

The state of debate in the Northwest

August 2017

A report on the NFC Survey on The State of Debate

"I love my job but I would love job security more."

"I'm sad to see compartmentalization of debate.

We are split at least three ways - parli/ipda/BP - without much love between those "countries" and a fair amount of arrogance in all camps towards the value/non-value of the other camps.

We need to heal the divide between debate styles to regenerate our sense of community"

-Two NFC coaches

Table of Contents

Overview.....	2
Schools participating	4
Years coached	4
Tenure Track?.....	4
Rank of DOF	5
Course load	5
Assistant coach count.....	6
Administrative support?.....	6
How safe is your program?	6
Total number of students	7
How many students enter these events?.....	7
How many tournaments?	9
What national tournaments?	10
Strengths, weaknesses & suggestions for each genre	11
NPDA.....	11
Policy.....	12
BP.....	13
IPDA	14
NFA LD.....	15
Grading each format of debate.....	16
Educational value changed over time?	18
If you had the power to change forensics?	19
Reflections on Community Colleges & Forensics	20
Final thoughts on state of debate in Northwest.....	22
Appendix: In their own words – coaches’ comments	A
A: Is your program safe?	A1
B: What type of debate? Why?	A2
C: Did you change forms? Why?.....	A4
D: Strengths of each genre of debate	A5
E: Weaknesses of each genre of debate	A8
F: Suggestions for each genre of debate.....	A11
G: State of intercollegiate debate	A15
H: Job satisfaction.....	A16
I: If I were the God of debate, I would?	A17

Summary and analysis of NFC Debate Survey

Conducted January-July, 2017

Hi to my Northwest friends:

A year or so ago, Korry Harvey and I were chatting and he said, wistfully, he would love to get the community together to try to understand the ways we are divided so that we might search for ways to bring us back together.

Korry, who I often regard as the conscience of the NFC, was talking partly about the split in debate in our region, but he was also talking about our NFC family which is not as close as it once was.

Not everybody comes to Thanksgiving dinner anymore.

Korry was echoing views I heard often in reading the surveys we completed in 2017.

Here's one voice that seemed to be speaking for us all.

"I'm sad to see compartmentalization of debate," wrote the coach. "We are split at least three ways - parli/IPDA/BP - without much love between those 'countries' and a fair amount of arrogance in all camps towards the value/non-value of the other camps. We need to heal the divide between debate styles to regenerate our sense of community."

Korry inspired me to collect data and help organize just such a forum about the state of debate.

The survey was released in January 2017 and, after gentle prodding, was returned by almost all of our coaches. About 34 of 40 responded, a solid response including community colleges, private colleges and public universities.

On **Friday, Sept. 8, we gather from 6 to 9 p.m.** at Northwest College in Seattle to discuss the survey and take steps to "heal the divide...and regenerate our sense of community." We will feed you!

The Survey Monkey data was very informative, but as many of you know, reading survey monkey data can be daunting – and distributing those results to a community isn't easy.

I decided to create **a report on the survey results** and send it to everyone a month ahead of our meeting. Well, that didn't happen, but with two weeks to our gathering, here is my report. I hope you have time to read this prior to the meeting. I think the results are very instructive on the state of debate in our region as well as the state of forensics in the nation. I hope it promotes a good discussion.

Here's how I organized this report.

I have presented the demographic data question by question: how many students, how many coaches, what events, etc.

Then I dug into the "essay questions" which asked us to reflect on debate: What format have we chosen and why? What's your perception of each form of debate?

I collected these responses and reorganized them by the type of debate. Thus, I collected the NPDA data in one place:

- Why did programs choose NPDA?
- If you left NPDA, why?
- What are the strengths of NPDA?
- What are the weaknesses?
- In what ways could NPDA improve?

The same questions were asked of all forms: NPDA, BP, IPDA, Policy, NFA-LD.

The survey included questions about our job satisfaction and our wish list for improving debate in the region and in the nation. I summarized those responses in this report, and then included all the original responses in the appendix. Reading the full texts from all coaches is recommended. My summaries are not enough to get the full sense what our friends had to say about the state of debate.

No one is identified in this report. All responses are anonymous. I wanted to respect the privacy of the respondents. If we wish to self-identify our views at the meeting, that's great. Until then, no names.

I am working on an agenda for our meeting about debate. I have identified three parts, and will be fine-tuning the plan in the next two weeks. I welcome input.

1. **Demographic trends. 30 min looking at survey data. What does the data tell us about our size, teaching loads, travel, support?**
2. **Listening session. 90 minutes. Positive presentations by advocates (perhaps in teams of two) of three genres – parli/policy, BP, IPDA, including benefits and addressing perceived weaknesses that arose from the survey. Then questions. 10 minute PM followed by 20 for Q & A.**
3. **Peace talks. 45 minutes Can we build bridges between programs and debate styles. Is the ideal of merging the community into one debate genre gone forever? Can we at least increase tolerance for one another?**

Prompts for this talk might include: Where and why do we not live in peace? How could we heal those wounds? What are the costs and benefits of our segregated debate community? Is it possible for judges/coaches in one camp to judge in the pool for another camp? Would more community gathering time at tournaments help? Are prep rooms isolating us? Should debaters attend finals outside their genre just to support friends in other debate formats? (For example: BP debaters attend NPDA finals)

4. **The path forward. 15 minutes. NFC's next steps? A five-year vision for advancing debate in our region? Take this report to NCA and the fruits of this meeting to NCA 2018? (2017 likely too late).**
5. **(For the Saturday meeting: Concerns raised in the responses about programs-at-risk, jobs at risk and struggles with institutional support. Let's do this when all coaches will be present.)**

I look forward to seeing everyone in Seattle on Friday night, Sept. 8 from 6 to 9 p.m. at Northwest University in Kirkland. We will feed you.

I hope this report is useful. I know it's long, sorry. But, hey, it's thorough!

Brent bnorthup@carroll.edu (406) 459-2371

Report on 2017 NFC survey on State of Debate

Question 1, 2 & 3: Schools participating.

A solid 34 of the 40 schools contacted returned the survey, including community colleges, four year private colleges and public universities.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Four year private	50.00%	17
▼ Four year public	29.41%	10
▼ Community college	20.59%	7
TOTAL		34

Analysis: This provides a sufficient sample of all three types of colleges to justify meaningful discussion of the responses. I was not seeking scholarly validity, but rather valuable insight to spur discussion.

Question 4: How many years have you coached?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ 1-5	8.33%	3
▼ 6-10	16.67%	6
▼ 11-15	19.44%	7
▼ 16-20	27.78%	10
▼ 21-25	11.11%	4
▼ 25+	16.67%	6
TOTAL		36

Analysis: A full 20 coaches have 16 or more years as coach. That's a wealth of experience in our region.

Question 5: Does the DOF have tenure track status?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Yes, DOF is always on tenure track	47.06%	16
▼ DOF is sometimes on tenure track	8.82%	3
▼ No, DOF is not on tenure track	44.12%	15
TOTAL		34

Comments (8)

Analysis: Are there things the NFC could do to help schools elevate the DOF to tenure track? Is there data on forensics (assessment data?) that could help coaches persuade administrators to offer tenure?

Question 6: What rank do you hold?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Full Professor	22.86%	8
Associate Professor	14.29%	5
Assitant Professor	22.86%	8
Instructor	28.57%	10
Adjunct	11.43%	4
TOTAL		35

Comments (5)

Analysis: Hard to gauge whether this is good or bad, since years of service plays a role in this. But I see eight full professors among us as encouraging.

Question 7: Beyond forensics, how many college courses do you teach in a typical quarter/semester?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
0	5.88%	2
1	23.53%	8
2	32.35%	11
3	32.35%	11
4	5.88%	2
TOTAL		34

Comments (16)

Analysis: Some coaches are working VERY hard with full loads plus the team. One coach noted he teaches 5!! courses beyond forensics. Holy overload, Batman. The NFC should advocate a “fair” load for a coach. A two-course credit for coaching, perhaps? Perhaps this data will help make that argument.

Question 8: Beyond yourself, how many assistant coaches in your program?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ 0	35.29%	12
▼ 1	41.18%	14
▼ 2	17.65%	6
▼ 3	5.88%	2
▼ 4	0.00%	0
TOTAL		34

Comments (6)

Analysis: Wide variation here. Let’s hope the ones teaching the most, have assistants, but I fear those working hardest have the least help.

Question 9: How would you describe administrative support for your program?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Strong support	35.29%	12
▼ Good support	32.35%	11
▼ Some support	20.59%	7
▼ Weak support	8.82%	3
▼ Poor support	2.94%	1
Total Respondents: 34		

Comments (12)

Analysis: The NFC needs to mobilize to help all programs whose future is not secure. I put this on the agenda. We will discuss this at the NFC meeting, likely on Saturday.

Question 10: How likely is it that your program might be discontinued?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Program quite safe	32.35%	11
▼ Program seems safe	52.94%	18
▼ Not sure	8.82%	3
▼ Program support tentative	2.94%	1
▼ Program truly at risk	5.88%	2
Total Respondents: 34		

Analysis: Again, some red flags here are worthy of our collective support. We will discuss Saturday.

Question 11: Total number of expected team members?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ 0-9	28.57%	10
▼ 10-15	34.29%	12
▼ 16-20	11.43%	4
▼ 21-25	14.29%	5
▼ 26+	11.43%	4
Total Respondents: 35		

Analysis: Quite a mix of program size. How well are we doing at providing Designated tournament experiences that serve both the very small and the very big?

Question 12: How many students enter these types of events?

ANSWER CHOICES	AVERAGE NUMBER	TOTAL NUMBER	RESPONSES
Individual Events Responses	8	226	29
Parliamentary Debate Responses	3	95	28
BP Debate Responses	7	209	28
Policy Debate Responses	1	18	25
IPDA Debate Responses	6	162	29
Total Respondents: 33			

Analysis: This question was enlightening. Programs have shifted their focus dramatically in the past five years. Here's the data from that same question in 2012.

ANSWER CHOICES	AVERAGE NUMBER	TOTAL NUMBER	RESPONSES
Individual Events Responses	11	345	32
Parliamentary Debate Responses	8	211	26
BP Debate Responses	8	211	25
Policy Debate Responses	1	17	21
IPDA Debate Responses	8	208	27
Total Respondents: 35			

Analysis: Parli has fewer students, while BP and IPDA have grown. Individual events participation is down. I suspect some key programs may not have been included in the 2012 survey, but the trend remains

clear. Why is this happening? In some ways that's the theme of this survey. A number of choices appear to be tentative or "soft," meaning that the program has reservations about the form of debate, but various factors keep them from changing.

Specialization trends:

I took a deeper look at the data in this question, and discovered some other trends.

- Twelve programs choose only one form of debate – with no IEs. Total specialization.
- Of the 15 programs with 7 or more students in IEs, 11 of them chose IPDA for debate.
- Only six programs have 10 or more students in IEs; eight have 5 to 9; three have 1-4 IE students;
- Fifteen programs are not competing in individual events.

In short, we are specializing. Many tournaments do not offer individual events. Many individual events tournaments offer only IPDA debate. Thus, programs committed to IEs are frequently choosing IPDA because it's available at more IE tournaments than any other debate form.

I predict that before long, more than half our schools will be competing in one event (some form of debate), and many of the others will be IE/IPDA combos.

Those of us with long memories and gray hair remember when NPDA and IEs were together at most tournaments, and many of those also offered policy.

The survey did not ask an important question: How many students are competing in both IEs and debate simultaneously during their forensics years. The data suggests two groups are forming: A group of programs with IE/IPDA and another group of debate-only programs. The third and smallest group competes in IEs plus either BP or NPDA or Policy, or a combination of those.

Back story on specialization in forensics:

In the 1990s the NIET national tournament included top NPDA debaters. In 2017, I suspect debate/IE dual threats will primarily be found at PKD and PhiRhoPi, where students can compete in debate plus IEs – and, in their dreams, perhaps win both. The NFC does not offer NFA-LD, but many IE programs in the Midwest and East compete in NFA-LD and individual events.

I contacted the president of NFA, Karen, and asked her if NFA students did both LD and IEs simultaneously, and she that is rare. A few might double enter at regular tournaments, but rarely at nationals.

Thus, even when programs do not specialize, the students in those programs do specialize – most debaters do not enter individual events and most IE students enter no debate events. The exception to that is the IE/IPDA pairing by many programs in our region. That bucks the national trend.

I personally have always believed a student should experience both speech and debate events as part of a liberal arts forensics experience. But I sense that view is shared by fewer people than ever before in American forensics. Or, perhaps, the logistics of doing both have killed that ideal – meaning many tournaments do not offer both debate and IEs... thus a student often cannot do both.

Question 13: How many Northwest tournaments do you attend each year?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
0-2	11.76% 4
3-5	52.94% 18
6+	41.18% 14

Total Respondents: 34

Analysis: Northwest schools do have loyalty to our regional tournaments, but coaches have expressed concern over fewer tournaments in our region lately. Why? We should discuss this.

Question 14: How many tournaments does your program enter in a typical year?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
0-3	2.94% 1
4-6	29.41% 10
7-9	32.35% 11
10-12	17.65% 6
12-15	14.71% 5
16+	2.94% 1

Total Respondents: 34

Analysis: A wide variation here. Again, how can Designated tournaments serve both programs with small squads as well as those with large squads? Keeping nov/jr/senior divisions was a request of many programs as a way of encouraging students from small programs.

Question 15: What national tournaments do you attend?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Phi Rho Pi	16.13%	5
▼ PiKap	41.94%	13
▼ NPDA	22.58%	7
▼ NPTE	19.35%	6
▼ NDT	6.45%	2
▼ BP (USU Nats)	35.48%	11
▼ CEDA	3.23%	1
▼ NIET	12.90%	4
▼ NFA	9.68%	3
▼ IPDA	12.90%	4
Total Respondents: 31		
Comments (7)		

Analysis: PKD has the most NFC schools, followed closely by BP and then by NPDA.

Strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for each genre

Let's shift to specific summary of comments on strengths and weaknesses of each format, including why programs chose that format, why they left and what would tempt them to return. I've organized this by genre, rather than by order of questions.

The survey painted a clear picture of why programs prefer some formats over others. I found it both informative and helpful in understanding the divisions between us that have segmented us.

Please read the full transcript of responses in the appendix, too. This is only Brent's fallible summary.

Strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for NPDA

(See full responses in appendix)

Why programs chose NPDA

- *education, requires research and grounding in real world data*
- *team work, requires cooperation with another human*
- *accessible, can train those who have not done before easily*
- *accountability, judging based on content, usually not based on "style" or aesthetics*

Strengths of NPDA:

Focused Research, academic rigor, theory building
Range and diversity of topics, argument theory
Quick thinking, refutation, responsive clash
Structure: line by line,
Tech argumentation, argumentative agility

Weaknesses of NPDA:

Inaccessible, not audience focused
Technical debating: K, T, off topic
Speed, gamesmanship
Disrespect, hostility, toxic culture, lack of ethical consideration
Coaching in prep; isolation of prep rooms

Why some programs left NPDA:

Speed and spreading
Off case K and projects, irrelevant arguments
Rudeness, disrespectful, hostile competitive atmosphere
Not accessible
Lack of opportunities for new debaters and young students

I would enter NPDA more often if:

Went back to early 2000s style and strategies, old style NPDA
Prep rooms and coaching in prep were eliminated
More topical argumentation, accessible style, no topic areas
More community interaction
If speed was not a factor
More jr/nov recognition

Strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for Policy

(See full responses in appendix)

Why programs chose Policy

We have a long and rich history in both NDT and CEDA. It's what our school and alum value and support and remains the focal point of our program. We find that this format of debate provides our students with unique pedagogical and competitive opportunities not found in other formats. We recently began our BP program to provide opportunities to students with little or no debate experience or who just did not have the time to commit to policy but still wanted to be involved in debate.

Strengths of policy

Academic rigor, research, research, and research
Depth of knowledge, detailed policy analysis
Refutations skills
Knowledge of argument theory
Excellent preparation for legal work

Weaknesses of policy

All consuming work load, cost, high entry barrier
Culture, intensity, isolated community, elitist & reductive
Speed and spread, off-case project/K strategies
Doesn't address actual topics
No circuit for beginners

Reasons given for leaving policy:

Overlaps with parli – many grouped parli and policy together

Speed and spreading
Off case K and projects, irrelevant arguments
Rudeness, disrespectful, hostile competitive atmosphere
Not accessible
Policy community not supportive of new debaters

I would enter Policy more often if:

More like it was in the '80s
Novices weren't cannon fodder; more nov/jr divisions
Speed and spreading were eliminated
If I had a full-time assistant
More on case, less K/project, less game-playing

Strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for BP

(See full responses in appendix)

Programs chose BP because

- *BP good fit for program's values and educational mission. Combination of both "combative" and "collaborative" modes of communication; less gamesmanship*
- *BP (with the 4-team format) appeals to the focus in our program on communicating persuasively in a wide variety of contexts.*

Strengths of BP:

Accessible delivery, holistic in-depth analysis
Communicative, argument focused, admin friendly
Consensus judging, international opportunities
Cooperative debate, elegant partner debate
Easy to train (low entry barrier) students with no experience

Weaknesses of BP

In-round research restrictions (no Internet, no coaching)
Judging system and selection, "cult of the judge"
Format unfair to opening teams
No rebuttals; lack of rejoinder
Not enough jr/novice divisions – and open is a hard pool to enter
Shallow argumentation; topics not always good

Programs left BP because:

Debaters only speak once
Rules are a bit odd
Not always offered
Not conducive to a CC program

I would enter BP more often if:

If we understood four-team format; more workshops
Judging better less ponderous and topics were better
If there were more opportunities to speak (rebuttals)
If internet allowed in prep
If bigger budget and trained bp coach
If larger team to have 4 team practice rounds

Strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for IPDA

(See full responses in appendix)

Programs chose IPDA because

IPDA is accessible to students with and without previous forensics experience. It promotes both good reasoning and good communication skill development.

It is a debate form to showcase on campus and be proud of when university officials watch.

Strengths of IPDA

Gentle learning curve, accessible

Conversational, easiest to coach & practice with small teams

Extemporaneous speaking skills, logical reasoning

One-person team avoids partner problems

Simplicity

Weaknesses of IPDA

Lack of depth, weak/metaphorical topics, poor judging standards

Rounds too short

Aff picking topic and defining debate

Not sufficiently rigorous or intellectual

Not enough coach involvement in prep

Why programs left IPDA:

Not rigorous enough

We would enter IPDA more often if:

More academically demanding and educational

If speeches lengthened

Topics were improved, more knowledge-based topics

Don't let aff pick topic and define resolution

Strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for NFA-LD

(See full responses in appendix)

Disclaimer: Data on NFA-LD is much less reliable. Many coaches are not familiar and it is not offered much in our region. Keep that in mind as you read this. Many simply did not reply to LD questions.

Why programs chose NFA LD

Not enough responses

Strengths of NFA LD

Research blended with delivery

Logical argumentation

Theoretical and philosophical argumentation

Accessible style in policy format

Same files all year

Weaknesses of NFA-LD

Why programs left NFA-LD

No responses

I would enter NFA LD more often if:

Offered in our region

Coaches grade debate formats

What is your ideal form of debate? Grade all current genres.

Fascinating data from this question. Highly subjective, but still informative, even fascinating.

Take a look.

	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
NPDA	0.00% 0	3.23% 1	16.13% 5	16.13% 5	9.68% 3	6.45% 2	12.90% 4	6.45% 2	9.68% 3	12.90% 4
BP	6.25% 2	9.38% 3	15.63% 5	18.75% 6	12.50% 4	9.38% 3	9.38% 3	0.00% 0	6.25% 2	3.13% 1
IPDA	6.67% 2	20.00% 6	16.67% 5	0.00% 0	10.00% 3	6.67% 2	3.33% 1	3.33% 1	6.67% 2	10.00% 3
Policy	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	20.00% 6	10.00% 3	10.00% 3	0.00% 0	3.33% 1	10.00% 3	16.67% 5	13.33% 4
NFA-LD	0.00% 0	3.33% 1	3.33% 1	6.67% 2	10.00% 3	6.67% 2	13.33% 4	10.00% 3	10.00% 3	0.00% 0

Translating this data:

Converting to grades, the weighted average grades, rounded off, is roughly:

BP: B- (6.28 with 6 being a B- and 7 being a B)
 IPDA: B- (6.04 with 6 being a B- and 7 being a B)
 NPDA: C+ (4.72 with 4 being a C and 5 being C+)
 Policy: C (4.20 with 4 being a C and 5 being a C+)
 LD: C+ (4.58 with 4 being a C and 5 being a C+)

We professors are tough graders, obviously.

But the reasons for the low averages are obvious: every genre has its critics. Looking at averages reminds of Luke from New York and Lucy from California...on average, they're from Kansas.

But we still can see trends in our community's perception of the formats. NPDA and IEs have lost members while IPDA and BP have gained members – for complex reasons worth careful further study.

And it's fair to say many coaches have not found their ideal form of debate, but rather a "currently preferred form." Sometimes we make choices by default: this movie is best choice tonight at the multiplex, but still not a classic movie. Maybe "Citizen Kane" will open next week. We wait. We hope.

Side note: some programs in our region and around the country are emphasizing public debates for their campus and their community as an alternative to prioritizing competition. "My satisfaction has largely depended on my development of a civic dimension for our program," wrote one coach. "Our public offerings are now equal to – and poised to soon overtake – the amount of energy we expend on competition. I'm pretty sure if we were only a competitive team, I would have quit some time ago."

I cross-tallied grades to see how coaches of one genre evaluated other genres. Specifically, who gave each genre its lowest grades?

Critics of NPDA:

Data from throughout the survey shows that numerous IPDA and BP programs once did NPDA, but changed because of perceived shifts in NPDA strategies, style, learning curve and culture. Not surprisingly, they often rated NPDA low.

Critics of Policy

Critics of policy follow the same pattern as critics of parli. Some programs are critical of policy, for similar reasons as parli: strategy, style, learning curve and culture.

Critics of IPDA:

Conversely, many NPDA and policy programs are critical of IPDA because of its lack of research, its topics and its shortness. Some BP programs have the same concerns about IPDA.

Critics of BP

Critics of BP come from varied sources including CCs (because it requires four teams to practice and is still relatively unknown to many programs). Policy and parli programs see it as insufficiently research-based and criticize BP's lack of rebuttals. There is concern about winning in opening Gov, because of a perceived "systemic bias."

Criticism of NFA-LD followed the same lines as policy/npda, but NFA-LD is often cited as being more accessible.

Community Colleges: IPDA appears to be the only format receiving solid ratings from CC coaches. All the others earn low ratings. IPDA is accessible for CC students, coaches note. There was a time when parli and policy were popular among CC programs. Why the shift?

Analysis: We are a divided region in so many ways. Our programs are big & small, two-year & four-year. We prefer different forms of debate.

Sadly, we are sometimes critical of each other's choices, as this survey shows vividly.

The question is whether we can find unity amidst the diversity, friendship amidst the competition. I believe we can build bridges across some rivers, perhaps not across oceans. Need a ferry for that. (I recommend the Kalakala, my favorite Seattle/Winslow ferry as a child.)

The purpose of the Sept. 8 gathering is to explore roads to peace. What else did you expect from a Quaker?

In your view, has the educational value of these events changed over time?

	NO OPINION	NO CHANGE	SIGNIFICANT DECLINE	MODERATE DECLINE	VALUE STAYED SAME	MODERATE IMPROVEMENT	SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT	TOTAL
Individual Events	13.33% 4	3.33% 1	3.33% 1	13.33% 4	50.00% 15	13.33% 4	3.33% 1	
Parli Debate	10.00% 3	0.00% 0	53.33% 16	26.67% 8	3.33% 1	0.00% 0	6.67% 2	
BP Debate	43.33% 13	0.00% 0	3.33% 1	6.67% 2	23.33% 7	23.33% 7	0.00% 0	
IPDA Debate	33.33% 10	3.33% 1	0.00% 0	20.00% 6	23.33% 7	20.00% 6	0.00% 0	
Policy Debate	27.59% 8	3.45% 1	24.14% 7	10.34% 3	20.69% 6	13.79% 4	0.00% 0	
NFA LD	64.29% 18	3.57% 1	3.57% 1	7.14% 2	17.86% 5	3.57% 1	0.00% 0	

Comments (3)

Analysis: Further data which suggests the community perception (not shared by all) that the value of parli and policy have declined, and that BP and IPDA are seen in a more positive light, providing options for former parli programs. Korry once asked how parli might regain more community support, and that question is many ways formed the birth of this debate forum.

If you had the power to change forensics for the better, what would you do?

Thoughtful, value-centered and community-centered responses appeared here.

The only way to appreciate the responses is to read their full version in the appendix.

But here's a sampling of various dreams. If we were the God of forensics, here's what we would do:

- Increase the level of inclusion and equity. Tired of the cutthroat nature of competition-driven forensics. There needs to be a greater sense of community.
- More accessibility and affordability for small programs
- More inclusivity and compromise to create more participation--compromise to go slower but also to be willing to go faster; to try new arguments and to try debate traditionally;
- More local engagement and public debates. I would also be interested in more school vs school topic debates (like we do with the Irish, Chinese, & Japanese national teams, but between more local school
- More inclusive, a better balance between research and oratory.
- Have Jack Howe from Long Beach (Father CEDA we used to call him) watch a CEDA round and then with a tear in his eye tell the debaters his vision on why CEDA started.
- More online tournaments, and then inviting teams from all over the world to participate. More global events for teams without large budgets. Training videos being made and put up on YouTube that help teach various interp, platform, limited prep and debate events would be helpful for teams with only one coach.
- Emphasis on community of speakers, find ways to interact more and cheer for each other more. 2. Attend finals of debate styles other than our own and applaud 3. Rejuvenate IEs in the Northwest 4. Remember that we are training future leaders who need an accessible style to advance social justice. 5. Why do we sit and speak? Let's be old-fashioned and stand and look our audience in the eye and persuade them with intelligent on-topic argumentation. 6. Sportsmanship above all else. 7. We must not let alcohol and drugs become synonymous with forensics. Speaking under the influence not cool.
- More resources for coaches/directors (job security, pay for travel time). I would also change how negative participants of any one activity are about other activities. I would make folks who hate fast debate learn to love it and folks who can only speak fast learn to do interp and BP.

And, saving the best for last

- ...Free Pilot G2 pens for all.

Reflections on community colleges and forensics:

I'd like to finish this report with some observations on the unique perspectives of our community college friends. This is drawn from the survey, supplemented by my 29 years in the NFC – in the land of Orv.

At the end of my writing, I went back and read all the responses of two-year coaches to get a view of their perspectives and concerns.

Department of the obvious: CCs have most students for only two years and many students are commuters, perhaps working while going to school. Budgets tend to be less than plush and coaches have heavy teaching loads, in many cases. Teams are sometimes small, and putting practice rounds together can be challenging. BP takes 8 students for practice. Some teams are only six students.

The CC view of debate often focused on accessibility to new students without background in debate and the need for workshops and training in new and/or challenging formats.

I will offer Brent's observations on what I learned about needs of community colleges from this survey.

1. CC coaches are dedicated to speech and debate.
2. CC students are hungry for speech and debate opportunities.
3. CC coaches work hard at coaching and teach a lot of courses
4. CCs need accessible opportunities for new students to learn a new skill
5. CCs need nov/jr to make success possible for the young and new
6. CCs welcome help in training new students in all genres – workshops, etc.
7. CCs are believers in debate, but face unique challenges in training their debaters and finding tournaments and formats that are “CC friendly” in a variety of ways.
8. The debate over debate is NOT just theoretical for CCs; rather, the issues revolve around how to provide opportunity for inexperienced new students to learn and succeed while facing some unique challenges. Practicalities often trump (sorry for the verb) theory in the search for the best debate format for CC students. Highly technical debate formats with steep learning curves are a challenge for two-year programs. Accessible travel destinations matter to CC budgets.
9. The NFC should embrace two-year programs and assist in all ways possible.

Some of these issues apply to smaller four-year programs as well. In forensics, the rich get richer and the poor stay poor with alarming regularity. How to close that gap is a very vital question in debate society as well as in our country and our world.

Let's close by listening to the words of the Community Colleges coaches as a guide to what we can do to support them and their students:

I would like to see college communication departments universally retaining forensics programs as a part of curriculum and ensuring the access of students to participate in forensics as it develops necessary skills for successful graduates.

IPDA seems to be more accessible for beginning students and community college level competition. There seems to be a four-year school advantage in the other forms of debate unless there is a novice and JR level division.

Make it easier to attend tournaments virtually. Our pool is shrinking. A bigger pool means less institutional bias for placing.

IPDA meets the educational goals of our program. We need debate types that are accessible to students of all levels. We also need debate types that will easily be defended to administration and community supporters. IPDA meets these needs.

I teach five courses, besides coaching.

The NFC is fractured. I am at a loss as to how to improve it...but I'm not sure this should be our priority. We are in danger of losing more CC programs and need to help find a way to keep struggling programs (Clark, LCC, Bellevue, CBC) afloat and find ways to help develop more CC programs in Oregon.

(I wish for) ...better communication between the 4 year programs and the Community Colleges.

Final thoughts on the state of debate in the Northwest (and the nation) in 2017

Reading the survey results provides plenty of support for both glass-half-full and glass-half-empty drinkers.

We are clearly a more divided – some say fractured – community than 20 years ago. We don't gather as a community often, and when we are together we often don't see each other until awards – if then. We have chosen different themes for our programs, and have grown a touch intolerant of choices other than our own. We are working hard to improve inclusivity in our region, but that very mission has highlighted ways in which we were not inclusive or welcoming.

Five years ago many called for reunification of the region – perhaps a common form of debate with more community focus. Now, I hear more people conceding that we will travel different roads, but wondering if, while doing so, we can live peacefully together – like a city of many cultures, each enhancing the next.

That seems a more realistic goal, but we must not give up on the noble task of improving each of our own cultures to make it more educational, more tolerant and more welcoming.

While we might be separating in some ways, we are clearly still more of a family than any other region I know of. A dysfunctional family, yes, but we still love each other.

The voices of our region, through this survey, were clearly filled with a love of forensics, of teaching and of our students.

One coach noted that “our community is tremendously valuable.”

I'll close with one realistic voice from our community about our calling.

“I love my job,” a coach wrote. “but I would love job security more.”

There's always a “but” when we reflect on our lives.

Let us not forget, however, that we are blessed to work with talented students who are passionate about their lives and their futures. We get the privilege of giving them a boost as they go forth to conquer the world.

That's a gift to them and to us as well.

END

Appendix

Coach Comments

Appendix A: Is your program safe?	A1
Appendix B: What type of debate? Why?	A2
Appendix C: Did you change forms? Why?	A4
Appendix D: Strengths of each format	A5
Appendix E: Weaknesses of each format	A8
Appendix F: Suggestions for each format	A11
Appendix G: State of intercollegiate debate	A14
Appendix H: Job satisfaction	A16
Appendix I: If I were God of forensics, here's what I'd do.	A17

Q9 How would you describe administrative support for your forensics program?

#	ELABORATE ON YOUR ANSWER?	DATE
1	Our department supports us philosophically, but we are funded through Student Activities, who are indifferent to us as an organization.	7/28/2017 1:42 PM
2	School provides Travel & Scholarship Budget. We are often highlighted in school marketing and reports.	5/29/2017 11:05 AM
3	The mere fact that I was hired as a full time tenure track instructor and DOF despite the tumultuous recent past of the program demonstrates significant support from the administration and institution.	5/25/2017 4:15 PM
4	Depends on the year	5/25/2017 3:17 PM
5	Our new school head is not an effective leader or advocate for forensics	5/25/2017 2:28 PM
6	2 departments share admin assistants (2 part-time), they are willing to help the team from time to time.	5/24/2017 8:08 PM
7	I serve as my own admin	5/23/2017 5:53 PM
8	TRAVEL FUNDS BUT NOTHING FOR SCHOLARSHIPS	2/6/2017 11:49 AM
9	Money is tight	2/5/2017 10:54 PM
10	Strong from the department but not from the University	2/5/2017 9:37 PM
11	We are not a budgeted line item, so we do not know if we will be there each year.	2/5/2017 8:19 PM
12	We get what's contractually required (release time) and support in hosting events, but our administration rarely recognizes our accomplishments and we have to fight to have press releases sent out.	2/5/2017 8:13 PM

A 1

What format of debate has your program chosen? Why?

Programs chose NPDA/NPTE because...

NPDA/NPTE

- *education, requires research and grounding in real world data
- *team work, requires coop with another human
- *accessible, can train those who have not done before easily
- *accountability, judging decisions based on content, usually not based on "style" or aesthetics

NPDA, LD, BP (limited)

NPDA- we have been a traditional NPDA school and I still like the format, worry about dwindling numbers
LD My preferred format if no NPDA. LD more technical form of debate, with plan-focused structure,
BP- We dabble at the designateds. LD has a nationals tied to our speech program

NPDA and BP

Offered at tournaments attended

NPDA

NPDA Policy oriented resolutions, peers institutions, recent success legacy

NPDA

Academic rigor/emphasis on research. Historical participation. Healthy regional circuit.

Programs chose BP because...

BP only

BP best blends accessible delivery with intelligent analysis, requiring knowledge of events.

BP

We are looking for a lower barrier to entry

BP

Student - coach ratio main reason. Focused on one rather than spread the program. I teach three other classes

BP worlds

not my choice. what the program has done.

BP

Student interest

BP only

International access, timely and topical motions, accessibility and public comprehension

BP and WUDC

BP Communicative. Medium research load. Admin can come watch. Program was already BP

BP, limited IPDA

BP good fit for program's values and educational mission. Combines both "combative" and "collaborative" modes

BP (4 team format) appeals to the focus in our program on communicating persuasively in a wide variety of contexts.

BP

Inherited a BP program, continuing because it serves a student population with no prior debate experience well.

BP

BP allows me to maximize the number of students I can take to a tournament.

BP and ipda

BP Money and student preferences

BP

BP Pedagogy

A 2

Programs chose IPDA because...

IPDA	We usually don't have enough attendance to run a full NPDA debate Our students don't all graduate at same time of year, so easier to have individuals debate than teams.
IPDA and Parli	IPDA seems to be more accessible for beginning students and community college level competition. There seems to be a four year school advantage in the other forms of debate unless novice and JR division.
IPDA, NPDA IPDA	Availability in the Northwest IPDA meets educational goals of program. We need types that are accessible to students of all levels. We need debate types that will easily be defended to administration and community supporters.
IPDA IPDA	It is most similar to what we've done in the past and most aligns with our educational philosophy. As a two-year college, we experience a significant amount of turnover among team members. While I would love to coach NPDA, I find IPDA is easier to master in a limited amount of time.
IPDA, noda IPDA IPDA only. IPDA, BP, NPDA, PF	Availability of competition. Ease of access to the activity. It serves my pedagogical goals for the team and for my students. IPDA is the style I competed in college. style I am most familiar with and think holds the most value. Student talent, interest, and preparation
IPDA	IPDA is accessible to students with and without experience. It promotes good reasoning and good communication It is a debate form to showcase on campus and be proud of when university officials watch it.
IPDA	COMBINES BOTH REASONING AND SPEAKING SKILLS
IPDA	Parli and CEDA are too hard to be competitive in when you attend so few tournaments. Parli is also discouraging for novices to enter when there are few tournaments with nov/jr in those forms. not enough for practice rounds. As our students are not on scholarship, we have students float in and out and so hard to be consistent with team members. I chose IPDA as it is very user friendly and keeps divisions so my novices are guaranteed novice rounds. As IPDA has creep of counterplans this year and more policy terms, I assume it will go the route of parli and evolve.
NPDA and IPDA	Desire of students to do NPDA is limited, so I try to accommodate. IPDA is our first choice
NDT/CEDA, BP	We have a long and rich history in NDT and CEDA. Its what our school and alum value and support and remains the focal point. We find that this format of debate provides our students with unique pedagogical and competitive opportunities We began BP program to provide opportunities to students with little or no experience or who did not have time to commit to policy
LD, NPDA, IPDA, we will do PF at P	Access to the team is key so depending on the tournament and the skills and interest of the debaters we have done multiple styles.
We have yet to debate this year.	Student's have had almost exclusive interest in IE's for 2016-2017.

If you did stop entering a form of debate or will stop, why?

Why programs left NPDA

- 1 I couldn't keep up with NPDA and speed. My students have no experience. Need background for NPDA. BP can be taught pretty quickly
- 2 Lack of availability
- 3 NPDA became less accessible to our students than IPDA. IPDA provided more flexibility.
- 4 Abstracted argumentation strategies, inaccessible delivery, hostile competitive atmosphere
- 5 rudeness from other teams; disrespect of debaters to judges; sitting while debating; graduate students writing cases.
- 6 Lack of opportunities for first and second year students.
- 7 No longer served my goals/needs.
- 8 Topicality, "K," and other approaches to debating that seemed to eliminate debating the current events inherent in motions.
Also, coaching during prep runs counter to our educational philosophy as a program.
- 9 NPDA nationals prohibitively expensive, but won't stop us altogether. NPDA culture offputting - will lead us to stop.
- 10 Parli moving towards CEDA/NDT in style and argument. Off case K replaced case arguments. Debaters stopped standing and little attention to audience.
I could not justify teaching this to future lawyers and leaders, so we shifted to BP where (for now) audience is valued and strong arguments are essential.
A parent or administrator can enjoy BP, whereas NPDA/policy rounds require translation. BP is a little less gamesmanship
I admire the minds and analytic skills of parli/policy debaters, but I wish they were more audience-centered and topic-centered in presentation.
- 11 We are worried about numbers in NPDA. Not fully stopping yet, and if it would turn around, we would still be doing parli.
- 12 CEDA/NPDA, like NDT before it, devolved into speed, irrelevant arguments eschewing the resolution. valued gamesmanship and running T above everything else
- 13 Money and I didn't like it because it was too close to policy without evidence
- 14 As schools stop supporting a form then the numbers fall and no divisions. too disheartening to enter novice debaters in Jr or open.
As forms evolved, too many rounds drop the resolution and debate canned cases/theory, spewing teams out of round. hard to be competitive.
I also feel that the benefits of training students in communication and critical thinking has been lost with how CEDA and Parli have evolved.
- 15 Pedagogy
- 16 NPDA WAS TAKEN OVER BY POLICY. IN BP STUDENTS ONLY SPEAK ONCE AND THE RULES ARE A BIT ODD
- 17 BP is just not conducive to a CC program. We don't have budget to travel to make us competitive. NPDA has gotten too technical/theory based.

Why programs left Policy

- 18 If the regional NPDA circuit collapses as policy did, then we will be forced to make a shift.
- 19 Policy community not supportive of new debaters.
- 20 Prefer a communicative form of debate

Why programs left BP

- 21 It is too hard to maintain good coaching with more than one or two styles of debate. Also BP wasn't offered at many tournaments we attended.
- 22 We have so little interest in it but if there are some international students on the team who did it in their home nations then I like to offer it to them.

Why programs left IPDA

- 23 Not remotely rigorous
- 24 I had one student request to do IPDA at WWU, but we opted not to take that route for travel reasons.

Greatest strengths of each of these forms of debate?

Greatest Strengths of NPDA

Academic rigor/research emphasis; team-based; breadth of topics.
Allows elite programs to compete.
Breadth of knowledge, quick adaptation
Careful focus on argument structure and impacts
Content, research, theory building, argument construction
Focused research
I struggle to find one in it's present form.
knowledge of argument theory, depth of research, time commitment, strong organization
Partners, quick pace, strategy, gives Policy experienced HS kids a better fit
Partnership. Persuasive yet with some evidence or research. Creative arguments, less formal.
Policy-oriented resolutions, debaters believe in working outside tournaments
quick thinking; strategic; refutation
research
Research
Responsive clash, extension speeches, rigorous research burden, IEs often available
Structure
Structure and Line by line
Team debate, philosophical focus
Tech argumentation
Technical structure of argumentation, team work, innovation, argumentative agility
The range and diversity of topics that can occur.

Greatest Strengths of BP

page 1

Access for some students
accessible delivery, consensus judging, wholistic analysis, broad range of topics does BP
Accessible for lay audiences and use of multiple judges.
adaptability to different audiences
Allows a user friendly format that is easy to introduce students to debate.
Allows for students to confront international and other types of topics.
Communicative, Argument-focused, Admin Friendly
cool places to go
Critical thinking, advocacy
Different debate roles than other formats
Easier for beginners to debate overall, has better philosophical reasoning for real world scenarios
Elegant partner debate
Fostering skills in communicating persuasively to a wide range of audiences
Good extemp skills, good for students with no prior debate experience (or limited time to learn debate)
good speaking; more cooperative kind of debate; more viewpoints represented in a debate; easy to train
It appears to value some communication skills and teach teamwork.
It has the lowest barrier to entry
More public speaking oriented/less technical; breadth of topics; accessibility.
No idea, truthfully, global travel?
Oratorical Skill
Persuasive. Allows them to work on their public speaking strengths and to still work in a team .
Positive argumentation
Public focus
regional/geographic accessibility; it is cheap and less classes missed. quickly accessible with little experience.
Rhetorical/theoretical analysis and critical application of arguments, more in-depth, broader scope
Slow and low barrier to entry
Working with other teams on same sides
world (including Canada) does BP so intercultural immersion possible, no coaching in prep

AS

20

Greatest Strengths of IPDA

page 2

Access and a gentle learning curve
Accessibility; true argumentation and persuasion
Accessibility to newer competitors
Accessible
Accessible and appropriate for lay audiences.
Allows a user friendly format that is easy to introduce students to debate.
Conversational, quick to learn, little to no jargon, easy for public observation.
Easiest to coach and practice with small teams, allows for more individual competition
Easy access to the sport and some evidence is still used
easy entry into debate for non debaters; accessible style, LD-style
Extemporaneous speaking skills and argumentation on a wide range of issues
I don't know much about the format
Insufficient experience/exposure to comment. Accessibility.
Internet access and fast
It promotes both good reasoning and good communication.
Logical reasoning
one person debating avoids partner problems; communication oriented model
Oratorical Skill
Self-reliance, research and structure practice, networking, collegiality
Simplicity
speaking practice
Wide applicability of skills, communicative style

Greatest Strengths of Policy

Academic rigor/research emphasis; depth of knowledge on a particular topic.
Allows elite programs to compete.
deep research, thinking, refutation skills; great knowledge builder
detailed policy analysis, exposure to complex literature
I don't have one.
Improving research skills and use of evidence
Increases student understanding of real world structures, policies and analysis
Intense research
knowledge of argument theory, depth of research, incredible time commitment
partnerships evidence and creative thought
pedagogical and competitive value
research
Research
Research
Research
Research and foundations of arguments
Research driven
Research skills and in depth knowledge
Research-focused
Research, evidence, peer students and institutions
Tremendous research skills, excellent preparation for legal work

AG

20

Greatest Strengths of NFA-LD

page 3

accessible style in policy argumentation
actual research and persuasive speaking
Allows for research based debate, but adds delivery.
Best balance of above
don't have to work with another person
Good fit for policy background students
Highly-polished presentation
Insufficient experience/exposure to comment.
Logical argumentation
few tournaments, but allows elite competition.
Potentially it teaches good research skills.
research
Research
Research and foundations of arguments, not as much as policy.
Research skills and writing well-developed policy cases
research, thinking, refutation skills; 1 v 1 avoids partner problems
Simplicity, ease of scheduling
Theoretical and philosophical application in rounds
Use the same files all year.

A7

20

Greatest drawbacks of each of these forms of debate?

Weaknesses of NPDA

p1

Abuse of ideas; inaccessible; toxic culture
Bad Krit debate due to lazy debaters who do not know the foundation.
Balancing technical abilities with good arguments
Coaching during preparation time; limited opportunities debate the issues raised in the motion
delivery speed, lack of audience focused presentation/delivery, game-playing argumentation, off case/project strategies.
coach-driven prep time, prep rooms isolates the community, challenging for newcomers to learn the language
disrespect
Dwindling numbers in the PNW
Fewer programs participating
Gamesmanship, lack of real ethical consideration
Hard for new debaters to jump in and be competent.
High learning curve, expensive
High likelihood of collapsed entry, hard for newcomers.
Hostility
I think NPDA relies on speed and spread which teaches poor communication habits.
Intensity w/o research
it's become a game ; willing to use policy research in NPDA round and use tactics rather than debate
K, Meta-debate often overtake issues debate, Coach prep of teams
Requires more time to learn with a consistent partner
speed, isolated community
Technical nature = access problematic; lack of written evidence = teams play loose with facts; white/male dominated.
Technique over talent
The emphasis of technical debate over delivery/persuasion
The in-between experience level for those who aren't Novice or Open isn't usually recognized.
Limited tournaments with high expectation of placing means this is a risky pool to be in
The speed, the gamesmanship, the exclusivity, the lack of decorum
too rapid; too difficult; too much work to be good
Unchecked speed, rampant assertion

Weaknesses of BP

- > Lack of a coach can often lead to stereotypical arguments and lack of formal rebuttals can lead to a lack of depth.
- > Frankly I don't like students who are currently active in debate being in charge either
4 team format, in round research restrictions and inability to coach students before debates
arguments are not as deep as they should be
Cult of the Judge
Culture can be difficult for outsiders
Even less recognition for Junior division and a much harder open pool with upper division students and education levels
Format is inherently unfair for opening teams
Have not done too much BP, but for small teams hard to practice.
Having a well trained and reliable judging pool.
Length
Judge selection is highly suspect.
judges at the center, no coaching at tournaments, too style bound, no real clash
Large number of students required, limited experienced judges
Length of round/conflict w/ie patterns at tournaments
Length of the round and limited CX opportunities
No burden of rejoinder
No extension speeches
No idea
not enough BP tournaments, First Gov systemically tough to win, only one speech per debater,
a touch of judge elitism, no national organization, chaotic "business" meetings
not enough refutation or rebuilding of arguments; judging by ranking circumvents deciding what is best position in debate
Not offered consistently
Outside of the PNW, tab procedures and anti-Western US bias
Requires a stronger knowledge base than most CC students have time for and a lack of other CC teams.
Sometimes forces an event drop at some tournaments; team debate is not for everyone
The four-team format is still a bit confusing to me.
The topics
Too stylized

AB

21

Weaknesses of IPDA

p2

students come up with plans without speaking to coach or another debater - can lead to stereo typical arguments .
interpretations which may be resolutional but a little bit off of the normal interpretation
Coaching during preparation time; lack of opportunity to work with a teammate
debaters can sometimes win without depth, short speeches, some metaphorical topics
Having students diverge on the nature of the resolution.
I don't know much about the format
Insufficient experience/exposure to comment.
Lack of depth
Lack of preparedness
N/A
No teams
nonsense topics, poor judging standards
not sure
Only one period of CX
Resembles 1990s parli too much- not enough structure and technical argumentation
Rounds are too short, topics superficial.
Slowly evolving
sometimes has terrible topics (intellectually vacuous), sometimes not very good judging,
sometimes debaters are not well trained and have very poor argument positions
Speeches/rounds too short, no partner.
Terrible resolutions - not educational at all
times do not allow for solid development of arguments - and despite 30 minutes of prep...the misinformation is astounding.
The topics. I do not want to drive 8 hours to have a debate on the Beatles!
AFF picking topic and defining debate is total BS! Lots of other things also.
Too short to form more than a couple of thoughts, weak competitors
Too short a format
Weak topics
Widest range of different competitive approaches

Weaknesses of Policy

All consuming work load, fewer programs participating
Cost
Culture
Elitist & reductive, tends toward authoritarian attitudes
Emphasis on technique means lack of accessibility for beginners; cutthroat competition; no circuit for beginners to develop.
Entry/success barrier
Hard for new debaters to jump in and be competent.
high entry barrier
I think Policy relies on speed and spread which teaches poor communication habits.
Intensity
monetary costs and missed classes. less accessible to students with little background.
Not offered consistently
Speed & spreading; tab judging that does not allow for intervention in cases where judges know evidence is flawed or inaccurate
Speed and spread
speed, isolated community
Speed, K, and often doesn't address the actual issue
speed, lack of audience-focused presentation/delivery, game-playing argumentation, off case/project strategies,
coach-driven prep, prep room isolation, challenging for newcomers to learn the language
Technique over talent
The cost!
The investment in research is simply not something my school can do
Time and Resources for a CC makes this hard.
too difficult; too rapid; fracturing because of policy versus project/k teams
Too expensive
Workload for students

A9

Weaknesses of NFA-LD

Brevity

Insufficient experience/exposure to comment.

it's not available in this region

limited involvement

No breadth of knowledge

No NFA-LD circuit in the NW

No partner

not enough in northwest to do; has some of the problems of npda and policy with speed, kritiks, too difficult, etc.

Not offered consistently

Not offered enough in PNW

not sure

Rarely offered and if offered, not many entries.

Research preparation heavy and very policy heavy

seems to be accelerating towards policy style, not offered much in West,

So few tournaments out here.

Speed & spreading; lack of opportunity to work with a teammate

speed, isolated community

Teams with strong research files have an advantage.

Too uncritical, re-entrances western elitism

A10

Constructive changes each debate genre could make that might tempt you to enter more teams

We might enter more teams in NPDA, if

There were a junior and novice division's . And if we had money for an assistant coach .
drop coaches prep
Folks debated the topic
Had prep time and CX all the time.
If I get to stay at HSU and the NW community holds out this is my hope
IF IT WENT BACK TO THE EARLY 2000S FORMAT
It wasn't actually policy debate? If it was the old style of NPDA
na I'm too new as a coach to judge interest in trying other events
No
No plans to do this.
others would bring more teams
Prep rooms and coaching during prep were completely eliminated from the event
speed was not a factor
There was more JR level recognition
There wasn't pressure to adapt to the National Circuit Style and also more support for CC teams
I'd need more coaches versed in NPDA in order to pull it off.
topical argumentation, accessible style, no topic areas, more community interaction
We enter a lot of teams in NPDA, but entry barrier for most is the technical nature of NPDA.
had coach who was more knowledgeable and/or compatible members of team stick around for 2+ years
when you got to open, it was more communication focused.

We might enter more teams in IPDA, if

We enter most of our teams in ipda
Bigger budget and full time debate coach
Coaching during prep eliminated; team IPDA became an option at more tournaments
I don't attend many tournaments with the IPDA option
I don't know, but have heard others say this format is not very academically demanding.
If we are going to pay for travel, I'd like the event to be educational.
It was offered at more tournaments
judging and topics were better
lengthen speeches, emphasize knowledge-based topics more
more schools participated
N/A - we already enter every member of the team in IPDA
Never
No plans to do this.
The topics were not so poorly worded fact and value topics
and the AFF did not get to pick the topic and define the resolution
They spoke more slowly
We enter plenty of teams in IPDA, but I'd love to see a higher standard for resolutions
we had a budget to support a larger team.
Will not

All

We might enter more teams in BP, if...

The topics and the judging more consistent . There was some room for research already in it
As long as our budget allows we'll continue to field students in BP.
Bigger budget and full time debate coach
I had students show dedication to the research
If we understood the 4-team more and there were more common standards in judging.
Internet access allowed during prep (paper "brief books" are environmentally irresponsible)
IPDA vanished in our region
judging and topics were better
more accessible
More coaches and bigger budget
more tournaments, train the new with workshops, invite international debaters
My team is growing and I'm getting better at dragging folks to tournaments
Nothing, since we do not have the interest
NPDA and IPDA were not available; if BP rounds and judging weren't so ponderous
PROVIDE MORE OPPORTUNITIES TO SPEAK
The pedagogical benefits were clearer, better reports about the state of judging
There was more JR level recognition and it was offered at more tournaments
we had a larger team to run practice rounds.
Were more widely competed in NW

We might enter more teams in Policy, if...

I don't think we'd ever go there.
I just don't think that we would do this without a much larger budget
It was like it was in the 80's.
more schools and if I had a full-time assistant
No
Nothing, too expensive and only 2 chances in the whole NW
novices weren't seen as cannon fodder
Speed & spreading were eliminated from the event
speed was not a factor
Stronger regional representation
style more accessible, more on case, less K/project, less game playing
We had a different coach
We might do policy if there were a viable novice and junior division.
Will not

A12

We might enter more teams in NFA LD, if...

Bigger budget and full time debate coach

Had more tournaments offering this style of debate and a different coach

I really have no experience with NFA LD, so hard to comment here.

it was available in the Northwest

More options to do it!

Never

No plans to do this.

not sure

offered more often, avoid migration to policy style

Speed & spreading were eliminated from the event

speed was not a factor

there were lots of students to create divisions.

we gave up on teamwork as an important educational construct

We'd give it a try possibly if there was a viable circuit in the NW

Will not

A13

Q25 Final comments on the state of intercollegiate debate, Spring 2017?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 22

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	To me, on the competitive level, it's all about novice and junior divisions. Beyond that, a sense of a welcoming and inclusive community makes a huge difference in both the number and variety of people that want to participate.	8/17/2017 4:12 PM
2	Coaches should pick a format that benefits their students, not based on personal preferences or rejection of practices they feel not appropriate (speed, etc.) The continual split of the community tends to be when critical mass of numbers is reached and some feel alienated or that they can't succeed. Important to determine if that is because values changed, or with more people just harder to compete because of numbers involved. Could do better encouraging people to teach debate rather than just coach those with experience. Our region needs to generate more novices, not just seek out those experienced in high school to fill team spots.	8/17/2017 12:20 PM
3	Lots of good things with all the formats, but significant drawbacks as well.	7/16/2017 12:53 PM
4	Sad to see compartmentalization of debate. We are split at least three ways: parli/ipda/BP...without much love between those "countries" and a fare amount of arrogance in all camps towards the value/non value of the other camps. We need to heal the divide between debate styles to regenerate our sense of community.	7/3/2017 9:22 AM
5	Generally happy. Would like to gauge interest in PF among northwest schools.	6/28/2017 3:52 PM
6	too splintered leaving small pools	6/2/2017 12:29 AM
7	There will be 3 novice divisions at policy tournaments in Fall 2018: Weber, Gonzaga, and Washington. The NDT D2 community would encourage all NFC programs who are considering fielding teams in policy to join us. Our existing D2 programs are more than willing to assist with research or just helping programs new to this format to navigate the logistics. We hope some folks will take us up on this!	5/31/2017 10:46 AM
8	The community is tremendously valuable.	5/26/2017 10:16 AM
9	The Pacific Northwest is an amazing region that should be very proud of the community it has built. If the roads were easier HSU would be there more.	5/24/2017 8:15 PM
10	It is unfortunate that our community has been divided into three different groupings, which reduces our chances for students to meet a wider array of people. Yet given the philosophical divide that exists, and is strong, I am reluctantly satisfied with the division. Those who want to speak fast can in NPDA and those who do not want to can enter IPDA. Those who cherish team debate have two options and those who do not have IPDA.	2/7/2017 9:39 AM
11	I hope the data collected by the community prove helpful for the NFC.	2/6/2017 12:09 PM
12	I just hope there will always be a form for new students with no high school experience to compete in so the number of college students who can experience debate will grow instead of decline.	2/5/2017 8:53 PM
13	Way too many formats. We should all try to create 1 or 2 formats in which we can do our various things. Too much emphasis on points and false claims about the evil of other formats or the inability to compete in certain formats.	2/5/2017 8:46 PM
14	The NFC is fractured. I am at a loss as to how to improve it...but I'm not sure this should be our priority. We are in danger of losing more CC programs and need to help find a way to keep struggling programs (Clark, LCC, Bellevue, CBC) afloat and find ways to help develop more CC programs in Oregon.	2/5/2017 8:24 PM

A 14

Q25 Final comments on the state of intercollegiate debate, Spring 2017?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 22

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	To me, on the competitive level, it's all about novice and junior divisions. Beyond that, a sense of a welcoming and inclusive community makes a huge difference in both the number and variety of people that want to participate.	8/17/2017 4:12 PM
2	Coaches should pick a format that benefits their students, not based on personal preferences or rejection of practices they feel not appropriate (speed, etc.) The continual split of the community tends to be when critical mass of numbers is reached and some feel alienated or that they can't succeed. Important to determine if that is because values changed, or with more people just harder to compete because of numbers involved. Could do better encouraging people to teach debate rather than just coach those with experience. Our region needs to generate more novices, not just seek out those experienced in high school to fill team spots.	8/17/2017 12:20 PM
3	Lots of good things with all the formats, but significant drawbacks as well.	7/16/2017 12:53 PM
4	Sad to see compartmentalization of debate. We are split at least three ways: parli/ipda/BP...without much love between those "countries" and a fare amount of arrogance in all camps towards the value/non value of the other camps. We need to heal the divide between debate styles to regenerate our sense of community.	7/3/2017 9:22 AM
5	Generally happy. Would like to gauge interest in PF among northwest schools.	6/28/2017 3:52 PM
6	too splintered leaving small pools	6/2/2017 12:29 AM
7	There will be 3 novice divisions at policy tournaments in Fall 2018: Weber, Gonzaga, and Washington. The NDT D2 community would encourage all NFC programs who are considering fielding teams in policy to join us. Our existing D2 programs are more than willing to assist with research or just helping programs new to this format to navigate the logistics. We hope some folks will take us up on this!	5/31/2017 10:46 AM
8	The community is tremendously valuable.	5/26/2017 10:16 AM
9	The Pacific Northwest is an amazing region that should be very proud of the community it has built. If the roads were easier HSU would be there more.	5/24/2017 8:15 PM
10	It is unfortunate that our community has been divided into three different groupings, which reduces our chances for students to meet a wider array of people. Yet given the philosophical divide that exists, and is strong, I am reluctantly satisfied with the division. Those who want to speak fast can in NPDA and those who do not want to can enter IPDA. Those who cherish team debate have two options and those who do not have IPDA.	2/7/2017 9:39 AM
11	I hope the data collected by the community prove helpful for the NFC.	2/6/2017 12:09 PM
12	I just hope there will always be a form for new students with no high school experience to compete in so the number of college students who can experience debate will grow instead of decline.	2/5/2017 8:53 PM
13	Way too many formats. We should all try to create 1 or 2 formats in which we can do our various things. Too much emphasis on points and false claims about the evil of other formats or the inability to compete in certain formats.	2/5/2017 8:46 PM
14	The NFC is fractured. I am at a loss as to how to improve it...but I'm not sure this should be our priority. We are in danger of losing more CC programs and need to help find a way to keep struggling programs (Clark, LCC, Bellevue, CBC) afloat and find ways to help develop more CC programs in Oregon.	2/5/2017 8:24 PM

A 15

Has your job satisfaction changed? Comments

Because I'm getting old and tired. ;-)

disagreement with my former program

Due to administrative problems, not students or other coaches.

Exhaustion

Exhaustion - hard to coach a team with national aspirations alone.

Fluctuation from year to year

fracturing into genres of debate is sad, NIET style is rigid

Greater support from my institution

Now as a DOF, I have to do a lot more paperwork and administrative nonsense.

Paperwork is lame, but the payoff is worth it.

I AM RETIRING. TOO MUCH HASSEL WITH ADMINISTRATION FOR FUNDING

I got an ADOF

I have moderate job security and 12-months of regular pay - just a massive improvement

I love my job but I would love job security more

I still love coaching, but school's lack of structural support for coaching staff and team is a morale buster.

(cont.) has been a significant structural shift in how colleges administer programs that I didn't anticipate

More students who are not as intense

My satisfaction has largely depended on my development of a civic dimension for our program.

(cont.) Our public offerings are now equal to--and poised to overtake--the energy we expend on competition.

(cont.) I'm pretty sure that if we were only a competitive team, I would have quit some time ago.

No evidence or research or note

No single reason.

Significant travel schedule doesn't allow much publication and is a challenge with a young family.

Some years are better than others so over all it stays the same

Still love working with the students, but it is hard to coach without a faculty position without any pay and benefits.

BP has helped me expose students to different cultures with international travel. We travel less & choose our tournaments

Workload has increased without proportionate support.

A16

Q27 If you had the power to change college forensics overall (everywhere, not just in our region) for the better, what would you change?

Answered: 27 Skipped: 9

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Increase the level of inclusion and equity. Tired of the cutthroat nature of competition-driven forensics. There needs to be a greater sense of community.	8/17/2017 4:12 PM
2	Eliminate Round Robins and Special Qualification tournaments and replace them with Novice and JV events. Those at the top already get disproportionate recognition.	8/17/2017 12:20 PM
3	I would like to see college communication departments universally retaining forensics programs as a part of curriculum and ensuring the access of students to participate in forensics as it develops necessary skills for successful graduates.	7/28/2017 1:57 PM
4	Merge many of the national tournaments into a very few.	7/16/2017 12:54 PM
5	1. Emphasis on community of speakers, find ways to interact more and cheer for each other more. 2. Attend finals of debate styles other than our own and applaud 3. Rejuvenate IEs in the Northwest 4. Remember that we are training future leaders who need an accessible style to advance social justice. 5. Why do we sit and speak? Let's be old-fashioned and stand and look our audience in the eye and persuade them with intelligent on-topic argumentation. 6. Sportsmanship above all else. 7. We must not let alcohol and drugs become synonymous with forensics. Speaking under the influence not cool.	7/3/2017 9:29 AM
6	more accessibility and affordability for small programs	6/29/2017 11:06 AM
7	Make it easier to attend tournaments virtually. Our pool is shrinking. A bigger pool means less institutional bias for placing.	6/28/2017 5:02 PM
8	1) Interps being split by source material seems unnecessary, as lines have blurred as to how they differ. 2) Support of wider range of voices to avoid closing out more diverse opinions. I love what our community stands for, but I'm afraid we're going to create an echo chamber.	6/28/2017 3:55 PM
9	more inclusivity and compromise to create more participation--compromise to go slower but also to be willing to go faster; to try new arguments and to try debate traditionally; to create debate events that fit for more programs rather than less who have left other forms of debate because they don't like it anymore (and for the other forms of debate to avoid being what others don't like); utopic and unrealistic but that's what i wish	6/2/2017 12:33 AM
10	Prioritize funding for college forensics.	5/31/2017 11:01 AM
11	All programs participating in a format of debate that showcases the strengths of the activity and students in a way that the public can access and understand. I also believe that there's much more that can be done to include the public in our events, thereby increasing the investment they have in academic debating.	5/30/2017 8:56 AM
12	More local engagement and public debates. I would also be interested in more school vs school topic debates (like we do with the Irish, Chinese, & Japanese national teams, but between more local school).	5/29/2017 11:31 AM
13	More online tournaments, and then inviting teams from all over the world to participate. More global events for teams without large budgets. Training videos being made and put up on YouTube that help teach various interp, platform, limited prep and debate events would be helpful for teams with only one coach.	5/28/2017 5:48 PM
14	Coaches not writing or preparing their students' speeches for them.	5/26/2017 3:36 PM
15	More new programs! There are countless schools within reasonable driving distance of our college that do not have teams. This is frustrating because a) many of our students transfer to such schools and wish they could continue competing, b) we would love to have more local tournaments, and c) have more local teams at our own tournament.	5/26/2017 10:19 AM

A17

27

16	I would make it more welcoming and open by increasing novice and Junior divisions . It's never fun to be cannon fodder .	5/25/2017 3:27 PM
17	More inclusive, a better balance between research and oratory.	5/25/2017 2:33 PM
18	Reduce the length of tournament days; Offer more workshops for new debaters/speakers; Find ways to share our work and expertise with communities beyond the college circuit	5/25/2017 2:23 PM
19	More resources for coaches/directors (job security, pay for travel time). I would also change how negative participants of any one activity are about other activities. I would make folks who hate fast debate learn to love it and folks who can only speak fast learn to do interp and BP. Also - free Pilot G2 pens for all.	5/24/2017 8:17 PM
20	Less of a culture of supremacy - I'd like people to be able to take risks. I see a lot of cookie-cutter outside of our region (and from some AFA schools in region) that I don't support. I don't believe there is only one way to do something.	5/23/2017 6:03 PM
21	I would like to see us celebrate diversity in performance strategies and style - we should encourage student growth as communicators and speakers, rather than forensicators. There's a significant gap between the educational value of what forensics has to offer and what is honored competitively - I would like to see this change.	2/6/2017 12:18 PM
22	Get people to relax and have a good time. Less gossip and fewer cliques.	2/5/2017 11:01 PM
23	Not sure other than fixing the things I mentioned in the comments of each of the styles.	2/5/2017 9:50 PM
24	Have Jack Howe from Long Beach (Father CEDA we used to call him) watch a CEDA round and then with a tear in his eye tell the debaters his vision on why CEDA started.	2/5/2017 8:58 PM
25	One or two types of debate formats.	2/5/2017 8:47 PM
26	Make me the debate god.	2/5/2017 8:37 PM
27	Better communication between the 4 year programs and the Community Colleges.	2/5/2017 8:25 PM

A18

