

Agenda for Spring NPDA Meeting 2006:

Opening

Officer Reports

Director/Host Reports

Committee Reports

--Budget Committee: Brent Northup and Robert Trapp

New Business for Discussion

1. 2007 Tournament and the Colorado College Bid-Bonnie Stapleton
2. District Representation and Districting-Ed Inch
3. Proposal-Michael Dorsi

(Submitted after the 30 day deadline for the meeting, but open for discussion for consideration on the agenda in November.)

Proposal to formally allow Judge Sharing

Insert bold text to NPDA Championship Tournament Operating Procedures
(since these have been separated from the Bylaws but have the same status)

In section B add #6

6. When covering entries with judges, one judge is sufficient to cover two teams entry in the tournament. The commitment of a judge may be used to cover two teams from the same school, or may be shared to cover one team from each of two schools. A judge whose obligation is shared shall be considered to represent both schools for issues of constraints and minimum judging requirements. The tournament invitation should reflect this option for judge sharing when explaining judging obligations and make clear that both schools must indicate when they are sharing a judge's obligation.

Justification:

Many programs have few or no coaches who can act as their judges, while other programs often have surplus judges. Under the present rules, a judge who would ordinarily represent one school can represent another.

However, if each school has an odd number of teams, then both schools need to bring an extra judge. This proposal would allow teams to share a judge for that last segment- covering the last team.

In cases where schools are significantly short on judges, they could have multiple judges from other schools each share half of their commitment (for example, school A entering two teams without access to a judge could share one obligation with school B, and share a second obligation with school C).

This procedure is used at various tournaments in Parliamentary and other forms of debate. Some people buy and sell obligations in money amounts, some donate, some are compensated in pizza and beer. It has worked in a variety of settings.

I have spoken to Konrad Hack and he has indicated that the NPDA judge pool is sufficiently large such that this proposal will have a negligible effect on strikes and/or pairings.

In short, I see this proposal as offering much to gain but nothing to lose. NPDA should adopt this such that it will clearly be in effect by NPDA 2007.

Adjournment: