### 61st Annual Franklin R. Shirley Classic at Wake Forest University – 2017 Tournament Invitation

Intercollegiate policy debate programs are invited to enter two teams in the 2017 Franklin R. Shirley Classic, November 11-13, 2017, hosted by Wake Forest University.

**We look forward to welcoming everyone back and to those joining us for the first time. Some features:**

1) Friendly and efficient.

2) Hospitality. SNACK TENTS!!! Slow-pour coffee. There will be multiple. Delivery available to judges.

3) Gary Larson run tabroom.

4) Meals. We will be providing lunch and dinner on Saturday and Sunday. For breakfast on Saturday and Sunday, we will provide slow pour coffee, Krispy Kremes, oatmeal, yogurt, fresh fruit, and granola bars. The hotel also includes hot breakfast for those who would like it.

5)Graduate Student OPEN HOUSE: Friday night at the Hawthorne Inn from 7-10pm. Any graduate program that would like to participate should email Jarrod at [Jarrod.atchson@gmail.com](mailto:Jarrod.atchson@gmail.com) to reserve a table. This is a fantastic chance for anyone thinking about graduate school to meet with people from across the community.

6) Poker – if sufficient interest and lead volunteer come forward, we will again have the Vince Binder Charity Poker Tournament benefiting the Vince Binder Scholarship Fund.

**Placement Strategies**

1 - Very few additional prelim rounds – No extra rounds, no one is left out. Expect to judge near your commitment. We plan on having 12 “emergency” rounds. We will do our best to try to maximize “in-it” debates for everyone.

2 - Large panels for as long as the pool allows.

3 – $50/round for quarters, semis and finals – All judges are obligated through the Octos. For judges that are black and/or non-cis male who volunteer, are placed, and judge you will receive $50/round. Volunteer does not guarantee placement.

**Judge Preference Adjustment System**

We will use the same judge assignment system as last year.

Categories– judges will be placed into one of four categories 1 – black, non-cis male 2 – non-black, non-cis male 3 – black cis male 4 – non-black cis male.

Assignment - Individuals may choose to self-identify; if they do not, the tournament will do so for them. . GO HERE: <https://goo.gl/forms/iz9G2BIj4elzt6Pb2>

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.

You can read about the results of last year’s procedure here: http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php/topic,7017.0.html

Gary’s thorough “FAQ” from last year is also at the bottom of this invite.

**A few words about HB2 – the North Carolina bathroom law**

The central message of Wake Forest is “Pro Humanitate” roughly translated as for the good of humanity.  In recent years, Wake Forest has been ahead of the curve on HB2 by making sure that we have a robust LGBT center and a strong commitment from the university to protect students from measures like HB2. The Wake Forest Administration has issued an [official statement](http://news.wfu.edu/2016/03/25/media-advisory-wfu-statement-on-recent-nc-legislation/) that staunchly opposes the measure which includes the line "Wake Forest underscores its commitment to creating an inclusive environment for all members of the University community as well as visitors to our campus.” The faculty Senate overwhelmingly passed a [resolution](http://news.wfu.edu/2016/04/11/media-advisory-wake-forest-university-faculty-adopt-resolution-against-hb2/) opposing the law. The President of the university has written [editorials](http://www.charlotteobserver.com/opinion/op-ed/article74171157.html) in opposition to the bill. Finally, a number of Wake Students, including debaters, stood in solidarity on chapel steps and attended other rallies.

The good news in terms of the Shirley is that HB2 does not apply to Wake Forest because we are a private institution. The law only applies to government owned buildings.

We will continue to publish a list of gender neutral restrooms on campus. We are also preparing a list of restaurants and businesses that we know are friendly establishments for the LGBT community. The law is restricted to government buildings and we cannot think of a reason why someone would need to go to a public building during the Shirley. Private business owners cannot "enforce" the law because it doesn't apply in any private setting.

We appreciate the concern for everyone's coaches and debaters; let us know if there is anything more we can do.

**STRUCTURAL ABLEISM:**

We want to thank all of those who worked with Wake Forest understand what we can do to make the Shirley experience better.

1 – Please notify us directly and not just on Tabroom if you have an attendee who needs limited room movement.

2 – Don’t hesitate to let us know what else we can do to make the experience better for any of the debaters involved. We are not perfect, but we are actively listening in order to improve.

3 – We will post information about the location of our quiet room and gender neutral restrooms as the tournament approaches. We will continue to use the first floor of Carswell for those debaters who need limited room movement. We are investigating multiple options at the moment for coaches who are in need of limited movement.

**SCOUTING:**

We will do it; we will share what we have. We cannot be everywhere. We think shared scouting produces better debates and rewards hard work. Two very strong requests:

1 – Report on yourself – prior to the tournament, we very strongly encourage full-texts of 1ac and subsequent 2ac’s. Major 1nc positions should be up.

2 – Report on the rounds you judge and debate in – the wiki was created not so that people would report on themselves, but when you debated a team and they falsely disclosed the 1ac, you could go online and write a note to the community explaining how the other team plans to win the debate.

**AUDIO and VIDEO RECORDING:**

All rounds (defined as the speeches and judge critiques) are open to the public under invitation from Wake Forest and may be electronically recorded as per North Carolina Law. We strongly recommend any recordings be accessible to those competing/judging if asked.

**FEES:**

Tournament fees are $75 per person (debaters, coaches, judges, scouts). We can accept credit cards for registration fees.

Any drops after November 9th will still require schools pay the per person fee.

**JUDGING COMMITMENT:**

- Each school must provide 4 rounds of prelim judging for each of their teams.

- Every judge should post their philosophy on tabroom.com and enter conflicts.

- All judges are obligated through the octofinals.

- The tournament reserves the right to approve a school's hired judge not part of their staff/alumni network.  Our aim is to ensure that all hired judges have collegiate CEDA/NDT experience judging and/or debating at the Varsity level.

 - All coaches must make themselves available to judge at least 1 preliminary debate and will be on the pref sheet.  Anyone wishing to apply for an exemption to this rule should simply notify the tournament 1 week prior.  Possible reasons for exemption include: health, family-care, unique travel situations, etc.

**JUDGING PROCEDURES:**

- Prelim rounds must be decided within two hours and thirty minutes of the posted start time of the debate. The tab room will flip a coin to determine the winner when the judge cannot decide in time. Elim rounds must be decided within two hours and forty five minutes of the posted/announced start time of the debate. The tab room will flip a coin to determine the winner when the judge(s) cannot decide in time.

- Judges must vote for one and only one team in each debate and must assign speaker points and ranks in prelim rounds.

- Fifteen minutes will be allocated to post round discussion of the decision, but we must ask that the post-round cease 15 minutes after the decision deadline so debaters can move on to their next debate with adequate and fair time.

- Coaches who communicate with a judge in an attempt to influence the decision before a decision is rendered may be removed from the tournament.

- Clipping/Ethics Challenges – The tournament will defer to the judges in determining ethics/clipping challenges. It is not our intention to review. We will provide the Council of Tournament Directors recommendations if needed. The definition of clipping is to be determined by each judge. Our advice to debaters: be clear, mark your cards, convince through persuasion, and it will in all likelihood be a-ok.

**JUDGE CONSRAINTS:**

Judges should initiate constraints to remove perspectives of bias. Teams should only initiate constraints when the judge has overlooked one constraints listed below. A judge should constrain themselves from seeing a debater if they:

* Debated on the same squad at the same time as the debater
* Had a coach-debater relationship
* Coached at the school a debater attends within the past 2 years
* Had/have a romantic relationship
* Spent significant time teaching lab together at summer workshops
* Engaged in direct harassment based upon CEDA’s definition of harassment.
* Familial/long-term relationship amongst coaches
* Clarification: Judge beliefs about debate pedagogy are not grounds for a constraint.

If large numbers of constraints are used, follow-up is likely on the part of the tabroom.

**TOURNAMENT HOTEL: Hawthorne Inn & Conference Center**  
420 High St SW, Winston-Salem, NC 27101 (336) 777-3000  
You may use www.hawthorneinn.com. Go to “Reserve Online” link…Enter your arrival/departure dates and your group code 26R6AH .Your reservation will automatically be calculated at your discounted group rate of $109.00 a night plus taxes. Individual reservation cancellations must be made no later than 72 hours in advance to avoid charges. Includes wireless internet and parking.

Overflow Hotel within walking distance:

**Historic Brookstown Inn**: 200 Brookstown Ave, Winston-Salem, NC 27101. Rate is also 109.00 plus taxes. Group code is WFSR17. Please call to make a reservation: (336-725-1120)

**SPEAKER POINTS:**

A 30 point scale with tenths, no ties will be used. Judges giving below a 26 will be asked to provide justifications.

**ELIMS**: Top 32 teams clear on basis of wins, adjusted points, total points, opp wins, twice adjusted points, ranks, random number. Brackets broken in elims. Side equalization procedure used for elims.

**IN CASE:**

Topic: the 2017-2018 CEDA resolution,

Time limits: 9-3-6, 10 minutes prep 

**HOSPITALITY:**

Coffee, doughnuts, yogurt, and fruit for breakfast under the tent. Lunch & dinner on Saturday and Sunday. Coach of the Year award Friday night, plus the usual Survivors Party™ on Monday night after the conclusion of the final round. We will have an awards assembly either Sunday evening or Monday after doubles.

**CONDUCT:**

All participants debate at the invitation of Wake Forest University according to its tournament rules as well as any rules of their sponsoring institutions. We abide by all rules and norms of CEDA and the AFA, including but not limited to CEDA's sexual harassment policy.

Looking forward to hosting you all in November,

The Wake Forest Coaching Staff

**2017 Franklin R. Shirley Classic Tentative Schedule**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Friday** | **November 10** |
| 7:00 – 9:30 PM | Registration – Hawthorne Inn – online available, also can take money and shake hands |
| 7:00 – 10:00 PM | Opening Reception. Desserts, Coffee, and Graduate School Open House at Hawthorne Inn |
|  |  |
| **Saturday** | **November 11** |
| 7:15 AM | Pairings for Rounds 1 & 2 |
| 8:00 AM | Round 1 Start |
| 10:30 AM | Round 1 Decision Deadline |
| 10:30 AM | Lunch served on campus |
| 11:15 AM | Round 2 Start |
| 1:45 PM | Round 2 Decision Deadline |
| 2:15 PM | Round 3 Pairings |
| 3:00 PM | Round 3 Start |
| 5:30 PM | Round 3 Decision Deadline |
| 5:30 PM | Dinner served on campus |
| 6:15 PM | Round 4 Pairings |
| 7:00 PM | Round 4 Start |
| 9:30 PM | Round 4 Decision Deadline |
|  |  |
| **Sunday** | **November 12** |
| 7:00 AM | Round 5 Pairings |
| 7:45 AM | Round 5 Start |
| 10:15 AM | Round 5 Decision Deadline |
| 10:30 AM | Lunch served on campus |
| 10:45 AM | Round 6 Pairings |
| 11:30 AM | Round 6 Start |
| 2:00 PM | Round 6 Decision Deadline |
| 2:15 PM | Round 7 Pairing |
| 3:00 PM | Round 7 Start |
| 5:30 PM | Round 7 Decision Deadline |
| 5:30 PM | Dinner served on campus **| Coach of the Year Award Presentation |** |
| 6:15 PM | Round 8 Pairing |
| 7:00 PM | Round 8 Start |
| 9:30 PM | Round 8 Decision Deadline |
| ASAP | Tab releases full bracket and pairing for doubles |
|  |  |
| **Monday** | **November 13** |
| 7:00 AM | Tabroom Flips Coin for Side Equalization |
| 8:00 AM | Doubles Start |
| 10:45 AM | Doubles Decision Deadline |
| 11:00 AM | Doubles Postround Ends |
| 11:00 AM | Awards Ceremony |
| 11:45 AM | Octas Start |
| 2:30 PM | Octas Decision Deadline Elims will proceed with a 2:45 decision deadline, 15 min max decision explanation time, and 30 min prep time from the end of decision time to the beginning of the next elim round. |

**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 prefe rred 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.