

**NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION**  
**BUSINESS MEETING**  
**Thursday, March 20, 2014**  
**7:30-10:00pm**  
**San Francisco Room, DoubleTree Inn**

**AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes (Fall 2013)
- III. Reports (See reports online, where applicable. Short reports, as needed, will be presented orally at the meeting. Executive Reports and Committee Reports, where possible will be posted on the NPDA website 10 days before the meeting.)
  - a. Executive Council
  - b. Committees
    - i. Finance Committee
    - ii. Site Committee
    - iii. Additional Committees as Needed
  - c. Tournament Director
  - d. Other reports
- IV. Action Items
  - a. None
- V. New Business
  - a. Novice Definition Change – Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University
    - 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 the area shaded in yellow and replacing it with the section shaded in green).
    - 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
  - b. **From Rob Layne, Texas Tech University**
    - i. Proposal to require judges to disclose to willing debaters.
      1. 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.”
2. The new section would read:
    - 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 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. 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.
  3. 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.

VI. Adjournment