

**NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION BUSINESS
MEETING**

**Friday, November 18, 2005
6:30 pm – 9:15 pm Sheraton/Dalton B**

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes (Spring 2005)
- III. Reports
 - A. Executive Council
 - 1. President – Edward S. Inch, Pacific Lutheran University
 - 2. Vice President – Kevin Minch, Truman State University
 - 3. Executive Secretary – Renea Gernant, Concordia University
 - 4. Treasurer – Brent Northup, Carroll College
 - 5. National Student Representative - Caitlyn Ross, Colorado College
 - B. Committees
 - 1. Nomination Committee – Kevin Minch, Truman State University
 - 2. Championship Tournament Committee – Konrad Hack, Azusa Pacific University
 - 3. Host – Trisha Goodnow, Oregon State University
 - 4. Site – Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University
 - 5. Committee on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment – Lisa Ashby, Concordia University
 - 6. Finance Committee – Robert Trapp, Willamette University
 - 7. Outreach Committee – Kate Shuster, Occidental College
 - 8. Publications Committee – Renea Gernant, Concordia University
 - 9. Professional Development
 - 10. Other committee reports and announcements
- IV. Old Business
 - A. Counting Canadian Tournaments. Michael Dreher, Bethel University. See Attachment 1.
 - B. Alternative Formats. Robert Trapp, Willamette University. Be it resolved that the NPDA endorses the efforts to include various forms and formats of parliamentary debate.
- V. New Business
 - A. Approval of Budget. Brent Northup, Carroll College. See Attachment 2.
 - B. Constitution Consistency, Integration, and Re-Draft. Renea Gernant, Concordia University. See Attachment 3.
 - C. By-Laws Consistency, Integration, and Re-Draft. Renea Gernant, Concordia University. See Attachment 4.

- D. Voting Procedure. Kevin Minch, Truman State University. See Attachment 5.
- E. Roberts Rules. Kevin Minch, Truman State University. See Attachment 6.
- F. Novice and Junior Sweepstakes Points. Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University. See Attachment 7.
- G. Elimination Rounds for Yearlong Sweepstakes. Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University. See Attachment 8.
- H. Six Preliminary Rounds for Yearlong Sweepstakes. Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University. See Attachment 9.
- I. Proxy Votes. Edward Inch, Pacific Lutheran University: See Attachment 10.
- J. Experimental Formats. Edward Inch, Pacific Lutheran University. See Attachment 11.
- K. Experimental Sweepstakes. Edward Inch, Pacific Lutheran University. See Attachment 12.

Attachment 1

Counting Sweepstakes from Canadian Tournaments

Proposal: It is proposed for NPDA Bylaws that “Bylaw VII. Sanctioning of Tournaments, Subpoint A” be revised as follows (additions in italics):

“Unless hosted by a national or regional organization, the host of an NPDA sanctioned tournament must be a member of NPDA. *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.*”

Purpose: This allows Canadian tournament participation to count for NPDA sweepstakes.

Rationale: 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.

Attachment 2

Attachment 2 consists of the budget, as well as the following proposals from Brent. The budget will be separately available. The proposed method of passing the budget is the following three-step method:

Funding for the Irish debates as a separate line item.

Funding for the Eastern European debaters as a separate line item.

Pass the remainder of the budget

Attachments 3 and 4:

Attachments 3 and 4 are really the proposed revisions to the Constitution and By-Laws. Rather than include them in this document (which would make it a 90-page document), they are separately located on the NPDA website:

Proposed Constitutional Changes:

<http://www.parlidebate.org/fall2005-proposedconstitution.pdf>

Proposed Bylaw Changes:

<http://www.parlidebate.org/fall2005-proposedbylaw.pdf>

Attachment 5

Proposal: It is proposed that Section 7 be added to Article VII of the Constitution as follows:

The agenda for business meetings shall be divided into four sections: Reports, Action Items (Action Agenda), Discussion Items (Discussion Agenda) and Consent Items (Consent Agenda).

- A. Reports by officers or committees shall be made at each business meeting in fulfillment of the constitutional responsibilities of the officer and for the purpose of addressing issues of concern to the organization. Reports shall not be used to present legislation and shall not be subject to debate. Reports should not exceed five minutes each, but may be extended as necessary at the discretion of the Presiding Officer (the President or his/her designee in the absence of the President).
- B. Business appearing on the agenda for the first time shall be listed as a Discussion Item. The Presiding Officer shall set a time limit for discussion of each item based on the size of the agenda and the amount of time made available for the meeting. After discussion has ended, the item will automatically become an Action Item at the next meeting of the organization. The body may elect to immediately move a Discussion Item to an Action Item at the same business meeting if a motion is made to that effect, seconded and supported by 2/3 of the members present at the meeting (excluding proxies).
- C. Action Items are placed on the Action Agenda for their final reading. Items advanced from a Discussion to an Action Item at the same meeting are not subject to a second period of debate. Items appearing as on the Action Agenda at a meeting subsequent to their original period of discussion are again subject to debate if so desired by the body. The intent of this section is that the primary debate on an issue shall take place at one meeting, followed by further time for contemplation and, if necessary, further debate and a final vote at a later date.
- D. Consent Items are those items which the Presiding Officer believes to be non-controversial (such as wording changes for consistency or minor Bylaw alterations). The Presiding Officer may entertain a motion to pass one or all of the items on the Consent Agenda without objection. If any member of the body objects, the item automatically moves to the Discussion Agenda.
- E. Effective Date: This process shall become effective at the November 2006 (NCA) Business Meeting of the Association.
- F. The President, in consultation with the Executive Council, shall have the power to set the agenda for the business meeting based on submissions from the membership or committees. He or she shall have the power to limit the number of items on the agenda at any given meeting, based on the amount of business that may be realistically completed and the order of importance legislation may have to the timely and efficient running of the organization.

Purpose: This proposal changes the decision-making and meeting framework of the NPDA to provide greater transparency and more opportunity for people to have input into important decisions. Specifically, it identifies business items, provides a timeline for considering them, and allows more membership feedback before decisions are made.

Rationale: Often, decisions are made quickly with a membership and proxies in a single meeting able to carry significant votes. This allows for more organizational transparency and slows down some of the decision making to provide greater involvement, discussion, and feedback.

Attachment 6

Proposal: It is proposed that Section 8 be added Article VII of the Constitution as follows:

Business Meetings of the Association shall use the latest edition of *Roberts Rules of Order, Revised*, to rule on all matters of parliamentary procedure not addressed by the Bylaws or Constitution. When in contradiction, the rules of the Association take precedence.

Purpose: This proposal clarifies and affirms that Roberts Rules will be used as the means for conducting Association business.

Rationale: The Constitution does not currently specify the rules that are used. This change largely affirms current practice but also can help meetings be run in a more predictable and coherent way.

Attachment 7

Novice and Junior Sweepstakes Points

Proposal: It is proposed for the NPDA Bylaws that item IV. Season Sweepstakes Awards: Under Section II, we should delete subsection c.

~~“c. Teams entered in Junior and Novice Divisions will only count for one half of the points they would earn according to point (a). Only Open division will be counted for full value.”~~

Purpose: This would reverse the action taken at the last business meeting to count novice and junior as only half of the worth of senior contributions toward the yearlong sweepstakes race, and continue the traditional practice of counting the competitive accomplishments of all debaters equally, regardless of division.

Rationale: There are multiple rationales:

- Recognizes the contributions of all team members for this team wide award.
- Encourages inclusiveness both in the organization and within different squads by valuing the beginning debaters.
- Encourages outreach to new programs, which will likely begin at the novice and junior levels.
- Sandbagging can be and has been discouraged in more appropriate ways, such as better definitions of what true novices and juniors should be.
- Recognizes that team members help to peer coach and mentor novices and juniors, and encourages this practice to continue.
- Discourages programs from concentrating resources just on one or two senior teams, when invaluable learning can take place at the beginning levels if the organization encourages this.
- Recognizes the values of community colleges in parliamentary debate, which feel snubbed by the past action of devaluing the novices and juniors.
- This author believes that the highest learning curve is probably amongst the novices and juniors just breaking into debate, and this encourages them.

Attachment 8

Elimination Rounds for Yearlong Sweepstakes

Proposal: It is proposed that on item IV. Season Sweepstakes Awards: Under Section II, we should amend subsection “a” as follows to delete the words “the first two” and replace them with the words “*for each of the appropriate*”.

“a. One point for each debate win (including a win for a bye and a win by forfeit) by a team in the final four preliminary rounds of a National Parliamentary Debate Association sanctioned tournament and two points for a win by a team ~~the first two~~ *for each of the appropriate* elimination rounds.”

Purpose: This would reverse the action taken at the last business meeting to count only the first two elimination rounds rather than all of the appropriate elimination rounds for NPDA sweepstakes points, as this and other intercollegiate debate organizations have traditionally accommodated.

Rationale: The current wording seems to devalue the importance of any elimination rounds beyond the first two. This makes very little sense. In truth, the further a team advances through the elimination bracket, the higher the level of competition and the difficulty of debate and the more difficult the wins are to achieve, meaning that they should be rewarded at least as much as the earlier elimination rounds for determining yearlong accomplishments.

The earlier action to reverse this traditional practice and count only the first two elimination rounds was I think well intended, but hastily arrived at and ill advised. The goal was to recognize that some regions run tournaments on a week day afternoon with only one or two elimination rounds, and that those efforts do not reflect well with the traditional sweepstakes formula. While I am sympathetic to those concerns, a one afternoon tournament with 3-5 schools and two elimination rounds is not the same level of difficulty as is a two to three day tournament with thirty or more schools, and four to five elimination rounds. Nor should it be treated as the same.

One adverse result is that many other, larger tournaments may consider just canceling all elimination rounds past the second since NPDA is saying that those rounds are no longer valued, which would deny students many invaluable learning opportunities.

Attachment 9

Six Preliminary Rounds for Yearlong Sweepstakes

Proposal: It is proposed that on item IV. Season Sweepstakes Awards: Under Section II, we should amend subsection “a” as follows to delete the word “four” and replace it with the word “six”.

“a. One point for each debate win (including a win for a bye and a win by forfeit) by a team in the final ~~four~~ six preliminary rounds of a National Parliamentary Debate Association sanctioned tournament and two points for a win by a team the first two elimination rounds.”

Purpose: This would reverse the action taken at the last business meeting to count only the last four rather than the last six preliminary rounds for NPDA sweepstakes points.

Rationale: Many members look to NPDA documents and actions as advisory norms for planning tournaments. The primary rationale for the proposed return to the traditional practice of counting the last six rounds of debate rather than just the last four rounds is that six preliminary rounds of debate provide considerably more learning opportunities than do four preliminary round tournaments. Absent this proposed change, I think many tournaments will be switching to a four round format. This robs students, especially beginning students of one third of their traditional learning experience.

Additionally, six round events also provide a much better gauge for which teams are deserving of advancing to the elimination brackets. And the enormity of a rough preset draw, the random bullet judge, or the bye all increase drastically.

Attachment 10

Change Proxy Voting

Proposal: It is proposed that Article VII, Section 3 of the Constitution be revised as follows (strike through representing deletions, italics representing additions):

Each member institution may be represented by one voting representative at a Business Meeting. ~~No member institution represented at a Business Meeting may vote more than 10 proxies in addition to the member's own vote.~~ At least 5% of the member institutions must be personally represented (~~proxies do not suffice for this purpose~~) for the meeting to conduct any business other than hearing reports and discussing them. The National Student Representative and District Student Representatives will each be given a vote at the fall and spring NPDA business meetings. ~~If the District Student Representatives are unable to attend either the fall or spring business meeting, the National Student Representative may deliver the respective vote by proxy.~~ *Proxy votes may only be cast for proposals published in the NPDA Business Meeting Agenda.*

Purpose: This change means proxy votes may be cast for proposals that have been disseminated in the agenda. Proxies votes would not be allowed on proposals and amendments stemming from floor debate and discussion in the Business Meeting.

Rationale: The current system of proxies undermines constructive debate. Votes are cast by member who are not present, do not know how arguments are evolving, and cannot know of amendments or changes made on the floor.

Attachment 11

Experimental Formats

Proposal: It is proposed that NPDA allow for experimental parliamentary debate forms as follows by adding the following to NPDA By-Laws Section XI. J. Experimental Forms and Formats. The Executive Committee may allow experimental parliamentary debate forms at the Championship Tournament. Experimental debate formats may be included in the Championship Tournament for a maximum of two years. Continued inclusion of experimental formats will require the passage of a bylaw allowing for the continued inclusion of the format. Only one experimental format may be included in the national tournament each year. Experimental formats must be a form of parliamentary debate: limited preparation, multiple topics, and public sphere. The Championship Tournament invitation will include rules for debating for experimental formats.

Purpose: This proposal allows the Association to offer alternative formats at the national tournament. It would enable the organization to respond to member interest, changing practice, and innovate.

Rationale: The NPDA currently defines itself by its format as opposed to its mission, outcomes, or purpose. This change allows the organization to respond to member need, explore its identity, and innovate.

Attachment 12

Experimental Sweepstakes

Proposal: Add to NPDA Bylaw Section XI. I. 7. Alternative Format Sweepstakes. Teams participating in an NPDA Experimental Format Debate may have points earned in tournament competition to be included in the annual sweepstakes award calculation.

Purpose: This allows for experimental debate formats that will be included at the Championship Tournament to be included in the annual sweepstakes calculation.

Rationale: The change allows member schools to experiment without penalty.