

**NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION
BUSINESS MEETING
MINUTES**

Thursday, November 20, 2014

8am to 9:15am

Palmer House Hilton – Salon 6 – 3rd Floor

I. Call to order 8:02am

II. Approval of Minutes (Spring 2014). Approved

III. Reports

A. Executive Council

- i. Brent Northrup Treasurer's report. Expenses have come under control. Currently, have \$1,100 up.

- ii. Mike Middleton V.P. Report -
 - a. Call for Bids to host NPDA 2016. He also will need members for Site Selection Committee.
 - b. NPDA All Americans is coming up. Need committee members. Two and Four year school representatives will be needed.
 - c. VP Nominating Committee - Balloting will begin December 1 and close December 22. Announcement will be made on Parli L and Net Benefits. Committee nominated Jeannie Hunt, NW College and Phil Sharp The University of Nevada. Floor was opened for additional nominations. None were proposed. Nominations closed. Everyone vote!

- ii. Gina Lane - Tournament Director -
 - a. Not present. Joe Gantt, President noted that the invitation would be released in about a month.

B. Committees

- i. Ad Hoc committee NPDA Growth and Stability (Joe Gantt). Need survey to go along with invitation. Personalized invitation will be released by president and executive council to programs that do not know that NPDA is in their region.
- ii. NPDA Journal – (Joe Gantt) - Marty Birkholt, Editor has ideas for new journal. Previous editor hard time getting submissions. Will try to get journal turned around quickly. Needs co-editors.

IV. Action Items

A. Novice Definition Change – Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene.

- i. **Proposal:** I would like to propose that high school experience be counted as equal to but not greater than College experience when determining

NPDA Novice eligibility, by deleting and replacing Section VI, Article 4. subsection 1. as shown below (removing first area and replacing it with the section in italics).

- ii. **Rationale:** Current interpretations of Novice definitions disqualify beginning debaters that have had even one round of high school tournament experience in any form of debate including Public Forum format from counting as novices per NPDA, but allows up to two full semesters of college experience for beginners that start in college. This penalty discourages beginners that have extremely limited high school experience, and causes many to quit rather than be forced into Junior or Open divisions at tournaments

iii. **Current Text**

D. Novice

1. For purposes of the NPDA Championship Tournament, a novice shall be defined as an undergraduate student who is in his or her first year of participation in intercollegiate competitive debate and meets the criteria below:

- a. Students with *more than two semesters of* previous competitive experience in high school or intercollegiate debate formats would be ineligible for novice status.
- b. High school debate formats include, but are not limited to, Cross Examination (CX) Debate and Lincoln-Douglas (LD) Debate.
- c. Intercollegiate debate formats include, but are not limited to, Parliamentary Debate (such as NPDA, APDA, CUSID), CEDA/NDT, NFA-LD, NEDA and ADA.

iv. **PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGE**

Student Eligibility Standards

4. *For tournament directors who desire definitions of novice and junior, the NPDA suggests the following guidelines:*

- a. *To be classified as a novice:*
- b. *The student should have no more than ~~one~~ two semesters of high school debate experience.*
- c. *The student should be in the first two semesters of collegiate debate.*
- d. *Once the student has advanced to elimination rounds more than 3 times, the student should be advanced to the junior or open division.*

v. **Discussion.**

- a. Phil Sharp: Question about how the standards affect other tournaments throughout the year. Also noted it appears in two different places.
- b. Marlin Bates shared it would effect both national tournament and bylaws. Changes tournament and rules for by laws

- c. Steve Woods - How does it change tournaments if it is a bylaw?
- d. Marlin – If the tournament chooses to follow NPDA guidelines, this will be what’s in the bylaws.
- e. Rolland Petrello - It would effect invitations that state in their documents that they follow NPDA rules.
- f. Jeannie Hunt – It seems to say it is a suggestion.
- g. Joe – Yes, it is a suggestion. But, it would need to be communicated to the community. Tournaments would end up having different eligibility standards.
- h. Marlin – The only changes would be High School experience to college experience.
- i. Steve – Two semesters of HS experience could differ from student to student.
- j. Phil – Question on phrasing. Do you go advance after three times novice or high schools?
- k. Joe – Just college seeing the other info.
- l. Marlin -We currently allow two semesters college experience
- m. Rolland/Steve –They will trophy out pretty easily
- n. Joe – The TOP will refer to them as a novice in their first year.
- o. Joe - Any other discussion?
- p. Action Item move to vote. Ayes won.
- q. TOP and Bylaws change is passed

B. Action Item Two – Judge Disclosure - Rob Layne, University of Utah

i. Rationale: The section would require that disclosure of the decision would take place after the ballot had been submitted, thus providing debaters with immediate feedback of their performance within the debate. This also aligns the current practice of requiring disclosures after elimination rounds, which may be technically discouraged under the current reading of this section.

ii. Current section in “NPDA Rules of Debating”

- a. 5B. A running update of all teams’ records will be publicly posted in a “warm room” or common area accessible to all tournament participants. After returning the ballot, the judge may, at his or her discretion, give brief constructive comments to the debaters. Such conversations should, if possible, take place in the established “warm room” area if one is designated by the tournament. No one may be required to enter the “warm room” or participate in discussions. Judges should refrain from checking the records of teams they are about to judge should such information be available.
- b. Strike “After returning the ballot, the judge may, at his or

her discretion, give brief constructive comments to the debaters.”
And replace with “After submitting the ballot, the judge must announce the decision of the debate and give brief constructive comments to debaters wishing to receive the decision and/or receive constructive comments.”

c. Add: In the section stating, “No one may be required to enter the “warm room” or participate in discussions.” Strike “one” and replace with “**debater.**”

iii. The new section would read:

1. 5B. A running update of all teams’ records will be publicly posted in a “warm room” or common area accessible to all tournament participants. After submitting the ballot, the judge should be strongly encouraged to announce the decision of the debate in open division. Such conversations should, if possible, take place in the established “warm room” area if one is designated by the tournament. No debater may be required to enter the “warm room” or participate in discussions. Judges should refrain from checking the records of teams they are about to judge should such information be available.

iv. Discussion

- a. Joe – Will anyone speak in favor of the proposal as Rob Layne is not in attendance?
- b. Steve – How does it effect judging pools?
- c. Jeannie – It would slow down tournaments.
- d. Joe – Discussion on action item?
- e. David Worth – What does strongly encouraged mean?
- f. Joe – We would place language in the invitation to strongly encourage.
- g. Phil – Remembers discussion at NPDA. People were mostly against it. I agree with most sentiments at the meeting. It would encourage arguments with judges.
Sends messages that they debaters are entitled to pressure judges. I am a fan of disclosure and warm room. But, I don’t support this kind of idea.
- h. Joe – Any other discussion?
- i. Rolland - How does this change current practice?
- j. Joe - it would change the NPDA stance. We have a warm room where they can find out if they won/lost. Judge is under no pressure to discussion. Change NPDA stance. It would be more of rhetorical change.
- k. Michael – This is a rule addressing a cultural issue.
- l. Joe – Any other discussion?
- m. Call to question. Naves have it

C. Action Item Three - Proposal to allow mid-year graduate/otherwise half- ineligible teams to accrue half-points for their squad for season long sweepstakes.

i. Rationale: Current by laws do not contain any provision for teams containing mid-year graduates/ineligible members earning partial points. Past & current practice has been to not count them at all since bylaws say they do not earn points.

ii.

VI. Student Eligibility Standard

1. Midyear graduates may compete in the NPDA National Championship in the spring after graduation at the discretion of the member school. The NPDA will not accept points accrued by midyear graduates at regular season tournaments after their graduation.

2. Addition:

a. *In the event that a school has a team that is composed of one member that is mid-year graduate and one that is not, the team shall be considered as a hybrid for season-long sweepstakes points*

b. *In the event that a school has a team that is composed of one member that is considered ineligible and one that is not, the team shall be considered as a hybrid for season-long sweepstakes points*

iii. Discussion

a. Joe – Action Item is in reference to discussion on differing interpretation of points. Question is if a team has a mid-year graduate that is still competing, would it be a hybrid? This means no points for the mid-year graduate. Call for discussion.

b. Marlin - Clarification

c. Phil – What is stopping ineligible student competing and getting points?

d. Joe – Nothing to prevent that from happening.

e. - Phil – I agree with rule change.

f. Marlin - The only reason I submitted is it is not clear.

g. Steve – If a student graduates in 3.5 years, why penalize them?

h. Joe – There were two interpretations previously but neither interp allowed earned points after graduation.

i. Steve – Who earns points?

j. Joe/Marlin – You just cant earn points after graduation.

k. Rolland – Clarification?

l. Joe - Once a student graduates, their team can only get half points for the pair of students. Until that time full points

m. Joe - Other discussion?

n. Call to question.

o. Action Item passes.

V. New Business

- A. Joe – Call for new business. None brought forward.

VI. Adjournment

Attendees

Jeannie Hunt – Northwest College
Steve Woods – Western Washington
Marlin Bates – University of the Pacific
David Worth – Rice University
Todd Graham – Southern Illinois University
Phil Sharp – University Nevada-Reno
Rolland Petrello – Moorpark College
Bob Becker – Northwest College
Terry Rogers - Casper College
Steve Farias – University of the Pacific
Mary Lynn Veden – University of Arkansas
Joe Gantt – Lewis and Clark College
Michael Middleton – University of Utah
Dena Counts - Abilene Christian University
Brent Northrup – Carroll College
Cory Nims – University of Nevada-Reno: National Student Rep