

NPDA Business Meeting, Spring 2008
Best Western Hotel, Colorado Springs, March 27

The meeting was called to order at about 7:32 p.m. by Kevin Minch, NPDA President.

1. Fall 2007 business meeting minutes approved without objection.
2. Reports: Renea
 - Not many district reps sent in All-American stuff. Only 2 - thanks!
 - Rewards good competitors and good citizens.
 - Encourage people to submit. District reps - solicit. Coaches - solicit district reps.
 - Not necessarily those who trophy every week, but those who are solid citizens.

 - Looking for sites for 2010 and 2011. If interested, contact Renea or Marlin Bates, or Marty Birkholt.

 - John Meany question: How much money of increased funds go to the host?
 - Brent response: \$3,000 line item goes to host. There's an openness if the host runs into additional difficulties.
 - Kevin - University of the Pacific will be the host for 2009:

 - Marlin Bates (UOP): Administration is supportive - we get all the rooms on campus. November will be our regular season tournament. Open to suggestions - perhaps a day at the ballpark, other items...

 - Danny - Thanks to everyone for helping for season sweepstakes. 49 tournaments in the last 7 days.

 - Adam Kretz (Student Rep) - Good response from district student reps. What we like: Decrease elitism; more openness with dialogues/relationships

 - Bifurcation between NPTE/NPDA squads - this can be problematic. Not sure of solvency - for example, MPJ, topic areas. Some teams trying to bridge the gap... How do we overcome the division?

 - Brent - No report, other than to say that there will be a photographer to deal with the final round. The trophy presentation will actually be a part of the DVD.

 - Tournament Conduct (ad hoc) - Withdrew report

 - Audra (Host related) - Covered at the opening meeting.

Joe (Tournament Director) - Bookmark my page – postings of topics and results will be online. (Website not included since it won't be relevant after this tournament)
Note: verbal announcement plus powerpoint = when the time starts. Not when the webpage is updated. Therefore, have somebody in the room. The clock in the back is the official time for the tournament.

2. Consent Items - This was amendment to an original proposal - unanimous consent.
3. Action Items:
 - a. Season Sweepstakes (Joe Gantt) - Ad hoc committee on Season Sweepstakes. What appears was amended in the fall.
 - 1) Could we offer more recognition?
 - 2) Programs with different priorities will have different options. Some programs that are junior/novice feel that they can't compete.
 - 3) Still overall – open, junior, novice, community college

(No motion/second necessary)

Question: How many teams are required for open? (Top 4 - clarified from Fall 2007 open).

John Meany: No evaluation of the meaningfulness of these awards. Originally, we had “glummed” onto other debate organizations...I've mentioned this for a decade - nobody has answered whether this harms the organization, and could create more emptiness and more rigor. Will NPDA say, “It is meaningless - it's not connected with anything...” Let's be honest.

Joey Mavity: Language designed so that 4 junior teams not count toward overall. Limits for lower divisions in overall sweepstakes. Can't include more than 2 junior/novice toward open.

Jeannine Hunt: Community colleges only get 2 teams that count toward overall. Why take more than 2 teams then?

Marty: “I've been slightly more opposed than John. I've moved more than once to eliminate these awards...” How we travel teams is driven by awards. The only evidence of the effectiveness of these awards is that it decreases the region. Makes it difficult for small regional tournaments to survive.

John: Is it possible to opt out of this award? If I'm asked, I don't want to be in a position to defend.

Kevin: (Speaking as Truman DOF) I agree too... I don't know what would happen.

Joey Mavity proposes an amendment: “In open/varsity, junior and novice, a school's top 2 teams will count for divisional sweepstakes.”

Amendment seconded.

Marty: Are the divisions defined elsewhere?

Joe: Says yes.

Michael: Concur, but with proviso that no proscription and no enforcement mechanism.

Amendment passes without objection.

Audra: What defines open? Junior? Novice? Really poor idea. Really problematic without clear definition. We'd hassle a gov team with tons of spec arguments.

David Romanelli - Being an old CEDA guy, this brings back the notion of dropping down divisions.

Joe: This affected teams' decision, who to put in division, how many to travel...

Motion to extend debate by 5 minutes.

Adam: This affects the debaters - as a part of a program that sandbagged, it was clear that team decisions were made based on sweepstakes points.

Michael: this time proposes the amendment to strike IIIA. The amendment is seconded.

Joey: I remember coming late - this was passed and then came back... what is the effect for this tournament? None.

John M. - Support the amendment.

Renea Gernant: Why increase awards that are problematic?

David Worth - I can report this to my administrator, and wants something like this... There's some kind of system to this... Not any more meaningless than win-losses

Crystal Lane: For schools like LSU, fewer opportunities = fewer opportunities to make an argument as to why this should be supported. Taking away opportunities is bad.

Motion to extend debate by 5 minutes.

Marlin: Abuse of novice/junior/senior non-unique. Happens at any tournament. Administrators like bright, shiny objects. Helped budget by saying, "Look what we did..."

Joey: Two questions - 1) Unclear effect voting on a null A. The C point says there's other language giving awards. Then we should amend the amend. 2) On/off again?

Kevin - Reason why we take 2 meetings to do legislation.

Andrew Hoag: - Self-interested - Small school, new program - sweepstakes not matter. Can't afford more than 2 teams, no scholarship budget. National sweepstakes - we can compete in novice level.

Audra - Disadvantageous to small budget schools - will drive different tournaments, small tournaments. NFA-LD - Tournament sweepstakes. If you get them qualed, then work toward 1 tournament. Not chase points locally - do it at the national tournament.

Kevin - Procedural error on my part - in November, is it in order? Robert's Rules of Order says to replace, which is out of order.

Thus, the motion by Michael D. to eliminate the language of A entirely is ruled out of order.

Kevin says - If you don't like, then new proposal for November meeting. Allows opportunity to speak on anything would cancel out season sweepstakes.

Move to extend debate for 3 minutes.

Renea - Clearly, there are issues. Why complicate a system that's not good. Let's vote it down, try to come to something better. There could be other options - i.e., 20 deep in junior college, not just 5. We could award in a variety of different ways. I believe regional circuits destroyed by the chase for national sweepstakes points.

Joey - Although more complex, this could undermine some of the harms. Incrementally beneficial change to support this resolution and continue the conversation.

Marty - By expanding awards, makes the problem worse.

Jeannine Hunt: Expand awards, limit the numbers that participate for junior/novice.

Rob Layne: Will raise entry fees?

Brent: Not settled - hardware or online?

Vote: 11 for, 9 against. Motion Passes

Audra asks to reconsider. Seconded.

Revote: 10 for, 12 against. Motion fails.

Addendum 3:

Joey - Can't fly in for budget and steal points.

Amendment: "(at end)... when those affiliations are not open to schools at-large."

PSCFA - Anyone can join, but must be a member.

Functionally, NCCFI would be excluded since not everyone can be a member.

Amendment seconded.

Marty - Can count everything except NCCFI, PRP?

Dan Schabot: Unless we define these tournaments, then NPDA is members-only – the host school must be a member. Functionally kills sweepstakes.

David: This would discourage state tournaments, right?

Everyone: Yes.

Melissa Franke: What is the purpose? What's attempting to be excluded?

Kevin: Legislative history - November - allow 1 closed tournament. Amendment was made to exclude all closed tournaments.

Joe: Original idea of amendment - multiple closed tournament for some schools, none for others. Still give some incentive, but not to tip the balances too much.

Marlin: Amendment clarifies, but what is a closed tournament...

Marty - Don't want to exclude PRP, NCCFI. We're not Christian, we're Catholic...

State tournament moved us up 8 places, repulsive.

Vote: 5 for, 9 against. A few abstentions. Amendment fails.

Crystal Lane: Can't be voted on intelligently on open and closed. We're in a double-bind.

Joe: Passing/not passing - still a mess.

Dan: Under current definition, individual school tournaments can be closed since you have to be a member of NPDA to get points. We're in a double-bind.

Konrad: Suggest/move to refer motion back to committee.

Kevin: The committee has not dissolved. We have problems with committees; some have items in their basket greater than 2 years. If we do, I'd publically admonish so that we look at this committee.

Is this in order? Yes.

Motion to refer to committee. Passes.

Item #4: 10 semesters

Adam: Got the idea at the fall meeting, many were opposed. Students think this is important.

Michael: Extremely opposed because of Novice Nationals.

Adam: Would this be non-unique?

Michael: No, it's unique because Novice Nats is specifically listed as one of the national tournaments that decrease eligibility.

Bill Nessen: Have students going back and forth between CEDA and Parli. If they switch, which is good, then the current language is confusing.

Marty: Question - If we believe 5 years is good, then 5 nationals - why make the distinction? Just because 2 national organizations and an invitational have changed, why should we do the same? Is this good educationally? Believe it's not good...get a degree.

Audra: Redshirt functionally now. Take 5 years to do degree. Could financially support - we have the same issue as various sports programs. I understand students' desire, but is there educational value?

Andrew Hoag: How much of a difference? People extend years in debate by going to 2 tournaments in a semester.

Bill: CEDA - Takes 5 years to degree.

Kristen Whalen: In CSU system, taking 5 years to get degrees. Reality of attending school.

Brent: Bring organizations and athletics in sync. Invite them to come back...

Jim Schnoebelen: All for graduating in 4 years; why some people are: community college level - not all credits transfer.

Michael: Not my experience in private schools... many of our students are less than 4 years due to community college + other credits.

Audra: Why keep them on scholarship so that we prolong them for 5 years? Shouldn't be involved as an organization in the nitpicking of realities... support them for 4 years, then finish.

John Meany: Conflate time for academic work and participate in debate? There are different learning curves - unless we examine what they get out of 5th year of college (perhaps 9th year of debate). Perhaps reduce to 2 years to keep consistent with junior colleges. It may be the case that students who are staying for additional time are occupying resource/coaching space that would be better for others. Debate tends to exclude non-experienced, women, people of color.

Marty: Big institutional push as well - get out for 4 years. Motion creates effect of advantaging programs with scholarship budget.

Adam: What is the reason debate is 4 years? Is it because of college = 4 years? Should make decision based on lack of data?

David: Why appeal to tradition?

Joey: (Already said)

Melissa: Argument in favor of extending - program not institutional level. Write into scholarship - coach/judge for 5th year - is competition necessary for the scholarship?

Audra: Agree. Grad students can compete in other countries; but if we extend the bachelor's, life not ideal. Why not create a grad student league? Until then, let's not do.

Brent: This gets to why we teach. Research has been done - cross line from students to professional competitors. Reason for school is corrupted. Long-term value of education diminishes toward competition. Get it back toward education.

Adam: Current rule disadvantages 5-year programs - i.e., architecture. I go to a private school, but what if the program itself requires 5 years to graduate? Why not compete each of those years?

David Romanelli: Why is 5 any less arbitrary? Adult students taking 3-6 hours per semester-how long would that go on?

Joey: Other ways to get money... No unique responsibility to be their source of funding.

Vote: 2 in favor, 10 against. Motion fails.

5. Kevin: We are having problems with democracy - we change governing documents through the response of the people. Preaching to choir ... but talk to colleagues who didn't come. Meeting attendance is dwindling. Pulling teeth to serve on committees that actually do work. Some people are on 3 committees. Need people to step up and volunteer. Attend district meetings - doesn't support democracy when I have to appoint caretaker district representatives. Doesn't help students when I ask Adam to appoint student district reps.

Officers meeting this summer - We're going to try to do that... Mop up things that had been for 2-3 years, move it toward the fall meeting. If interested, talk to Kevin this weekend.

Joey - I never saw the call for emails.

Kevin - Parli, NPDA-L, cross-posted to Net Ben.

6. Other items:

Michael suggests a look at district boundaries.

Motion to adjourn and seconded...