NFC Meeting Minutes 2009
**Next NFC Meeting: Saturday, Sept. 11, 2010 on the campus of
Northwest Nazarene Univ. in lovely Nampa, Idaho. Host: Brooke.**

Friday Assessment Conference
Friday, Sept. 11, 2009

The NFC held a one-day assessment conference at LC on Friday, Sept. 11.

*At the conclusion of that conference, the 21 persons attending from 18 schools
unanimously affirmed a commitment to ongoing discussion of assessment and to the
development of specific initiatives to support the assessment of forensics programs.*

Attending assessment:
IE Assessment: Jeff Stoppenhagen, Boise State; BJ Southard, Lewis & Clark; Letha
Quinn, Northwest Nazarene; Mark Porrovecchio, Oregon State; Jackson Miller, Linfield;
Craig Rickett, Spokane Falls; Mack Sermon, College of Idaho; Beth Hewes, CSI.

Debate Assessment: Derek Buescher, UPS; Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark; David Bailey,
Boise State; Steve Woods, Western Washington; Allen Amundsen, Humboldt State;
Melissa Franke, PLU; Robert Trapp, Willamette; Tom Schally, U of Oregon; Malynda
Bjerregaard, Snow College

Report on conference and suggestions for next steps available by Linfield, Nov. 20.

Minutes of the assessment workshop
Notes from the Individual Events Group
NFC Assessment Meeting September 11, 2009 Notes from the Individual Events Group

The individual events working group focused on the issue of how best to conduct
assessment in platform, limited preparation, and interpretation of literature events.
Strategies for collecting assessment-related data, suggestions about how to evaluate this
information, and ideas about how to present the results to outside bodies were considered.
The following is summary of the group's discussion, which focused on four broad types
of assessment: empirical, portfolio, alumni, and outside review.

Empirical approaches to individual events assessment can provide both direct and
indirect measures of the impact of participation in limited preparation, platform, and
interpretative events. Direct measures include pre-test/post-test and performance rubrics.
Indirect measures include information about student's GPA as well as statistics related to
retention of students.

The pre-test/post-test option involves creating a set of questions for students to complete
at the beginning of the semester or the beginning of the year. Normally, the same
question set is used for both the pre and the post-test. All individual events could be

assessed in this way, but the questions for some events have to be more process based (e.g. "Which of the following is an internal preview?") as opposed to content based. As a result, this empirical measure has somewhat limited use in interpretative and platform events. In some limited preparation events, however, questions on the test can include both process-based and content-based issues. For instance, a pre/post-test could be designed for students competing in extemporaneous speaking to measure their general knowledge of both structural elements of a speech AND domestic/international events. In a more general sense,

Another type of direct empirical measure is the use of performance rubrics. The idea behind these rubrics is to create a scoring system (normally on a scale of zero to 4) for evaluating specific competencies that a student should be developing through their participation in individual events. These rubrics have to be tailored specifically to the program goals and outcomes of the particular department in which forensics is housed, and thus there will be some variability as to what is measured from program-to-program. Rubrics should be used by the director of forensics, or other coaches, to evaluate student speeches or performances. It is important to note that rubrics can, and probably should, be used more than once over a semester or competitive season. The use of rubrics at multiple times throughout the semester or year allows coaches to test for signs of improvement. A sample rubric for a persuasive speech is included at the end of this document.

A couple of indirect empirical measures can also provide some useful assessment data. Most forensics programs already do some tracking of data related to G.P.A.'s (since maintaining a certain G.P.A. is often a requirement for participating in forensics), but a systematic effort to compile this G.P.A. data can provide insight into the impact of forensics participation on G.P.A. In addition, data about retention rates for students participating in forensics can also provide valuable data. Most institutions already track campus-wide retention rates, and a comparison between forensics participants and the general campus population could provide an indicator of the program's ability to attract and retain students.

Portfolios can also provide valuable assessment data for individual events. Most of the portfolio information constitutes a direct measure, and the data contained in portfolios is normally student-generated. There are, however, important ways in which careful planning on the part of the Director of Forensics and regional and national forensics associations can enhance the value of portfolio projects for students.

Portfolios can include a variety of materials, but some of the most common for individual events are:
- videos of practices and/or showcase events
- suggestions/notes provided by coaches during practice sessions
- ballots from tournaments
- reflective essays/journal entries from the students

Given this wide range of materials, an electronic portfolio might be the preferred means for collecting and storing this information. Ballots and other written documents can be

scanned and turned into PDF files, and all other types of materials (student writings, videos) can be created electronically in the first place.

The reflective writings on the part of the students are important because they provide a venue for self-assessment. The entire portfolio should be reviewed by the director of forensics at the end of the semester or year, and the students' growth through competition and participation should be evidenced in the reflective writings.

One way in which regional and national forensics organizations might be able to facilitate more insightful reflective writings on the part of students is by standardizing ballots. Many tournaments use very open-ended ballots for individual events, with a space simply marked "comments" for the judges. This practice can result in students receiving a wide range of comments and make it difficult for students to assess their progress. For instance, a judge at one tournament might provide some nice insights into character development for a prose piece, while a ballot from another judge might focus almost exclusively on the competitor's appearance. A ballot that provides a series of broad categories or questions (focused on specific competencies) might help to ensure more consistency in terms of feedback on the skills that are most relevant to assessment.

Information collected from program alumni is a third type of assessment. Anecdotal data about alumni "success stories" (careers, graduate schools, etc.) can provide an indirect measure of the impact of participation in forensics activities. Most institutions also conduct alumni surveys. If it is possible to isolate the data from forensics alumni within these broader surveys, some useful comparisons between the general alumni population and the forensics alumni might be made. Also, it might be possible to place some targeted questions for forensics alumni on the broader institutional surveys. Finally, forensics directors are in an advantageous position in terms of collecting data from alumni because of the close relationships they develop with students. Directors might be able to use their contacts with alumni and the bonds that result from forensics travel to collect more detailed information than might otherwise be possible. Alumni data is, for the most part, an indirect type of assessment.

A final type of direct assessment for individual events is an evaluation of program by an outside review. A program review could be conducted by an individual, but a small group of reviewers is probably preferable. This review group might consist of a group of current coaches as well as a panel of retired/emeriti coaches. Ideally, this review team would be able to see a program's students in rounds at a tournament, and offer some insights on whether or not a program is meeting its stated goals based on:
- a review of the stated program goals and outcomes
- observations of students in rounds at the tournament
- a review of student portfolios
- interviews with students and coaches
- a consideration of any other assessment data that the program collects

The outside review team could be funded in part by fees paid to the regional forensics organization. The regional organization could also serve as the body that solicits and assigns reviewers for individual programs.

Assessment Criteria: Policy Persuasive Speech

<u>Intended Outcome</u>: The student will demonstrate comprehension of concepts and development of skills necessary to persuade an audience to accept his or her point of view on an issue of public policy.

PERFORMANCE AREA	RATING = 4 SUPERIOR	RATING = 3 EXCELLENT	RATING = 2 ACCEPTABLE	RATING =1 SERIOUSLY DEFICIENT	RATING = 0 FAILING
Structural Elements	• Introduction includes effective attention getter • Clear preview of main points • Consistent use of transitions • Clear Review of main points • Conclusion includes strong final appeal • Overall superior organization/structure	•All structural elements listed under superior are present •Inconsistent effectiveness in 1-2 elements •Overall excellent organization/structure	• 1 structural element listed under superior is missing OR • Inconsistent effectiveness in 3 elements • Overall average organization/structure	• 2-3 structural elements are missing OR •Inconsistent effectiveness in 4 or more elements • Lack of sufficient preparation clearly demonstrated • Seriously deficient organization/structure	• 4 or more structural elements are missing • Remaining element that are included are effectively develope • Almost no evidence preparation for assignment • Overall failure of organization
Content & Application of Persuasive Concepts	• Effective development of arguments supporting 3 policy stock issues (ill, blame, and cure) • Overall powerful advocacy for change •Appropriate consultation of sources (at least 5 cited) •Overall superior accomplishment of assignment criteria	• Ineffective development of 1 stock issue • Overall powerful advocacy for change • Appropriate consultation of sources (at least 5 cited) • Overall excellent accomplishment of assignment criteria	• Ineffective development of 1 stock issue •Advocacy for change included but not powerful • Average consultation of sources (at least 3-4 cited) • Overall average accomplishment of assignment criteria	• 1 stock issue missing OR • Ineffective development of 2 or more stock issues • Attempts at advocacy for change not successful •Consultation of fewer than 3 sources •Seriously deficient in meeting assignment criteria	• 2 or more stock issu missing OR • Ineffective development of all st issues • No attempts at advocacy • Consultation of 0-2 sources • Overall failure to m assignment criteria
Delivery	• Effective eye contact •Varied and appropriate use of gestures and movement •Effective use of vocal variety, volume, rate, and pauses •Clear articulation •Use of correct grammar and pronunciation •Effective extemporaneous delivery •Overall superior delivery with energy and commitment .	•Effective demonstration of all but 1 of the elements listed under superior •Effective extemporaneous delivery •Overall excellent delivery with energy and commitment	•Ineffective demonstration of 2-3 more elements • Too much dependence on notes or reading •Overall average delivery with lukewarm energy and commitment	•Ineffective demonstration of 4 elements •Almost total dependence on notes •Lack of preparation/practice evident •Delivery is seriously deficient with little energy	• Ineffective demonstration of 5 o more elements • Total dependence o notes OR •Difficulty using note •Total lack of preparation evident •No energy or commitment •Failing delivery
Audience Adaptation	• Topic selection interesting and meets criteria • Time limit met • Clarity of language • Appropriate use of supporting materials •Effective use of oral footnotes • Overall superior audience adaptation	• Topic selection interesting and meets criteria • Minimum time limit met and not more than 15 seconds over •Some inconsistency in clarity of language •Appropriate use of supporting materials •Effective use of oral footnotes •Overall excellent audience adaptation	• Topic selection questionable •Minimum time limit met and not more than 30 seconds over •Some inconsistency in clarity of language • Some supporting materials ineffective •Awkward oral footnotes or some information missing •Overall excellent audience adaptation	• Topic selection inappropriate • Minimum time limit not met or maximum exceeded by more than 1 minute • Language inappropriate for topic or audience • Major supporting materials missing •Only 1 or 2 oral footnotes •Seriously deficient audience adaptation	• Topic selection inappropriate • Minimum time lim not met or maximum exceeded by more th 1 minute • Language inappropriate for top or audience •No supporting materials •No oral footnotes •Overall failure to ad to audience
Comments TOTAL					

Minutes of the assessment workshop
Notes from the Debate Group

Minutes Debate Assessment NWFA Fri Sept ll, 2009
Steve Hunt chairing shortened minutes full minutes recorder
Melissa Franke

Background readings
Steve Hunt The values of Forensics Participation Pp l-l9
In Terry Winebrenner ed Intercollegiate Forensics 2nd ed
Kendall Hunt 1997

Mike Bartanen Rigorous Program Assessment in Intercollegiate Forensics: Its time Has
Come The Forensic Winter 2006 33-45

    I.   Prelude

Learning objectives need to be tailored to the mission statement
Of the university or college and department or program within
Which forensics is located

Learning objectives can be knowledge, skills, habits of mind,
Appreciations, attitudes, et al.

    II.   Debate learning objectives
        Other lists exist Glenda Treadaway etc. values of debate
        Defending your debate forensics program

l. Informed citizens knowledgeable of current events controversies
policy options and informed re marketplace of ideas and free expression and argument as
a decision making mechanism

2. Organizational skills   problem solution intro body conclusion
case making refutation

3. Listening critical listening and notetaking flowsheeting

4. Appreciation varying cultural political economic religious etc perspectives and ability
to adapt differing perspectives

5. Public speaking advocacy skills

6. Role of argument in decision making policy change conflict resolution vs tradition,
religion, dictator alternate methods

7. Ability to critically analyze evaluate critique process complex information

8. Research library and electronic   finding the best materials swiftly and efficiently

9. Critical thinking   understanding analysis synthesis logic
like logic on LSAT

l0. Proof   logic reasoning and evidence what constitutes adequate proof

11. Language usage style repartee wit positive and negative
assessment can say all is well or Rome is burning type of debate can mean considerable difference in style presentation are debaters learning public presentation vs competitive presentation or both?

l2. Ethics of advocacy civility sportsmanship collegiality

l3. Argument as conflict management dispute resolution

l4. Public forum presentation knowledge of public vs private sphere argumentative techniques

15. Career preparation policy Congress law courts teaching education bsns

l6 Constructive criticism

    III.   Methods of assessment

Generally empirical, portfolio, reviewer, triangulation, alumni
WE want to gather materials we already have or which are easily accessible Assessment should take the least time possible to do it ``well not be overly time consuming or expensive this is what discourages DOF's who are already busy folks.
Anecdotal evidence current students and alumni is good but not enough.

l. # of alumni gong to graduate professional schools

2. Individual portfolios from students
Ballots over time
Tournament results
Briefs research assignments
Videos

3. Program portfolios
Sweeps results tournament results
PR stories
New students attracted retained
GPA of students
Histories

Public debates/speakers bureaus
International debates public forum debates
Oral interpretation festivals
HS demos assistance connections

4. Alumni surveys
Annual banquet or reunion
List of careers professions graduate degrees
Skills from forensics utilized in job career
Donations to college/university
Perhaps alumni can help with this outsourced or mayhaps better with personal in source connections to alumni

5. Empirical pre test post test reliable valid data
Critical thinking surveys as Hunt Allen Louden et al
Coyote graduate survey described Mack Sermon
Pretest post test public speaking surveys available/e comm. Education NCA

6. Proof of peer coaching training

7. Triangulation similar or aspirational programs
Difficulty of picking comp schools by budget number type of tournies coaching staff public vs private schools scholarships
Etc. but can data mine for aspirational goals

Do you do well compared to like schools get value for expenditure focus on education as well as competition

8. Standardized ballots particularly with written typed info
re skills and have you seen progress
Need time emphasis in tournaments for feedback assessment for this to be possible

9. At designated master teacher emeriti forensics folks evaluate schools students in addition to ballots watch rds sit in with preparation

10. Reviewers necessity to set evaluative criteria rubrics in advance
Necessity to negotiate good reviewers between programs and departments deans et al
Master teachers forensics folks review at tournies go to
School examine curriculum and COCURRICULA   R WORK
Write assessment
Pay for it versus volunteers by school or NWFA
Reviewers as mentors critics

Saturday Regular meeting
Saturday, Sept. 12 2009 - 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.
Lewis & Clark College, Portland

1.   Thank you to Steve (who doesn't really look retired) and BJ for hosting.
2.   Introductions of all coaches
Introductions of all coaches: In attendance – Robert Trapp, Willamette; Gary Gillespie, Northwest University; Melissa Franke, PLU; Derek Buescher, UPS; Letha Quinn Northwest Nazarene; Jason Sandford, Northwest University; Allen Amundsen, Humboldt State; Aaron Kaoi, MHCC; David Bailey, Boise State; Steve Woods, Western Washington; Daniel Broyles; Pacific; Jennifer Conner, Pacific; Jackson Miller, Linfield; Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark; Christi Siver, U of Washington; Beth Hewes, CSI; Jeff Stoppenhagen, Boise State; Brooke Adamson, Northwest Nazarene; Abigail Hines, George Fox; Craig Rickett, Spokane Falls; Mark Porrovecchio, Oregon State; Mack Sermon, College of Idaho, Malynda Bjerregaard, Snow College; Brent Northup, Carroll College.

3.   Introduction of officers
President...Brent Northup, Carroll (expires May 2011)
NFC At-Large Representative.............Mack Sermon, C of Idaho (ends May 2010)
Community College Representative…Shannon Valdivia (ends May 2010)
NIET rep...Mark Porrovecchio, OSU (ends May 2010)
CEDA/NDT rep...................................Derek Buescher, UPS
Parli Rep: ....Mary Lynn Veden, University of Washington

4. Budget Report
          Cash on Hand, Sept. 11, 2009: $2742.37
          Cash on hand, Sept. 3, 2008: $2507.63
          Cash on hand, Sept. 8, 2007: $3090.68
          Cash on hand, Sept. 8, 2006: $3005.73
          Cash on hand, Sept. 9, 2005: $3417.74
          Cash on hand, Sept. 9, 2004: $1743.44
          Cash on hand, August 25, 2003: $1182.34
          Cash on hand, August 31, 2002: $1221.20
          Cash on hand, August 31, 2001: $1498.55

5. **Calendar updates**.
          Calendar corrections. Latest draft of calendar enclosed with survival guide.

Tournament reports:
          Designateds:
          Lewis & Clark, October 9-11. Has added questions to extemp and impromptu; added forensics criticism; added BP/Worlds; Tab will be Buescher, Trapp, ML Veden. Enter on ForensicsTournament.net

Linfield, November 20-22. IPDA, NPDA, BP; Bring judges, might have to reduce large debate entries; Invite available; Mad Lib returns; Political Cartoons in Extemp;
Pacific University, January 29-31. No major changes, invite not available yet; On break so no classes during tournament. May offer its own sweepstakes formula.

Other regional tournament announcements
Reed Tournament moves to PLU, Sept. 26, 27 – Whitman West
University of Washington, Novice/Junior championship March 6; two judges per round to maximize feedback; Top judge award; Certificates
UPS on Oct. 24,25; likely parli only;
College of Idaho, Halloween Havoc, Oct. 30, 31
Spokane Falls, March 12,13
Hatfield, Feb. 27, 28
Oregon would again like to host a regular tournament. All coaches agreed to work with Oregon to try to make this happen – find an open date, etc.

8. Special reports:
CEDA, NDT Derek. No more NW CEDA championship. National debate development conference proceedings published this fall by IDEA.
Worlds @ Turkey: Entries closed; waiting list. Melissa PLU is going.
American World Champs at University of Denver on April 9-11.
NFA – Jackson Miller. In Ohio April 15-19.
NPDA – Brent Northup. Texas Tech March 20-22.
NPDA Journal …David Williams of Texas Tech doc.williams@ttu.edu
NIET, Mark Porrovecchio. At Oregon State on Saturday, March 6.
PKD – Jeff…2009 & 2010. Regional at MHCC in 2010; National at MHCC in 2011.
Western States Conference & Tournament – Derek. UPS will host the Western tournament separate from the Alaska conference. Different places, different dates.
Interstate Oratory – Jackson Miller Oklahoma, April 23,24
Phi Rho Pi – Shannon Phi Rho Pi @ New Orleans (5-10)
NPTE – Derek. At Azusa March 27-29. Doubletree Hotel.
Seattle Urban Debate League, Derek. Reformed. No director right now. In transition.
Portland Debate League. Mike Dugaw.
IFA: In Berlin.

New business: None submitted.
Adjourned @ 12:24 p.m.