

NPDA Business Meeting

Lubbock, TX

March 19, 2010

Business Action Summary

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

Konrad Hack was appointed as the parliamentarian for the meeting.

1. Reports from Officers:

Brent Northup: The NPDA Journal will be available online and Brent will have a few paper copies as well.

2. The Site Committee has accepted a bid from Colorado College for 2011, on roughly the same dates as this year (March 18-21). We have tentative bids for the 2012 tournament as well.

3. A report was brought back from the committee working on the proposal to have two divisions at the national tournament. The committee members were: Joe Gantt, Dan Schabot, Jacob Stutzman, Shannon Valdivia, Andy Luster, Glenn Prince, Aaron Donaldson, and Marlin Bates.

Joe Gantt reported that two ideas developed out of the committee's discussion—to keep the NCA motion or to have a slightly altered one.

The unaltered motion from NCA was brought from the committee to the body and seconded.

After extensive discussion, the original NCA proposal was defeated.

The second proposal was moved and seconded. This proposal says that there will be two judging pools (mpj and adaptation) & the tournament director can determine where the judges are placed based on their philosophies.

It was moved, seconded and ratified to suspend debate and move immediately to a vote.

Upon that vote, the second proposal was defeated.

4. The new business item on the agenda, Change to Elimination Round Rules, was not moved for consideration by the body.

5. Adjournment was moved, seconded and ratified at 9:05 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Lisa Ashby

Discussion Summary

Renea Gernant, NPDA President, called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m.

Konrad Hack, Concordia University-Irvine, was thanked for serving as parliamentarian.

Reports from officers:

Presidential report – Happy that Joe is hosting. Thank Glenn. It's been a quiet year.

Treasurer report – Please tell Glenn you're entered. Danny Cantrell has done some good work in getting the journal published. I ordered 20 copies; some should be in Monday. If you want to get one of these early copies, let Brent know.

Back to regular system – getting out through the membership.

Tournament results – Please get them in if they're not in.

Committees: Site Committee – Marty reporting from Skip. Colorado College will be the host for 2011. Approximately the same dates (March 18-21 – Friday-Monday).

Good discussion for future sites. One tentative site considered for 2012 or 2013.

During the last meeting, we referred to an adhoc committee on whether or not to have multiple divisions at the NPDA business meeting.

Martin Bates – Amendment to create two divisions at this tournament. As a result of our vibrant, extensive discussions, 3 motions were put forward by the committee.

First 2 motions come from committee. Motion #1 is the original NCA motion; motion #2 comes from committee discussions.

3rd motion – Executive summary of views for and against these motions. Since we don't have the printed summaries here, they will give those reports here. Joe Gantt (for); Aaron Donaldson (against).

Marlin asks for the original NCA to be brought up. 2nd.

Joe: The committee met for about 3 months. Looked at several different proposals. 2 proposals advanced out of committee. Proposal #1 = NCA. Adaptation and MPJ division. One division is MPJ; the other is 5% strikes. 1 singular judging pool; adaptation division gets selected first. The MPJ then gets the judges left.

Proposal #2 – 2 different judging pool; self-select which pool they'd like to be in. Depending on numbers/discretion of TD – people could be put into two different divisions.

Otherwise, other than nomenclature (MPJ vs. technical), there are no differences between the two divisions as far as the proposals.

The committee felt in a majority that there is a problem at NPDA in terms of participation, access, and the future of NPDA. At the time of the committee meeting,

This is the first time we have under 200 in quite a long time... Community College + Pi Kappa Delta are on the weekend. However, the same was true in 2005, and there were 233 teams at Texas Tech last time.

The thought – are we plateauing or declining as an organization? This proposal seeks to find argumentative space for as many people as possible... while not trying to take argumentative space away. NPDA on the last day is very different than NPDA on the last day from 2002/2003. The committee tried to make no normative judgment between communicative and technical debate. The majority sought to find argumentative space. Many of the founding members of NPDA no longer attend. 9 of 16 former national champions no longer attend this tournament – this is disturbing. We felt that technical division would be the only thing remaining in about 3-5 years unless action was taken. It will likely be the same schools that attend the NPTE. If this is inevitable, why not have more access to the tournament? This allows for different pedagogical goals to be met.

Committee: Joe Gantt, Dan Schabot, Jacob Stutzman, Shannon Valdivia (Mt. Hood), Andy Luster, Glenn Prince, Aaron Donaldson, Marlin Bates

Aaron (speaking as Opp of the committee – Marlin points out that Marlin and Aaron were the 2 in the minority). Disagree not because of status, but there are alternatives. Questions of accessibility and participation are crucial. I debated in the middle of Montana, and only now feel a member of the community. The proposal has a history of stratification... we are trying to “rule away” our problems, which is antithetical to the concept of argumentation. Then we could head toward, why not have 2 weekends – one for each division? This could lead us down the same road as NDT/CEDA... we lose circuits, funding, and exposure to the very kinds of elements that this curriculum exists.

Alternative – Caustic narratives that are endemic to debate activity; caustic nature is an unfortunate byproduct of competitive individuals. Don't believe we need to continue to create rules to separate each other. What is the common narrative that includes both? Critical position was affective. We are here to confront the elements that challenge us the most. Let's do so in a way that's invitational – there will be an NCA panel. What is the way to get final round panels that both can feel good about.

Joe – Don't oppose the motion. I sign on.

Kyle Cheesewright – Proposal is interesting... there is a schism in the community. I don't see the proposal as healing; this cements the schism. Majority competes in technical division; other division feels forced out in structural nature. Why do we want to forward mutually preferred for the technical? In the policy realm, nobody really defended the policy, but really can't get rid of the policy... valuable skill = engage across belief spectrums; MPJ cements the belief spectrum...speak to those who already believe in what we do. MPJ in technical is based on preference, not mutuality; ensure that they talk nobody they disagree. MPJ is not the direction we should go regardless of technical. This isn't productive way to heal this schism.

Phil Sharp – Concerned about schism – want a big tent, hate what’s happening now. When people leave, then it gets more technical... then debaters adapt even less. It’s offensive to say that one division is adaptation and the other isn’t. 2 divisions of 90 teams leads to 2 divisions of 45 teams. The NPTE will gain; British parli would also gain as well. Wish we could get along, even when fighting.

Joey Mavity: POO on time limit

Steve Hunt: Oppose formalization of division. Not a healing action...seen this happen before. NDT to CEDA; CEDA to parli; parli to British. Too many division. Many kinds of debate are good; but it’s tough to have novice/junior divisions. Hard to have local/regional debate. More things you subdivide debate into, the harder it is to have regional debate. What do we have in common? Formalization weakens organizations.

Renea suggests keeping in realm of 2-3 minutes... also let’s acknowledge those for the proposal.

Shelby Jo Long – 1st year in 11 that I haven’t brought students to the NPDA; love this community, but difficult time to go to national tournaments because disenfranchised; no debate background before me. I’ve coached... but I teach 4-4 without an assistant coach. I need an alternative. We’ve partially transitioned to BP style. I want to support; there needs to be an alternative. Not making a CP or counterproposal; perhaps one that allows procedurals and one that doesn’t. It takes a while to grasp procedurals without background. BP rejects procedurals; can do kritiky things w/o format.

Jacob Stutzman (Oklahoma City Univ. – starting w/4 students; 2 wrestled in high school...). OK – not replete with technical teams. Want students to learn both ways, where see that happen. At NPDA, you get one or another. Need a big tent; NDT and CEDA are two separate organization. Difference here – one organization, two different styles. Could be way to keep big tent together.... This is the first year in a decade that CEDA > NPDA. In 1999, Pt. Loma was the limiting factor, thus....

Josh Caplan (Purdue) – Question about process.... Did people ask the schools who aren’t in NPDA why they’re not coming?

Joe – Reached out to programs who aren’t attending NPDA the past couple of years – attending in ’08, not in ’09/’10. Not an official survey, but I did reach out to those programs.

Josh – What is NPDA doing to reach out to other schools. Midwest – not have budget to come out here. We’re going to lose because of stylistic... but NPDA is a joke. Like parli, but not engaging why they’re laughing it off. West coast bias... Stronger Midwest schools can’t access these opportunities; this proposal doesn’t address this.

Dan Schabot (Cameron) – Small/dual programs. I’m not going to apologize for how I run my team – sick of people having to apologize... there are circuits. IPDA moving to northwest. Slow circuit CEDA in southeast. Fast circuit NPDA/NPTE, slow circuit/different circuits... if not a large program, you can’t go to large nationals... if you also have IE, you have to choose. Large national tournaments can’t do. This proposal does speak to that. Scientific method not applicable to narratives. There will be ethnography of this tournament at NCA... different circuits, not feel welcome now. Jason Stahl (Belmont) mentioned

that he would consider returning if his students would have a positive experience. His students didn't feel they learned. I agree with some of the negative, but this is the only way NPDA can be inclusive. Right now, we're not.

Marlin – Ironic speaking against this proposal. If you want to heal the division, don't cement. Should get access to myriad opinions. Will any number of divisions guarantee positive experience? Not mean to indict personally, but rather pedagogically. Help students to understand... Coaches figure out how to win the game they're supposed to play. If this is the way we go forward, UOP will leave. The point is to talk to every type of crowd. Do not believe we need to do something just because something needs to be done. Worst reason for doing a policy.

Joe – I've made the case for why this is a good idea; what Marlin asks for is 100% solvency; I'm not stock issues. ☺ I love the idea of a big tent; I wrote a paper in 2005 that NPDA was most pedagogically sound because it allowed for both experiences. I don't believe that describes NPDA today. NPDA today is for technical programs. Avoid the land mine – in late elims, judged by teams breaking at the tournament... thus, already speaking to those who you want to speak to. Fewer judges with different perspective on activity. All of the harms are inevitable and will happen in 3-5 years. Only way to provide access is 2nd division. Schools can have teams in each division. We'll be technical only in 3-5 years; more likely that NPTE will be seen as viable.

Renea asks – totally new arguments at this point.

Joey Mavity (APU) – Confusion ... analysis is substantively lacking. If this is a cycle, recapitulating the division; removes difference and the other. If want progressive environment that helps encountering the other, what is the way of promoting difference that is safe? This isn't really productive... radical proposal = get rid of strikes completely. Tabbing software prefer non-regional – at least a geographical difference. Methodology = reaction.

Steven Doubledee (Washburn) – Marlin stole my speech. Once I figured out to listen to people older than me, life is easier. If we deny and ignore history, we'll repeat itself. Was part of the CEDA experiment; it was attempted and didn't work. Try or die argument doesn't work. Shouldn't just jump into another solution. We need to stop as a community and work together. Job interviews aren't mutual pref. Schism is an illusion if we want it to be. Don't have to be divided. First time this year went to "traditional" – not sure what this means... persuasive w/o jargon but speedy – what is that? Coaches are asking, "What are you doing here?" Slinging mud at each other...

David Worth (Rice) – New argument... one of the reasons CEDA didn't turn out the way they wanted to was that there weren't rules; debaters debated the way they wanted to... CEDA evolved, the game changed. Proposal won't work for the same reason. Proposal – 2 divisions use same rules. TD change the division for a judge – don't like that. I'll choose both. We'll be at NPTE, AFA, learn different ways... in adaptive division, I'll vote the same way. Division won't work. Do appreciate the effort.

Matthew Hogan (Student rep, UNR) – Echo sentiments on the opp; even if rules existed, won't debate... NFA-LD people speed anyway; judges don't uphold rules. Joey/Aaron ideas solve back. The room agrees

that there is a problem. OK not to exclude; embrace the other team. Max is fast debate; if they want it to go slower... we'll focus on those sorts of things.

Renea – 3 people to speak.

Rebecca (Wheaton) – Vote against not because appreciate the effort to solve; excludes schools that don't fit well into either category. Two divisions – where is the place for my school? Don't fit well; other schools. Be forced to go elsewhere.

Brent to Rebecca – Fit now?

Rebecca – While don't like the dissension and ways of diversity not handled, can exist a little longer without the divisions. We may still have to leave.

Jacob – Collect last three; stylistic or strategic choices... force to one extreme or another. Remember the days of "This isn't CEDA" – this is a call we can pretty clearly reject. The proposal doesn't change the arguments used; a speed K could work in the MPJ division. For those teams who have a vision of how they want to debate, MPJ gives a way. For those who oppose MPJ – adaptation is what we have now; nothing different...but some with a different division. This won't happen under the new proposal. No restrictions argumentatively.

Question – who wants MPJ?

Joe – 2007 survey – 65% said they wanted MPJ.

Who took the survey?

Konrad – Renea and I had discussion about particular round. Belief that judge was out of bounds that round happened; got me to think – what is judge? Public/technical – fundamental schism – is how the judge adjudicates? Interventionist/non-interventionist? Will follow assumption... if judge is critic of argument, then the judge will do that. This is the distinction Joe is trying to capture. Can we say what is an illegitimate decision?

Move to extend by 10 minutes. Motion fails.

Vote on the original NCA motion. Motion fails.

Committee moves for revised motion. 2nd.

Move to suspend debate, Seconded. Passes.

Vote on revised motion. Motion fails.

Joe – Began as thought experiment. Totally cool with what just happened... for the first time, we started addressing some of the issues. If this discussion stops here, then we will hit the inevitability scenario.

Other solutions – we need to do that. What should be next?

Aaron - If judging this weekend....keep this in mind. Keep this narrative in mind; people are leaving. Engage and invite and encourage participation.

Renea – Please go to Aaron’s panel. I believe that Joe’s projection is dead on. Watched the organization develop... Renea and Kevin panel – good discussion, but only 3 people attended. Regional debate is dying; precursor to death of national organization = death of regional circuit. In some cases, NPDA wasn’t taken seriously; in other places, NPDA was vibrant. More coaches saying “we can’t access this activity.” Brilliant people with PhD’s in rhetoric feel as if they have no voice. Have to be serious – have to do something... many schools like Shelby Jo’s and mine where there is no inroad. My school is not competing for the first time... couldn’t convince my coaching staff. In community doesn’t really teach.

Michael – Will this committee continue?

Phil Sharp – The outreach committee ... at our regional tournament – can we set aside an hour? Find out why people won’t go to NPDA.

Marlin – As chair, some things didn’t come forward. Hoped that there would be an actual study. Have to back up with a study... organization must endorse. Involvement; one of you must volunteer to be on the committee. Difficult to be the lone voice in the wilderness.

Joey – Ran debate camp over last summer – 80 students. Barely host – ran at loss, used vacation time. Have to do things like that... begged people who don’t think like me to help – 0 help. Southern California Debate Cooperative – need help. I don’t have the energy to do without help... instance of the “in group” reaching out... how do you think?

Marlin – Pacific will help.

Renea – What’s limitation? Work + comm. Lack of funding. That’s the limitation for camps; I’m an administrator teaching 4+4+4... can’t do that.

Joey – Do I use vacation for NCA or camp? Tuition = minimal amounts;

Renea – 2nd item on the agenda – Jim Hanson amendment.

Fails for lack of sponsor.

Announcements?

Matt – Be aware of district meetings and student meetings. Students should have a voice.

Strike confirmation sheets...

Motion to adjourn.