

IMPROMPTU:

1. Maximum time of seven minutes of which at least three minutes must be speaking time.

2. All contestants will be given the same three topic choices in each round; therefore, contestants must wait outside the room until their turn to draw.

3. Topics will be developed to conform to the following areas:

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| Round I | "Attack or Defend" |
| Round II | "Creative" (Pictures, Cartoons, or Objects) |
| Round III | "Philosophical Quotation" |

DISCUSSION:

1. The national Discussion topic will be utilized.

2. Each contestant will participate in the same group all three rounds. Each group should follow the decision-making process and proceed at its own pace.

3. Each group will have a resident judge (same all 3 rounds) and a visiting judge evaluate each round.

4. Schools having students who are qualified or willing to serve as chairpersons should not put an asterisk by the individual(s)' name. Otherwise, the tournament director will arbitrarily assign chairpersons.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Amendment I. Chapter Attendance at National Conventions

Delete the following sections:

504—Requires attendance at National Conventions.

504.1—Method of securing an excuse from attending National Conventions.

504.2—Mandates forfeiture of Charter for failure to attend National Conventions.

903—Requires new chapters to send a delegate to National Convention.

Effect of the Amendment:

This amendment removes the constitutional requirement that chapters of Pi Kappa Delta attend the National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta. Section 504 mandated such attendance. Section 504.1 allowed excuses from attendance but did not specify any actual criteria for allowing such excuses. Section 504.2 provided for enforcement through removal of the charter. This amendment has been proposed because travel costs have become burdensome to many chapters. It recognizes that chapters which continue to support the ideals of Pi Kappa Delta by maintaining membership, having an active local program, and paying the annual chapter assessments are valuable to Pi Kappa Delta.

Amendment II. Chapter Attendance at Province Conventions

Delete Section 532 which requires chapter attendance at province conventions.

Effect of the Amendment: Chapters would no longer face the requirement of attendance at province Conventions. This provision of the Constitution has been ignored by some provinces. The Constitution contains no enforcement provision. Passage would be consistent with proposed Amendment I.

Amendment III. Modification of sections on Standing Committees, their number and method of ap- pointment.

Part 1. Delete Section 564, Standing Committees, as it is now written and substitute with the following:

564—The chairman of the following standing committees shall be ~~nominated~~ by *appointed*

the National President and approved by majority vote of the National Council: Charter and Standards Committee, Committee on Public Relations, Committee on Research, Committee on Convention Arrangements and Program, Committee on Convention Tournaments, and Constitution Revision Committee.

Part 2. Change sections 564.1 through 564.5 and add section 564.6 as indicated below:

564.1—Strike the first sentence and insert in its place: Charter and Standards Committee.

564.2—Strike the first sentence and insert in its place: Committee on Public Relations.

564.3—Strike the first sentence and insert in its place: Committee on Convention Arrangements and Program. In the second sentence, delete the first four words ("This National Council Member . . .") and insert in that place: "The chairman."

564.4—Strike the first sentence and insert in its place: Committee on Convention Tournaments. In the second sentence delete the first word, "This," and insert in its place, "The."

564.5—Strike the first sentence and insert in its place: Constitution Revision Committee.

(New Section)

564.6—Committee on Research. The duty of this committee shall be to advance scholarship and research in forensic activity and argumentation theory and to communicate new information through appropriate means, including publications and professional meetings.

Effect of the Amendment:

Part 1 of this amendment permits the National President to select chairman of the standing committees from the entire membership of Pi Kappa Delta, rather than limiting selection to members of the National Council. It also adds the requirement that the National Council approve such appointments. It divides that Committee on Public Relations and Research into two committees: a Committee on Public Relations and a Committee on Research. Part 2 of the amendment changes subordinate sections to maintain consistency within the Constitution and removes some requirements for specific membership patterns, leaving size of the committees and method of selecting members to be determined by the National Council where no longer specified by the Constitution.

Amendment IV. Emphasize the National Chapter Dues Are Annual.

503—In line 4: Insert "annually" between the words "shall" and "collect."

Effect of the Amendment:

This amendment adds emphasis to earlier wording in Section 503 which indicates that chapter dues are to be paid annually to assure that the chapter remains in good standing.

Amendment V. Provides a Method for Direct Appointment of Student Members of the National Council by the National President when Needed.

554—Add after the final sentence: Results of the above elections shall be reported promptly to the National President by the province governor of the host province. Should these provisions not be completed, the National President may appoint one female and one male Student Representative to the National Council.

Effect of the Amendment:

When the site of the next National Convention and Tournament is not established at the time set for the election, or if for some other reason, the host province and host school are not able to act, a method is available to assure student voice at the the meetings of the National Council.

ADVANCE DEGREES Highest Distinction

Idaho GAMMA

James Bradley Goes (D, IS)

North Dakota DELTA

Lowell Philip Bottrell (D)

Washington EPSILON

Patrick Michael Madden (D)

NEW MEMBERS OF PI KAPPA DELTA

UNIVERSITY OF CHARLESTON, W. VA.

52066 Nancy Frances Parsons

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE, MN.

52067 Jeri Lynn Bedient

52068 Karen Boril

52069 Scott Alan Carlquist

52070 Mike Edlund

52077 Darcy M. Eischens

52078 Jack Granlund

52079 Harold H. Henderson

52080 Dean Jorgenson

52081 Penny Jane Laughlin

52082 Daniel Swanson

DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY

52083 Marion Johnson

52084 Daniel Lois Burchfield

52085 Tommy Morgan

52086 Kathy Plessinger

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LACROSSE

52087 Kelly O'Connell

STERLING COLLEGE, KS.

52088 Cheryl Hamilton

52089 Donna Nuckolls

52090 Andrew Woodyard

SHEPHERD COLLEGE, W. VA.

52091 Sallie Bloomfield

52092 James Funkhouser

52093 Alan Krisfalusi

52141 James Parrish

52567 Michelle Zollner

ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

52094 Sara Saliba

52095 LaDawn Fuhr

52549 Sylvia Haydar

52550 Michael Phillips

EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY

52096 Dawn E. Clark

52097 Phyllis Walker

52098 Tommya Cosco

ST. OLAF COLLEGE, MN.

52099 Scott Benson

52100 David LaRochell

52101 Randall Fuller

52102 Margaret Peggy Kerr

52103 Jeffrey D. Brand

52104 Douglas Zimmerman

52105 David Heintz

52106 Ann Lisa Merklin

UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND, WA.

52107 Laurie C. Criss

52108 Ronald James Drnjevic

52109 Tobey Fitch

52110 Aaron Peterson

52111 Debra Jean Teal

52112 Kenneth A. Teal

NORTH DAKOTA ST. UNIVERSITY

52113 Scott R. Staska

52114 Dawn Lynn Clark

52115 Tammy Norman

52116 Joan Woolfrey

52117 Lavonne L. Lussenden

52118 Cathy Ann Selberg

52119 Jill E. Samuelson

52120 Michael L. Bartle

52121 Brenda Greenland

52122 Asunta Thompson

52123 Diane Ishaug

52124 Jacqueline S. Schmid

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

52125 Joe Pulio

52126 Joseph W. Drobeno

52127 Tammy J. Campbell

52128 Debra A. Azar

52129 Lyn M. Tolan

52130 Dave Persons

52131 Karen Carlton

52132 Robert L. Knechtel

52133 Debra Kaye Neal

52134 Jeris L. Poindexter

52135 Emily J. Garcia

52136 Michael Walsdorf

52137 Jackie Lynn McCarthy

52138 Julie Hausten

52139 Timothy M. Rezash

52140 Sandra Briars

ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY, OK

52545 John Byron MacKay Thomas

52546 Gary John Pernice

BLACK HILLS ST. COLLEGE, S.D.

52547 Lynn Ann Delzer

52548 Edward Borkowski

52568 William A. May

52569 William D. Kellar

PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY, WA.

52551 Rosemary Jones

52552 Michael Bundick

52553 Stephen Lentz

52554 Colleen Philippi

52555 Lisa Ritthaler

THIEL COLLEGE, PA.

52556 Marcheta L. Wright

52557 Carmon J. Whittaker

52558 Linda K. Braun

52573 Kathy L. Kersul

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY, KS.

52559 Don B. Center

52560 Bruce E. Worner

52561 Thomas M. Martin

52562 James A. Reist

52563 Timothy S. Durst

52564 Philip Boyer

52565 Daryl Palmer

52566 Patrick Fleming

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY, VA.

52570 Maurice R. Yarnell

52571 Alice Anne Doyle

52572 Carroll E. Prescott

SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE, KS.

52574 Michael S. French

52575 Michelle R. Wampler

52576 Dana Shireman

52577 James A. Rollins

52578 Kelly J. Rundell

52579 Teresa Norris

52580 H. Douglas Pfalzgraf

52581 Forrest James Robinson, Jr.

THE SCHOOL OF THE OZARKS, MO.

52582 Michael Skyles

52583 Annette Litke

52584 Michael Whittington

52585 Andy A. Adams

52586 Sandra L. Gault

52587 Connie Lewis

REPORTS FROM RELIABLE SOURCES

MARTEL COACHES REAGAN

A Pi Kappa Deltan, Dr. Miles Martel, Professor of Speech Communication and Director of the Political Campaign Debate Research Project at West Chester State College, was debate advisor to President Ronald Reagan during his successful campaign.

Martel is no stranger to political debate. He assisted Governor Richard Thornbough of Pennsylvania in his successful campaign in 1978. In the 1980 campaign he was debate advisor to two Pennsylvanians, Dennis Rochford and Arlen Specter.

Martel was tapped by the Reagan campaign in mid-August and served as part of the debate-advisor team through the Reagan-Carter debates. He found Reagan friendly and approachable and willing to take advice.

Martel helped Reagan to become aware of Carter's strengths and weaknesses as a debater. This reduced the likelihood of an emotional confrontation. He also emphasized the nonverbal side of the presentation, an important aspect of a public debate.

When asked if he would become a permanent part of the Reagan administration, Martel refused to comment.

Martel is a former Director of Debate and a charter member of Iota Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta at West Chester State College in Pennsylvania.

ROY MURPHY ENTERS HIGHEST ORDER

Roy D. Murphy, National President of Pi Kappa Delta from 1963-1965, died November 25, 1980, at the age

of 68, following a heart attack.

Murphy provided leadership in the speech discipline throughout his professional career. He founded the speech department at the University of Southwest Louisiana in 1940 and continued as its head until his retirement in 1977.

He served Pi Kappa Delta in numerous positions: Governor of the Province of the Lower Mississippi, 1943-45; Associate Editor of **The Forensic**, 1945-51; Member of the National Council, 1953-67; National Vice-President, 1959-63; National President, 1963-65; Past President, 1965-67; and Member of Order of the Beards, 1967-80.

Murphy was instrumental in the development of the Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate and served on that committee from 1961-64.

He is survived by his wife, Lil; two daughters, a sister, and three grandchildren, by thousands of forensic squad members who called him coach, and by all of us in Pi Kappa Delta.

His belief in forensics is reflected in his message to Pi Kappa Deltans in the May 1964 Forensic:

"You are . . . qualified to take your place in our democratic society, for you are well informed on social, economic, and political problems; you arrive intelligently at what you believe to be the truth regarding controversial issues by exploring the facts existing on all sides of such matters; you are capable of expressing effectively what you believe to be the truth regarding such questions. The preservation of our democratic society rests with alert, educated, and articulate individuals. You are one of those individuals."

LARRY BLUNT NAMED TO COUNCIL

The Province of the Southeast has named Larry Blunt, a student from Old Dominion University, as the second student representative to the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta, according to Dr. Fran Hassencahl, Lt. Governor. He joins Gaylen Stanley whose appointment was announced earlier. Mike Gray, who served temporarily pending a final decision on the site of the National Convention, has been appointed a student member of the tournament evaluation committee.

PRESIDENT HUFFORD TAKES SABBATICAL

National President Roger Hufford was granted a one-semester sabbatical to continue study in Arizona. His address until further notice is: Roger Hufford, 7253 West Mariposa, Phoenix, Arizona 85033.

PKD SUMMER CONFERENCE LAUNCHED

The National Council of Pi Kappa Delta, at its meeting in New York City in November, advanced plans for an August, 1981, conference for Kappa Delta members on debate and competitive speech events. The conference, an educational workshop offering college credit, would coincide with the summer meeting of the National Council, August 16-22, at Snow Mountain Resort near Granby, Colorado, a facility operated by the YMCA.

The conference is aimed to meet the interests of college students and their coaches. The package price \$142 includes housing, meals, and two quarter credits in Forensics. A highly qualified faculty led by Larry S. Richardson, Summer Conference

Director and National Council Member, promises an intensive learning experience for college students and faculty interested in deepening their theoretical and practical understanding of competitive speaking events and Cross Examination Debate Association approaches to debate.

Director Richardson tells **The Forensic**, "We are now contacting top people in I.E.'s and CEDA debate. You will be impressed with the faculty."

Interested PKD members will find Richardson's full address in the announcement on the back cover of this issues of **The Forensic**.

President . . . from page 3

reduce your registration fee from \$40 to \$25, but it also means dipping into reserves, which this year are adequate for the purpose.

Five dollars from each membership has been set aside for your promised rebate. If memberships are reduced to \$10, the rebates must be discontinued. This could mean less incentive for local chapters to recruit members, and with fewer memberships cuts in service would be necessary. National Council might alter the size of the rebate each biennium, to adjust for inflation, and maintain membership dues at \$15 for some years to come. Each Convention Evaluation Committee could recommend targets for the next biennium, and suggest costs they want trimmed or eliminated. Our members should make this decision at Gatlinburg, and we invite you to give careful attention to the financial considerations involved.

National Council has worked hard to give you your money's worth, and we hope you will feel at Gatlinburg that we have succeeded.

Convention and Standing Committees

CONVENTION

CHAIRMAN

Roger Hufford
Clarion State College

LOCAL HOSTS

CO-COORDINATORS

Margaret Greynolds
Georgetown College

Terry Cole
Appalachian State U.

MEMBERS

Jim Holm
Austin Peay U.
Robert Woodland
Tennessee Tech. U.
Gaylen Stanley
Appalachian State U.
Larry Blunt
Old Dominion U.

PROVINCE

COORDINATOR

Gary Horn
Southwestern College

PARLIAMENTARIAN

Margaret Greynolds
Georgetown College

NOMINATING

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Bob Derryberry
Ouachita Baptist U.

MEMBERS

Jim Clymer
Bowling Green State U.
Carolyn Keefe
West Chester State

RESOLUTION

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Susan Miskelly
Bridgewater State

MEMBERS

Jack Samosky
Cal. State U. - Hayward
Larry Blunt
Old Dominion U.

CONVENTION

EVALUATION

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Carol Gaede
Moorhead State

MEMBERS

Donna Tobias
Texas A & I
Jim Norwig
U. of Wisconsin -
La Crosse
Mike Bartanen
Pacific Lutheran U.
Mike Gray
Cameron University
Gaylen Stanley
Appalachian State U.

CONSTITUTIONAL

REVISION COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

Larry Richardson
Western Washington U.

MEMBERS

Suzanne McCorkle
Boise State U.
Suzanne Larson
Humboldt State U.

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

Walter Murrish
U. of Mo. - Kansas City

**RESEARCH
SUBCOMMITTEE
CHAIRMAN**

Wayne Thompson
U. of Houston

MEMBERS

Robert Pruett
Wright State U.

Dale Hample
Western Illinois U.

Steve Hunt
Lewis & Clark College

**PUBLIC RELATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE**

CHAIRMAN

Sally Roden
U. of Central Arkansas

MEMBERS

William Corbin
Northeast Missouri
State U.

Beth-ann Bartels
Missouri Western State
College

**CHAIRMAN AND
STANDARDS
COMMITTEE**

Tony Allison
Cameron University

MEMBERS

David Ray
U. of Arkansas -
Monticello

H. Francis Short
Kansas State U. -
Pittsburg

Derald Harris
Central Missouri State U.

The Contest in Rhetorical Criticism

Wayne N. Thompson

Mr. Thompson holds the degree of highest distinction from the Illinois Nu chapter. He is a former forensic director at the American University, Bowling Green State University, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. In 1980 he was acting forensics director at the University of Houston. Holder of the Ph.D. from Northwestern University, he is the author or the co-author of seven books, including **Modern Argumentation and Debate** and **Responsible and Effective Communication**. He resides in Houston, Texas.

Rhetorical criticism was the least satisfactory of the forensic contests that I judged during the 1979-1980 season. The typical contestant began with a description of the background, proceeded with a superficial and often misinformed exposition of the critical apparatus he had chosen, and then glibly applied each part of the apparatus to

the speech he was analyzing. The outcome, at best, was a slick, polished oral essay, admirable for delivery and style, interesting to listen to, but short on substance. At worst, contestants made embarrassing misstatements about their chosen methodology and/or made applications that would have astounded the originator of the critical apparatus if he had been present.

Pointing out shortcomings of such a presentation should be of value, but the lengthier part of this paper will be on principles and positive suggestions.

Here, briefly stated, are the most common weaknesses of contestants in rhetorical criticism:

1. Overemphasis on form at the expense of substance; too often the

central feature of a presentation is the critical methodology, not the rhetorical event.

2. Poor time distributions: too much time on speaker, situation, and methodology, and too little on critical analysis.

3. A superficial, even mistaken, grasp of the chosen methodology.

4. No explanation of the reason for choosing a particular method; the listener suspects that the contestant would use the method no matter what the characteristics of the rhetorical event.

5. An attempt to do too much; time constraints are severe, and trying to apply every subpoint within a methodology leads to superficiality.

6. A confusion of rhetorical criticism with oratory and persuasive speaking. Many judges reward speakers who excel in style and delivery, even though they are weak in content. Like other speech teachers, I applaud a polished presentation, but I see no reason for including rhetorical criticism in the crowded tournament schedule if its emphasis is on the same skills as those rewarded in other events.

But what should one do when he engages in rhetorical criticism? I believe, as did Aristotle, that the heart of rhetoric is effectiveness.¹ This statement does not mean that I restrict rhetorical criticism to analyses of persuasiveness; to the contrary, appraising a speech for its ethics or logic, for its truth or social utility, may be both illuminating and salutary. Every rhetorical event is different, and in some instances the most useful analysis is one whose purpose is the evaluation of something other than effectiveness. The only unique burden on such a contestant is that of giving cogent reasons for the chosen approach.

Effectiveness, nevertheless, is the distinctive dimension of rhetoric,

and this generalization should guide the rhetorical critic. Much of the mystery of criticism disappears when one realizes that its function is to answer two basic questions, "How effective was the speech?" and "Why?" These questions should provide direction during both research and final preparation.

Evidence of effectiveness seldom is conclusive, but the contestant should make the most of what is available. The testimony of contemporary observers and the opinions of historians are of value, and sometimes an examination of later historic events produces proof of effectiveness or its lack. One of the best of the many published journal articles exemplifying this approach is Michelle B. Davis and Rollin W. Quimby, "Senator Proctor's Cuban Speech," **Quarterly Journal of Speech**, 55 (1969), 131-141. Polls, also, may support a generalization about effectiveness. I used polls, as well as published opinions, in my articles on Barbara Jordan's 1976 keynote address.²

The more difficult task for the critic, however, is finding one or more answers to the question "Why?" The contestant should use most of his speaking time in stating the reasons he has found for success or failure, in reporting the thought processes leading to those reasons, and in justifying the generalizations. Answering the question "Why?" requires creative thought of the highest order, and the ultimate test of the worth of a critique is the insightfulness of the analysis. Judges should base their decisions on such questions as "Did the contestant say anything that is not already generally known?" "Is the analysis superficial or does it probe deeply?" and "Does the speaker justify his conclusions?" The highest compliment that can be paid the critic is the reaction. "That's

right: why didn't I think of that myself!"

Deserving such a compliment is not easy; indeed, in the early stages of preparation the contestant must struggle for a starting place. His own examination of the speech and related circumstances may suggest tentative conclusions worth pursuing, and the comments of journalists or other observers may be beginning points that careful research and thought will either affirm or deny. Similarly, historic judgements often are worth reexamination.

The various apparatuses for criticism, also, may be helpful in this initial process of searching for a productive starting point. Aristotle and his successors, for example, suggest that the critic look at each of the five canons (invention, arrangement, style, delivery, and memory), and in so doing the critic may locate, at least tentatively, the feature of the rhetorical event that was the most powerful in determining effectiveness. Similarly, the methodologies of Burke, Bitzer, and Bormann—all widely used in contests—may be helpful.

The choice of methodology, it cannot be too strongly emphasized, should not be arbitrary or premature. Likewise, the critic should not always apply all parts of a methodology. The overall objective is to make an insightful analysis—to determine what is unique about the particular event and to isolate the reason or reasons for effectiveness. With this overriding objective in mind, the critic chooses the method that best serves his purpose, and he uses as much of the critical apparatus as he finds enlightening. The function of a critical method is to subject guesses and hunches to systematic examination, but the analyst is likely to find some parts more useful than others.

In conclusion, I suggest that the contestant follow this sequence in preparing for the contest in rhetorical criticism:

1. Choose a speech or perhaps a movement.

2. Do thorough research. Find out as much as possible about the speaker, the immediate situation, the social and political milieu, and the published judgments.

3. Do research on the probable effectiveness. Make a judgment, and prepare support for it.

4. Look for an answer to the question "Why?" Prepare a justification for your answer. More than one reason for success or failure may exist, and you must decide how many to include. You are not obligated to cover every aspect, but you must clarify for your listener whether your analysis is total or partial.

5. Choose the critical method that is best adapted to your topic. Tell your audience why you selected the method.

6. Prepare your rhetorical critique. The parts are likely to be an introduction giving background for the speech and telling listeners why an analysis of it is worthwhile, an appraisal of effectiveness, a statement of the critical method and an explanation of the reasons for choosing it, a series of sections organized around generalizations giving reasons for effectiveness, and a conclusion.

My experience suggests that not all judges and forensic directors will agree with the preceding statements, but beginning a dialogue on rhetorical criticism, a comparative newcomer to forensic competition, should be beneficial. The devil's advocate, however, is not my role. I believe strongly that the major criterion to apply in judging should be the quality of thought in

(Continued, page 31)

PI KAPPA DELTA

NATIONAL CONVENTION AND TOURNAMENT

April 1-4, 1981, Gatlinburg, Tennessee

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

April 1

- 8:00 A.M.-7:00 P.M. Convention and Tournament Registration, Lobby of the River Terrace Motel.
- P.M. 12:00-5:30 Pi Kappa Delta Conference on Forensics, Debate, and Argumentation.
- 6:00-7:00 Meeting of Province Governors; Meeting of Student Lt. Governors.
- 7:00-8:00 Province Meetings.
- 8:00-Adj. First Business Session of the Convention.

April 2

- A.M. 8:00-9:00 Continental Breakfast; Designated Contest Rooms Vacated. Students meet with the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta.
- 9:00 Draw for Extemporaneous Speaking Topics Begins.
- 9:30-11:00 Extemporaneous speaking I; Interpretation of Poetry I.
- 11:00-12:30 Informative Speaking I; Impromptu Speaking I.
- P.M. 12:30-2:00 Championship, CEDA, and Traditional Debate I; Lincoln-Douglas Debate I and II; Dramatic Duo I; Discussion I.
- 2:00-3:30 Oratory I; Interpretation of Prose I.
- 3:30-5:00 Championship, CEDA, and Traditional Debate II; Speaking to Entertain I.
- 5:00-6:30 Championship, CEDA, and Traditional Debate III; Discussion II.
- 6:30-7:30 Break for Evening Meal.
- 7:30-9:30 Second Business Session of the Convention—Elect Officers.
- 9:30 Dance.

April 3

- A.M. 8:00-9:30 Continental Breakfast Honoring Past Presidents.
- Designated Contest Rooms Vacated.
- 9:00 Draw for Extemporaneous Speaking Topics Begins.
- 9:30-11:00 Extemporaneous Speaking II; Interpretation of Poetry II.
- 11:00-12:30 Championship, CEDA, and Traditional Debate IV; Lincoln-Douglas Debate III and IV; Dramatic Duo II.
- P.M. 12:30-2:00 Championship, CEDA, and Traditional Debate V; Speaking to Entertain II.
- 2:00-3:30 Oratory II; Interpretation of Prose II.
- 3:30-5:00 Championship, CEDA, and Traditional Debate VI; Lincoln-Douglas Debate V and VI; Discussion III.
- 5:00-6:30 Informative Speaking II; Impromptu Speaking II.
- 6:30-7:30 Break for Evening Meal.
- 7:30-8:30 Province Meetings.
- 8:30-Adj. Third Business Session of the Convention—Elect National Council.

April 4

- A.M. 8:00-9:30 Continental Breakfast and Students' Meeting.
- Presentation of Research Papers.
- Designated Contest Rooms Vacated.
- 9:00 Draw for Extemporaneous Speaking Topics Begins.
- 9:30-11:00 Extemporaneous Speaking III; Interpretation of Poetry III.
- 11:00-12:30 Championship, CEDA, and Traditional Debate VII; Lincoln-Douglas Debate VII and VIII; Dramatic Duo III.
- P.M. 12:30-2:00 Informative Speaking III; Impromptu Speaking III.
- 2:00-3:30 Oratory III; Interpretation of Prose III.
- 3:30-5:00 Championship, CEDA, and Traditional Debate VIII; Speaking to Entertain III.
- 5:00-7:00 Final Business Session of the Convention.
- Final Round of Championship and CEDA Debate.
- 8:00 Convention Banquet with Awards.