

Spring Business Meeting
National Parliamentary Debate Association
Stockton Grand Hotel
Friday, March 27, 7:30-10 PM
AGENDA

I. Reports

- A. President*
- B. Vice President*
- C. Executive Secretary*
- D. Treasurer*
- E. National Student Representative*
- F. Tournament Host
- G. Tournament Director
- H. Ad Hoc Committee on Ethics
- I. Professional Development and Outreach Committee
- J. Host and Site Selection Committee

* Per the business meeting procedures advanced texts of major items from officer reports will be placed on the NPDA website 10 days in advance of the business meeting.

II. Consent Items

There are no consent items scheduled.

III. Discussion Items**

- A. A bill to clarify judge eligibility (Kevin Minch) – See Addendum 1
- B. A bill to amend the rules governing the number of teams necessary for out-rounds at invitationals (Jim Hansen) – See Addendum 2

** Items may be advanced at the same meeting to the Action Agenda with a two third vote of members present and voting (excluding proxies). Otherwise, items on the discussion agenda are automatically held over for a second reading at the November business meeting.

Action Items***

- A. A bill to eliminate season sweepstakes (Michael Dreher) – See Addendum 3
- B. A bill to clarify the NPDA's sanctioning policy (Jim Hansen) – See Addendum 4

*** Items on the action agenda are in a second reading and are being considered for final disposition requiring a simple majority vote.

Open Discussion / Advice for Council

Addendum #1

Amendment to the Tournament Operating Procedures

Insert Item E after the current Item D and renumber the document accordingly.

E. Judge eligibility

- 1. Member schools should strive to supply judges for the National Championship Tournament who have completed their college years, or have significant life experience, and possess sufficient knowledge to effectively adjudicate the rounds they judge.**
- 2. In order to be an adjudicator at the National Championship Tournament a judge shall meet one or more of the following initial criteria at the time their name is submitted as part of the tournament entry:**
 - a. they shall have completed a baccalaureate degree;**
 - b. they shall have exhausted competitive eligibility in all intercollegiate forensics; or,**
 - c. if some eligibility remains, they shall have foresworn any future competition in intercollegiate forensics.**
- 3. The judge shall not have competed in intercollegiate debate in the United States after May 1 of the year preceding the National Championships and shall not do so in the period between entry in the tournament and the conclusion of the National Championship Tournament.**

Rationale:

There has been a fair amount of confusion over whether students can compete and judge debate in the same academic year, with many programs expressing confusion about whether they can or cannot use judges who may have debated during the current academic year. This policy aims to clarify this issue and begins with an aspirational statement that, whenever possible, schools should use judges who have graduated or are appropriately mature to the task.

While many judges can leave competition and judge effectively and objectively under these circumstances, this policy aims to address the possibility that someone in recent competition may be biased by their competitive experiences and unable to judge effectively when not further removed from the competitive environment.

The language emphasizes intercollegiate competition in the United States to allow for the fact that some overseas competitors compete in graduate school at Worlds, but might otherwise be qualified to judge at NPDA having seen few, if any US competitors. This policy also recognizes that some overseas programs sponsored by IDEA might involve American seniors in international competition during the summer after their senior year, with minimal discernable affect on their ability to judge objectively at home the following year.

Addendum #2

Amend Bylaw 3L to read as follows:

Tournaments may hold as many elimination rounds as is desired, but **teams may earn points toward National Parliamentary Debate Association Sweepstakes** only ~~elimination rounds meeting the following specifications will be counted toward National Parliamentary Debate Association Sweepstakes~~ when: 1) they are among the top half of the field and they do not have less than a 50% win-loss preliminary record or 2) they have over a 50% win-loss record.

- ~~1. For semi finals, there must be a field of 8 teams in the division;~~
- ~~2. For quarterfinals, there must be a field of 15 teams in the division;~~
- ~~3. For octa finals, there must be a field of 29 teams in the division;~~
- ~~4. For double octa finals, there must be a field of 58 teams in the division;~~
- ~~5. For double double octafinals, there must be a field of 115 teams in the division.~~

Rationale:

1. The current rules are an artifact of copying the old CEDA constitution written long ago.
2. The current rules allow more than half the field to break (for example, 16 of 29 teams advance).
3. The current rules count points for teams who advance with a losing record 4. The current rules can lead tournaments to not advance teams with winning records (for example, when there are 54 teams at a tournament, the rules reward points for breaking to only 16 teams).

Addendum #3

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 #4

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.