

**NPDA Tournament Business Meeting Spring 2004  
Universal City Sheraton--CSU Northridge Nationals**

Orders of Business

Call to order by Sharon Porter at 8:56 p.m.

Approval of minutes from Fall 2003 NPDA Business Meeting (as posted at [www.parlidebate.org](http://www.parlidebate.org)): MSP.

Approval of agenda and procedures: MSP to amend agenda to group items. MSP to limit debate to 6 minutes/1 minute per speaker.

Reports – make them 1 min. oral/written

President – Sharon Porter--See typed report. Sharon contacted Matt Sobnosky from CIDD. Tryouts have always been at CEDA and they are willing to consider at least one tryout through NPDA. Marilyn Young is the committee chair and she wants to know which fall semester tournament we would like for the British tryouts.

Vice President – Ed Inch--Oversaw elections. Highest turnout ever returned Renea and Brent. Thanks to Michael and Robert for their work with elections. Executive Secretary – Renea Gernant--There will be season sweeps at the end of this tournament.

Treasurer – Brent Northrup--Complete treasurer's report available soon. There will be a reimbursement plan and an invoice. He noted that we had \$13,000 at the start of the tournament. There is high accountability via monthly on-line reports to the finance committee.

National Student Representative – Keith West--People are interested in warm room/disclosure and that students are guardedly optimistic for a good tournament.

Championship Tournament Committee – Ed Inch--He has better than guarded optimism for the tournament. Thanks to Konrad for being a stud.

Tournament Director – Konrad Hack--Reported at banquet. Said everything he should say and some he shouldn't ☺.

Tournament Host – Rebecca Opsata--She is happy we are here.

Site and Hosting – Skip Rutledge--Looking forward to next year and the dates are March 17-20 at Texas Tech University (end of spring break). We are looking for a host school for later.

Committee of Discrimination and Sexual Harassment – Lisa Ashby--Legal review in process. There will be a recommendation coming.

Finance Committee – Robert Trapp--Trapp has a budget but it isn't all together. We have sort of replicated last year's meeting. We really need to have a fiscal year. We will be able to report at NCA. We didn't spend everything budgeted. The group tends to allocate liberally and spend conservatively.

Outreach Committee – Kate Shuster--Introduction. Need for the organization to do outreach and reduce costs and to work with new districts. Good outreach is accountable and outcomes based. Proposals haven't consistently been funded. She has a proposal and will be presenting it later.

Professional Development – Matt Taylor--Two pieces of research were approved for this tournament. Tech and Utah have things floating about and they meet the Northridge criteria. We need to help colleagues with assessment for program and professional development purposes.

Publication Committee – Renea Gernant--Look on the webpage for cool stuff.

Journal Editor – Ed Inch, Trischa Goodnow--Trischa is waiting on some materials but will be coming out soon.

Webmaster – Michael Dreher--Thanks for patience. The philosophies are up. He is working on moving the NPDA website to a separate provider.

**Business Items**

**Proposal from Patty and Jason Steck, Century and St. Thomas**

**Proposal 1: To make an exception for this tournament.**

Century and St. Thomas squads are merged squads. They are paired together as a hybrid. There was a family emergency for another Century team and now there is a need for another hybrid (from South Orange). They are asking for an exception to the rule prohibiting dual hybrids for both Century and South Orange.

Handling: Robert Trapp moved to charge the executive council to take action to allow for an exception to the hybrid rule and to present it to NCA later. Seconded. Discussion: There have been other teams who have requested exceptions and didn't get them. Withdrawn. Move to suspend the 30 day rule for this item at this tournament to be followed by a vote on this situation. Passed. Move to suspend the bylaw on hybrid for this situation. Second. Passed.

**Proposal from Michael Dreher, Bethel College:**

**Proposal 1: Codify Top Novice Tie Breaking Procedures**

Revise Bylaw XI, subpoint I, number 3 to include: As a tie-breaker, the seeding of the tied teams after preliminary rounds will determine placing. Handling: Michael liked what was in the invitation and wants it codified. Second. Passed.

**Constitutional Retreat Proposals:**

**Proposal 1: Revise Article V. Section 5. b. to specify the accounting process to be employed by the Treasurer.**

**Revise Article V. Section 5. b. to specify the accounting process to be employed by the Treasurer.**

"During the school year, the Treasurer will file 'monthly cash disbursement reviews' with the finance committee chair, enclosing month-end bank statements and itemizing all income and expenses – and providing copies of invoices to justify each transaction. At the close of the fiscal year (June

30) the Treasurer will prepare and distribute to the membership an accounting of the financial state of the Association – and will assemble the cash disbursement reports into a year-end "cash disbursement report" to be available to the Finance Committee and the officers – and brought to the NCA business meeting for inspection by members."

Justification: Setting the report date to coincide with the end of the fiscal year would allow all of the Championship Tournament expenses to be included in the report. An external audit safeguards the Treasurer as well as the other members of the Executive Council and the Association.

Handling: MSP.

**Proposal 2: Revise Article VI. Section 1. a. 2. to empower the Treasurer, with the oversight of the Finance Committee, to prepare the annual budget.**

Add "2.

- a) The Treasurer shall substantially detail the financial state of the organization along with the annual comprehensive cash disbursement report by July 30. This report will be sent to the Finance Committee and posted on the NPDA website when convenient for the Webmaster.
- b) By February 1 all committee chairs and executive officers shall submit budget proposals, requests to the Treasurer for possible inclusion in the following year's annual budget.
- c) On or before March 1 the Treasurer shall submit a draft budget divided into three parts: general operational expenses, national tournament expenses, and special projects to the Finance Committee and publish it for feedback.
  - [1] The operational budget is the regular yearly operation for officers to do their work, pay bills, send mailings, etc.
  - [2] The national tournament budget consists of tournament expenses.
  - [3] All other submissions would be included under the heading of special projects.
- d) The Finance Committee shall meet in conjunction with the spring meeting and approve or amend the proposed budget.
  - [1] Operational expenses and national tournament expenses will be considered by the Finance Committee and, if passed unanimously, submitted to the membership under the heading of "regular operational and national expenses, approved unanimously by the Finance Committee"
    - [a] Unanimously approved operational and tournament expenses will be forwarded to the membership as a block for ratification, unless someone specifically asked for a particular line item to be considered from the floor.
      - If one or more members of the Finance Committee vote "no" on a general operational or national tournament expense, the item will be brought to the membership under the heading of "expenses lacking unanimous Finance Committee approval.
      - These items will be considered line item as the second order of budget business.
    - [b] If any member of the Finance Committee wished, she or he could ask that a line item be classified as "for special consideration" and taken to the NPDA meeting for consideration.
      - Items labeled "for special consideration" will include any item that a finance committee member believed posed a possible conflict of interest for them.
      - The committee might vote on the item, and offer approval, but would consciously seek specific ratification by the membership later.
      - A finance committee member might also propose a new expense be automatically labeled as "for special consideration" to allow wider debate on an item not previously in the budget.
  - [2] Special project items will automatically be taken to the membership for specific approval.
- e) The budget, presented by the chair of the Finance Committee, will be ratified by the membership at the NPDA Business Meeting through a four step approval process.
  - [1] Operational and national tournament expenses submitted to the membership for unanimous approval of the Finance Committee.
  - [2] Operational and national tournament expenses lacking unanimous Finance Committee approval.
  - [3] Expenses offered for special consideration represent potential conflicts of interest for one or more Financial Committee members or new items which one or more member believes should have general approval before becoming an ongoing expense.
  - [4] Special projects, all items that are not regular parts of the operational or national tournament budget.
- f) The Finance Committee can voluntarily choose not to vote on items 3 and 4 until the membership vote.

Justification: Although the process of creating the budget is formalized in the Constitution, it has never been actualized. Since the process has never been operational it has placed undue burden on the Treasurer to create, justify, and account for spending throughout the year. Additionally, it has enabled officers and committees to request funds in a largely informal, ad hoc basis. The proposed system recognizes that an individual rather than a committee would be in a better position to formulate a budget. Additionally, it provides structure to the process of creating a budget, ensures oversight and input, and forces officers and committees to consider their expenses in advance.

Handling: MSP

**Proposal 3: Add Article VI. Section 1. a. 4. to establish the Finance Committee as the fiscal oversight body of the NPDA.**

Add "4. To provide annual fiscal oversight.

- a) During the year, any deviation in spending in a particular line item greater than 10% shall be approved by the Finance Committee.
- b) Requests for the creation of new line items or reimbursements shall be approved by the Finance Committee.
- c) The Finance Committee shall be responsible for working with the Treasurer, the Host and the Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee to negotiate trophy contracts and to develop and revise recommendations and requirements for national hosts as needed.

Justification: The proposed changes ensure that the Treasurer is not put in the uncomfortable position of having to negotiate contracts, make spending adjustments, and reimburse significant unanticipated expenses without the approval of a larger body. Presently, the Treasurer is placed in the position of having to make snap judgments about spending as problems arise, then account for them later. This system reinforces the position of the Treasurer as an accountant/clerk for the organization and diffuses responsibilities for spending decisions onto a larger body.

Opposition: to c. Trophy negotiations and decisions should not be delegated to the host, who changes each year. The site development committee is also an inappropriate body for trophy negotiation and decision. The committee should be comprised of the Treasurer, the Vice President and the Tournament Director to negotiate national trophy contracts.

Handling: MS. Trapp moved to strike section A. Second. MSP the motion sans sub A.

**Proposal Submitted by Kate Shuster, Claremont McKenna College**

**Proposal #61: A proposal to amend the Constitution to add to standing committees:**

**Add to Article VI, Standing Committees, the following:**

**Section 5 – Outreach Committee**

**A. Committee Outline and Basic Duties**

The outreach committee shall promote and coordinate outreach efforts on behalf of the NPDA and its member institutions. All NPDA monies spent on outreach efforts must be approved by a vote of this outreach committee. Although the committee will not have the direct authority to spend dues money or other funds available for outreach projects, the committee will be charged with approving proposals for funding, to be subsequently approved by the membership and provided to the finance committee or other designated budget management agent of the NPDA.

The outreach committee may only approve an outreach project by a majority vote. Persons or institutions seeking funding for outreach projects must submit proposals to the committee for approval. Proposals must follow approved annual guidelines, and must minimally include the following in order to be considered for funding:

- A designated project sponsor, preferably a staff or faculty member at a college or university.
- A budget request with projected expenses identified by line-items.
- An agreement by the project sponsor to produce a narrative outcomes report and a budget report within 60 days of the conclusion of the project funding period.
- A letter of request for funding, outlining the proposed project and a summary of expected outcomes, including the number of people served by the project and the expected results (both in the long-term and short-term) of the project.

Project proposals must be submitted to each member of the outreach committee no later than the officially published bi-annual deadlines (Figure 1). Project proposals that are submitted after the designated due date for each project review period will not be considered until the next project review period.

**Figure 1: Project Proposal Submission Dates**

Project Implementation Period	Project Proposal Submissions Due	Project Approval at:
Spring & Summer	One Month prior to NCA business meeting	NCA Business Meeting
Summer & Fall	One month prior to Nationals Business Meeting	Nationals Business Meeting

**B. Committee Membership**

The committee will be composed of three members. One member will be designated Chair. The committee members, including the Chair, will be appointed by the NPDA President to serve two-year, renewable terms on the committee. Terms will commence on June 1<sup>st</sup> of each calendar year. Prospective members of the committee must apply in writing to the NPDA President no later than May 1<sup>st</sup>. The NPDA President will be responsible for reviewing applications to serve on the committee, and must publish information about upcoming vacancies on the committee no later than April 1<sup>st</sup> in a year when vacancies will be upcoming. If a member of the committee must resign, for any reason, the NPDA President will appoint a committee member to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the original committee member's term.

Committee members must demonstrate a commitment to outreach, as well as experience conducting outreach projects with demonstrable outcomes and sound fiscal management. Preferred candidates should have a track record of domestic and/or international outreach, as well as the ability to manage ongoing projects through logistical and technical support. In order to apply for committee positions, prospective committee members must submit a outreach resume to the NPDA President as well as a letter of interest outlining their qualifications to serve on the committee. The letter of interest should comprehensively detail past projects the candidate has managed or been involved with in a substantial capacity. The letter should detail the outcomes these projects achieved, and should explain what future projects that candidate would be particularly interested in managing and supporting.

Committee members are not eligible to apply for funded projects, nor may they serve as the primary sponsor of a designated outreach project. Committee members may receive compensation for expenses related to required oversight of projects..

Committee members must be actively involved in supporting ongoing projects. They must also be actively involved in reviewing and commenting on project proposals during the designated review period. The Chair shall be responsible for collecting project proposals and ensuring that each committee member has a copy of all proposals during the designated review period. The Chair shall also be responsible for calling votes on proposals in a timely manner, to ensure that a slate of approved projects can be made available to the NPDA Membership (hereafter, the Members) by the Project Approval meetings, conducted twice yearly at NPDA Business Meetings. The Chair is responsible for bringing copies of approved project proposals, to be shared with the Members, at each business meeting. In addition, approved projects will be listed on the NPDA website 15 days prior to the designated business meetings.

### C. Proposal Guidelines and Acceptance Procedures

The Committee will be responsible for producing, on a yearly basis, guidelines for project proposals. These guidelines will suggest areas that are likely to be funded in the upcoming year as well as provide suggestions for proposal authors. These guidelines will be made publicly available by July 1<sup>st</sup> every year. The Chair of the Committee will be responsible for soliciting input from the Members and ensuring that this input is considered in producing the guidelines.

In general, proposals should aim to serve the greatest number of students possible, in the most meaningful way possible, for the least amount of money possible. All approved proposals must have a demonstrated relationship to the interests and needs of the Members, and to increasing the stature and expanse of the NPDA as a whole.

All proposals will compete against each other for potential approval by the committee. The committee may, during the project review period, request more information from prospective project sponsors, or return project proposals to principal investigators for revision. The committee must provide constructive feedback on all submitted proposals. This feedback may be the work of the committee as a whole, or the Chair may designate one committee member to provide comments on a specific proposal.

Once the project proposal submission deadline has passed, the committee members will deliberate on the submitted proposals. They will have to decide which to send on as approved projects, for approval by the membership, and which to send back for revision. Funding for the approved project list may not exceed the money set aside for project funding in any given year. Once the committee has voted on an approved list of projects, that list must be presented to the Members for final approval. This presentation will happen at each of the bi-annual business meetings for the NPDA. The membership may vote up or down on each proposal, or may make suggestions for proposals, to be forwarded to the project sponsor by the Chair, but may not make modifications to proposals. The committee members are charged with discussing and presenting proposals to the Members, and answering all questions about proposals that the Members may have. In this way, the committee serves as the primary principal investigator for NPDA outreach projects.

If the Members approve a project by a majority vote, that project's budgeted expenditures should be paid out of funds for Outreach set aside by the Members on an annual basis. The Chair will designate a committee member to serve as a primary liaison for each approved project. It is the responsibility of the liaison to work to support the ongoing project. This liaison is also responsible for collecting the outcomes reports (narrative and budgetary) produced by the project sponsor at the conclusion of the project.

These reports should be made public and distributed to the Members within 15 days of their receipt. Reports are due to the outreach committee within 60 days of the conclusion of the funding period for the approved project.

### D. Funding

Funding for outreach projects will be set-aside on an annual basis at an amount determined at the spring business meeting. Funding for the initial outreach program year, effective July 1, 2004, is \$4,000.00.

### Rationale And Reasons to Support The Amendment

1. The NPDA must conduct serious outreach to ensure the growth and sustainability of parliamentary debate. This outreach should be coordinated, outcomes-based, and cost-effective. It should also be genuine outreach, designed to bring debate to communities without organized debate participation and to maximize participation.
2. The committee structure will help to ensure efficient use of limited resources. It will also ensure that projects are approved by the membership and supervised by experienced committee members.
3. The structure of the committee will assist in securing funding support for NPDA projects. It is necessary to implement program reporting, accounting, and transparency procedures for grant and donor submissions.

Handling: MS. Discussion regarding how or if the committee be bypassed. We asked why the amount of \$4000 was in there but no one did anything to change it. Where do the Irish fall asks Brent. Kate says it's a special project. Marty says the Irish and outreach could be different. Trapp moves to strike the word "all" in section A to allow for other special projects. SP Moved amendment to say that "Outreach is an educational effort done to increase the emphasis on communities who don't have training or experience parliamentary debate." SF. Main motion sans word "all" in section A reopened. Passed. 15 For. 10 Against.

Motion to take out of order By-Law Proposition 6. Second. Passed.

### Proposal #6: Revise By-Law VIII. B.1. to allow mid-year graduates to debate all year.

Replace with "B. 1. Mid-year graduates may compete for their alma mater at the NPDA Championship Tournament in the Spring after their graduation at the discretion of the program's Director of Forensics, and may participate in invitational tournaments assuming the invitational allows mid-year graduate participation and so long as its not past their fourth NPDA Championship Tournament year of competition."

Justification: This provision would not punish students who happen to graduate early for academic and/or financial reasons and would make sweepstakes consistent.

Handling: MS. Motion to amend that we replace last period with a comma and adds "or the eighth semester limitation." Second. Passed. Students speak to item indicating that students shouldn't be punished for graduating. Ronna notes that this would ignore another rule. Skip feels it just extends the tournament exemption. Motion fails.

**Proposal 5: Revise Article IV, Section 2. to allow for the creation of NPDA Districts.**

Replace "American Forensic Association district" with "National Parliamentary Debate Association district"

Justification: See Legislative Proposal; redistricting Article VII: Business of the Association and VIII: Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws.

Handling: MSP

**Proposal 4: Representative System of the NPDA and for Redistricting**

Prologue: Three proposals came from a subcommittee concerned with the structure of NPDA decision-making and the efficiency of current AFA districting for the NPDA. The initial proposals were drafted by that subcommittee and amended based upon discussion at the retreat. The first proposal moves the decision making of the NPDA from the entire membership to a Legislative Assembly consisting of representatives from the districts. The second proposal is divided into two parts, one part that changes the district lines and expands the representation of districts--giving one additional, at-large or special constituencies representative for each region--and a second part that operationally defines NPDA districts. See commentary sections for specific discussion of each proposal.

**Proposal 4 a: The current structure for conducting business will be replaced with a Legislative Assembly made up of NPDA district representatives.**

Delete existing Article VII and Article VIII of the Constitution to be replaced with the following: "Article VII: Business of the Organization

- Section 1. The Legislative Assembly of the National Parliamentary Debate Association constitutes the governing body of the National Parliamentary Debate Association. The Legislative Assembly is the only body that can propose changes for ratification by the membership at large or institute changes to the By-Laws. Legislative Assembly decisions must be reported to the body at NPDA at-large business meetings and via electronic posting.
- Section 2. The Legislative Assembly shall consist of one faculty/school, one student and one at-large or special constituencies representative from each NPDA district. The members of the NPDA Executive Council will serve as non-voting, resource members of the Legislative Assembly.
- Section 3. Legislative Assembly meetings will be held annually at the National Championship Tournament and at the National Communication Association Convention. Meetings of the assembly are open to observers and members of the NPDA who may request a place on the agenda of these meetings 30 days prior to the assembly meeting. NPDA Business Meetings will be held annually at the National Championship Tournament for reports and discussion. Additional Business Meetings may be called by the Legislative Assembly or the Executive Council as needed. At least sixty days notice will be given before the meetings.
- Section 4. Each district representative will have one vote in the Legislative Assembly. Members of the Legislative Assembly not in attendance may vote by written proxy with no one member of the assembly voting more than 5 proxies. At least 25% of the membership of the Legislative Assembly must be personally present to conduct business.
- Section 5. The presiding parliamentary officer of the Legislative Assembly will be the President of the National Parliamentary Association or his/her designee.
- Section 6. Tie votes will result in failure of an item of business.
- Section 7. The Executive Council may veto decisions of the Legislative Assembly by a 2/3 vote of the Executive Council. A 2/3 vote of the Legislative Assembly is required to over-ride an Executive Council veto.

Article VIII: Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws

Section 1. Amendments to the Constitution

- a. An amendment to the Constitution may be initiated by any member of the Legislative Assembly or any member of the organization via a member of the Legislative Assembly;
- b. Amendments to the Constitution must be submitted to the Executive Secretary forty-five days prior to a Legislative Assembly meeting to be considered at that meeting. The Executive Secretary will communicate proposed amendments to the President and the membership no later than 30 days prior to the Legislative Assembly meeting.

- The President will provide the Legislative Assembly with an agenda no later than 15 days prior to the Legislative Assembly meeting.
- c. A two-thirds vote of the Legislative Assembly voting (including proxies) will be necessary for a proposed constitutional amendment to be sent to the Executive Council.
  - d. Within ten days following the Legislative Assembly meeting, the Executive Council must vote to endorse or veto the legislation.
  - e. In the case of endorsement, the Executive Secretary will distribute within ten days of the decision by mail a ballot containing all proposed constitutional amendments. Balloting on these will cease at midnight thirty days after the date of the Executive Council ruling. A two-thirds vote of the schools voting by mail on the proposed amendment will be necessary for its enactment.
  - f. In the case of a veto, the Executive Secretary will return within ten days the decision to the Legislative Assembly. The Legislative Assembly may call a special meeting of the Assembly and/or wait until the next Legislative Assembly to consider an override of the veto. An override of the veto requires a three-quarters vote of the Assembly.
  - g. In the case of an override, the Executive Secretary will distribute within ten days of the decision by mail a ballot containing all proposed constitutional amendments. Balloting on these will cease at midnight thirty days after the date of the Executive Council ruling. A two-thirds vote of the schools voting by mail on the proposed amendment will be necessary for its enactment.

Section 2. Amendments to the By-Laws

- a. An amendment to the By-Laws may be initiated by any member of the Legislative Assembly or any member of the organization via a member of the Legislative Assembly.
- b. Amendments to the By-Laws must be submitted to the Executive Secretary forty-five days prior to a Legislative Assembly meeting to be considered at that meeting. The Executive Secretary will communicate proposed amendments to the President and the membership no later than 30 days prior to the Legislative Assembly meeting. The President will provide the Legislative Assembly with an agenda no later than 15 days prior to the Legislative Assembly meeting.
- c. A majority of the members represented and voting in the Legislative Assembly will be necessary to send amendments of the By-Laws to the Executive Council.
- d. Within ten days following the Legislative Assembly meeting, the Executive Council must vote to endorse or veto the legislation.
- e. In the case of endorsement, the changes will be enacted upon the endorsement of the Executive Council.
- f. In the case of a veto, the Executive Secretary will return within ten days the decision to the Legislative Assembly. The Legislative Assembly may call a special meeting of the Assembly and/or wait until the next Legislative Assembly to consider an override of the veto. An override of the veto requires a two-thirds vote of the Assembly.
- g. In the case of an override, the legislation will be enacted.

Justification: Using a traditional legislative model and infusing that model with the experience of other forensics organizations, this legislative structure increases the ability to conduct business by creating a smaller legislative body. In addition, the system gives balance to districts in terms of voice and increases student representation to the legislative process. The structure empowers district representatives and encourages them to meet with and seek ideas from their districts, facilitating a more efficient and locally situated means for districts to communicate about and propose legislation.

**Proposal 4 b.1: Revise Article IV. Sections 2 and 3. to expand representation and to redistrict the NPDA to be more representative of travel patterns and/or local interconnectedness.**

Replace Section 2. A district faculty/school representative, a district student representative and a district at-large or special constituencies representative will be elected from each National Parliamentary Debate Association district that has at least five NPDA member schools. Districts may determine when and how these representatives are elected and assign the at-large or special constituencies representative as appropriate. Each district shall have at least one faculty/school representative and one student representative. The regional faculty/school representative will serve as the district chair. All three representatives will have voting membership on the NPDA Legislative Assembly. The faculty/school and student representatives shall be elected for two-year, renewable terms with representatives from even numbered districts elected in even years and representatives from odd numbered districts elected in odd years. The at-large or special constituencies representative shall be elected for a two-year, renewable terms with representatives from even numbered districts elected in even years and representatives from odd numbered districts elected in odd years. Terms begin and end at the conclusion of respective election year's national tournament. If for any reason a regional representative cannot serve the entirety of their term, then the members of the representative's constituency shall call a new election to be held as soon as possible to fill the remainder of the term.

Justification: The need for this change presupposes the passing of a Legislative Assembly structure for business in the NPDA. The initial discussion of the subcommittee centered on using the existing district school and student representatives as the Legislative Assembly feeling that a smaller legislative body was superior to a larger one in ability to increase balanced attendance at meetings and in terms of conducting actual business. However, other members of the retreat body felt that the Legislative Assembly should be larger than the proposed twenty-member assembly and suggested doubling the number. Members of the retreat body were split over which would be best, a large or a small assembly. A compromise was reached with three representatives and the at-large representative choice. Overall, the compromise enabled consensus. Some concerns remained about the at-large representative: Who is the constituency for the at-large representative and how will district meetings be held in order to elect at-large representatives? The body opted to leave these questions open to the districts and the subcommittee amended the "at-large representative" as "the at-large or special constituencies representative". In later discussion, options floated for voting included nominations and mail balloting or elections at regional meetings in conjunction with regional tournaments. On the question of constituencies, the proposal allows for districts to assign this representative as is appropriate for the district. For example, in areas with large two-year school populations, the at-large or special constituencies representative may serve two-year schools; in districts with large travel areas, the district may elect a sub-district representatives (northern/southern); in districts with notable large/small or public/private

program concerns, the district may elect to represent these constituencies. If no particular special constituency exists within the district, the district may retain the at-large distinction and choose to elect generally from the district population.

**Proposal 4 b.2.: To alter NPDA districting:**

The NPDA uses the AFA districting system. Replace with "The National Parliamentary Debate Association will operationally define districts as indicated below (the amendments are reflected below--preamendment location is underlined):

District One and Two: Two divisions born from the schools of California, Hawaii, Nevada and Arizona (*An ad hoc committee of the schools of California/Hawaii/Arizona shall decide how to redistrict into districts one and two--North/South, 4-Year/2-Year, large/small program, et al. Each resulting district shall have representation as assigned in Article IV. Section 2.*)

District Three: Oklahoma, New Mexico and Texas

District Four: Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Alaska, Montana and British Columbia, Canada

District Five: Utah, Wyoming, Colorado and Alberta, Canada (Nevada, Idaho)

District Six: Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota

District Seven: Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi (Oklahoma)

District Eight: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Georgia, Tennessee, Florida, Alabama

District Nine: Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois (Kentucky)

District Ten: West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, DC, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine--and anyone else we've forgotten

Justification: These districts often travel together. They have regular contact with member schools. These divisions give some balance in terms of how many schools are represented by each district. However, it was the general feeling of the subcommittee that the number of schools was not the primary reason for these divisions. Rather, the primary concern is travel patterning. In retreat participant discussion, questions were raised about where to place Canadian provenances, what to do with inactive memberships, et al. The initial proposal was amended to place the two active Canadian programs in districts to which they seem to travel most often. Discussion suggested that while there is greater inactivity currently in some districts over others, all districts have more or less inactive programs at various points in time and this did not seem a compelling reason to change districting representative of travel patterns. Although imperfect, these districts seemed appropriate for an initial redistricting. In addition, the committee would accept as friendly amendment, requests from member schools in specific states/provenances to place them in alternate districts before this proposal goes to a final vote. The body suggested that this number and alignment of districts may be modified by the NPDA as districts increase in size, participation and mobility.

Handling: After a little discussion and before the proposal there was a motion MSF to create 10 districts instead of this proposal. The primary reason for the motion was a concern about a constitutional amendment that was tentative. Then we decided it was a bylaw and moved on. Then the proposal for handling all of proposal four was handled.

MS then discussion. MSP to amend by moving MSP to amend by moving Idaho to District Four. MSP to amend by moving Oklahoma to District Three. MSP to amend by moving Nevada to District One or Two. MSP to amend by moving Kentucky to District 8. Return to the mail motion for all of proposal four. Motion failed. For 10, Against 13

Motion to reconsider. Second. Passed. Motion to divide the motion. Second. Passed. MSP to support 4B2 with all previous amendments. Move to table 4A and 4B1 until NCA. Second and passed.

**Proposal 6: Delete Article IV. Section 3. to eliminate the Two Year Schools Representative.**

Justification: See Legislative Proposal; redistricting Article VII: Business of Association and VIII: Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws.

Handling: Move to table 6 until NCA.. Second and passed. For 12, Against 4.

**Proposed NPDA By-Laws Changes**

**Proposal #1: To authorize a constitutional revision team to make non-substantive changes to NPDA By-Laws for editorial and consistency purposes.**

Handling: MSP

**Proposal #2: Revise By-Law I. to clarify affiliate membership.**

Replace phrase in parenthesis with "(affiliate membership applies to schools that did not enter teams in any NPDA sanctioned or national competition during the previous year)"

Justification: This change is necessary to clarify how the organization defines affiliate membership.

Handling: MSP

**Proposal #17: Revise By-Law XI. F. 1. to be consistent in referring to districts designations.**

Replace "AFA Districts" with "NPDA Districts".

Justification: This change would be necessary if the redistricting proposal becomes part of the Constitution.

Handling: MSP.

**Proposal #23: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. d. to break brackets in elimination rounds at the Championship Tournament.**

Replace with "d. In the event that two teams from the same school meet in elimination rounds, the Tournament Director or his/her staff will break brackets according to the following criteria: (1) protecting the higher seed; (2) changing the fewest number of brackets; (3) preserving original bracket order."

Justification: This proposal restores equity to the elimination round bracket. The bracket is, at best, an approximation of the strength of the field. It is accurate, both pragmatically, and logistically to assert that the bracket is not pure, especially when side constraints, met team before, school constraints, and in some cases, regional constraints all skew the bracket. This recognizes and values the contribution that individuals make to their squad and avoids a team being eliminated from the Championship Tournament without losing an elimination round debate.

Handling: Breaking Brackets: Trapp spoke in favor of it saying that we break brackets in every prelim bracket and that the only argument is that we have pure seeding and there isn't. Says it hurts kids' feelings. Northup notes that there is also an argument that breaking brings a human touch and some are concerned about it being biased but now programs allow for it. Schabot argues that it hurts small schools. Hack says that there is a pairing for round one and that Schabot's argument goes both ways. Jensen asks how far we would break them. There must be a final round says Skip. Some general arguments about hurt feelings including an argument that all debate can lead to hurt feelings. MSP. Birkholt argues post meeting that if we use the prelim argument then we should also equalize for sides since that is a bigger problem.

**Proposal #28: Add By-Law XI. G. 8. to specify elimination round judge commitment and mandate the Tournament Director to print list of those judges obligated for morning elimination rounds.**

Add "8. All judges are committed to judge two rounds past the elimination round of their last competing teams, or octafinals, whichever is later. The Tournament Director will print a list of the judges being used for morning elimination rounds."

Justification: Encoding the commitment level leads to more transparency and clarity. It also leads to the largest possible pool for the highest quality of judging, and reduces the number of people leaving early, leading to larger audiences for the later outrounds and more education for those watching and debating.

Handling: Discussion of overcommitment. Motion MSP.

Motion to take #4 and #34 out of order. MSF.

Motion to adjourn. SP

Further items left untouched to reappear AGAIN on the NCA Chicago meeting agenda.

**Proposal #3: Revise By-Law III. to provide a mechanism for the Executive Secretary to submit annual budget requests.**

Replace III. Executive Secretary's Office with "The Office of the Executive Secretary shall submit an annual budget request to defray the telephone and mailing expenses connected with doing National Parliamentary Debate Association business."

Justification: All budget requests should be submitted specifically to the Finance Committee for inclusion in the budget. Following formulation by the Treasurer and the Finance Committee, the budget would then be approved by the Executive Council and the membership. While the Executive Secretary will receive a budget, it should be based on his/her estimated need.

**Proposal #4: Replace By-Law IV. Season Sweepstakes with IV. Season Honor Awards.**

Replace IV. Season Sweepstakes with "IV. Season Honor Awards:

- Section 1. The National Parliamentary Debate Association will confer Honor Awards on outstanding schools that participate in sanctioned tournaments during the season. Awards will be given for varsity, junior, novice and two-year honors. Schools in the top 5, 10, 15 and 20 percent will be eligible for honor.
- Section 2. Points will be accumulated for Honor Awards according to the following formula:
- a. One point for each debate win (including a win for a bye and a win by forfeit) by a team in final four preliminary rounds of a National Parliamentary Debate Association sanctioned tournament and two points for a win by a team the first two elimination rounds.
  - b. Each of the four teams for which a school receives credit toward Honor Awards at a sanctioned tournament will receive at least one point toward Honor Awards, even if they win no debates at all.
- Section 3. Final Honor awards will be based on the total points accumulated at the six sanctioned tournaments at which each school has gained the most points during the season.
- Section 4. Ties will be rounded up for inclusion in the highest grouping possible for that number of points.
- Section 5. When students from two different schools combine to form a team at a sanctioned tournament, the total points earned by such a split team will be divided between their two schools.
- Section 6. Should a school enter more than four teams in a sanctioned tournament, the rounds of only that school's four best teams will be counted toward Honor Awards.
- Section 7. Should two teams from the same school be scheduled to debate each other ("closing out a bracket") in an elimination round of a sanctioned tournament, their school will receive two points for winning the round even if the debate is not held. If two teams from the same school meet in a preliminary round, the school will be awarded one point for winning the debate even if no actual debate occurs. The point will be awarded to the team indicated on the tab sheets as having earned the win or bye.
- Section 8. Teams from a host school may enter competition in their own tournament. Wins by those teams will count toward NPDA Honor Awards.
- Section 9. At tournaments in which teams in elimination rounds are given byes, a team receiving a bye shall be awarded two points for a win.
- Section 10. To be counted for Honor Awards points the National Parliamentary Debate Association division of a tournament must contain at least six teams from a minimum of three schools.
- Section 11. Tournament directors shall submit results to their District Representative within 10 days of the tournament for calculation and report. District Representatives shall report and send copies of the calculated results to the Executive Secretary or her/his

designee within 21 days of receiving results from the Tournament Director. Tournaments held within 20 days of the Championship Tournament should have their results submitted directly to the Executive Secretary or her/his designee within three days of the completion of the tournament.

Section 12. Any errors in the National Parliamentary Debate Association reports of tournament results and Honor Awards point totals must be brought to the attention of the Executive Secretary or her/his designee no later than fourteen days prior to the commencement of on-site registration for the NPDA Championship Tournament. Any mistakes made on tournaments held within two weeks of the NPDA Championship Tournament must be corrected during the first day of the NPDA Championship Tournament.

Section 13. Tournaments may hold as many elimination rounds as is desired, but a tournament must have at least six teams for finals to count and eight teams for semi-finals to count for Honor Awards.

Section 14. A team must be present and must debate in more than half of the preliminary rounds as a team in order to count for the purpose of determining the number of teams in a division as part of the determination of the appropriate number of elimination rounds that earn National Parliamentary Debate Association Honor Awards points."

Justification: The current system discourages local rather than national circuits, rewards coaches for keeping students in junior varsity, et. al. This proposal provides public relations assistance to programs while not encouraging abuses.

Opposition: This proposal to too likely to place NPDA in the uncomfortable position of defining junior and novice divisions, a job best left up to tournament directors at individual tournaments. It would be better to keep the present system, and add something akin to a "Robert Trapp Honors Award" to the top 10 percent of programs each year whose points are earned solely in open competition. An appropriately named two-year award (Orv Iverson?) should honor the top 10 percent of two-year achievements each year. NPDA should not determine awards by using the varied definitions of novice and junior – and should not police or even seek to influence those guidelines. This proposal should be debated more fully, separated from the Prescott proposals and voted on later.

#### **Proposal #5: Revise By-Law VII. to change the criteria for sanctioning tournaments.**

If School Honor Awards or Season Sweepstakes are retained, change VII. Criteria for Sanctioning Tournaments to:

"VII. Criteria for Sanctioning NPDA Tournaments:

Tournaments meeting the following general criteria will be designated as counting for sweepstakes/honor award points:

- A. Unless hosted by a national or regional organization, the host of an NPDA sanctioned tournament must be an affiliate or a regular member of NPDA.
- B. Unless hosted by a national or regional organization whose rules specify invitation of members only, the tournament shall be open to all members of NPDA and the host school shall complete and submit a sanctioning form.
- C. Unless exceptions are clearly noted in the tournament invitation sanctioned tournaments must follow the NPDA "Rules of Debating and Judging" in By-Law XII.
- D. The tournament must be attended by at least six teams from a minimum of three schools.
- E. If the Executive Secretary (or other person designated to count honor award points) fails to receive tournament results during the time period mentioned in Article IV, Section 11, the tournament cannot be sanctioned for the following year.
- H. Appeals of sanctioning decisions may be made to the Rules and Ethics Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee."

Justification: We don't want to penalize people for hosting our event and we believe affiliate memberships encourage more schools, especially those who may not have an NPDA team or don't come to nationals, to host the event.

#### **Proposal #7: Revise language in By-Law VIII. to consolidate rule enforcement with the Professional Development Committee.**

Replace "President" with "Chair of the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee" and "Executive Council" to "Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee"

Justification: This would consolidate enforcement of rules into one body, relieving the President and the Executive Council of the task.

#### **Proposal #8: Revise By-Law VIII. by adding guiding definitions for a novice and a junior.**

Add "3. For tournament directors who desire definitions of novice and junior, the NPDA suggests the following guidelines:

- a. To be classified as a novice
  1. The student should have no high school debate experience.
  2. The student should be in the first two semesters of collegiate debate.
  3. Once the student has advanced to more than 3 elimination rounds, the student should be advanced to the junior or open division.
- b. To be classified as a junior
  1. The student should be in the first four semesters of intercollegiate debate.
  2. The student should not have advanced to elimination rounds more than 3 times in junior or open division.
  3. Once the student has advanced to more than three rounds, the student should be advanced to open."

Justification: This provides guidance to Tournament Directors who would like a uniform definition of junior and novice. Tournament Directors may use other definitions for junior and novice, and have those definitions count for sweepstakes/honor points, provided they make their definitions clear in the invitation.

Opposition: NPDA should not offer guidelines for the definition of novice and junior. That's outside the province of NPDA and should be left to tournament directors. Even a 'guideline' moves beyond NPDA's appropriate sphere of influence.

#### **Proposal #9: Revise By-Law VIII. D. to consolidate enforcement of rules with the Professional Development Committee.**

Throughout VIII. D. change "President" to "Chair of the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee" and "Executive Council" to "Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee."

Justification: This would consolidate enforcement of rules into one body. It would relieve the President, Executive Council and Tournament Director of this responsibility.

**Proposal #10: Revise By-Law X. B. 3. b. 3. and 4. to eliminate the resource team from the Committee on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment.**

Eliminate "and resource team members" from By-Law X. B. 3. b. 3. and 4.

Justification: The resource team has not been functioning and has very little impact on the effectiveness of the Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Committee.

**Proposal #11: Revise By-Law XI. to change the composition of the oversight agent for the Championship Tournament from the Executive Council to the National Championship Tournament Committee as per Constitution, Standing Committee, Section 5.**

Eliminate "For purposes of the NPDA Championship Tournament, the "Executive Council "refers only to the President, Vice President, Executive Secretary, and Treasurer, and does not include the National Student Representative."

Justification: This change would be necessary to conform to composition of the Championship Tournament Committee as established in the Constitution Article VI, Section 5.

**Proposal #12: Revise By-Law XI. A.1. c.. to change reimbursement of tournament staff**

**(also applies to all issues involving providing food, lodging, and travel assistance to tournament staff) to use the language of "no net gain/no net loss".**

"Tournament personnel should incur no net financial loss by working on the tournament – and personnel may apply to the Finance Committee for reimbursement of costs above and beyond those that would have been incurred had they not served on the tournament staff."

Justification: The "no net gain/no net loss" principle would mean that tournament staff should not be given travel, food and lodging benefits if such benefits would mean that they accrue a "net gain" by serving the tournament. On the other hand, the staff should be allowed to apply for reimbursement for any "net loss" suffered because of service to the tournament.

**Proposal #13: Revise By-Law XI. A. 1. d. to allow tournament staff to count as judges from an entering school.**

Replace with "d. Members of the tournament staff shall count as judges from entering schools and may be used as judges in the elimination rounds."

Justification: Individuals should not be penalized for their service to the organization.

**Proposal #14: Revise By-Law. XI. C. to provide a process for determining debater eligibility and an enforcement mechanism for violations.**

- Add "
3. The Director of Forensics or program director's signature will be required on entry forms certifying eligibility for the tournament and for the novice division.
  4. Prior to the NPDA Championship Tournament, if an eligibility violation is determined by the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee the following sanctions will be applied.
    - a. If the eligibility question deals with a novice debate, the student will lose the novice designation.
    - b. If the eligibility question deals with an open debater, the team will be given the option to fill in with another debater.
    - c. In either case, the school will be fined \$250. per violation.
  5. If a violation is discovered after the NPDA Championship Tournament, the following sanctions will be applied if the violation is reported to the Professional Development, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee within 21 days of the Championship Tournament.
    - a. The team's records will be eliminated. Any team awards will be returned, and any individual speaker awards for the ineligible debater will be returned. The other member may retain the speaker award she/he has earned.
    - b. The school will be fined \$250 per violation.

Justification: We want to be proactive, rather than reactive if possible.

**Proposal #15: Revise By-Law XI. D. to expand the Championship Tournament to ten preliminary rounds of debate.**

Change "eight" to "ten"

Justification: There are two predominate reasons for increasing to ten preliminary rounds. First, the current number of preliminary round debates is insufficient to sort the elimination round bracket. Increasing the number of preliminary rounds will better rank order the teams advancing to elimination rounds. Second, adding two more rounds adds more debates for all debaters at the tournament thereby increasing the educational value of the Championship Tournament (arguably the best laboratory all year for teaching argumentation and debate) for all participants, not just those advancing to elimination rounds.

If changed, would affect subsequent items.

Opposition: Our current system, advancing all winning teams, minimizes the interference of speaker points on the advancement process – and insures that all appropriate teams advance to out rounds. NPDA has gone on record opposing speaker points – the 64 team system most likely reinstates speaker points as part of our policy.

**Proposal #16: Revise By-Law XI. E. 1. to be less prescriptive regarding when topics will be written.**

Replace with "1. In addition to the responsibilities indicated under the Championship Tournament Committee, Subcommittee duties, the Topic Selection Committee shall select an appropriate number of topics to be debated at the tournament."

Justification: This brings this section into conformity with the Topic Selection Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee.

**Proposal #18: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. a. to determine random and power matched rounds in the 10 round tournament**

Replace with "a. "Rounds 1 and 2 will be randomly matched, while rounds 3-10 will be power matched based upon each team's cumulative record through the previous round."

Justification: This change would be necessary should a 10 round tournament proposal be approved. It determines what rounds will be randomly matched and which rounds will be power matched.

**Proposal #19: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. to eliminate power-matching criteria for an 8 round tournament.**

Eliminate By-Law XI. F. 3. d. and e.

Justification: This power-matching criteria would not be used if a 10 round tournament is adopted.

**Proposal #20: Revise By-Law XI. F. 4. to establish the tab room disclosure criteria for a 10 round tournament.**

Replace with "After tabulating the results of each preliminary rounds (1-9) and releasing the pairings of the subsequent round, the tabulation staff will post the results of the previous round by listing each team name followed by an asterisk (if that team won) in a common are accessible to all tournament participants."

Justification: The number of rounds would change with the 10 round tournament.

**Proposal #21: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. a. to advance the top 64 teams to single elimination rounds.**

Replace with "a. Following the conclusion of the last preliminary round, teams will be rank-ordered according to the criteria listed below. The top 64 teams will advance to the single elimination round."

Justification: The current number of preliminary round debates is insufficient to sort the elimination round bracket. Increasing the number of preliminary round allows for a better rank order of the teams advancing to elimination rounds.

**Proposal #22: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. b. and c. to eliminate partial elimination rounds with the adoption of a 10 round tournament.**

Eliminate b. and c.

Justification: With a guaranteed two extra rounds and a more accurate breaking of brackets, partial elimination rounds would no longer be needed.

**Proposal #24: Revise By-Law XI. G. 2 to mandate that all strikes and constraints received by the deadline be administered before the start of round one and to ensure all teams receive no less than 15% of the entire judging pool.**

Replace with "2. All strikes and constraints that have been received by the deadline shall be administered by the tabulation staff and Tournament Director before the start of round one. The number of allowed strikes for each individual team shall never be less than 15% of the entire judging pool."

Justification: Although complications can and inevitably do arise, instances of inequity have been rampant in errors made on issues of strikes. In such instances, time has restricted the full addressing of these issues. We believe that it is more important for equal treatment to be received by each student, and therefore prefer a call to action for strikes to be honored.

**Proposal #25: Revise By-Law XI. G. 4. to remove geographical judging constraints at the Championship Tournament.**

Delete G.4.

Justification: Geographical constraints are rarely consistently honored in practice. Judges hired by the tournament are often given no geographic classification, although they are in fact part of a region. Since their regional affiliation will not be specified, they would not be restricted from hearing a team from the same region. Geographical constraints harm the ability of schools in underrepresented regions to take advantage of their local judging pool in forming relations.

**Proposal #26: Add By-Law XI. G. 5. to advise judges to be judicially, politically and philosophically unbiased in rendering decisions.**

Add " 5. Judges should always strive to judge debates on the basis of who they thought did the better debating, avoiding rendering a decision based on their own judicial political or philosophical bias."

Justification: Although this standard may be implicit, it is good to remind people. These guidelines serve as a tool for training judges at other tournaments.

**Proposal #27: Add By-Law XI. G. 7. to impose a financial penalty on judges not available to fulfill their obligation.**

Add "7. A financial penalty of fifty dollars for each preliminary and one hundred dollars for each elimination round will be imposed against any and all judges who fail to be available to judge all rounds to which they are obligated.

a. Until fines are paid, the judge's affiliated or hiring school will be suspended from NPDA membership.

b. All fines are subject to appeal to the NPDA Rules and Ethics

Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee on the basis of extenuating circumstances."

Justification: Especially in later elimination rounds, it has been observed that judges are being substituted nearly at random when ballots are missed. Often it is the judge who are simply standing near the ballot table. There should be more of an initiative to compel judges to conform to their commitments. We seek to deter more than to punish, and the ability to appeal makes the prospect of crippling punishment unlikely. Rather it imposes a comparable inconvenience on the judge missing the ballot and the inconvenience faced by the ballot table.

**Proposal #29: Revise By-Law XI. H. 1. to require judges at the Championship Tournament to affirm that they have read, understand and agree to abide by NPDA rules.**

Replace with "H. 1. Enforcement of Section 4 of the NPDA Tournament Rules (section entitled "During the Debate") shall be the province of the judge (or in the case of multiple judge panels, of the Speaker of the House). All judges adjudicating at the Championship Tournament shall affirm, through electronic signature, that they have read, understand and agree to abide by the NPDA rules and guidelines for judging, including the Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Policy, prior to submitting their required judging philosophy. In extreme circumstances, paper signatures can be accepted with submission of required judging philosophy."

Justification: There have been consistent complaints that some judges are unfamiliar with rules, and in the absence of familiarity, have been making up their own rules. At the very least, to require an affirmation that the rules have been read, especially with the proposed method for implementation, increases the accountability of the judges to those rules. In addition, it further protects us against sexual harassment claims when all judges verify that they are informed of their responsibilities as judges.

**Proposal #30: Revise By-Law XI. H. 3. to consolidate enforcement of tournament rules with the Tournament Director and the Ethics and Rules Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee.**

Replace with "3. Enforcement of all other sections of the NPDA Tournament Rules shall be the providence of the Tournament Director in consultation with the Ethics and Rules Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee."

Justification: This change is necessary to consolidate the enforcement of NPDA Rules with one body.

**Proposal #31: Revise By-Law XI. I. 4. to provide consistency in the definition of a novice debater.**

Eliminate ""with a year of competition being defined as two tournaments in each of the two semesters."

Justification: As stated this conflicts with the definition of novice provided in By-Law IX. Novice Awards.

**Proposal #32: Revise By-Law XI. I. 5. a. 3) to provide sweepstakes points for both preliminary and elimination round debates.**

Replace with "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) 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."

Justification: The old system only rewarded preliminary round performance. The proposed system recognizes a school's performance during the entire tournament. However, the committee felt that preliminary rounds should be weighted heavier than elimination rounds to reflect a program's breadth rather than just depth. So a school that advances four teams but all drop in early elimination rounds should have points that reflect the success of many teams opposed to a school that has one team that wins the tournament but has no other teams doing well at the tournament. This team has the award the team won for its individual accomplishment but should be additionally recognized for that singular performance.

Opposition: The sweepstakes system is complex with subtleties that deserve discussion – and, perhaps, revision. There is merit to counting only prelims – winning 24 of 32 rounds is a sign of a balanced team. Two teams, who both reach semifinals, could earn 28 or more by themselves! The balanced four-team accomplishment is more worthy of "sweepstakes" recognition. The two teams would be appropriately recognized with top national awards – a more fitting honor for two teams than 'school sweepstakes'".

**Proposal #33: Revise By-Law XI. 1.5. a. 4) to include points gained from elimination rounds in the determination of Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards.**

Replace with "a) The greatest cumulative number of preliminary and elimination round points as enumerated in 5. a. 3)"

Justification: This just reflects the new sweepstakes system as the first factor in determining sweepstakes. The rest of the tie breaking system would remain intact.

**Proposal #34: Revise By-Law XI. 6. c. to conform to the change from the current Sweepstakes process to the School Honor Awards if passed.**

X. 6. Would be eliminated or changed if School Honor Awards are implemented.

Justification: This change would be necessary to provide consistency if School Honor Awards are adopted.

**Proposal #35: Revise By-Law XII. to charge the Tournament Director and the Rules and Standards Subcommittee with the enforcement of NPDA Championship Tournament rules.**

Replace paragraph 4 with "Charges of violations of any rules other than those in Section 4, including violations of rules before and after the debate, should be taken to the Tournament Director. In the case of serious violations of these Rules other than those in Section 4, the Tournament Director will direct the Rules and Standards Subcommittee to review and rule on the decision. If the violation is upheld the Rules and Standards Subcommittee may impose a penalty ranging from reprimand, to changing of a decision or speaker points, to withdrawal of a team or judge from the tournament.

Justification: This change is necessary to consolidate the rule enforcement with the Tournament Director and the Rules and Standards Subcommittee.

**Proposal #36: Revise By-Law XII. to bring language in conformity with current usage.**

Throughout By-Law XII. change "proposition" to "Government", "First proposition" to "Prime Minister", "Second proposition" to "Member of Government", "First opposition" to "Leader of the Opposition" and "Second opposition" to "Member of the Opposition".

Justification: The terms used in this section do not reflect current practice and consequently need to be changed.

**Proposal #37: Revise By-Law XIII. A. to clarify Host responsibilities for the Championship Tournament.**

Replace with "A. Host Responsibilities: Any amenities and associated expenses not required by the NPDA but elected to be provided by the Host will be the financial responsibility of the Host."

Justification: Not all of the responsibilities included are financial. While the Host is required to provide certain items for the efficiency of the tournament any costs associated with extras should be incurred by the Host.

**Proposal #38: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to allow for more than one hotel to serve the Championship Tournament.**

Replace with "2. Tournament Hotel(s): Host will work with the Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee and the President to locate the most appropriate hotel(s) to serve NPDA needs taking into consideration hotel(s) size and amenities, proximity to campus and other area attractions and dining opportunities, affordability of rooms, and willingness of hotel(s) to work with NPDA on minimizing hotel facility expenses. If it helps to negotiate more affordable room/night rental rate, the Championship Tournament Committee, in conjunction with the President, can require attending schools to stay at the tournament hotel(s) as a condition of participation in the tournament. Any gratis or complimentary rooms go against the NPDA hotel room needs. If any complimentary rooms are made available to the NPDA, the Host will be awarded one complimentary room for their use throughout the tournament though this room may be shared with other tournament personnel

Justification: The original implies that only one hotel will meet NPDA needs. The proposed change may encourage schools in smaller towns that do not have access to a large convention hotel. This does mean, of course, that the school must be able to meet any room requirements for the entire tournament. In addition, under the new organizational structure, the Host and Site Development Committee and the Championship Tournament Committee will be more directly responsible for the tournament. In addition, the Host has long hours at the tournament and may live a distance from the school. The NPDA should shoulder some responsibility for easing the burden on the Host.

**Proposal: #39: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to not pay for parking expenses associated with executive vehicle use or executive rental vehicles.**

Justification: Expenses for those already in attendance at the tournaments, and whose expenses would already be covered by their home schools, should not receive reimbursement for their expenses.

**Proposal #40: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to stipulate that the NPDA should work within the allocated number of comp rooms rather than purchase additional hotel nights. Hired judges and dignitaries should be given priority placement in these rooms with the understanding that the Tournament Host will be given one such room.**

Justification: Many of those currently using comp rooms are those who would already be attending the tournament. Consequently, their room charges should be covered by their home schools. Comp rooms should be used for hired judges and dignitaries.

Opposition: Leave the assignment of rooms out of the By-Laws. Some years those rooms may be used by the Host and hired judges. Other years it may be visiting international or domestic guests. Other years they may be used by tab staff without teams in the tournament. A new "no net gain/no net loss" policy – insuring that personnel receive no added benefits but instead are guaranteed "no net loss" – will insure that the comp rooms are not used as benefits for staff with teams competing. This comp room change is unnecessary and will tie the hands of administrators in assigning rooms.

**Proposal #41: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. by adding that the President should sign the hotel contract for the Championship Tournament.**

Add "The President of the National Parliamentary Debate Association should sign the hotel contract."

Justification: There was is ambiguity as to who should sign the hotel contract and it was the feeling of those assembled, including two past Presidents, that the contract should be signed by the President.

**Proposal #42: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 3. to allow flexibility regarding holding the banquet and reception.**

Replace a. and b. with "The Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee should investigate the impact of eliminating the banquet and replacing it with a reception that merges opening ceremonies, the student reception, etc. when negotiating hotel contract(s)".

Justification: Although we felt that cost reduction could be accomplished by replacing the banquet with a nice reception, we acknowledge that inclusion of a banquet could have an impact on other hotel charges. This proposal would provide the committee with more flexibility in the negotiation process.

Opposition: The banquet is an essential part of hotel contract negotiations – and is an important social and ceremonial occasion for the Championship Tournament. The NPDA contract stipulates we have \$18,000 in banquet revenue to receive the room rates we have been offered this year. That's normal. We should leave the banquet in the By-Laws.

**Proposal #43: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 4. to count the Host as a judge for their school.**

Replace with "4. Entry Commitments: The Host is responsible for meeting its own entry fees. Like any other school the Host must either provide judges to cover its commitment or pay. However, the NPDA will cover the judging commitments for the host school for up to four teams as commensurate with equivalent personnel handling hosting responsibilities.

Justification: It is unfair for the Host to have to pay for hired judging because they must be available at all times to handle any problems associated with the site. In addition, it seems reasonable to allow an additional person, e.g. an assistant coach, who is also handling site responsibilities to carry out those duties rather than judge. However, there must be a second person working for the tournament to receive the additional judging benefit.

**Proposal #44: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 6. to make the NPDA responsible for typical administrative expenses.**

Replace with "6. NPDA will be responsible for operating expenses directly related to the Championship Tournament competition such as ballot production and copying, copier rental, schematics, copying, etc. The expenses for these materials will be reimbursed by the NPDA upon presentation of receipts. The host school will be responsible for expenses related to the site such as custodial charges, maps, poster board for directional signs, etc.

Justification: Hosting the Championship Tournament is expensive and the NPDA should absorb the costs directly related to the tournament itself. The costs should remain fairly constant regardless of who hosts the tournament. The host should only have to pay for those costs that are specific to their school.

**Proposal #45: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 7. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for hired judges.**

Replace "President" with "Tournament Director"

Justification: The Tournament Director is in the position to know the need for judges.

**Proposal #46: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 8. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for student help.**

Replace "President" with "Tournament Director"

Justification: The Tournament Director is in the position to know the need for student help.

**Proposal #47: Revise By-Law XIII. B. to provide for a mechanism for paying unexpected expenses at the Championship Tournament.**

Replace with "B. NPDA Financial Responsibilities: The below expenses are anticipated in running most tournaments. It is a partial, but not exhaustive list of all possible tournament expenses. Should other tournament related expenses arise during the course of the Championship Tournaments that are not itemized in this document, the Vice President and/or the Tournament Director can authorize payment for those as well on behalf of the NPDA."

Justification: Although under the proposed organizational structure all expenditures must be approved by the Finance Committee, a mechanism needs to be in place to allow for the smooth functioning for the Championship Tournament. In emergency situations that might arise during the Championship Tournament (i.e. the copier blows up), the Vice President and/or Tournament Director must be able to make quick decisions to remedy the situation.

**Proposal #48: Eliminate By-Law XIII. B. 1 Topic Committee expenses.**

Justification: Under the new Topic Selection Subcommittee procedures, this expense would be unnecessary.

**Proposal #49: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. a. to limit officers expenses to those not normally covered by their schools but allow them to be counted toward their school's judging commitment.**

Replace sentence 2 and 3 with "The NPDA will apply a 'no net loss' policy to officers, allowing them to apply to the Finance Committee for reimbursements for expenses above and beyond what they would have incurred. Officers will count toward their school's judging commitment."

Justification: The 'no net gain/no net loss' principle would mean that officers should not be given travel, food and lodging benefits if such benefits would mean that they accrue a 'net gain' by serving the tournament. On the other hand, the officers should be allowed to apply for reimbursement for any 'net loss' suffered because of service to the tournament.

**Proposal #50: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. b. to require the President and/or Tournament Director to submit a budget for tournament expenses.**

Replace with "b. The President and/or Tournament Director will submit a budget request to the Finance Committee to pay ordinary expenses during the tournament."

Justification: Most tournament expenses are predictable and should go through the normal budgeting process.

**Proposal #51: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. c. to eliminate providing a rental van for administrative staff.**

Eliminate By Law XIII. B. 2. c.

Justification: A special van for transporting members of the administrative team (the NPDA officers) is unnecessary since they will either be traveling with their teams or can submit a proposal for transportation costs to the Finance Committee. Expenses for those already in attendance at the tournament, and whose expenses would already be covered by their home schools, should not receive reimbursement for their expenses.

**Proposal #52: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. a. to limit tabulation staff expenses to those not normally covered by their schools and allow them to be counted toward their schools judging commitment.**

Replace sentence 2 and 3 with "The NPDA will apply a 'no net loss' policy to tabulation staff, allowing them to apply to the Finance Committee for reimbursements for expenses above and beyond what they would have incurred. Tabulation room staff expenses will count toward their school's judging commitment."

Justification: The 'no net gain/no net loss' principle would mean that tabulation room staff should not be given travel, food and lodging benefits if such benefits would mean that they accrue a 'net gain' by serving the tournament. On the other hand, the officers should be allowed to apply for reimbursement for any 'net loss' suffered because of service to the tournament.

**Proposal #53: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 2. to require the President and/or Tournament Director to submit a budget for tournament expenses.**

Replace with "b. The President and/or Tournament Director will submit a budget for request to the Finance Committee to pay ordinary expenses during the tournament."

Justification: Most tournament expenses are predictable and should go through the normal budgeting process.

**Proposal #54: Recommendation to allow the Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee the authority to investigate how canceling the banquet and replacing it with a reception would impact the hotel contract.**

Justification: See By-Law XIII. A. 3. Proposal.

**Proposal #55: Recommendation to delete By-Law XIII. B. 5. a. Imported Judges.**

Delete By-Law XIII. N. 5. Imported Judges

Justification: No action was taken by the body on this issue but it was recommended that an assessment be made to determine the necessity for imported judges. Hosts are already required to guarantee hired judges and the total number of judges used is less than that number. So the total judges a Host would have to hire would not be significantly increased, if at all. In addition the costs of paying the expenses for imported judges is quite high. Since the organization's officers choose who the imports will be, the practice appears biased. The President or Tournament Director may still bring in judges but the expense for these must be approved through the Finance Committee.

Opposition: The reasons for retaining imports: first, we diversify the judging pool, especially when we are in non-metro settings; second, we provide a sense of history as former champions, coaches and officers join us for the event; third, we increase the supply of potential tournament workers - the treasurer used one import to assist at registration and to coach the Europeans; the Tournament Director, I believe, also used one at registration - and I believe that the Executive Secretary has sometimes used an import to assist with secretarial work. Fourth, imports are exceptional judges who will be rested and effective all tournament long; finally, imports are a smart way to use our complimentary rooms and consequently would only require airfare (approximately \$350).

Hired judges are paid \$200 so the costs of imported judges is roughly \$150.00.

**Proposal #56: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 5. b. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to work with the Tournament Host in arranging hired judges.**

Replace with "b. "The Tournament Host will prove the number of qualified judges requested by the Tournament Director. One month prior to the Championship Tournament, the Tournament Director will notify the Host of the anticipated need for hired judges."

Justification: The Tournament Director is responsible for the operation of the Championship Tournament, including receiving the registration information, and should notify the Host of judging needs in a timely fashion.

**Proposal #57: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 6. to make participants responsible for printing their own Judging Philosophy Booklets.**

Replace with "a. Judging Philosophy Books: Participants in the National Tournament are responsible for printing their own Judging Philosophy Booklets from the data base. The Host will be responsible for obtaining the judging philosophies for local hired judges. The Tournament Director will be responsible for obtaining judging philosophies from all other judges."

Justification: The Host has access to judges they hire and so should obtain judging philosophies from those judges. The last sentence provides a responsible party to obtain all other judging philosophies.

Proposal #58: Recommendation that the NPDA investigate ways in which The Irish, Eastern European and other international efforts can become self-sustaining and not dependent on NPDA funding.

Proposal #59: Recommendation to encourage the Championship Tournament Committee to explore paper reduction strategies in the areas of pre tournament booklets, results packets, etc., so as to minimize those costs.

Proposal Submitted by John Meany, Claremont McKenna College

Proposal 1: Proposal to amend the preamble to the *NPDA Rules of Debating* regarding sanctions.

Existing language

Sanctions for violation of Section 4 of Rules of Debating and Judging (rules that apply during the debate) shall be province of the judge.

Proposed language

Sanctions for violation of Section 4 of Rules of Debating and Judging (rules that apply during the debate) shall be the immediate province of the judge. In the case of a dispute regarding a judge's interpretation of the rules, enforcement of the rules, or adhering to the procedures of the tournament, one or both debate teams may appeal a judge's decision regarding sanctions to the tournament director for a final decision.

Justification

This suggested change closes a loophole in the existing preamble. If a judge chooses to violate NPDA rules or acts in an arbitrary or capricious manner regarding the rules or norms of the tournament, there is no procedure in place for teams to appeal the wrongful or prejudicial decisions of the judge. This language change would ensure that judges follow the rules as explained by the tournament director.

Proposals by David Berube, U of South Carolina (no wording submitted):

Proposal 1: Sanctioned tournaments budgets.

Proposal 2: Judge qualifications on strike sheets: when 10% of the guest judging pool is from the school or the community, judging philosophies and/or evidence of training must be provided.

Proposal 3: Mutual preference judging.

Proposal 4: Tournament directors at NPDA sanctioned tournaments who push ballots when judges are no shows must inform the teams of the pushed critic. A pushed critic should never be a struck critic.