

MSHSL
Speech Advisory Committee Agenda
April 28, 2009

1. Great Speeches Rule Change
 - a. See page 4

This rule change proposal was **approved** by the Advisory Committee. See pages 2 and 3 for the exact rule proposal to be sent on to the MSHSL Board on June 8.

2. Extemp Speaking Rule Change
 - a. See page 5

This rule change proposal was **approved** by the Advisory Committee. See pages 3 and 4 for the exact rule proposal to be sent on the MSHSL Board on June 8.

3. State Tournament
 - a. Jury Selection
 - i. As elected voices, shouldn't MSCA Advisory Committee serve in this capacity?

Barb selects the members of the jury. She and Chris expressed concerns about MSCA Advisory or other coaches serving in this position as many of them judge at the tournament. It was asked that Barb clarify the jury selection and rule infraction procedures with the MSCA membership.

- b. Judge Ballot
 - i. Increase coach votes from 25 to 40 to give tournament directors more elected judges.

Barb and Chris agreed that this is a good idea. Next year's ballot will ask for coaches to vote for up to 40 judges. We discussed state judges who were not on the ballot and that we encouraged Barb to explain that at CTAM.

- c. Tabulation -- Procedures Change Proposal
 - i. See pages 6, 7 and 8
 - ii. The power of prelims ranks vs finals ranks
 1. Cases in point:
 - a. "AA" Oratory – student goes 3,2,2 in finals and takes 1st, student goes 1,3,1 in finals and takes 2nd.
 - b. "AA" Inform – student goes 4,2,2 in finals and takes 1st, student goes 1,1,4 in finals and takes 2nd.

Advisory members communicated their admiration for the work the tabulation committee has done. Advisory members recommended to the tabulation committee that it focus the proposal. The problem and the proposed solution should be succinctly and clearly stated. Advisory would like to specifically explore the pros and cons of dropping the worst prelim rank from the final tabulation. More discussion, perhaps a full session, could occur at CTAM provided there is room in the program. After this full-session discussion or (at the least) MSCA meeting-discussion, the MSCA membership can decide what the next step will be.

d. Alternates

- i. Will the MSHSL ask us to revise our current policy regarding entering alternates in order to save money (lodging, etc for alternates) for schools?

This agenda item was tabled for now and was not discussed due to time constraints.

e. Host for 2011 and 2012

- i. Jenn Baese at Lakeville North has expressed interest

Chris also indicated that St. Michael-Albertville may be interested in hosting. These schools are encouraged to move forward and contact the MSHSL. Gustavus site: It was clearly communicated by the Advisory members that Gustavus not be considered a permanent site.

4. Registered MSHSL Judges

- a. More MSHSL Registration Clinic offerings needed
 - i. Who has permission to run a clinic?
 - ii. Clinic at GAC this summer?

This agenda item was tabled for now and was not discussed due to time constraints. However, Stewart Wilson is willing to run a judging clinic Oct. 10, 2009 for one act and speech in Walker.

b. School leave time for judges

- i. Support from MSHSL needed. School administrators need to hear that if judges aren't allowed paid leave, the MSHSL will have trouble finding judges.

Chris has written a letter that can be sent to administrators of schools who have adopted a policy that restricts paid-leave for judging. Those who seek MSHSL assistance should ask Chris to send this letter to their administration.

5. Rules Infractions

- a. Disqualification Adjustment Proposal - See page 9

- b. Does being spread out at Gustavus make a rule-infraction discussion with coach more difficult?

It was recommended by Advisory members, provided there is space in the program, to have a CTAM session on this topic. It was also agreed that dropping a student who has committed a rules infraction to the bottom of the round is preferable over dropping 1 or 2 ranks.

Other items discussed:

State Speech 2010: April 23, 24

State Speech 2011: April 15, 16

Could free state-tournament programs be provided for assistant coaches? Maybe set a maximum of 2 assistants per team to help control cost?

GREAT SPEECHES

Great Speeches is an event in which the contestant speaks about **either**

•a single speech OR •an anthology of speeches (not to exceed three) related by common author, theme, or other element.

Each speech (public address) must have been delivered by the speaker before the speaker's intended original audience. For example, "Sermon on the Mount" is Biblical Prose; "Antony's Funeral Oration" is Shakespearean Drama. The contestant's analysis should convey the delight, edification, and challenge of contemporary or historical public address.

Information about each author/speaker, subject, original audience, and occasion must be included in an introduction. During the presentation, the contestant must also justify the selection for presentation to the contestant's immediate audience. The justification need not be an explicit statement, but may include such subjects as the historical or potential importance, language style, rhetorical technique and audience appeal. Comments about textual accuracy and ghostwriting style may be included where appropriate. All materials quoted, paraphrased, or summarized from other sources must be documented both orally and in the written text.

A minimum of 25% of the presentation must be the contestant's own material. How portions of the original speech text are incorporated into the participant's presentation shall be at the discretion of the participant. Statements, analysis and exposition may be either interspersed throughout the presentation or contained in only one or a few portions of the presentation.

For purposes of documentation, the student is required to provide a citation indicating the source of the selected speech within the written **and oral text of the student's speech.** The selected speech must have been published with an ISBN or ISSN or an online resource. Recorded speeches may be used only if they have also been published in print or online. An ISBN/ISSN or the citation of the online resource should be provided at sub-section, section, and state contests. (An ISSN covers periodical and serials.)

If the speech is selected from an online source, student and coach are strongly encouraged to check the reliability of the online source.

Judging should be on the general effectiveness of the student's interaction with the audience to share the greatness of the speech. The Judge's primary attention should be on the participant's judgment in choosing and editing the material, sensitivity to author's ideas and purpose, and, especially, the speaker's analysis of historical potential, and/or rhetorical import of the speech. The student may, but is not required to, use a rhetorical model. Secondly, delivery emphasis should be on communication. Since this is not a prose interpretation event, posturing, impersonation, and imitation are to be avoided.

A copy of the script must be filed with the Contest Manager before each contest. Updated copies of the script must be submitted at Subsection, Section, and State levels.

The use of a script is optional, provided it is not used as a prop.

**THE MAXIMUM TIME OF THE PRESENTATION SHALL NOT EXCEED EIGHT (8) MINUTES.
NO GRACE PERIOD IS PROVIDED IN THIS EVENT.**

EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

The Extemporaneous Speech should be an original synthesis of current fact and opinion on a topic drawn by the contestant. Speakers may choose from either U.S. or International topics. The Judge(s) should consider the quality of information presented by the speaker, together with the speaker's use of that information to support the thesis.

The subjects for this event shall be taken from the following magazines and newspapers, with an attempt to balance social, economic, and political issues:

Time St. Paul Pioneer Press

U.S. News & World Report Minneapolis Star Tribune Newsweek

The MSHSL will recommend, each fall, subject areas chosen from these publications.

The MSHSL will provide questions in both U.S. and International areas for each level of MSHSL competition. Questions shall require persuasive rather than informative speeches.

The goal of this activity is the encouragement of extensive reading, understanding of many subjects, and the development of reasoned, supportable positions on issues.

The order of speaking shall be determined by lot. Thirty (30) minutes before the contest begins, the first speaker shall draw three questions. The speaker shall immediately choose one of them and return the other two, which shall then be put with the other questions remaining to be drawn. The questions chosen shall be recorded by the Event Manager. Each of the succeeding speakers shall, at intervals of seven (7) minutes, in turn, follow the same procedure. In the event that the student draws a previously performed question, she/he may draw a substitute question.

In finals at ALL levels of competition, a student may not repeat a question previously chosen at that level of competition. During the thirty (30) minutes of preparation of the speech,

Delete this current language as redundant:

~~the contestant shall have access to magazines and other materials.~~

Students may consult published books, magazines, newspapers and journals and Internet articles downloaded from established news sources, provided:

- A. They are originals or photocopies of whole pages.
- B. Provided those originals or photocopies are uncut.
- C. There is no written material on that original or copy other than highlighting and citation information (such as publication title and date).

D. Topical index may be present.

No other material shall be allowed in the extemp prep room other than stated above. Extemporaneous speeches, handbooks, briefs and outlines shall be barred from the extemp prep room. Outlines and notes created in the prep room during preparation time at the tournament are allowed.

However, students are not permitted the use of computers. After the contestant has drawn a question, the student shall not confer, or have any communication, in any way with a coach or others until the speech has been delivered. A maximum of 50 words of notes shall be allowed each speaker. Any symbol should be considered a word. (Examples of symbols are: \ = therefore; > = greater than; < = less than; ^ = increase; = = equals; v = decrease.)

Each speaker shall present the question drawn to the Room Manager or Judge(s) of the round. Upon completion of the speech, each speaker shall immediately present any notes used to the Room Manager or Judge(s), who will present the same to the Contest Manager.

The Judge(s) shall not be permitted to ask questions of the speakers.

Unless otherwise determined by the Region Committee, the questions are to be furnished by the League Office for:

a. Subsection Contests The questions, U.S. and International, will be furnished to the Contest Manager prior to said contest.

b. Section Contests The questions, U.S. and International will be furnished to the Contest Manager prior to said contest.

The contestant in Extemporaneous Speaking is responsible for: a. Strict adherence to the question drawn. b. Well-chosen information relative to the question drawn. c. Organization of the material. d. Effective delivery.

THE SPEECH SHALL BE EXTEMPORANEOUS AND SHALL NOT EXCEED SEVEN (7) MINUTES IN LENGTH. SPEAKERS WARNED THAT TIME HAS EXPIRED MAY CONCLUDE WITH ONE FINAL SENTENCE. NO GRACE PERIOD IS PROVIDED IN THIS EVENT.

**Spring 2009 Informational Meeting
State Tournament Scoring Committee Report (Revised 4/21/09)**

SUMMARY:

At last fall's CTAM conference a committee was tasked to study state tournament scoring. Statistics are helping understand the prelim-round change from 3 to 4 rooms. There's been 16% more total ties, 44.2% more prelim ties, and 28.8% more students involved in ties. Average prelim scores for finalists are lower and grouped tighter (prelim scores are 17.88% lower, standard deviation is 23.91% lower), which makes overcoming a "bad" prelim rank more difficult. Including prelim-round ranks in the total score, as compared to a finals-round-only score, switches 13.46% of state champions in both the 3 and 4-room formats (no change). Ultimately, the 4-room format has many scheduling advantages, but magnifies some problematic scoring issues such as tiebreak methods and prelim-round room-difficulty (the randomness of "tough" and "easy" rounds). However, the root cause of these issues actually goes back to the 2 and 3-room formats, as well as the overall tournament scoring and "pooling" philosophy (how a pool of competitors is narrowed down to finalists). This committee will likely give an update at September's CTAM conference, and the MSCA membership would vote on any proposals then.

GENERAL UPDATE:

As Speech's state tournament prelim format has evolved from the 2-room, to 3-room, to 4-room format, the scoring system has remained basically the same. *Yet the scoring math, logic, and pooling philosophy are different with each room format.* Some changes were expected, some were unexpected, and some are hard to quantify. Regardless, this committee is discussing what changes, IF ANY, might make a fairer and more logical state scoring system.

The committee's challenges range from practicality to education—many coaches are rules experts and are familiar with scoring logic, but when transferring scoring logic to a unique room format the fundamental math changes (causing logical fallacies). Further complicating matters, our state tournament uses a hybrid scoring system that combines several scoring philosophies. Hybrid cars, good. Hybrid scoring systems, not necessarily good.

It appears the root cause of many issues actually goes back to 2002, when more students advanced to state. The 4-room format has many advantages, but it has also aggravated some issues that began with the 3-room format. Based on analyzing available scores from 1997-2008, numerous statistics help better understand current scoring practices, as well as the evolution of the state tournament's scoring system.

Page 1 of 4

STATISTICS:

The equivalent of 8 years of results, 4,500+ competitors, and 1,600+ finalists were analyzed. When comparing available and relevant data of the 2, 3, and 4-room format, three statistics are interesting—the amount of ties, average finalist scores, and using prelim ranks in the total score. What follows is the simplified data, contact committee members below if you want more details.

TIES:

Ties have increased significantly from the 3-room to 4-room format (16% more total-tie occurrences and 28.8% more students in ties). An increase was expected, but the most notable statistic is the 44.2% increase in prelim ties, which has caused lengthy discussions on whether prelim-round tiebreak methods should be revised. However, when compared to 2-room ties, the 4-room format has 5.5% fewer total students in ties (only a prorated, total students comparison was made given the fewer students and rounds in the 2-room format).

COMPARING 3-ROOM AND 4-ROOM TIES:

- Finals-tie occurrences have increased by 2.3%.
- Prelim-tie occurrences have increased 44.2%.
- Total-tie occurrences have increased 16.0%.
- Total students in tie situations have increased 28.8%.

Note: The difference between total students in ties and total-tie occurrences is due to an increase in ties involving 3-6 competitors, primarily during prelims.

COMPARING WITH 2-ROOM TIES (prorated):

2-room 3-room 4-room

Total students in ties (prorated) 104.25 76.5 98.5

Percentage change from 2-rooms n/a -26.6% -5.5%

AVERAGE FINALIST PRELIM SCORES:

With 4 rooms, average finalist prelim-scores have decreased 17.88% due to awarding more low ranks (four 1s instead of three, etc.). Prelim-score standard deviation also decreased 23.91%. This combination results in a *dramatic* “bell curve” shift and tighter grouping of finalist prelimscores (talk to a math teacher about this).

This is why more prelim ties occur with 4 rooms, but also means it's now more difficult to advance to finals if one gets a “bad” prelim rank. Thus, prelim-round room-difficulty becomes more of an issue. Plus, the “bell curve” shift means getting a 6 prelim rank now is actually worse than getting an 8 prelim rank with the 3-room format.

On a related note, with the available data since 1997, none of 208 state champions received a last-place ranking in either prelims or finals. In this regard, nothing is different between the 2, 3, and 4-room format. Only for 1996 and earlier, when 2-room last-place ranks were no lower than a 5, did state champions overcome a last-place rank in either prelims or finals.

Page 2 of 4

There are many perspectives on this complex subject (whether to “rank out” competitors), and major math ramifications and/or trade-offs with any change.

FINALIST AVERAGES:

3 rooms 4 rooms Difference Percent

Average PRELIM score 7.395 6.073 -1.323 -17.88%

Standard Deviation 2.198 1.673 -.525 -23.91%

Average TOTAL score 20.840 19.370 -1.470 -7.05%

Standard Deviation 6.238 5.983 -.255 -4.09%

RANGE OF FINALIST SCORES:

3 rooms 4 rooms “Shift”

Average prelim-score range 3.00 to 11.79 2.73 to 9.42 -2.37

Average total-score range 8.37 to 33.32 7.41 to 31.34 -1.98

(“Shift” = the change in the high end of the “bell curve” range. This uses two standard deviations, which is 95% of all scores. For three standard deviations, which is 99.7% of all scores, the “shift” is -2.90 for prelim scores and -2.24 for total scores. The 4-room low-range for prelim scores, 2.73, in reality is 3.0)

USING PRELIM RANKS:

Including prelim ranks in the total score is a touchy subject for many! This method obviously creates different results compared to finals-round-only ranks. Adding prelim ranks in the total score is a long-standing tradition, and for draw events and Discussion there is significant merit to this scoring philosophy. However, for the other nine categories, prelim-round room-difficulty is an issue (One question raised was, “Do all 13 categories need the same scoring philosophy?”). “Pooling” logic is how a pool of competitors faces off and is reduced to finalists. “Pooling” is a complex issue for ANY tournament format. With the 2, 3, or 4-room format, competitors cannot face all their competition, and face some competition more than once. Arguably, pooling logic is more problematic with the 4-room format (the Opponents Ranks tiebreak method attempts to address this). To better understand how often prelim ranks effect who the state champion is, hypothetical results were done. *This data is NOT meant to endorse any particular philosophy!* There's been no change between the 3 and 4-room formats, where state champions would hypothetically “switch” 13.46% of the time if only finals-round ranks were used. However, the two years of 4-room data is volatile. Regardless, since 2002 it appears hypothetical “switches” would happen less than in the 2-room format. Of note, draw events and Discussion would NOT “switch” significantly more or less than the other nine categories.

Only state champions were analyzed, but the main issue is whether using prelim ranks in the total score still works with the evolving room format. Including prelim ranks is complicated by examples that both support and refute different views. Addressing this would likely involve major changes (more panel judging, semi-finals, different ranking philosophy, etc.), but not

necessarily changing from 4 rooms (which has scheduling advantages).

HYPOTHETICAL STATE CHAMPION "SWITCHES" IF PRELIM RANKS WERE NOT PART OF THE TOTAL SCORE (for available data):

	2 Rooms 1997-2001 Percent	3 rooms 2002-2006 Percent	4 rooms 2007-2008 Percent
Draws & Disco	4 25.0%	4 12.5%	2 12.5%
Other 9 Categories	7 19.44%	10 13.89%	5 13.89%
Sub-total	11 21.15%	14 13.46%	7 13.46%

TOTAL: 32 out of 208 champions (15.38% average)

Since 1997, a breakdown by category is intriguing. One can speculate on these statistics, but arguably the results have to do with the subjective nature of judging specific categories.

HYPOTHETICAL STATE CHAMPION SWITCHES, BY CATEGORY

Category "Switches"	Category "Switches"
Great Speeches 5 of 16	Extemp Speaking 2 of 16
Humorous 4 of 16	Creative 1 of 16
Original Oratory 4 of 16	Extemp Reading 1 of 16
Storytelling 4 of 16	Informative 1 of 16
Discussion 3 of 16	Prose 1 of 16
Duo 3 of 16	Drama 0 of 16
Poetry 3 of 16	

TOTAL: 32 of 208 state champions (15.38% average)

QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, OR CONCERNS:

Contact any committee member below, or the committee's chair Randy Holland at 612-840-6914, or storyshark-2@yahoo.com.

Section Name and School
 1A John Fogarty, Cannon Falls
 2A Roxy Janke, Fairmont
 3A Shari Nelson, Round Lake-Brewster
 4A Mike Vergin, Mounds Park Academy
 5A Margaret Kitterman, Sauk Centre
 5A Bonnie Spohn, Eden Valley-Watkins
 6A Bob Shaffer, Staples-Motley
 7A Jack Gritzmacher, Eveleth-Gilbert
 8A Stewart Wilson, Walker-Hackensack-Akeley
 8A Sam Gruenberg, East Grand Forks
 1AA Jody Saxton-West, Northfield
 2AA Bob Ihrig, Mankato West

Section Name and School
 3AA Ceil McDonald, South St. Paul
 3AA Cort Sylvester, Rosemount
 3AA Susi Sullivan, Rosemount
 3AA Chris McDonald, Eagan
 3AA Polly Reikowski, Eagan
 4AA Randy Holland, Roseville
 5AA Mark Quinlan, Centennial
 6AA Scott Sieling, Bloomington Jefferson
 7AA Jill Lofald, Duluth Denfeld
 8AA Dale Neuschwander, St. Cloud Tech
 8AA Jody Waltman, Little Falls
 MSHSL Barb Seng, MSHSL

Proposal to Change the Penalty for Rules Violations for Speech

Currently the rules' violation penalty for Speech events reads:

D. Disqualification The committee in charge of the tournament, along with members of the Rules Interpretation Committee, must automatically disqualify any student for violation of any rules including time limits. In the event that a student is disqualified, the Tabulating Committee, upon being notified of the disqualification, will record (1) no ranking number in that round nor (2) total score of said contestant on the score sheet. "DQ" will be written in the appropriate box of competition on the score sheet. Any previous round scores earned by the contestant prior to the violation, shall remain on the score sheet. The Tabulating Committee will adjust the rankings for the other contestants on the specific judge ballot(s) as though the disqualified contestant had never competed.

Proposed change:

In the paragraph above change "Disqualification" to "Penalty for Rules Violations". change "automatically disqualify" (in line 2) to "penalize" and delete the words "including time limits" (lines 2-3).

Insert the following prior to "In the event a student is disqualified".

ANY STUDENT WHO VIOLATES A RULE WILL BE DROPPED TWO RANKINGS ON EACH JUDGE'S BALLOT FOR THAT ROUND. (A STUDENT CANNOT BE DROPPED LOWER THAN THE LOWEST POSSIBLE RANK IN THE ROUND.) THE DROP IN RANK WILL BE COMMUNICATED TO THE TABULATING COMMITTEE BY THE COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF THE TOURNAMENT ALONG WITH MEMBERS OF THE RULES INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE. THE TABULATING COMMITTEE WILL ADJUST THE RANKINGS FOR THE CONTESTANTS ON EACH JUDGE'S BALLOT FOR THAT ROUND. FOR SERIOUS, INTENTIONAL INFRACTIONS THE COMMITTEE MAY CONSIDER DISQUALIFICATION.

The new paragraph would then read as follows:

D. Penalty for Rules Violations The committee in charge of the tournament, along with members of the Rules Interpretation Committee, must penalize any student for violation of any rules. Any student who violates a rule will be dropped two rankings on each judge's ballot for that round. (A student cannot be dropped lower than the lowest possible rank in the round.) The drop in rank will be communicated to the tabulating committee by the committee in charge of the tournament along with members of the rules interpretation committee. The tabulating committee will adjust the rankings for the contestants on each judge's ballot for that round. For serious, intentional infractions the committee may consider disqualification. In the event that a student is disqualified, the Tabulating Committee, upon being notified of the disqualification, will record (1) no ranking number in that round nor (2) total score of said contestant on the score sheet. "DQ" will be written in the appropriate box of competition on the score sheet. Any previous round scores earned by the contestant prior to the violation, shall remain on the score sheet. The Tabulating Committee will adjust the rankings for the other contestants on the specific judge ballot(s) as though the disqualified contestant had never competed.

Rationale

Rules are meant to keep one contestant from gaining an unfair advantage over another. A penalty is meant to ensure that if the rule is not followed, an unfair advantage will not be allowed to the rule breaker; a penalty should take away the unfair advantage. However, a penalty should not be unnecessarily punitive. If a basketball player commits a foul, he is not immediately ejected from the game, but the player he fouls gets to shoot free throws or the fouled player's team gets to keep the ball. The unfair advantage is nullified, but the offending player is allowed to continue.

Certainly, no speaker should gain an unfair advantage by going longer than the time allowed or by purposely cutting sections from extemporaneous reading cuts. Those are good rules, but right now the penalty is too severe. Dropping a speaker two ranks would ensure that any unfair advantage would be nullified.

Disqualification for going overtime or missing a word or two is too harsh a penalty. The harshness of it makes some people hesitant to enforce it. I have heard that a speaker at sections had gone overtime at his/her subsection contest, but was only given a warning. This action, which is very well-intended, demonstrates the fact that if the punishment is too harsh, no one will want to enforce the rule because the punishment goes beyond fairness. We need fair consequence for these fair rules.