

NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION
BUSINESS MEETING
Friday, November 21, 2008
San Diego, California
Manchester Grand Hyatt, Elizabeth A Room
8:00 AM-10:45 AM
AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes (March 2008 Meeting—Available on NPDA Website)
- III. Reports
(Some officers have their reports online, including the President, on the NPDA website. Short reports, as needed, will be presented orally at the meeting. Executive Reports and Committee Reports, if applicable, will be posted on the NPDA website 10 days before the meeting.)
 - A. Executive Council
 - B. Reporting Committees
 - 1. Site Committee
 - 2. Nominating Committee
 - 3. Additional Committees as Needed
 - C. Tournament Host
- IV. Consent Items (There are no consent items being presented for this meeting)
- V. Discussion Items
 - A. A proposal to eliminate season sweepstakes (Michael Dreher—See Addendum A)
 - B. A proposal to repeal Tournament Operating Procedures changes by the Executive Council pertaining to the use of “Tournament Paper” (Marlin Bates—See Addendum B)
 - C. A proposal to repeal Tournament Operating Procedures changes by the Executive Council pertaining to the use of Judge Constraints (Marlin Bates—See Addendum C)
 - D. A proposal to clarify the criteria for sanctioning invitational tournaments (Jim Hansen—See Addendum D)
 - E. A proposal to clarify the requirements for paid membership status (Danny Cantrell—See Addendum E)
 - F. A proposal to require institutional support for a team to participate in the activities of the NPDA (Renea Gernant—See Addendum F)

(As of October 27th, no other items have been submitted. The deadline was midnight on October 22.)
- VI. Action Items
(There are no Action Items due for discussion at this meeting. However, an item listed under discussion items, after initial debate, may be moved to the Action Agenda by a 2/3 vote of those present and voting. At that time the item may be debated again and voted upon in its second reading.)
- VII. Open Comment Period

Addendum A

Motion: Strike Bylaw III and Bylaw V. Renumber other amendments appropriately.

Effect: This has the effect of removing season sweepstakes and rendering the process of NPDA tournament sanctioning moot. Hence, this item has been placed at the top of the agenda because of its effect on agenda items below.

Addendum B

Motion: To repeal Item #12 of the Executive Council's changes to the Tournament Operating Procedures instituting the use of official tournament paper.

Information: The following is the text of the original policy advanced by the Executive Council. The motion would repeal the section in boldface and would return sub-section C to sub-section B.

The Rules of Debating shall be amended to read:

4. During the debate
 - A. Any published information (dictionaries, magazines, etc.), which may have been consulted before the debate, cannot be brought into the debating chambers for use during the debate. Except for notes that the debaters themselves have prepared during preparation time and a copy of the NPDA "Rules of Debating and Judging," no published materials, prepared arguments, or resources for the debaters' use in the debate may be brought into the debating chambers.
 - B. Additional Resources:**
 - 1. Each team will be allowed timers, writing instruments, a copy of the NPDA rules and tournament paper provided for that specific round.**
 - 2. Ten minutes prior to topic announcement tournament paper will be released to competitors**
 - a. Each individual competitor will be provided with 15 sheets of letter-sized paper per round**
 - b. A copy of the tournament paper for each round will be provided to the judges when retrieving ballots.**
 - c. No competitor may use any other paper in the debate round that is not provided by NPDA for that specific round. Any team that uses any other paper during a debate round must be given a loss for the round.**
 - d. Only material handwritten by the competitors may be put on the tournament paper and used in the debate.**
 - C. Debaters may refer to any information that is within the realm of knowledge of liberally educated and informed citizens. If they believe some cited information to be too specific, debaters may request that their opponent explain specific information with which they are unfamiliar. In the event further explanation of specific information is requested, the debater should provide details sufficient to allow the debater to understand the connection between the information and the claim. Judges will disallow specific information only in the event that no reasonable person could have access to the information: e.g., information that is from the debater's personal family history.

Rationale: There are too many variables that create inequalities.

Addendum C

Motion: Amend item #8 of the Executive Council's changes to the Tournament Operating Procedures pertaining to judge constraints. The motion would add the language "or other cases as approved on a case-by-case basis by the Tournament Director or Ombudsperson."

Information: The text put forward by the Executive Council appears below and boldfaced items are changes they made. The underlined text would be the addition proposed by Dr. Bates.

H 3. of the National Championship Tournament Operating Procedures shall be changed to read:

3. No team will be judged by someone associated with either member of the team or the team's school for the past four years. All teams and judges registered for the tournament should note such conflicts on their entry. **At registration, judges will be provided a team list to return to the tab staff marked with any teams they feel they should be constrained against.**

Change H 3. to add after the text above:

Any constraints entered by a team in effect for the tournament will need to be justified and accepted by the Tournament Director based on the following categories: former coaches, former team members, romantic relationships, or other cases as approved on a case-by-case basis by the Tournament Director or Ombudsperson.

Rationale: Regarding the constraint policy, I am concerned over things such as this situation: Prof X, DoF, has an intense grudge against Mr. Y, Graduate Coach. As a result, Prof. X makes a point of deciding against my teams. Therefore, in my mind--based on a prior relationship (Mr. Y went to and then left Prof. X's school), that person is a constraint and not a strike. If asked, I will explain and justify that position. Could my students strike Prof. X? Perhaps, but why should the students be penalized for Prof X ['s behavior]?

Addendum D

CURRENT RULE

- V. Criteria for Sanctioning NPDA Tournaments:
Tournaments meeting the following general criteria will be designated as counting for sweepstakes points:
- A. Sanctioned tournaments are those for which
 - 1. There is prior notification made from the school or tournament host and received by the Executive Secretary. Notification should be made no less than 30 days in advance of the tournament.
 - 2. There is support for the purposes of the organization both in philosophy and by paying dues.
 - 3. Results are submitted in a timely fashion and formatted as requested by the Executive Secretary.
 - B. In accord with A, unless hosted by a national or regional organization, the host of an NPDA sanctioned tournament must be a regular or affiliate member of NPDA.
 - C. 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 must be included in the NPDA calendar. The NPDA calendar will be prepared no later than June 1 by the Executive Secretary based on applications submitted from tournament hosts. The Executive Secretary may prepare addenda to the NPDA calendar later in the debate season.
 - D. Unless exceptions are clearly noted in the tournament invitation, sanctioned tournaments must follow the NPDA "Rules of Debating and Judging" in By-Law XII.

MOTION CHANGES RULE TO:

- V. Criteria for Sanctioning NPDA Tournaments:
Tournaments meeting the following general criteria will be designated as counting for sweepstakes points:
- A. Sanctioned tournaments are those for which
 - 1. There is prior notification made from the school or tournament host and received by the Executive Secretary. Notification should be made no less than 30 days in advance of the tournament.
 - 2. Results are submitted in a timely fashion and formatted as requested by the Executive Secretary.
 - B. ~~In accord with A,~~ Unless hosted by a national or regional organization, the host of an NPDA sanctioned tournament must be a regular or affiliate **dues paying** member of NPDA.
 - C. 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 must be included in the NPDA calendar. The NPDA calendar will be prepared no later than June 1 by the Executive Secretary based on applications submitted from tournament hosts.

The Executive Secretary may prepare addenda to the NPDA calendar later in the debate season.

D. Sanctioned Tournaments:

1. **may release topic areas including general or specific ones before the tournament but may not release the actual resolutions.**
2. **must have two person versus two person debates (except if a few teams are "mavericks" or three person teams where only two people debate at one time).**
3. **must not use quoted evidence as the basis for argument in debates.**
4. **must not allow the use of written, drawn, or recorded materials in a debate unless they were written, drawn, or recorded during the preparation time for the debate by the debaters who are debating.**
5. **must have debates that result in a win or loss.**

E. Tournaments must use debate guidelines which conform to Section D to be sanctioned and must clearly note in the tournament invitation any alterations to the NPDA "Rules of Debating and Judging" in By-Law XII.

RATIONALE

1. NPDA should have explicit standards of which tournaments should count. The current reliance on "supporting the philosophy" of the organization is vague and leaves the Executive-Secretary to make decisions about which tournaments to count without clear guidance.
2. Tournaments should be given maximum flexibility to meet the needs of the debaters, coaches, and programs they serve. Flexibility allows for innovation, something that has been a foundational aspect of the NPDA.
3. NPDA points should count only when tournaments do not release resolutions, have two person teams, not use quoted evidence, use materials that were prepared only during preparation time, and have debates resulting in wins and losses. These are core aspects upon which almost the entire NPDA community can agree.
4. Alterations from NPDA rules of debating and judging require notice in the invitation.

Addendum E

Motion: Revise Constitution Article III-Section C

Current:

Section C: Membership shall annually be made to the NPDA Treasurer.

Revise to:

Section C: Membership Dues and grace period

1. Membership shall be made annually to the NPDA treasurer.
2. Schools whose membership was in good standing as of the previous NPDA championship tournament will be considered members for all organizational purposes and shall be entitled to all benefits of membership for the current school year.

Rationale:

Most schools pay membership retroactively for the school year at the NPDA championship tournament. So, for 2008-2009, most schools are not current members until the 2009 NPDA Championship tournament.

Tournament sanctioning requires schools to pay before the Executive Secretary can sanction a tournament. This has caused confusion for schools who normally pay at the championship tournament to have to pay ahead of time. This change would allow schools who paid at the previous NPDA championship tournament to have all the benefits of membership the subsequent year before paying dues at the Championship tournament.

For example, if School A paid its 2007-2008 membership dues at the 2008 Championship tournament, and hosted a NPDA sanctioned tournament in the Fall of 2009, their 2008 membership would allow the Executive Secretary to sanction their tournament even though their 2008-2009 membership has yet to be paid.

This would also clarify who can vote during the school year on organizational business items. There was some confusion over whether a school that normally paid their membership dues at the end of the season had the right to vote in elections and business meetings during the current school year even through their current dues were not paid. This would ensure that all schools who were members as of the previous NPDA championship tournament had the rights of privileges throughout the subsequent school year.

Schools who were not current as of the previous NPDA championship tournament **would** have to pay current dues in order to gain the benefits of NPDA membership for the current school year. So, if School B was not a member as of the 2008 NPDA championship tournament, and wanted to vote in an 2009 election, they would have to pay their 2008-2009 membership dues before being granted that privilege.

Addendum F

Motion: Revise the NPDA Bylaws to read as follows...

III. Season Sweepstakes Awards:

- A. The National Parliamentary Debate Association will confer sweepstakes awards on **teams officially representing their** outstanding schools that participate in sanctioned tournaments during the season.

V. Criteria for Sanctioning NPDA Tournaments:

- C. Unless hosted by a national or regional organization whose rules specify invitation of members only, the tournament shall be open to all **regular institutional** members of NPDA and must be included in the NPDA calendar. The NPDA calendar will be prepared no later than June 1 by the Executive Secretary based on applications submitted from tournament hosts. The Executive Secretary may prepare addenda to the NPDA calendar later in the debate season.

VI. Student Eligibility Standards:

- A. Participation in NPDA is open to officially enrolled undergraduate students in good standing at the college or university they are representing and meeting the following criteria:
1. **A student must represent a recognized degree granting institution and participate with the full knowledge and support of that institution, its officials, and all forensics organizations operating within that institution.**
 2. A student needs to be seeking a baccalaureate degree at the institution they are representing unless competing for a two-year honor, in which case, pursuit of associate's degree or equivalent two-year certification at said institution is sufficient.
 3. Possession of one of the aforementioned degrees precludes further competition for those respective honors at the national tournament.
 4. "Good standing" and definition of degree pursuit are defined by the institution the student is representing.
 5. A student is limited to competition in four NPDA National Championship Tournaments.

Rationale:

The by-laws assume that institutional support is required for a student to participate in NPDA and to garner NPDA sweepstakes (e.g. Bylaw III.A., IV, VI). It is clearly the intent that students "represent" their institution and that the institution follows the bylaws of the organization.