

Fall 2007 NPDA Business Meeting
Saturday, November 17, 2007, 12:30 p.m.
Chicago, Palmer House Hilton

1. At 12:30, President Kevin Minch called the meeting to order. Kevin noted the problems with the business meeting time this year: (1) it conflicts with NFA, and (2) we received half the time we normally get. Hopefully this will be fixed for next year.
2. Motion to move and accept the minutes from Spring 2007 - unanimously.
3. Reports (several items online)

Treasurer (Brent Northup): Taking the VHS tapes from the '90s, and '00s. Working on digitizing and putting chapters on each DVD. Free copies for participating debaters; the rest will become available. In last year's case, we even have the awards ceremony (1st and 2nd) as the last chapter for that DVD.

Order form available on forensicstournament.net; credit cards can be taken there as well.

Finance Committee (Marty Birkholt): Brent's submitted budget approved; slight changes. Marginal surplus. Outreach committee hasn't spent their budget; the money will be left so that they can use it at some point if desired. The budget is posted online.

Nominating Committee (Renea Gernant): Had an email-based meeting (Ed Inch, Sharon Porter, Tom Kuster) after Konrad Hack announced his resignation.

Exec Secretary: Danny Cantrell (Cerritos) (From Nominating Committee)
 Michael Dreher (Bethel Univ.) (From Nominating Committee)
 Glenn Prince (Western Kentucky Univ.) (From floor)

Treasurer: Brent Northup (Carroll)

Ballots will be sent to Renea through an external server. Michael won't see any of the results.

Kevin: The election will be done sooner so that Joe Gantt can transition into tournament director. Then the newly elected executive secretary will be appointed to fill out the remainder of the term until NPDA Nationals.

Konrad Hack has agreed to serve on the first computer in the tab room.

Site Committee (Marty Birkholt): The committee received a bid from Dr. Marlin Bates at the University of Pacific. The committee has a verbal commitment from UOP; the committee is awaiting a written confirmation from UOP's administration.

Kevin believes the UOP bid was flexible for dates. The goal is to have the hotel negotiations wrapped up by December 2007. Hotels are reporting they would like 2 years notice before the national tournament. 2 new buildings, including a new student union, will be ready for the tournament.

Marty mentions that the School of Pharmacy rooms might be available as well.

Kevin encouraged future bids for national tournaments. Kevin reported that the tournament invitation will come out sometime in December. The hotel block is available; go ahead and reserve early!

Audra Diers (Host): The one hangup for nationals is the wireless access; USAFA is still working on that issue. They do have a colonel and a general supporting the request - it may be 3-4 weeks before figuring out whether it's doable.

Everyone will be able to drive to the Fieldhouse - walkable, but unpleasant. There will be a shuttle to the cadet area.

Thursday - registration will be publically accessible - 100 yd. away from the building.

Throughout each day, there will be vans available to get people back to the fieldhouse.

4. Consent Items:

- 1) Team prep rooms at nationals. Joe mentioned that practice is to have team prep; gov't prep rooms have become antiquated. Prep rooms will be first-come, first-serve.

Question: Affect local tournaments? No.

No objections.

- 2) Electronic voting: Michael notes that we've been doing this for several years.

No objections.

5. Discussion items:

- 1) Joe presented the season sweepstakes item. The committee reported that some programs like to move novice debaters up to open; others keep them at a lower level longer. In some locations, where there are only open divisions, there would be no penalty.

Open, junior, novice, overall (overall would be the status quo).

Question from Gary Rybold - Community College sweepstakes still awarded? We've done that, but it's not part of the bylaws. Joe mentioned he would welcome such an amendment.

Bill Sheffield moves (Skip seconds) to allow a community college sweepstakes.

Question from Marty: Do we give trophies to each of these divisions? Not necessarily. There's actually not a mandate to have trophies - it's just what we've done.

Question from Steve Hunt: Definitions/limits - would these be the same?

Comment from Skip: Gary's in China; may not be necessary to have novice/junior distinctions if we do a community college.

Amendment from Jeremy Christansen: Eliminate all sweepstakes awards entirely.

Parliamentarian (David Worth): Substitute amendments would be equivalent of main motion. And since main motions have to be submitted 30 days prior to the business meeting, the Christansen amendment was ruled out of order.

Vote on Junior College sweepstakes - 2-year sweepstakes - Passes

John Meany: No methodology in terms of this award - would this increase/decrease membership? Then I'm in favor of maximizing awards for every member school.

Question: Marty - Definition of novice/JV? Joe - Yes, but they're guidelines, not binding for sanctioning status. Marty - Committee felt they should be binding.

Skip: Renea does something for novice awards - director's assurance that they are novice.

Question: Top 4 teams from each division → 16 teams count toward sweepstakes points?
Joe: top 4 teams in each category; they could be same.

Glenn: The fact that the rules are not binding is problematic - people would inflating their divisions.

Trischa: 1 school could win novice, JV, open and overall? What does that prove?

Dan Schabot: 2 schools of thought; IPDA has run a 3-division structure – it does artificially increase some divisions, but it's not a bad thing to increase participation.
Complaint - we won't enter people in novice because we don't know the lines.

(Motion to extend discussion by 5 minutes without objection):

Scott Jensen - Would love to see a junior division expanded. The learning curve in parl is different. HS public forum/LD isn't the same - and they're forced to go open...

Brent - Not sure what I feel about final vote - only makes sense to count 2 teams in junior/novice. West coast - 2 teams is more common. Should amend to have 2 teams...

Amendment (Brent Northup): Limit number of teams in open/JV/novice to 2 teams per schools.

Clarification: How would community college awards work? Would work same as status quo.

Amendment (Scott W.) on the amendment - top 4 teams in open; in overall - count 2 from novice and JV.

The amendment, as twice amended:

Five season sweepstakes awards will be conferred: overall sweepstakes, open/varsity sweepstakes, junior varsity sweepstakes, novice sweepstakes and community college.

Schools may count up to 4 teams toward the overall sweepstakes; up to 2 of which may be novice and junior teams (cannot count more than combined 2 from novice and junior divisions). In junior and novice divisions, a school's top 2 teams will count for divisional sweepstakes.

Close the question. Vote on the amendment, twice amended: 11 in favor; 8 opposed. Several abstained. This passes.

So, the new proposal: 4 open; 2 JV, 2 novice; 4 overall (2 of those 4 can be from junior and novice divisions).

Amendment passes.

Move to extend by 2 minutes.

Main motion: Skip - Committee arguments that it was better to add divisions - those focusing on seniors denied opportunities from those who included JV/novice. It's designed for senior-only programs.

Trischa: Clarification - would/could? It's could

John: We don't know - plural opinions isn't the same as evidence. Personal reflections/stories not good. Tinkering with the way people make decisions in terms of how they participate. Growth only happens when there weren't divisions. Going into this blind = opposite of what would occur.

Kevin reminds: This is no actual vote today - this goes to the Spring business meeting.

2. Amendment - Closed Tournaments:

Joe (from sweepstakes tournament) - Only allow 1 closed tournament. Some schools have more access based on school's region and/or affiliation.

Dan Schabot: Amendment - add language "excluding state tournaments."

Questions: Round Robins? Would be closed - not held by national/regional association. Round robins don't count.

Amendment dies for lack of second.

Chris W. Amendment: Schools may only count 1 tournament hosted by a school.

If you host 3 tournaments per year, then the host could only count 1.
Amendment seconded.

Parliamentarian: Not germane. Kevin says "you can amend anything..."

Glenn Some regions have more - if you're in those regions, host a lot of tournaments.

Scott - Different than closed - closed = only some opportunity. Host a tournament = anyone can come...

Joe: Regions that are debate-rich versus not... programs who can't host. Not have ability/resources. Not to boost - but to provide a service to the region.

Move to extend by 2 minutes

Michael: Counter to fostering regional tournaments

Brent: Exec secretary nightmare...risk the harm of 2-3 tournaments on a campus to not police independent.

Skip: Swing tournaments - could easily sidestep the requirements.

Scott: 1. Not a secretarial nightmare - know who host. PLAN's - need to encourage to participate - not just travel, but host. Incorporates into organization.

Renea: Issue w/PLAN's - Nebraska is so spread out, it has to be in Lincoln or Seward.

Move to extend by 2 minutes.

Scott - Can non-PLAN members go? Yes...

Question has been called.

Vote on amendment: Fails

Main motion:

Extend time by 2 minutes

Marty - Would not like to see this moved forward - object to closed tournaments counting at all... if we can't all go, why shouldn't count. Didn't want NE state tournament counts - delegitimizes the tournament. I like the lovely walnut Nebraska trophy - that should be its own reward.

Renea - Would make bookkeeping easier...

Amendment (Marty): Count 0 closed tournaments.

Clarification: Would PKD nationals clarify? No.

Jeremy - Could limit the number of teams? Yes, but can't limit which schools come.

Scott: Would not count state, round-robins? Correct.

Amendment passes.

What goes to the Spring business meeting – no closed tournaments count.

3) Judging Obligations:

Chuck - Change language - only obligated to judge 2 rounds past obligation.

Audra - What does that do to judging availability?

Joe - The second judging obligations amendment would decrease panel sizes in order to ensure enough judges.

Audra - Opposed because 2 amendments needed to make it work. What if we pass addenda 5 (judging obligations 1), but not addenda 6 (judging obligations 2)?

Skip - We could combine

Brent: No research in this! How many judges are available on Sunday morning - can be dicey on Sunday morning - need Konrad, Danny, etc. for authoritative information.

Skip: I've been on the computers - can remove now for hardship. We've been able to operate effectively on SQ

Adam K. - What would this mean to students? Univ. of Oregon - special round after double-octas - different judges/resolution...

Glenn - Judge homogeneity? Adapt, limited number of strikes - the default would be to take them out of the pool. Some discussion as to whether it would affect the judge pool? Would it basically equal MPJ? No research on this, but it's a danger.

Marty: Possible to not move forward? Kevin - The proposal moves forward no matter what...it will go for a second hearing at the national meeting because of new procedures.

Marty: Amendment to remove strikethroughs and bold to return us to the status quo for #5 and #6.

Amendment seconded.

Steve Hunt: Does the committee/individual have data? Chuck - No.

Question called.

Vote to return to status quo - Unanimous.

Michael - What if it fails in the spring? Kevin - Gaping crater in constitution!

Judging Obligations 2: Chuck - More flexibility for the tournament director.

Parliamentarian: We didn't amend item #6 after all.

The motion fails for lack of a second.

Eligibility - Adam: Asked for submissions from people in the community...1 person responded. Extend eligibility to 10 semester. Rationale offered: consistency with other debate organizations (CEDA, NDT, etc.)

Also, people who debate for 7-8 years will exist, no matter what...but if limited by travel schedule or other circumstances would have additional eligibility.

Amendment seconded.

Directors with both policy/parli programs - easier to keep track of things.
Questions: Once 4 national tournaments, could still compete in 9th semester? Yes.

Marty: Could be ambiguity - 10 semesters take precedence? No. Contestants still limited to 4 national tournament years. Last year, we took care of that issue.

John: Why value consistency unless original decision makes sense? Empty followership... I don't believe the original decision makes sense - should reduce eligibility to maximize learning opportunities. 6 semesters would be ideal, not 10.

Bill N.: Majors/minors/double majors all expand the amount of time students are in school - if school wants to see them competing, reason for 10.

Skip: Speak against - mistake to stay longer. Exploiting them - not going on to grad schools. Discourage those from beginning if we spend \$\$ on seniors.

Move to extend by 2 minutes.

If goal to enhance consistency, 10 semesters/4 nationals - not consistent. This basically equals redshirt.

Michael - This equals death of Novice Nationals - they won't go because it counts at 8 semesters.

Adam: Favor of making clean break of debate. Some people don't agree - it's important - would like to compete. Important to compete. Not encouraging to stay on...

Goes forward to Spring business meeting.

Agenda items completed.

Questions from floor:

Dan - Does AFA assign slots for business meetings? Kevin - I was told to submit this as a panel - would prefer nights, etc. Didn't impact assignment for slot. When objections were raised, NCA would only take modifications and not allow us to move the panel.

Long term solution: NPDA can be an independent affiliate with NCA so that we can get their own time slot? Could help AFA/NFA.

Meeting adjourned without objection.