Constitution: Section I.V: Officers and Duties

- B. Constitution: Section V.A: Standing Committees 2 [PASSES]

- C. Constitution: Section V.D: Parliamentary Debate Committee

PROPOSAL:

There is an expressed need to provide a judging guide to be sent out with the tournament invitation that specifies the expectations of judges. Directors want to be able to instruct their judging staff of the rules and guidelines judges should follow at NCCFI.

IF WE WANT TO ADD JUDGING SHEET:

SUGGESTION 1 FROM JASON HOUGH:

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: IN CONSTRUCTION SPEECHES NEW ARGUMENTATION SHOULD BE ALLOWED. (There have been judges not allowing or encouraging new arguments during constructive speeches and we want to make sure that critics understand that new arguments are allowed in constructive speeches.) [PASSES]

THERE WAS SOME CONCERN OF JUDGING PHILOSOPHY OF THIS TOURNAMENT TO BE CLARIFIED ON TOURNEY INVITE.

MOVED AND SECONDED TO ADAPT THE JUDGING TIP. [PASSED]

D. Constitution: Section VIII: Assets

E. By-Law 1.B

F. By-Law 3.B

G. By-Law 6.D & E

H. NEW AMENDMENT: MOTION ADD PARLI AND LD SPEAKER AWARDS TO THE CONSTITUTION. JASON HOUGH SECOND
ALL PROPOSE AND MOTION PASSES [1ST TO PASS]

TOPIC COMMITTEE WAS MICHAEL SKIP AND RENAE

NCCFA IS INCORPORATED

- 2) Proposals/Information Items from Topic Committee (Appendix B)
- 3) Elections

Tournament Director, Webmaster - Michael Dreher, Bethel University – OFFICE OPEN

President - Renea Gernant, Concordia University (Nebraska) - 2008 – OFFICE OPEN

District 1 Representative - Michael Marse, California Baptist University - EXPIRED

District 1 Representative - Karen Nishie, Vanguard University - 2009

District 2 Representative - Jay Bourne, University of the Cumberland - EXPIRED

District 2 Representative - Gary Harmon, Kansas Wesleyan University - 2009

Treasurer - Jason Hough, John Brown University --EXPIRED

Secretary - Brooke Adamson, Northwest Nazarene College – EXPIRED

KONRAD HACK- TOURNEY DIRECTOR

SKIP RUTLEDGE – PRESIDENT

ERICK ROEBUCK DIST. 1 REP.

BRYAN MOORE DIST 2 REP.

JASON HOUGH- TREASURER

BROOKE ADAMSON- SECRETARY

ADAPTED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

- 4) Hosting Bids (Tentative)

2009—Concordia University, Irvine (Feb 13-15, 20-22 or March 13-15)

CU IRVINE FOR 2009 HOST PASSED [Note post-meeting: The tournament will now be hosted by Biola University]

2010—Kansas Wesleyan University (March on either end of their spring break)

RENEA: DISCUSSION OF WHAT IS APPROPRIATE AT NCCFI WITH CHANGING LITERATURE FOR NCCFI AND WHAT TOPICS ARE APPROPRIATE. [Nothing proposed]

LET'S CONTINUE OUR DISCUSSION OF THE SPIRIT OF NCCFA

WELCOME GROVE CITY

PICTURES AVAILABLE TODAY AS WELL AS AROUND AWARDS

8:06 AM

Closing Prayer/Adjournment

Appendix B: Item One

Principles for Writing NCCFA Parliamentary Debate Resolutions. (rev 2/13/08)

This document is a compilation of guidelines and principles formulated to provide guidance for constructing fair, appropriate and balanced debate resolutions for the National Christian College Forensics Association National Championship Tournament.

Suggested Principles:

1. **Fact, Value, Policy Resolution types:** NCCFA desires to offer resolutions that draw from various traditional resolution types, including fact, value, policy and metaphor. Metaphoric resolutions can of course be fact, value or policy. While it is recognized that not all resolution types might neatly fit into this categorization, it is seen as a functional and fair beginning place.
2. **Balance Off Setting Preliminary Rounds:** Since teams typically change sides on offsetting rounds, off setting rounds should be of a similar resolution type in order to provide similar burdens on both sides of the resolution for an equal number of rounds. For example, if round one is a policy round, so too then should be round two, to attempt to equalize the affirmative policy burdens or advantages with burdens associated with being on the opposition for a policy topic. This principle might not work in elimination rounds or non offsetting rounds, like tournaments with an odd number of preliminary rounds.
3. **Actualizing Principles One and Two:** Therefore, for example, the preliminary rounds for a six round tournament might look like this. Rounds One and Two Resolutions could be policy, Rounds Three and Four might be value, and Five and Six could be a Fact. Metaphors or even directed metaphors could fit for any of these categories. Elimination rounds should attempt to provide various resolutional types.
4. **Complete Resolutions and Ordering Before Tournaments Begin:** The entire list of resolutions from round one through finals (and a backup or two) should be completed and in the tournament director's possession prior to the commencement of round one. The alternative, to have members of the tab room considering, crafting and or changing resolutions throughout the tournament, can give the appearance of favoring programs associated with those making those decisions. For example, if a coach knows that their team is to be on the negative in round three, they might be tempted (or so could go the appearance) to provide a difficult to prove resolution in round three.
5. **Randomize Resolutions' Subject or Content Areas:** Resolutions should draw from both faith based or religiously charged topics and the type of topics debated at other tournaments. Ethical considerations of various contemporary issues might lend themselves to good debates.
6. **Debatability or Fair Division of Ground:** Resolutions must be carefully scrutinized by members of the resolution committee to try to insure a fair division of ground. Efforts should be invested to make sure that both sides of the resolution are defensible. Occasionally, the cutely worded resolution seems to trump the well balanced resolution. NCCFA wishes to avoid this mistake. Let us not sacrifice debatability for cleverness of wording. Also to be avoided should be resolutions forcing judges into potentially faith denying choices of great significance, like *In this instance, this house would renounce Christ as Lord and Savior* (an obvious exaggeration), but perhaps even extending to topics like “ *Resolved: Give the devil his due*”
7. **Currency of Resolutions.** An effort should be made to keep many if not most of the resolutions current in their focus. Debaters should not have to be history majors to intelligently debate the resolutions. As a standard of currency one might consider what good Extempers are prepared to speak about, including recent topics from the last month or two, but not necessarily requiring lap top access to follow immediately breaking developments from the internet. Internet access questions for each year's tournament are to be determined by the host and organization separate and apart from resolution writing guidelines.
8. **Avoid Hyper Specific Knowledge requirements.** Likewise, debaters should not have to be biblical scholars to be able to debate religious based controversies. Commanding a basic, working familiarity with scripture, as is required of most students in institutions of faith, is certainly an acceptable burden to place on debaters though in resolutions. This should not be read as a prohibition against all faith based or religious centered topics. Topics can include well worded and fairly grounded debates on traditional questions of faith or religion, as long as there is no undue attempt to be divisive of the body of believers. Debaters are also asked to consider this principle when framing the debate. As brothers and sisters in Christ we should be able to intelligently discuss areas of disagreement without impugning others' character, or salvation for positions assigned on given resolutions.

9. **Encourage a large pool of resolutions from coaches entering parliamentary debate:** The committee should be encouraged to draw topics largely from resolutions submitted to the committee well in advance of the tournament. The wordings of resolutions can certainly be finessed to better meet the guidelines provided in this document, but the committee should try to honor such recommendations for a large portion of the resolutions submitted. Only if the committee feels strongly that there are not enough well chosen resolutions submitted along the criteria set forth in this document should the committee then feel free to submit additional resolutions. This might also be required should insufficient coaches submit resolutions, leaving the committee to have to rely overly on the suggestions of just a small number of coaches, or students whose resolutions can be submitted through their director.
10. **Committee members involved in selecting resolutions should not be able to coach their students on how to debate the resolutions.** There may be an unfair time advantage to the coaches that participate in selecting which topics are chosen to be debated, versus other coaches or debaters allowed just the traditional 15-20 minutes of familiarity with the resolutions. To avoid even the appearance of such an advantage, topic committee members working with the resolutions ahead of time should abstain from content directed coaching, leaving only the ability to discuss with students comments relating to the judging preferences for a given round, unrelated to content specific information or suggestions.
11. **Judge Instructions encouraged.** The NCCFA President or designee should provide important judge training prior to the commencement of debate rounds through whatever means are deemed appropriate at the tournament, and/or should encourage handouts to be made available for the judges to highlight important judging principles.
12. **Publicize these suggested principles.** In an effort to provide more transparency and input into this area of resolution writing that frequently draws attack from members of our community so well trained in critical thinking, we would like to publicly disseminate these suggested guidelines for all too see. We should also encourage participants to be supportive and edifying in their public comments on the resolutions whenever possible to provide a more enjoyable tournament experience for all.

Appendix B: Item Two

NCCFA National Tournament Parliamentary Judging Guide (2/13/08)

Parliamentary Debate: Tournament Rules, Regulations, and Judging Tips

1. Ask the debaters to sign in on the board indicating their team name and their first and last names for each team member. Please include all this information on the ballot. Please write clearly.
2. There will be a central announcement of the topic, which will begin the 20-minute preparation time. Teams not present by the end of the preparation time should be forfeited. Anything beyond a minute or two of grace will throw the tournament off. To begin the speeches, call the house to order and introduce each speaker in order and state the time to be allowed for each speech
3. Speeches should not exceed the following times. There is no preparation time between speeches. Many judges introduce the speeches by titles and times. (For example: "We thank the Prime Minister and recognize the Leader of the Opposition for a constructive speech not to exceed 8 minutes.")

PM (Prime Minister)	Constructive – 7 minutes	
LO (Leader of the Opposition)	Constructive – 8 minutes	
MG (Member of the Government)	Constructive – 8 minutes	
MO (Member of the Opposition)	Constructive – 8 minutes	
LO (Leader of the Opposition)	Rebuttal – 4 minutes	{No new arguments in Rebuttals but new extensions and examples are O.K.}
PM (Prime Minister)	Rebuttal – 5 minutes	
4. The Judge (known as the Speaker of the House) should give time signals indicating minutes of speaking time remaining. Judges often grant about a 10-second grace period at the end of a speech to finish a sentence or thought. The Judge should also alert debaters when one minute has been used and when one minute is remaining in the Constructives by rapping on the desk sharply. This alerts all when Points of Information are allowed.
5. Points of Information (POIs) may be used in constructive speeches only, and only after the first minute and before the last minute of the speech. They may not be used in rebuttals. Speaking time is not stopped for these

points. POIs are traditionally for the non-speaking side to ask brief questions *or make brief points*. The speaker can decide whether or not to yield to the POI. If accepted, the POI should not exceed 15 seconds.

6. Points of Order may be used by the non-speaking side to point out a rule violation, such as arguing a new argument in rebuttals or speaking over time. These points are directed to the judge, and time must be stopped while the judge rules on the objection. The judge can ask for a very brief response by the speaker then rule either: Point Well Taken – if the judge agrees with the objection, Point Not Well Taken – if the judge disagrees, or Point Taken Under Advisement – if the judge will decide the point after the debate. Speaking time resumes upon the judge’s ruling. Do not allow a lengthy debate on these objections, and discourage numerous, frivolous objections.
7. Please do not provide oral critiques to debaters before ballots have been completed and turned into the ballot table. Revealing decisions is discouraged for tournament management reasons. Orally revealing decisions later at judge’s discretion once ballots are completed and returned is all right, assuming neither the debaters nor the judge is delayed from other tournament responsibilities.
8. Debaters may refer to written materials such as briefs, dictionaries, lap tops, and almanacs in Prep Time, but may not actually read such materials during the round, unless it was actually written down during the preparation time by the debaters, not their teammates, coaches or friends.
9. Coaching during prep time is not against the rules. *However, critics or debaters may not delay their rounds to confer with others.* Should such practices delay rounds or negatively impact the tournament, a judge’s teams may be penalized with losses at the Tournament Director’s discretion, in elimination rounds too.
10. Please clearly write the decision and reasons for the decision on the ballot. Please be constructive. Rank speakers 1-4 (no ties) and rate them up to 30 points each (ties permitted). 0-20 points are discouraged unless debaters are very rude or are not trying. 30 points means the speaker was perfect, which is also fairly rare. Average speaker points often fall in the 24-28 range for Open, and may be a little lower for Novices or Juniors.

Appendix B: Item Three

BASIC DEBATE JUDGING TIPS

1. Do not abuse your power as a critic by creating artificial hoops the debaters must jump through (such as addressing you by a clever title, or repeating certain phrases or words in exchange for speaker points). This may seem clever to a critic at the time but can be demeaning and annoying to debaters trying to apply the many other concepts they are struggling to remember and learn.
2. Debate judges are encouraged to base their decisions primarily on the arguments delivered by the debaters, as opposed to interjecting their own viewpoints of what is right or wrong with the topic. This is especially important in matters of faith since the judge and debaters may be making arguments or decisions based on an assigned role per the resolution, or arguments presented in the round, other than their own deeply held personal convictions. Remember that debate is a role playing exercise, and the judge’s role is to pretend that they are a clean slate non intervening critic.
3. The arguments offered may or may not be the actual views of the debaters involved. They are supposed to be working on improving their argumentation skills, and have been assigned a particular side to defend on each resolution. They are expected to choose the most effective argument to defend their assigned role. And in fairness they cannot debate against the critic’s views, since frequently those views are not issued in the round and there is a power differential since the judge decides the outcome of the round.
4. If you are the judge in charge of a particular debate make sure you are familiar with the rules, regulations, and judging tips shown on the preceding page. You will need a watch that allows you to gauge seconds and minutes, and most participants expect that the critics will be actively taking notes where possible of the main issues discussed.

5. If you are judging elimination rounds you need not rate or rank the debaters, but you should complete the rest of the ballot and sign it.
6. Your ballot should clearly explain the reason for your decision, what argument(s) convinced you and why. Why did you not accept the other side's response if any? Writing "Oral Critique Given" is not enough. Coaches need the data to help to work with their students on needed areas of improvement.
7. Comment constructively on how the various debaters might have done a better job and comment on what you enjoyed or found impressive. Comments should look to both content and delivery.
8. If you are chairing a round with multiple critics you should probably not make final rulings on Points of Order that might restrict other critics' decisions. Do not discuss the round with the other critics until all ballots have been completed and signed and the decision has been announced.
9. It is against organizational and school policy to engage in practices that could be considered sexually harassing or personally demeaning in any manner, such as offering pejorative comments on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity, preference, etc. Please remain courteous and civil at all times.
10. Finally, thanks for judging. Your role is a critical one in encouraging the debaters to continue and to grow in this worthwhile activity. Your suggestions are very important, but your attitude is even more important. Please be supportive and encouraging at all times. Remember you may know a great deal more than many of these debaters or on specific topics. Please don't assume they are stupid for not knowing all that you know. They will learn with your encouragement and constructive criticism. But rude or insulting comments may just cause them to become discouraged or disillusioned and quit. No one wins in that scenario. We hope you enjoy your rounds.
11. Forfeit Rule: The teams must be prepared to debate at the end of their 20-minute preparation period, or the judge may drop one or both teams. Allowing anything beyond a minute or two of grace could throw the entire tournament off. Please help us keep on time.