DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 407 CS 508 184

AUTHOR	Hunt, Steven B.; Inch, Edward S.
TITLE	The Top Fifty Forensics Programs in the U.S.: A Twenty Year Retrospective.
PUB DATE	Feb 93
NOTE	26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western States Communication Association (64th, Albuquerque, NM, February 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Debate; Educational Research; Financial Support; Higher Education; Longitudinal Studies; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Cross Examination Debate Association; National Debate Tournament

ABSTRACT

A study examined the competitive, financial, and programmatic characteristics of the top 50 forensics programs in the United States. Surveys were sent in 1978, 1983, 1987, and 1992 to the programs that met this definition. Criteria for identification of the "top" 50 differed slightly for each survey (based on different measures of competitive success), and more than 50 programs were sent questionnaires in each of the four surveys. Response rates were high for each survey: 49 schools responded in 1978, 51 in 1983, 57 in 1987, and 45 in 1992. Results indicated that 13 schools have remained solidly among the top programs in all 4 surveys, and 26 schools appeared on 3 of the 4 surveys. Factors that make a difference in a program's success include: a fine director of forensics, a favorable geographic location, a quality school, a great tradition, staff, squad size and participation, scholarships, and budget. Results also indicated that: (1) almost 50% of the top 50 schools turned over every 5 years; (2) the definition for success among the top 50 programs shifted away from National Debate Tournament debate and toward Cross Examination Debate Association debate and individual events; (3) top 50 programs generally have a staff of 1 or 2 people and about 30 active members; (4) top 50 budgets have increased from an average of $10,980 in 1974 to an average of $34,700 in 1992; and (5) most budgets come primarily from administrative sources. (Ten tables of data are included.) (RS)

THE TOP FIFTY FORENSICS PROGRAMS IN THE U.S.: A TWENTY YEAR RETROSPECTIVE

by

Steven B. Hunt, Lewis & Clark College

Edward S. Inch, Pacific Lutheran University

THE TOP FIFTY FORENSICS PROGRAMS IN THE U.S: A TWENTY YEAR RETROSPECTIVE

What are the top forensics programs in the U.S.? Do these programs change over time? What makes one program great while another is mediocre and still another below par? Success obviously distinguishes a great forensics program but what is success? Is success solely determined by excellence in competition or is success better measured by contributions to campus and community or better still by educational values taught students? The quality of a school overall certainly makes a difference in attracting quality debaters and individual speakers. Geographic location and tradition can make a difference. The leadership of a fine director of forensics certainly is a very important factor in program success. Many factors make a difference and they are most difficult to ferret out. Many are philosophic and must remain speculative, but some are pragmatic and a survey of program characteristics in terms of staffing, squad size and composition, tournament attendance, scholarships, forensics organization membership, and budget and budget sources could reveal some quantitative characteristics of top forensics programs. This study was designed to discover the competitive, financial, and programatic characteristics of the top fifty programs in the hope of isolating the dominant variables that distinguish the outstanding forensic traditions from the lesser programs.

I. METHOD

Our task was first to identify the top fifty programs in the United States and then survey each program for its vital characteristics. Selecting which programs belonged in the Top-50 is a difficult task and depends on the measures one selects to use. We selected the Top-50 on the basis of cumulative performance in the five years preceding the survey. Therefore, the four surveys sent represent a total of 20 years of program histories. Programs may be successful for many different reasons and often it is difficult to compare programs that excel in debate and those that excel in individual events. However, for each of the surveys the programs were selected using the following factors.

The 1978 programs were chosen on the basis of National Debate Tournament (NDT) participation and success, Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) participation and success, National Forensic Association (NFA) participation and success, and national sweepstakes results as determined by Jack Howe's *Intercollegiate Forensics Results*. The 1983 programs were chosen on the basis of the same criteria, adding success in the American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament (NIET) to the list. The 1983 choices were somewhat hampered because the *Intercollegiate Forensics Results* had not been accurately maintained or published between 1981-1983. The 1987 programs were chosen on the basis of participation and success in NDT, CEDA, NIET, NFA, *Pi Kappa Delta* (PKD), *Phi Rho Pi* (PRP), or *Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha* (DSR-TKA) nationals, and from the results of the *Intercollegiate Forensics Tournament Results Book*. The 1992 programs were selected similarly. Programs were evaluated for their participation and success at NDT, CEDA, NIET, NFA, PKD, PRP, or DSR-TKA nationals, and from the results of the *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results* book.

Although ISTR sweepstakes placement was weighted heavily, the authors believe that it overvalues individual events and sweepstakes placement. We weighed debate more heavily than ISTR. We especially valued success at the National Debate Tournament and Cross Examination Debate Association annual sweepstakes points.

The surveys were sent in 1978, 1983, 1987, and 1992 and the results have been analyzed for both dominant characteristics and important trends. Actually "top fifty" is somewhat a misnomer

since more than fifty schools were surveyed in each of the four surveys. Table 1 shows which programs were included on the survey for each of the four surveys:

TABLE 1: THE TOP FIFTY 1978 - 1992

School	1978	1983	1987	1992
I. 20 Years of Great Forensic Tradition				
Ball State University				
Bradley University				
Dartmouth College				
Eastern Michigan University				
George Mason University				
Macalester College				
Mankato State University				
United States Air Force Academy				
University of Alabama				
University of California Los Angeles				
University of Kansas				
University of Kentucky				
University of Redlands				
II. Fifteen Years of Excellence				
Arizona State University				
Baylor University				
Biola University				
Bowling Green State University				
Brigham Young University				
Emory University				
Emporia State University				
Georgetown University				
Gonzaga University				
Harvard University				
Lewis & Clark College				
Loyola Marymount University				
Northwestern University				
Ohio State University				
Southern Illinois University				
Southern Utah University				
Southwest Baptist College				
Southwest Missouri State University				
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill				
University of Nebraska Lincoln				
University of Oregon				
University of Southern California				
Wake Forest University				
William Jewell College				
III. Ten Years of Success				
California State University Long Beach				

California State University Northridge				
Concordia College				
Cornell University				
Eastern Illinois University				
Florida State University				
Kansas State University				
Illinois State University				
Miami University of Ohio				
Moorpark College				
North Dakota State University				
Northern Arizona University				
Orange Coast College				
Pacific Lutheran University				
Samford University				
San Diego State University				
San Francisco State University				
Southwest Missouri State University				
University of Arizona				
University of California Berkeley				
University of Central Oklahoma				
University of Michigan				
University of Pittsburgh				
University of the Pacific				
University of Utah				
University of Wisconsin Eau Claire				
University of Wisconsin Madison				
University of Wyoming				
Wayne State University				
Weber State College				
Western Washington University				
Wheaton College				
Whitman College				

IV Five Years Coming and Going

Anchorage Community College				
Augustana College of South Dakota				
Bethel College				
California State University Chico				
California State University Fullerton				
California State University Los Angeles				
Carroll College				
Claremont College				
Clarion State University				
College of DuPage				
College of Eastern Utah				
College of Wooster				
Colorado College				
Emerson College				

Harding College				
Hastings College				
Humboldt State University				
Miami of Florida				
Middle Tennessee State University				
Moorhead State University				
Northern Illinois University				
Oakland University				
Palomar College				
Rice University				
Santa Ana College				
Seton Hall University				
Southwestern College				
St. John's Jamaica				
St. Olaf College				
Stetson University				
Suffolk University				
University of Florida				
University of Colorado				
University of Georgia				
University of Houston				
University of Illinois				
University of Iowa				
University of Louisville				
University of Massachusetts				
University of Mississippi				
University of Missouri Kansas City				
University of Northern Iowa				
University of San Francisco				
University of Santa Clara				
University of Southern Colorado				
University of Tennessee				
University of Texas Arlington				
University of Texas Austin				
University of Wisconsin La Crosse				
Vanderbilt University				
West Georgia College				

The director of forensics at each selected program was sent a rather extensive questionnaire. The first section of the questionnaire concerned the nature of the program staff. Specifically, questions focused on the characteristics of the director of forensics, the characteristics of assistance available to the director, compensation and release time for the director and others who assisted in the program, and how forensics counted toward tenure and/or promotion. The second section focused on the squad. How large was the squad and in what did they participate? Did squad members get scholarships and/or academic credit or both? What kinds of forensics organizations was the squad a part of? The third part of the survey asked about competitive success in sweepstakes, individual events, and debate. And, finally, the fourth part of the questionnaire asked about budget.

The response rate was high for each of the four surveys. 49 schools responded to the 1978 survey. 51 answered the 1983 questionnaire. 57 returned the 1987 survey and 45 responded to the 1992 survey.

II. THE TOP FIFTY: AN OVERVIEW

Over the past twenty years, 121 different schools have appeared in the Top-50. Of these, thirteen schools have remained solidly among the top programs in all four surveys. Another 26 schools have appeared on three of the four surveys. This means that three-fourths of the top programs are consistent performers that remain strong year after year. 31 of the top 50 programs remained the same from 1987 to 1992 with 10 others just below top 50 status in 1992 that were on the 1987 list.

Not surprisingly, the most consistent programs seem to have consistent direction. Eleven directors have remained in charge of top fifty programs during at least three of the four surveys. These people include Bob Derryberry of Southwest Baptist, Steve Hunt of Lewis & Clark, Al Louden of Wake Forest, Bill Southworth of Redlands, Melissa Wade of Emory, David Frank of Oregon, J.W. Patterson of Kentucky, Todd Lewis of Biola, Scott Nobles of Macalester (just retired), Jay Busse of Loyola Marymount, and Bill Balthrup of the University of North Carolina (just retired). Nineteen Directors of Forensics from the Top-50 remain the same from 1987 to 1992. Five have gone on to become department chairs, 3 have gone into law and 4 have switched programs but are still active in forensics.

A. Success of Top Fifty

Since competitive success was used to identify the top fifty programs in each of the survey periods, it comes as no shock that the top fifty programs are very successful. Table 2 shows the relative success of the top programs during the last twenty years. Because the questionnaire has changed over the years, some of the data from the 1992 survey provided additional information. The 1992 questionnaire contained the following inquiries: How often was the school in the top 50 according to the ISTR, how often in the top 10, how many times had the school earned a Superior sweepstakes award at PKD, DSR-TKA, or PRP, how many teams had the school sent to the NDT and how many of those teams participated in octafinals, how often was the school in the top 25 of the NDT ranking system, how many teams had the school sent to CEDA nationals, how many of those teams were in double-octafinals, how many years was the school in CEDA's top 25, how many AFA-NIET slots had the school earned over five years, how many of those slots went to quarterfinals and finals, how many times did the school win an AFA-NIET top 10 sweepstakes, how many slots had the school, qualified for at NFA, how many of those slots broke to quarterfinals and finals, and how often was the school a top 10 finisher at NFA nationals.

TABLE 2: PROGRAM SUCCESS

Description	1978	1983	1987	1992
ISTR Top 50			49	144
ISTR Top 10	94		29	102
Superior Award				56
Teams at NDT	176	158	131	94
NDT Octafinals	55	56	55	50
NDT Top 25				55
Teams at CEDA				237

CEDA Double Octas			44	110
CEDA top 25	29	51	76	67
AFA-NIET Slots		577	1265	1916
AFA Quarterfinals				339
AFA Finalists				133
AFA Top 10		30		45
NFA Slots	534	418	1961	3183
NFA Quarterfinals				409
NFA Finalists	57			140
NFA Top 10		20		40

In 1978 the 49 responding schools had qualified 176 teams to the National Debate Tournament in the last five years. 65 of those teams had made the octafinals or better at the National Debate Tournament out of a possible 80 such slots. The directors of forensics at the 49 schools claimed that their schools had been in the top 10 schools for schools of their size 94 times in the last five years according to Jack Howe's *Intercollegiate Forensics Results*. These same directors claimed that their schools were in the top 3 schools for schools of their size a collective 49 times in the last five years in the same publication. These same 49 schools qualified 534 people or slots to NFA individual events nationals. There was some confusion in responding as to whether the question asked for the number of people qualifying or the number of slots qualified in. Representatives of the 49 schools took 1st, 2nd, or 3rd at NFA individual events nationals 57 times out of approximately 150 chances for 1st, 2nd, or 3rd at NFA nationals from 1974-1978. Finally, these schools collectively won 29 mentions in CEDA debate's top 10 of the 50 possible slots from 1974-1978.

In 1983 the responding 51 schools had qualified 158 teams to the National Debate Tournament in the last five years. 56 of those teams had made the octafinals or better at the National Debate Tournament of the 80 possible such slots. The 51 programs had qualified 577 people or for 577 slots at the National Individual Events Tournament; the same confusion as to people or slots once again applied. The directors of forensics at the 51 answering programs stated that collectively their programs had gleaned 30 of the 50 possible top 10 finishes at the NIET in the previous five years. The 51 forensics programs had qualified 418 people or slots for NFA individual events nationals and had nailed down 20 of the possible 50 top 10 finishes at that tournament over the previous five years. Demonstrating that memories can fail or that exaggeration prevails in forensics as well as in other areas of life, the 51 responding squads claim 51 of the possible top 50 finishes in CEDA debate's cumulative sweepstakes for 1978-1982. Responses to questions concerning *Intercollegiate Forensics Results* top ten success had to be discarded because of the inaccuracy of that publication and/or no results for 1981-1983.

The 1987 results showed continuing success for the responding 57 schools. The involved programs qualified 131 teams to the National Debate Tournament out of approximately 300 slots available in 1983-1987. The responding programs had 55 teams make the octafinals or better at the National Debate Tournament 1983-1987. It is a matter of public record that a mere seven schools qualified over sixty teams to go to the NDT 1983-1987 and that five of these schools accounted for thirty five octafinalists or better during these years. The power in NDT debate is very much concentrated seemingly at Dartmouth, Northwestern, Kansas, Baylor, Emory, University of Southern California, and a few others. In CEDA debate the replying 57 schools accounted for 76 of the 100 top CEDA sweepstakes slots of the last five years. These schools also supposedly had 44 of the 32 possible octafinalists or better at the first two CEDA National Tournaments. This confused result

may also be the product of dim memories and a bit of bragging, but more pragmatically is probably the result of a system that goes to triple octafinals. Many directors were probably counting their teams who broke to triple octas or double octas rather than just those who made octafinals or better at CEDA Nationals 1986 and 1987. The directors of forensics at the 57 responding schools claimed in round terms to have qualified 553 people for about 1,265 slots at the NIET in the last five years and to have qualified 658 people in 1,961 slots to NFA in 1983-1987. In individual events too the power seemed concentrated Bradley and George Mason, nonrespondents, had lots of people in lots of slots. Among respondents Mankato St, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Southern Utah, and Whitman College had lots of people in lots of slots at the NIET. At NFA individual events nationals the numbers were even more incredible. Illinois State claimed about 120 participants in 500 or so slots over five years. Eastern Michigan claimed 150 participants in 500 or so slots over the same period. Mankato State asserted it had about 60 participants in 200 slots for the same time period. 8-10 very large individual events programs entered 500 people in about 2,000 slots at NFA Nationals 1983-1987. These schools included: Ball St. University, Bowling Green, Eastern Michigan, Illinois State, Mankato State, Miami of Ohio, Ohio St. University, Suffolk University, and the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. A few times the schools only qualified the people. They did not attend due to budget constraints but most of the above mentioned schools qualified and sent their participants. In the National Sweepstakes ratings published in *Intercollegiate Forensics Tournament Results* the 57 respondents claimed 49 of 60 possible top 20 finishes for the past three years and claimed to have been in the top ten for schools of their size 29 out of a possible 30 times. These results may be a bit exaggerated as some said they had not received the results and were merely guessing as to their finish or proclaiming as true what they had merely heard unofficially from others on the forensics grapevine.

The accuracy of the 1992 results are probably similar to those of previous surveys. Some schools responded that they could not remember clearly and offered estimates of number of slots qualified for the AFA and NFA national tournaments. Similarly, some schools overestimated the number of times they were listed in the top 10 of the ISTR: out of 50 available slots, the responding schools claimed to be mentioned 102 times. We believe this is probably a case of schools counting themselves as being in the top 10 for their size as opposed to the overall best 10.

However, the data does yield several interesting results. Clearly, the top fifty schools received significant sweepstakes recognition. They were ranked as top 50 in the ISTR 144 times in five years and earned superior sweepstakes rankings 56 times in the honorary fraternity national sweepstakes. NDT participation continued to decline, down to 94 teams from 131 in 1987. Yet, while the number of teams diminished, the top fifty schools remained powerful in NDT with 50 of their teams--more than half--participating in the octafinal rounds. The strength in NDT remains with schools such as Dartmouth, University of Michigan, Georgetown, Harvard, Northern Iowa, Iowa, Redlands, Wake Forest, Kentucky, and Emory. In CEDA, the top fifty schools entered 237 teams into the national tournament and nearly half of them, 110, garnered places in the elimination rounds. The top schools were also recognized in the CEDA rankings of the top 25 programs a total of 67 times out of a possible 100. For the past five years the top CEDA schools included: Macalester, Kansas State, Southern Illinois, UCLA, Gonzaga, University of Central Oklahoma, UMKC, and William Jewell.

The biggest single change between the 1987 and 1992 survey, however, is in individual events. In 1987, the top schools qualified a total of 3,226 slots at the AFA-NIET and the NFA National Tournament. In 1992, this figure jumped markedly to 5,099 total slots. Of these slots, the top schools managed to get 748 slots into the elimination rounds. Further, the top schools received top 10 placement in AFA and NFA sweepstakes a total of 45 and 40 times respectively. In other words, the top fifty schools seem to dominate individual events by taking 85 of 100 top sweepstakes places. The top individual events schools included: Eastern Michigan, Bradley, Arizona State, George Mason, College of DuPage, and Hastings.

A few trends should be noted in the composition of the ever shifting top fifty forensics schools from 1977-1992. First, there is a definite shift from NDT to CEDA and individual events. NDT power seems to be based mainly in the Midwest, East, and South. CEDA power was based mostly in the West but is shifting toward the Midwest. Individual events strength is mainly in the Midwest and East. Junior colleges represent a very small portion of top fifty programs. There were 2-3 such programs in 1977-78, none in 1983, and two in 1987, and 4 in 1992. Private schools represented 16-18 schools in 1977 in the top fifty but moved up to 20-23 such places in 1983 and held about that many positions again in 1987 and 1992. Small private colleges seem to compete well with major universities, at least in forensics, as 6-8 small colleges were represented in the top fifty for 1977 and 10-12 were represented in 1983 through 1992

B. Staffing

The first set of questions in each survey concerned the staffing for the forensics program. The results of all four surveys show a great deal of diversity. Some programs have a single director of forensics doing everything and other programs have many people who share the work load. Table 3 illustrates how program staffing has changed in the last 20 years. It shows the number of top 50 programs with co-directors, the amount of release time given to the director and the number of graduate/law assistants in the program. Note that the first number represents to number of programs and the second number represents the percentage of responding programs.

TABLE 3: STAFFING PROFILE

Description	1978	1983	1987	1992
Programs with co-director	26/53%	26/51%	36/63%	36/80%
No release time	6/12%	7/14%	8/14%	4/9%
1/4 release time	8/16%	5/10%	4/7%	1/2%
1/3 release time	8/16%	10/20%	8/14%	4/9%
1/2 release time	10/20%	7/14%	7/12%	7/16%
1 class release	10/20%	12/24%	15/26%	9/20%
Extra compensation	5/10%	2/4%	4/7%	3/7%
Graduate/Law Assistants	31/63%	24/47%	31/54%	33/73%

In the 1978 survey there were about a dozen programs with but a single director of forensics. The preponderant majority of programs had 2-3 people working on a forensics staff with a director of forensics and some combination of other staff members and/or graduate or law school assistants. A very few programs had more than 3-4 people working with forensics. In most instances the director of forensics was responsible for the administration of the program which meant planning, budgeting, decision making, public relations, record keeping, and miscellaneous paperwork. If there were more people working with the program, other duties were usually divided. Frequently debate was separated from individual events and sometimes the competitive program was separated from on campus demonstrations and speakers' bureaus. Graduate or law assistants were almost always mostly involved with direct coaching and travel.

Only 3-5 directors of forensics reported getting extra compensation for directing, but almost all had release time of some sort. One class per quarter or semester was a frequently mentioned amount of release but 1/4, 1/3, and 1/2 were also frequently mentioned amounts. Released time was

expressed in many ways as for example, one class off per quarter or semester, 25 percent released time, or one third released time, or four semester hours released time, etc. Assistance from other faculty was listed as quite minimal--mainly help with on campus tournaments and travel to one to two tournaments per year if that. The average number of people working with "top fifty" programs to include staff and graduate assistants was 2.7 in 1977. The vast majority of programs had two to three people working with their program. Four or five large graduate schools had a staff of six or more.

Things had not changed very much with regards to staffing by 1983. A dozen or so programs had only a director of forensics. Most programs had two or three people working with forensics. Only nine programs had more than five people on a staff working with forensics and all were schools with graduate programs and graduate assistants. The director of forensics still was primarily responsible for administration. There were more options in 1983 on how to split responsibilities as many programs were doing some mix of NDT and/or CEDA debate, individual events, speakers' bureaus, and on campus and community demonstrations. Sometimes people specialized on the staff vis these various events but many times everybody did a little bit of everything. Some directors of forensics stated that they traveled and coached less than others on their staff to balance out their administrative duties but many said they traveled even more than their graduate assistants. One-fourth to one third release time or one class per term were still by far the most common amounts of released time and almost no one got extra compensation as the director of forensics. Three or four directors, however, were listed as administrators rather than faculty at their schools and got administrative contracts, sometimes for more than nine months, instead of faculty contracts. The amount of assistance from non-forensics faculty remained minimal. Help with local tournaments, judging, and one to two trips a year seems the average maximum directors can cajole from nondesignated faculty however much these professionals may value forensics education in the abstract. The average staff size in 1983 had crept up to 2.99 with 2 or 3 person staffs still the most common. Again, there were around a dozen single person staff programs and only nine or ten with more than five working with the forensics program as part of their direct educational responsibilities.

In 1987 more programs tended to have a co-director or associate/assistant director among the top fifty forensics programs. The number of single director programs was down to eight or nine programs. The director of forensics still served as administrator-decision maker in all programs sometimes sharing these responsibilities with a colleague but most frequently doing this work on her or his own. The rest of the staff either chipped in and shared all responsibilities or more frequently assisted by specializing in some aspect of the program. Many programs, perhaps most, split debate coaching responsibilities from individual speaking coaching responsibilities. Some programs split oral interpretation and readers theatre from the other individual events coaching. Usually, the larger the staff, the more specialization there was. Release time was still the method whereby most directors of forensics and their colleagues were compensated for their time spent on forensics teaching, coaching, and administration. Most directors got 1 class per term or one fourth or one third or one half of their time released for forensics.

The number of programs with graduate assistants or law assistants outnumbered the number of programs without about three to two. Those programs without graduate assistants almost always had a second or third professional working with the director of forensics except for those eight or nine single person programs mentioned earlier. Two to three person staff programs were still by far the most frequent and the average staff size was up to 3. The amount of assistance received from non-designated forensics faculty remained just about the same as in the 1977 and 1983 surveys.

In 1983 ninety percent plus responded that tenure criteria for forensics people were no different than for other faculty at their college or university. This percentage had gone down to about seventy five percent in 1987. In 1983 ten to twelve directors of forensics were on administrative contracts, or renewable term contracts, or non-tenure contracts. This number had increased slightly in 1987 to thirteen or fourteen. At those schools having different promotion or tenure standards in 1983, the directors stated that forensics was weighted heavily into teaching

excellence or into professional service and that publication expectations were slightly lowered. The number of schools having modified tenure/promotion standards doubled to about fifteen in 1987. Modifications included counting coaching in teaching and/or professional service and/or reducing publication expectations once again.

At a few schools coaching was counted as the equivalent of creative work. In one instance a collective bargaining agreement defined the duties of the director of forensics and 65% of the job was to be forensics and 65% of the evaluation had to be on criteria relevant to that job description. In 1983 thirteen directors claimed that a forensics person would have difficulty with tenure or promotion at their school while twenty two said this was not the case. In 1987 the numbers were fifteen directors claiming that they or colleagues in forensics would have difficulty with tenure or promotion at their institution while twenty three said this would not be the case. Those stating a problem said forensics professionals would have difficulty meeting the publication standards at their schools.

By 1992 only 2 of the top fifty programs directors said they worked alone and hence were individually responsible for their programs. 36 had a co-director or assistant director. Most also had graduate teaching assistants or law school assistants. The average staff had just over 4 people with the most common staff sizes being 2 or 3 people. There were 4 staffs of 4, three staffs of 5, 6 staffs of 6, and 6 staffs of 7. Three staffs had more than 7 people. The director of forensics was most frequently a speech communications person though one education doctorate and 7 JD's were serving as directors of forensics. 18 Directors held a PhD while 15 had an MA in some aspect of speech communication. There was 1 MA of Education, 2 MFA's, 1 MA in English, 2 ABD's, 1 EDD, 7 JD's, and 1 BS who was a person serving in an interim one year position. The people from speech mentioned many specialties but the following interests were mentioned most frequently: 13 focused on public address, 12 on communications theory, 10 on rhetoric or rhetorical theory, 9 on law or communications and the law, and 5 on organizational communication. A scattering of other specialties were mentioned: 4 said their work was primarily in interpersonal and 4 mentioned oral interpretation, 3 said argumentation or argumentation theory, 2 focused on political communication, and 2 on small group, and 1 each mentioned intercultural, speech education, and persuasion.

Three quarters of the respondents (32) who were directors of forensics were tenured or on tenure track contracts. 12 directors were on renewable term contracts. Several directors had relatively unique contracts: 2 were tenured to the university outside of any department, 2 held administrative contracts, and 2 were contracted through the dean of students or student affairs. 35 of the directors appeared to be white males and 10 directors seem to be white females. To the authors' knowledge, no directors, as defined by the U.S. government, were members of minority groups.

Almost all the associate/assistant directors of forensics did not hold PhDs and almost all were on term contracts, frequently adjunct faculty or instructor or lecturer contracts. Only 7 associate/assistant situations appeared to be tenure track options. Most often staff duties are not formally subdivided except that the director of forensics appears to do most of the administration in terms of the paperwork, hiring, budget matters and reporting. Frequently, there is a staff split functionally into those doing debate and those doing individual events teaching, directing, and coaching on those squads doing both debate and individual events which are the preponderant majority.

The director of forensics most frequently gets 3 semester hours or 1 class per semester release time though a few get 1/2 release time. In 7 cases, due to some kind of special appointment or contract, release time is irrelevant as forensics is the job for the director of forensics. There are so many different situations for graduate teaching assistant vis release time, compensation, and responsibilities that nothing generalizable can be said about their situations except that most share in squad coaching, travel, and judging responsibilities for which they get some kind of release, official recognition, or compensation from their institutions.

In 1992, the directors who responded said that for the most part there was no difference in tenure requirements than with other faculty. Five directors had administrative contracts, 6 renewable

term contracts and were not in tenure consideration. 4 of the respondents reported problems for directors of forensics getting tenure but nothing is being done about is vis special standards. One person said that there were problems for the director and associates in getting tenure and said that the position was now a renewable term contract instead of tenure track for that very reason.

Many, however, said that the standards are not different, but forensics does get special consideration. For example, 4 said that forensics counts as part teaching and creative activity. 3 said that forensics especially counts as university or college service. Several responded that they must work very hard. 6-7 must write and publish to be considered for tenure and promotion. 2-3 received tenure on the basis of service and teaching but the times have changed and now directors must write and publish.

Overall, the data yield some important trends. First, almost all of the top fifty schools have more than one person directing the program. Eighty percent of the top programs in 1992 were co-directed. That is a significant increase over 63% in 1987 and 53% and 51% in 1978 and 1983 respectively. Furthermore, 32 programs have assistants and almost every program has at least one other person who participates in coaching the program. A second significant trend is the provision of release time for the director of forensics. In 1978, 6 programs claimed to have no released time and this number remained relatively constant through 1987 when 8 programs claimed to have no release. Yet, in 1992, the number has dropped to 4 which suggests that more schools are recognizing the time commitment involves in directing the forensic program. Most directors receive 1/2 time or 1 class release per semester.

C. Squad Demographics

This section of the paper examines squad size and composition. Table 4 shows the number of participants each program had overall, in debate, in individual events, and in CEDA and NDT debate. Each of the responding squads were asked to identify their "core" membership. Core members were defined as those students who participated in more than five debate tournaments (>5 NDT or >5 CEDA) and/or who participated in more than five IE tournaments in more than two events (>5 IE Tourn. and >2 IEs/Tourn.). Some programs, in addition to CEDA and NDT, listed other forms of debate such as Lincoln-Douglas or Parliamentary, however, these are extremely small levels of participation in all the surveys.

TABLE 4: SQUAD DEMOGRAPHICS

Description	1978	1983	1987	1992
Average size	35	31	31	31
Size range	12-100	10-65	8-102	8-100
Average debaters	19	17	16	18
>5 NDT Tourn.	14	12	9	10
>5 CEDA Tourn.			12	13
Average IEers	22	15	N/A	21
>5 IE Tourn.	13	14	15	16
>2 IEs/Tourn.				19
Conflicts/Tourn.				17
Pentathelon				6
NDT programs	45/92%	33/65%	22/39%	17/38%
CEDA programs	11/22%	35/69%	37/65%	29/64%

IE programs	40/82%	42/82%	45/79%	35/78%
Tournaments Attended	27	23	20	21

In 1977 the average top fifty squad had 35 active participants. The range went from twelve to one hundred plus. The most frequent squad size was somewhere between twenty and thirty-five students strong. In 1983 the range in squad size for the top fifty forensics programs went from ten to sixty five plus with thirty-one the average size down four from the 35 average in 1978. Perhaps this slight decrease was insignificant and due mostly to the decline in gigantic over sixty member squads and perhaps it was economically induced because of the tremendous inflation between 1977 and 1983. In 1987 top fifty squad sizes ranged from eight to one hundred and two. Most squads had ten to forty active members with the average size at between thirty one and thirty two. By 1992, while the range or participants remained relatively constant at 8-100, the average number of participants dropped again to 30.

One top fifty program in 1978 had no debate and attained its ranking solely on the basis of individual events. Two programs were primarily CEDA oriented as far as debate was concerned. Nine programs had a mix of CEDA and NDT debate. Thirty-six programs were primarily NDT oriented or had only NDT debate. Nine programs had no individual events participation or infrequent individual events participation. Most squads had 10-20 students debating during the year though the overall average was 19. The average attending five or more tournaments in debate went down to 14 and the more common core debate squad was 8-16 members strong. The average top fifty squad in 1977 had 22 members doing individual events but that figure goes up to 27 when the nine programs with no individual events to speak of are discounted. On average 13 of these individual events participants went to five or more tournaments during the year or 16 again discounting the nine programs without significant individual events participation. The range in debate went from 4 to 75. The range in individual events was from 6 to 75 with 18-30 being the most frequently claimed individual events squad size.

In 1983 three squads had no debate or no debate to mention and were in essence individual events squads only. This was an increase of two from 1977. Fifteen squads did CEDA debate or in essence only CEDA values debate. Thirteen squads on the top fifty list only debated NDT policy debate. The rest of the programs had a mix of NDT and CEDA. These figures show a considerable increase for CEDA among the top fifty programs between 1977 and 1983. The top fifty programs averaged 17 debaters or 18 if one disregards the 3 programs with no debate. Only five squads claimed more than 30 debaters. These squads averaged 12 debaters going to more than 5 tournaments in a given year. Nine said they had less than 10 active debaters in a given year. Ten program directors in the top fifty claimed to have no individual events programs or in essence no individual events competition. This was about the same as in 1977. Ten squads simultaneously claimed to have more than 30 students regularly entering oratory, extemp, expository, impromptu, oral interpretation of various kinds, et al. The range was from 3-50 plus other than those squads with no individual events students. The average squad had 15 individual events entrants or 19 if one disregards those squads with no individual events program. An average of 14 of these students attended more than 5 tournaments for those squads that had individual events programs.

In 1987 three top fifty programs are individual events only though a fourth barely dabbles in debate. Fourteen squads are primarily NDT debate oriented. Twenty nine squads mainly do CEDA debate. Only about eight top fifty squads are attempting still to mix both NDT and CEDA debate in any serious fashion. The range of debate participation other than the three non-participants goes from 2 to 50. The average top fifty program has 16 active debaters. Among NDT programs 9 debaters tended to go to five tournaments or more per year in 1987. Among CEDA programs 12 debaters tended to go to five tournaments or more per year in 1987. Ten programs claimed to have

no individual events or in essence no individual events competition in 1987. Two more squads only had a very few individual events participants. The rest of the top fifty had five or more students entering individual events on a regular basis. In fact, twenty squads had more than 15 students entering individual events at more than five tournaments per year. Six squads even had ten or more students entering pentathalon though 27 top fifty squads had no pentathalon entrants.

In 1992, 6 programs participated primarily in individual events which is up from 1987. 6 squads are primarily NDT although 17 participate in it. The numbers for NDT are down considerably over the last five years and fewer of the top fifty remain as active as they once were in the NDT. 5 programs participate in CEDA only. The range of debate participation for schools that did debate was between 2 and 27 and the average number of debaters in a top 50 program was 13. These numbers are significantly less than in the 1987 survey. The average debaters in a program dipped by three in the last five years. Most of the top 50 programs, however, enter individual events on a regular basis. Individual events participants in programs ranged from 2 to 50 members and the average program had 21 individual events speakers. Only 6 programs participate in individual events only, but individual events constitute a significant component of most other programs. 4 programs are active in NDT and Individual Events, 16 programs do both CEDA and IEs, and 8 programs do all three. The size of the core group of squad members, however, remained relatively stable in 1992. On average 10 NDT debaters and 13 CEDA debaters traveled to more than five tournaments each years which is up only one competitor from the previous survey. Similarly, the core group of individual events competitors was up one over the previous survey at 16. These figures seems to suggest that the number of core debaters in a program has dropped from 1978-1983 but seem to have stabilized during the past 10 years. Similarly, the number of individual events competitors has consistently grown during each of the survey periods.

In all these figures it is interesting to note some trends. First and most obvious, there is a tremendous shift in the top fifty forensics programs from squads doing primarily NDT debate and some individual events to squads doing CEDA and quite a bit of individual events. Squad size went down from 1977 to 1983 but has more or less plateaued from 1983-1992. There may even have been some growth in participation, however most change is merely a shift from NDT to CEDA and IE's with individual events becoming the largest single component in any of the surveyed schools. The number of debate only programs has remained about the same. The number of individual events only programs has grown. The preponderant majority of top fifty programs have always and still do a mix of debate and individual events. Most top fifty programs had at least ten squad members. In every case the number of participants greatly outnumbered the active core squad members who attended five or more tournaments in debate, individual events, or in both debate and individual events. But top fifty "core" members usually ranged from 8 to 30.

In 1977 the average top fifty forensics program attended 27 tournaments with a range running from 10 to 50 plus. Most went to 18 to 35 tournaments with only 8 programs in the top fifty going to less than 20 and only 7 attending more than 35 in a single year. In 1983 the average top fifty program attended 23 tournaments with the range running from 8-40 plus. Twenty two squads attended 10-20 tournaments per year. Only four squads claimed to regularly have attended more than 30 competitions per year. Tournament attendance was definitely down for the top fifty whether because of fewer tournaments, more focus on a few larger tournaments, financial exigencies, or whatever between 1977 and 1983. In 1987 the average top fifty squad attended between 19 and 20 tournaments per year. Attendance seemed to be distributed fairly evenly between debate only, individual events only, and mixed tournaments. In 1992, the average top program attended 21 tournaments and the range ran from 10 to 40.

Tables 5-8 that follow provide a more detailed assessment of squad size and participation patterns.

TABLE 5: SQUAD SIZE

Size	1978	1983	1987	1992
5-10	0/0%	0/0%	2/4%	2/4%
11-15	2/4%	12/24%	9/16%	7/16%
16-20	9/18%	4/8%	10/18%	7/16%
21-25	8/16%	5/10%	5/9%	6/13%
26-30	5/10%	3/6%	3/5%	2/4%
31-35	4/8%	4/8%	7/12%	6/13%
36-40	5/10%	4/8%	7/12%	3/7%
41-45	0/0%	3/6%	0/0%	2/4%
46-50	3/6%	3/6%	3/5%	1/2%
51-55	3/6%	1/2%	4/7%	0/0%
56-60	6/12%	2/4%	1/2%	2/4%
61+	3/6%	4/8%	5/9%	2/4%

In 1978, the largest program had 120 members. In 1987, the largest was 102 and in 1992 the largest had 100. The following three tables examine the distribution of debaters in the top 50 programs. However, for the most part, the average squad size has remained constant over the past twenty years. While several squads are huge and some are relatively small, most seem to have between 15 and 25 members.

For the 1992 survey, squad size ranged from 7-100. Most expressed squad size not as a single number but as a range like 20-25, however the average squad size for 1992 was 22-30, but 32 was the average of all the numbers given. The average CEDA squad size was 17-19 with a range of 6-50. The vast majority of programs had between 10-20 debaters with a core squad of 13-15 debaters. The average NDT squad size is slightly smaller than the CEDA size with 12 to 13 members and a range of 2 to 30. Core squad members attending more than 5 NDT tournaments is 10-11 debaters. The average IE squad size is 26-29, slightly distorted upward by one huge squad of 130 participants. Without this distortion the average IE squad size would be between 23-26. Average core squad size for individual events was 20-22 and without the distortion, the core would be between 16 and 18.

Table 6 provides a detail of the number of debaters who participate in the Top-50 programs:

TABLE 6: TOTAL DEBATERS

Size	1978	1983	1987	1992
0	1/2%	2/4%	3/5%	6/13%
1-5	1/2%	2/4%	4/7%	1/2%
6-10	8/16%	17/33%	15/26%	6/13%
11-15	10/20%	9/18%	13/23%	14/31%
16-20	16/33%	5/10%	9/16%	12/27%
21-25	5/10%	8/16%	4/7%	3/7%
26-30	3/6%	7/14%	4/7%	1/2%
31-39	3/6%	1/2%	1/2%	0/0%
40-49	3/6%	0/0%	1/2%	0/0%
50	1/2%	1/2%	2/4%	0/0%
55	1/2%	0/0%	0/0%	1/2%
60	0/0	0/0%	0/0%	1/2%

75	1/2%	1/2%	0/0%	0/0%

Most programs seems to support between 6 and 25 debaters. However, the total number of debaters participating seems to be in decline during the twenty year survey period. In 1978, the majority of programs travelled between 6 and 20 debaters and one third of the programs had between 16 and 20 active debaters. In 1983, the number dropped. While the majority of programs travelled between 6 and 20 debaters, one third of the programs had only 6-10 debaters, down signficiantly from the previous survey. In 1983, the majority of programs had only 6 to 15 debaters with 26% of the top fifty with only 6-10 debaters. In 1992, the numbers increased slightly, more than half of the programs have between 11 and 20 debaters with roughly one third of the programs having 11-15 members. The slight increase in 1992 could represent a resurgence in debate but it more likely represents the effects of programs that have decided to do debate only and have concentrated all of their resources and people in one area.

The total number of debaters was further broken down into the number of debaters who participated in NDT and CEDA debate as illustrated in Tables 7 and 8.

TABLE 7: NUMBER OF NDT DEBATERS

Size	1978	1983	1987	1992
1-5	N/A	6/12%	5/9%	2/4%
6-10	N/A	10/20%	11/19%	4/9%
11-15	N/A	8/16%	7/12%	6/13%
16-20	N/A	7/14%	2/4%	2/4%
21-25	N/A	1/2%	3/5%	2/4%
26-30	N/A	2/4%	0/0%	1/2%

TABLE 8: NUMBER OF CEDA DEBATERS

Size	1978	1983	1987	1992
1-5	N/A	7/14%	7/12%	1/2%
6-10	N/A	16/31%	15/26%	6/13%
11-15	N/A	4/8%	11/19%	7/16%
16-20	N/A	5/10%	5/9%	8/18%
21-25	N/A	1/2%	1/2%	1/2%
26-30	N/A	1/2%	1/2%	2/4%
31-35	N/A	0/0%	1/2%	0/0%
36-40	N/A	0/0%	1/2%	0/0%
41-45	N/A	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
46-50	N/A	1/2%	1/2%	1/2%
51-55	N/A	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
56-60	N/A	0/0%	0/0%	1/2%
75	N/A	1/2%	0/0%	0/0%

As illustrated in Table 7, although the total number of programs participating in NDT has diminished, the number of debaters participating in each program has remained relatively stable. Although the number of 6-10 member programs has declined markedly, the number of 11-15 member programs has remained relatively constant. This suggests that smaller programs are deciding against NDT participation and only the programs with a well established core of debaters are electing

to continue to participate. Table 8 suggests that at least some former NDT debaters are moving to CEDA. In the 1983 and 1987 surveys, most programs had between 1 and 10 CEDA debaters. In 1992, only 2% of the Top-50 programs had only 1-5 CEDA debaters. Instead, the majority of programs had between 6 and 20 members which represents a marked increase in the number of CEDA debaters participating in the Top-50 programs.

Table 9 shows Top-50 memberships and affiliations Almost all top fifty squads are members of The American Forensics Association but from there memberships diversify considerably. It does seem that membership in NDT among top fifty squads has gone down just a little and membership in CEDA among top fifty squads has gone up a moderate amount. PKD is losing a small percentage of top fifty programs while DSR-TKA seems to have picked up a bit. Once again to say much more much more specifically would take a more specific questionnaire with more time for analysis. Table 9 shows the relative distribution of top 50 squads by organization.

TABLE 9: FORENSIC ORGANIZATIONS MEMBERSHIP

Organization	1978	1983	1987	1992
AFA	N/A	49/96%	50/88%	39/87%
NIET	N/A	37/73%	33/58%	29/64%
NDT	N/A	39/76%	36/63%	27/60%
CEDA	N/A	39/76%	48/84%	34/76%
NFA	N/A	19/37%	22/39%	22/49%
PKD	N/A	17/33%	15/26%	9/20%
DSR-TKA	N/A	19/37%	29/51%	19/42%
PRP	N/A	0/0%	2/4%	4/9%
Discussion	N/A	4/8%	2/4%	0/0%
Interstate Oratory	N/A	16/31%	19/33%	16/36%
Other	N/A	N/A	33/58%	12/27%

The trend in 1992 is away from large combination programs. Of the Top-50 programs, NDT, or mostly NDT, squads consisted of: George Mason, Georgetown, Harvard, University of Iowa, University of Kentucky, Redlands, and Wake Forest. CEDA, or essentially CEDA, squads in the Top-50 included: Emporia, Gonzaga, Macalester, Southern Illinois, University of Central Oklahoma, UMKC, and William Jewell. IE only, or essentially IE only, squads in the Top-50 were: Bradley, College of DuPage, Eastern Michigan, Hastings, Mankato State, and Seton Hall. Several schools participated in CEDA and IEs. These included: Arizona State, Ball State, Biola, Chico State, Eastern Utah, Cornell, Kansas State, Macalester in the past, Northern Arizona, San Francisco State, Southern Utah, Southwest Baptist, University of Oregon, University of Texas Arlington, and USAFA. Some programs combine NDT with IEs and these included: Concordia, Illinois State, Miami University of Ohio, Moorpark, University of Nebraska, and the University of Northern Iowa. Only Emory did predominantly debate and offered NDT and CEDA. And schools doing NDT, CEDA, and IEs were: Orange Coast, San Diego State, and SMS. This indicates an enormous trend not to be doing NDT, CEDA, and IEs simultaneously. Programs have begun to focus and specialize much more.

Six squads do IE's only, that is about twice as many as in 1987. Six focus on NDT and only 6 more do NDT and IE's. Three more programs have NDT, CEDA, and IEs meaning that 15 squads have an NDT focus which is about the same as in 1987. 7 Squads focus primarily on CEDA and 15 are doing CEDA with IEs. Three squads do NDT, CEDA, and IEs which means that 25 squads have CEDA focus and that is down slightly from 1987 but there were fewer respondents in 1992 than 1987

which could account for the difference. IE participation numbers and events is up among the Top-50 programs. 30 squads of the top programs do IEs seriously. Core IE squads are around 20 members, participation in IEs is up while debate has shifted from NDT to CEDA is fairly flat vis participation and numbers between 1987-1992. The number of squads trying to do both NDT and CEDA and/or NDT, CEDA, and IEs continues to decline to a precious few.

D. Scholarships and Financial Aid

The 1977 questionnaire asked a few questions about forensics scholarships and financial aid. The 1983, 1987, and 1992 questionnaires asked a few more. None of the questionnaires was specific enough to detail the exact source of scholarship monies, the exact amounts, or detailed competitive criteria for the initial award of scholarship monies or their renewal. Most of all, none of the questionnaires asked what total tuition and fees were at the various schools so data could be derived about forensics aid in proportion to total costs. Nonetheless, some generic hints about forensics scholarships and financial aid are revealed in the questionnaires' responses.

Seventeen programs in 1977 claimed to have no scholarship monies for forensics. Thirty two programs had scholarship monies in some form for forensics. Many of the scholarships or tuition waivers were for token amounts. A very few paid full tuition. The usual form of application was by letter or form to the director of forensics. The director of forensics cooperated in some way with the financial aid office to award monies on the basis of need, talent, experience, potential, hard work, etc. A few said grades and/or college boards also counted and a few had an interview process in addition to applications before monies would be awarded. A few scholarships were named and dedicated to forensics. Some were limited to in-state fees. Most forensics scholarships involved some sort of cooperative arrangement between financial aid and forensics with the director of forensics having a great deal of discretion as to how that aid labeled forensics was distributed.

Twenty two programs in 1983 claimed to have no scholarship monies for forensics. Three said they had general college talent grants which frequently went to forensics students but were not specifically designated for forensics. Twenty eight others said they had forensics financial aid in one form or another. It is very difficult from the brief section on scholarships and financial aid in the top fifty questionnaire to tell exactly what people had for sure as this is seemingly one of the more delicate areas of forensics information and some directors were loathe to release complete details. State schools generally have tuition or partial tuition waivers or grants that substitute for tuition or out of state waivers for tuition. Private schools have grants or tuition scholarships. Many of these were for token amounts up to $500. Quite a few private schools had $1000-$2000 talent grants. There were more talent grants than any other category of aid. A few schools, both public and private, had tuition scholarships.

The criteria for these waivers, grants, or scholarships were fairly standard. Talent, as indicated by performance, records, or letters of recommendation seemed to be number one. Need played a big part in the granting of forensics scholarships after talent had been determined. Hard work, involvement, dedication, potential, coachability, etc. also entered into the forensics scholarship decision. Some programs also demanded grades for the initial application or for continuance. A 3.0 GPA was the most common minimum though a few programs let that slip as low as 2.5. A few programs also looked for SAT or ACT test scores or for other indications of general "smarts" as indicated by more than one director. The application process usually involved a letter or form which in a few cases was followed by an interview. There was considerable director of forensics discretion in the granting of forensics aid at most schools, but the director still almost always had to cooperate in some fashion with financial aid as there were very very few endowed forensics scholarships.

In 1987 thirty-nine schools indicated they had some form of financial aid or scholarships for forensics students while eighteen schools indicated that they did not. Obviously the number of

schools granting aid has gone up while those without forensics aid monies has stayed about the same. Once again the types of aid varied significantly. Some programs had a designated pot of money that they could divide however they wished. Some colleges and universities had a set number of scholarships or tuition waivers per year or class, as 10 overall or 3 per class for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, or seniors. Fewer schools had designated debate scholarships and more had more general forensics scholarships. In 1977 and 1983 when scholarships were mentioned they most frequently were debate scholarships. This was still true in 1987 but to a much lesser extent. The application process was still pretty much standard at all schools. The student indicated interest by application through a letter or form and was evaluated by financial aid for need and talent or merit and by the director of forensics for forensics talent or potential. Several schools mentioned that their programs were "part of a larger merit program" at their college or university. Criteria for forensics talent continued to be experience at workshops, tournament records, motivation and interest, and ability to contribute to a squad. Three or four schools indicated that their forensics aid monies came from alumni or other forensics benefactors. A few mentioned grade standards again and a 3.0 G.P.A. once again was most frequent among those schools having grade standards. A few directors responded to the new question about whether it made a difference being at a public vs. a private school. Their responses generally indicated that aid was much more significant at private schools because expenses were greater.

In 1992, of the 45 returns we received, 13 of the top fifty claimed to have no scholarships or tuition waivers. State colleges and universities often have out-of-state tuition waivers and many of the scholarships mentioned were in token amounts of $500, $800, or $1000 a year. Ten of the schools have full tuition waivers or scholarships. Many of the responding programs had only 3-4 scholarships but some have 12, 15, and even 20 grants, tuition waivers, or scholarships.

The application process was most usually a letter to the director of forensics sometimes through admissions offices or committees. Standards for awards were most often high school grades, standardized test scores, and promise of success based on previous participation and success. Sometimes an audition was used. Renewal was based on dedication, hard work, usually a 3.0 GPA, but sometimes as low as a 2.4 GPA was allowed and in the case of one program, merit scholarships required a 3.75.

Scholarship and financial aid efforts actually went down a bit between 1977 and 1983 which surprised the authors. Efforts went up, however, between 1983 and 1992. Many schools added talent or merit awards. Still most top fifty forensics programs only have token merit awards ranging from $100 at some public schools to $500-$2500 dollars at some of the private colleges and universities. A few schools have full ride tuition waivers, some confined to in state students only, some granting only out of state tuition rate waivers. A few schools have full ride scholarships. The number of full ride waivers or scholarships, however, is fairly small compared to the total number of participants at top fifty programs. For fuller information on this topic someone is going to have to ask for details on tuition waivers and scholarships. Public schools need to be separated from private colleges and universities. Most of all a comparison needs to be made between aid and total college or university costs which means getting tuition and fee data at the same time as one gets scholarship and financial aid data. Only such a process would give the forensics community real in depth forensics financial aid and scholarship information.

Meanwhile, this survey of the top fifty programs indicates financial aid and scholarships among top forensics programs are increasing but not at accelerated rates. More schools are giving aid or scholarships but only a few have "full ride" Cadillac programs and some of these are not in the top fifty forensics programs. Anyone seeking causative connections between scholarships and forensics success would have a ways to go because 30% of the top fifty programs had no forensics aid or scholarships at all or mere token amounts.

E. Budgets

Probably the most interesting section for most people will be this section on the budgets of the top fifty national forensics programs. Money talks because money is power. Perhaps what distinguishes the top fifty forensics programs more than anything else is that they have bigger budgets. That, at least, is probably what many people think. They may well be correct but many top fifty programs are getting along on medium sized budgets, particularly considering how many students they serve. Their directors may be justified when they argue that they get more per dollar than some of their peers. Table 10 shows the distribution of budgets across each of the four survey periods.

TABLE 10: TOP 50 BUDGETS

Budget	1978	1983	1987	1992
5,000-10,000	11/22%	7/14%	0/0%	0/0%
10,000-15,000	23/47%	8/16%	4/7%	1/2%
15,000-20,000	10/20%	14/27%	10/18%	5/11%
20,000-25,000	2/4%	8/16%	12/21%	8/18%
25,000-30,000	1/2%	5/10%	10/18%	4/9%
30,000-35,000	1/2%	3/6%	8/14%	7/16%
35,000-40,000	0/0%	1/2%	4/7%	6/13%
40,000-45,000	0/0%	0/0%	2/4%	2/4%
45,000-50,000	0/0%	1/2%	0/0%	2/4%
50,000-55,000	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	2/4%
55,000-60,000	0/0%	0/0%	1/2%	1/2%
60,000-65,000	0/0%	1/2%	0/0%	3/7%%
65,000-70,000	0/0%	0/0%	1/2%	1/2%
70,000-75,000	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	1/2%
75,000-80,000	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	1/2%
92,000	0/0%	0/0%	1/2%	0/0

This table reveals nothing startling--it takes money to succeed and in each survey period the budget climbed with program success. In 1974-75 top fifty budgets ranged from $3,600 to $17,000+ . The average budget was $10,980. The mode for top fifty budgets in 1974-75 was $10,000-$11,000. Eleven programs had less than $7,000 while eleven programs had more than $14,000. In 1977-78 top fifty forensics budgets ranged between $5,000 and $29,000+. The average budget was $13,340. The mode for top fifty programs was $13,000-$14,000. Twenty programs had between $10,000 and $14,000 in their budgets. In 1979-80 forensics budgets at the more successful national programs ran from $2,900 to $48,000. The average budget moved up to $15,390. Twenty five programs had budgets between $5,000 and $12,000. Fifteen programs had budgets between $15,000 and $23,000. In 1983-84 the range of top fifty budgets went from $7,000 to $60,000. The average budget was $20,100. The modal budget was $20,000. Twenty seven programs had between $13,000 and $22,000. Thirteen programs had between $20,000 and $23,000. A second set of figures derived from the 1987 survey for 1983-84 instead of from the 1983 survey came up with slightly different figures. These figures are different because the top fifty schools in 1987 are different from the top fifty schools of 1983 and because different schools responded.

According to the 1987 figures for 1983-84 top fifty budgets ranged from $7,000 to $57,000. The average budget was $18,700. The modal budget was between $19,000 and $20,000. Twenty eight

forensics programs had budgets between $17,000 and $26,000. Only four squads had less than $8,000 and only six were above $30,000. The most pertinent figures for most interested people concern 1987-88. In 1987-88 top fifty budgets range from a low of $10,000 to a high of $92,000. The average budget for travel and services not for scholarships or salaries is $27,200. Thirty eight programs, by far the preponderant majority of top fifty respondents, had budgets between $15,000 and $32,000. Only 3 budgets were below $14,000 and only 6 budgets were above $36,000.

The 1992 survey results showed the average budget increasing once again to $34,893 and had a range of $14,500 to $75,000. This is a significant increase over the previous survey period of approximately $7,000. Twenty programs had budgets ranging from $20,000 to $30,000 as illustrated in Table 10. Only 2 programs had budget below $15,000 and 8 had budgets exceeding $50,000. The standard deviation was 16,301 with a variance of 2.7E+ 0.8. Interestingly, the large standard deviation suggests first that a Top-50 program needs a minimum budget of $18,893 and second--and more importantly--that money is probably not the determining factor of success. Budgets between $18,893 and $51,194 are required for Top-50 success. A likely explanation for the large standard deviation, the authors expect, is that regional travel costs and distances mean that some programs necessarily expend large amounts of money getting to and from tournaments while programs in California and the Mid-West are located close to the majority of their tournaments and can drive instead of fly.

In 1977, 26 programs claimed that all or essentially all of their budgets came from administrative sources, several commenting that they preferred the stability of administrative budgets to the "flightiness" of student allocation and felt justified in administrative funding due to the educational nature of forensics activities. Nonetheless, eight programs got all or essentially all of their budgets from student governments or through a fee per student system. Fourteen programs got some student monies and some administrative monies. There were very very few forensics endowments. Eight programs claimed to get significant monies from their alumni but the questionnaire was not specific enough to pick up how or when they collected such monies. National tournament competition money was often extra and obtained by special request after qualification though sometimes national competition was built into regular budgets.

In 1983 thirty one programs stated that all or essentially all of their budgets came from administrative sources. This was up a bit. Six claimed that all or essentially all of their budgets came from student government. This was down a bit. The other respondents had some sort of mixed system for obtaining their budgets. There were still very very few endowed forensics monies. Many programs still got extra funds for national competition. About the same half dozen plus claim significant alumni funds but these seem to be raised *ad hoc*. Very few got any significant financial breaks in expending their money. Those that did usually had a donated squad van or station wagon. As in 1977, there were not many significant sources of funding outside the administration, students, and/or alumni. A few programs got significant dollars from their summer institutes or through handbook sales. The most common significant fund raiser was running forensics tournaments, particularly high school tournaments on campus. Many programs make from $1,000 to $4,000 annually through their tournaments mostly through a tremendous number of donated hours by forensics staff, students, alumni, and others given to tournament management and judging. Way down the list as a fund raiser but used by a few squads in special instances were food sales: burritos, snacks, candies, bagels, et al. A lot of programs claim significant support from department chairs, deans, vice presidents, provosts, presidents, and/or trustees who are ex debaters or speakers.

The budget situation did not change significantly in terms of sources of funds in 1987-88. Thirty seven respondents in 1987-88 proclaimed that their exclusive budget source was administrative. Six programs got all or almost all of their budgets from students. Ten programs got their budgets from a mix of administrative and student sources. One school's budget uniquely came almost entirely from alumni and current gift funding. Only four schools mentioned significant endowment monies as part of the regular budget. In 1987-88 as was the case in 1977-78 and 1983 forensics had to pay most

mailing and phone costs though in some instances these were shared with or paid by a departmental budget. Most programs got student secretarial work study assistance mostly independently but in some cases shared with their base departments. Most programs in 1987-88 seem to have built nationals competition into their budgets versus getting extra monies once qualified for nationals as only seven or eight programs mentioned getting extra funds for nationals from their deans, presidents, or alumni. Seven to eight schools did mention getting significant alumni funding. Four used this partly for their current expenses as mentioned above. The remaining alumni funds seemed to go for the beginnings of an endowment fund or for student scholarships. This seems to be a burgeoning area of potential for top fifty programs except in those instances where school rules prevent mailings or phonathons to alumni separately from school wide efforts. More research into this area should prove worthwhile for someone. In 1987-88 very few programs got special deals in expending their funds. The most common break was a free van or car or cheap mileage fees. Ten to fifteen programs mentioned getting school vans for twenty to twenty five cents a mile. Finally, almost no one in the 1987 survey mentioned special fund raising efforts. Those that did disparaged such efforts as too much work for too little return. A typical comment stated "we tried jogathons and candy sales but the money raised was seldom worth the effort."

In 1992, 30 programs are 90-100% dependent on administrative funds. However, 5-6 programs are totally dependent on student fees and activity fees and 5-6 more programs are 25% to 75% dependent on student fees. In other words, 10-12 programs of the Top-50 are heavily dependent on student government or student activity fees for the financing. Very few programs have endowments or foundation monies--too few really to count. The advantage claimed with administrative monies is stability and the ability to engage in long term planning. Student monies were most often subject to annual budget justification and the amounts could vary substantially.

Quite a few programs do get alumni contributions, but only a few hundred to a few thousand dollars per year. Several programs make several thousand dollars on high school tournaments or workshops which go to budget. Only 3-5 programs engage in funding raising activities and these activities account for only a few thousand dollars. Pursuing funding raising activities maybe restricted by university rules or perhaps time limitations when forensics already occupies a tremendous amount of time.

After substantial budget increases during the preceding 15 years, the five years leading to 1992 seem to have represented a time to plateau and maintain. While the average budgets for the Top-50 have increased overall, the amount of increase has diminished and a significant number of the top programs have absorbed budget cuts--or believe they will in 1993-94.

However, by and large, the Top-50 programs have been generally successful in maintaining their budgets and keeping ahead of inflation. Most program directors make their budget appeals to their dean, vice-president of academic affairs, or their provost. Most make an annual case for their budget and associated increases and 10-12 schools must appeal to the Dean of Students vis student activity fees or to student council or student allocation boards for student monies.

The appeals for forensics budgeting are both wide ranging and cross the spectrum from the cliché to the ingenious. Most directors start with the educational values of forensics arguing that forensics teaches critical thinking, research skills, self-assurance, case making and refutation, and oral communication presentational skills. Most then make a series of arguments concerning forensics as a recruiting mechanism to get some of the best and brightest students to attend their schools. Many discuss forensics as one of the oldest and most distinguished special education programs for gifted students. Most then proclaim that they have broad based programs with great student participation. In fact, number of students and participation was the most frequently mentioned budget argument. Almost all directors of forensics then discuss competitive excellence. Some discuss excellence in general as an educational objective while others discuss success versus school rivals. Lots of public relations phrases such as a tradition of excellence came into play in budget requests. Publicity and public relations for the college or university via the forensics program was also included in a majority

of budget requests. Several directors said they did regular reports and/or an annual report to assure they were in front of the college community regularly not just at the time for requesting money. Many directors of forensics in requesting budgets mentioned their campus and community service with regards to tournaments, public debates, and esp. with high school demonstrations. Quite a few directors argued the career successes of forensics alumni. Some attached testimonials as proof of their claims. Many directors mentioned the number of tournaments attended, miles traveled, and student successes. Most mentioned inflation and rising travel, lodging, and food costs. Most argued their frugality in getting the most possible per dollar expended. Directors of forensics used the rhetorical "kitchen sink" in their budget appeals. Many commented that they made special efforts throughout the year not just annually at budget request time to sell forensics on their campuses and particularly to key decision makers such as deans, vice presidents, provosts, and presidents.

Several important trends can be seen in this analysis. Budgets have risen from an average of $10,980 in 1974-75 to almost $35,000 which is almost a three-fold increase. Although part of the increase can be attributed to inflation--particularly in travel and housing costs--the average top 50 program had stayed ahead of inflation and ahead of many university budgets. Importantly, the bulk of this increase was achieved up though 1991-92. 1992-93 budgets seem to have flattened out and projected 1993-94 budgets in many instances show a decline. Even so, there are very few budgets below $20,000 in the Top-50. The vast majority of programs have budgets of $15,000-$40,000. One half of the Top-50 budgets are about $30,000 and one third of the top budgets are above $40,000. In 1992 the trend is away from separate monies for national travel and the expectancy for the top programs is that nationals should be built into the program's operating budget.

$35,000 may seem like a lot of money to commit to a co-curricular activities program, but expenditures for forensics shrink to insignificance when compared to sports, music, drama, or even student government on most campuses. $34,700 to send thirty gifted, talented, and hard working students to 21 tournaments per year seems quite a good deal. Forensics remains one of the best programs ever for gifted and talented students as it has been for over one hundred years. Most directors of forensics, in fact, state they have absolutely no difficulty selling almost anyone on the academic and intellectual values of forensics, they just have trouble getting the money to implement this philosophic commitment pragmatically in their program budgets.

III. SUMMARY

What makes for a great forensics squad or at least a top fifty forensics squad as defined in this paper? A fine director of forensics, a favorable geographic location, a quality school, a great tradition, and a number of other intangibles certainly make a distinct difference. For the more than one hundred programs identified in four top fifty surveys in this study, staff, squad size and participation, scholarships, and budgets also seem to make a difference. Only thirteen schools appeared on all four surveys and twenty-four appeared in three of the four. The top fifty programs are fluid, almost fifty percent of the top fifty schools turn over every five years.

The definition for success among top fifty programs has shifted away from NDT debate and toward CEDA debate and individual events. By 1992, individual events constitute the largest single component of the successful program. While NDT remains a central component in several top 50 schools, their numbers have dwindled markedly from 1978 to 1992. Twenty years ago, the top 50 programs sent 176 teams to the NDT, now only 94 teams are sent. NDT has become much more regionalized over the passage of time. There are still 6 programs that emphasize primarily NDT debate, but that is a sharp decline from 14 only five years ago.

Although the number of schools participating in CEDA exceeds NDT, they have begun to decline. Five years ago, 37 programs participated in CEDA debate and 10 years ago 35 programs were active. In 1992, however, only 28 programs claimed to be active in CEDA. Part of this decline

can be attributed to 45 versus 51 survey returns 5 years ago, but nonetheless, a slight decline is evident.

Participation among top fifty schools in individual events is way up. The average number of individual events participants is much higher than 10 years ago. The 1983 survey showed only 15 average participants compared to the 1992 result to 21. Individual events participation was roughly equal between the 1992 and 1978 surveys but individual event success is much higher in 1992 indicating a greater program focus and commitment to individual events participation. For instance, in 1978, the top 50 programs accounted for 534 total individual events slots at the NFA national tournament. In 1983 the number jumped to 418 slots in the NFA and 577 total slots at the AFA-NIET for a total of almost 1,000 slots. Yet, in the 1992 survey, top 50 programs accounted for 3,183 slots at NFA and 1,916 slots at AFA during the last five year period.

A top fifty program generally has a staff of two to three people. There is one director of forensics and often an associate or assistant director. At many schools the co-director or assistant director is a professional colleague perhaps with only an MA and lecturer status, but a professional colleague nonetheless. At many schools with graduate programs a graduate student may be an assistant director. The director of forensics and her/his co-director or assistant usually get 1/2 released time or one class. Graduate students get 1/2 or all of their teaching load allocated to forensics. There is a small rising trend for forensics professionals to get administrative or term contracts but most directors of forensics are still as regular academic on tenure tracks. There seems to be another small trend to modify normal tenure and promotion standards for forensics folks weighting teaching and service a bit more heavily and diminishing slightly in quantity if not quality publication expectations but this question needs more detailed and more thorough research and analysis than was possible in this paper. There is also a disturbing, yet still slight trend, to replace tenure track positions with renewable term contracts.

A top fifty forensics program usually has about thirty active members. Six top 50 squads in 1992 seem to be pretty much exclusively individual events teams--up from 4 five years ago. Eleven top fifty squads in 1992 seem to be pretty much exclusively debate teams with a few more who merely dabble on the side in individual events. The preponderant majority of top fifty forensics squads do both debate and individual events with some people specializing in one or the other but with many doing both. Top fifty squads attend twenty or more tournaments a year generally and sponsor one to four tournaments per year on their own campuses. The most typical pattern seems to be to host one college and one high school tournament per year but some host more and a few less. 13 of the responding schools have no scholarships or tuition waivers, but the remaining majority do. 10 schools offered full tuition waivers although most seemed to have token scholarship awarded on the basis of merit. There seems to be a rising trend toward more schools having some form of forensics financial aid, especially vis merit awards, but details as to forensics financial aid as a proportion of overall school costs and real cross comparisons between schools in this arena awaits for detailed and thorough future analysis.

Top fifty budgets have increased from an average of $10,980 in 1974 to an average of $34,700 in 1992. The majority of schools in the top fifty have budgets ranging from $20,000 to $40,000. There are a very few small budgets among top programs and only two have budgets less than $15,000. Conversely, the number of big budget programs have increased markedly. In 1978, no program claimed to have a budget in excess of $50,000. In 1983, one program made such a claim. In 1987, three programs had budget over $50,000 and one claimed a budget level of $92,000. Yet, in 1992, 8 programs have budgets over $50,000.

Most top fifty budgets come primarily from administrative sources as forensics is considered a co-curricular academic activity at most schools. There has been an upward trend in top fifty programs getting their funding from administrations with 26 getting most of their money in this manner in 1977 but 37 getting most of their money in this manner in 1987. Nationals competition used to be an extra with a special request made at the end of the year for most schools and that is still

the way it is at a few schools but many top fifty programs seem to have built nationals tournament funding into their budgets. Few top fifty schools get any breaks on expenditures except for the usage of school vans or cars and mileage rates at twenty to twenty five cents a mile at a number of colleges and universities. All budget figures are primarily travel figures with some mailing, phoning, and paper and supplies tossed in. Scholarship figures and salary figures would be additional budget costs for most programs. Finally, very few schools participate in fundraising beyond hosting tournaments and some efforts with alumni.

We have attempted to combine the data about the top 50 programs over the twenty years in an effort to discover the dominant characteristics of these programs. Through persistence in following up on questionnaires the data base seems basically good. A few schools did not respond and a few refused information on some things as for example 2-3 schools refusing their budget figures and a few directors just skipping some questions which accounts in places for the discrepancy between total respondents and the exact figures listed in the various tables. Nevertheless the four surveys over twenty years of forensic history seem to present a fairly good retrospective for the "top fifty forensics programs in the U.S." The authors hope that this information is useful to the forensics community and will help top fifty programs to maintain or increase their status and for other programs to join them.