

**NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION
BUSINESS MEETING**

Thursday March 23rd, 2016: 6:30 PM – 8:00 PM

Foothill Hall, Hotel Elegante of Colorado Springs, CO

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Fall 2016)

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
 - i. Finance Committee
 - ii. Site Committee
 - iii. Additional Committees as Needed
- C. Tournament Director
- D. Other reports: NPDA Journal

IV. Action Items

V. Discussion Items (See Below)

- A. A Proposal to Increase Student Involvement in Organizational Decision-Making
- B. A Proposal to Modify NPDA Tournament Sweepstake Elimination Round Points
- C. A Proposal to More Accurately Seed Preliminary Brackets
- D. A Proposal to Reintroduce the Rules of Debating and Judging to the Bylaws
- E. A Proposal to Standardize Flex Time
- F. A Proposal to Remove Points of Personal Privilege
- G. A Proposal to Create Season Long Sweepstakes Divisions for Novice, Junior, and Open Divisions
- H. A Proposal for Setting Standards for Novice, Junior, and Open Divisions

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment

A Proposal to Increase Student Involvement in Organizational Decision-Making

1. Rationale – Students have little say or decision-making power in an organization that is for and about them. This proposal provides Student District Representatives with a vote in NPDA business meetings. This provides additional regional student representation to the organization and expands the voice of the organization’s membership.
2. Current Constitutional Article (VI. C 1-7) versus Proposed Constitutional Article (VI. C 1-9)

A. Current Article

Section C: District Student Representative duties are:

1. To communicate district/national information to subscribers
2. To provide to the Treasurer mailing lists of active student programs in the district;
3. To hold at least one district or interest group meeting each year at an appropriate tournament to discuss upcoming items of business and district concerns and to report to and advise the Executive Council at or before the National Championship Tournament on issues related to their districts and special interests.
4. To review district membership indicating two-year and four-year schools;
5. To solicit and send resolutions to the Tournament Director for use at the Championship Tournament;
6. To recruit judges for the NPDA Championship Tournament;
7. To assist as needed in collection of tournament information for season long awards.

B. Proposed Article

Section C: District Student Representative duties are:

1. To communicate district/national information to subscribers
2. To provide to the Treasurer mailing lists of active student programs in the district;
3. To hold at least one district or interest group meeting each year at an appropriate tournament to discuss upcoming items of business and district concerns and to report to and advise the Executive Council at or before the National Championship Tournament on issues related to their districts and special interests.
4. To review district membership indicating two-year and four-year schools;
5. To solicit and send resolutions to the Tournament Director for use at the Championship Tournament;
6. To recruit judges for the NPDA Championship Tournament;
7. To assist as needed in collection of tournament information for season long awards.
8. *To vote in NPDA Business Meetings as a representative of their elected district.*
 - a. *Student District Representatives should vote in the best interests of the organization and elected districts rather than their school or team.*

b. Student District Representatives may give their proxy to the National Student Representative for voting during business meetings, but will be bound by rules concerning proxy votes.

A Proposal to Modify NPDA Tournament Sweepstake Elimination Round Points

1. Rationale – During a partial elimination round, schools are rewarded for avoiding a partial elimination debate by accruing points in a bye for the NPDA Tournament Sweepstakes. This creates a problem of a school that advances more teams to elimination rounds and are all eliminated during their first debate accruing more points than a team that advances fewer teams, but wins more elimination rounds. This proposal would start elimination round point accumulation in the first full elimination round, rather than in a partial elimination debate. This proposal awards points for winning debates rather than avoiding a partial elimination debate based on speaker point differentials.
2. Current Bylaws (IX L 5 a 3) versus Proposed Bylaw (IX L 5 a 3)

A. Current Bylaw

3) Sweepstakes points will be accumulated from a combination of preliminary and elimination round records from the top four teams from a school during the competition. Ordinarily, the records of the four teams from each school with the highest number of preliminary round wins will be awarded two points for each preliminary round. An additional two points will be awarded per team per elimination round won (including advancement by a bye) by the four teams accumulating the most elimination round points. These may not necessarily be the same four teams that accumulated the most points in preliminary rounds. The National Champion will receive an additional two points for its school in addition to any elimination round points earned.

B. Proposed Bylaw

3) Sweepstakes points will be accumulated from a combination of preliminary and elimination round records from the top four teams from a school during the competition. Ordinarily, the records of the four teams from each school with the highest number of preliminary round wins will be awarded two points for each preliminary round. An additional two points will be awarded per team per elimination round won ~~(including advancement by a bye)~~ *in a full elimination round* by the four teams accumulating the most elimination round points. These may not necessarily be the same four teams that accumulated the most points in preliminary rounds. The National Champion will receive an additional two points for its school in

addition to any elimination round points earned.

A Proposal to More Accurately Seed Preliminary Brackets

1. Rationale – Currently, round two of the NPDA Championship Tournament is randomly paired. This creates a problem of potentially having a team debate two perceivably stronger teams based on random assignment. This proposal changes round 2 to be paired high-low in bracket as rounds 3 through 8 are currently paired. In doing so, this power-matching creates a more accurate bracket and preserves the pairing strategy used in other power-matched rounds.
2. **Current Bylaws (IX I 1a – 2a) versus Proposed Bylaws (IX I 1a – 2a)**

A. Current Bylaws

I. Scheduling of the Debates

1. Randomly paired debates.
 - a. The first two debates shall be paired randomly.
2. Power-matched debates
 - a. Rounds 3-8 will be power matched based on each team's cumulative record through the previous round.
 - b. All power-matched rounds shall be conducted using standard high-low within bracket procedures.
 - c. If a record bracket contains an uneven number of teams, the bracket shall be evened by "pulling leftovers up." The uneven bottom of the upper bracket is moved to the top of the next lower bracket according to opposition record. Care should be taken to avoid second "pull-ups."
 - d. For the purpose of power-matching rounds 3-4, team order shall be determined by the following criteria:
 - 1) Number of Wins
 - 2) Total Speaker Points
 - 3) Adjusted Speaker Points: Adjusted by dropping the high and the low scores
 - 4) Opposition Wins: The strength of the team's competition as defined by the number of wins earned by the team's opposition
 - 5) Double-Adjusted Points: Adjusted by dropping the two high and the two low scores
 - 6) Judge Variance: The average number of points that each judge gave the team relative to the number of points the judge gave to all other teams the judge was assigned
 - 7) Random

B. Proposed Bylaws

I. Scheduling of the Debates

1. Randomly paired debates.

- a. *The first debate shall be paired randomly.*
- 2. Power-matched debates
 - a. *Rounds 2-8 will be power matched based on each team's cumulative record through the previous round.*
 - b. All power-matched rounds shall be conducted using standard high-low within bracket procedures.
 - c. If a record bracket contains an uneven number of teams, the bracket shall be evened by "pulling leftovers up." The uneven bottom of the upper bracket is moved to the top of the next lower bracket according to opposition record. Care should be taken to avoid second "pull-ups."
 - d. *For the purpose of power-matching rounds 2-4, team order shall be determined by the following criteria:*
 - 1) Number of Wins
 - 2) Total Speaker Points
 - 3) Adjusted Speaker Points: Adjusted by dropping the high and the low scores
 - 4) Opposition Wins: The strength of the team's competition as defined by the number of wins earned by the team's opposition
 - 5) Double-Adjusted Points: Adjusted by dropping the two high and the two low scores
 - 6) Judge Variance: The average number of points that each judge gave the team relative to the number of points the judge gave to all other teams the judge was assigned
 - 7) *Random Number*

A Proposal to Reintroduce the Rules of Debating and Judging to the Bylaws

1. Rationale – At some point the "Rules of Debating and Judging" were removed from the Bylaws and are even referred to by the Bylaws, but now no longer exist as part of that document. This proposal seeks to reintroduce those rules back to the Bylaws as without them technically we have no official rules to guide the event.
2. Proposed Bylaw addition

Amend the Bylaws to Add:

X. Rules for Debating and Judging

The purpose of these rules is to define some goals and procedures of the debates so that, to the extent possible, everyone will enter the debates with a shared set of expectations.

These rules are designed to apply to the framework for debate rather than the substance.

They are framed in ways that attempt to allow many degrees of freedom in regard to debaters' creativity.

These Rules apply to the NPDA Championship Tournament. They also apply to any NPDA sanctioned tournament unless the director of a tournament publishes changes or alterations to these Rules in the tournament invitation.

Sanctions for a violation of Section 4 of the Rules of Debating and Judging (rules that apply during the debate) shall be the province of the judge. In the case of a dispute regarding a judge's interpretation of the rules, enforcement of the rules, or adhering to the procedures of the tournament, one or both debate teams may appeal a judge's decision regarding sanctions to the tournament director for a final decision.

Charges of violations of any rules other than those in Section 4, including violations of rules before and after the debate, should be taken to the Tournament Director. In the case of serious violations of these Rules other than those in Section 4, the Tournament Director will direct the Rules and Standards committee to review and rule on the decision. If the violation is upheld the Rules and Standards committee may impose a penalty ranging from reprimand, to changing of a decision or speaker points, to withdrawal of a team or judge from the tournament.

RULES OF DEBATING AND JUDGING

1. Resolutions

A. A different resolution for each round will be presented to the debaters at a specified time prior to the beginning of each debate. The specified time will be determined by adding fifteen minutes to the amount of time needed to walk to the most distant building in which debates are to occur.

B. The topic of each round will be about current affairs or philosophy. The resolutions will be general enough that a well-educated college student can debate them. They may be phrased in literal or metaphorical language.

2. Objective of the debate The proposition team must affirm the resolution by presenting and defending a sufficient case for that resolution. The opposition team 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.

3. Before the debate

The proposition team, if they wish, may use the room assigned for debate for their preparation. If the proposition team uses the debating room for preparation, both the judge and the opposition must vacate the room until the time for the debate to begin.

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. 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.

C. Format of the debate

First Proposition Constructive Speaker: 7 minutes

First Opposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Second Proposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Second Opposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Opposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 4 minutes

Proposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 5 minutes

D. Constructive and Rebuttal Speeches Introduction of new arguments is appropriate during all constructive speeches. However, debaters may not introduce new arguments in rebuttal speeches except that the proposition rebuttalist may introduce new arguments in his or her rebuttal to refute arguments that were first raised in the Second Opposition Constructive. New examples, analysis, analogies, etc. that support previously introduced arguments are permitted in rebuttal speeches.

E. Points of Information

A debater may request a point of information—either verbally or by rising—at any time after the first minute and before the last minute of any constructive speech. The debater holding the floor has the discretion to accept or refuse points of information. If accepted, the debater requesting the point of information has a maximum of fifteen seconds to make a statement or ask a question. The speaking time of the debater with the floor continues during the point of information.

F. 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.

G. 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.

5. After the debate

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

B. A running update of all teams' records will be publicly posted in a "warm room" or common area accessible to all tournament participants. After returning the ballot, the judge may, at his or her discretion, give brief constructive comments to the debaters. Such conversations should, if possible, take place in the established "warm room" area if one is designated by the tournament. No one may be required to enter the "warm room" or participate in discussions. Judges should refrain from checking the records of teams they are about to judge should such information be available.

C. Debaters or coaches will refrain from arguing with judges' decisions or comments. Debaters or coaches who harass judges may be withdrawn from the tournament on a two-thirds vote of the Championship Tournament Committee.

A Proposal to Standardize Flex Time

1. Rationale – Flex time has been a hallmark of major tournaments with little to no impact on tournament scheduling and an increase in clarity of rounds. The use of flex time has allowed team to ask questions and think about arguments potentially improving the quality of debates. This proposal seeks to standardize a practice that many tournaments have utilized and is being utilized by the NPTE. This would create a standard practice event-wide rather than creating a national versus regional practice gap.

2. Current Bylaws (Not a Bylaw)

A. Format of the debate

First Proposition Constructive Speaker: 7 minutes

First Opposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Second Proposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Second Opposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes
Opposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 4 minutes
Proposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 5 minutes

3. Proposed Bylaws

A. Format of the debate

First Proposition Constructive Speaker: 7 minutes

Opposition Flex Time: 2 minutes

First Opposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Proposition Flex Time: 2 minutes

Second Proposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Opposition Flex Time: 1 minute

Second Opposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Opposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 4 minutes

Proposition Flex Time: 1 minute

Proposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 5 minutes

Add H. Flex Time

Flex time may be used by the controlling team to prepare arguments, drink water, set up stands, ask questions of their opponents, etc. Flex time may not be used as additional speech time.

A Proposal to Remove Points of Personal Privilege

1. Rationale – This parliamentary point serves no particular use for the activity and is rarely ever utilized in debate rounds. This proposal is an attempt to streamline existing practices and rules for debating and judging.
2. Current Rule

G. 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.

3. Proposed Rule

- a. Delete - G. 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.~~

- b. Amend the Bylaws to Reflect the Sub-point adjustment of the section's removal.

A Proposal to Create Season Long Sweepstakes Divisions for Novice, Junior, and Open Divisions

1. Rationale – Currently, NPDA awards season-long sweepstakes divisions for cumulative efforts between Novice, Junior, and Open. As some programs may focus on a particular division (such as Open or Junior), recognition of those focused efforts is missed. This proposal would seek to award the top 5 schools in Novice, Junior, and Open categories.
2. Proposed Bylaw

Amend III. Season Sweepstakes Awards

Add:

N. Novice, Junior, and Open Division Season Sweepstakes Awards

1. NPDA will confer season sweepstakes awards that meet all the eligibility requirements above to the top 5 schools in each division of Novice, Junior, and Open.
2. Points for each division will be calculated using the points accumulated from the top four teams counted for the cumulative season sweepstakes awards.
 - a. Final sweepstakes awards for each Novice, Junior, and Open division will be based on the total points for the accumulated points at the four sanctioned tournaments at which each school has gained the most points for a division during the season.
 - b. For example, School A attends Tournament 1 and accumulates division cumulative points from three Novice teams (10, 6, 4) and 1 Open team (4). School A then attends Tournament 2 and accumulates division cumulative points from 2 Novice teams (10, 8), 1 Junior Team (4), and 1 Open Team (6). School A will then have 38 Points for the Novice Division, 4 Points for the JV Division, and 10 points for the Open Division.
3. Ties will be broken based on number of tournaments won in that division.

A Proposal for Setting Standards for Novice, Junior, and Open Divisions

1. Rationale – Division eligibility standards can be quite different between regions, programs, and tournaments. This can lead to teams that have had substantial success in a division not moved up to other tiers of debate. Further, in an effort to accumulate season sweepstakes points, some schools may keep debaters in divisions for too long. This proposal seeks to standardize division eligibility to protect students that ought to be placed in a particular division from students that have outgrown the division competitively.

2. Current Bylaws (VI D 1-2)

D. For tournament directors who desire definitions of novice and junior, the NPDA suggests the following guidelines:

1. To be classified as a novice:

- a. The student should have no more than two semesters of high school debate experience.
- b. The student should be in the first two semesters of collegiate debate.
- c. Once the student has advanced to elimination rounds more than 3 times, the student should be advanced to the junior or open division.

2. To be classified as junior varsity:

- a. The student should be in the first four semesters of intercollegiate debate.
- b. The student should not have advanced to elimination rounds more than 3 times in junior or open division.
- c. Once the student has advanced to more than three elimination rounds, the student should be advanced to open.

3. Proposed Bylaw

D. Eligibility for Novice, Junior, and Open Divisions

1. To be eligible in Novice:

- a. The student should have no more than two semesters of high school debate experience.
- b. The student should be in the first two semesters of collegiate debate.
- c. Once the student has won 8 elimination rounds (including byes), they are no longer eligible for the Novice division.

2. To be eligible in Junior:

- a. The student should be in the first four semesters of intercollegiate debate.
- b. Once the student has won eight elimination rounds (including byes) in Junior or Open, they are no longer eligible for the Junior division.

3. To be eligible in Open:

- a. Any NPDA eligible student may debate in the Open division.

4. A team's divisional eligibility for a tournament will be based on the most experienced partner. For example, a team is made up of debaters where one debater is eligible for Novice and the other is eligible for Junior. That team would only be eligible to debate in Junior or Open.
5. Coaches are encouraged to track student performance to ensure that students are moved up to appropriate divisions once those students have exhausted their divisional eligibility.