

NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION  
BUSINESS MEETING

MINUTES

Thursday, March 20, 2014

7:30-10:00pm

San Francisco Room, DoubleTree Inn

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order @ 7:32
- II. Approval of Minutes (Fall 2013): Approved
- III. Reports
  - a. Executive Council
    - i. None
  - b. Committees
    - i. Finance Committee
      1. At Fall Meeting
    - ii. Site Committee
      1. Looking for hosts.
      2. Would love to have people submit themselves to be host
  - c. Tournament Director
    - i. Not present
  - d. Other reports
    - i. Ad Hoc committee on NPDA Growth/Stability
      1. Has found all of the email address and stuff.
      2. Meeting with members and will put the survey out after all of the nationals
    - ii. Journal
      1. Journal is getting restarted
      2. Marty is working on it.
- IV. Action Items
  - a. Reminder of two-step process
    - i. Must be on the agenda 30 day before meeting
    - ii. Then discussion
    - iii. Then move to an action item at the NEXT meeting
- V. New Business
  - a. Novice Definition Change – Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University
    1. Proposal: I would like to propose that high school experience be counted as equal to but not greater than College experience when determining NPDA Novice eligibility, by deleting and replacing Section VI, Article 4. subsection 1. as shown below (removing the area shaded in yellow and replacing it with the section shaded in green).
    2. Rationale: Current interpretations of Novice definitions disqualify beginning debaters that have had even one round of high school tournament experience in any form of debate including Public Forum format from counting as novices per NPDA, but allows up to two full semesters of college experience for beginners that start in college. This penalty discourages beginners that have extremely limited high school experience, and causes many to quit rather than be forced into Junior or Open divisions at tournaments
    3. Discussion

- a. Layne: says that these definitions do not guide tournaments at large
- b. Gantt: Only affect nationals
- c. SDSU person: Only guidelines
- d. Sherris Minor: Invitational tournaments
- e. Marlin: Its what invitationals use for definitons
- f. Phil: Confused with wording as in the agenda. Also pedagogically it makes sense to ease them into the upper divisions
- g. Korry: If a region only has two divisions, then this is difficult
- h. Bates: As such, tournaments have eliminated the novice division
- i. Kevin Garner: Why are there two different rules/guidelines?
- j. Gantt: TOP was separated from Bylaws six years ago
- k. Jacob S.: SO, let's make them the same
- l. Phil: (Read from the 2012 Bylaws regarding novice definition)
- m. Chris: Two different standards are creating problems. A past NPDA tournament used guidelines and not TOP to award novice awards
- n. Bill: Need to make this changes so it reflects the discussion and makes changes so it moves to an action item in the fall meeting
- o. This will move to an ACTION item at the Fall 2014 Meeting. Will be adapted to reflect changes in the TOP as well as the Bylaws.

#### **TOP Proposed Change**

##### D. Novice

1. For purposes of the NPDA Championship Tournament, a novice shall be defined as an undergraduate student who is in his or her first year of participation in intercollegiate competitive debate and meets the criteria below:

- a. Students with *more than two semesters of* previous competitive experience in high school or intercollegiate debate formats would be ineligible for novice status.
  - II. 1) High school debate formats include, but are not limited to, Cross Examination (CX) Debate and Lincoln-Douglas (LD) Debate.
  - III. 2) Intercollegiate debate formats include, but are not limited to, Parliamentary Debate (such as NPDA, APDA, CUSID), CEDA/NDT, NFA-LD, NEDA and ADA.

#### **PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGE**

##### VI. Student Eligibility Standards

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

- 1. To be classified as a novice:
  - 1. The student should have no more than ~~one~~ two semesters of high school debate experience.
  - 2. The student should be in the first two semesters of collegiate debate.
  - 3. Once the student has advanced to elimination rounds more than 3 times, the student should be advanced to the junior or open division.

- b. From Rob Layne, Texas Tech University
  - i. Proposal to require judges to disclose to willing debaters.
    - 1. Current section in “NPDA Rules of Debating”
      - a. 5B. A running update of all teams’ records will be publicly posted in a “warm room” or common area accessible to all tournament participants. After returning the ballot, the judge may, at his or her discretion, give brief constructive comments to the debaters. Such conversations should, if possible, take place in the established “warm room” area if one is designated by the tournament. No one may be required to enter the “warm room” or participate in discussions. Judges should refrain from checking the records of teams they are about to judge should such information be available.
      - b. Strike “After returning the ballot, the judge may, at his or her discretion, give brief constructive comments to the debaters.” And replace with “After submitting the ballot, the judge must announce the decision of the debate and give brief constructive comments to debaters wishing to receive the decision and/or receive constructive comments.”
      - c. Add: In the section stating, “No one may be required to enter the “warm room” or participate in discussions.” Strike “one” and replace with “debater.”
    - 2. The new section would read:
      - d. 5B. A running update of all teams’ records will be publicly posted in a “warm room” or common area accessible to all tournament participants. After submitting the ballot, the judge must announce the decision of the debate and give brief constructive comments to debaters wishing to receive the decision and/or receive constructive comments. Such conversations should, if possible, take place in the established “warm room” area if one is designated by the tournament. No debater may be required to enter the “warm room” or participate in discussions. Judges should refrain from checking the records of teams they are about to judge should such information be available.
    - 3. Rationale: The section would require that disclosure of the decision would take place after the ballot had been submitted, thus providing debaters with immediate feedback of their performance within the debate. This also aligns the current practice of requiring disclosures after

elimination rounds, which may be technically discouraged under the current reading of this section.

ii. Discussion on item

1. Rob L. speaking in favor of his motion.
2. Phil: I support disclosure and such, but there are judges/coaches that would oppose this in particular. When we force disclosure, we are forcing justification. That would move them out
3. Kevin G: Already mandate judges do certain things. Requiring an RFD already, the competitor could then learn more actively. Harassment policy already protects the critic.
4. Cristi: I agree, but my region would feel extremely excluded. This would only exacerbate the situation. Coaches can then interpret the ballot with the student.
5. CLARIFICATION: This changes the "Rules of Debating & Judging" that is on the website. We need to have that document.
6. Rob L.: (Favor): Important to keep in consideration, but ballot is imperfect and not able to follow-up as well as a delay. We should be encouraging disclosure. Worlds requires disclosure.
7. Kyle (Against): Disclosure is sometimes not going to be beneficial to the students. Judges sometimes feel uncomfortable. Reduction of pedagogical flexibility is not advantageous.
8. Sherris (Favor): This is only at Nationals explicitly, so what is the problem. Brings us in line with other forms of debate.
9. M. Hogan (Against): National final rounds as well? Requires disclosure then as well. Ability for the judge to be protected. Emotions do get involved and is problematic if we do not allow this flexibility
10. KGar: (Favor) Rules says not until ballot is turned in. So, there is processing time?
11. Marie A. (Against): World's is disclosure on consensus, not just a single judge. So there is a support system. Also, there is some check system because of multiple judge panel. Also, philos are supposed to be here. Debaters do not adapt, they tend to force positions
12. Rob (Favor): Teaching debaters to justify their arguments, why not judges justify their decisions. Also, since this is post-ballot, why would the judge not have a rationalization? This should balance pedagogically. Would say that debaters ARE adapting to change their arguments so that the judge does vote.

13. Chris: Rounds in junior/novice to not disclose for protection of them. Could change the number of schools to enter NPDA. If it only applied to Open debates, then that might help. TD could vary which divisions this applies to
14. Jeannie: gives rights to students and none to judges. Plus, this will only delay tournaments because of the disclosure. Additionally, oral disclosure happens, then the ballots become blank and no help to coaches.
15. Neesen: Puts incredible responsibility on the judges disclosing as well. Where is the proof? How do we adjudicate?
16. Brandon: Love disclosure when it is allowed. Gun to your head does not make this a good idea.
17. Rob L (Favor): "Must" is the problem? [Discussion about the mythical friendly amendment ensued]
18. Gantt: Have to be voted on, to change. So is there a motion?
19. MOTION-AMENDMENT: Rob L.: "The judge should be strongly encouraged to announce the decision of the debate in open division"
  - a. Gina (USAFA): Comparison to WUDC is not valid. Disclosure in NPDA becomes more combative. How debater's screwed up, not how to learn. Because judges feel the need to justify. Perhaps we should have judge training.
  - b. Matt: Strong encouragement becomes a tournament burden and it becomes a bright line problem. What does this mean? Who determines the encouragement
  - c. Jacob S.: Forced speech is bad, this allows some discretion for the judge. The judge has to justify the not doing it beyond just not wanting to.
  - d. Sherris: This creates a more even community norm. Allows judges to do so.
  - e. Korry: Pedagogically disclosure is good. Aggressive debaters often create a problem. This allows the judge to have some flexibility. We also need to train our debaters.
  - f. Matt S. Put the language in your invitation, so regional interpretations are possible.
  - g. MOTION: Amendment passed.
2. MOTION: MOVE TO SUSPEND THE RULES to advance this to an action item.
  - a. Matt H: We should not suspend the rules to allow other programs to know this.
  - b. Rob L: We should do this because that means that

we should be checking invitations all the time to make sure if.

- c. Bates: That is what happens. It does result in a lot of changes
- d. KGar: This would let people know in advance
- e. Chris: No, it would not the eligibility change was not known until well into the next year.
- f. Korry: Who knows about this?
- g. Swanson: MOve to close discussion
- h. Cristi: PKD overlaps, so delay is good
- i. Jacob: PKD has little overlap with NPDA
- j. Phil: Rules of order: Could we move to table?
- k. Gantt: Motion on the floor, needs a second
- l. Jeanie: Not a lot of people at NCA
- m. Bill: Could give a lot of proxies
- n. Cristi: Not a lot of overlap, but sanctioning would cause a lot more discussion.
- o. 4 in favor, lots against. Chair says MOTION FAILS.

3. Phil: What are our options? Move to end discussion.  
Seconded

4. Discussion closed, move to action in Fall 2014.

b. Eligibility & Season-Long

- i. Gantt: Different Exec Secretaries have interpreted it differently
- ii. Bates: To be clear, there is NO rule in the Bylaw ALLOWING an Executive Secretary to record half-points. The only statement is to not allow mid-year debaters to accrue points. Additionally, there is NOTHING regarding a team having one ineligible debater. Again, if ineligible, then no points. This seemed fairly clear to me. Additionally, we do not want officers making interpretations if there are not explicit rules in place.
- iii. Phil S: Seems to penalize the squad
- iv. Gantt: This not a legislative change just an indication of how future Exec Secretaries are going to interpret it.
- v. Bates: That seems to not be a good idea. We do not want officers just doing things not within the written rules.
- vi. Phil: what about the 3.5 year graduate?
  - 1. Bates: The rule regarding possession of a BA is the rule dictating that, not this section.
  - 2. Phil: Seems we should protect someone graduating earlier than those graduating later.
- vii. KGar: Clarification why is there a difference between tournament sweepstakes counting and season-long?
- viii. Gantt: This is not a legislative change, only a clarification on how Exec Secretary is going to interpret this going forward.
- ix. Chris: Is this going forward as a legislative change?

1. Bates: I will submit it.
2. Dena: I will accept it.
3. Rob: Will this allow ineligible debaters to accrue points?
4. Marlin: It would allow a team with AN ineligible debater to accrue ½ points. However, that is a separate clause and, so, could be changed/removed.
5. Skip: Change in interp was only for your (Gantt) tenure, I think. Do you know how it changed, because I think *current* interp is what it was in the *past*. Ineligible debaters should not be allowed to continue to accrue points if they are not with the school

x. Gantt: Not sure. Thus, the need to clarification.

#### VI. Other discussion

- a. Brendon W: SDSU is looking for a DoF. Keep an eye out for this.
- b. Skip: What happened on Item 1? Moved to action for Fall
- c. Chris: Inclusivity: how do we address this and how do we address "micro-aggression." Something to put into the schedule? Whitman example: Walkout at the tournament, raise community rules, can't we just all be nice to each other? Forums for discussion? Can an institutional approach be done? Personal stories raised
- d. Cristi: As a member of the Women's Debate Institute we are trying to create a "Best Practices" Document. Trying to add a move away from legalistic language to what this means in actual situations. What do we do in disclosure, in the team room, at tournaments. We should move from the 'people are good and want to be good' standpoint, then people need to know what is and what is not harassment. So as to avoid the chilling effect that can happen. Please contact her if you need/want to share a narrative and help shape the document.
- e. KGar: Excited the conversation has started. Has been looking for a way to bring this to the forefront. Perhaps if we had people sign a document saying they read the sexual harassment document? Inclusion forums are good, but they do not focus on how we can change. Perhaps to encourage self-reflection and allies.
- f. JPerkins: Thought I was going to a better world than interp. Very concerned about this. Lose a little of the interaction with the increase of electronic ballots and prep rooms. Joey (Mavity?) says we should have a period of time to relax, not necessarily a forum, but just an interaction space.
- g. Gantt: Need more student interactions in the business meeting. Should encourage their participation.
- h. Minor: Has IRB approval to get female narratives for inclusion into a paper about the root causes. Forum fatigue is caused because we keep looking at what's wrong and not what we can do to make it more hospitable to more individuals.
- i. Phil S. look around the room and see talented and caring people that are working to increase inclusivity, and more needs to be done, perhaps the

NPDA could form a committee with these individuals. Plus this cmte could approach local tournaments and encourage innovation and the change we want to see in the activity.

- j. Chris: We have a lot of safety nets, but no springboards. At Whitman tournament, was dress focused. Perhaps we could change the institution so that things like "slut-shaming" and sexual preference outing did not happen.
  - i. Brent: What do you mean by that?
    - 1. Chris: IEs demand a specific way to dress for competitors and this encourages classism and replicates this structure.
- k. Korry: We all try to deal with this. NW Forensics conference has created a group to deal with this. Forward on all fronts: Need action on the regional level. We see them more regularly. We should develop structural change in the region and then share those tools. For example: require sexual harassment training for all students. So we can disseminate these practices, share ideas. WDI is a fantastic resource for all of us. WDI put together a fantastic survey, we should share the data so it can be used. We have made a lot of ground in the NW, we have a long way to go, but it is good.
  - i. Brent: Survey is a lot of work. It was very carefully created, we would love to give it to anyone who wants to use it.
  - ii. Could even use survey monkey
- l. Rob L: Have had a lot of discussions at TTech and one of the things we have honed in on vis a vis structural change is judge training. WUDC is very much about judge training and how to make decisions and how to engage competitors. Also, how we interact with students. We sometimes engage in mean ways to justify decisions. We need to alert folks and what is occurring and how they can become better. Not policing, but encouraging meaning and understanding. Have talked with certain tournaments in doing training before for new judges and others. Consider spending time before tournaments start to have discussions. Have debaters there as well.
- m. Skip: Discussions are incredible. Concrete steps: The Powerpoint that NPTE put together was a great first step. Also, best practices is a great thing and is the next step to the policy. Perhaps we could pass it along
- n. Sherris: Needs to be some cross-engagement with other activities so that we can figure out how others are handling it. Also, to see how we can be a better community
- o. David: We have a NCA panel that would help with this
- p. Cristi: Go back to your institution and see how they are handling it.
- q. Gantt: Talked to my Title IX officer and asked how we could go about doing this and they loved it.
- r. Kyle: Just want to mention that this is a lot of very positive work. We also need to recognize our own complicity in the micro-aggressions. We do this when we do not want to deal with narratives that make us uncomfortable. This is implicit in everything we do and how we question

- other's abilities and situations. We have to be willing to analyze that.
- s. Brent: Willamette is hosting a conference on this soon that is free. Some rules are good (UNA) like requiring
- t. Korry: We need to get everyone involved.
- u. Bates: Said some stuff that amounts to: Make sure we are inclusive and not shaming across the spectrum of both humanity (gender/orientation/ethnicity) and practice (speed/arguments/etc). Educate.
- v. Gantt: Want student inclusion before moving forward with ad hoc committee.

VII. Hotel Behavior in celebration

- a. Gathering for NPTE, setup was allowed to go until 2 am
  - i. Got a little too loud (literally noise went through the roof (ceiling)).
  - ii. Do not bring outside alcohol, because the hotel was selling alcohol.
  - iii. Need to work with them since the hotel is working with us
  - iv. This will help us in the future.

VII. Adjournment: 9:37p

ATTENDEES:

Marlin Bates	University of the Pacific
Joe Gantt	Lewis & Clark College
Mike Middleton	University of Utah
Kevin Garner	William Jewell College
Dena Counts	Abilene Christian University
Phil Sharp	University of Nevada, Reno
Matt Swanson	Grand Canyon University
Bill Neesen	California State University, Long Beach
Justin Perkins	Palomar/San Diego State
Chris Pierini	Univ. Washington
Korry Harvey	Western Washington University
Jacob Cerny	Western Washington University
Brendan Silk	Western Washington University
David Worth	Rice University
Kyle Cheesewright	College of Idaho
Jeannie Hunt	Northwest College
Rob Layne	Texas Tech University
Jacob Stutzman	Oklahoma City University
Gina Iberri-Shea	United States Air Force Academy
Marie Arcidiacono	Los Medanos College
Brent Northup	Carroll College
Skip Rutledge	Point Loma Nazarene University
David Airne	University of Montana
Brendan Whearty	Palomar
Rebecca Sietman	Wheaton