

Agenda, NPDA Business Meeting, November 2009

Reports

Officers/Appointees (announcements not already on-line)
Host Report for 2010 -- Joe Gantt, Texas Tech
Site Committee -- Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma
Other Committees -- Chairs Reporting
Other Announcements

Old Business

- 1) Judge eligibility (holdover from Spring 2009, as amended during that meeting – Addendum 1)
- 2) Elimination rounds and sweepstakes (holdover from Spring 2009, as amended during that meeting – Addendum 2)

New Business

- 1) Item Related to Speaker Points as Sorting Criteria -- Danny Cantrell, Exec. Sec. (Addendum A)
- 2) Item Related to Two Divisions at NPDA National Tournament -- Joe Gantt, Texas Tech (Addendum B)
- 3) Amendment of Item Two Related to Standard Parliamentary Debate Division at NPDA National Tournament -- Marty Birkholt, Vice-President and Renea Gernant—President (Addendum C)

Adjournment

Old Business: Addendum 1 (Judge Eligibility)

Amendment to the Tournament Operating Procedures
Insert Item E after the current Item D and renumber the document accordingly.

E. Judge eligibility

- 1. Member schools should strive to supply judges for the National Championship Tournament who have completed their college years, or have significant life experience, and possess sufficient knowledge to effectively adjudicate the rounds they judge.**
- 2. In order to be an adjudicator at the National Championship Tournament a judge shall meet one or more of the following initial criteria at the time their name is submitted as part of the tournament entry:**
 - a. they shall have completed a baccalaureate degree;**
 - b. they shall have exhausted competitive eligibility in all intercollegiate forensics; or,**

- c. **if some eligibility remains, they shall have foresworn any future competition in intercollegiate forensics.**
 - d. **exceptions to the waiver of eligibility can be made on a case-by-case basis by the executive council for undergraduates who have entered debate through non-traditional channels.**
3. **The judge shall not have competed in intercollegiate debate in the United States after May 1 of the year preceding the National Championships and shall not do so in the period between entry in the tournament and the conclusion of the National Championship tournament.**

Rationale:

There has been a fair amount of confusion over whether students can compete and judge debate in the same academic year, with many programs expressing confusion about whether they can or cannot use judges who may have debated during the current academic year. This policy aims to clarify this issue and begins with an aspirational statement that, whenever possible, schools should use judges who have graduated or are appropriately mature to the task.

While many judges can leave competition and judge effectively and objectively under these circumstances, this policy aims to address the possibility that someone in recent competition may be biased by their competitive experiences and unable to judge effectively when not further removed from the competitive environment.

The language emphasizes intercollegiate competition in the United States to allow for the fact that some overseas competitors compete in graduate school at Worlds, but might otherwise be qualified to judge at NPDA having seen few, if any US competitors. This policy also recognizes that some overseas programs sponsored by IDEA might involve American seniors in international competition during the summer after their senior year, with minimal discernable affect on their ability to judge objectively at home the following year.

Old Business: Addendum 2

Amend Bylaw 3L to read as follows:

Tournaments may hold as many elimination rounds as is desired, but **teams may earn points toward National Parliamentary Debate Association Sweepstakes only counting elimination round points** ~~elimination rounds meeting the following specifications will be counted toward National Parliamentary Debate Association Sweepstakes~~ when: 1) they are among the top half of the field and they do not have less than a 50% win-loss preliminary record or 2) they have over a 50% win-loss record.

- ~~1. For semi-finals, there must be a field of 8 teams in the division;~~
- ~~2. For quarterfinals, there must be a field of 15 teams in the division;~~
- ~~3. For octa-finals, there must be a field of 29 teams in the division;~~
- ~~4. For double-octa-finals, there must be a field of 58 teams in the division;~~
- ~~5. For double-double-octafinals, there must be a field of 115 teams in the division.~~

Rationale:

1. The current rules are an artifact of copying the old CEDA constitution written long ago.
2. The current rules allow more than half the field to break (for example, 16 of 29 teams advance).
3. The current rules count points for teams who advance with a losing record
4. The current rules can lead tournaments to not advance teams with winning records (for example, when there are 54 teams at a tournament, the rules reward points for breaking to only 16 teams).

Addendum A

Proposed Change: Treat total speaker points as higher sorting criteria than adjusted points.
Submitted By: Danny Cantrell, NPDA Executive Secretary, Rio Hondo College

Rationale:

This motion seeks to empower judges who may feel marginalized given the greater weight to wins than speaker points for both seeding in elimination rounds and speaker awards. Given that current procedure drops a high and low score, some debaters may feel free to ignore judge adaptation for a judge given that one round of lower speaker points is not going to hurt the team's chances at the tournament.

By moving total speaker points higher in the rankings, each judge's ballot matters to a team's ranking and how they land in brackets. One bad round of speaker points would have greater significance.

The following three changes are proposed to the bylaws in addition to anywhere else in the documents which discuss the seed order where adjusted speaker points come before total speaker points. Following wins total speaker points should be the second criteria.

G.5. Scheduling elimination rounds

a. All teams with winning records (5-3 or better) will advance to the single elimination rounds. The initial seeding order of teams advancing to elimination rounds will be determined by the following criteria:

1) Number of Wins

2) Adjusted Speaker Points: Adjusted by dropping the high and the low scores

3) Total Speaker Points

2) Total Speaker Points

3) Adjusted Speaker Points: Adjusted by dropping the high and the low scores

4) Opposition Wins: The strength of the team's competition as defined by the number of wins earned by the team's opposition

5) Double-Adjusted Points: Adjusted by dropping the two high and the two low scores

6) Judge Variance: The average number of points that each judge gave the team relative to the number of points the judge gave to all other teams the judge was assigned

7) Random

J.2. The top twenty speakers at the tournament will receive an award as determined by the speaker points assigned to them in the preliminary rounds. Speaker order shall be determined by the following criteria:

a. ~~Adjusted Points: Speaker points after dropping high and low scores~~

b. ~~Total Points: Total speaker points~~

a. Total Speaker Points

b. Adjusted Speaker Points: Adjusted by dropping the high and the low scores

c. Double-Adjusted Points: Speaker points after dropping the two highest and the two lowest scores

d. Judge Variance: The average number of points greater or fewer that each judge gave the speaker relative to all other speakers to which the judge assigned points

e. Number of Wins: The speaker's number of wins in the preliminary rounds

f. Opposition Wins: The strength of the speaker's competition as defined by the number of preliminary round wins earned by the speaker's opposition

g. If all the speakers involved in a tie are indistinguishable based on all of the above criteria, then an "unbreakable tie" will be declared.

J.4. All novice debaters (those debaters in their first year of debate competition) will be eligible for the Top Novice Speaker award, regardless of the status of the person with whom they debate. The top five novice speakers will be recognized. The top novice speakers are also eligible for regular speaker awards. Speaker order shall be determined by the following criteria:

a. ~~Adjusted speaking points~~

b. ~~Total speaker points~~

a. Total Speaker Points

b. Adjusted Speaker Points: Adjusted by dropping the high and the low scores

c. Double adjusted speaker points

d. Judge variance

Addendum B:

Proposed Changes: Two-divisional structure for NPDA

Submitted By: Joe Gantt, Texas Tech and Jacob Stutzman, Oklahoma City University

Rationale: The overall goal is to create a more all-encompassing NPDA National Tournament by introducing two divisions: Standard NPDA Division and MPJ Division

B, 1: On or about December 1 prior to the tournament, the Tournament Director shall send a tournament invitation to all member schools. The tournament invitation shall announce a deadline for entry that is approximately six weeks prior to the Championship Tournament. The tournament invitation will include a maximum number of teams that each school is allowed to nominate **and a description of the form of mutual preference judging that will be used for the MPJ division of the tournament.**

Rationale: As scholarship and best practices regarding MPJ evolve, the tournament operating procedure should remain flexible enough to accommodate changes. The NDT, for example, simply specifies that a form of mutual preference must be used while allowing the form to

change from year to year. As long as the form is described in advance, schools and teams can make an informed choice about which division to enter.

B, 2: A complete nomination must consist of the number of teams, the number of judges, the names of teams and judges (although names may be changed prior to the tournament), **the division in which each team will compete (which can also be changed prior to the tournament)**, and a deposit to be applied to entry fees.

Rationale: The nomination is also where novice competitors are identified, so this would simply require coaches to mark the correct division for each team when they submit the entry.

D, 3: The tab room staff at each NPDA Championship Tournament will track the performance of novice competitors and novice two-person teams **in each division**.

D, 3, a: Certificates, plaques, or other appropriate awards should be given to the top five novice speakers **in each division**.

D, 3, b: Certificates, plaques, or other appropriate awards should be given to the top three novice two-person teams **in each division**.

Rationale: Novices should be eligible for recognition within their own competitive divisions, and each of these changes simply makes those awards available.

E, 1: There shall be eight preliminary rounds of debate **in two divisions: Adaptation and MPJ. The two divisions shall use the same rules and resolutions, differing only in the procedures used to assign judges.**

Rationale: This is the central point of the proposal. Insofar as the national tournament may be split, it should be divided using a simple criterion that represents competing, but valid, goals for competition. Naming the divisions in this way avoids the risk of one division being perceived as inferior while clearly identifying each according to the competitive practices that are privileged in the division.

H, 1: Each preliminary round should be adjudicated by one judge. Each elimination round prior to the quarter final round will be adjudicated by no fewer than three judges. The quarter final and semi finals will be adjudicated by no fewer than five judges. The final round will be adjudicated by no fewer than seven judges. At the discretion of the Tournament Director, each team in the semifinal and final round of debate **in the MPJ division** may be allowed to remove one or more judges from a tentative panel. In this case, the Tournament Director has the right to name one or more judges who cannot be removed by either team. The team will be given up to three minutes to return the judge strike card or forfeit their right to strike judges. From the remaining potential judge panel, the tab room will randomly assign judges to the debates. The final judge panel will then be announced to the teams debating. **Teams in elimination rounds of the Adaptation**

division will not have the opportunity to strike judges that they did not strike or constrain prior to the start of the tournament.

Rationale: Insofar as adaptation is a good goal and one that dictates the competitive practices of the preliminary rounds of the tournament, procedures should not change for the last rounds of the tournament where a champion is determined.

H, 2: All strikes, **judge preferences** 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.~~ **The number of allowed strikes for each individual team in the Adaptation division shall never be more than 5% of the entire judging pool.**

Rationale: The previous strike procedures would be moot and this change just requires judge preferences to be submitted on time.

H, 3: No team will be judged by someone associated with either member of the team or the team's school for the past four years. All teams and judges registered for the tournament should note such conflicts on their entry. At registration, judges will be provided a team list to return to the tab staff marked with any teams they feel they should be constrained against. Any constraints entered by a team in effect for the tournament will need to be justified and accepted by the Tournament Director based on the following categories: former coaches, former team members, romantic relationships, or other cases as approved on a case-by-case basis by the Tournament Director. **Judges and program directors should identify obvious conflicts of interest and exclude those judges from judging teams impacted by that conflict.**

Rationale: The change here simply moves language that was previously in H, 4.

H, 4: ~~All judging assignments will be made at random from a pool. Judges and program directors should identify obvious conflicts of interest and exclude those judges from judging teams impacted by that conflict.~~ **Judging assignments will be made for the Adaptation division first, using random selection from the pool. The MPJ division will be assigned judges second, with privilege given to preference over mutuality of judges.**

Rationale: Two divisions operating from the same pool must be ordered in terms of the judging assignments. If the MPJ division were assigned judges first, then presumably the same highly preferred judges would almost always be assigned to that division, segregating the judging pool.

The assignment of judges to the Adaptation division first preserves the movement of judges between divisions, while the privilege given to preference once the MPJ judges are assigned ensures that debaters in the MPJ division are likely to see their preferred judges.

- J, 1: Each debater advancing to elimination rounds **in each division** will receive an award. Each member of the team will receive an award appropriate to their placing in the tournament (Quarterfinalist, Semifinalist, etc.).
- J, 2: The top twenty speakers at the tournament **in each division** will receive an award as determined by the speaker points assigned to them in the preliminary rounds. Speaker order shall be determined by the following criteria
- J, 3: All teams, both members of which are novice (in their first year of debate competition with a year of competition being defined as two tournaments in each of two semesters), will be eligible for the Top Novice Team award. The top three novice teams **in each division** will receive awards. The top novice teams are also eligible for regular team awards.
- J, 4: All novice debaters (those debaters in their first year of debate competition) will be eligible for the Top Novice Speaker award, regardless of the status of the person with whom they debate. The top five novice speakers **in each division** will be recognized. The top novice speakers are also eligible for regular speaker awards. Speaker order shall be determined by the following criteria

Rationale: Given that debaters will be competing under different paradigms and that two national champions will be named, it seems appropriate to identify all elimination round participants, the top speakers in both divisions, and the Top Novice teams and speaker in both divisions.

- J, 5, a, 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. **The top four teams may come from either competitive division and schools need not be entered in both divisions to be eligible for sweepstakes awards.** 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 won (including advancement by a 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 **in each division** will receive an additional two points for its school in addition to any elimination round points earned.

J, 5, a, 4, j: The lowest cumulative speaker award placings for the school's four highest placing individual speakers **across divisions**.

J, 5, b, 3: Ordinarily, the records of the four teams from each school with the highest number of preliminary round wins will count toward the determination of sweepstakes awards. **The four teams may come from either competitive division, and schools need not be entered in both divisions to be eligible for sweepstakes awards.** However, in the event that all schools wishing to enter four teams at the Championship Tournament cannot be accommodated, the maximum number of teams that count for tournament sweepstakes will be set at the number of teams that every school was allowed to enter.

J, 5, b, 4, j: The lowest cumulative speaker award placings for the school's four highest placing individual speakers **across divisions**.

Rationale: Awarding separate sweepstakes awards would force a difficult decision for schools that split their entry between the two divisions. A school that enters two teams in Adaptation and two in MPJ would be unlikely to compete for sweepstakes against schools that enter four teams in either division. The collected revisions to sweepstakes would count both divisions toward a single sweepstakes award without requiring teams to be entered in both divisions to be eligible. In short, though we may have teams that win different national championships, there will be a single overall sweepstakes award and a single two-year college sweepstakes award given at the national championship tournament.

ADDENDUM C

Proposed Change: To clarify procedures in the Standard Parliamentary Debate Division at NPDA National Tournament

Submitted By: Marty Birkholt, Vice-President and Renea Gernant—President

1. Participants in the Standard Division of the National Tournament will adhere to the following guidelines:
 - a. Topics will be announced in the room of the debate.
 - b. Judges and proposition teams will have access to the room assigned for the debate in order to prepare.
 - c. Opposition teams should leave the room and return no more than 15 minutes after the announcement of the topic. The round will start within 5 minutes of their return.
 - d. Students/teams will not use published or electronic sources in preparation other than a dictionary.
 - e. Students/teams will not use coaches as a reference during prep.
 - f. Students/teams who fail to adhere to the guidelines of the event will forfeit the round in which the violation occurs.
 - g. Judges in the standard division as in the alternate division agree to adhere to these guidelines when signing the critic certification form.