

**NPDA Business Meeting  
Spring 2009  
University of the Pacific  
Hilton Hotel, March 27, 2009 – 7:37pm**

Officers Present: President Kevin Minch (KM), Vice President Renea Gernant (RG), Treasurer Brent Northup (BN), National Student Rep Josh Seefried (JS), Executive Secretary Danny Cantrell (DC)

**Reports:**

KM: No report – getting stuff ready to turn over

RG: Marty Birkholt is VP elect

Site Committee – have one bid for 60 rooms, another for 80 rooms but would like more bids

Marlin Bates – Gave out phone number

Joe – Final copy of strike confirmation sheets in morning before round 1, supplemental strike sheet

Ad Hoc Committee on Ethics – advised to move to a code of ethics, something on paper code of tournament ethics. Gina Lane chair, 3 members of NPDA and 3 members of NPTE represented. Will have a report ready for November meeting.

Professional Development – Will hopefully have something for November regarding grants for research

**Agenda:**

Item A: Judge Eligibility

KM: Judges go to competition? Rules not entirely clear

Motion, seconded

JS: Uncomfortable atmosphere to have someone competing judge you

Gary Rybold: Seems reasonable

Steve Doubledee – across the board in any debate?

Marlin/Josh – any intercollegiate forensics would count

DC: only affects people who competed in the previous year

Glenn Prince: Does this also apply to worlds tournaments?

KM: Worlds' tournaments are really not the problem

John Meany: undergrads as judges – routine and encouraged.

Brian Danielson: Significant life experience opens doors to other things

Kevin Minch: If have BA then moot point – do not need B/C

Matthew Hogan: Aspirational statement

Phil Sharp: come to activity later, preclude their involvement,

Steve: giving up competition in the future

Phil: c and 3 different questions

Joey: amend

John Meany: Point of Order – follow procedure?

Phil: 3<sup>rd</sup> subset of first two

Marty B: a, done competing, b done competing, c = done competing

Marlin: against b/c not dicating if can or can not compete – discusses judge eligibility – in order to judge = exhausted eligibility or given up eligibility.

Joey – voted down

**VOTE – amendment fails**

Chris – amend “in National Parliamentary Debate Association”

Marlin – compete at NFA/AFA and then judge

Joey – just give up NPDA eligibility

UNR – 3 addresses question – competing after May 1 can not judge at National Championship

Marlin – amendment unnecessary bc 3 moot

Chris – limits of our organization

Joey – lose NPDA eligibility

Marlin – do that, then a competitor compete at AFA/NFA against somebody else, judge them at NPDA

Joey – 3 is past, c is future oriented

**Question on amendment – motion to amend carries**

Phil – move to include “except in extraordinary circumstances”

**AMENDMENT:**

**Add “D. exceptions to the waiver of eligibility can be made on a case-by-case basis by the executive council, for undergraduates who have entered debate through non-traditional channels.**

Glenn – too vague

Geoff Brodak – OK – some procedure to determine for an exception

John – undergrads sufficiently mature to judge, eliminate the whole thing

Kyle Cheesewright – judges not enrolled, can judge without BA degree

Marty – allow executive council make waivers

Steve Doubleddee – come back, previously judge, bring unique experience – clause makes a lot of sense, exec council determine case by case

Joey – move to vote, second

**VOTE ON AMENDMENT – passes**

**Amendment – 3 – “intercollegiate forensics”**

**Call question – passes**

Joey – is worlds intercollegiate forensics

Michael Dreher – IFA count?

**Amend – strike “in the United States” clause, second**

Joey – problem with bringing intercollegiate debate to China

Gary – problems with China trip in May

Marlin – get to compete at Worlds – precludes group of people want judging just b/c opportunity to compete

Joey – changing the date matter? – no

**Vote – AMENDMENT FAILS**

John – plenty happy with 1 – undergrads who can judge and people who meet other criteria that would make bad judges. This misses the point about judging that there should be moves to certify and train to establish guidelines.

Joey – What would that look like?

John – Certification works – support in judging literature for contests – judges of BBQ competition  
shame intercollegiate debate

**BOUND to November meeting – 2/3 vote to move to action item**

Addendum 2 –

KM: Move to Addendum 3

Addendum 3 –

Michael Dreher – discussion regarding tinkering with formula debate moves to eliminate anyway, never had clean up or down on sweepstakes

Gary – have had lots of discussions up and down.

Glenn – any PR to generate, look to ranking to look good, take away tool = more damaging

Marlin – used it to generate more budget, admin believe

John – better to justify in defensible manner, more insistence to defend, should have more awards

Marty – does to regional circuits? Hurt Midwest

Matthew Hogan – hurts school with bad press

Jeannie Hunt – in our circuit it makes us look better,

Chris – system broken not justify

JS – go to smaller tournaments to rank up

DC – can help schools,

Joey – lack of integrity and rigor

Marlin – system of set method, BCS may be bogus, local and regional tournaments get bigger under this system – only count two elims, any ranking system morally bankrupt – have to draw a line – a tool used and abused

Glenn – only counts first two elims so even small tournaments that go to semi/qtr – use lots of things to justify your program, PR a part of our job

Matt – published = not to use them. Impossible not to disclose to them

Marty – keep changing, unintended consequences.

John – PR important, come up with own methodology and compare with data from tournament – why does organization support? –

**Call the question – motion fails 11-15**

Addendum 2:

Second.

Dreher: question, over 50% win loss record

Gary: what about prelims?

DC: this would just

**Joey: amend to include "only counting elimination round points", second**

Glenn – less wordy, vote on Joey amendment clearer

Melissa – vague?

**Vote on amendment – passes**

Joey – bring up partial problem

Phil – incentives non standard way of breaking, more prelims good, allow for point inflation

Joe – not such a big difference between 27 and 29 teams... 1 or 2 teams should not make such a big difference

Melissa – makes problem of increased complications

Glenn – makes rounds more important to get 4-2

Michael – privilege tournaments with partial round

Dan Sietman – debating whether or not sweeps points on byes/elim rounds – just not count bye?

DC: too many byes

Joey: small tournaments with 20 teams – help those tournaments get more points / smaller tournament has more room on occasion

**Carries over automatically to November Meeting**

#### **Addendum 4:**

KM: brought up from Jim Hanson

JS: good idea b/c ambiguous what sec can do to sanction

#### **DC: amend to strike 1, second**

SD: why?

DC: makes CEDA topics for every parli tournaments

Joey: says we can't change our activity in intriguing ways – no more bound to research them

Melissa: strike 1 = topic areas not defines NPDA

Bill: wide variety of tournaments that 4 tournaments had topic areas, ignores tournaments wouldn't do it – not very realistic – self correcting

Chris: doesn't require – doesn't change mindset

Steve Doubledee: event about education – discussion at best yes/no. Topic areas = in depth into those areas, learning about current events – had better on topic debates

Josh: forcing people out of activity – just do not release full resolutions

Marty: evaluates – fundamental difference between debate with topic areas

Marlin:

#### **Amendment fails:**

#### **DC: Amendment: add "not" to 1**

John: topic areas not meaningful, doing human experiments without IRB, extemp/limited prep versus impromptu. Largest study of debate of UDL – negative or neutral educational outcomes

Joey: no tournaments sanctioned

Gary: allow topic areas than do research and find out what happens. Broad area.

Glenn: fundamental question of the activity. Topic areas same bad debating.

Chris: tournament directors have the choice. Fear -> evidence based debates?

Michael: purpose of the activity in constitution

Melissa: general topic areas prohibited

Steve: disagree, no this is not policy debate – find that students know specific passages of areas.

Marlin: topic area allow focus – do briefs anyway, head them in right direction

DC: no fear of policy debate – just research burden too much, tournament director can experiment just no sweepstakes, extemp

JM: research says just the opposite – retard education when release information, methods of instruction and do not reach same conclusions

#### **Amendment fails**

**Vote on main motion (had been carried from Fall so this is the final vote):**

**Motion passes.**

### *Open Forum*

Gina: Ethics codes – not much work done yet but will do more next month.

KM: happy to serve organization.

RG: organization should speak to

Geoff: forfeit policy counterintuitive. Errs on side of ending debates. Start the PMC rather than ending the round. Sanction goes on b/c losing speech time.

Phil: community way addressing sweepstakes system

Bill: more people involved in voting. Technology put on web, people remotely – do all voting through members.

John: consider ways judges reveal decision during elimination rounds. Return one at a time. Private announcement. Consensus expression of results.

Marlin: ruling on prep rooms.

Outreach committee: research on inclusivity of debate – gender/ethnic background and how affect activity

Brent: at a crossroads in redefining parli – npde/npda discussion at a large level.

RG: continue to do research and look to pedagogical basis of event

Gina: update on journal?

KM: no update from David Worth, problem with transferring materials.

Brian: open discussions at co-ops, wsca/wfa division = encourage people to submit, beginning of May

Bill: videotape rounds and wants copies = flash drive them to you.

Joey: co-op/camps great place for discussion. Listserve as mechanism for discussion/tech additional mechanism more open to seeing what organization doing. Visibility = stop stagnation.

Move to adjourn, second. 9:45pm