

**NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION  
BUSINESS MEETING  
Monday, November 15, 2010  
3:30-4:45 PM  
San Francisco, CA  
Parc 55 Hotel, Divisadero  
AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes (Spring 2010)
- III. Reports

(See reports online, where applicable. Short reports, as needed, will be presented orally at the meeting. Executive Reports and Committee Reports, where possible will be posted on the NPDA website 10 days before the meeting.)

- A. Executive Council
- B. Committees
  - 1. Nominating Committee
  - 2. Finance Committee
  - 3. Site Committee
  - 4. Additional Committees as Needed
- IV. Action Items
  - 1) Change to Elimination Round Rules – Jim Hanson (Whitman)
- V. Discussion Items
  - 1) Disclosure of Rules Violations – Michael Dreher (Bethel)
  - 2) Accommodations for Debates- Michael Dreher (Bethel)

Proposal Texts:

- 1) Change to Elimination Round Rules – Jim Hanson (Whitman)

*CURRENT*

NPDA By-Laws, Section III.

L. Tournaments may hold as many elimination rounds as is desired, but only elimination rounds meeting the following specifications will be counted toward National Parliamentary Debate Association Sweepstakes:

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.

*CHANGE TO*

NPDA By-Laws, Section III.

L. Tournaments may hold as many elimination rounds as is desired, but NPDA Sweepstakes points are counted only for the first two elimination rounds where:

- 1) the number of teams competing is half (rounded down) or less of teams competing in preliminary rounds and these teams have at least 50% win-loss records including byes (e.g. For a division with 37 teams competing, points would be counted for the first elimination round with 18 or fewer teams who each have 3-3 or better records).
- 2) all of the teams competing have a better than 50% win-loss record including byes (e.g. For a division with 30 teams competing with 16 3-2 and better teams, points would be counted for the first elimination round with 16 or less of the 3-2 teams).

*RATIONALE:*

1. The current break to elimination rules are a hold over from copying the CEDA Constitution long ago when partial elimination rounds were rarely used (if at all).
2. The current break to elimination rules allow points for teams with losing records who advance to elimination rounds (2-3 team that is 8th seed out of 15 teams) and also allow points for teams seeded in the lower half of teams who advance to elimination rounds (eg 3-3 team that is 16th seed out of 29 teams).
3. At the same time, the rules do not count points for teams that advance to elimination rounds who may have 3-1 and 4-2 records (for example, when a 17th seed advances at a tournament with 57 teams).
4. These new rules provide a consistent way for tournaments to advance teams. Top half of teams with at least 50% win-loss record (or over 50% win-loss record).

Disclosure of rules violations (Michael Dreher)

*CURRENT:*

I. 2. In addition to enforcing Section 4 of the NPDA Tournament Rules, the judge (or in the case of multiple judge panels, the Speaker of the House) shall be responsible for declaring a forfeiture to a team not showing for a debate. After the expiration of the allotted time between announcement of the topic and the beginning of the debate, a judge shall report violations via the ballot.

*CHANGE TO:*

Add the following text at the end of this section "...via the ballot and to the debaters involved."

*RATIONALE:*

Under the current system, debaters are not informed as to whether or not they were in violation. This creates inequity in the system when some teams are notified that they have been forfeited and other teams have not. This also leads to a denial of the ability to appeal such a decision, since the decision is not ultimately revealed until the cume sheets and/or ballots have been received. In all other cases of tournament infractions, the ability to appeal is given at the time of the debate. Given the wording, and what has happened to a variety of teams in the past, the ability to appeal this decision is uniquely denied.

Accommodations for debates (Michael Dreher)

Insert as item E. Accommodations for debates. Renumber subsequent items as necessary.

Insert the new language:

E. Accommodations for debates

1. Students and/or judges who need ADA accommodations shall notify the tournament director as soon as possible and preferably at the time of entry whether there will be a need for any accommodations.

2. In consultation with the host, the tournament director shall provide the necessary accommodations. Such accommodations could include rooms near the ballot table and/or topic announcement for both judging and preparation, and/or other reasonable accommodations as defined by the ADA.

3. If an ADA room is necessary for a judge or a debater, preference shall be given to keep the same room for both competition and preparation. ADA requests shall trump any school reserving preparation rooms as part of the tournament.