## Fullerton-Georgetown Tournament 2022

CSU Fullerton and Georgetown University would like to invite you to our co-sponsored policy debate tournament to be held during Winter Break. The Directors of both programs are co-sponsoring this event to continue the partnership between Georgetown and CSU Fullerton. After this year, we will trade-off with one another in order to ensure that there is a major national tournament on the West Coast at least once a year. To that end, the years that Gonzaga hosts a fall tournament, Georgetown will host the Winter tournament. The years that Harvard hosts in the fall, CSU Fullerton will host the Winter tournament. Over the past ten years the policy debate community has chosen to increasingly erode support for West Coast tournaments and ignore the cost to sustain competitive national policy debate programs when almost all national tournaments occur on the East Coast. The ideological (and racial) divides that characterize the clash of civilizations in our community has had deleterious effects, including the profound risk of destroying policy debate on the West Coast with many programs that have chosen to do other forms of debate because of the lack of access to national tournaments in the region. If our goal is to strengthen debate and encourage colleges and universities to form and support policy debate teams then we must have equitable distribution of national tournaments to make it feasible for programs to travel to national competition. We hope that all major national traveling programs will join us to support the CSU Fullerton/Georgetown partnership. We also hope that this partnership demonstrates to the broader policy debate community that the anger and conflict that characterize our current divides can be replaced with cooperation when good will exists on both sides.

### Tournament Format and COVID

Entries in the Open division may participate either online or on Georgetown’s campus in Washington, D.C. Entries in JV and Novice must participate online.

The tournament will feature EIGHT preliminary rounds of two-person, switch-sides, cross-examination debate on the 2021-2022 CEDA topic. Elimination rounds will start with double-octafinals.

We will have an online zoom room that corresponds to every actual room in the ICC, White Gravenor etc. Gary will make a pairing as normal. If the two teams assigned to ICC 105 are both in person, the round will be in person. If one or both of the teams is online only, then the round will occur on zoom but a physical team will debate from the assigned ICC room. In either situation, the judge could be either in D.C. or be online. For physically present judges in rounds where at least one of the teams is online, the judge will listen to the debate from a designated judge room. In this room, judges wear headphones and watch their rounds online. For rounds where at least one team is on campus, judges will return to their assigned physical room to give their decision. We will provide a designated judge room on elim day as well. In preset rounds, in-person teams will be guaranteed to debate other in-person teams unless there is an odd number.

The tournament is tightly scheduled to allow time for dinner and recreation and we will enforce decision time. Courtesy demands, and we insist, that rounds start on time and be adjudicated within 2 hours and 15 minutes of start time for preliminary rounds and within 2 hours and 30 minutes of start time for elimination rounds.

**SOCIAL DISTANCING POLICIES**

Please note that **Georgetown policy still requires masks to be worn at all times indoors** except when an individual is eating. This includes wearing a mask while debating.

Georgetown policy also states that:

* Georgetown has a vaccination requirement and visitors should plan to be fully vaccinated before coming to campus.
* Visitors must not come to campus if exhibiting symptoms or have been diagnosed with COVID-19, or have otherwise been instructed to quarantine or isolate.
* Visitors are encouraged to receive a COVID-19 test on the day of arrival through a local clinic or pharmacy.
* Visitors will likely need to register via Google form for Georgetown’s contact tracing program. Details will be provided to visitors closer to time.

### Tentative Schedule

\*\*Tentative. We will post a schedule including all time zones via Google Doc in December.

#### Sunday, January 2nd – Registration – TBA

#### Monday, January 3rd

*9:30 AM EST: Breakfast on Georgetown’s campus*

7 AM PST/10 AM EST: Rounds 1 & 2 Pairings released

7:45 AM PST/10:45 AM EST: Round 1 Start Time

10:00 AM PST/1:00 PM EST: Round 1 Decision Time

*Lunch available on Georgetown’s campus*

10:30 AM PST/1:30 PM EST: Round 2 Start Time

12:45 PM PST/3:45 PM EST: Round 2 Decision Time

*Snacks available on Georgetown’s campus*

1:30 PM PST/4:30 PM EST: Round 3 Pairings Released

2:15 PM PST/5:15 PM EST: Round 3 Start Time

4:30 PM PST/7:30 PM EST: Round 3 Decision Time

#### Tuesday, January 4th

*9:30 AM EST: Breakfast on Georgetown’s campus*

7 AM PST/10 AM EST: Round 4 Pairings Released

7:45 AM PST/10:45 AM EST: Round 4 Start Time

10:00 AM PST/1:00 PM EST: Round 4 Decision Time

*Lunch available on Georgetown’s campus*

10:30 AM PST/1:30 PM EST: Round 5 Pairings Released

11:15 AM/2:15 PM EST: Round 5 Start Time

1:30 PM PST/4:30 PM EST: Round 5 Decision Time

*Snacks available on Georgetown’s campus*

1:45 PM PST/4:45 PM EST: Round 6 Pairings Released

2:30 PM PST/5:30 PM EST: Round 6 Start Time

4:45 PM PST/7:45 PM EST: Round 6 Decision Time

#### Wednesday, January 5th

*9:30 AM EST: Breakfast on Georgetown’s campus*

7 AM PST/10 AM EST: Round 7 Pairings Released

7:45 AM PST/10:45 AM EST: Round 7 Start Time

10:00 AM PST/1:00 PM EST: Round 7 Decision Time

*Lunch available on Georgetown’s campus*

10:15 AM PST/1:15 PM EST: Round 8 Pairings Released

11 AM PST/2 PM EST: Round 8 Start Time

1:15 PM PST/4:15 PM EST: Round 8 Decision Time

1:30 PM PST/4:30 PM EST: Doubles Pairings Released

2:15 PM PST/5:15 PM EST: Doubles Start Time

4:45 PM PST/7:45 PM EST: Doubles Decision Time

5 PM PST/8 PM EST: Awards Ceremony + Guest Speaker

#### Thursday, January 6th

*9:30 AM EST: Breakfast on Georgetown’s campus*

7 AM PST/10 AM EST: Octas Pairings Released

7:45 AM PST/10:45 AM EST: Octas Start Time

10:15 AM PST/1:15 PM EST: Octas Decision Time

10:30 AM PST/1:30 PM EST: Quarters Pairings Released

11:15 AM PST/2:15 PM EST: Quarters Start Time

1:45 PM PST/4:45 PM EST: Quarters Decision Time

2:00 PM PST/5:00 PM PM EST: Semis Pairings Released

2:45 PM PST/5:45 PM EST: Semis Start Time

5:15 PM PST/8:15 PM EST: Semis Decision Time

5:30 PM PST/8:30 PM EST: Finals Pairings Released

6:15 PM PST/9:15 PM EST: Finals Start Time

8:45 PM PST/11:45 PM EST: Finals Decision Time

#### JV/Novice Scheduling Note

We will poll entries in JV and Novice to make a decision about whether to run concurrently with the first 6 prelims in Open and then begin elims, or begin prelims on Tuesday the 4th and run concurrently with the Open schedule.

### Fees

Tournament fees are $90 per person for **each on-campus** **attendee**, and $40 per person for **each online debater** (i.e. $80 per team for online participants).

This will cover (for on-campus participants) food and custodial costs, and (for all) tab/platform staff, awards and their shipment, honorarium for a guest speaker, hired judging if needed, and fee waivers for programs in need. To apply for a fee waiver, please e-mail [reidbrinkley@gmail.com](mailto:reidbrinkley@gmail.com) and [bwk9@georgetown.edu](mailto:bwk9@georgetown.edu).

We will provide instructions regarding how to pay as soon as possible.

### Judging Obligations

We require 4 prelim rounds per entry in Open and 3 prelim rounds per entry in Novice and JV. Judges are **obligated through the second elimination round** or one round past their team’s elimination, whichever comes later.

### Tech Time

§ ADA Policy on Tech Time (Standing Rule I.1):

If debates occur utilizing an online venue, tournaments may permit each team to be allocated up to 10 minutes of “Tech Time” for resolving exclusively tech-related problems (e.g. internet connection, audio/video issues). Tech time should not be used as additional standard prep time. If the time elapses before the team can resolve the issue, they will forfeit the debate. In the event a speech needs to be redelivered entirely or in part, the time for that should count as tech time for the team experiencing the problem, if their tech time runs out while giving the speech the remaining time should be deducted from prep time. In the event a speech needs to be redelivered entirely or in part due to a judge tech issue, the judge must communicate the issue to the tab room immediately in order to minimize delays in the tournament schedule.

### Recording and Scouting Policy

All rounds of the tournament are open for viewing by registered participants for educational purposes in accordance with the rules of the American Forensics Association and the American Debate Association. Anyone not registered as a debater or judge must get prior approval from all participants in order to watch a debate. If competitors are not comfortable with observers, they may ask observers to leave at their discretion.

Consistent with national speech and debate standards, any participants or other individuals that wish to record any portion of the tournament **must** obtain the prior consent of all individuals identifiable in the recording(s). Use of such recordings should be **limited to private educational purposes**. Recordings should not be published, reproduced or shared with those not participating in the tournament, or uploaded to other online environments, without the prior consent of all individuals identifiable in the recordings.

Coaches and program directors are encouraged to discuss this audio and video recording policy with their participants prior to the tournament, and are expected to take any reasonable and necessary actions to ensure compliance by participants who are affiliated with their respective schools.

To facilitate competition and feedback, debaters and judges should keep cameras on whenever possible. In situations where this creates problems, the director of the relevant team or judge must confirm the identity of the participant prior to the start of rounds..

### Awards

We will provide awards to the participants in elimination rounds and to the top speakers in each division, consistent with/proportionate to entry levels. Awards will be shipped after the tournament.

We will recognize the top speakers at the tournament consistent with entry levels, and send awards to those speakers after the tournament as well.

In keeping with the tradition of the Kathryn Classic, a special guest will speak at the awards ceremony.

### Conduct

We encourage all tournament participants to maintain the highest standards of ethical conduct in their interactions with other tournament participants and staff. All participants debate at the invitation of CSU-Fullerton and Georgetown University according to its tournament rules as well as any rules of their own sponsoring institutions. The tournament abides by the rules and norms of the American Forensics Association, the American Debate Association, and the Cross Examination Debate Association. As University employees we are obligated to report any destructive, threatening, violent, harassing, or otherwise unacceptable behavior to the appropriate campus authorities.

### Judging Diversity Policy + Adjustment System

We believe that judging preferences reflect the systematic inequalities present in all facets of American life. To account for this, we are adopting a modified version of the judge assignment process created by Gary Larson and used by Wake Forest in recent years. We will ask and **strongly encourage** all judges in the pool to self-identify in one of four categories: 1) Black, non-cis-male, 2) Non-Black, non-cis-male, 3) Black cis male, 4) Non-Black cis male. If judges do not self-identify, they will be placed in a 5th category, “unidentified.”

Preference Correction - Prior to the start of Round 1, a preference correction will be established to the categories as needed to rectify the potential for structurally discriminatory effects of preference systems.

We will be aggressive in seeking compliance. Your participation in this process helps to make it work without requiring tournament staff to make determinations about judges’ identities on their behalf.

You can read about previous results of this procedure here: http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php/topic,7017.0.html

#### Frequently Asked Questions for Judge Assignment Procedures by Gary Larson

**Q.  How (if at all) will pref sheets be modified at the tournament?**

A.  They will NOT be modified in any way.  For teams still in contention, the tournament will continue to use a target threshold of 50 with a maximum mutuality difference of between 25 and 30.  The actual mutuality "goal" will be 10 and the goal for average pref will be between 18 and 20.  All of these numbers are contingent on the system being able to meet the objectives with available judges with VERY minimal "extra" rounds included during prelims

**Q.  How does the "correction" work if pref sheets aren't changed and if traditional maximums are honored?**

A.  Once all of the pref sheets have been entered, I will calculate a population mean for the entire pool and a sample mean for each of the four identified categories.  If a sample mean for one of the diverse categories is higher (worse) than the population mean, the "boost" will be equal to that difference in means.

So what is done with that number? The underlying logic of STA and tabroom for that matter is that the primary computation of the "value" of a pairing involves the pref of the two teams and the absolute value of the difference between them as additive values and the average pref of the judge as a subtractive value (there are some additional factors that principally impact multi-judge panels). The goal is to have the LOWEST number.

(Aff Pref + Neg Pref)\*PrefWeight+ Abs(AffPref - NegPref)\*MutualWeight**- JdgPref\*JdgWeight**

While the pref and mutuality components are well understood, the impact of average judge preference is less well known even though I've been using it for 20 years. Since a higher value reduces the sum, it means that all things being equal the computer assigns a less preferred judge to a round as opposed to a more preferred judge. Initially, this value was critical in prelims to ensure that partial commitment highly preferred judges don't get used prematurely since they will be most important in late rounds. Adjusting the value has proved to be the greatest art associated with judge placement and largely accounts for the fact that I tend to be more successful than most in managing the judging pool with a significant number of partial commitments even though several use my underlying algorithm in tabroom.

But as the community values have evolved, the JdgPref function has become more prominent since it is the principal vehicle by which I limit the number of judges who get preffed out and to increase the profile of rounds heard by judges who argue that they are inappropriately preffed low. This is still an angst filled process for me as I attempt to manage two contradictory objectives - get the best judges possible for each round and be able to brag about the average pref of a tournament as opposed to using everyone for their commitment and having lower pref judges potentially judge important debates.  But one of the problems with increasing the weight of the jdgpref parameter is that it pushes low preferred majority critics just as much as it pushes low preferred minority critics.

The next evolution is opt-in. It happens one of two ways. Many tabrooms just use manual replacement to push opt-in judges into rounds, particularly in elims. Since I prefer to solve problems via algorithm if possible, I assign an arbitrary value to opt-in that I ADD to each opt-in judge's avg jdg pref number.  While it might seem counterintuitive to improve a low preferred critic's access to rounds by making their average appear WORSE, that's exactly what is required since it is negative variable.  But we have at least two problems.  Critics prefer to not opt-in. And the weight of the "thumb" on the scale is completely arbitrary.

The current initiative is just the next step in the evolution of what the jdgpref variable has been doing for years. It solves the low and unrepresentative rate of opt in by attempting to identify all of the judges in various categories.  It also makes the weight less arbitrary by making the value exactly the difference between sample and population means, presumably the amount of "structural" inequality that is present in the system. So I don't change anyone's sheet or the values associated with any team and judge.  I just increase the push associated with a worse average pref for each judge who is in a category that has a worse than expected average.

**Q.  What will happen if the "correction" by itself doesn't push a diverse judge into a round?**

A.  I am not a fan of manual intervention, not trusting myself to either be sufficiently omniscient or wise to make those changes fairly and equitably.  Others certainly take a different view.  But my experience is that the algorithmic solution does, in fact, achieve most of our objectives.  Most critically, Wake will not be using the proportionality metric in elims that it used in the past. In other words, in previous years, we attempted to ensure that the ratio of available opt-in critics that were assigned was at least as great as the percentage of all available critics that were assigned.  But as the number of available opt-in critics got down to just one or two, it meant that critics were assigned independent of the preferences of the debaters in the round.  That will not be the procedure this year.  That said, we still encourage as lar ge and diverse population of critics as possible to be available into late elims.

**Q.  Why are we asking that all judges assign themselves to categories even if they wish to opt-OUT of any differential treatment associated with their category identification?**

A. The hypothesis is that structural inequality gives rise to differential ratings of judges in various demographic categories and that it is appropriate for an algorithm to adjust for that systematic variance.  But if judges can choose whether they want to be included, we're not actually measuring the structural impact of being in such and such a category at all. So hypothetically, if the top half of a particularly category of judges could opt out of the statistical comparison, the comparison could conclude that that category of judges are preferred much less than the rest.   We can end up with a circular argument where "the subset of judges who aren't preferred in a demographic category aren't preferred."  Now I imagine that some coaches or judges would argue that there is another dimension that needs to be added (ie perhaps it is "sympathetic to identity politics") but I'm less convinced that that would be a structural variable that an algorithm should correct.

**Q. Will the size of the "correction" be publicized?**  After the tournament is completed, the sample mean of each of the judge sub-categories will be published as an indication of the aggregate differences in ranking associated with each group.  It is my judgment that it is that variance that ultimately needs to be addressed by teams as they fill out their sheets.  In general, while I have designed statistical solutions to address community issues (e.g. ZSCR2), I am much more convinced that proactive behaviors are ultimately the best solution.  I would love to calculate the sample means and discover that there isn't, in fact, any adjustment warranted.

### Format, Entries, Elims

The topic will be the 2022-222 CEDA resolution. We will offer all 3 divisions (Open, JV, Novice) so long as entry numbers permit. Entries must accord with CEDA and ADA eligibility rules.

We will clear all teams with winning records, up to a triple-octafinal in Open, and will clear half the field in JV and Novice.

Hybrid entries will be determined on a case-by-case basis at the determination of the tournament directors.

Entries from host schools (Fullerton and Georgetown) may compete and will be eligible to clear.

See “Tournament Administration” below for further information.

#### JV/Novice Scheduling Note

We will poll entries in JV and Novice to make a decision about whether to run concurrently with the first 6 prelims in Open and then begin elims, or begin prelims later and run concurrently with the Open schedule.

### Tournament Administration Rules

**ABAP Digital Bill of Rights Statement:** We endorse the principles of the Digital Bill of Rights laid out by the Association of Black Argumentation Professionals, which you can find here: http://blackargpros.org/index.php/abaps-digital-debate-bill-of-rights/?fbclid=IwAR1lp-8Q1O242XE\_xb5wXna04lDFLwAbiuTejNSSL6qLNWS3HOTv3TUFgss

For most of the procedures below, we thank the American Debate Association, many of whose rules we are adopting.

#### FORMAT

Cross-examination style debate format will be used, with two-person teams. There will be four nine-minute constructive speeches, beginning with the affirmative. After each constructive, there will be a three-minute cross-examination by a member of the opposition. There will be four six-minute rebuttals, beginning with the negative. Each team will be allocated ten minutes of preparation time to be used in between speeches and cross-examination periods. Each debater must give one constructive speech and one rebuttal.

We will permit each team to be allocated up to 10 minutes of “Tech Time” for resolving exclusively tech-related problems (e.g. internet connection, audio/video issues). Tech time should not be used as additional standard prep time. If the time elapses before the team can resolve the issue, they will forfeit the debate. In the event a speech needs to be redelivered entirely or in part, the time for that should count as tech time for the team experiencing the problem, if their tech time runs out while giving the speech the remaining time should be deducted from prep time. In the event a speech needs to be redelivered entirely or in part due to a judge tech issue, the judge must communicate the issue to the tab room immediately in order to minimize delays in the tournament schedule.

#### TOPIC

The topic will be the 2021-22 CEDA resolution.

#### OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE

Once the debate has begun, a team may not receive assistance, suggestions, or coaching from anyone while the round is in progress. This does not prevent debate partners from helping one another, but does prevent outside persons from helping a team during the course of a debate. In an online debate, a debate team may receive assistance from tournament staff in order to resolve technology issues with debate equipment or the ability to transmit the debate.

#### DECORUM

Debaters and judges should treat one another with civility during debates and when debate decisions are revealed and discussed. Debaters and judges should treat one another with generosity, respect and kindness. Participants (debaters, judges, coaches, observers, etc.) may not engage in any nudity, sexually explicit or illegal behavior, or use illegal substances while at the location of the debate rounds or during a debate. Debaters and judges are bound by the code of conduct and any institutional rules of their own colleges or universities and should conduct themselves as if they are in a classroom environment.

#### RESPONSIBILITIES OF JUDGES

A. Judges should listen conscientiously and in a manner designed to promote recognition and recall of positions advanced in speeches and question periods. Judges are encouraged to provide verbal and nonverbal feedback to encourage comprehensibility and to discourage violating the rules of debate. During debates conducted online, the judge should maintain a visible video presence during speeches and cross examination. Further, judges will attempt to avoid verbal and nonverbal feedback which degrades, humiliates or otherwise belittles the efforts of the debater speaking.

B. Decision Time

In preliminary rounds, judges are expected to render a decision within 2:15 of the announced start time. In elimination rounds, judges are expected to render a decision within 2:30 of the announced start time. At debate tournaments conducted online the time given to render a decision may be expanded by time allotted to resolve technical difficulties. If a judge needs to take additional time following a delay because of technical difficulties (Tech Time), the judge should promptly communicate the need to delay and the amount of time of the delay to the tournament tab room staff. If the judge is unable to make a decision within the appropriate time parameters for that round, the tab room should randomly decide a winner by coin flip.

C. Oral critiques by judges are encouraged for all rounds so long as the critique does not delay teams or the judge from getting to the next scheduled round before the scheduled start time. During a debate conducted online, the judge should conclude their oral critique no later than five minutes before the scheduled check-in time for the next round. Judges should refrain from long critiques when debaters need to get off campus to eat during meal breaks.

#### JUDGING

Judges must render a decision in which one of the teams participating in the debate is declared the winner.

Judge Conflict Policy

Judges and students have an affirmative obligation to identify conflicts prior to the start of the tournament. Failure to do so may result in removal of preferences for the teams from the schools involved, adjustment of the judge’s schools judging obligations, and/or financial penalties.

Conflicts of interest in which a judge should preclude themselves from judging a particular team or school, and for which a team should constrain a judge, include:

a) Previous significant coaching relationship with a debater,

b) Current or previous romantic relationship with a debater,

c) Current romantic relationship with a member of the coaching staff of a school,

d) Familial relationship with a debater or member of the coaching staff of a school,

e) Recent (within the last four academic years) coaching position with a school,

f) Recent (within the last four academic years) undergraduate competitor for a school.

Assignment. The tournament will place judges using an ordinal rank, mutual preference system, incorporating adjustments to maximize diversity (see “judge diversity policy”). The benefits and burden of judge placement should be shared equally across the novice, junior varsity, and open divisions. Judges should never be subjectively evaluated by tournament directors for preclusion from teams or divisions, for mutual preference or for judge placement.

Philosophies. Judges should make judge philosophies on tabroom.com before the tournament opens the judge ranking system.

#### FORFEITURE

A. All Rounds: A fifteen-minute forfeiture rule will be in effect. Beginning with the announced starting time for a round of debate, teams and judges will have a fifteen minute 'grace' period. A team which is not ready to begin debating after the fifteen minutes have expired will be declared to have lost the debate.

The tournament may require a Check-in Time by which all debaters and judges must have been officially checked in to their room and performed audio and video checks. Failure to do so may result in forfeiture and/or disqualification. Following Check-in Time, standard start time/forfeiture policy applies.

#### COIN FLIPS IN ELIMS

We will manage coin flips electronically through Tabroom.com.

#### ELIGIBILITY FOR DEBATE DIVISIONS

A. Varsity Debate – open to all students;

B. Junior Varsity Debate – Open only to students who are competing in their first two academic years of intercollegiate debate beyond the novice level. Debaters competing in JV must progress to open or varsity debate if they advance to the final round of three JV, open, or varsity tournaments (no matter where) in which there are 20 or more teams in the division, or if they qualify to attend the National Debate Tournament.

C. Novice Debate--This division is designed for debaters who are truly in their first year of competitive debate or who have so little previous experience that they are functionally first-year debaters. Debaters must have no more than a combined total of 50 rounds of debate (including Lincoln Douglas, parliamentary, public forum, and policy debate) prior to the current academic year, of which no more than 24 rounds can be policy debate. If a debater has more than 24 rounds of policy debate, the debater may retain novice eligibility until advancing to elimination rounds and winning an elimination round at two tournaments or upon completion of the second academic year. Debaters who have advanced and won an elimination round at two or more college policy tournaments in a previous academic year are ineligible.

#### DEFINITION OF DEBATE TEAM (Hybrids & Mavericks Policy)

A debate team is defined as the two-person team that begins the first round of the tournament and who debate together throughout the course of the tournament. Mavericks may not enter the tournament. In extenuating circumstances, if one of the debaters of an entered team cannot debate in one or more rounds, the remaining debater may be permitted to continue debating and receive speaker points. However, the team will be ineligible to clear to elimination rounds or receive speaker awards. Teams and judges should notify the tabroom of any maverick situation.

Hybrid teams may be allowed, on a case-by case basis, at the discretion of the tournament directors and are allowed to clear to elimination rounds at the discretion of the tournament directors. The hybrid must be declared to the tournament directors in advance.

Entries from host schools (Fullerton and Georgetown) may compete and will be eligible to clear.

#### CONDUCT OF COACHES AND PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Coaches and Program Directors should treat one another and debaters (whether from their school or other institutions) with civility, generosity, respect and kindness during ADA sanctioned debate tournaments. This, at a minimum, means refraining from the use of hostile or abusive speech, acts of intimidation, or threats or acts of physical violence.