

Minutes for the NPDA Business Meeting in New Orleans

6:30 – 8:00 p.m., Thursday, November 21

Notes: m/s/p = Motioned, seconded, passed

m/s/f = Motioned, seconded, failed

Order of Business

Call to order: 8:02 p.m. Thirty-two members were present.

Approval of minutes from spring 2002 in Denver, online at www.parlidebate.org/business-spr02.pdf m/s/p

Approval of agenda and procedures m/s/p

Reports (distributed in advance – questions will be entertained)

1. President – Tom Kuster: See attachment.
2. Executive Secretary – Renea Gernant: Please get results in. Check the list for tournament information that is still needed.
3. Treasurer – Brent Northup: See attachment. Questions were raised about the budget and how it is spent in advance. The complete budget report is available: <http://www.parlidebate.org/fall02-treasurer.pdf>
4. Webweaver – Michael Dreher: Wants tournament topics. Check website for corrections.
5. Journal Editor – Ed Inch: Please submit papers for NPDA Journal.
6. Student Representative – Rebekah Caruthers: Working with student representatives.
7. Tournament Host – Jil Freeman: All is going well.
8. Tournament Director – Robert Trapp: All is going well.
9. Publications Committee – Renea Gernant: See attachment.
10. Committee on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment – Lisa Ashby: See attachment. Questions about how the policy meets legal standards in California.
11. Site Committee – Sharon Porter: We don't have a site but we have two possibilities and Sharon is looking for ideas. There may be a need to make the tournament a little less expensive in order to get programs interested in hosting.
12. Finance Committee – Brent Northup: The books were closely checked in the 503c process and we now have our NPO status.
13. Elections Committee – Sharon Porter: Ed Inch has been nominated to be president.
14. Ad Hoc Committee on Gender Diversity – Susan Arnsdorf: See attachment.

(The report of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Decision Making in NPDA is included in the agenda items below.)

Unfinished business (there is none)

New business

Items A-C and Proposals 1-7 are in "Group One – Organizational Matters"

A. To establish a committee of two to prepare a proposal for formalizing NPDA ethics and rules procedures

Submitted by Tom Kuster, NPDA president

The NPDA directs the president to appoint a committee of two to prepare a proposal, to be brought to the spring 2003 business meeting, for establishing an Ethics and Rules Committee or some other appropriate structure for overseeing this aspect of the National Championship Tournament. The committee of two will, among other things, be asked to

- Review how other forensics organizations manage the upholding of ethical standards and observing of tournament rules
- Consider the need for a statement of ethical standards for NPDA
- Propose a structure and procedure for dealing with allegations of violations in connection with the National Championship Tournament
- Explore the implications, including legal ones, of applying sanctions for violations
- In general, formulate a suitable procedure for NPDA to follow in these regards, with attention to important values such as the integrity of our tournament, due process, confidentiality, and the like.

Discussion: Curiosity about what they will do and number of members.

Handling: m/s/p

B. A proposal that NPDA become a member of IDEA

Submitted by Tom Kuster, NPDA president

The NPDA should join I.D.E.A., the International Debate Education Association, as a voting member.

Justification: I.D.E.A. is the organization that is promoting debate education around the globe, and especially in the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe and Central Asia. NPDA membership would provide these benefits: support of this important international movement and of the young people learning through debate the fundamental processes supporting democracy; valuable opportunities for international contacts and activities for our students; two-way learning on the organizational level, as we become aware of unique problems faced by debate educators around the world and how

they are solving them, and as we try to find in our own experience ways to support their work. Information about I.D.E.A. is on their website at www.idebate.org. The cost will be \$150/year.

Discussion: The IDEA will be joining us.
Handling: m/s/p

C. A proposal to support attendance of international debaters at the National Championship Tournament

Submitted by Robert Trapp and Tom Kuster

The NPDA, in cooperation with one or two sponsoring NPDA schools, shall support two debate teams from Central or Eastern Europe or Central Asia to participate in the NPDA Championship tournament in March.

The teams shall be selected as follows:

1. The two highest ranking Central European, Eastern European, or Central Asian NPDA eligible debaters from the NPDA - IDEA International Championship Tournament held in January. Rank shall be determined using the standard NPDA season sweepstakes formula.
2. Two debaters drawn at random from a pool including all Central European, Eastern European, or Central Asian debaters participating in the NPDA - IDEA International Championship Tournament.

The division of support shall be as follows:

- 1) NPDA shall provide round-trip airfare to the NPDA tournament.
- 2) NPDA shall provide lodging at the tournament hotel.
- 3) NPDA shall provide banquet tickets at the NPDA tournament.
- 4) Host schools shall provide local transportation.
- 5) Host schools shall provide meals prior to, during, and after the NPDA tournament.
- 6) Host schools shall provide at least one entertainment event.

Reasons to support:

- 1) To support debate in the emerging democracies.
- 2) To add an intercultural dimension to the NPDA tournament.
- 3) To support the NPDA - IDEA International Championship.

Discussion: This would bring students over to our tournament to compete. Meany asked if the students would need to meet eligibility requirements. Trapp clarified that they would need to do that. Rutledge asked about the selection process.

Carruthers was really concerned that a person from another school could win the national championship in the U.S.

Handling: m/s/p

Following are proposals brought by the presidentially-appointed Blue Ribbon Committee to study decision-making

procedures in NPDA. Their report follows the timetable they were given – namely, to report proposals to the 2002 NCA meeting of NPDA, with action to be taken at the spring tournament meeting in 2003. However, nothing prevents us from taking action on any of these items at the NCA meeting this fall if we wish.

Note: Several of the proposals call for substantial changes to the Constitution and/or ByLaws. These proposals are written in a way to encourage quick understanding and to prompt discussion. However, they do not supply the specific language, or specify the places in the Constitution/ByLaws where changes would be made. In these cases, let us consider passage of these items, if it should occur, to mean that the NPDA favors the ideas expressed, and directs the leadership to prepare appropriate Constitutional language embodying those ideas for action at the spring tournament meeting.

Proposal #1: The President is directed to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee (or extend the charge of the present Blue Ribbon Committee) to plan a Parliamentary Debate Developmental Conferences beginning 2004.

Explanation: Among other things the Committee would entertain bids for hosting sites and dates, determine topics for discussion, review submitted position papers on these topics and arrange for the publication of the conference results.

Justification: There are many important issues facing the parliamentary debate community that cannot be addressed in the limited time provided by our business meetings. The conference might address such topics as the future orientation of NPDA, the potential philosophical differences in the community, the organizational and decision making process and procedures including changes to increase participation and efficiency, tournament management issues, officers' responsibilities and roles in decision making, season sweepstakes, how to employ technology to make all the above tasks easier, etc. Additionally, the conference could provide an outlet for scholarly endeavors for NPDA coaches.

Discussion: Some of these are recommendations that would need to be put into constitutional language, approved in the spring and mailed.

Handling: m/s/p

Proposal #2: *[This proposal requires Constitutional changes – see "note" above]* "Individual members" should be given the right to vote in elections for representatives. Individual memberships should not be available to active debaters enrolled at a member institution or to paid coaches at those institutions.

Justification: The Constitution allows for both individual and institutional memberships. However, nothing is specified as to privileges associated with these memberships. Currently only institutional members are allowed to vote. Thus, many people who might be very informed and concerned and who might want to be more involved in NPDA decision-making must seek "sponsors" in order to participate. This proposal would provide individual members a direct role in at least one aspect of NPDA activity.

Discussion: Idea is to give individual members a voice.

Handling: m/s/f

Proposal #3: [This proposal requires Constitutional changes – see “note” above] Voting should be restructured so that votes for both Constitutional and ByLaws changes may be cast EITHER at a Business Meeting OR in a mail ballot sent out after the Business Meeting to all voters who did not attend. Absentee voters would have 1 month to return votes to the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary would report on the web site the identities of all representatives not voting. Proxy votes would be abolished in favor of absentee voting.

Justification: At present, only changes to the Constitution itself must be ratified by a mail ballot. Changes to the ByLaws (including tournament procedures) can be made on the spot at any business meeting. On many important matters, then, business meetings are the exclusive forum for NPDA voters, yet many cannot access these meetings. NCA meetings are only accessible to those voters who have institutional funding to attend or who have the ability to expend personal money to purchase their own way. NPDA tournament meetings are only slightly more accessible due to the fact that attendees must still find the resources to attend the tournament every year. Not every NPDA school can attend every NPDA national tournament. The current system serves to privilege those programs with well-established institutional support and undermine those who have budget problems.

Discussion: Would allow members who can't come to NCA to vote. There are concerns about exit polling and other biases in the system that would happen there. Others didn't want people substituting voting for discussion.

Handling: Postponed until the next meeting.

Proposal #4: The President shall appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to determine a new and representative districting system for NPDA.

Justification: Employing the American Forensic Association districting system does not accurately reflect the travel patterns of NPDA participating schools, resulting in disproportionate districts. Districts should be proportionally sized, with some attention also given to school size.

Discussion: This is study not a proposal. This might help reps to be more vital in the organization.

Handling: m/s/p

Proposal #5: [This proposal requires Constitutional changes – see “note” above] Each district should elect three representatives -- two faculty representatives and one student representative. Voting for faculty representatives and student representatives for the next year would be done at NPDA nationals (i.e. representatives for 2003-2004 would be elected at 2003 NPDA Nationals).

Nominations for faculty representatives should be sent to the Executive Secretary no later than 30 days prior to the tournament. Ballots would be distributed to institutional members at registration. Absentee ballots would be mailed to

all individual members and all institutional members not present at the tournament. Ballots would be due to the Executive Secretary no later than 30 days after the tournament. Voters would indicate their preference for no more than two candidates within their district. The two candidates from each district receiving the most votes would be elected. In case of a tie, the NPDA President would break the tie.

Student district representatives would be elected by simple majority vote of students present at a meeting for each district held at nationals. The national student representative would continue to be elected at the national student meeting. A room would be allocated and publicized for each district to hold its meeting.

Justification: Members should have a say in the organizations of which they are members. A district representative system provides an avenue for that communication.

Handling: Deferred due to time restraints.

Proposal #6: Attendees at Business Meetings should register upon entry to the meeting as either voting or non-voting attendees. A visible designator (i.e. button, sticker, stamp) should be issued to eligible voters to differentiate them from ineligible participants. Eligible voters would include the following: a voting representative of each member school, faculty district representatives, student district representatives, NPDA President, NPDA Vice President, NPDA Executive Secretary, NPDA Treasurer, and national student representative.

Justification: Currently, there is no check on who actually votes in the Business Meeting and no way to check that proxies are fairly and accurately voted. Misrepresented proxies and outright ineligible voting are extremely easy to accomplish under the current system.

Handling: Deferred due to time restraints.

Proposal #7: Business Meetings should be restructured as follows (all times may be extended or contracted by majority vote of the meeting):

- Registration: 10 minutes
- Friendly Amendment Period: 15 minutes. During this period, anyone who seeks to craft a "friendly amendment" may consult with the initiator of the proposal (or his/her designate) to craft a friendly amendment.
- For each proposal:
 - 1) The Chair will report the proposal.
 - 2) The initiator (or designate) will report any friendly amendments.
 - 3) The initiator will control 5 minutes of time to be allocated for speakers in support of the proposal.
 - 4) The Chair will control 5 minutes of time to be allocated for speakers in opposition of the proposal.
 - 5) The Chair will call the motion, pending a motion to extend debate (which may be extended by majority vote). All extensions of debate must allow for equal time for and against the proposal. If there is no successful motion to extend debate, the motion will

be deemed to have been constructively seconded and members present may vote.

6) The Executive Secretary will record the vote.

However, designation of approval or rejection of the motion will be deferred pending absentee ballots (see #2).

7) Upon approval, measures will be immediately put into effect

Justification: Business meetings are not as productive as they might be. The time devoted to reports should be shortened and distribution of the important information should be provided in written form to attendees. A more structured method for dealing with proposals is needed for efficiency.

Handling: Deferred due to time restraints.

Items D-K are in "Group Two – Tournament Procedures"

Motion was seconded and passed to take K out of order.

D--An amendment to promote clash in debates.

Submitted by John Meany, Claremont Colleges

An amendment to Bylaw XIII: Tournament Rules. Rules of Debating and Judging, Section 2. Objective of the debate.

Current text: The opposition must oppose the resolution and/or the proposition team's case. If, at the end of the debate, the judge believes that the proposition team has supported and successfully defended the resolution, they will be declared the winner; otherwise the opposition will be declared the winner.

Proposed change: The opposition must oppose the proposition team's case. If, at the end of the debate, the judge believes that the proposition team has supported and successfully defended the resolution, as reasonably interpreted, they will be declared the winner; otherwise the opposition will be declared the winner.

Justification: These changes will promote clash in the debate. The current language presumes a resolution existing independently of its interpretation by the proposition team. The proposed language change suggest that the resolution does not have a fixed meaning prior to contextualization by the proposition team. In addition, the changes promote clash by directing opposition argument to the proposition case rather than to a different understanding or interpretation of the resolution. As any statement may have myriad reasonable interpretations, as well as other interpretations that are contradictory, foolish, or maniacal, the claim that the opposition could debate any of these, rather than the presumably sensible position advanced by the proposition team in a debate, undermines the purpose of adversarial argumentation.

Discussion: Concern that it institutionalizes an inverse rule. There was the suggestion that it locks the opposition into

arguing the government case even if it is problematic. Meany argued that you could still argue that it didn't support the resolution.

Handling: m/s/f

E--An amendment to eliminate points of order and privilege.

Submitted by John Meany, Claremont Colleges

An amendment to Bylaw XIII: Tournament Rules. Rules of Debating and Judging, Section 4. During the Debate. Subsection (4F) Points of Order and subsection (4G) points of Personal Privilege.

Current text: 4F. Points of Order

Points of order can be raised for no reason other than those specified in these Rules of Debating and Judging. If at any time during the debate, a debater believes that his or her opponent has violated one of these Rules of Debating and Judging, he or she may address the Speaker of the House with a point of order. Once recognized by the Speaker of the House, the debater must state, but may not argue for, the point of order. At the discretion of the Speaker of the House, the accused may briefly respond to the point of order. The Speaker of the House will then rule immediately on the point of order in one of three ways: point well taken, point not well taken, or point taken under consideration. The time used to state and address a point of order will not be deducted from the speaking time of the debater with the floor. A point of order is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor violations.

4G. Points of Personal Privilege

At any time during the debate, a debater may rise to a point of personal privilege when he or she believes that an opponent has personally insulted one of the debaters, has made an offensive or tasteless comment, or has grievously misconstrued another's words or arguments. The Speaker will then rule on whether or not the comments were acceptable. The time used to state and address a point of personal privilege will not be deducted from the speaking time of the debater with the floor. Like a point of order, a point of personal privilege is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor transgressions. Debaters may be penalized for raising spurious points of personal privilege.

Proposed change: Delete the language.

Justification: These points are almost always "taken under consideration." In other words, they are merely disruptive of the proceedings and are not subject to an immediate ruling from the chair. This is even more the case in elimination rounds, in which a speaker is unlikely to speak for the other judges on a panel. In addition, if the speaker of a multiparty panel does try to include other judges in the deliberation or commentary of a point, the inclusion of 3 or more voices during a debater's speech, particularly a rebuttal, is so extraordinarily disruptive of the flow of the speech that an opposing team tactically 'wins' many points, even when the ruling is not in their favor.

These points cause considerable confusion in the debate. A debater does not often know how to proceed on arguments that are "taken under consideration." Debaters do not know if they ought to counter every instance of a potentially new argument in a rebuttal speech. If they do not counter an argument with a point of order, does this mean the judge should not recognize it as a new argument? If they counter two new arguments in a rebuttal with points of order, are they unable to make more points (and, perhaps, seem disruptive) or will the judge presume that the team is conceding that other issues are not new to the debate? And, in replying, for example, that a point is "well taken," is a judge indicating that no other argumentation can be made on the point or only that the present articulation of the argument seems new? Points of privilege are even more infrequently used and almost exclusively disruptive, having little to do with the substance of a debate.

It seems that debaters ought to advance arguments in their speeches and judges can 'take into consideration' anything that is relevant for decision-making at the conclusion of the debate without the intrusion of frequently unnecessary and often confusing points of order and privilege.

Discussion: Carruthers suggested that POPP are the only means the debater has to voice their concerns. She suggested that POO are also useful. Others suggested that we should take out the option of judges to take the matters under consideration.

Handling: 17 for (4 proxy) ; 21 against (7 proxy)

F--An amendment to provide additional information regarding tournament success.

Submitted by John Meany, Claremont Colleges

An amendment to Bylaw XII: Tournament Operating Procedures. Section I. Awards. Subsection (6) Season Sweepstakes.

Add an additional subsection (d) with the following language:

The NPDA will certify sweepstakes results, based on the criteria outlined in the NPDA Constitution, Article VII, in each of the following categories: Overall, Varsity, Junior Varsity, and Novice. The NPDA will publish a sweepstakes ranking of the top twenty-five (25) schools and the top ten (10) two-year colleges on the NPDA website.

Justification: This sweepstakes certification increases the information with which programs are able to provide promotional information, both within a college or university and to outside individuals and groups. It provides recognition for students in their competitive divisions. It increases the number of recognized schools, an important consideration as the organization continues to expand. It will not increase costs, as there is no formal award other than official sanction by the NPDA of annual rankings.

Discussion: Discussion of workload. Discussion of need to define novice, et al.

Handling: Postponed until spring.

G--An amendment to create a judge training session.

Submitted by John Meany, Claremont Colleges

Amendment to Bylaw XII: Tournament Operating Procedures. Section (A) Tournament Staff.

Proposed addition: It is the responsibility of the tournament director to establish a time and location for judge training during the administration of the national tournament. The tournament director will select one or more representatives to conduct training sessions regarding tournament rules. Participating judges must attend the training session to judge at the tournament. If a judge has previously participated in a training session at the national tournament, the judge may receive a waiver for future training sessions, with the exception of a training seminar for any rules changes from the previous training session. Schools are responsible for hiring judges to replace any of their judges failing to attend the training session.

Justification: This procedure will familiarize judges with the rules for the national tournament and permit questions and exploration of the scope of established rules.

Discussion: Meany suggested that there were those who should know more about debate before the tournament. Hack suggested that it has to be everyone or no one but he really liked the idea that everyone be on the same plate. Parker asked about the logistics. Freeman and Shipley raised a concern about burdens on the host. A minimum round requirement was suggested as an alternative. Inch suggested a sign-off option. Rutledge suggested that it be a supplemental. Diers asked if it had to be a session or if it could be a sign-off? Handling: m/s/postponed until spring

H--An amendment to prevent inappropriate judge identification

Amendment to Bylaw XII: Tournament Operating Procedures. Section (G) Judge Assignment.

Submitted by John Meany, Claremont Colleges

All adults ineligible to compete at the national tournament are eligible to judge the event. The tournament may not make any notation on a judge or strike list indicating a special status for judges, including first year judging.

Justification: This will allow qualified individuals to judge at the national tournament, without discriminatory status references (e.g., "first year out" or "Irish").

Deferred due to lack of time.

I--An amendment to increase tournament disclosure.

Submitted by John Meany, Claremont Colleges

An amendment to Bylaw XIII: Tournament Rules. Rules of

Debating and Judging, Section 5. After the Debate.

Proposed addition: After the completion of tabulation for each preliminary round of debate and the announcement of the subsequent preliminary round of debate, for round 1-7, the tournament director or designated representative will post the win/loss and individual speaker results of the preceding debates, in a conveniently located room or public space.

Justification: This addition will provide tabulation transparency for the event, increasing accountability, improving communication about practice, and providing a secondary check on results accuracy.

Deferred due to lack of time.

J--An amendment to require judge decision disclosure.

Submitted by John Meany, Claremont Colleges

An amendment to Bylaw XIII: Tournament Rules. Rules of Debating and Judging, Section 5. After the Debate.

Proposed change: Delete sections 5a, 5b, and 5c. Current text:

5A. After the final rebuttal, the Speaker of the House will dismiss the teams, complete the ballot and return it to the tournament director. The judges should not give oral comments before the ballot is completed and returned to the tournament director.

5B. After returning the ballot, the judge may, at his or her discretion, give brief constructive comments to the debaters. Judges should refrain from announcing the decision. After these comments, debaters and coaches will refrain from seeking further information about the debate from the judge.

5C. Debaters or coaches will refrain from requesting that judges reveal decisions. Debaters or coaches who harass judges for information may be withdrawn from the tournament on a two-thirds vote of the Tournament Committee.

Amended wording: At the completion of each preliminary and elimination round of debate, judges are required to verbally announce their decision. The judge will be given a three minute period of time to explain the decision of the debate. Immediately following the announcement of the timed three minute period, judges must return ballots to the tabulation staff.

Judges may engage debaters regarding decisions after ballots are delivered to the tournament staff. Judges must announce decisions but debaters are under no obligation to listen to decisions. Debaters may be excused from the competition room at their request prior to the announcement of the decision. Students and Coaches should avoid harassing critics regarding decisions.

Justification: Decision disclosure is a tool for judge education and consistent decision-making; a guide for improved practice for participants; a move to open communication in a critical community; a legitimate check on unaccountable decision-

making; a needed secondary check on tournament tabulations; and a means to promote fairness in disclosure (a method to eliminate problematic 'selective' disclosure).

Deferred due to lack of time.

K -- An amendment to give priority to equal judge strikes

Submitted by Mark McCaig, D3 Student Representative

An amendment to Bylaw XI: (NPDA Championship Tournament Operating Procedures), Section G (Judge Assignment).

Proposed addition:

The Tab Room shall make every reasonable effort to enforce strikes before each round at the NPDA Championship Tournament. Should the Tab Room be unable to enforce strikes for one or more teams that have submitted their strikes in accordance with tournament procedure for a certain round, strikes shall not be enforced for any team that round.

Justification: The addition of the proposed language will insure that no team has an unfair advantage over another with regard to judge strikes at the national tournament.

Discussion: Shipley doesn't believe that this will happen again. The goal for this year will be to revise the strike system so that this situation would be a non-issue. Others argued that the bigger issue is that we need to make sure no strikes are allowed for any team.

Handling: m/s/p that we amend by eliminating the first sentence. m/s/p amended by-law

Closing discussion about scheduling.