

faculty reception, seminars on forensic practice, and the like. Two day tournaments are typically fast-paced, exhausting events.

Third, the director should decide whether or not the tournament will have elimination rounds. Some tournaments end the competition after the preliminary rounds have concluded. Awards are presented on the basis of preliminary round record and the decision not to have elimination rounds reduces the length of the tournament considerably. However, elimination rounds provide a tournament with the chance to showcase the best competitors in each event and can be a valuable teaching tool if other students take the chance to observe.

Based on these considerations, there are many possible schedule variations depending on the tournament. However, there are some basic guidelines that can be followed when designing a schedule. First, the director should decide how long the average individual events round will take. The length of a round is dependent on how many speakers the largest panel will have, how far the rooms are away from the ballot pick-up station, how limited the judging pool is, ballot writing time, oral critique time, and whether double or triple entries are allowed.

For example, suppose a tournament offered events with a time limit of 10 minutes and a maximum panel size of six contestants. This means that each round will have at 60 minutes of speaking time. If the average distance of the rooms from the ballot pick-up station is five minutes, then the schedule needs to account for 10 minutes of travel time for the critic. If the judging pool is extremely limited and the same judges will judge the following round, another five to ten minutes or so will need to be added to allow the critic to get a cup of coffee or take a quick break. On average a critic will take one to two minutes to fill out a ballot after the speech has concluded, this adds another twelve minutes to the round. Oral critiques tend to take at least as much time as the speech and if such critiques are offered, another hour should be added to the schedule for each round. Finally, if students are double and triple entered, the critic may have to wait in the room for a few minutes while the contestant finishes in another round. Taken together, an individual events round could easily take two and one half to three hours. For most schedules, that is far too long and the easiest element to dispense with is the oral critique. Although such critiques are valuable educational tools, they are difficult to work in regularly in a tournament setting. The only other alternative for shortening the length of a round is reducing the number of contestants to four or five. Even so, only a half hour would be cut and the director would need to find a third more rooms and judges to handle the additional panels of four or five. Therefore, on average, individual events rounds take about an hour and a half, sometimes if there is a plentiful supply of critics and close rooms, the time can be reduced to an hour and fifteen minutes.

If the tournament offers debate, it can be useful to alternate between the power-matched debate rounds and the individual events rounds to allow the tab room staff time to record and power-match the debate round. The director should also consider whether "blocking" events can be used. Blocking events means that all three rounds of an individual events conflict pattern occur consecutively. They may alternate with debate rounds, but no other individual events patterns are run until all of the first pattern has been completed.

Similarly, the randomly matched debate rounds can also be blocked and run consecutively. Blocking has the advantage of giving students extended blocks of time to get something to eat, study, or take a break. It also gives contestants a time to focus uninterrupted on a particular event.

Following is the schedule used for our tournament:

Thursday

2:00 PM	Registration, Regency Room, University Center
4:00 PM	Round 1, Pattern A (Ext, Exp, DI, Dual)
5:30 PM	Round 2, Pattern A (Ext, Exp, DI, Dual)
7:00 PM	Round 3, Pattern A (Ext, Exp, DI, Dual)

Friday

8:00 AM	Round 1, Pattern B (Ora, HI, IR, Imp)
9:15 AM	Round 1, Lincoln-Douglas
10:45 AM	Round 2, Pattern B (Ora, HI, IR, Imp)
12:00 PM	Round 1, Cross Examination
	Round 2, Champ. Lincoln-Douglas
1:30 PM	Round 3, Pattern B (Ora, HI, IR, Imp)
2:30 PM	Round 2, Cross Examination
	Round 2, Intermediate Lincoln-Douglas
4:00 PM	Semi-Finals, Individual Events
5:00 PM	Round 3, Cross Examination
	Round 2, Inexperienced Lincoln-Douglas
6:30 PM	Finals, Individual Events
7:30 PM	Round 3, Lincoln-Douglas
8:30 PM	Awards, Eastvold Auditorium

Saturday

8:00 AM	Round 4, Lincoln-Douglas
9:30 AM	Round 4, Cross Examination
11:00 AM	Round 5, Lincoln-Douglas
12:00 PM	Round 5, Cross Examination
1:30 PM	Round 6, Lincoln-Douglas
2:30 PM	Round 6, Cross Examination
4:30 PM	Debate Elimination Announcement, Kris Knutsen
5:00 PM	Elimination Rounds of Debate

This schedule is for a combination tournament of individual events and debate. IE only tournaments would, of course, use a very different schedule. Several things should be noted about this schedule. For example, the individual events patterns are blocked. While this is not appropriate for all tournaments, it is appropriate if the hope is to get students on and off the campus as quickly as possible. Because we do not have the facilities for managing the 1200 students and judges at our high school tournament, by blocking events we can keep the number of people on campus to about 700 in any given hour. Notice, for instance, that all the A pattern events are concluded on Thursday evening. The A pattern has the most students, they

are scheduled to arrive and depart after classes on campus have ended, and those that do not make the elimination round will not return on Friday or Saturday. Similarly, the individual events awards are on Friday evening which means that only debaters return to the campus on Saturday. In our situation this is important because vandalism problems mean that we try to limit the number of open buildings. Again, however, the particular decisions about schedule depend entirely on the capabilities of the host location.

F. Tournament Manager Software and Configuration

The Tournament Manager software is intended to duplicate, as much as possible, the procedures involved in manually managing a tournament. Too many programs, I believe, force the tournament director to adapt the tournament to the software as opposed to the other way around. Tournament Manager's configuration screen, therefore, asks the same kinds of questions that have been addressed already.

The program asks how many ranks and rates will be printed on the ballots, then it asks for event and division entry along with the maximum allowable number of contestants in a panel. Finally it has the operator enter the rooms and the schools and allows notations to be made about which rooms are appropriate for disabled students. It is important to track which students and critics have limited movement or might have difficulty climbing stairs. Although most buildings are accessible to participants who might have difficulty walking, it makes more sense to use rooms that are near and easily accessible. That way the participants and the tournaments are more likely to stay on time. Apart from these types of questions, the program also allows the operator to enter the tournament fee structure, sweepstakes formula, and the tournament schedule.

II. Entries

For me, the most difficult part of managing a tournament is maintaining accurate entry lists. Although most attending schools will get their entries in on time, most schools will also have changes in the entry right up to the time of competition. The problem for a tournament director, then, is how to keep the changes clear and how to keep the tournament records accurate.

The invitation is an important link in the record keeping of a tournament. The entry form should be clear and easy to file. It should also contain the information needed to contact the entering school in case of question. A sample from our tournament follows:

ENTRY FORM

School Information

School Name:	Code:
Director:	Phone:
Address:	FAX:
	E-Mail:

Individual Events Entry (Indicate Division in the Appropriate Box)

NAME	A:Ext	A:Exp	A:DI	A:Dual	B:Ora	B:HI	B:IR	B:Imp
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								

Critic Entry

Name	Comment	IE	Debate
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

Any tournament's individual entry form should be adapted to its unique needs. For example, in our tournament having an E-mail address or FAX number is important because once the information has been transferred from the entry form to the computer, a confirmation of entry is sent back to the school. This can usually be accomplished in minutes because the computer can generate a printout that lists each event and the contestants entered in that event by the school. The computer can also generate an invoice that shows the fee calculation. The advantage of using a computer at this point is that once the names are correctly entered in the computer, there is no chance for a transcription error. Everyone in the computer, unless dropped, will appear in every round, correctly spelled, every time.

Additional features that should be found on the entry include the events, the divisions, and a space for comments. The event list should include which pattern the events are in so that entry errors can be corrected quickly. Otherwise, if double entries only are allowed, a student entering a third event in a pattern might not be easy to see. A comment space should also be provided somewhere on the form to list the limitations of critics and contestants. If someone has difficulty climbing stairs, the tournament director needs to be able to make accommodations.

A. The Master Book

Somewhere in a tournament, there needs to be one place that is always completely accurate. That place should be the master book. All entries, adds/drops, notes, and changes should be kept in the master book. The master book may be a notebook, file folders, or whatever other filing system one may feel is appropriate. However, there needs to be a single place that is completely accurate. All checks and double checks should be made from this book. When any entry, change notice, or note of any sort arrives, it should be filed into the master book.

B. Codes

If the tournament director does not want students from the same school or region to meet one another in competition, then some system of coding needs to be in place. Contestant codes are used to identify contestant affiliation to avoid scheduling conflicts. If the goal of the tournament is to find the best speaker, then a director may decide to dispense with codes. Codes are used to protect the speakers of a school or region from meeting one another unnecessarily. They are used to ensure a diversity of competition.

For most tournaments, every school receives a code when it is entered. The code is then assigned to every contestant, critic, and debate team entered. There are many ways to code contestants. The most common is to number the school on the basis of entry. In other words, the first school to enter is listed as school 1, the second school is 2, and so on. In the *Pi Kappa Delta* national tournament, the codes also include province affiliation. Thus, the first school entering from the first region might be numbered 101, the second school from the first region would be 102, and so on.

Another system of coding is the use of school names where students from Pacific Lutheran University are coded as PLU-Jones, students from Lewis & Clark College might be coded as L&C-Smith. When I have used school name coding in the past, I have found it much easier at a later date to submit results to national organizations because the school code and school name are the same. In fact, I have found using the *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results* book code system to be very useful. It always seems difficult to me to figure out what school 117 was three months later. Besides the ease of use, it always seemed more personable to refer to a contestant by school and not by code number. However, numbers are easier to double check and process than school names because the checker can discriminate on the basis of one or two digits. We found more checking errors were associated with recording using letters instead of numbers.

Most tournaments now use the contestant's name attached to the school code. However, some tournaments use a blind code such that a contestant from school 12 might be listed as 12-XYL with the XYL representing a student or critic name found only on the master list in the tournament headquarters. The proponents of such systems hope to overcome the biases associated with name recognition and ensure a greater degree of fairness through anonymity. The drawback, of course, is that a biased critic will still recognize the contestant once the round begins anyway thereby reducing the effectiveness of the blind code. Additionally, double-checking in the tabulation process is more difficult with random letters and numbers than with a name. For example, if the computer operator misspelled 12-Jones as 12-Jons, the contestant would probably be able to figure out the error. On the other hand, 12-XXYLLD and 12-XXYLLE might not be as easy to correct because the contestant might assume that the code was assigned to another member on the squad.

A sample school roster with codes might look like this:

- 01 Carroll College
- 02 Whitman College
- 03 Western Washington University
- 04 University of Washington
- 05 Portland Community College
- 06 Seattle Pacific University
- 07 Clark College
- 08 California State University - Northridge
- 09 Grays Harbor College
- 10 Oregon State University
- 11 University of Alaska
- 12 Linfield College
- 13 Lower Columbia College
- 14 Seattle University
- 15 Sacramento
- 16 Lane Community College
- 17 Clackamas Community College
- 18 Willamette University
- 19 Pacific Lutheran University
- 20 Lewis & Clark College
- 21 University of Oregon

An important decision the director needs to make is whether members of the home team will be allowed to compete in the tournament and if they are allowed, will they be permitted to participate in the elimination rounds. This is a very controversial issue and one that needs to be explained to the visiting schools (preferably in the invitation) and the home school students. Because the tournament is an opportunity to host other schools, one school of thought is that it is inappropriate for the host school to participate. Schools that traveled to attend the tournament should be awarded and not members of the hosting institution. Another point of view is that the members of the host school should not be penalized because they are hosting the tournament. This argument is analogous to other activities participating when they host other schools such as

with tennis or basketball. This school of thought argues that the competitive experience is at least as valuable for the home students as the other students with the added benefit that perhaps family and friends might be able to see their students in competition. Such chances for public relations are few and far between and could be valuable assets for a program. A third point of view, a compromise, is to allow the home students to participate in the preliminary rounds but not in the final rounds. This way, students can experience the benefits of competition but not prevent the attending schools from being awarded in the final rounds. However, the home school would still play a role in helping or preventing other schools achieving the elimination rounds with the disadvantage that home school students tend not to take the competition seriously to the possible detriment of attending schools if they know they cannot win.

C. Add/Drop/Changes

The best prepared tournament can be devastated by adds, drops, and changes if they are not processed carefully. We had an instance once where one third of the tournament changed during registration. All the individual events paneling was ruined and needed to be resectioned. Obviously, any changes need to be made as soon as possible and the original entry forms in the master book need to be corrected to reflect the changes.

There are some considerations that should be made when evaluating add/drop policies. First, there will be last minute changes. This means that if a director sections all preliminary rounds in advance, all the rounds will need to be adjusted and panels will need to be equalized. For instance if every panel of Junior Drama has six speakers and then two drops in one panel yield four speakers, some speaker should be moved to make all the panels as equal as possible. To combat the problems imposed on tournaments by late changes, some directors levy a change penalty and charge the school making the change five or ten dollars. For the most part, careful double checking and confirmation forms can avoid miscommunications. Perhaps the best method for conducting double checks is to send a copy of the entry back to the school after the contestant lists have been made up. This is especially easy with a computer because the list that is returned to the school will have all the entries placed into the appropriate events so that the attending school can double check its own information.

Computers excel in their ability to process changes quickly and accurately. A laptop computer can be placed at the registration table and changes can be made on the spreadsheet or database instantly. The Tournament Manager allows global changes which means that a dropped contestant will be taken out of all events or any set of specified events. These changes are then also reflected in subsequent postings of rounds. Because computers have the capability of processing changes so quickly, we typically do not pre-match the rounds but wait until after registration. Preparing a round of individual events takes about an hour using the computer.

D. Critics

Critics are also over worked people. Whereas students have breaks between rounds and function on an adrenaline rush, judges write ballots between rounds and for the most part have already worked a full week prior

to attending the tournament. They deserve breaks during tournaments, but how many breaks people get from judging depends on the number of judges available for a given number of panels.

Ideally, a pool of twice as many judges as needed will do the job well. However, a pool of one third more than the total number of panels in a round will allow people rounds off. But the reality of tournament management is that there are often many fewer judges than are actually needed and that means that the schedule from the beginning should provide critics with as much opportunity as possible to get from one round to the next and write thoughtful critiques between rounds. Realistically, a tournament director should strive to give a critic one round off for every two rounds on.

For the most part, however, critics are a very scarce resource. To overcome limitations in the number of judges available and to enhance the overall educational value of the tournament, many directors have argued for the increased use of "lay" judges. Lay critics are not professional forensic educators and they offer a different judging perspective than the veteran tournament critic. But, should non-expert critics evaluate speeches that require a tremendous amount of technical expertise to develop. For instance, can a lay critic fairly evaluate Communication Analysis or Oral Interpretation? Faules explained the controversy well when he wrote: "If we are teaching students to speak to everyday audiences, why not let the layman judge or, better yet, why not let the audience judge? It is likely that the criteria used by a layman judge differs from that of an expert-critic judge. There are some who contend that forensic speaking is a specialized activity and most likely the [speaker] will be facing a specialized audience after he completes his education. Others assert that we may be specializing our students right out of reality."¹⁰

Certainly, individual events involve specialization. Some students work exclusively on developing their interpretative or oratorical skills. Should these students be judged by a lay critic who has no understanding of the intricacies of the event? This question would not be as important if expert and non-expert critics evaluated speeches similarly, but they do not. Nicolai found that there does not seem to be any significant similarity between lay critics and expert judges.¹¹ This means two things. First, expert-critics who presumably know what to look for evaluate speeches differently. And, second, if lay judges are unable to pick up on the complexities of a particular event, we may be teaching our students such highly specialized skills as to hinder the students' ability to transfer their forensic education to the world outside the tournament.

Finding a qualified and competent critic pool seems to involve a combination of expert-critics and lay-critics. Perhaps students should learn to adapt their speaking to different audiences and expectations. However, the tournament has a responsibility, I believe, to offer at least some minimal training for its critics. Such training might involve just a packet of material that provides the event rules, a set of criteria that may be employed in evaluating different speeches (similar to the criteria referenced ballots discussed earlier), and expectations for what should be written on a ballot.¹²

The tournament director should work to develop a list of potential critics who have judged before or who have expressed an interest in being a critic. Other regional tournaments probably have a similar list of people that the director may use as well. However, a variety of community critics may be

available and the director should explore whether local lawyers, professors, the League of Women Voters, members of Toastmasters, and the like would be interested in critiquing a few rounds.

E. Double-Checking

As entries come into the tournament director, they are filed in the master entry book. Once each entry is assigned a code and filed, the process of developing event lists begins. The event list is simply the names and codes of contestants listed for each event. Likewise the critics should be listed on a grid or card that shows what rounds the critic is available to judge and tracks what events the critic has been assigned to judge.

There are many ways to construct an event list, but such a list simply breaks out each school's entry into the different events. One way of keeping a list is in individual folders by event and it might look like this:

Junior Informative Speaking

3-Gregg Dean

3-Patty Fulton

7-Dave Penman

7-David Schuly

7-Jeff Palenski

7-Ron Buch

13-Eric Ostling

13-Jeff McGraham

13-Pete Pilotti

13-Ryan Todd

13-Tina Ubl

16-Carrie Frye

16-Ranell Trantham

17-Patrick Lairson

It is important to keep the entries in school code order. Depending on the matching system used, this helps to avoid conflicts when the panels are created. The problem with a paper folder system is, of course, that adds and drops will make keeping the numerical list in order difficult. The other problem is one of transcription. As entries are copied from the master book to the one, two or more events, there are opportunities for writing the wrong code number or contestant name. Also, when changes are made, they will now need to be made in two places—the master entry book and the individual events folder.

Because so many names and events are copied, changed, and recopied, double checking is an absolutely vital step in the management of a tournament. Double checking is really a series of double checks that begins from the moment an entry is received. Once the entry is received, a confirmation of entry should be returned to the entering school. The confirmation should provide an initial assessment of fees, ask any questions about the entry such as name spelling or division, and it should list how many slots have been entered in each event. If there are problems, it is best to find them early. Ideally, confirmations of entry should be returned by either E-Mail or FAX because speech is usually important.

The second double-check occurs after the event lists are completed and just prior to placing the contestants into panels. In this double check, the event list is read by one person to another person who is looking at the master entry book. This double check helps to find and correct any transcription errors that occurred during the transcription of names from the master book to the list.

A third double check is made at the registration table where the entering school is given a final list of people entered for each event. This provides the school with a chance to correct any division or name errors, enter an omitted person, or drop a person. Finally, if the tournament is matched by hand, the list of names in each panel for all rounds needs to be read back to someone looking at the master book to catch any omissions.

Double-checking is easily done if the tournament uses a computer. Because the event list is compiled directly into the computer, there are fewer opportunities for transcription errors. If the computerized event list is further used to match the rounds, then there is virtually not chance of error in creating the panels. Even if the tournament is not using dedicated software, a simple spreadsheet or database will work well. Lists can be maintained easily and sorted quickly.

F. Tournament Manager Software and Entries

The goal of the tournament manager is to reduce the number of errors as much as possible in compiling entry lists. Every time an entry is transferred from one place to another, the opportunity for error (misspelling, omission) exists. Although entries can be taken by telephone and placed directly into the software's database system, I advocate a hard copy for the master book at all times. That way, in case of any questions or problems, there is a copy that can be consulted that is kept completely accurate. Additionally, double checking is easier when the book can be consulted by a number of people. Computers can become the source of tournament bottlenecks if too many people are trying to access information simultaneously.

The Tournament Manager allows the operator to place entrants into each of the events electronically. Additionally, it also maintains a critic database. It will prompt the user to enter rounds the judge is available so that the list can be used in assigning critics to rounds later. Changes can be made directly to the event lists in the software and confirmation of entry forms can be printed which may then be faxed to the school to be double checked.

The goal of managing a tournament at this point is simply to create and maintain as accurately as possible a list of all the entries and critics for each event. The best way to accomplish this is through checking and double checking to be certain that transcription errors did not happen while transferring names and codes from the master entry forms to the event lists and that changes are made accurately. Checking can be very labor intensive, but for every error caught before the tournament begins, confusion and delays are avoided later.

III. Preliminary Rounds

Setting up the preliminary rounds means that each of the entrants in an event is placed into a panel of speakers with a critic and a room. Every event is divided into panels. Most panels are between five and seven contestants and