

## NPDA Business Meeting – Spring 2007, Colorado College

1. Kevin reminds us that we've changed business meeting procedures. Simple version: any legislation takes two meetings in order to be approved. Everything on the agenda was moved to the floor at NCA, and then passed to bring to this meeting.

No new agenda items.

Another change: cut down reports, some of the reports are online.

If done earlier, general comments for next year.

Move to approve Fall 2006 meeting minutes. Passed unanimously.

2. Kevin's report is online. <http://www.parlidebate.org/pdf/president-spring07.pdf>

Only item of significant interest: national student rep became vacant due to inactivity. We waited as long as possible; no response happened. To facilitate elections, appointed Kevin Garner from William Jewell as interim student rep.

Key item: the national student meeting needs to be taken seriously! Only half of the district reps were filled; 1/3 of faculty reps were unfilled.

3. VP report - None. Professional Development
4. Joe's report: Season-long sweepstakes complete - we have pretty much everything. Those will go online in the next couple of days. If errors, please let Joe know by mid-day Sunday.

In the fall report, next year will be much tougher in terms of tournament sanctioning. In the past, leniency. In the future, rules will be followed:

- a. 30 days prior for sanctioning
- b. results returned within 21 days after

If attending tournament, ask Joe preferably 45 days in advance if the tournament has been sanctioned. Try to get it done in advance!

Question: If they can't be bothered, can you do it? Joe says, I've never encountered it, but on a case-by-case.

Michael's clarification: You can submit for a director online; they just need to be members!

5. Brent's report: I now love credit cards, even though I wasn't in favor of them before. Eventually: membership, videos...

They do charge every time, and we'll figure out how much it is. This year: we'll see how it works, then we'll decide whether to increase money to cover the cost. There's much

Looking for videotapes of previous national finals. Brent has turned it over to a DVD duplication company, with chapter of each of the 6 speakers. Aztec Video will videotape this year. One thing we don't have - videocamera. Would someone tape who has won the final debate and the teams winning the trophies...that would be nice to have on the DVD. We're close to having a system to having this online....

IDEA project of Robert Trapp: \$2200-\$2500 coming to NPDA because of those who joined.

Full report after the tournament is over.

6. Marty Birkholt (Chair, Finance Committee): Proposed budget in front - extend the previous budget. No actual numbers for '06-'07 until after this tournament. Would like to pass budget as is, then ask at the Fall business meeting if there's a need to amend.

Comes as a committee report, no second necessary.

Question (Gary Rybold): PRP has interest; could we do the same thing?  
Brent says, we could consider the same thing...we just haven't.

Motion passes.

7. Webmaster: Please use the spreadsheet version of sweepstakes, it's most accurate.
8. Journal (in absentia): An issue just came out, one will come out soon.
9. Kevin (interim student rep): Opposition by students to breaking of brackets.

Kevin Minch: We discussed this; we can't take action during the reports; we'll talk about this during the open forum.

10. Site Committee (Marty Birkholt): Bid from USAFA for 2008.

Dates are the COFO dates: Friday-Saturday-Sunday after Easter (1 week after this year). (March 28-30, 2008).

II. Action Items:

A. Sanctioning Penalties - Clarifying the penalties.

Question: What is timely basis? 21 days.

Vote: Unanimously passes.

B. Definition of semesters: Clarify what is fall and spring semester. No definition as to when Fall ends and Spring begins.

Question (Gary Rybold): Why December 25, not 31<sup>st</sup>?

Answer: If it's a New Year's tournament...it could be confusing to have half in the fall, half in the spring.

Vote: Unanimously passes.

C. Tabulation of sweepstakes points:

Reason - Currently, last 4 prelim rounds. Can lead to squirrely results. To relieve inequity, percentage system based on number of prelims.

Vote: Unanimously passes.

D. Eligibility standards: Only amendment is to strike 2 standards to mix the two. The language was confusing – does the national tournament take away 1 or 2 semesters, or a national tournament year?

Language: 8 semesters, or 4 national tournament years. If you have remaining semesters + national tournament years, you can compete.

Question: Where is language delineated? If you do 8 semesters of debate but no national tournaments?

Answer: Compete at nationals = 1 semester

If you compete in 3 tournaments each semester, eligibility is exhausted.

Question: Is national = 1 semester of eligibility?

Kevin's explanation: gate #1 is semester.

Question: Do we have a database that can help?

Joe's answer: Not as of now; demonstration of eligibility rests with the student's program, not NPDA, NPDA Executive Secretary, or Executive Council.

With national tournament years, it's pretty easy to go back. We do have national tournament results, we can check. But, hard to check with other national tournaments. It would be difficult to keep the database.

John Meany: Could raise at COFO?

Michael says that he will raise at COFO.

Joe says he could keep a database for NPDA.

Question: Still confusing.

Joe's comment: Only applies to NPDA National tournament. No control over regular tournament.

Glenn's question: Also assumes ill will on part of students...are they trying to find loopholes in the rules? Yes, there's ambiguity, but no impact to the ambiguity.

Kevin: Reason for this is pre-emptive appeals – we think we might have problems, can you clarify? There were some that couldn't be answered; there are two - three different scenarios.

Joe: Provide benefit to the student; it is open to amendment so that scenario doesn't exist.

Question: Why doesn't 1 national = 2 semesters?

What's the harm in allowing 4 nationals + compete after that?

Michael: What about sweepstakes points?

Joe: Conceivably, could compete for 16 years, 2 tournaments per semester. Could find loopholes, then the loophole should help the student and not damage the student.

Katie: What is intention - 8 semester or 4 nationals - whichever come first?

Could put this in the language and end the discussion.

Skip: Invitationals say we follow NPDA guidelines.

Joe: Remove one of the strikethrough, keep the first sentence of IV E 1b:

The number of semesters...

**Amendment: Keep** the first sentence of each of the b points.

Passes unanimously.

Motion to extend debate by 2 minutes.

Text of motion? First sentence will remain in its entirety; everything else struck through.

Motion passes as amended.

E. Change tabulation of tournament sweepstakes:

One to clarify; one to change

Currently: Additional 2 points per each team advanced. Basically, a 4-3 round is worth double. (2 pts for winning, 2 pts for being in the quad-octa). Intent: you don't get points for losing.

Clarify: additional 2 points on top of the 2 points for winning the final round.

Kevin's comment: Custom is this would be for 2008 unless we vote to change for this year.

Motion passes (not unanimously).

F. Statue of limitations: We've had appeals - when do tournament results become final? Any time within 30 days, an appeal can be made; results final after that unless it's impossible to know.

If you come into information 45 days after, you get 30 days.

Motion passes unanimously.

G. Clarification of preparation materials:

There was an error in the agenda - the phrase "briefs prepared prior to the debate" should read "briefs prepared prior to preparation time."

Question: Clarification - would it be better to strike the (except those prepared by a debater's partner) since it's already imbedded in "notes that they physically constructed during the preparation time..."

Amendment  
Amendment seconded.

Question: "Being brought into the debating chambers?" - ruled out of order

Patty - I believe it needs to be stay - what if the partner writes out the argument for the other partner?

Andrew: Could be used to get rid of note passing...  
But those are created in the room.

Joey: Could say, "They were my partner..."

Question: What's brought into the round - rule doesn't matter if I write T shell and my partner reads it.

Patty: Problem is third line - "they physically constructed" - who is they?

Audra: If debating in round, that's they. Jurisdictional craziness...

Michael: What if you have 3 debaters on a team of two?

Audra: Only for NPDA Nats?

Michael: But people use NPDA guidelines...

Question: Better to have, "the two debaters debating in that round?"

All those in favor of the amendment:

Amendment passes - parenthetical is struck.

Fresh amendment: modify they to mean "the two debaters participating in that round."

Amendment passes unanimously.

Main motion:

Jeremy: What if 3<sup>rd</sup> member of team writes advantage #5? What is the enforcement?

Joe: Same issue with current language. Enforcement issues won't change. Valid concern; what trying to do is what is allowed and what isn't allowed.

Brian: Question about "brought into the debating chambers.." - what if it's in the bag?

Amendment and seconded: for use during the debate at the end of section A.

Question: If my team writes 14 T shells,

Move to extend debate by 5 minutes.

Lisa: It already says, "into the debating chambers for use during the debate."

John: This has come up previously for this language - multiple previous - this is a term of art that means use in the debate.

Brian: Why can't we codify to repeat the same language?

Call the question on the amendment (".....chambers for use during the debate.")

Amendment passes unanimously.

Question about what "physically constructed" - could a debater type up a position and print it during prep time?

Joe: My thought - previous or current wording could be to type and print during prep time.

Move to extend debate by 5 minutes.

Gary: Does it say written?

Joe: Prepared by debaters during prep time.

Amendment: "notes that the two debaters handwrite during the preparation time.

Blind debater - necessary to make allowance?  
Already allowed by ADA.  
Amendment passes.

Gary Rybold amends that it would be adopted immediately. Seconded.

Joe mentions, we have in the invitation in the previous language. Believes that it would be unfair to change the rules now, and then disqualifies.

Brian concurs. Let this continue - what's the harm?  
Brian - Announce before round 1.

Gary: Naive...worked on this 2-3 years ago about handwritten rules. Are people printing out briefs/flows, use during debate?

Joe: No, I don't know that.

Gary: Will print out a flow? Is it happening now?

Danny Cantrell: What are we voting on? Announce this at 8:25? Very confusing - appeals likely...

Glenn: Fairness should supercede.  
Precedent setting...come into effect when not all the teams here, not all on Net Benefits.

John: Problems with other documentation; judges may reference a document that doesn't follow the rules.

Skip: Last time, we made a hasty decision, and it took a toll... let it run its normal course.

Gary: Not aware of typing out flow sheets. If have brief on Iran sanctioning case, and prepare and move...haven't heard of printing out flow sheets - are we allowing this? Rule that it was handwritten.

Vote to allow tomorrow - Fails 1 to many.

Main motion: Amendment to strike "or notes prepared by teammates, coaches, or colleagues..."  
-Thought is to vary from policy, but this change doesn't meet that thought.

Intent of amendment: Allow notes  
Amendment seconded.

Audra: Support; help our students...Question before us has been - no prepared materials; but, it's an unnecessary part.

Antitethical to the rest of the amendment; why allow notes for coaches/others?

Gavin: Whole idea - by two debaters - attempt to level a playing field. WKY - whole bunch of teams, if they all wrote positions, could have blocks for every round - 20 people can write lots of frontlines!

Gavin: Sentence equalizes large/small team. Popular/larger/afford people to prep...makes it a bit more fair.

Glenn: Quality > quantity. If 20 people from WKY shoved to Joelle's - why not allow people to use the best arguments in prep time? What is the enforcement... is this Joelle's handwriting? More prep = better debates.

David: Not clear that helping each other in prep isn't educational....but can help small squads.

Small school with 1 coach - what is the functional difference between me writing positions and having them pre-flow ... multiply work in 20 minutes? If intent = what can debaters prepare, then if we rule out their blocks before hand, this issue falls in the same category.

Remove that line - what does this rule change?

Amendment: Fails unanimously.

Motion to extend by 5 minutes.

Amendment: Change the proposal as follows:

~~“Notes that the two debaters handwritten during the preparation time...” and “...or notes prepared by teammates, coaches, or colleagues~~

Will help small schools.

John: After 30 years, are debate communities critical communities.”

Exclusion of this doesn't make distinction, but may have card-cutters move into parli.

Resolution doesn't prevent people talking to those debaters and having them write down those arguments. Intent: prevent human copy machines. Why make the change when we just amended to talk about the two debaters... force the debaters to critically make the decision who to listen to.

Move to extend by 5 minutes.

Patty: Important to think in terms of competitive equity, less popular for small schools. If some schools thought “write in advance,” this isn't allowed.

Gavin: Agree with Brian and Patty; main justification = increased education, prep; where do we draw the lines? Then let's go to the “let's put all my pre-written tubs in...”

Audra: Agree with amendment from competitive and organizational - who is the handwritten police? If the debaters want to handwrite, there's no regulation check.

Chris Shaw: Being from a school where we were alone; pre-prep is OK if we allow coaches. How can any of this be enforced?

Joey: Group preparation good.  
25 pieces - can understand in 7 minutes?  
Strike the language = equal opportunity to

Two points: Equal opportunity - open prep - can consult many people, processing different story.  
Debaters should write their own flows - only way to process.

Enforcement: Morally reprehensible - not endorsed.

John: Agree - additional paper, not help. No reason to change. Enforcement - If no enforcement, why have any body of rules unless self-executing based on ethical principles.

Michael: Worry that there's little student voice, why not table the amendment? Call the question.

Vote on the amendment: Division called. Aye = 8 Nay = 22.

Michael: Move to Rules/Standards Committee.

Joe: Speak against to committee. Whether we refer or use current/past rules, not address the amendment.

Michael: Reason to move - we're confused. Let that committee decide.

Aye = 15, Nay = 13. Refer to committee passes.

Addenda 8 - IDEA Agreement.

We have to approve this after ratifying through the Executive Council position.

This is to get a sense of the body - if the UN grant is continued, do we want to continue with this agreement?

Skip: Would the lifetime dues be still good - get money back?

Kevin: School has to be renewed, individuals are permanent. Then the gift to schools increases.

Robert: We're not sure with the IDEA-UN Foundation agreement. It won't be the same; but, individual memberships are lifetime.

Vote to authorize Exec Council to work with IDEA to facilitate the money. Nothing from NPDA  
→ IDEA.

John: 501(c)3 allows us to fundraise separately; if we participate as IDEA members, then it could undermine the ability of the organization to do its own fundraising. This could be a barrier.

Gary: Nice to get a rebate; IDEA - PeopleSpeak - \$6,000 could cover 4 students going to China in May...why not take advantages of free money?

Vote: Passes unanimously.

End of scheduled business - now to discussion:

Glenn - Season long sweepstakes... Should revisit this award. Should include state, other closed tournaments.

Kevin comments - Prescott started work on this, Fall 2004 report. Proposed new system.

Personal opinion: whatever is done should be process.

Joe comments: Serious problems...amendment passed as a result of the quick fix that we've tried in the past. Should we/will we find a perfect system?

Kevin: What about appointing a committee to get legislation for November? Sure...

Kevin G. - Student requests about breaking brackets. William Jewell last affected; we had a team sit out... breaking brackets changes the tournament - changes the results of the prelim rounds.

Joey: Homeschool league - debate = debate people you like...if I hit someone on my team, will it be so emotional if 10-12 year olds can manage?

Jeremy: Bracket is meaningless if speaker points are meaningless....

Patty: Agree with Joey, if debates happened, this is fine. Cultural norm = don't debate. Team rule is you debate it out...

Glenn: Speaker points aren't that arbitrary - people have earned the points; adaptation...while someone may get bad points, something to be said for consistency of performance in prelim rounds.

Robert: Favor of breaking brackets - but we do this in prelims all the time... should be consistent and meet in prelims.

Brent: Don't want soldiers killed by friendly fire!

Gary: Hurtful when someone had to drop out...

Kevin M. - Should talk about this at the Student Business Meeting.

John: Need to get a copy of this from the meeting. Breaking brackets -

Kevin G. - Ask the squad - what do you want to do?

Joey: With discussion topics,

Glenn - 10 semesters - is the reality that we need extra eligibility because of increased requirements?

Brent: I've seen organizations morph; we're in the middle. The elephant in the room: parli vs. policy - NPTE is now leading. Others feel left behind... A philosophical discussion would be good - our community is beginning to fracture a bit. What is the forum? Net Benefits not right; it's for the believers.

John: As part of foundation for good decision-making ... there needs to be a formal commitment to data collection. Is it possible to collect about NPDA, other organizations? Committees, COFO, etc.?

Joey: 1) Net Benefits is a valid place...sensitive to community college. Reason for more believers - where else do they engage the discussion? Help me see the world as you see it... Old guard = this is the way I see it.

Kevin G. - Regardless of NPTE, etc., we're all united in parli - we have enough other kinds of debate... board members of NPTE, NPDA should dialog - what could we learn from each other? Two should come together during the week or the summer...

Kevin M. - Tossed around the idea of a developmental conference - piggyback on what IE community is doing.

Glenn: Brent's right, but if we all sit down and have a roundtable dinner, we have more in common than in difference.

Michael: What about those who aren't here?

Chris: What about those who are added? Discussions of everyone = we can't get anywhere. "Anyone should win any round" is not the problem. Not compete = stop?

John: Slightly amend Michael's comment - my concern ...overwhelming number of institutions that don't have debate. 90% of colleges don't have debate - outreach - how do you reach people who aren't part of the organization? If we're as large as we can be, we'll only get smaller... static growth over the last few years. Are we growing? Over last 4 years, no. Why not is the question we should raise. Over time, we should increase.

Kevin M.: I agree. Glenn and I are getting email from APDA schools in the East; their only drivable tournament is WKY. Where haven't we expanded? East? Texas. I want domestic outreach.

Renea: John and I discuss; regional circuit is very important. PLUM's and PLAN's aren't highly sophisticated, and likely mocked - but 10 teams - including one here, enjoyed. Style wouldn't work at NPDA, but circuit excites people about doing parli. How do we outreach? Renea makes people go to PLAN's - you can learn from them...We need to stop being bigoted.

Kevin M.: We have a tendency to forget about tournaments that need to be supported...

Joe: Competed in NPDA from 1994-1998 - now I have teams that have sock puppets. We need a developmental conference to talk about the misconceptions...us versus them isn't good for all of us.

Joey: As an organization, we have goals...what is the central principle? Does this mean that some people don't fit in? We shouldn't be everything to everyone.

Kevin M.: Brief attempt at a goals statement, it died.

John: Agree in principle, but same things have been said by NDT - 400 to under 100. Majority have opted out, nobody new replaces. It's another thing to examine in a critical way what's happening in an organization - what we say in debate is disproven in critical thinking. For example, it's not a good idea to have experienced people take resources - more experienced should take more resources in order to get awards. Kate Shuster has done two comprehensive

examinations between debate and critical thinking... good luck in finding a connection.

Joey: Trophies are worthwhile? Should we present to everyone...

Kevin: I will ask for volunteers for various committees. It took 3 months to fill out the slots. Committees could drive this organization, but do not. People complain - but don't put it on paper...

Most district meeting attendance was abysmal - there will be clear signage. Faculty and student rep. I could have been a tyrant and appoint everyone... we can't seem to fill those slots.

Renea is now officially VP of NPDA.

Minutes taken by Michael Dreher, Bethel University