

**NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION
BUSINESS MEETING
Thursday, March 27, 2007
7:30 PM-10:00 PM
Colorado Springs, CO
Doubletree Hotel**

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Fall 2006)

III. Reports

- A. Executive Council
- B. Committees

IV. Consent Items

V. Action Items

- A. Sanctioning Penalties (Renea Gernant, Concordia University).
See Addenda 1 (p. 2)
- B. Definition of Semesters (Joe Gantt, Texas Tech University)
See Addenda 2 (p. 3)
- C. Change in Tabulation of Sweepstakes Points (Joe Gantt, Texas Tech University).
See Addenda 3 (p. 4)
- D. Clarification of Eligibility Standards (Joe Gantt, Texas Tech University).
See Addenda 4 (p. 6)
- E. Change in Tabulation of Championship Tournament Sweepstakes (Joe Gantt, Texas Tech University).
See Addenda 5 (p. 7)
- F. Statute of Limitations (Joe Gantt, Texas Tech University).
See Addenda 6 (p. 8)
- G. Clarification of Preparation Materials Rule (Joe Gantt, Texas Tech University).
See Addenda 7 (p. 9)
- H. IDEA/NPDA Cooperation

VI. Discussion Items

Addenda 1

An amendment to strengthen penalties for failure to comply with sanctioning policies.

Add to NPDA Bylaws, Article V, I & J (old I becomes K)

- I. If a tournament fails to submit results in a timely basis then the tournament shall no longer be sanctioned.**

- J. The sanctioning penalties in points, G, H and I above may be lifted if a new program director is in place or a successful appeal to the Executive Council is made.**

Justification: This addition to the sanctioning rules ensures that tournaments who wish to be sanctioned by NPDA turn in results by the dates specified in the governing documents. This allows the Executive Secretary to compile sweepstakes results in a reasonable time. However, it maintains a level of grace in case there is a new tournament director in place.

Addenda 2

A bylaw amendment to define semesters for eligibility purposes.

Add to NPDA Bylaws, Article II (addition bolded):

The National Parliamentary Debate Association season begins September 1 and ends with the NPDA Championship Tournament. **The Fall semester shall be composed of tournaments that take place between the beginning of the season and December 25; The Spring semester shall be composed of tournaments that take place between December 25 and the end of the season.**

Justification: This addition to the bylaws defines the terms "Fall semester" and "Spring semester" for clarity. Other portions of the bylaws, specifically those concerning eligibility, utilize these terms. However, without definition, the terms are confusing and leave little room for enforcement. This change will provide the needed clarity.

Addenda 3

A bylaw amendment to remedy sweepstakes inequities concerning the “final four preliminary rounds” of competition.

Remove from NPDA Bylaws, Article III, B, 1:

(B added for context)

B. Points will be accumulated for sweepstakes according to the following formula:

~~1. 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 for the first two elimination rounds.~~

Replace with:

B. Points will be accumulated for sweepstakes according to the following formula:

1. Teams will receive a preliminary round point total equal to the decimal percentage of preliminary rounds won, multiplied by five. Preliminary round point totals will be calculated to two decimal points. Teams will accrue two points for a win for the first two elimination rounds that meet NPDA sweepstakes specifications.

Justification: Currently, the NPDA sweepstakes system counts the only the final four preliminary rounds toward sweepstakes totals. While the goal of this modification was to ensure that smaller tournaments were not marginalized in sweepstakes results, the effect of the change has led to some very strange results. Take, for instance, this result from a 7 round tournament:

Team A: WWLWLL, loss in double-octos = 1 point

Team B: LLLLLL = 1 point (see bylaw which states that each team entered receives one point even if they win no debates at all)

Under the present system, both teams receive identical sweepstakes points, despite the fact that one team won more than 50% of their rounds and advanced to elimination rounds, while the other team won no debates at all. This inequity is magnified by the fact that teams who win early preliminary rounds generally face a dramatically more difficult schedule during those final four preliminary rounds than do teams that lost early preliminary rounds, due to power matching.

This amendment would provide this result in the above case:

Team A: WWLWLL, loss in double-octos = 2.86 points

Team B: LLLLLL = 1 point

This is a more just reflection of what occurred during preliminary rounds. Furthermore, this result is achieved while still allowing tournaments with fewer preliminary rounds to achieve the same point totals as those tournaments with a greater number of prelim rounds.

Furthermore, this amendment will ease the process of submitting results to the Executive Secretary. Currently, a compilation of preliminary records and elim results is not sufficient, as there is no way for the Executive Secretary to determine how a team performed in the last four rounds of a six round tournament. Finally, the addition of decimal places will lessen the possibility of ties.

Addenda 4

A bylaw amendment to clarify student eligibility standards.

Remove from NPDA Bylaws, Article IV, E, 1, b & Article IV, E, 2, b:

~~b. The number of semesters in which a student competes is superseded by the number of national tournament years in which the student competes. In other words, a student competing in no more than one or two tournaments during a semester retains eligibility for that semester, providing that he or she does not attend a national tournament during the course of that year. Once a national tournament is attended, that year is “used” regardless of the total number of tournaments in which the student has competed that year.~~

~~b. The number of national tournament years in which a student has competed supersedes the number of semesters in which he or she has competed. Thus, if a student does not compete in the Fall or attends only a limited number of tournaments, he or she has still used a tournament year of eligibility if he or she attends any national tournament in the Spring.~~

Justification: The intent of the two eligibility standards (eight semesters, four national tournament years) was to keep students from competing into perpetuity; however, the language above is confusing and may conflate the two standards. A student who has competed in less than eight semesters and less than four national tournament years should still be eligible to compete, regardless of when those semesters and national tournament years occurred. This puts our eligibility policies more closely in line with those of other forensics organizations as well.

Addenda 5

An amendment to the Championship Tournament Operating Procedures concerning sweepstakes.

Remove and replace, NPDA Championship Tournament Operating Procedures, J, 5, a, 3:

Sweepstakes points will be accumulated from a combination of preliminary and elimination round records from the top four teams from a school during the competition. Ordinarily, the records of the four teams from each school with the highest number of preliminary round wins will be awarded two points for each preliminary round. An additional two points will be awarded per team per elimination round ~~advanced (win, lost or bye)~~ **won (including advancement by a bye)** by the four teams accumulating the most elimination round points. These may not necessarily be the same four teams that accumulated the most points in preliminary rounds. The National Champion will receive an additional two points for its school **in addition to any elimination round points earned.**

Justification: This brings the championship tournament procedures further in line with existing NPDA sweepstakes procedures. Season-long sweepstakes only counts elim wins or byes, not points earned by the appearance in the rounds themselves. Furthermore, this eliminates a possible inequity that might exist in a 4-3 vs 4-3 preliminary round; according to the language above, that preliminary round would be worth four points, which is equal to the number of points earned in the national championship final round.

The second modification clarifies the fact that the National Champion earns two additional points in addition to the two points earned by winning the final round. While the original language seemed to indicate such, this language makes it more clear.

Addenda 6

An amendment to the Championship Tournament Operating Procedures creating a statute of limitations for challenges to awards presented at the Championship tournament.

Add, NPDA Championship Tournament Operating Procedures, J, 7.

All appeals of awards presented at the Championship Tournament (including season-long sweepstakes), such as appeals based on tabulation error, debater eligibility or inconsistency with governing documents, must be made within 30 days of the conclusion of the Championship Tournament, unless information for the appeal was not available in that timeframe, in which case an appeal must be made within 30 days of that information coming available.

Justification: At some point, results must become final. This standard allows a fair amount of time for appeals to be made, but finalizes awards once that time has expired.

Addenda 7

An amendment to clarify rules as to what can and what cannot be brought into the debating chambers during the debate.

Remove from NPDA Rules of Debating and Judging:

~~4. During the debate~~

~~A. Any published information (dictionaries, magazines, etc.), which may have been consulted before the debate, cannot be brought into the debating chambers for use during the debate. Except for notes that the debaters themselves have prepared during preparation time and a copy of the NPDA "Rules of Debating and Judging," no published materials, prepared arguments, or resources for the debaters' use in the debate may be brought into the debating chambers.~~

Replace with:

4. During the debate

A. While debaters may consult outside material during preparation time, they may only take the following into the debating chambers for use during the debate: notes that they physically constructed during the preparation time, and a copy of the NPDA "Rules of Debating and Judging." Except in the case of a documented ADA exception, other resources, such as published materials, notes or flows from previous debates, briefs prepared prior to the debate, information copied electronically from pre-existing or online files, or notes prepared by teammates, coaches, or colleagues (except those prepared by a debater's partner) may not be brought into the debating chambers.

Justification: This rule change clarifies what may or may not be brought into the debating chambers. The old standard was vague in certain areas, and was outdated a bit due to technological advances.