



2025 SPRING COACHES CONFERENCE BROPHY COLLEGE PREP | APRIL 19, 2025

A Note about Process: According to the ASDCA Bylaws, the Board of Directors votes on new proposals first, and then if they pass, they are brought before the full coaches caucus for final approval. The proposals on this document were all considered by the board at their March 6 meeting, and you can view the minutes of that meeting [by clicking here](#).

A Proposal to Reform State

Sponsor: Nick Leonardi

Details:

Status Quo (if both proposals fail)

Schools without full AIA membership would be banned from competing at State and the tournament would likely collapse to a single division. Winter Trophy would remain divided by divisions in the same way as it currently is.

Proposal A: D2 ASDCA State

The division split would remain as it currently is, but the D2 State tournament would no longer be affiliated with the AIA. D1 State would continue to be affiliated with the AIA. Winter Trophy would remain divided by divisions in the same way as it currently does.

Proposal B: Division Realignment & D2 ASDCA State

D1 would be for district based public schools regardless of enrollment size, and D2 would become the division for all public charter schools, private schools, and any homeschooled students. D1 State would continue to be affiliated with the AIA and D2 state would be sponsored by the ASDCA. This re-alignment would change the division assignment of less than five schools that competed at 2024 State and would also affect division alignment with regards to Winter Trophy.

Rationale: Effective the 2025-2026 season, the AIA has decided to eliminate the Non-Athletic Membership option, which would in turn prevent several schools who currently participate in the State tournament from doing so in the future. This is in addition to several schools with active programs that are currently ineligible to compete in State. If the new rule goes into effect, the size of D2 state would drop to approximately 50% of the 2025 numbers.

It is in our best interests as educators to provide a pathway for as many students as possible the opportunity to compete at State. The other tournament that is divided by division is Winter Trophy, but because it is run by the ASDCA and not the AIA, we have more flexibility in how we manage it.

ASDCA Board Vote: [Proposal Withdrawn by Author Prior to Voting]

A Proposal to Standardize Accessibility Requirements

Sponsor: Agatha Attridge

Details: This proposal would provide the following alterations to the section "Physically Challenged Competitors" (p. 7) in future editions of the AIA Speech and Debate Tournament Rules Book:

1. Amend the heading "Physically Challenged Competitors" to "Accessibility";
2. Add the following language:

"I. Tournament host sites will provide access to single-occupancy restrooms, as well list on that tournament's invitation where such facilities are located."

Rationale: Summary: we need to standardize single-occupancy restroom access at tournaments. The proposed changes will do that while remaining in compliance with tumultuous state and federal challenges to restroom access.

The Much Longer Version: many tournaments do not provide access to, single-occupancy restrooms for students', judges', and faculty advisors' use, despite the presence of these facilities on the host campus. In the wake of January 29th, 2025's Executive Order titled "Ending Radical Indoctrination In K-12 Schooling" (some legal scholars are referring to it as ERIKS), some members of our community will likely prefer to visit single-occupancy restrooms rather than their standard counterparts. This proposal aims to establish both consistent access to these restrooms as well as inform

community members about where they may be located through the centralized logistics mechanism that is the tournament invitation.

Of course, as I'm sure the Help Desk has learned at every tournament ever held, nobody ever **reads** the tournament invitation, so there are probably additional places the information might be useful; this recommendation is meant to ensconce a bare minimum. Tournament directors in this state are creative enough to discern the sources that students and judges **actually** consult, and adjust accordingly.

While the language of the preexisting section in question does provide voluntary means of requesting and receiving this accommodation (line G), the process of doing so--explaining that request in writing to the tournament--may force students or school employees to disclose information in a manner legally inadvisable under the aforementioned Executive Order. Additionally, placing a positive onus on accommodation has a well-studied chilling effect on whether or not those accommodations are received, especially when students may not know that their request is a possibility (an impact of the difference between "Accessibility" versus "Accommodation"). While some tournaments do provide these accommodations upon request (for those who know who to ask, or to ask at all), the lack of consistent expectations for community members **becomes** the expectation. To be frank, it's an embarrassing question to have to ask, and asking at all may draw attention to topics of conversation no longer germane under ERIKS. I'd prefer that "not drinking any water for two to three days straight" weren't even a considerable option for any of our community members. Lest I seem overdramatic, I invite skeptical members of this body to independently research the harmful impacts of unsafe, inconsistent bathroom access for **specific populations**.

If the wording of this proposal and justification appear vague, that is not by mistake. Whether or not ERIKS remains legally actionable in the near future is largely irrelevant, as future federal/state action hampering equitable restroom access may prove longer lasting. Speaking from experience tweaking bylaws regarding accessibility for other forensics organizations, I strongly advise that any workshopped changes to this wording, or whichever mechanism this body

determines best ensures single-occupancy restroom access, remains similarly broad and untargeted with its wording.

ASDCA Board Vote: Yay: 13 Nay: 0 Abstention: 1

Voting Caucus:

A Proposal to Eliminate Common Debate Topics from Congressional Bills

Sponsor: Heather Hunter

Details: This proposal asks tournament directors to exclude bills or amendments that align with Public Forum (PF) or Lincoln-Douglas (LD) resolutions debated within Arizona in the past 24 months,

Rationale: In the realm of Congressional Debate, the overlap between Public Forum (PF) and Lincoln-Douglas (LD) debate topics has become a notable concern. This overlap often results in an uneven playing field, as PF and LD debaters typically have extensive research files prepared in advance, giving them a distinct advantage over their Congressional Debate counterparts. The proposal to eliminate common debate topics from Congressional bills aims to address this imbalance by ensuring that the topics discussed in Congressional Debate are distinct and not pre-researched by participants in other debate formats.

Moreover, the proposal seeks to mitigate judge fatigue, a common issue when judges are repeatedly exposed to the same arguments and evidence across different debate formats. By diversifying the topics in Congressional Debate, judges are more likely to remain engaged and attentive, leading to more accurate and fair assessments of debaters' performances.

In conclusion, the proposal to eliminate common debate topics from Congressional bills is a strategic move to enhance the fairness and educational quality of Congressional Debate.

ASDCA Board Vote: Yay: 1 Nay: 12 Abstention: 1

A Proposal to Adopt the Updated 2025-2026 AIA/SDAC Rules Manual

Sponsor: Jim Welty

Details: This proposal asks for approval on the [updated 2025-2026 AIA/SDAC Rules Manual](#)

Rationale: The current rules manual is outdated in a number of areas. From the internet rules, to the lack of inclusion for OSWP, to general tournament procedures that are no longer followed, the manual is in need of update in order to ensure that this organization fairly communicates the rules it holds for coaches and students. This update not only attempts to cover a more complete set of expectations for students and coaches, but also includes updated formatting for clearer communication, an AI policy, and policies outlining protest procedures.

ASDCA Board Vote: Yay: 12 Nay: 1 Abstention: 1

Voting Caucus:

A Proposal to Create Rural and/or Native American Teams

Sponsor: Marco Dominguez

Details: This proposal will help with both funding and purpose for the ASDCA Program Support Committee to make a conscious goal to help rural and/or Native American High School create teams and help them with initial travel. The ASDCA can decide the amount of allocated funds, but a stronger push to help with promoting diversity in our community by putting money into this committee to support new teams in these areas. These funds should also include money for a mentor coach to travel to these schools to increase their chance for successful competing.

Rationale: Our community will never be able to support teams in these areas if we do not make a conscious decision to actually go there to help get them started. We will not have these underrepresented communities create teams without our actual in person help.

ASDCA Board Vote: Yay: 0 Nay: 10 Abstention: 1

A Proposal to Formalize the Equity Committee as an Elected ASDCA Committee

Sponsor: Jim Welty

Details: Using the powers granted to it under Article VII under the ASDCA Bylaws, the Board will designate the Equity Committee as an official committee of the ASDCA, continuing to serve in its capacity as the adjudicator of discrimination and harassment concerns at Arizona Tournaments. They will now do so under the following process:

- The equity committee will comprise 4-6 members elected by the whole coaches caucus at the Fall Coaches Conference.
- Members of the committee will serve 2-year terms, and will be elected in a staggered cycle (up to 3 members voted on in odd years, up to 3 members voted on in even years)
- Members of the committee will be called in by Arizona Tournament Directors to address equity issues at the director's discretion.
- Their task will be to meet with affected parties, determine exactly what occurred, and issue a recommendation for action to both the Tournament Director and Coaches of the affected parties. These recommendations should be in line with ASDCA/AIA/NSDA rules of conduct, ethics, and behavior.
- If no more than 2 equity committee members are present at a given tournament, those members can add additional ad hoc members to serve that singular tournament at their discretion.

Rationale: The Equity has served a significant role in the organization for many years now as the primary adjudicating body for harassment and discrimination issues in AZ Speech & Debate. However, the role's lack of structure threatens the sustainability of the committee. Formalizing the committee serves to continue its work, and ensure that it becomes a mainstay of AZ Speech & Debate.

ASDCA Board Vote: Yay: 12 Nay: 0 Abstention: 0

Voting Caucus:

A Proposal to Amend the Bylaws to Add an Executive Director Role

Sponsor: Jim Welty

Details: Added to Article V, the ASDCA Bylaws will be amended to read the following:

5.11 Executive Director

The Executive Director shall be appointed by and serve at the discretion of the Board of Directors. The Executive Director shall act in an advisory capacity to the Board, attending meetings and providing insight on organizational operations, strategic initiatives, and other matters as directed by the Board. However, the Executive Director shall not have voting rights on Board decisions. The Executive Director shall oversee the day-to-day business operations of the organization, ensuring alignment with its mission, policies, and strategic goals. They shall be responsible for implementing Board directives and representing the organization in external affairs as appropriate. The Executive Director shall perform all other duties incidental to the role or as properly assigned by the Board of Directors.

Rationale: As the organization grows, it takes on more responsibilities, and therefore more is demanded of the organization's leadership. The executive director role would help delegate responsibilities for those outside of the affairs of tournaments, and therefore expand organizational capacity in external outreach, fundraising, and day-to-day business operations.

ASDCA Board Vote: Yay: 11 Nay: 0 Abstention: 1

Voting Caucus:

A Proposal to Add Cross-Ex to the Final Round of Extemp

Sponsor: Meg Howell-Haymaker

Details: We should adopt the NSDA rules for implementing cross-examination in the final round of Extemporaneous Speaking.

Rationale: It is an important skill that expands the skills learned, sets better extempers apart from other extempers, and is great practice for the Qualifier and Nationals.

ASDCA Board Vote: Yay: 11 Nay: 0 Abstention: 1

Voting Caucus: