

Schools in attendance: Bethel (MN), Bethany Lutheran, Carroll, Claremont, Cedarville, Concordia-NE, Colorado College, Creighton, Lewis-Clark State, Occidental, Oregon State, Pacific Lutheran, Pt. Loma, Rice, Truman, Univ. of South Carolina, South Orange, Southern Illinois, Willamette, Webster University, Temple University

Michael Bartanen, Pacific Lutheran, will be the parliamentarian for the meeting.

1. The minutes from Spring 2005 were moved and adopted.
2. Ed Inch's report - What we've been working on: the first project was assessing the community goals - what are we about? A letter was sent to the Exec Council as well as district representatives to identify who we are as an organization. The questions:
 - 1) What is NPDA's identity? What are our goals? What do we seek to be?
–Several commented that we tend to be in opposition to others without necessarily arguing what we stand for. The other issues dealt with process - transparency, why are we doing what we're doing... As we integrated the Prescott reforms, we noticed some are contradictory, some aren't clear, and the organizational chart changed dramatically.

Ed invited the Executive Council to meet at Bethel University during August 2005 to look at what had been passed during the last 4 Business meeting to see what had been missing from the Constitution and Bylaws, as well as to see what kinds of consistency changes needed to be made.

We attempted to codify the document so that the document was consistent and clear; however, some aspects of the revised Constitution and Bylaws are broader than the original documents for the purpose of achieving organizational goals. Thanks to Renea and Michael for going through all of the previous meetings, and then suggesting changes as a result of what had passed previously.

- 2) Budget - We didn't get as much revenue, but we did balance at the end of the year thanks to Brent. The bills were paid in a timely way. Our challenges:
 - a) We shouldn't pass a budget that is intended to be out of balance. We believe that we should be able to make our expenses.
 - b) The organization needs to keep reserves so that we can pay our debts. If a tournament didn't happen due to disaster, etc., we should be able to make our commitments. Brent's budget is an attempt to reflect that.

- 3) How to develop our governing structures better. We have them now, but we don't use them as effectively as we can – especially the district representatives.

3. Kevin Minch's report: Site, National, Tournament Champ committee.

Site committee is in place. Regional + two former national hosts. Current members: Skip Rutledge (Pt. Loma Nazarene), Ric Shafer (Texas Tech University), Dan Schabot (William Carey College), Marty Birkholt (Creighton University), Duane Fish (Northwest College-WY), Todd Graham (Southern Illinois University).

Want to get as many tournament hosts out from 2006 as possible, with the goal of having the next three lined up. Kevin suggests that prospective hosts shouldn't feel bound by previous tournaments – we want it around the country.

Nominating committee: Last 3 presidents. The following nominees were brought from the committee:

Executive Secretary - Renea Gernant (Concordia University), Bill Cue (Metro Comm. College of Longview)

Treasurer - Brent Northup (Carroll College), Glenn Prince (Western Kentucky Univ.)
Moved/seconded to close nominations.

Konrad Hack sent a report about the national tournament which Kevin placed in the minutes:

3/24-27/06 - 12th national tournament. Friday - Monday. We should be able to accommodate all teams. Entry deadline: 2/28/06. Forensicstournament.net for entry - Danny Cantrell (Cerritos College) will run primary computer.

Friday - Business meeting, Irish debate, opening assembly

Saturday - 5 prelims

Sunday - Remaining prelims, start of elim rounds.

Monday - Last 5 elims

There is no one hotel; there will be multiple hotels. There will be a reception on Friday in lieu of banquet.

The site visit will take place the first weekend of December. Invitation likely December 15.

The entire tournament will be on the campus (not in hotels for elims as has been done in the past).

4. Exec Secretary - Renea

Things are slower due to the new sweeps format. When submitting using the online results (or otherwise) - remember that we have decided the last 4 rounds, not all rounds, count. Posting will be going up.

Michael's brief report - the first posting is now up; however, there is a problem with the script figuring the totals (the rankings are right; the totals don't show up) - this should be fixed soon. The *NPDA Journal* is mostly online except for some random articles.

5. Treasurer - Brent

We had less revenue as a result of a smaller than expected national tournament, but we went into a conservative mode... so we ended up about \$800 to the good. \$22,000 in the bank - but that's misleading. We're really close to \$19,000.

Note: No banquet = no banquet revenue. Thus, the overall revenue for the 2006 tournament will go down.

Skip asks a question about what was the host support item - that was technicians, etc. for the final round.

Alan Tauber - Is there money for outreach for 2005-2006? The budget is done by date. If there are expenses that you'd like by budget - please contact Brent or Ed - the budgeted are based on requests as of this time.

Alan - \$500 spent on International? Brent says it's break even or better the last two years.

Robert Trapp - Budget committee put this together?

Ed says - Any requests were supposed to be by Robert and Brent - so this is out of cycle.

Robert - Surprised that finance committee not consulted.

Ed - Some budget for this year. Finance Committee should get a working document for passage this year.

Ed - Notes that we can choose not to pass a budget... Finance Committee will work with Brent to come up with budget. After this year, we have 9 months to deal with planning a budget. The problem is now that we try to live with an 18 month fiscal year in 12 months.

By the national tournament, there will be a budget for 2006-2007. We will work without a budget, but be fiscally conservative.

Robert and John Meany say, "It works for us."

6. Student Representative Report - Caitlyn Ross

Caitlyn reported that the executive council actively sought student input for constitutional/bylaw changes. Most are responsive to student requests for transparency/access. Right now, the present documents have contradictions. Believes that

the issue of access will be solved if you look at Kevin's new business meeting proposal (proposal D). Every item will be discussed at NPDA National tournament - most student-run teams can't go here. Even if coaches go, no voice at NCA. Students can come and have voice at tournament. Exec Council responds to those concerns.

7. Tournament Host - Trischa Goodnow: Different in that we don't have one hotel. It's actually a headache reliever. No banquet, but perhaps second reception before final round. Working on getting rounds televised - campus and/or OPB (Oregon Public Broadcasting)
8. Site Committee - Skip Rutledge: 2 possibilities for the next two years. Colorado College for 2007 (some details needed, but looking good), and UC-San Diego potentially for 2008. Potential joint between Pt. Loma/UCSD (because UCSD is student-run). Colorado College - est. 150 rooms. Marty indicates that we'll never be back to Omaha (SHAME!).
9. Comm. on Sexual Harassment- Lisa Ashby: Policy revision coming within the next month.
10. Outreach Committee - Kate Shuster - Has made decision to resign. Unable to confirm that members were appointed according to the rules; also asked for a full committee which hasn't been done. Not wanting to blame anybody, but wants to go in a different direction.
11. Publications Committee - Renea Gernant: Web functions, "people say nice things and mean things."
Trischa Goodnow: Journal has a special issue shortly pending the arrival of one article. Another issue is nearly ready; thus, two within the next six months. Send article!
12. Old Business:
 - 1) Allowing Canadian tournaments to count for sweeps points without requiring membership (proposed by Michael Dreher, Bethel):

Michael - Brought by me at request of other members.
Kate - Does this include US schools?
John - Outreach best through cultural exchange/outreach. Inclusion of points seems irrelevant to whether people cross the border or not. Weird that American college can't adopt this format, but weird for one particular country.
Robert - Would friendly to strike Canada and held outside the United States?
Amendment move and seconded to strike Canada and instead include "international tournaments."

Trischa says - you could do well without ever competing here. Should limit international tournaments. Possible to do 4 outside.

Brent - Tournament in Saskatchewan, and voluntary sent money...

Amendment withdrawn by Robert.

Motion fails.

2) Item #2 - Robert Trapp - Alternative formats. Move and seconded. The intention here is "to let many flowers bloom." Boxed in for single format.

Alan - Is this covered in New Business #11 and #12?

Ed - This is aspirational.

John - To endorse?

Ed - Aspirational, part of community mission.

Motion passes.

13. New Business:

Approval of budget - The budget was withdrawn, pending approval from the Finance Committee.

Constitutional changes: The following includes some of the rationale for the changes.

1. Strike purpose statement and create a different statement.

2. Membership - add "purposes of organization"

Section C - response to fire alarm. Should have some kind of penalty/sanction for those who do such actions.

3. Officers - Conflicted, messy - new section starts on page 6 of revisions:

Elected officers listed first. President - maintain records and give to successor is new duty.

Vice President - Subcommittee, site, research - implied elsewhere, but not stated.

Exec Secretary - Item I is new - one officer per committee. Elected official has responsibility to make sure that committees are functioning. Nobody elected makes sure that committees are functioning now, so this changes.

Treasurer - Item K - put on professional, maintain records - if leave office, give to next officer. Hypothetically, if one of us dropped off - they're on my computer - and no obligation to give...

4. The following section consolidates various offices that had been in place, but their

relationship to each other and other parts of the constitution were never really clear. These positions have been functioning, but never really had job description - since not elected. The section also includes a mechanism for appointment.

5. Added parliamentarian this year. The constitution also specifies the duties of the Sexual Harassment Officer - the duties are implied in several places, but not really in one place. This position is included in rules/policy making, but not in one place. Same for Championship Director.

6. District/Student reps (the latter now is in document) - Asking to have group meetings, advise exec council about needs of districts. Same for 2-year college rep.

7. Committee Appointments - The way this section was revised was by Renea and Lisa creating a chart where all the power in the organization really is - and tried to make it fit... if things didn't make sense, then we moved it around.

8. Committees - Tried to make committee description match - mechanisms are the same - information/funding the same. Weird things such as some had deadlines, other didn't. Some ask for money, others don't.

Some committees were huge - publications dropped from 4 to 2 at-large members because it proved impossible to get people together.

Rules and standards - There were two different committees - one for the Championship Tournament, and one that wasn't. The question was who had oversight and who didn't. This was condensed into one committee.

9. Meetings - Article VIII G and VII H will be extracted for purposes of the discussion process. This section will be dealt with separately in Kevin's proposal (which is attachment 6 of the agenda).

The constitutional revisions were moved by Renea and seconded.

John questions article IV, A1 - Remove officers to mis, mal- or non-feasance - doesn't include district reps, championship tournament director, etc.

Renea - It wasn't in the previous document - so there's no reason why we couldn't. The President could be asked to take care of the problem.

Amendment by John Meany: Strike the last sentence from Article IV, Section A, 1. Add the following provision.

4. Any elected position can be removed for mis, mal- or non-feasance by petition of 2/3 of

the membership of the organization or by a 2/3 vote of members present at any business meeting.

Point of order - can we do this here? Parliamentarian says yes.

Amendment passes.

Amendment - Article V, Section A: by Robert (moved and second)
“These officers.... and shall serve at the pleasure of the President.”

Amendment passes.

Amendment to Article VI, Section D: Moved by Alan Tauber, seconded.

“Any representative can be removed for mis— by 2/3 of the constituency or by a 2/3 vote of members present

Amendment passes.

Article II, Section A: Kate Shuster (moved and seconded):

At the end of section A: “and which includes the use of points of information.”

Alan - Wouldn't this go against CX?

Audra - Could be points of information in a different structure

Would Matt Taylor's innovation of POI + CX count?

Kate - What makes it parli = POI.

Michael - Why not Points of Personal Privilege?

Kate - I don't consider that a friendly amendment.

Alan - What about points of order?

Kate - The only universal is the point of information. All that we have in common is POI's. Why not floor not a ceiling...

Robert - Friendly... Students to participate in parliamentary debate.

Amendment vote - on adding POI - Needs division. Yes - 13 + 7 proxies = 20. No - 7 + 5 proxies = 12. Abstention - 1. Thus, the amendment passes.

Ed comments - thanks to Lisa, Renea, and others...

Motion to send out constitution and amended passes unanimously.

This will now be sent to a mail ballot.

Webmaster's Note: This document is available on the website as:

<http://www.parlidebate.org/nov05-proposals.pdf>

2. Bylaw Proposals - Renea

Renea asks that if we have contention on Statement of Principles - then let's sever and come back to this later.

Kevin did work on this; feedback given as opening information.

Page 3 - Renea's office was listed.

Page 4 and 5 - dealt with separately as Skip's proposals.

If there is a statement of principles - then we don't want to worry about AFA code of ethics... thus,

Page 7 - This section will be deleted, as the Canada change failed.

Page 8 - 9 - Redone, cleaning up.

Skip asks, "Coenrollment allowed?" Yes.

Not an attempt to coordinate with AFA.

Page 20 - We want to sever the bylaws and make it a separate procedures document.

Page 20 - Treasurer, not finance committee reimburses.

Page 21 - Rewording

Page 21 - Right now, tab staff is part of teams at the tournament.

Page 26 - Right now, what we actually do is the additional text.

Page 27 - Comes into effect assuming that the Constitutional changes pass.

Page 27 - Delete electronic signature line; rather, we want to affirm no matter what way that is.

Page 34 - Turn in to Ballot Staff, not tournament director.

Page 40 - We don't mail; we distribute.

Caitlin asks - We could probably delete fax.

Motion and second.

Jared Miller - Guilty until proven innocent - Can you prove someone competed too long?

John - At every other point, it does fall upon the student/director. Protests presume that there is a legitimate claim before a need for a defense. Doesn't protest have to be accepted? Is included in

any other place in the bylaws?

Michael - no.

If set up procedure, vague.

Skip - Are there procedures for modifying? Is it in the document?

Renea - Assume same procedures.

Alan - Motion to sever statement of principles. Motion fails for lack of second.

Kate moves to sever statement of principles. Motion seconded.

Motion passes.

Page 27 - Enforcement -

Motion to make Bylaw XI H 1 and 2 consistent with Bylaw XII Paragraph 3.

Page 33 -

Motion: Bylaws 4A: "Except for notes ~~made~~ (that the debaters themselves have prepared) ~~made~~ during preparation time

(The motion is to add the parentheses and have the strikeouts)

Question by Jeremy Grace: Enforcement? This would go to the Tournament Director.

Amendment passes.

Alan moves at end of A1: "However, the Exec Council shall have the power to waive this requirement in cases of discrimination, sexual harassment, dual enrollment, or other such situations as the council shall deem necessary."

Moved and seconded.

Kate asks - How sexual harassment would empower council? What is the legal definition that will be used?

Lisa responds: Privacy information would not send to NPDA -

Trischa: Not sure how dual enrollment fits in.

Gary: Sexual harassment - If student claim, then wouldn't have to prove anything... Remind about Dylan Hendrickson - went to UC-Irvine, had to take classes on campus to qualify, give him one more person debating.. Which is an exception.

Amanda: Would proposed language allow someone to compete without seeking a degree?

Alan: It could, but trust not to take blind exceptions and be responsible.

Marty: This ties the executive council. Registrar would verify.

Gary: But, he's not pursuing a degree at that point...

Skip: Question - if they are co-enrolled, two different verifications. Doesn't that meet?

Michael: Dealt with in point A?

Alan: Point 1 says that he'd have to compete for Irvine...

Motion fails.

Original motion as severed... passes.

Now on to the severed part:

Trischa moves to refer the severed section to Professional Development Committee to be reported at the Championship tournament. Seconded.

Jeremy asks who is on the committee – Lisa Ashby (Concordia), Marty Birkholt (Creighton), Michael Dreher (Bethel Univ.), Trischa Goodnow (Oregon State), Jeremy Grace (Rice)

Motion passes.

Kevin proposal: Similar to legislative ideals... students often can't come to NCA.

Idea is to break into 3 - working backwards:

Consent - Minor items, we can cluster together.

Discussion: Moves to the next meeting - idea is to use notes, then discuss at next meeting, then vote at next meeting. Then acted upon and finished. Provision has emergency situations - i.e., if has to be dealt with for urgency (i.e., tournament procedure because wrong, then we have the mechanism). Try to not deprive majority or minority chance to discuss. Cycles beginning next year. Any new item at this meeting next year would then be voted on at the national tournament. It could happen where new items are at nationals - then voted on in fall.

Moved and seconded.

Trischa - If we do this then discuss again? Kevin - not as much.

This allows proxy so that everyone is always represented.

John - In interest of more discussion/action - section A if reports prior to business meeting (i.e. online 5-10 days in advance) so that we can suspend unless reason to discuss.

Redundant notetaking - summarizing the debate.

Caitlyn - This is fabulous. Important for student-run organizations.

Jeremy - Can happen now? No. It's a Constitution.

Moved and seconded: Change the first line as possible. Shall be posted online 10 days prior to each business meeting.... Reports shall be reviewed as necessary.

Amendment passes.

Motion passes.

Kevin's proposal - Robert's Rules - It's not written anywhere.
We'll use Robert's unless it contradicts. Specify latest edition.

Moved and seconded.

Passes unanimously.

Skip Proposal #1 - Novice/Junior Sweepstakes points -
Moved and seconded.

Letter from Pacific Southwest Collegiate Association. Reading the letter into the record.

Jeremy - By passing this, you penalize schools that don't have these opportunities available.

Kate - This is rationale for eliminating sweepstakes.

Marty - Sandbagging juniors/novice - Do we define?

Ed - The sandbagging was dealt with in the letter - exact definitions would be better -

Gary - At APU, there was a disqualification - admitted that he didn't understand rules...

John - Question about enforcement of novice/junior sweepstakes points. Is there any codification if the points are illegitimate? i.e., Taking example - would points prior to exclusion count?

Renea - I could do it if informed by TD and appeal. If I weren't told, then I couldn't.

John - Is there a procedure?

Renea - Yes. Within Exec Council.

Marty - Then we look to Bylaws at Sub D on page 10? Guidelines don't solve problems.

Skip - Don't disenfranchise. Explain better as organization what we think junior/novice. Have TD include in invitation - talk about it to coaches on listserves...

Kate - Sandbagging is a problem... The sweepstakes system in general encourages it.

Alan - Shouldn't we go through at least one year to see?

Scott Jensen - 1) Eliminate the ½ point rule doesn't eliminate sandbagging - tournament awards, etc. still encourage sandbagging; 2) I don't like the idea of sending a message that wins don't count as much. 3) Slippery slope - Incentive for taking away opportunities... NPTE only recognizes open debaters; if NPDA is full points - incentive to create tiered program.

Rebecca - Fairly new to NPDA - Strong motivation to come to this meeting because of Skip proposal... we are discriminating as a result of new rule.

Alan - Who gets the message of discrimination? Do they know?

(Various members at meeting) - Yes, they do.

Marty - No concerns about novices onboard... fine to count as full points if we modify bylaws if TD are required to use these definitions, and then the Exec Council could then rule on that. Since we don't have novices in our part of the country - further marginalizes regional tournaments in other areas.

Skip - Working with novice takes lots of time and resources. Work of seniors - why not recognize novice and juniors. Alternative is different value system - others reward two teams...

Kate - Motion reorients deck chairs on Titanic! Opposite of arguments that we've made previously...

Michael - Why not have separate sweepstakes (open/junior and novice)?

Gary - Most tournaments have tougher rules than NPDA - 30 rounds = junior. In our league: 2 times in finals in league. If we had consistent rule, then agree. Novice and junior is valuable; community colleges get level playing field. Half our points will be open. Why not elsewhere?

Jared Miller: Why not overall awards?

Motion to reestablish full points: 10 members + 12 proxies = 22. Against: 6 + 0 proxies. = 6.
Motion carries.

Skip asks to take H first, instead of G.

Jeremy discusses - not lot of schools, will punish vast majority instead of large district/

Motion passes to go out of order.

Skip: To motion H - read rationale, learn more than 6 rounds as opposed to 4 rounds. Would get more rounds. Better...

Scott: Would like ideal world where sweepstakes doesn't guide; ideally more debating the better. The change still allows 6 or more rounds - but perpetuates wellness. It doesn't tie hands of tournament director, but makes it less likely that we don't go to smaller tournaments.

Marty: Many tournaments - try to experiment - driven decision to 4-5 round tournaments. If privilege certain regions, then we should become WSPDA.

Alan: Irony - not focus on just one/two team. If I care about sweepstakes - local tournaments are 8 hours away... then we won't support the region.

Trischa: Works in opposite direction too... 8 round tournaments, only 6 counted. Already losing 2 rounds in previous status quo. Having 4 is in favor...

Robert: Different reason, but in favor. Sweepstakes drives. I like having 4 round tournaments. Unsupported assertion that 6 rounds are better than 4. 4 rounds, lots of oral comments, and dinner may be better than 6 rounds.

Gary: 6 rounds + 4 round swing = 3 days straight. Liked it in NDT when based on percentage in victories. Percentage = points. In March, we should think along these lines....

Skip: Gary made points. Multiple tournaments the same weekend. If afraid of points driving tournament decisions, then go to multiple tournaments.

John: Yes, this did. Could go and have different group of students... everyone got value for 4 rounds. Rather than nightmare, could be liberating.

Caitlyn: Nightmare scenario is a strawman argument. Doesn't answer regional tournaments. Far too many students affected if 6 rounds instead of 4. Even if it happens, outweigh regional tournaments.

Vote with division: Yes - 4 members + 7 proxies = 11. No - 13 members + 5 proxies = 18. 1 absention.

Motion G: Rationale is listed on the agenda.

Jeremy - Just building tournaments in our region. 15 teams then semifinals at Cy-Fair. Want to build at Cy-Fair - even though not sanctioned tournament. Vast majority of tournaments by us can only have 2 elimination rounds.

John - Not now, nor ever has been a justification for sweepstakes. It's a sham award - discriminates against more schools. 200 schools in NPDA - 90% excluded. Ranking not rating system. Doesn't say you're doing equivalent/serious/rigor in the program. Only says 1, 2, 3, and so on.

Marty - Gary asked, what happens to junior division? When count all outrounds - push to have octas... then we collapsed and the junior/novice get collapsed. That's why I hate sweepstakes.

Gary - Are we seeing resurgence of junior protected divisions?

Marty - Not long enough to see - but we are seeing experimentation. Didn't have novice, but did have junior division. At end of year, we'll see.

Jeremy - At Texas State tournament, no junior/novice.. But it does show on cumes, and there are separate finals.

Caitlyn - At William Jewell and others.

Rebecca - Tournaments still collapsed in my area.

Vote: Motion fails by acclimation.

Brent asks - best 4 prelim rounds?

Motion I - Proxy Votes - Motion/seconded

Ed comments - the amendments shouldn't be able to be voted on by proxies. But the originals can.

Marty - If there are amendments - then what?

Ed - Then proxies can't vote on the main motion.

Caitlyn - More feasible under Kevin's new proposal.

Ed - Yes, but basically prevents schools getting 10 votes.

Jeremy - Now could a school bring 36 proxies?

Renea - Yes, but only to the published document.

Jeremy - Shouldn't we set a limit?

Gary - This could lead to parliamentary shenanigans... if not enough votes to defeat a proposal, but how about a majority on an amendment...

Renea - Already happens now.

Gary - Couldn't use proxies to vote for amendment - then voids out all proxies.

Amanda - Action items/cycle works well with this.

Brent - Eliminate proxies in all... now that we have 2 meeting requirement. Always have a vote

because it has 2 meetings.

Brent amends - to eliminate proxies entirely.

Gary - After seeing proxies tonight, several CC that can't afford it. Didn't think there would be a movement to eliminate sweepstakes. Proxies have swayed vote; why not have them?

Phil Sharp - This meeting - always disenfranchises.

Renea - New business format solves.

Caitlyn - Only comment - doesn't mandate discussion starts here. Could still vote at NCA, then proxy votes eliminate.

Eliminate proxy amendment - Fails.

Kate - This is how the sweepstakes system got changed.

Robert - Motion to undo all the deletions in attachment 10. Moved and seconded.

Gary - What does it change?

Robert - Puts the 10 proxy limit back in...

Gary - If amend, then proxy is voided.

Robert's amendment doesn't change this.

Amendment passes unanimously.

Motion as amended - 10 members + 5 proxies = 15. No - 8 members + 7 proxies = 15. Motion does not carry.

The final two motions are tabled until the spring meeting.

The meeting is adjourned.