

**NPDA BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES:  
Thursday, November 11, 2004  
Wabash Parlor-Third Floor  
Palmer House Hilton**

**Order of Business**

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes (Spring 2004)

Moved, seconded, and passed

Approval of Agenda and Procedures

Proposal to amend agenda order by grouping

Moved, seconded, and passed

Proposal to limit debate on proposal to 6 Minutes with 1 minute per speaker

**Reports**

President – Sharon Porter

Three major things I did this year...

1) Things that passed and made it through, but not in constitution and bylaws. Join us in a meeting at lunch to go over those issues.

2) Asking individuals to serve: Publications Committee – Ronna Leggett (UN-Reno) Need two individuals for Sexual Harassment Committee. Recommendations are: Tyson Helder (Truman), Becky Kohl (Creighton)

3) Represented NPDA at three conferences at no cost to NPDA: IDEA youth forum (Estonia), Chinese Debate Festival, IDEA/Istanbul Conference

Vice President – Ed Inch, Pacific Lutheran University

Big task: Nominations for VP – to be voted. There will be online voting.

Two nominees from Nominations Committee: Kevin Minch (Truman), Bonnie Stapleton (Colorado College)

Moved from the committee.

Executive Secretary – Renea Gernant, Concordia University

Tournaments coming in... they are slowly coming.

List of tournaments that have posted has been sent to parli and npda-l.

Treasurer – Brent Northup, Carroll College

Brent's report attached. Finance Committee

(Note: The web version will be found at: <http://www.parlidebate.org/2004treasurer.pdf>)

Contingency – Maximum possible expense, but likely to spend less.

Gary Larson – appreciation for running tab program, but did gratis. Professional tab rooms at CEDA, NDT to run -- \$1500 less than some places, but might work. It's in as a contingency line item.

Travel for judges -- \$3000-4000 down to \$1100. i.e., Marcus Paroske, Michelin Massey; as well as tab room. No profit/loss – no automatic officer travel. If they aren't part of their team, then they get to travel. Journal and other bills not paid – should be around \$18000, and should be solvent, even with contingency.

Moved, passed treasurer's report.

National Student Representative – Elizabeth Alquist, UC-Berkeley

Major concerns – mandatory stay in tournament hotel for all teams. This is expensive for teams.

Mandatory banquet – vegetarians, vegans found less than appetizing (chicken dinner minus the chicken). Hotel – reception as opposed to banquet?

Additional concerns about NPDA waive fees for student-run, student-funded groups (perhaps tournaments that are going under). New representative for split district 1 needs to be decided.

*Steve Hunt question: When should this be considered? The contract is based on total fees...*

*Elizabeth response: See item #54.*

*Sharon comment: Under Tom's administration, the Finance Committee can provide assistance to programs; this has not yet been implemented.*

*Elizabeth response: Could make public?*

*Sharon response: This needs to be clarified.*

## Committees

Championship Tournament Committee – Ed Inch, Pacific Lutheran University

Most is in place; TD again Konrad. Host = Ric. Skip = host. Some not completed.

Tournament Director – Konrad Hack, Azusa Pacific University

Konrad not here.

*Steve Hunt question: Will we hire Gary Larson?*

*Answer: Very serious consideration.*

*John Meany comment: CEDA and NPDA are in conflict.*

Tournament Host – Ric Shafer, Texas Tech University

We're excited to have you come – more excited than you are to come!

Banquet is at Civic Center

Hotel is not large enough to have outrounds – will have outrounds at Civic Center

There will be vegetarian options

*Robert question: Civic Center negotiation – does this require banquet?*

*Ric response: Contract doesn't mandate catering done through them. However, conference rooms not paid for – if no banquet, then pay for conference rooms.*

Site and Hosting – Skip Rutledge, Point Loma Nazarene University

*Sharon report: Still need for 2006. Have 1 application – Pacific Lutheran. There would be a limitation on size if at PLU.*

Committee on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment – Lisa Ashby, Concordia University

No written report; response for legal review still being worked on. Voluntary that schools join NPDA; voluntary that students compete. We just coordinate; they don't believe we need a sexual harassment. We don't have a fiduciary relationship. There are a few choices: a) Scrap, since we don't need to; b) If want a political statement, need to be fixed as far as some procedures; currently – only to national tournaments; not all tournaments subject to this. Trying to figure out – get rid of it or fixed?

*Steve Hunt: CEDA has undergone a legal review; should check with them.*

*Lisa response: The legal review has given us a response.*

Finance Committee – Robert Trapp, Willamette University

Defer to Brent. But, on second thought... the three of us have been on for 3 years. It's time to rotate out of the committee – I volunteer first.

Outreach Committee – Kate Shuster, The Claremont Colleges

Reconstituted committee formed. Proposal by membership passed; will work with other members of committee for guidelines. Likely about 1 month. Guidelines by new year; submit proposals; will vote up/down at the spring business meeting. Full of cautious optimism.

Professional Development – Matt Taylor, California State University, Long Beach

Struggling to find agenda. Trying to standardize practices. Our committee name is misleading. Non-directional in terms of what we do. Program Assessment – how do we document what programs are doing? When promotion/tenure concern; no good way of assessing that. Redefine what we're doing beyond our specific charter. Specific issues – let us know. Inactive.

*Steve Hunt: This group could talk about training/judging in cooperation. This group could talk about managing tournaments. Standards for promotion, etc. AFA has standards, but could be tweaked for this group. Updating, making them relevant.*

*Kate Shuster: Formally build bridges with education departments to bring Arg/Deb, public speaking, critical thinking into educational contexts. Particularly, at places with certificates/doctorates... build with professional association for college educators.*

Publication Committee – Renea Gernant, Concordia University

Journal came out. Yeah! Trish needs more information. Discussion about fix/improve webpage. Webpages are example of bad info in → bad info out. If you don't send that to me, then they'll be wrong. Same thing is true as far as tournament information.

Sanctioning form doesn't come in until week before – thus, it doesn't get on the calendar. If you know of tournaments, get permission, do it yourself! If you know something is wrong, send information to me or to Michael. We need that information – especially for student programs. When the information changes, please let us know!

Journal Editor – Trischa Goodnow, Oregon State University

It's done. Yeah. Went over budget for a variety of reasons. Journals sent to anyone who was ever a part of NPDA. Send articles. Please. Almost enough for 2<sup>nd</sup> journal, but need articles.

Webmaster – Michael Dreher, Bethel University

Second what Renea said. In addition, past copies of journals are going online; likely to finish during January 2005. Proposal coming as far as mirror copy of website.

#### Ad Hoc Committees

Committee on Limiting the Size of the National Tournament – Jeremy Grace, Rice University

General opinion = if it isn't broken, don't fix it. Sharon claims, 9/21/04: "Most members would prefer to remain open." But proactive steps should be taken should it be necessary. Answer pro/con questions – if desirable...

Pro – smaller. True perceived national tournament. Hosting earlier/prestigious. Smoother. Education up. i.e., others solve (Novice Nats, PKD...). Entire community to come together.

Con – smaller. Perceived not national. Not prestigious. Complaint smaller programs. Education down. Open door – larger programs not take all teams. NPTE solves for rigorous process.

Potential solutions:

Limit to 4 teams. NPDA qualification – outround at NPDA sanctioned tournament. Deep outround at NPDA sanctioned tournament. Quarterfinal at open; semifinals at JV. Point structure similar to NPTE – top 200 teams in 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> round bid. Hybrid – 1 team plus qualifications.

Data must be collected – what would happen to previous national tournaments? Data could shed important light. Study would be prerequisite. Large tournament hotel/banquet shouldn't be requirement. Is this a deterrent? Size problem or financial problems/rigidity of tradition? Inevitability if community continues to grow.

*Brent comment: Budget implications as far as some of these proposals.*

*Phil Sharp comment: System of cap with lottery for 5<sup>th</sup> team; lottery needs clarification.*

*Kevin Minch response: Admin likes 2-3 months ahead for plane tickets; don't want to tell teams, "Oh, you could have come."*

*Sharon comment: NEED HOST FOR 2006!*

Committee on Taping the Final Round – Michael Dreher, Bethel University

Ric has already selected a potential company for taping the final round.

#### Old Business:

#### Constitutional Proposals

Proposal #4: To establish a representative system for the NPDA and for redistricting.

Proposal #4. a.: Delete Article VII and VIII and replace with a Legislative Assembly made up of NPDA district representatives

*Elizabeth: Economically feasible? 9 districts, 3 representatives – 1 must be student. NPDA willing to fly 9 student reps to meeting? Not fair to have assembly where all students vote by proxy. How finance? Some of problems of redistricting. Districts with few schools get 1 school.*

*Matt response: District takes responsibility to fund. There should be ways to make sure that students get in. Ridiculous that so few people are here at this meeting. Need more people here.*

*Trischa response: 18 people here, 7 gave reports. I have no faith that if require 2 people to be here, will be here. Should be funded, but aren't here.*

*Glen response: Come from scant district. Try to do outreach in region – try to get local. Good idea; but never grow region unless representation from region.*

*Matt response: NDT Exec Council, NIET Exec Council are well attended.*

*Elizabeth response: Rule change – why can't exec council veto by Leg Assembly?*

*Renea response: Hypothetically, some potential for vetos/overrides – could come back. District reps, "We want more responsibility/to be active." This is the way to get responsibility.*

*Steve response: 1 student rep?*

*Elizabeth: NCA to fall on tournament weekend?*

*Michael: No. Only FCC-Jacksonville.*

*Move to extend debate.*

*John question: Special constituency?*

*Sharon: Flexible for district to determine – district 1, 2 for example could designate a CC to be the rep, or a student.*

*John: Not related to NPDA?*

*Renea: Sure, it's up to the district. It could be small/large school rep.*

*Steve: Matt – would explain on section 7? (May veto on 2/3 vote; 2/3 to override) What hypotheticals?*

*Matt: Exec Council may want to overrule, but there should be a process. No specific hypotheticals.*

*Ed: Imagine a case, assembly decides no banquet. Could have budget implications – exec council would have power to overrule.*

*Renea clarify: Leg assembly would then say, "It's worth the \$25K to approve."*

*Matt: Exec council shouldn't be impotent. Should preserve some authority, checks and balance.*

*Marty Birkholt: Concerns for during meeting/tournament – Exec Council may need to act on their own; didn't want that ability to be unchecked.*

*Steve Hunt: Assumed that leg assembly 1 or 2 times per year? What about other meetings? Could act?*

*Matt: Emergency goes to Exec Council, then reviewed during the year. Basic mood: How do we make this meeting and NPDA Business Meeting better?*

*John Meany: Leg Assembly, but may not be democratic. Shifts ability to initiate to districts w/o sufficient/equal representation. With need for outreach – move national championship decision making to areas without foundation? Southern California has stuff because of outreach.*

*Encourage development by having outside of known areas – may be risk. Hosts no longer have parli, etc.*

*Kevin: Redistricting tried to get proportionality. May need to shift periodically – roughly equal numbers.*

*Elizabeth: Future redistricting by Leg. Assembly? People aren't represented have incentive not to do?*

*Brent: Have been on NIET – can be bogged down for years as well. Can go on for decades there...*

*Close discussion.*

*Vote: 9 present + 1 proxy = 10 in favor. 11 present + 6 proxy = 17 against.*

Proposal #4. b. 1.: Revise Article IV. Section 2. and 3. to expand representation and to redistrict the NPDA to be more representative of travel patterns and/or local interconnectedness.

*Becomes irrelevant due to 4a failing.*

Proposal #6: Delete Article IV. Section 3 to eliminate the Two Year Schools Representative.

*Withdrawn for lack of motion.*

## **By-Laws Proposals**

### **Committee Responsibilities**

Proposal #10: Revise By-Law X. B. 3. b. 3. and 4. to eliminate the resource team from the Committee on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment.

Recommended by Tom Kuster, Bethany Lutheran.

*Lisa comment: Group that would be the committee itself; do the policy development and the hearings. The resource team was to be available for informational purposes. Adds a layer of people that aren't being used since we have representatives from across the country on the committee.*

*Moved and seconded. Passed unanimously.*

Proposal #11: Revise By-Law XI. to change the composition of the oversight agent for the Championship Tournament from the Executive Council to the National Championship Tournament Committee as per Constitution, Standing Committee, Section 5.

*Moved and seconded. Passed unanimously.*

### **Financial Proposals**

*Brent notes that we've already adopted most of the Prescott accountability materials; may not need debate on all 18 items here.*

#### General

Proposal #3: Revise By-Law III. to provide a mechanism for the Executive Secretary to submit annual budget requests.

*Moved, second. Unanimous approval.*

Proposal #58: Recommendation that the National Parliamentary Debate Association investigate ways in which The Irish, Eastern European and other international efforts can become self-sustaining and not dependent on NPDA funding.

*John Meany comment: Are dependent on NPDA funding now?*

*Robert: Anything can be put in the budget any year. I am not against this; IDEA wants to expand into the United States. They feel the best way to expand is to cooperate with NPDA. Working with high school organizations as well (i.e., NFL). Don't want to send a signal to IDEA – cooperate, but we won't cooperate.*

*Kevin Baaske: Organization spent \$3,600 for Eastern Europe, \$270 for Irish; these are worthwhile expenses.*

*Marty: Not amendment to bylaws. Just a recommendation. It would go through budget, right? Really does nothing.*

*Brent: Writing letters to SAS as a cosponsor. If they give us 3 tickets – plane goes away. But can't get their attention; PLU has attention.*

*John: IDEA work – agree with Robert. Concern: Not define future based on past. Other programs that we can work with... Might be possible to bring in those who clear at international tournaments. No need to commit to Eastern European. Work with IDEA, international outreach.*

*Ed Inch: Amend to recommend the phrase "The Irish, Eastern European, and other" to be stricken.*

*Moved, seconded. Amendment passed. Original proposal as amended. Passed.*

Tournament specific

Proposal #50: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. b. to require the President and/or Tournament Director to submit a budget for tournament expenses.

*Moved, seconded. Unanimous approval.*

Proposal #53: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. to require the President and/or Tournament Director to submit a budget for tournament expenses.

*Moved, second. Unanimous approval.*

Proposal #52: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. a. to limit tabulation staff expenses to those not normally covered by their schools and allow them to be counted toward their schools judging commitment.

*Moved, second. Unanimous approval.*

Proposal #12: Revise By-Law XI. A. 1. c. to change reimbursement of tournament staff (also applies to all issues involving providing food, lodging, and travel assistance to tournament staff) to use the language of "no net gain/no net loss".

*Phil Sharp moves to group 12, 13, 43, 49, 44, 47, 57, 59.*

*Moved, seconded. Vote to group – passed unanimously.*

*Vote on passing proposals: 12, 13, 43, 49, 44, 47, 57, 59 – passed unanimously.*

Proposal #13: Revise By-Law XI. A. 1. d. to allow tournament staff to count as judges from an entering school.

Proposal #43: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 4. to count the Host as a judge for their school.

Proposal #49: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. a. to limit officers expenses to those not normally covered by their schools but allow them to be counted toward their school's judging commitment.

Proposal #39: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to not pay for parking expenses associated with executive vehicle use or executive rental vehicles.

*Brent comments: Any judge coming into airport, can pick up and redistrict.*

*(Combine with #51). One vehicle available for tournament administration – pickup people. Total cost = \$900.*

*Motion, then withdrawn.*

*Rob Layne: Prescott – Exec Council could get parking paid for.*

*Fails to due lack of motion.*

Proposal #40: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to stipulate that the NPDA should work within the allocated number of comp rooms rather than purchase additional hotel nights. Hired judges and dignitaries should be given priority placement in these rooms with the understanding that the Tournament Host will be given one such room.

*Brent comments: We don't already use all of these rooms now. They're used for people like Gary Larson; if we can't reimburse, this ties hands. I'd rather have it worded as "to reduce or keep within the comp rooms." Could be in situation where Gary gets invited, but there are no comp rooms.*

*Michael moves: Let's adopt Brent's language.*

*Question: Need to decide how comp rooms handed out?*

*Brent: Normally for Gary or import judges.*

*NOT moved; dies.*

Proposal #42: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 3. to allow flexibility regarding holding the banquet and reception.

Proposal #54. Recommendation to allow the Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee the authority to investigate how canceling the banquet and replacing it with a reception would impact the hotel contract.

*Matt moves: Group #42 and #54. Seconded and passed to group.*

*Motion, second. 15 present + 5 proxies = 20 in favor. 0 opposed, 1 absence.*

Proposal #44: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 6. to make the NPDA responsible for typical administrative expenses.

Proposal #47: Revise By-Law XIII. B. to provide for a mechanism for paying unexpected expenses at the Championship Tournament.

Proposal #48: Eliminate By-Law XIII. B. 1 Topic Committee expenses.

*Brent comments: If you're on topic committee; new rules should reduce, but not put at required zero. If meal together, should have expenses paid for.*

*Fails due to lack of motion.*

Proposal #51: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. c. to eliminate providing a rental van for administrative staff.

*Fails due to lack of motion.*

*Sharon believes: There are two vans.*

*Renea believes: There is one van.*

*Sharon believes: If fail both, no vans. If pass both, two vans. If pass one, one van.*

Proposal #55: Recommendation to delete By-Law XIII. B. 5. a, Imported Judges.

*Brent comments: Only 3 last year. TD brought in 3 last year – Marcus Paroske, Kyle DeBeer, Michelin Massey. 2 were in room together. The proposal is to not bring in any import judges. Imports get room and airfare; don't get paid or food. Marcus – value as judge, and as history. Brent's idea – leave to the discretion of the tournament director. Usually only \$150 or so extra.*

*Steve Woods: Get rid of hired judges; slate nationally. No constituency –*

*Glenn: Do like the concept; there are strikes, so we can avoid.*

*Michael: Cheaper for NPDA – I've been there when I didn't have teams at the tournament. It's actually cheaper for NPDA to get me there doing work.*

*Robert: Hired judges for \$200; import for \$200-400. Only issue is small financial issue.*

*Kevin Baaske: Think bad – discretion to limited number of people. Control pay for hired judges; but not control how much paid.*

*Trischa: On committee; not really deleting... wording = more complicated. Each Exec Council person now can bring in – that's the issue we had.*

*Moved, seconded. 8 present supported.. Opposed: 8 present + 8 proxies = 16. Motion fails.*

Proposal #57: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 6. to make participants responsible for printing their own Judging Philosophy Booklets.

Proposal #59: Recommendation to encourage the Championship Tournament Committee to explore paper reduction strategies in the areas of pre-tournament booklets, results packets, etc., so as to minimize those costs.

### **Sweepstakes and Tournament Sanctioning**

*Renea Comments: Part of Prescott committee – Matt, Kevin, Keith West – students feel system is abused; looked at a variety of proposals.*

*Matt comments: Committee – season sweeps should go away. However, the committee came up with a compromise, since they felt that the current proposal wouldn't pass.*

*Renea moves to group #4 and #34. Passes unanimously.  
Move, second on #4 and #34.*

*Elizabeth comments: Disadvantages really small programs such as UC-Davis.*

*John Meany: Number of individual teams winning – static since the beginning. The numbers seem particularly small now. Restrictions in current rules that discourage regional/local unless large numbers. Current system encourages national level circuit. Match sweepstakes system to regional.*

*Elizabeth: Hard to recruit – if could win,*

*Renea: Unless only 4 tournaments, no way to win sweepstakes awards.*

*Brent: "I'm a both/and" person. Why not do both? i.e., There are no community colleges here today. South Orange County, etc. had regular success. There are ways to amplify without taking recognition away.*

*Jeremy: For smaller schools – top 20% - program honored.*

*Matt: Data used. Renea used travel patterns. In terms of fear – not so convinced by that... this matches more of our programs. NDT problem – only 2-3 competitive teams. But, if I have 4 teams, then I have incentive. Understand econ disadvantage; exception.*

*Elizabeth: Why not have different divisions? i.e. Junior Varsity, Novice...*

*Matt: Goal was never more awards – but programs use to get recognition.*

*Move to extend time.*

*Kevin Baaske: two issues – no. of teams, tournaments; but also divisions.*

*Status quo – 2 teams, 4 tournaments – expansion = allows larger programs to recruit more students.*

*Marty: Committee sentiment – Eliminate?*

*Matt: Season sweeps should be eliminated; but used to market programs on campus now. How to market but unitary vision of national champion?*

*Marty: Move to amend "honor awards"*

*Move to reconsider: eliminate season sweepstakes. Moved and seconded.*

*Marty to speak on behalf on motion: Lot of investment on part of organization in terms of Exec Secretary time. My only program – Not useful in terms of national tournament sweeps. Money used somewhere else... constantly abused. Flood junior and novice divisions inappropriately. Discourages novice divisions/debaters.*

*Kate Shuster: Experience – students hindered by national sweepstakes rules. Reconsider commitment by coaches who won't move them out of novice and junior division. Retards development of many debaters.*



*Renea: Other issue was geographic issue. Local tournament – 10 teams was acceptable. Now, if you want to be competitive to Pt. Loma, big tournaments... etc.*

*Elizabeth: Issues seem not specific to season sweepstakes – but the way we calculate (Novice/JV) are issue.*

*Solution: change way we calculate.*

*John: Novice sweepstakes – will obscure. Happy to confirm any sweepstakes.*

*Renea: I'll keep stats if you want.*

*John: If sweepstakes award, will organize tournaments based on awards.*

*Michael: As long as sweepstakes encourages 6 round, large number of elim round tournaments, season sweeps isn't good.*

*Trischa: Who did survey?*

*Ed: Look at demographic characteristics – geographically bound. Used for PR – this is important.*

*Undermines students; burnout.*

*Vote to eliminate season sweepstakes:*

*14 present + 3 proxies = 17 in favor. 1 against + 4 proxies = 5 against. 3 abstain.*

Proposal #4: Replace By-Law IV. Season Sweepstakes with IV. Season Honor Awards (if passes)

Proposal #34: Revise By-Law XI. 6. c. to conform to the change from the current Sweepstakes process to the School Honor Awards (if passes)

Proposal #5: Revise By-Law VII. to change the criteria for sanctioning tournaments.

### **Hosting and Site**

Proposal #37: Revise By-Law XIII. A. to clarify Host responsibilities for the Championship Tournament.

Proposal #38: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to allow for more than one hotel to serve the Championship Tournament.

Proposal #41: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. by adding that the President should sign the hotel contract for the Championship Tournament.

### **Eligibility, Rules and Enforcement**

Proposal #7: Revise language in By-Law VIII. to consolidate rule enforcement with the Professional Development Committee.

Proposal #9: Revise By-Law VIII. D. to consolidate enforcement of rules with the Professional Development Committee.

Proposal #14: Revise By-Law. XI. C. to provide a process for determining debater eligibility and an enforcement mechanism for violations.

Proposal #60: Revise By-Law XII: To amend the preamble to the NPDA Rules of Debating (John Meany, The Claremont Colleges)

*Moved and seconded to take out of order.*

*John's comments: If judges create own rules, nothing anyone can do to stop that.*

*Matt: Team used evidence; rule violation. Judge: I don't enforce.*

*John: Can appeal the violation of rules by the judge to the tab room.*

*Rob: Then what happens? What can TD do?*

*Kate: In situation, read briefs.*

*Elizabeth: What if debaters argue rules don't matter – then violate the rules? Is judge forced to vote against them?*

*Kate: Judge discretion now.*

*Ed: Do it.*

*Ric: TD in decision – what if not know rule? As judge, can't give discretion.*

*Vote: 13 present + 4 proxies = 17 for. 4 present + 4 proxies = 8 against. Motion passes.*

Proposal #36: Revise By-Law XII. to bring language in conformity with current usage.  
Proposal #8: Revise By-Law VIII. by adding guiding definitions for a novice and a junior.  
Proposal #31: Revise By-Law XI. I. 4. to provide consistency in the definition of a novice debater.

## **Tournament**

### General

Proposal #30: Revise By-Law XI. H. 3. to consolidate enforcement of tournament rules with the Tournament Director and the Ethics and Rules Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee.  
Proposal #35: Revise By-Law XII. to charge the Tournament Director and the Rules and Standards Subcommittee with the enforcement of NPDA Championship Tournament rules.  
Proposal #45: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 7. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for hired judges.  
Proposal #46: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 8. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for student help.  
Proposal #56: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 5. b. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to work with the Tournament Host in arranging hired judges.  
Proposal #16: Revise By-Law XI. E. 1. to be less prescriptive regarding when topics will be written.  
Proposal #32: Revise By-Law XI. I. 5. a. 3) to provide sweepstakes points for both preliminary and elimination round debates.  
Proposal #33: Revise By-Law XI. 1.5. a. 4) to include points gained from elimination rounds in the determination of Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards.

### Judges

Proposal #24: Revise By-Law XI. G. 2 to mandate that all strikes and constraints received by the deadline be administered before the start of round one and to ensure all teams receive no less than 15% of the entire judging pool.  
Proposal #26: Add By-Law XI. G. 5. to advise judges to be judicially, politically and philosophically unbiased in rendering decisions.  
Proposal #29: Revise By-Law XI. H. 1. to require judges at the Championship Tournament to affirm that they have read, understand and agree to abide by NPDA rules.  
  
Proposal #27: Add By-Law XI. G. 7. to impose a financial penalty on judges not available to fulfill their obligation.

*Moved and second to take proposal #27 out of order. Approved.*

Brent: This is additional to the previous penalties.

Elizabeth: Circumstances – if emergency?

Renea: In situation, the person(s) usually tell us.

Michael: There's language for appeals.

Ed: After the fact.

*Approved unanimously.*

Proposal #25: Revise By-Law XI. G. 4. to remove geographical judging constraints at the Championship Tournament.

*Moved and second to take proposal #25 out of order.*

*John Meany: Hasn't made sense for many years. Not consistently applied throughout the tournament. i.e., Bryan Norcross from CSU-Long Beach. Steve Woods – William Jewell, then WWU?*

*Matt: Never applied to hired judges.*

*Vote: Approved*

#### 10 Round Tournament

Proposal #15: Revise By-Law XI. D. to expand the Championship Tournament to ten preliminary rounds of debate.

Proposal #18: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. a. to determine random and power matched rounds in the 10 round tournament

Proposal #19: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. to eliminate power-matching criteria for an 8 round tournament.

Proposal #20: Revise By-Law XI. F. 4. to establish the tab room disclosure criteria for a 10 round tournament.

Proposal #21: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. a. to advance the top 64 teams to single elimination rounds.

Proposal #22: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. b. and c. to eliminate partial elimination rounds with the adoption of a 10 round tournament.

#### **New Business**

Proposal #1: Endorse a decision to move the webpage to an off school site provider and empower the publication and budget committees to choose and fund the site.

Justification: The webmaster would have increased flexibility and the server would be more reliable.

*Moved to take out of order. Seconded. Approve to take out of order.*

*Michael provides justification for alternative server.*

*Ed: Why do we need?*

*Marty: Michael needs justification to spend the money.*

*Vote to approve unanimously.*

Proposal #6: Revise Bylaw VII, Sanctioning of Tournaments.

Subpoint A:

Current text: Unless hosted by a national or regional organization, the host of an NPDA sanctioned tournament must be a member of NPDA.

Proposed addition: after NPDA, add: "Tournaments held in Canada and run by Canadian schools do not require NPDA membership to have their tournaments sanctioned, although they are encouraged to become NPDA members.

Justification: This would be a simple way to promote more outreach between US and Canadian debaters. It is hoped that this amendment would encourage more US schools to consider Canadian tournaments.

#### **Adjournment**

**Constitutional Proposals**

**Proposal #4: Representative System of the NPDA and for Redistricting**

Prologue: Three proposals came from a subcommittee concerned with the structure of NPDA decision-making and the efficiency of current AFA districting for the NPDA. The initial proposals were drafted by that subcommittee and amended based upon discussion at the retreat. The first proposal moves the decision making of the NPDA from the entire membership to a Legislative Assembly consisting of representatives from the districts. The second proposal is divided into two parts, one part that changes the district lines and expands the representation of districts--giving one additional, at-large or special constituencies representative for each region--and a second part that operationally defines NPDA districts. See commentary sections for specific discussion of each proposal.

**Proposal 4 a: The current structure for conducting business will be replaced with a Legislative Assembly made up of NPDA district representatives.**

Delete existing Article VII and Article VIII of the Constitution to be replaced with the following:

"Article VII: Business of the Organization

- Section 1. The Legislative Assembly of the National Parliamentary Debate Association constitutes the governing body of the National Parliamentary Debate Association. The Legislative Assembly is the only body that can propose changes for ratification by the membership at large or institute changes to the By-Laws. Legislative Assembly decisions must be reported to the body at NPDA at-large business meetings and via electronic posting.
- Section 2. The Legislative Assembly shall consist of one faculty/school, one student and one at-large or special constituencies representative from each NPDA district. The members of the NPDA Executive Council will serve as non-voting, resource members of the Legislative Assembly.
- Section 3. Legislative Assembly meetings will be held annually at the National Championship Tournament and at the National Communication Association Convention. Meetings of the assembly are open to observers and members of the NPDA who may request a place on the agenda of these meetings 30 days prior to the assembly meeting. NPDA Business Meetings will be held annually at the National Championship Tournament for reports and discussion. Additional Business Meetings may be called by the Legislative Assembly or the Executive Council as needed. At least sixty days notice will be given before the meetings.
- Section 4. Each district representative will have one vote in the Legislative Assembly. Members of the Legislative Assembly not in attendance may vote by written proxy with no one member of the assembly voting more than 5 proxies. At least 25% of the membership of the Legislative Assembly must be personally present to conduct business.
- Section 5. The presiding parliamentary officer of the Legislative Assembly will be the President of the National Parliamentary Association or his/her designee.
- Section 6. Tie votes will result in failure of an item of business.
- Section 7. The Executive Council may veto decisions of the Legislative Assembly by a 2/3 vote of the Executive Council. A 2/3 vote of the Legislative Assembly is required to over-ride an Executive Council veto.

Article VIII: Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws

- Section 1. Amendments to the Constitution
  - a. An amendment to the Constitution may be initiated by any member of the Legislative Assembly or any member of the organization via a member of the Legislative Assembly;

**Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 2**

- b. Amendments to the Constitution must be submitted to the Executive Secretary forty-five days prior to a Legislative Assembly meeting to be considered at that meeting. The Executive Secretary will communicate proposed amendments to the President and the membership no later than 30 days prior to the Legislative Assembly meeting. The President will provide the Legislative Assembly with an agenda no later than 15 days prior to the Legislative Assembly meeting.
- c. A two-thirds vote of the Legislative Assembly voting (including proxies) will be necessary for a proposed constitutional amendment to be sent to the Executive Council.
- d. Within ten days following the Legislative Assembly meeting, the Executive Council must vote to endorse or veto the legislation.
- e. In the case of endorsement, the Executive Secretary will distribute within ten days of the decision by mail a ballot containing all proposed constitutional amendments. Balloting on these will cease at midnight thirty days after the date of the Executive Council ruling. A two-thirds vote of the schools voting by mail on the proposed amendment will be necessary for its enactment.
- f. In the case of a veto, the Executive Secretary will return within ten days the decision to the Legislative Assembly. The Legislative Assembly may call a special meeting of the Assembly and/or wait until the next Legislative Assembly to consider an override of the veto. An override of the veto requires a three-quarters vote of the Assembly.
- g. In the case of an override, the Executive Secretary will distribute within ten days of the decision by mail a ballot containing all proposed constitutional amendments. Balloting on these will cease at midnight thirty days after the date of the Executive Council ruling. A two-thirds vote of the schools voting by mail on the proposed amendment will be necessary for its enactment.

**Section 2. Amendments to the By-Laws**

- a. An amendment to the By-Laws may be initiated by any member of the Legislative Assembly or any member of the organization via a member of the Legislative Assembly.
- b. Amendments to the By-Laws must be submitted to the Executive Secretary forty-five days prior to a Legislative Assembly meeting to be considered at that meeting. The Executive Secretary will communicate proposed amendments to the President and the membership no later than 30 days prior to the Legislative Assembly meeting. The President will provide the Legislative Assembly with an agenda no later than 15 days prior to the Legislative Assembly meeting.
- c. A majority of the members represented and voting in the Legislative Assembly will be necessary to send amendments of the By-Laws to the Executive Council.
- d. Within ten days following the Legislative Assembly meeting, the Executive Council must vote to endorse or veto the legislation.
- e. In the case of endorsement, the changes will be enacted upon the endorsement of the Executive Council.
- f. In the case of a veto, the Executive Secretary will return within ten days the decision to the Legislative Assembly. The Legislative Assembly may call a special meeting of the Assembly and/or wait until the next Legislative Assembly to consider an override of the veto. An override of the veto requires a two-thirds vote of the Assembly.
- g. In the case of an override, the legislation will be enacted.

## Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 3

Justification: Using a traditional legislative model and infusing that model with the experience of other forensics organizations, this legislative structure increases the ability to conduct business by creating a smaller legislative body. In addition, the system gives balance to districts in terms of voice and increases student representation to the legislative process. The structure empowers district representatives and encourages them to meet with and seek ideas from their districts, facilitating a more efficient and locally situated means for districts to communicate about and propose legislation.

### **Proposal 4 b.1: Revise Article IV, Sections 2, and 3, to expand representation and to redistrict the NPDA to be more representative of travel patterns and/or local interconnectedness.**

Replace "Section 2. A district faculty/school representative, a district student representative and a district at-large or special constituencies representative will be elected from each National Parliamentary Debate Association district that has at least five NPDA member schools. Districts may determine when and how these representatives are elected and assign the at-large or special constituencies representative as appropriate. Each district shall have at least one faculty/school representative and one student representative. The regional faculty/school representative will serve as the district chair. All three representatives will have voting membership on the NPDA Legislative Assembly. The faculty/school and student representatives shall be elected for two-year, renewable terms with representatives from even numbered districts elected in even years and representatives from odd numbered districts elected in odd years. The at-large or special constituencies representative shall be elected for a two-year, renewable terms with representatives from even numbered districts elected in even years and representatives from odd numbered districts elected in odd years. Terms begin and end at the conclusion of respective election year's national tournament. If for any reason a regional representative cannot serve the entirety of their term, then the members of the representative's constituency shall call a new election to be held as soon as possible to fill the remainder of the term.

Justification: The need for this change presupposes the passing of a Legislative Assembly structure for business in the NPDA. The initial discussion of the subcommittee centered on using the existing district school and student representatives as the Legislative Assembly feeling that a smaller legislative body was superior to a larger one in ability to increase balanced attendance at meetings and in terms of conducting actual business. However, other members of the retreat body felt that the Legislative Assembly should be larger than the proposed twenty-member assembly and suggested doubling the number. Members of the retreat body were split over which would be best, a large or a small assembly. A compromise was reached with three representatives and the at-large representative choice. Overall, the compromise enabled consensus. Some concerns remained about the at-large representative: Who is the constituency for the at-large representative and how will district meetings be held in order to elect at-large representatives? The body opted to leave these questions open to the districts and the subcommittee amended the "at-large representative" as "the at-large or special constituencies representative". In later discussion, options floated for voting included nominations and mail balloting or elections at regional meetings in conjunction with regional tournaments. On the question of constituencies, the proposal allows for districts to assign this representative as is appropriate for the district. For example, in areas with large two-year school populations, the at-large or special constituencies representative may serve two-year schools; in districts with large travel areas, the district may elect a sub-district representatives (northern/southern); in districts with notable large/small or public/private program concerns, the district may elect to represent these constituencies. If no particular special constituency exists within the district, the district may retain the at-large distinction and choose to elect generally from the district population.

**Proposal #6: Delete Article IV, Section 3. to eliminate the Two Year Schools Representative.**

Justification: See Legislative Proposal; redistricting Article VII: Business of Association and VIII: Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws.

**Proposed NPDA By-Laws Changes**

**Proposal #3: Revise By-Law III. to provide a mechanism for the Executive Secretary to submit annual budget requests.**

Replace III. Executive Secretary's Office with "The Office of the Executive Secretary shall submit an annual budget request to defray the telephone and mailing expenses connected with doing National Parliamentary Debate Association business."

Justification: All budget requests should be submitted specifically to the Finance Committee for inclusion in the budget. Following formulation by the Treasurer and the Finance Committee, the budget would then be approved by the Executive Council and the membership. While the Executive Secretary will receive a budget, it should be based on his/her estimated need.

**Proposal #4: Replace By-Law IV. Season Sweepstakes with IV. Season Honor Awards.**

Replace IV. Season Sweepstakes with "IV. Season Honor Awards:

- Section 1. The National Parliamentary Debate Association will confer Honor Awards on outstanding schools that participate in sanctioned tournaments during the season. Awards will be given for varsity, junior, novice and two-year honors. Schools in the top 5, 10, 15 and 20 percent will be eligible for honor.
- Section 2. Points will be accumulated for Honor Awards according to the following formula:
- a. One point for each debate win (including a win for a bye and a win by forfeit) by a team in final four preliminary rounds of a National Parliamentary Debate Association sanctioned tournament and two points for a win by a team the first two elimination rounds.
  - b. Each of the four teams for which a school receives credit toward Honor Awards at a sanctioned tournament will receive at least one point toward Honor Awards, even if they win no debates at all.
- Section 3. Final Honor awards will be based on the total points accumulated at the six sanctioned tournaments at which each school has gained the most points during the season.
- Section 4. Ties will be rounded up for inclusion in the highest grouping possible for that number of points.
- Section 5. When students from two different schools combine to form a team at a sanctioned tournament, the total points earned by such a split team will be divided between their two schools.
- Section 6. Should a school enter more than four teams in a sanctioned tournament, the rounds of only that school's four best teams will be counted toward Honor Awards.
- Section 7. Should two teams from the same school be scheduled to debate each other ("closing out a bracket") in an elimination round of a sanctioned tournament, their school will receive two points for winning the round even if the debate is not held. If two teams from the same school meet in a preliminary round, the school will be awarded one point for winning the debate even if no actual debate occurs. The point will be awarded to the team indicated on the tab sheets as having earned the win or bye.

**Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 5**

- Section 8. Teams from a host school may enter competition in their own tournament. Wins by those teams will count toward NPDA Honor Awards.
- Section 9. At tournaments in which teams in elimination rounds are given byes, a team receiving a bye shall be awarded two points for a win.
- Section 10. To be counted for Honor Awards points the National Parliamentary Debate Association division of a tournament must contain at least six teams from a minimum of three schools.
- Section 11. Tournament directors shall submit results to their District Representative within 10 days of the tournament for calculation and report. District Representatives shall report and send copies of the calculated results to the Executive Secretary or her/his designee within 21 days of receiving results from the Tournament Director. Tournaments held within 20 days of the Championship Tournament should have their results submitted directly to the Executive Secretary or her/his designee within three days of the completion of the tournament.
- Section 12. Any errors in the National Parliamentary Debate Association reports of tournament results and Honor Awards point totals must be brought to the attention of the Executive Secretary or her/his designee no later than fourteen days prior to the commencement of on-site registration for the NPDA Championship Tournament. Any mistakes made on tournaments held within two weeks of the NPDA Championship Tournament must be corrected during the first day of the NPDA Championship Tournament.
- Section 13. Tournaments may hold as many elimination rounds as is desired, but a tournament must have at least six teams for finals to count and eight teams for semi-finals to count for Honor Awards.
- Section 14. A team must be present and must debate in more than half of the preliminary rounds as a team in order to count for the purpose of determining the number of teams in a division as part of the determination of the appropriate number of elimination rounds that earn National Parliamentary Debate Association Honor Awards points."

Justification: The current system discourages local rather than national circuits, rewards coaches for keeping students in junior varsity, et. al. This proposal provides public relations assistance to programs while not encouraging abuses.

Opposition: This proposal is too likely to place NPDA in the uncomfortable position of defining junior and novice divisions, a job best left up to tournament directors at individual tournaments. It would be better to keep the present system, and add something akin to a "Robert Trapp Honors Award" to the top 10 percent of programs each year whose points are earned solely in open competition. An appropriately named two-year award (Orv Iverson?) should honor the top 10 percent of two-year achievements each year. NPDA should not determine awards by using the varied definitions of novice and junior – and should not police or even seek to influence those guidelines. This proposal should be debated more fully, separated from the Prescott proposals and voted on later.

**Proposal #5: Revise By-Law VII. to change the criteria for sanctioning tournaments.**

If School Honor Awards or Season Sweepstakes are retained, change VII. Criteria for Sanctioning Tournaments to:

- "VII. Criteria for Sanctioning NPDA Tournaments:  
Tournaments meeting the following general criteria will be designated as counting for sweepstakes/honor award points:
- A. Unless hosted by a national or regional organization, the host of an NPDA sanctioned tournament must be an affiliate or a regular member of NPDA.
  - B. Unless hosted by a national or regional organization whose rules specify invitation of members only, the tournament shall be open to all members of NPDA and the host school shall complete and submit a sanctioning form.



**Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 6**

- C. Unless exceptions are clearly noted in the tournament invitation sanctioned tournaments must follow the NPDA “Rules of Debating and Judging” in By-Law XII.
- D. The tournament must be attended by at least six teams from a minimum of three schools.
- E. If the Executive Secretary (or other person designated to count honor award points) fails to receive tournament results during the time period mentioned in Article IV, Section 11, the tournament cannot be sanctioned for the following year.
- H. Appeals of sanctioning decisions may be made to the Rules and Ethics Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee."

Justification: We don't want to penalize people for hosting our event and we believe affiliate memberships encourage more schools, especially those who may not have an NPDA team or don't come to nationals, to host the event.

**Proposal #7: Revise language in By-Law VIII. to consolidate rule enforcement with the Professional Development Committee.**

Replace “President” with “Chair of the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee” and “Executive Council” to “Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee”

Justification: This would consolidate enforcement of rules into one body, relieving the President and the Executive Council of the task.

**Proposal #8: Revise By-Law VIII. by adding guiding definitions for a novice and a junior.**

Add “3. For tournament directors who desire definitions of novice and junior, the NPDA suggests the following guidelines:

- a. To be classified as a novice
  - 1. The student should have no high school debate experience.
  - 2. The student should be in the first two semesters of collegiate debate.
  - 3. Once the student has advanced to more than 3 elimination rounds, the student should be advanced to the junior or open division.
- b. To be classified as a junior
  - 1. The student should be in the first four semesters of intercollegiate debate.
  - 2. The student should not have advanced to elimination rounds more than 3 times in junior or open division.
  - 3. Once the student has advanced to more than three rounds, the student should be advanced to open."

Justification: This provides guidance to Tournament Directors who would like a uniform definition of junior and novice. Tournament Directors may use other definitions for junior and novice, and have those definitions count for sweepstakes/honor points, provided they make their definitions clear in the invitation.

Opposition: NPDA should not offer guidelines for the definition of novice and junior. That's outside the province of NPDA and should be left to tournament directors. Even a 'guideline' moves beyond NPDA's appropriate sphere of influence.

**Proposal #9: Revise By-Law VIII. D. to consolidate enforcement of rules with the Professional Development Committee.**

Throughout VIII. D. change “President” to “Chair of the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee” and “Executive Council” to “Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee.”

Justification: This would consolidate enforcement of rules into one body. It would relieve the President, Executive Council and Tournament Director of this responsibility.

**Proposal #10: Revise By-Law X. B. 3. b. 3. and 4. to eliminate the resource team from the Committee on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment.**

Eliminate "and resource team members" from By-Law X. B. 3. b. 3. and 4.

Justification: The resource team has not been functioning and has very little impact on the effectiveness of the Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Committee.

**Proposal #11: Revise By-Law XI. to change the composition of the oversight agent for the Championship Tournament from the Executive Council to the National Championship Tournament Committee as per Constitution, Standing Committee, Section 5.**

Eliminate "For purposes of the NPDA Championship Tournament, the "Executive Council "refers only to the President, Vice President, Executive Secretary, and Treasurer, and does not include the National Student Representative."

Justification: This change would be necessary to conform to composition of the Championship Tournament Committee as established in the Constitution Article VI, Section 5.

**Proposal #12: Revise By-Law XI. A.1. c.. to change reimbursement of tournament staff (also applies to all issues involving providing food, lodging, and travel assistance to tournament staff) to use the language of "no net gain/no net loss".**

"Tournament personnel should incur no net financial loss by working on the tournament – and personnel may apply to the Finance Committee for reimbursement of costs above and beyond those that would have been incurred had they not served on the tournament staff."

Justification: The "no net gain/no net loss" principle would mean that tournament staff should not be given travel, food and lodging benefits if such benefits would mean that they accrue a "net gain" by serving the tournament. On the other hand, the staff should be allowed to apply for reimbursement for any "net loss" suffered because of service to the tournament.

**Proposal #13: Revise By-Law XI. A. 1. d. to allow tournament staff to count as judges from an entering school.**

Replace with "d. Members of the tournament staff shall count as judges from entering schools and may be used as judges in the elimination rounds."

Justification: Individuals should not be penalized for their service to the organization.

**Proposal #14: Revise By-Law. XI. C. to provide a process for determining debater eligibility and an enforcement mechanism for violations.**

- Add "
3. The Director of Forensics or program director's signature will be required on entry forms certifying eligibility for the tournament and for the novice division.
  4. Prior to the NPDA Championship Tournament, if an eligibility violation is determined by the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee the following sanctions will be applied.
    - a. If the eligibility question deals with a novice debate, the student will lose the novice designation.
    - b. If the eligibility question deals with an open debater, the team will be given the option to fill in with another debater.
    - c. In either case, the school will be fined \$250. per violation.
  5. If a violation is discovered after the NPDA Championship Tournament, the following sanctions will be applied if the violation is reported to the Professional Development, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee within 21 days of the Championship Tournament.
    - a. The team's records will be eliminated. Any team awards will be returned, and any individual speaker awards for the ineligible debater will be returned. The other member may retain the speaker award she/he has earned.

**Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 8**

b. The school will be fined \$250 per violation.

Justification: We want to be proactive, rather than reactive if possible.

**Proposal #15: Revise By-Law XI. D. to expand the Championship Tournament to ten preliminary rounds of debate.**

Change "eight" to "ten"

Justification: There are two predominate reasons for increasing to ten preliminary rounds. First, the current number of preliminary round debates is insufficient to sort the elimination round bracket. Increasing the number of preliminary rounds will better rank order the teams advancing to elimination rounds. Second, adding two more rounds adds more debates for all debaters at the tournament thereby increasing the educational value of the Championship Tournament (arguably the best laboratory all year for teaching argumentation and debate) for all participants, not just those advancing to elimination rounds.

If changed, would affect subsequent items.

Opposition: Our current system, advancing all winning teams, minimizes the interference of speaker points on the advancement process – and insures that all appropriate teams advance to out rounds. NPDA has gone on record opposing speaker points – the 64 team system most likely reinstates speaker points as part of our policy.

**Proposal #16: Revise By-Law XI. E. 1. to be less prescriptive regarding when topics will be written.**

Replace with "1. In addition to the responsibilities indicated under the Championship Tournament Committee, Subcommittee duties, the Topic Selection Committee shall select an appropriate number of topics to be debated at the tournament."

Justification: This brings this section into conformity with the Topic Selection Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee.

**Proposal #18: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. a. to determine random and power matched rounds in the 10 round tournament**

Replace with "a. "Rounds 1 and 2 will be randomly matched, while rounds 3-10 will be power matched based upon each team's cumulative record through the previous round."

Justification: This change would be necessary should a 10 round tournament proposal be approved. It determines what rounds will be randomly matched and which rounds will be power matched.

**Proposal #19: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. to eliminate power-matching criteria for an 8 round tournament.**

Eliminate By-Law XI. F. 3. d. and e.

Justification: This power-matching criteria would not be used if a 10 round tournament is adopted.

**Proposal #20: Revise By-Law XI. F. 4. to establish the tab room disclosure criteria for a 10 round tournament.**

Replace with "After tabulating the results of each preliminary rounds (1-9) and releasing the pairings of the subsequent round, the tabulation staff will post the results of the previous round by listing each team name followed by an asterisk (if that team won) in a common are accessible to all tournament participants."

Justification: The number of rounds would change with the 10 round tournament.

**Proposal #21: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. a. to advance the top 64 teams to single elimination rounds.**

Replace with "a. Following the conclusion of the last preliminary round, teams will be rank-ordered according to the criteria listed below. The top 64 teams will advance to the single elimination round."

**Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 9**

Justification: The current number of preliminary round debates is insufficient to sort the elimination round bracket. Increasing the number of preliminary round allows for a better rank order of the teams advancing to elimination rounds.

**Proposal #22: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. b. and c. to eliminate partial elimination rounds with the adoption of a 10 round tournament.**

Eliminate b. and c.

Justification: With a guaranteed two extra rounds and a more accurate breaking of brackets, partial elimination rounds would no longer be needed.

**Proposal #24: Revise By-Law XI. G. 2 to mandate that all strikes and constraints received by the deadline be administered before the start of round one and to ensure all teams receive no less than 15% of the entire judging pool.**

Replace with "2. All strikes and constraints that have been received by the deadline shall be administered by the tabulation staff and Tournament Director before the start of round one. The number of allowed strikes for each individual team shall never be less than 15% of the entire judging pool."

Justification: Although complications can and inevitably do arise, instances of inequity have been rampant in errors made on issues of strikes. In such instances, time has restricted the full addressing of these issues. We believe that it is more important for equal treatment to be received by each student, and therefore prefer a call to action for strikes to be honored.

**Proposal #25: Revise By-Law XI. G. 4. to remove geographical judging constraints at the Championship Tournament.**

Delete G.4.

Justification: Geographical constraints are rarely consistently honored in practice. Judges hired by the tournament are often given no geographic classification, although they are in fact part of a region. Since their regional affiliation will not be specified, they would not be restricted from hearing a team from the same region. Geographical constraints harm the ability of schools in underrepresented regions to take advantage of their local judging pool in forming relations.

**Proposal #26: Add By-Law XI. G. 5. to advise judges to be judicially, politically and philosophically unbiased in rendering decisions.**

Add " 5. Judges should always strive to judge debates on the basis of who they thought did the better debating, avoiding rendering a decision based on their own judicial political or philosophical bias."

Justification: Although this standard may be implicit, it is good to remind people. These guidelines serve as a tool for training judges at other tournaments.

**Proposal #27: Add By-Law XI. G. 7. to impose a financial penalty on judges not available to fulfill their obligation.**

Add "7. A financial penalty of fifty dollars for each preliminary and one hundred dollars for each elimination round will be imposed against any and all judges who fail to be available to judge all rounds to which they are obligated.

- a. Until fines are paid, the judge's affiliated or hiring school will be suspended from NPDA membership.
- b. All fines are subject to appeal to the NPDA Rules and Ethics Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee on the basis of extenuating circumstances."

Justification: Especially in later elimination rounds, it has been observed that judges are being substituted nearly at random when ballots are missed. Often it is the judge who are simply standing near the ballot table. There should be more of an initiative to compel judges to conform to their commitments. We seek to deter more than to punish, and the ability to appeal makes the

**Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 10**

prospect of crippling punishment unlikely. Rather it imposes a comparable inconvenience on the judge missing the ballot and the inconvenience faced by the ballot table.

**Proposal #28: Add By-Law XI. G. 8. to specify elimination round judge commitment and mandate the Tournament Director to print list of those judges obligated for morning elimination rounds.**

Add "8. All judges are committed to judge two rounds past the elimination round of their last competing teams, or octafinals, whichever is later. The Tournament Director will print a list of the judges being used for morning elimination rounds."

**Justification:** Encoding the commitment level leads to more transparency and clarity. It also leads to the largest possible pool for the highest quality of judging, and reduces the number of people leaving early, leading to larger audiences for the later outrounds and more education for those watching and debating.

**Proposal #29: Revise By-Law XI. H. 1. to require judges at the Championship Tournament to affirm that they have read, understand and agree to abide by NPDA rules.**

Replace with "H. 1. Enforcement of Section 4 of the NPDA Tournament Rules (section entitled "During the Debate") shall be the province of the judge (or in the case of multiple judge panels, of the Speaker of the House). All judges adjudicating at the Championship Tournament shall affirm, through electronic signature, that they have read, understand and agree to abide by the NPDA rules and guidelines for judging, including the Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Policy, prior to submitting their required judging philosophy. In extreme circumstances, paper signatures can be accepted with submission of required judging philosophy."

**Justification:** There have been consistent complaints that some judges are unfamiliar with rules, and in the absence of familiarity, have been making up their own rules. At the very least, to require an affirmation that the rules have been read, especially with the proposed method for implementation, increases the accountability of the judges to those rules. In addition, it further protects us against sexual harassment claims when all judges verify that they are informed of their responsibilities as judges.

**Proposal #30: Revise By-Law XI. H. 3. to consolidate enforcement of tournament rules with the Tournament Director and the Ethics and Rules Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee.**

Replace with "3. Enforcement of all other sections of the NPDA Tournament Rules shall be the providence of the Tournament Director in consultation with the Ethics and Rules Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee."

**Justification:** This change is necessary to consolidate the enforcement of NPDA Rules with one body.

**Proposal #31: Revise By-Law XI. I. 4. to provide consistency in the definition of a novice debater.**

Eliminate ""with a year of competition being defined as two tournaments in each of the two semesters."

**Justification:** As stated this conflicts with the definition of novice provided in By-Law IX. Novice Awards.

**Proposal #32: Revise By-Law XI. I. 5. a. 3) to provide sweepstakes points for both preliminary and elimination round debates.**

Replace with "3) Sweepstakes points will be accumulated from a combination of preliminary and elimination round records from the top four teams from a school during the competition.

Ordinarily, the records of the four teams from each school with the highest number of preliminary round wins will be awarded two points for each preliminary round. An additional two points will be awarded per team per elimination round advanced (win, lost or bye) by the four teams accumulating the most elimination round points. These may not necessarily be the same four teams that accumulated the most points in preliminary rounds. The National Champion will receive an additional two points for its school."

## **Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 11**

**Justification:** The old system only rewarded preliminary round performance. The proposed system recognizes a school's performance during the entire tournament. However, the committee felt that preliminary rounds should be weighted heavier than elimination rounds to reflect a program's breadth rather than just depth. So a school that advances four teams but all drop in early elimination rounds should have points that reflect the success of many teams opposed to a school that has one team that wins the tournament but has no other teams doing well at the tournament. This team has the award the team won for its individual accomplishment but should be additionally recognized for that singular performance.

**Opposition:** The sweepstakes system is complex with subtleties that deserve discussion – and, perhaps, revision. There is merit to counting only prelims – winning 24 of 32 rounds is a sign of a balanced team. Two teams, who both reach semifinals, could earn 28 or more by themselves! The balanced four-team accomplishment is more worthy of "sweepstakes" recognition. The two teams would be appropriately recognized with top national awards – a more fitting honor for two teams than "school sweepstakes".

### **Proposal #33: Revise By-Law XI. 1.5. a. 4) to include points gained from elimination rounds in the determination of Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards.**

Replace with "a) The greatest cumulative number of preliminary and elimination round points as enumerated in 5. a. 3)"

**Justification:** This just reflects the new sweepstakes system as the first factor in determining sweepstakes. The rest of the tie breaking system would remain intact.

### **Proposal #34: Revise By-Law XI. 6. c. to conform to the change from the current Sweepstakes process to the School Honor Awards if passed.**

X. 6. Would be eliminated or changed if School Honor Awards are implemented.

**Justification:** This change would be necessary to provide consistency if School Honor Awards are adopted.

### **Proposal #35: Revise By-Law XII. to charge the Tournament Director and the Rules and Standards Subcommittee with the enforcement of NPDA Championship Tournament rules.**

Replace paragraph 4 with "Charges of violations of any rules other than those in Section 4, including violations of rules before and after the debate, should be taken to the Tournament Director. In the case of serious violations of these Rules other than those in Section 4, the Tournament Director will direct the Rules and Standards Subcommittee to review and rule on the decision. If the violation is upheld the Rules and Standards Subcommittee may impose a penalty ranging from reprimand, to changing of a decision or speaker points, to withdrawal of a team or judge from the tournament.

**Justification:** This change is necessary to consolidate the rule enforcement with The Tournament Director and the Rules and Standards Subcommittee.

### **Proposal #36: Revise By-Law XII. to bring language in conformity with current usage.**

Throughout By-Law XII. change "proposition" to "Government", "First proposition" to "Prime Minister", "Second proposition" to "Member of Government", "First opposition" to "Leader of the Opposition" and "Second opposition" to "Member of the Opposition".

**Justification:** The terms used in this section do not reflect current practice and consequently need to be changed.

### **Proposal #37: Revise By-Law XIII. A. to clarify Host responsibilities for the Championship Tournament.**

Replace with "A. Host Responsibilities: Any amenities and associated expenses not required by the NPDA but elected to be provided by the Host will be the financial responsibility of the Host."

**Justification:** Not all of the responsibilities included are financial. While the Host is required to provide certain items for the efficiency of the tournament any costs associated with extras should be incurred by the Host.

**Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 12**

**Proposal #38: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to allow for more than one hotel to serve the Championship Tournament.**

Replace with "2. Tournament Hotel(s): Host will work with the Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee and the President to locate the most appropriate hotel(s) to serve NPDA needs taking into consideration hotel(s) size and amenities, proximity to campus and other area attractions and dining opportunities, affordability of rooms, and willingness of hotel(s) to work with NPDA on minimizing hotel facility expenses. If it helps to negotiate more affordable room/night rental rate, the Championship Tournament Committee, in conjunction with the President, can require attending schools to stay at the tournament hotel(s) as a condition of participation in the tournament. Any gratis or complimentary rooms go against the NPDA hotel room needs. If any complimentary rooms are made available to the NPDA, the Host will be awarded one complimentary room for their use throughout the tournament though this room may be shared with other tournament personnel

Justification: The original implies that only one hotel will meet NPDA needs. The proposed change may encourage schools in smaller towns that do not have access to a large convention hotel. This does mean, of course, that the school must be able to meet any room requirements for the entire tournament. In addition, under the new organizational structure, the Host and Site Development Committee and the Championship Tournament Committee will be more directly responsible for the tournament. In addition, the Host has long hours at the tournament and may live a distance from the school. The NPDA should shoulder some responsibility for easing the burden on the Host.

**Proposal #39: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to not pay for parking expenses associated with executive vehicle use or executive rental vehicles.**

Justification: Expenses for those already in attendance at the tournaments, and whose expenses would already be covered by their home schools, should not receive reimbursement for their expenses.

**Proposal #40: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to stipulate that the NPDA should work within the allocated number of comp rooms rather than purchase additional hotel nights. Hired judges and dignitaries should be given priority placement in these rooms with the understanding that the Tournament Host will be given one such room.**

Justification: Many of those currently using comp rooms are those who would already be attending the tournament. Consequently, their room charges should be covered by their home schools. Comp rooms should be used for hired judges and dignitaries.

Opposition: Leave the assignment of rooms out of the By-Laws. Some years those rooms may be used by the Host and hired judges. Other years it may be visiting international or domestic guests. Other years they may be used by tab staff without teams in the tournament. A new "no net gain/no net loss" policy – insuring that personnel receive no added benefits but instead are guaranteed "no net loss" – will insure that the comp rooms are not used as benefits for staff with teams competing. This comp room change is unnecessary and will tie the hands of administrators in assigning rooms.

**Proposal #41: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. by adding that the President should sign the hotel contract for the Championship Tournament.**

Add "The President of the National Parliamentary Debate Association should sign the hotel contract."

Justification: There is ambiguity as to who should sign the hotel contract and it was the feeling of those assembled, including two past Presidents, that the contract should be signed by the President.

**Proposal #42: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 3. to allow flexibility regarding holding the banquet and reception.**

## **Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 13**

Replace a. and b. with "The Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee should investigate the impact of eliminating the banquet and replacing it with a reception that merges opening ceremonies, the student reception, etc. when negotiating hotel contract(s)".

Justification: Although we felt that cost reduction could be accomplished by replacing the banquet with a nice reception, we acknowledge that inclusion of a banquet could have an impact on other hotel charges. This proposal would provide the committee with more flexibility in the negotiation process.

Opposition: The banquet is an essential part of hotel contract negotiations – and is an important social and ceremonial occasion for the Championship Tournament. The NPDA contract stipulates we have \$18,000 in banquet revenue to receive the room rates we have been offered this year. That's normal. We should leave the banquet in the By-Laws.

### **Proposal #43: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 4. to count the Host as a judge for their school.**

Replace with "4. Entry Commitments: The Host is responsible for meeting its own entry fees. Like any other school the Host must either provide judges to cover its commitment or pay. However, the NPDA will cover the judging commitments for the host school for up to four teams as commensurate with equivalent personnel handling hosting responsibilities.

Justification: It is unfair for the Host to have to pay for hired judging because they must be available at all times to handle any problems associated with the site. In addition, it seems reasonable to allow an additional person, e.g. an assistant coach, who is also handling site responsibilities to carry out those duties rather than judge. However, there must be a second person working for the tournament to receive the additional judging benefit.

### **Proposal #44: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 6. to make the NPDA responsible for typical administrative expenses.**

Replace with "6. NPDA will be responsible for operating expenses directly related to the Championship Tournament competition such as ballot production and copying, copier rental, schematics, copying, etc. The expenses for these materials will be reimbursed by the NPDA upon presentation of receipts. The host school will be responsible for expenses related to the site such as custodial charges, maps, poster board for directional signs, etc.

Justification: Hosting the Championship Tournament is expensive and the NPDA should absorb the costs directly related to the tournament itself. The costs should remain fairly constant regardless of who hosts the tournament. The host should only have to pay for those costs that are specific to their school.

### **Proposal #45: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 7. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for hired judges.**

Replace "President" with "Tournament Director"

Justification: The Tournament Director is in the position to know the need for judges.

### **Proposal #46: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 8. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for student help.**

Replace "President" with "Tournament Director"

Justification: The Tournament Director is in the position to know the need for student help.

### **Proposal #47: Revise By-Law XIII. B. to provide for a mechanism for paying unexpected expenses at the Championship Tournament.**

Replace with "B. NPDA Financial Responsibilities: The below expenses are anticipated in running most tournaments. It is a partial, but not exhaustive list of all possible tournament expenses. Should other tournament related expenses arise during the course of the Championship Tournaments that are not itemized in this document, the Vice President and/or the Tournament Director can authorize payment for those as well on behalf of the NPDA."



**Original Proposals with Information and Justification: NUMERICAL ORDER - PAGE 14**

Justification: Although under the proposed organizational structure all expenditures must be approved by the Finance Committee, a mechanism needs to be in place to allow for the smooth functioning for the Championship Tournament. In emergency situations that might arise during the Championship Tournament (i.e. the copier blows up), the Vice President and/or Tournament Director must be able to make quick decisions to remedy the situation.

**Proposal #48: Eliminate By-Law XIII. B. 1 Topic Committee expenses.**

Justification: Under the new Topic Selection Subcommittee procedures, this expense would be unnecessary.

**Proposal #49: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. a. to limit officers expenses to those not normally covered by their schools but allow them to be counted toward their school's judging commitment.**

Replace sentence 2 and 3 with "The NPDA will apply a 'no net loss' policy to officers, allowing them to apply to the Finance Committee for reimbursements for expenses above and beyond what they would have incurred. Officers will count toward their school's judging commitment."

Justification: The 'no net gain/no net loss' principle would mean that officers should not be given travel, food and lodging benefits if such benefits would mean that they accrue a 'net gain' by serving the tournament. On the other hand, the officers should be allowed to apply for reimbursement for any 'net loss' suffered because of service to the tournament.

**Proposal #50: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. b. to require the President and/or Tournament Director to submit a budget for tournament expenses.**

Replace with "b. The President and/or Tournament Director will submit a budget request to the Finance Committee to pay ordinary expenses during the tournament."

Justification: Most tournament expenses are predictable and should go through the normal budgeting process.

**Proposal #51: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. c. to eliminate providing a rental van for administrative staff.**

Eliminate By Law XIII. B. 2. c.

Justification: A special van for transporting members of the administrative team (the NPDA officers) is unnecessary since they will either be traveling with their teams or can submit a proposal for transportation costs to the Finance Committee. Expenses for those already in attendance at the tournament, and whose expenses would already be covered by their home schools, should not receive reimbursement for their expenses.

**Proposal #52: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. a. to limit tabulation staff expenses to those not normally covered by their schools and allow them to be counted toward their schools judging commitment.**

Replace sentence 2 and 3 with "The NPDA will apply a 'no net loss' policy to tabulation staff, allowing them to apply to the Finance Committee for reimbursements for expenses above and beyond what they would have incurred. Tabulation room staff expenses will count toward their school's judging commitment."

Justification: The 'no net gain/no net loss' principle would mean that tabulation room staff should not be given travel, food and lodging benefits if such benefits would mean that they accrue a 'net gain' by serving the tournament. On the other hand, the officers should be allowed to apply for reimbursement for any 'net loss' suffered because of service to the tournament.

**Proposal #53: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. to require the President and/or Tournament Director to submit a budget for tournament expenses.**

Replace with "b. The President and/or Tournament Director will submit a budget for request to the Finance Committee to pay ordinary expenses during the tournament."

Justification: Most tournament expenses are predictable and should go through the normal budgeting process.

**Proposal #54. Recommendation to allow the Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee the authority to investigate how canceling the banquet and replacing it with a reception would impact the hotel contract.**

Justification: See By-Law XIII. A. 3. Proposal.

**Proposal #55: Recommendation to delete By-Law XIII. B. 5. a, Imported Judges.**

Delete By-Law XIII. N. 5. Imported Judges

Justification: No action was taken by the body on this issue but it was recommended that an assessment be made to determine the necessity for imported judges. Hosts are already required to guarantee hired judges and the total number of judges used is less than that number. So the total judges a Host would have to hire would not be significantly increased, if at all. In addition the costs of paying the expenses for imported judges is quite high. Since the organization's officers choose who the imports will be, the practice appears biased. The President or Tournament Director may still bring in judges but the expense for these must be approved through the Finance Committee.

Opposition: The reasons for retaining imports: first, we diversify the judging pool, especially when we are in non-metro settings; second, we provide a sense of history as former champions, coaches and officers join us for the event; third, we increase the supply of potential tournament workers - the treasurer used one import to assist at registration and to coach the Europeans; the Tournament Director, I believe, also used one at registration – and I believe that the Executive Secretary has sometimes used an import to assist with secretarial work. Fourth, imports are exceptional judges who will be rested and effective all tournament long; finally, imports are a smart way to use our complimentary rooms and consequently would only require airfare (approximately \$350).

Hired judges are paid \$200 so the costs of imported judges is roughly \$150.00.

**Proposal #56: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 5. b. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to work with the Tournament Host in arranging hired judges.**

Replace with "b. "The Tournament Host will prove the number of qualified judges requested by the Tournament Director. One month prior to the Championship Tournament, the Tournament Director will notify the Host of the anticipated need for hired judges."

Justification: The Tournament Director is responsible for the operation of the Championship Tournament, including receiving the registration information, and should notify the Host of judging needs in a timely fashion.

**Proposal #57: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 6. to make participants responsible for printing their own Judging Philosophy Booklets.**

Replace with "a. Judging Philosophy Books: Participants in the National Tournament are responsible for printing their own Judging Philosophy Booklets from the data base. The Host will be responsible for obtaining the judging philosophies for local hired judges. The Tournament Director will be responsible for obtaining judging philosophies from all other judges."

Justification: The Host has access to judges they hire and so should obtain judging philosophies from those judges. The last sentence provides a responsible party to obtain all other judging philosophies.

**Proposal #58: Recommendation that the NPDA investigate ways in which The Irish, Eastern European and other international efforts can become self-sustaining and not dependent on NPDA funding.**

**Proposal #59: Recommendation to encourage the Championship Tournament Committee to explore paper reduction strategies in the areas of pre-tournament booklets, results packets, etc., so as to minimize those costs.**

**Proposal #60: Proposal to amend the preamble to the NPDA Rules of Debating regarding sanctions.**

Existing language

**Sanctions for violation of Section 4 of Rules of Debating and Judging (rules that apply during the debate) shall be province of the judge.**

Proposed language

Sanctions for violation of Section 4 of Rules of Debating and Judging (rules that apply during the debate) shall be the immediate province of the judge. In the case of a dispute regarding a judge's interpretation of the rules, enforcement of the rules, or adhering to the procedures of the tournament, one or both debate teams may appeal a judge's decision regarding sanctions to the tournament director for a final decision.

Justification

This suggested change closes a loophole in the existing preamble. If a judge chooses to violate NPDA rules or acts in an arbitrary or capricious manner regarding the rules or norms of the tournament, there is no procedure in place for teams to appeal the wrongful or prejudicial decisions of the judge. This language change would ensure that judges follow the rules as explained by the tournament director.