

While not arguing the necessity of prescriptive, criteria-referenced ballots with "reason for decision" prompts, critics should strive to offer at least a few general comments placing the competitor's work in perspective relative to the round.

Mills and other scholars have furnished a better understanding of content with regard to interpretation ballots. His call to focus more on the internal workings of characters and to offer rationale for decisions should be heeded by critics. Ideally, the guidelines offered here will prove beneficial to those ends and in general when assessing our behaviors as judges of interpretation events. Further study would clearly prove beneficial, especially in analyzing how interpretation critics offer comments specific to performers' technique. If the ballot is to remain a vital instrument for offering feedback to those involved in the presentation of literature, we should periodically analyze the texts we create in response to the texts performed.

REFERENCES

- Carey, J. & Rodier, R. (1987). "Judging the judges: a content analysis of oral interpretation ballots." Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Boston, MA.
- Bartanen, Kristine M. (1990, Fall). "COLLOQUIUM ON BALLOT CRITERIA: The Use of Criteria Referenced Ballots for Individual Events." *National Forensic Journal*, 2, 133-144.
- Bartanen, Kristine M. (1991). "Judge as Educator-Critic: A Guiding Metaphor." *Proceedings to the 1991 Professional Development Conference*, 215-221, Pi Kappa Delta.
- Dean, K.W. & Benoit, W.L. (1984). "A categorical content analysis of rhetorical criticism ballots." *National Forensic Journal*, 2, 99-108.
- Hanson, C. T. (1988). "Students' beliefs about good and bad judges." *The Forensic*, 74 (2), 1-12.
- Harris, E.J., Jr. (1987). "Rhetorical criticism: judges' expectations and contest standards." *National Forensic Journal*, 5, 21-25.
- Jensen, S.C. (1988). "A categorical analysis of original speaking event ballots: a discussion of current trends in judging original speeches in intercollegiate forensics competition." Perspectives on individual events: Proceedings of the first developmental conference on individual events.
- Mills, D. (1991, Spring). "Interpreting the Oral Interpretation Judge: Content Analysis of Oral Interpretation Ballots." *National Forensic Journal*, IX, 31-39.
- Pratt, J.W. (1987). "Judging the judges: A content analysis of ballots for original public speaking events." Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Boston, MA.
- Wright, Kelly Jo. (1991). "Good Luck/Tough Round: A Study of the Educational Value of Judges' Comments." *Proceedings to the 1991 Professional Development Conference*, 248-258, Pi Kappa Delta.
- Yordon, J. (1993). *Roles in Interpretation*, 3rd ed. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

QUAIL ROOST CONFERENCE

The Professional Development and Support Committee of the American Forensics Association is charged with the responsibility of developing and promoting standards concerning the duties, evaluation, and tenure of forensics directors. As chair of this committee, Dr. Cori Dauber invited interested NDT debate directors to a conference held at Chapel Hill, N.C. at the Quail Roost Lodge to discuss tenure and promotion standards.

At the May, 1993 meeting participants established a goal of drafting a document that could be used by universities and outside evaluators in the tenure process. The document was not intended to serve as the final product of the group or as a blueprint for issues that are related to the question of tenure and promotion (i.e.—we did not address how one would negotiate job duties during the interview process)

By August of 1993 Dr. Dauber had a draft of the document for presentation to interested parties at the ALTA conference. The same draft was discussed at the SCA meeting in Miami, 1993. At the Miami conference the Professional Development Committee established a procedure to garner systematic commentary from interested parties.

First, we welcome comments from the CEDA, NIET, ADA, PKD, DSR-TKA and NFA communities. Our hope is that each of these groups will systematically gather comments and forward them to the Professional Development and Support Committee by May 1, 1994. Commentary should be forwarded to:

Edward Penetta
Director of Debate
Dept. of Speech Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
Bitnet: EPANETTA@UGA.CC.UGA.EDU

Second, between May 1 and September 1, 1994 the Professional Development Committee will edit the document. The editing is intended to reflect the recurrent problems/concerns outlined by members of all forensics communities. On September 1, 1994 the edited document will be circulated to the AFA President and Executive Secretary , our intention is that the AFA community will vote on the document at the 1994 business meeting in New Orleans.

Third, this document will be circulated to the CEDA and NFA et al communities in the early fall. Our hope is that each of these bodies will act on the document in 1994 or early 1995.

Our hope is that people will offer constructive commentary on the document before May 1, 1994. If we wait until New Orleans to solicit comments, the AFA would be forced to wait until 1995 until sanctioning the document. Given that some people face tenure and promotion in the 1994-1995 academic year and that such a document has been too long in the waiting, we wish to wait no longer. Thanks for your help.

POLICY CAUCUS WORKING GROUP ON TENURE FOR FORENSIC EDUCATORS: INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

On May 21-23, the Policy Caucus Working Group on Professional Development met at the Quail Roost Conference Center in Quail Roost, North Carolina. The goal of the Working Group was to produce a draft of a document on tenure for forensic educators which, after being circulated as widely as possible throughout the forensics community, could eventually receive the support of professional organizations representing forensic educators. The draft is attached to this paper. Our hope is that the attached document can eventually be provided to departments interested in hiring forensic educators in tenure track lines in order to bring the process of evaluating for tenure more in line with the role played by the coach. Several concerns emerged in the group's discussions, and are mentioned here in order to place the document in context.

First and foremost, for any such document to be of use it must be adaptable. Debate programs come in a wide variety of shapes and sizes and are attached to a wide variety of institutions with a correspondingly wide variety of expectations for tenure. A document prepared with only one type of program or host institution in mind does more harm than good.

That having been said, three considerations, stemming from conversations between active forensic educators, both tenured and untenured, and former directors, several of whom are currently departmental and institutional administrators, guided the development of the attached document.

1. The importance of mission statements. It became clear in our discussion that the expectations of a particular department, college or university go beyond the traditional classifications or categories of institutions. Based on the needs of the institution and the institutional and departmental mission statements, the department and the forensic educator should agree on an explicit mission statement for the forensic program. This process should take place well before a tenure review is to be initiated. The size of the program, emphasis on competition vs. on campus events, the standards by which the institution will assess what a "quality" program is, should be clearly laid out well in advance. Does the institution want a few students prepared to travel and compete at a national level, a large number of students prepared to travel and compete regionally, or a mix? This may help determine whether, for tenure purposes, forensics activities will be evaluated as primarily research, service or teaching, as well as the effect coaching will have on the other categories.

2. Outcome standards for teaching performance. For years forensic educators have discussed the difficulties inherent in using standard methods for evaluating teaching performance. Because the standard methods involve student ratings, there is automatically a problem given the relatively small size of most squads, not to mention a problem in protecting anonymity. It was the strong feeling of the Working Group that colleges and universities will increasingly be called on to evaluate teaching, not in terms of students like and dislikes, but in terms of what students can be demonstrated to have learned. Given that such standards are likely to be increasingly prominent, the difficulty in standard measures, and the potential to be explored in

modifying such standards for use with debate (and presumably IE) the Working Group strongly urges the adoption of this type of standard by the forensic community. The quality of a coaches' effort could be assessed by examining such things as four year graduation rate, improvement in competitive success over the duration of a students' career, or for that matter a coaches', number of students involved in activity, overall squad gpa, acceptance and success rate of students in major graduate programs and the like.

3. Tenure standards should distinguish between *scholarship* and *scholarly activity*. There has been, in some quarters, much recent debate over the appropriate placement of forensics activities in the standard tenure evaluation classification of teaching, service, and research. We suggest that this debate may eventually be irrelevant, as the classification should ultimately be determined through discussion between the coach and the department, taking into consideration the specific circumstances, the nature of the host institution, and the mission statements of the program, department, and college or university. We suggest instead the adoption of an understanding that in each of the three categories the professional's activities may be scholarly or not, and that scholarly activity in any of the three categories should be weighed more heavily than non-scholarly activity. As an example, if a scholar's primary research interest is in feminist critical theory, then participation on the curriculum committee of an interdisciplinary program in Women's' Studies, while still obviously service, would be service of a scholarly nature, where participation on a committee considering the need for building more dorm space would be non-scholarly activity. Publishing might or might not be scholarly, depending on the nature of the individual's research program and the specifics of a particular piece. Some publishing, in fact, might most appropriately be categorized and evaluated as service of a scholarly nature. This allows a holistic and contextualized consideration of a professional life, and means that for some, for whom coaching is not considered scholarship per se, the candidate for tenure can still receive all due credit for the differences between coaching and other activities normally undertaken by junior faculty.

The following document results from the consideration of these factors. It is intended as a jumping off point for discussion and debate, and we look forward to the reactions of our colleagues in the forensics community.

Respectfully, The Policy Caucus Working Group on Tenure and Professional Development

DRAFT DOCUMENT

REPORT OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE FROM THE QUAIL ROOST CONFERENCE ON ASSESSMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF DIRECTORS OF DEBATE

**SPONSORED BY THE AFA POLICY DEBATE CAUCUS
QUAIL ROOST CONFERENCE CENTER
ROUEMONT, NORTH CAROLINA**

MAY 21-23, 1993

Introduction

A well established and supported debate program offers exceptional opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate education that are equaled by few other academic programs. Debate permits undergraduates to develop such humanistic capabilities as research, analysis, critical evaluation of claims, and the construction and judgment of argument on important social issues. Debate introduces the intellectual excitement and rigor of research into the undergraduate curriculum in a manner characterized by both its intensity and interdisciplinary nature. Graduate students benefit by being able to pursue an advanced degree while obtaining the professional development as directors of debate that is so necessary to train future generations of students. The benefits derived from debate thus seem particularly appropriate for, and consistent with, the emerging concerns and trends in higher education.

Purpose

This document emerged from a three day conference attended by active directors of policy debate and university administrators. It offers, we believe, a perspective from which directors and debate programs can be evaluated. The conclusions presented here may be particularly valuable in addressing standards for promotion and tenure decisions. It is imperative to note that debate is viewed as a valuable professional activity that occurs within a complete professional life defined by individuals in conjunction with the educational missions of their institutions and departments.

Perspective

In generating possible criteria for evaluation, three fundamental principles guided the Working Committee's deliberations:

1. The director of debate's role, and basis for evaluation, should be grounded explicitly in the mission statements of the institution, department and debate program. The debate program's mission statement should be developed by the director and the appropriate departmental administrative officer or committee, and should identify the ways in which the debate program can complement and help accomplish the department's mission.
2. The director of debate's professional life should be characterized by excellence in all of its aspects. Assessments of such excellence should be

focused less on the existence of discrete accomplishments, and more on the integration of research, teaching, and service into a coherent and mutually supportive totality. The specific emphasis devoted to each aspect of professional life shall be guided by mission statements of the institution, department, and debate program. It should be remembered in this context, however, that the director is a professional who coaches, not a coach who is simply housed in an academic department as a matter of convenience.

Within the context of each institution and department, a distinction is made between work that qualifies as scholarly and work that does not. In each of the three traditional areas of evaluation, research, teaching, and service, activities may or may not be scholarly. In general, in each of the three areas, work is considered scholarly if it meets the following criteria:

— The work serves as a contribution to knowledge by, for example, (a) advancing understanding and/or information, (b) developing interpretive and critical perspectives, (c) integrating information so as to bring new insights to bear on it, or (d) applying new information and critical perspectives.

— The work contributes to the individual's personal-professional development by, for example, representing work in a new area for her or him, or work that is part of an integrated, evolving, and progressing program.

— The work is communicated to knowledgeable others so they can engage it, challenge it, adapt it, teach it, and write about it.

The perspective presented here therefore retains the traditional categories of academic life (research, teaching, and service), but places them within a framework recognizing the changing complexities and opportunities that increasingly characterize higher education.

3. The director of debate's professional life should be evaluated on the basis of clearly identifiable and measurable outcomes that are desirable and appropriate for the department and institution within which the director serves.

From this perspective, activities associated with one's performance as director of debate are part of an overall professional life. Serving as director of debate is a faculty assignment appropriate to an intellectual discipline — predominately that of communication studies — within a given institution and department. For an individual serving at a research institution, she or he may still be expected to engage in an active research program. At the same time, however, evaluation of that research program, in addition to teaching and service, should consider the totality of one's professional life within an institution and field. Within this perspective, for instance, research activities would be complemented by related, integrated teaching and service activities. Activities in each area gain in value proportionately to the extent they are consistent with the demands imposed by, and the resources committed to, fulfillment of the respective mission statements.

Activities and Outcomes

Evaluation of a director of debate's professional life should be measured in concrete terms consistent with the articulated goals of the program's mission statement. The weighting allocated to research, teaching, and service may

vary, depending on the needs of the institution. Similarly, it is not our expectation that the director would be evaluated, whether for promotion or for tenure based solely on her or his work as director. However, to the extent that coaching is part of a coherent professional life, there are elements of the director's activities which may best be evaluated as research, as teaching, or as service. Furthermore, while the director ought be held to standards of excellence in each area of activity, their position as director creates a context in which the evaluation of the director's performance in all activities should occur. The following identifies possibilities for making such evaluations:

1. Research

While individual research programs will vary, certain aspects of a director of debate's activities appropriately fit within the category of research, depending upon the standards and mission statement of each department and institution.

- Each director of debate should clearly identify her or his research program. Each research program should contain an emerging center or focus. It seems appropriate, given the concerns expressed with creating an integrated professional life across research, teaching, and service, that a reasonable concentration for such a research program might include forensic pedagogy.

- Each director should, in accordance with the appropriate departmental administrator or committee, identify those quality measures for assessing the research program. These measures should then be utilized in an evaluation of the director's research program by his or her peers, both within and external to the department.

- The degree of emphasis on research must be related to the institutional, departmental and programmatic mission statements.

- Each institution and department should accept that the research efforts of a director should be placed within the broader context of overall mission statements. Further, in those institutions where a research program of substantial importance is required, appropriate amounts of administrative support should be provided such that the director might have reasonable expectations of fulfilling the research component. The requisite administrative support for such a research program might consist of released time from teaching courses other than debate, the providing of research assistants, and so forth.

- In consideration of the value of publications resulting from a research program, the sources of publication should be evaluated in terms of their prominence within the research program's area of concentration. By this standard, for instance, *Argumentation and Advocacy* should be recognized as among the leading outlets for research in argumentation studies and in forensic pedagogy.

a. Activities within Research

Among the activities that might constitute a research program are the following:

- i. Research in debate theory, practice, and pedagogy.

ii. Debate coaching when viewed as performance. This perspective sees debate as a creative activity, somewhat along the lines of other artistic and performance-based research programs within the academy. The assumption expressed by those attending this conference, however, is that even a performance-centered debate program will still have some written component in order to qualify as scholarly research.

b. Measurable Outcomes.

The most obvious measurable outcomes for assessing the quality of a director's research program will remain publication of articles in appropriate regional, national, and international journals, and presentation of papers at conventions.

2. *Teaching*

Two primary dimensions of teaching are inherent within directing debate: (a) the act of teaching, typically associated with coaching and training students; and (b) the development of pedagogical works, such as handbooks, model syllabi, debate materials, and audio-visual aids conceived for pedagogical purposes and shared with knowledgeable colleagues. It is possible that, depending upon the way an individual program is characterized, the latter category of pedagogical works could be contained as research.

One very strong implication of this view is that debate should not be considered as an extra-curricular activity, but at the very least as co-curricular.

a. Activities within Teaching

Among the activities that might constitute teaching are the following:

- i. mentoring graduate students;
- ii. judging and critiquing debates;
- iii. critical thinking instruction;
- iv. coaching debate teams and individual debaters;
- v. writing textbooks for debate pedagogy;
- vi. writing handbooks.

One final point that should be emphasized about teaching in debate is the necessity to become familiar with, and to gain knowledge in many different fields and research methods in order to become conversant with the debate topic and to teach students effectively.

b. Measurable Outcomes

A number of measurable outcomes are possible when discussing a director's teaching accomplishments.

i. Peer reviews can be obtained from other directors who observe the teaching and other professional conduct of directors of debate while in the performance of those activities. Such reviews can be solicited by the appropriate administrator or committee, and can be added to the portfolio.

- ii. graduate rates of debaters within the program;
- iii. composite grade or quality point average for debaters in the program;
- iv. acceptance and attendance of debaters in the program to graduate and professional schools;
- v. overall win-loss record for the program, not as an absolute measure, but as changing win-loss records over the course of individual debater's careers reflect evidence that students are growing and developing;
- vi. achievement of the debate program against particular levels of competition;
- vii. rankings in the NDT or other point systems;
- viii. the number of participants in the debate program;
- ix. continued recruitment of stronger and more capable students to the debate program;
- x. measures of student satisfaction, including but not limited to student evaluations;
- xi. letters from former debaters;
- xii. exit interviews by the appropriate administrator or committee with graduating debaters and graduate assistants

This listing is intended to be illustrative only, and not to exclude other appropriate measures of successful teaching activity.

3. *Service*

A commitment to professional service is also to be expected of each director of debate. At the same time, one should recognize that the opportunities for such professional service at the regional and national level for directors of debate, frequently as junior level and non-tenured faculty, are perhaps unique within the academy.

As a rule, highly visible and, hence, highly demanding and time-consuming, professional service is often limited to senior faculty who have established the credentials and respect of their peers over a number of years. Development of those credentials usually begins during the initial academic appointment, although to some extent while pursuing the doctoral degree. For directors of debate, however, the process begins much earlier. The professional "introduction" to one's colleagues frequently occurs while an undergraduate debater; is strengthened as a graduate student traveling with debate teams and judging; and often enters as a fully accepted colleague with the first appointment as an Assistant Professor. It is not at all unusual for a junior faculty member to serve in positions of regional and national responsibility, whether as a member of a district or national debate committee or as actively involved in such professional associations as the AFA, ADA and others. Assuming competence, directors of debate may attain positions of substantial professional service while at a relatively young professional age. The net consequence of such circumstances is that many directors are completing their professional service to the forensic community at the time when colleagues are just beginning theirs.

As a result of these possibilities a kind of "reverse" presumption can be expected wherein directors of debate will have substantial professional service and leadership early in one's career. To the extent that the relative weightings of research, teaching and service must be interpreted within a coherent totality of professional life, administrators or committees evaluating directors must consider the time commitments expended and the effect of that commitment on teaching and research activities.

a. Activities

Among the activities which are appropriate for a director of debate's professional service are the following:

- i. hosting workshops for high school and college students and teachers;
- ii. hosting tournaments for high schools and colleges;
- iii. service to the forensic profession and to professional organizations;
- iv. hosting clinics to improve forensic pedagogy.

b. Measurable Outcomes

The following are examples of measurable outcomes for professional service.

- i. numbers of workshops, tournaments, and clinics hosted;
- ii. evaluations by participants at workshops, tournaments, and clinics where such evaluations are appropriate;
- iii. positions held and responsibilities accomplished in service to the profession and professional associations;
- iv. and by peer review.

It should be noted that positions of professional and association leadership and service constitute unusually good indications of peer evaluation. Given the relatively small size of the debate community, one's peers are well aware of an individual's abilities and the process of evaluation is continual. The nature of debate as explained at the beginning of this section means that colleagues are usually known for relatively long periods of time, and that appointment or election to positions of professional responsibility is testament by the community to an individual director of debate.

4. Administration

An essential part of any director of debate's duties is that of careful, diligent, and professional administration of the program and the funds allocated to it.

a. Activities

Among the activities that must be performed by every director in an administrative capacity are the following:

- i. supervision of students and others while traveling to tournaments and other activities;
- ii. timely preparation of all arrangements for travel;

iii. timely preparation and disposition of all relevant documents relating to travel, personnel, and financial matters.

5. Promotion and Tenure Document

While each institution and department has its own procedures and requirements for tenure and promotion and for the documentation supporting that process, this Conference recommends that each director be given the opportunity to prepare a three to five page narrative that presents his or her professional life in a succinct manner. Included within this document would be a statement of all the program's activities, the successes achieved, and how the various elements of teaching, research and service cohere into a professional life.

Concluding Comments

Differences will inevitably exist among debate programs and in the ways in which directors of debate create and administer successful programs. What seems most essential is that each director, working in conjunction with the appropriate departmental administrator or committee, work to establish a program mission statement. That mission statement should be the statement of guiding principle for the program, and for the director, expressing the philosophy supporting the program and influencing the daily decisions necessary for the program's survival and prosperity. While we recognize that many different outcomes can be associated with a "successful" program, we believe that, taken in combination, the criteria suggested here will increase the likelihood that directors are aware of the standards by which their work in forensics will be evaluated, and can even have some input into those standards.

The life, both personal and professional, of a director of debate is demanding and challenging. Yet, it is inordinately rewarding at the same time. When most think of the rewards directly linked to directing, however, it is the contact with one's colleagues and students which rush to mind most quickly. Other rewards, too, can be associated with one's professional life as a director of debate, and those should include promotion and tenure, and merit increases when they are justified. This Conference offers this document as a point from which discussion and evaluation may continue.

Respectfully submitted,

Cori Dauber, Director of Forensics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Conference Convener)

Bill Balthrop, Chair, Department of Communication Studies, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Becky Bjork, Director of Forensics, University of Utah

Bruce Daniel, Director of Debate, West Georgia College

Tim Hynes, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Louisville

Allan Loudon, Director of Debate, Wake Forest University

Ed Panetta, Director of Forensics, University of Georgia

George Ziegelmüller, Director of Forensics, Wayne State University

THE FORENSIC OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PROJECT: CAN WE MEASURE THE BENEFITS OF FORENSICS TO STUDENTS?

Michael Bartanen, Chair, Department of Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University,
President, Guild of American Forensic Educators

The Guild of American Forensic Educators is tackling one of the most vexing issues facing forensics competitors and teachers. How can we assess the role of forensics in a student's education? Assessment is doubtless one of the most important "trends" and "buzzwords" of contemporary education. In a period of shrinking financial resources, colleges and secondary schools are scrutinizing every academic program and activity to determine whether they are worth their cost. There is no longer a "business as usual" mentality. There is great competition for scarce resources. Universities are finding that new program innovations can only be justified as replacements for existing programs. There is no great pool of new money to inject into program growth. Competitive forensics may be one of the programs most at risk for replacement when money for new programs or curricular changes is needed.

The reason forensics is at risk is simple. We rely too much on unsubstantiated testimony or anecdotal evidence to justify the educational values of forensics. We claim, for example, to teach critical thinking skills although the evidence of our success is scanty. We rely exclusively on the personal testimony of our alumni about the benefits of forensics without really knowing what in particular contributed to their success. This lack of a clear understanding of the educational benefits of our activity leads us to debilitating disagreement among ourselves about the educational values of our current forms of competition. Delivery speed in debate and literary analysis versus performance in oral interpretation are two among numerous controversies that cannot be resolved unless we go about systematically collecting information about the educational outcomes that actually result from our activity. When we more clearly understand why forensics is valuable and which aspects of forensics are most crucial to the value of the activity, we can make rational decisions about how to improve forensics and explain our activity to administrators and others who decide whether a particular academic program is important enough to fund and support.

The Guild of American Forensic Educators has embarked on a comprehensive Forensic Outcomes Assessment Project. The Project will be directed by David Frank (University of Oregon) and managed by Bill Hill (University of North Carolina-Charlotte). Dr. Frank will coordinate all logistical activities and Dr. Hill will be responsible for setting up and supervising the working groups and the information gathering sections of the project.

The Forensics Outcome Assessment Project consists of several distinct activities: The first stage is identification of outcomes associated with forensics competition. This stage will attempt to answer the question: how should forensics benefit students? Dr. Hill and Dr. Frank will select two working groups, each with six to eight people, to review the literature, gather input from the community and identify potential outcomes that can be measured. One group will do this process for debate; the other for individual events. This process should begin in January 1994 and be completed by August 1994. Dr. Hill and Dr. Frank will oversee a joint meeting of the working groups to compare their findings and recommend useful ways of gathering data regarding the measurement of those outcomes collected by the task force groups.

The second step will be the development of measuring instruments and the gathering of data about whether contests achieve these identified outcomes. The working groups will develop a strategy for systematically gathering information. They will attempt to use the kinds of measuring tools used elsewhere in education for assessment purposes. This process should begin in September 1994 and be completed by May 1996. These findings will be compiled and distributed to participants in a national Assessment Conference.

The third stage of the project will be the calling of a Forensics Outcomes Assessment Conference in the summer of 1996. Conference participants will meet to consider how to act on the data. The format will probably be similar to previous national conferences on forensics. Specific recommendations for changing forensics will be introduced, discussed and voted on.

This Assessment Project will be difficult and time-consuming. It is, however, well worth the effort. The members of the Guild believe that the key to the long term health of forensics is knowing what it does, or does not do for students. We will be able to rationally evaluate our activity and move closer toward the ever elusive consensus about the kinds of activities and practices that make the most educational sense.

We earnestly invite the comments and participation of teachers, students and alumni. For further information about the project and possible ways you might participate, contact:

Dr. David Frank, Robert D. Clark Honors College, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 97403. Dr. Frank is the director of the project. For more information about project design and data gathering contact Dr. Bill Hill, University of North Carolina-Charlotte. Dr. Hill is the project manager and is responsible for the activities of the work groups defining the educational outcomes and gathering information about how forensic activities meet those outcomes. For more information about the activities of the Guild of American Forensic Educators contact Dr. Michael Bartanen, Pacific Lutheran University.

EXPLORING THE UNDISCOVERED COUNTRY: CREATING NETWORKS BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE FORENSIC PROGRAMS

Alfred C. Snider

Edwin W. Lawrence Professor of Forensics
University of Vermont

Submitted to *The Forensic*, December, 1993

The study and practice of expression and advocacy through communication should not be an activity which is isolated from itself. By nature, communication is interaction, so in promoting forensics we must not lose sight of the need to interact with the various ways in which forensics can change and enrich the lives of young people. This is the ideal.

The reality is that there is a strict division between forensics at the high school and college level. Besides crossing paths at a convention or a coach moving from one level to the other, there is often little action, and very little interaction between students involved in high school forensics and students involved in college forensics. High school students seem to be largely uninformed about the realities, opportunities, and formats available for them in college forensics. Once students move from high school forensics to college forensics they lose contact with their forensic origins. For most high school students, moving into college forensics seems almost as mysterious as the metaphor which has often been used for death – they pass into an “undiscovered country from which there is no return.” As a career professional dedicated to the practice of forensics, I see it as a responsibility to bridge this gap, to make the transition from one to the other easier, to allow high school experience and success to provide a foundation for success at the college level, and to make college forensics not an “undiscovered country from which there is no return” but a perceived opportunity which will still allow contact and interaction with the high school experience.

For this reason I have become interested in creating ways to facilitate the interaction between high school and college forensics. At the 1992 Conference on the Future of Forensics held in Denver by the National Forensic League with the help of Phillips Petroleum, I met many outstanding high school coaches who expressed their concern about the lack of networking with college forensic programs. They felt ill-informed about opportunities for students, format differences, and even the basic outline of modern forensics in high education. Specifically, they expressed their confusion about the difference between the American Forensic Association/National Debate Tournament format, the Cross Examination Debate Association format, parliamentary debate formats, and the emerging Lincoln-Douglas circuit. As a CEDA coach who spent the first 14 years of my career in the NDT format, I was stunned by their ignorance about the numerical and qualitative realities of CEDA.

The result of this concern has been my determination to attempt to create a network between the schools of the National Forensic League and the schools of the Cross Examination Debate Association. While my efforts have been confined to this area (one has to start somewhere) I see no reason why these concepts could not be applied to successful networking between other portions of the college forensic community.

Two essential elements underlie this approach. First, information is the critical component needed to create interaction. If the high schools have the names and addresses of all of the college forensic programs in their area, interaction becomes possible. Likewise, colleges armed with such information can become involved with the high schools and find out how to meet each others needs. Information also needs to provide basic information about forensic realities. Various college formats needed to be explained and communicated to high school students. As well, the colleges need to be informed about the National Forensic League, the National Federation, and the nature of the various high school events. This information needs to be lodged in an interactive network through which it can be easily shared. The current "word of mouth" system is not getting the job done.

Specific action steps involve each level of organization, instructions and competition. All of these steps are relatively easy once the parties have the needed information. Steps for the CEDA national organization include: create an information packet about CEDA for high schools; encourage and facilitate member participation in outreach; and provide mailing lists of nearby CEDA programs for high schools. Steps by the NFL might include: provide mailing lists of nearby high school programs to participating CEDA schools; and provide publicity and official sanction for this program. Action steps by individual CEDA member schools might include: work with the NFL District chairs to target high schools and perhaps get in touch with them by mail over the summer; encourage college debaters to serve as judges and part time coaches; offer a 1-day workshop to high school students to introduce them to debate as an exciting activity and provide instruction; offer a moderately priced high school tournament each year and waive fees for new programs; invite high schools to come and observe college tournaments they host; and distribute information about CEDA debate opportunities for graduating high school debaters. Action steps for high schools wishing to network might include: supply mailing list of local high schools to local CEDA schools; network with local CEDA coaches; attend and support events sponsored by CEDA schools; inform CEDA schools of high schools tournaments; utilize CEDA school resources (judges, part time coaches, etc.); and encourage high school students to consider CEDA in college.

Second, all parties need to be convinced of the reality of mutual benefit. None of this is going to happen unless high schools and colleges perceive it as in their benefit to network. Many excellent ideas never get adopted because they fail at the implementation phase. Forensic coaches and students are some of the busiest persons on any campus, and they have little time to spare on extraneous efforts. I think that this motivation can be created by communicating some basic points of mutual advantage. High schools need to realize how they can draw on college events and participants as resources as well as target their students toward future opportunities and scholarships. Colleges need to realize how their students will benefit from participation in

high school activities and how they can recruit high school students so that abilities and opportunities are best matched. Motivations for CEDA schools to participate include: recruiting; building stronger high school debate, which will help them; service to community; hosting high school tournaments made easier; and college debaters can learn through coaching and judging. Motivations for high schools to participate include: gain valuable instructional opportunities and resources; assist students in college placement; improve local tournament judging pools; increase tournament opportunities by attending university sponsored tournaments; and gain prestige through open cooperation with local colleges and universities. Motivation for CEDA national participation include: help high school debate, which will help college debate; improve recruiting; kill myths about CEDA; and build a constituency. Motivation for possible NFL participation include: help high school programs; service to colleges and universities; and aid high school students in locating opportunities in higher education.

Elements of this program are being tried on a demonstration level at the University of Vermont, at Syracuse University by Mark Whitney, and at Marist College by David Grassmick and Pam Clinton. The efforts at Marist College, supported by their President, seem to be the most advanced for the 1993-94 school year, with needs assessment having already taken place. When the program is in place results should be published.

If you are interested in taking part in this networking effort, please feel free to contact me. Email: DRTUNA@AOL.COM; Telephone: 802-656-4275; Fax 802-656-4275.

Even without an organized national program, each college forensic program should strive to learn which high schools in their area are active and create bridges between the two levels of our activity. Hopefully the ennobling characteristics of forensics will only be enhanced by our interaction and communication.

FROM MIAMI TO THE PROVINCES: FRATERNITY IS KEY

Those of us who attended the SCA Convention in Miami returned to our Universities revitalized and energized. Attending all the excellent programs and meetings, however, occasionally was a little difficult because the fun in the sun and a frolic in the ocean always seemed to be calling. All the Pi Kappa Delta program sessions once again were outstanding. Ed Inch, Pi Kappa Delta's SCA Program Planner, had submitted nine PKD programs for 1993. These were excellent sessions with a variety of topics all of interest to Pi Kappa Delta members and the forensic community. Ed, as PKD representative, should be commended for the strength of the 1993 programs.

MIAMI BUSINESS

The National Council also used the SCA time in Miami to meet and conduct PKD business. The minutes will reflect the proceedings, but basically the meetings consisted of reports of committees, the choice of a logo for the 1995 Convention and Tournament in Louisiana, and the vote to increase subscription dues for *The Forensic*.

In keeping with the past SCA conventions, PKD again hosted a reception. This year a room was rented in one of the hotels for the reception and it was well attended by PKD members and friends. As convention goes, we are all so busy during the program hours that the Friday night reception offers the opportunity to visit with people we otherwise might only have time to greet briefly in the hallways. The reception provides a good time to demonstrate the fraternal nature of Pi Kappa Delta. Since the receptions have been so well attended, the Council suggested that PKD approach the other forensic organizations about the possibility of co-sponsoring a reception in New Orleans at the 1994 SCA Convention. If this materializes, which seems likely, the reception will be held on Friday night before the convention starts on Saturday. We urge all members to go early to New Orleans and make the "PKD connection."

AWARDS

In addition to the PKD business and programs, three outstanding members in PKD and in forensics were presented awards. The *L. E. Norton* Award went to Tom Preston of the University of Missouri, St. Louis. Tom has been tireless in his efforts to extend knowledge through research and publications. The *John Shields* Award was presented to Harold Widvey of South Dakota State University. Harold also was honored on his recent retirement from his University by a panel of papers, "Speaker Development Through Forensic Experience: Papers Presented in Honor of Harold Widvey." The *E. R. Nichols* Award was given to Michael Bartanen, a tireless contributor in thought and deed to PKD and CEDA and the Guild of American Forensic Educators. The contributions of many seem pale in comparison to these three outstanding individuals, Tom, Harold, and Michael. They truly are mentors for both young and old in PKD. The presentation of the *Norton*, *Shields* and *Nichols* awards are only tokens which express PKD's appreciation. Each in his individual way, Tom, Harold and Michael, have all made PKD a better national honorary fraternity and have made many of us better individuals and coaches as a result of our association with them.

PROVINCE

The Fall SCA convention is over and PKD members must now turn their energies toward the Spring Province Convention and Tournaments. The Province Governors met in Miami and renewed their affirmation that the Governors should take a more active role in PKD. They also expressed their desire to make each Province Convention even more meaningful and effective. The Governors also strongly suggested that all chapters should strive to increase positive student perceptions of the fraternal nature of PKD, and the Governors now are planning to begin to stress fraternity at the Provinces. The Governors and the National Council members wish to encourage all members to make every effort to attend their Province Convention and Tournament.