meeting

May 2021 ISATA Meeting

*Date |5/3/2021* | 9:07 am | *Meeting called to order by* Robin Christensen

# Board Members

Robin Christensen (Mountain Home) – President

Marcy Curr (Pocatello) – Vice President

Kelly Aldridge (Vallivue) – Treasurer

Sara Bell (Mountain View) - Secretary

Jennifer Borman – Technology Commissioner

Donnie Drobny (Borah) – Debate Commissioner

Kara Smith (Timberline) – Speech Commissioner

James Haycock (Twin Falls) – Drama Commissioner

Jared Helm (Coeur d’Alene) – D1 Chair

Erin Davidson (Rocky Mountain) – D3 Chair

~~Robbie Fox (Twin Falls) – D4 Chair~~

Ted Bonman– D5 Chair

Shaun Nichols (Bonneville) – D6 Chair

Julie Hammons – IHSAA Rep

Dana Facer (American Falls) – ISATA Rep to IHSAA

# Approval of Minutes

Approved December 2020 minutes

[December 2020](https://msd2-my.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/g/personal/bell_sara_westada_org/Efer8CIu68lKqjmR8gqBfYoBmh30VlEK-AWWfokL7sELFA?e=h0pq4e)

# IHSAA Report –

**2020-2021**

o Drama – December 18-19 @ Virtual

o Debate – March 12-13 @ ~~Boise HS~~ Virtual

o Speech – April 9-10 @ ~~Lake City HS~~ Virtual

**FUTURE ROTATION SCHEDULE : Julie Hammons**

**●** [**State Tournament Rotation**](https://msd2-my.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/g/personal/bell_sara_westada_org/ETGoZF7vMjNNgcPqhk3mdjUBXvNHEKCI4xkkVT8HyIyyPg?e=waxvnH)

Drama 2021 – D3

Debate 2022 – D4 (was on prior notes but IHSAA document has D3)

Speech 2022 – D5 (Highland)

Justin gave input on District1 for Speech/Debate - not even in their curriculum right now. Julie suggested leaving for right now.

Drama: D3: December 3-4Centennial HS (Paul Host/ ? Manage)

Debate: D3: March 11-12 TBD

Speech: D5: April 8-9 Highland (Jett Host/Dana Manage)

**IHSAA NEWS - Julie Hammons**

* [2020 May IHSAA Exec Board Notes](https://msd2-my.sharepoint.com/%3Ab%3A/g/personal/bell_sara_westada_org/ETOzO3gI4ltFnumJyj-KhHwBj-3zbHeig-41vMeulR2GnQ?e=HXRWpc)

Refund for drama/debate (fines will remain)

NFHS

Theatre Safety NFHS ([www.nfhslearn.com](http://www.nfhslearn.com))

Speech and Debate Festival Management: Great resource for new coaches – virtual should not be the status quo but they see benefit of online/virtual platform.

NFHS novice debate topics – rules and regulations would have to be followed, but novice topics do not need to be followed. (they are the same as NSDA)

Kara Smith NFHS award –

**AREAS OF CONCERN**

Gender Discrimination: This is regarding R2R issue with speech student requesting “protest” - ISATA conference could have this presented – we need to be sure our judges are aware of discrimination/bias... “You have a really squeaky voice.”

We need training as coaches. DF: Tabroom/Online judging – ballots – do the judges need feedback? RC: working with equity committee at NSDA – maybe we should have this at our levels. JH: judge training needs to happen prior to the high stakes events. Students need a place to have their voice heard – having an equity officer would allow them to have that voice. Kids being “attacked” between rounds.

Commissioners hold 3 clinic per season ?? – webinar with examples – maybe hybrid of live/virtual. Would lend to better judge training and they would all be hearing the same message and rules. Similar to an “officials clinic”... equity piece could be across the board – speech/debate/drama... we could then require all people to get certified to judge at State tournaments. Commissioners to take this and run with it!

Regional philosophical differences : East/West division... We have to find a way to bridge the differences – we have to collaborate in speech arts. There needs to be respect and protocols across the districts.

Coach turnover rate: not requiring a speech certification – universities not turning out people who are certified in speech and is there the passion to do this event. Does the season have to be October-April. We should not be “competing” to raise funds. There is also some shaming that happens amongst coaches for attending tournaments – for not participating in events – etc. How about coaching mentoring?

# Treasurer’s Report – Kelly Aldridge

Checking: $4749.31

Savings $503.98

Nothing new or changed

# ISATA Report for 2021 - Marcy Curr

* December thoughts:
	+ October 7/8 (online would 8th only) - could the dates be moved because many districts don’t have October PD days any longer? Survey please… Maybe Oct
	+ Dates/Location: CSI on campus in Twin Falls or Boise venues
* Update:
	+ Theme:
	+ Dates/Location: Sun Valley/Wood River area – driving factor – when hosting in Boise or IF – those people go home and don’t mingle. Wood River HS/Community School – will reach out in June due to Covid issues... Air BnB options. End of September. Marcy will survey again but likely leaning towards Friday/Saturday. We might consider a hybrid option for Northern Coaches for caucus – synchronous, but will that option cut in person attendees down?
	+ Team building activities – mission/vision - improve culture of coaches

# Debate Business

**OLD BUSINESS**

* OCTAFINALS PROPOSAL – Robin Christensen
	+ 5.5 Octafinal Debate Bracket
		- Add a subpoint: 5.5B to read:
		- “If sixteen or less entries qualify for the state tournament in a single debate event, all sixteen will receive “octafinalist points” toward sweepstakes, but only the top eight will advance to elimination rounds. In this case, the octafinal round will not occur.”
			* Justification: This year, only 16 policy debate teams would have competed at state debate. As current rules do not outline what to do when only 16 teams qualify, this could have meant that the last placing team in preliminary rounds (with zero wins) would still make it to the octafinal round. This then makes our preliminary rounds almost pointless (they only determine seeding order). I think it is important to award schools sweepstakes points if they have qualifiers in a less-popular event, but I don’t think teams with zero losses should get a chance to debate in a break round. This would also give our “best debaters” the best chance at making it to the final round.
			* May Discussion:
				+ IHSAA has not allowed this in the past for sports.
				+ Kara throws shade at Jenn’s Policy 0-6 policy team
			* Fall Discussion:
				+ None…
			* Passes 1st Reading at Fall Conference 2020
			* Passes 2nd Reading at Winter Meeting 2021 – has to go before IHSAA Board

**NEW BUSINESS**

IHSAA spring meeting:

Add a subpoint: 5.5B to read:

* “If sixteen or less entries qualify for the state tournament in a single debate event, all sixteen will receive “octafinalist points” toward sweepstakes, but only the top eight will advance to elimination rounds. In this case, the octafinal round will not occur.”
* The board was pretty much unanimously opposed to giving sweeps points just for showing up at state. I made the following amendment, which they approved and moved from the discussion agenda to the first reading.
* Add a sub-point: 5.5B to read:
	+ “If sixteen or less entries qualify for the state tournament in a single debate event, entries will receive “octafinalist points” toward sweepstakes if they advance to the semi-final round In this case, the octafinal round will not occur."
* This puts the item on the agenda, and gives us time to discuss it at our next meeting.

We just can’t give out points for showing up. Random bye’s should not be able to earn points. This proposed language does not work. We can change this for the June IHSAA meeting with an alternate proposal.

DD: If we w/d then we are in the same position – kids earn the points octafinalist??? JH: The problem still remains – we have to fix the problem... KS: maybe points just up from Quarters up... RC: keep octafinal points if there are competitors... DD: past discussion, school size would affect who is champion, would small/medium schools be hurt....

DD to send out a survey to explore this issue- we MUST have a solution and ISATA can then reconvene and discuss – this needs to cover speech/drama as well.

June 8 is IHSAA board meeting –they would need new verbage at that point.

# Speech Business

**OLD BUSINESS**

* A PROPOSAL TO CHANGE JUDGE RANKING PRACTICES
	+ SECTION 1. Mandates: Replace the “1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 4” ranking system with a “1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7” system.
		- The rules would then read: Contestants in each section of each round will be ranked 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, etc., with 1 going to the best entry. There can be only one 1st, one 2nd, one 3rd, etc. in each round.
	+ SECTION 2. Justification: The main justification for the current system is that it protects novices feelings from being hurt by knowing they took last in their round. However, 1) we allow novices to compete at National Qualifiers without this protection, and that hasn’t decreased our participation. It also means kids will know what to expect/how to handle it when getting ranked the ‘6’ because these tournaments occur AFTER NSDA qualifiers. And 2) Districts and State are about competitive excellence and teaching students real world skills—this unnecessary safety cushion accomplishes neither of those things. The current ranking system also produces copious amounts of ties on rankings, which then leads to breaking based off of speaker points. However, speaking points are entirely subjective and differ wildly from judge to judge. A judge may choose to award every speaker they see a 10, while another may give every speaker a 7. This causes who makes the break sheet to be determined by luck of the judging draw. But with the new system, judges could still give all students 10 points, but only one student can take 4th, 5th and 6th, leading to fewer ties and more objective seeding. Additionally, districts and state showcase the highest quality pieces of the whole season. We even explicitly prohibit giving 6 points to a speaker in finals for this reason. It is entirely reasonable to view all 7 speakers in a round as deserving a 9 or 10. But in order to effectively rank competitors, many judges will give a “4.7” to a kid who otherwise would have gotten a “6.10”. This, along with not breaking because you took 4th in a round with the 3 best competitors at state, hurts much worse than a novice getting 6th in a round against 5 varsity competitors.
		- Discussion –
			* should develop a new points rubric to go with it, so points are less subjective
			* it’s a slap in the face in a high school educational program
			* it solves ties but a kid could take a 6 in a hard round and then another low score and they are destroyed, they can climb out of that hole of points.
			* But kids feelings and stuff?
			* Kara tried this using two scores but truncated and non to break ties.
		- Passes 1st reading at Fall Conference 2020

Winter Discussion: We’ve been trying this out online – it works – IHSAA is in favor of this as used to not have as many tiebreakers. Fewer NSDA points if auto posting.

* Passes 2nd reading at Winter Meeting. This will go to IHSAA board
* Board okay with this moving forward ASAP

Proposal use of NSDA material widened

IDC/NSDA Rule Precedence§A. The ISATA speech caucus will vote each year during the conference toadopt the current NSDA portion of the debate procedures and rules. This willserve to maintain consistency between the state and national rules.§B. All references to the NSDA district tournament should be understood asembodied in the state debate tournament. Procedures and references unique tothe district NSDA tournament--including but not limited to the tabulationcommittee, tabulation method, the national office and a national office referee--should be considered null and void at the state debate tournament.§C. The NSDA is in no way affiliated with the state debate tournament. Dutiesand responsibilities tied to the national office defer to the state grievance committee who acts as the final arbiter at the IHSAA state debate tournament.

All decisions rendered by this committee may not be appealed.

* Discussion: Does not have to be in their Digital script list – more open source. More options for students who do not have funding. Follow NSDA rules and adopt their rules in the future. NSDA no longer has a digital script list and ISATA rules references this. NSDA interpretation source no longer exists. Can NOT have ISBN number. We should be aligned more with NSDA.
* National Federal HS rules will supersede our rules in the future.
* Passes 1st reading Winter Meeting: Vote at Fall Meeting: Does not change anything this year.

**NEW BUSINESS**

From IHSAA spring meeting:

Issue 1: SECTION 1. Mandates: Replace the “1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 4” ranking system with a “1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7” system.

* The rules would then read: Contestants in each section of each round will be ranked 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, etc., with 1 going to the best entry. There can be only one 1st, one 2nd, one 3rd, etc. in each round.
* The board felt that they didn't really need to run this through 3 meetings, and told us to move forward with the rule with their blessing.
* Okay with IHSAA board – effective immediately

Issue 2: Determining State Speech weekends. Easter conflicts.

Proposal #1:

To amend Use of Materials rule #2 which states “Materials and/or presentations may not be significantly

altered from round to round or from district to state.” To read “Materials and/or presentations for Platform and Interpretation Events may not be significantly altered between rounds of the state tournament”

*Discussion: “significantly altered” has no meaning to it if student receives feedback at district -the student qualifies not the piece. Difference in District tournament times between district/state: Could they change entire piece, yes: What makes it out of districts might do well at districts but might not fly at state – depends on where the competition is... Drama already has this rule in their general rules.*

This would be a rule change for speech only, not general rules.

Proposal passes 1st reading

Considering proposal #2 and #6 together!

Proposal #2: Timing Regulations

To amend Timing Regulation Rule #1 to read “Events without given time signals shall have a 30 second grace period. After which a timing violation will result in being dropped one rank”

Proposal #6

A Proposal for Grace Periods

This proposal would add a 30-second grace period for all IHSAA speech events except the following: Impromptu, Panel Discussion, Radio Broadcast Journalism, and Retold Story.

Justification Statement: A growing number of events NSDA and NIETOC) and the tournaments that utilize them require the extension of a 30-second grace period before any penalty would be assessed. For consistency and judge knowledge, standardizing an overtime penalty for the 10 IHSAA events subject to the new rule would help eliminate confusion on when to assess them. The 30-second grace period would apply to: After Dinner Speaking, Communication Analysis, Dramatic Interpretation, Duo Interpretation, Extemporaneous, Humorous Interpretation, Informative Speaking, Original Oratory, Program Oral Interpretation, and Sales Speaking.

*Discussion: timer issue, when does the time start, when judge says ready, or the student starts speaking? NSDA/NIETOC has grace period... this would eliminate either issue. What about events having time signals vs not? Why do we need a grace period – the time should be the time. Amend to not include limited prep Impromptu/Extemp/Radio/Retold. How does the grace period solve the problem? When does the judge start the timer? Needing to teach kids that this would be a grace period – not for additional material – clear definition on the purpose of grace- we are not changing the event time.*

Proposal : Events without given time signals (HI/DI/Duo/Inform/POI/CA/ADS/Sales/OO) have a 30 second grace period. After which a timing violation will result in being dropped one rank.

Proposal passes 1st reading

Proposal #3: To align Idaho rules with National Rules

Rules for Duo Interpretation, Informative Speaking, Extemporaneous Speaking, Program Oral Interpretation, Humorous Interpretation, ~~Serious~~ Dramatic Interpretation, and Original Oratory should be rewritten to align with the NSDA rules in those events.

*Discussion: It would be handy to align with NSDA – there is confusion amongst competitors and coaches. We should just vote each year to adopt NSDA rules. Julie wanted to know differences – mostly Interp sourcing rules – NSDA opened up equity – but we were not aligned. They have grace period... What percentage of our students are competing on National circuit – almost all (maybe a few D4 are not) are competing in NSDA. When does NSDA rules come out- after summer conference in August; edits are in the NSDA manual. This would be problematic for IHSAA as they post in mid-July. We are aligned pretty well – it would be small wording changes.*

Proposal passes 1st reading

Proposal #4a: To change the judge requirements for State Speech

To amend the Speech Arts General rules State Tournament Judging #2 to read “a. Drama- one judge b. Speech- two judges c. Debate- one judge for every seven students or fraction thereof.”

*Discussion: Coach +2 so more judges in the pool: financial concern (see below) - could this be done by number of qualifying speech competitors (like 1-15 entries = 3 judges) or (1-4 = 1; 5-14 = 2)… 1 clean judge per school, this would be really hard.*

Proposal fails 1st reading

~~Proposal #4b: To add a preliminary judge in speech rounds. To add under “Judging Procedures for State Speech” #3: Each Preliminary round will use 2 judges.~~

 *~~Discussion: Coach+2 would level out the consistency in judging – this would be a financial concern for IHSAA (loses $25k on Speech/Debate/Drama already) - this might be a way to move away from a semi-final round – we might have teams not earning points – which could be an issue... In other competitions (BPA/FFA) have multiple judges to have multiple feedback – we do multiple rounds for this reason – having 3 prelim rounds gives them 3 feedback. Not about the feedback it is getting the scores... More scoring opportunities – semi-finals – more coaches would just complicate the preliminary rounds. Judge certification might just solve all the issues with better prepared/qualified judges.\~~*

Proposal withdrawn

Proposal #5

PROPOSAL: To allow contestants to utilize online resources during the 30 minute prep period

Current Text:

The draw room will post three topics in each category (domestic and international) from which each speaker may choose. Additional sets of topics for each speaker will be posted every seven minutes. He/she will have 30 minutes to prepare, and may use an index and research periodicals during this time. Resource materials will not be provided by the tournament.

Proposed Change:

The draw room will post three topics in each category (domestic and international) from which each speaker may choose. Additional sets of topics for each speaker will be posted every seven minutes. He/she will have 30 minutes to prepare, and may use an index, research periodicals, or online resources during this time. Resource materials will not be provided by the tournament.

Justification:

Extemp decreases in numbers every year due to the sheer amount of research burden on the contestants (who often don't have the team interest/infrastructure to do this consistently/effectively). Even with access to internet resources, students still have a very difficult task with Extemp, to sort through a VAST amount of information and distill them into a comprehensible, topical, persuasive 7-minute speech--no small feat. This is a very real-world skill to foster development in our students and one that reflects processes they will likely use in work and personal matters. Lowering the bar of the amount of time and effort kids have to put in on the front end as well as developing a more practical skill will surely make this a more useful and participated in event.

*Discussion: original intent was for internet access during a tournament – but now people have it – so we are leveling the playing field for 1 kid vs a team. State/district level this is good, but at invitationals might not have internet unless you have a hotspot – so there would be inequity again. This would have to be clearly outlined in hosting of tournaments. This is only for district/state. We would need guest log in for district/state. Winning/losing isn’t going to happen because of this.*

Proposal passes 1st reading

 Proposal #7 To modify the Sectioning Priority Rules

To amend rule 3 under State Speech Tournament Rules which currently reads: “Contestants will be placed into sections of 5–8 for each preliminary round. The following sectioning priorities should be followed to the extent possible… (and lists those sectioning priorities) to now read “Contestants will be placed into sections of 4-8 for each preliminary rounds. Round sections will be created using the default priorities of the tabulation software” and eliminate 3a-c

*Discussion: Our tab software does a better job of equity than people can do – it balances things we don’t consider. Sections were not 5 at State so that justifies the sections of 4.*

*Proposal passes 1st reading*

Proposal #8: To modify the judging assignment rules.

To amend the rule 3d under State Speech Tournament Regulations which currently reads: “Judges should not judge the same event or same contestant twice. Judges should not judge entries from their own school” to be relabeled as #4 (and subsequently relabel 4-6 accordingly) and read “Judges will not judge the same entry in the same event more than once. Judges should identify conflicts with other schools or students before the tournament begins. Judges will not judge entries from their own school or any school they have an identified conflict.”

*Discussion: The change would allow contestant to not have same judge more than once. We would have to track every judge – because kids are different entries... Would the judge being comparing rounds and changing a score?*

Proposal passes 1st reading

Proposal #9: To clarify the rules and expectations of Extemporaneous Speaking

To modify the rules for Extemporaneous Speaking in order to more clearly define the expectations of the event and provide meaningful guidance to competitors, coaches, and judges. As these rules and expectations should reflect the culture of the state they should be developed and agreed upon at the full body meeting (ISATA 2021).

*Discussion: What is the judge supposed to be judging – what should this event look like – we need to look at judging criteria – what make extemp good? If we adopt NSDA rules this would take care of that because NSDA is more extensive.*

*Motion: have Marcy write proposal and present at ISATA in October.*

Proposal #10: A Proposal Regarding Calculating Team Sweepstakes – Speech and Debate

This proposal would, in effect, standardize the way that team sweepstakes are awarded in case of a tie. The wording would be the same in both calculating State Debate and State Speech awards. Currently, the wording is similar, and this would standardize it across both disciplines.

Under “Debate Rules and Regulations”, section 5.6, and under “Speech Rules and Regulations, Determining Team Champions”, the following change would be made:

Current wording, Debate:

5.6 Determining Team Champions

C. Ties in team placement will be broken by:

1. Number of entries advancing into break rounds, then

2. Number of state qualifying entries.

New wording, Debate:

5.6 Determining Team Champions

C. Ties in team placement will be broken by:

1. Squad efficiency rating as determined by the total number of sweepstakes points divided by the number of entries that break to elimination rounds, then

2. Number of entries advancing into break rounds, then

3. Number of state qualifying entries.

Current wording, Speech:

2. A tie for team winners will be broken by:

a. largest number of entries breaking to finals,

b. largest number of first place finishers

New wording, Speech:

2. Ties in team placement will be broken by:

a. Squad efficiency rating as determined by the total number of sweepstakes points divided by the number of entries that break to elimination rounds, then

b. Number of entries advancing into break rounds, then

c. Number of state qualifying entries.

Rationale: Squad efficiency indicates nit just how many students advance but the quality of their work in those rounds. This would be a truer measurement of the “quality versus quantity” argument.

Example:

Team A and Team B each earn 25 sweepstakes points. Team A had 3 students advance and Team B had 4. Team A would earn the tiebreaker as they had less students earn the same number of points reflective of the quality of advancing entries.

*Discussion: What we do when there is a tie for points – essentially shifts the tie to side with smaller schools – squad efficiency not just numbers. Is there data of how the effects of why this proposal came to be? How is this fair for all schools? Should sweeps just be final rounds? Is there really a good solution.*

*Motion: table: present at ISATA in October with all 3 disciplines.*

# Drama Business

**OLD BUSINESS**

* A PROPOSAL FOR DIRECTOR’S/STAGE MANAGER’S BOOK

**#1 Proposal for Director’s/Stage Manager’s Book**

**(SM, ASM, / Dir)** (Do we want to just do one book and call it the Prompt Book?)

Contestants must provide a summary (at least one paragraph in length) of the script and the student’s intentions in preparing the entry. The summary may be displayed or handed to the judge. The summary shall include:

**Production Prompt Book:** Contestant should present a Production Prompt Book for a produced/non-produced one-act or full-length production, with the following included contents:

Requirements:

* Play Synopsis -  Summary of play
* Director’s Concept/Vision   - Intent Question
	+ a) the intended mood;
	+ b) the general style of production, theatrical period; or type of stage;
	+ c) title of the script for which the entry was produced.
* At least 3 sample Rehearsal/Performances Logs

Script with blocking notations and technical cues (key included)

* Floor Plan of at least one scene - Sketch

Plot Ideas?

* At least 3 different production plots specific to the selected production (i.e. Character-by-Page Spreadsheet, Costume Plot, Properties Plot, etc.)
* Pre-Show/Intermission/Post-Show Checklists
* Production Budget (including royalties, script purchase, publicity,

Publicity

* Poster??
* Audition Notice / Available cast
* Program with Play Synopsis/Word to the audience

Director’s Book-

* Printed One-Act or Full Length Script with blocking notations (notations key included)
* Audition Notice
* Floor Plan
* Director’s Concept/Vision
* Participation Contract
* Cast List/Contact Information

Stage Manager’s Book

* Printed Script with blocking notations and technical cues (key included)
* Floor Plan/Scenic Design
* At least 5 different plots as seen useful for scripted production
	+ Character-by-Page Spreadsheet
	+ Costume Plot
	+ Sound Plot
	+ Properties Plot
	+ Contact List
	+ Scenic (Scene-Shift) Plot
* Pre-Show/Intermission/Post-Show Checklists
* At least 3 sample Rehearsal/Performances Logs

Discussion:

* What is the benefit for kids that they don’t get through another event? Tech theatre kids benefit specific work.
* Current 10 tech events – will need to know about costs (rooms/judges/medals) – this is a solo event. Another category within the 10 entries.
* Possible online event
* Possible amp up of stage management programs in schools. Job security in future.
* Judging criteria and what product would look like

Table until ISATA: would not go into effect until 2022

* A PROPOSAL FOR MUSICAL AUDITION
* General Rules Acing Events: 5. Presentations may not contain more than 25% singing, except the Musical Theatre category
* Change to :
	+ General Acting #5: Presentations may not contain more than 25% singing, with the exception of Musical Theatre and Solo Audition Events
	+ Add to Solo Audition: 3. One of the two contrasting pieces may be a musical theatre song
* Rational for above: This form of Audition is mainly used for Collegiate Scholarship Auditions, It is becoming more and more necessary for our students to perform a musical theatre piece as part of their college audition. This is especially the case if they are going into a Musical Theatre Major.

Passes 1st reading Winter Meeting and must be discussed at ISATA would not go into effect until 2022

**NEW BUSINESS**

* **NONE**

# ISATA General Business

Sara Bell (Mountain View) has stepped down from coaching at the end of the 2020/2021 school year – Secretary position open: Filled by Brent Schindler until October meeting: Brent Schindler will take over for fall meeting and will open for elections.

Jenn Borman: Website and Videos

*Who has access to our State videos? We should keep it private because of copyright laws. Can use YouTube private channel that Donnie has rights to. Drama recordings: we are opening a can of worms with cuttings. We should let it live in the moment and let them work with each other to create performances. If we mentor, are we in any violation – no issue if not competitive... we should rely on each other to learn. Break out session on ISATA with best resources in a digital “binder,” bring your best stuff...*

Erin Davidson: How do we get great judges? (message: With virtual and tabroom it becomes very clear that there are some judges that either don't know how to score correctly or abuse the system to help their school they represent. Is there a way to either make sure they don't judge again or what do we need to do to adjust our training?) - Equity in the feedback kids get is sometimes upsetting. During competition how does it get caught between rounds? Perhaps a statement for judges – Student learning and growing – keep it positive and be kind. In person training of judges, maybe we really need to push for that again. Perhaps that would cause coaches to hit the appropriateness of comments. We need to define “equity”

State Speech dates: Not Easter weekend why early this year? IHSAA 5 year calendar. This is an issue for spring breaks/Easter/State... could it be later in April, also has to do with schools on tri-mester. Could we have State Speech and Debate in the same weekend? We could poll coaches... look at 5 year plan for IHSAA.

Move to adjourn: 12:54pm