

IPDA National Convention

Papers and Presentations: 10am – 11:30 am – Sunday, April 14, 2019

Skip Rutledge - Point Loma Nazarene University: “I’m a Debate Judge, Jim, not a Policy Maker.”

BusEd 222 - Abstract: The article begins with establishing criteria for constructing good judging paradigms, and then reifies the notion that primarily debate should be focused clash on a resolution, whereby the critic determines *which team best meets its burden of representing their side of the resolution in a given round*. There is admittedly a need in limited instances for parametrizing the resolution (for example with bi-directional resolutions to check affirmative abuse) to help focus that clash rather than invite unproductive counter-warrant wars or advocacy shifts. The current predominant “policy maker” judging paradigm, as some interpret or apply it within the parliamentary debate community at least as represented by NPDA, NDT and CEDA debate, as it relates to topical counterplans, is too constraining and ultimately could be harmful to the broader educational merits of debate. The article argues against continued blind adherence to the artificial restraints imposed by this narrowly interpreted version of the policy-making paradigm for judges regarding topical counterplans in parliamentary debate. Such a paradigmatic interpretation that promotes topical counterplans impairs substantive debate on the critical resolutive issues and invites less educational squabbling and nit picking over minor implementation issues.

Rylee Walter and Dr. Michael Ingram - Whitworth University, Spokane, WA: “Using Non-Advancing Competitors as Judges in IPDA Elimination Rounds”

BusEd 113 - Abstract: Tournaments of the International Public Debate Association frequently use student competitors who do not advance to elimination rounds as judges in the same tournament. There is a dearth of research on this practice and little formal academic discussion on the advantages, disadvantages and desirability of using such judges. This essay examines relevant literature on the practice, details a 2018 survey of IPDA competitors and coaches on five research questions, discusses implications and offers recommendations for further study. The essay raises serious concerns about the continued practice of using such judges.

Dr. Anthony McMullen – University of Central Arkansas: “Thoughts on the Use of Evidence in IPDA from a Legal Perspective.”

Bus Ed 104 - Abstract: IPDA debaters often misrepresent how judges should weigh evidence in a typical round. First, IPDA debaters sometimes insist on proof beyond a reasonable doubt. This standard is rarely appropriate anywhere outside of a criminal trial. Rather, the appropriate standard, and one that should be embraced by IPDA debaters, is preponderance of the evidence. Debaters may fear this standard because it requires the use of evidence, but those fears would be alleviated by taking a much broader view of what constitutes “evidence.” In addition, IPDA debaters should refrain from conflating the terms “evidence,” “sources,” and “citations.” This paper examines these three issues through the lens of the law.

Hannah Morris – Bossier Parish Community College: “Team IPDA and the Need for Professional Representation”

Bus Ed 105 - The research found in “Team IPDA and the Need for Professional Representation” focuses on the background of the International Public Debate Association and the many values that provide the foundation of the organization. The first value that the IPDA focuses on within its constitution is that of inclusivity; the research provided in this study makes this value the center of the question of why this change would be necessary. In order for the IPDA to continue on its path of growth and development, inclusivity should be at the forefront. Topics to be covered: IPDA history of divisions, TIPDA stats, Inclusion and Mea Culpa examples, Mentor Division.