

**NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
Friday, March 18, 2016
7:30 PM Best Western Golden Sails Ballroom**

I. Call to Order 7:46 pm

II. Approval of Minutes (Fall 2015). Approved.

III. Reports

A. Treasurer's Report - *Brent Northrup* – “We’re good.”

B. Site Committee Report - *VP Jeannie Hunt*. 2017 NPDA will be held at Colorado College. Please express your thanks to Julian Plaza for hosting. NPTE is also being tentatively planned for Colorado - CSU Pueblo. Tentative dates are March 23-26/Thursday – Sunday. We are beginning negotiations with Crowne Plaza which is now the Elegante.

C. Bylaw Review Committee Report – *Pres. Mike Middleton*. This committee’s work will be held over until the summer. The goal is to bring bylaws into alignment of current practices. If you are not serving on this committee but want to volunteer, email Mike. We hope to have a report at the November meeting (NCA).

D. Accessibility Committee Report – *Pres. Mike Middleton*. This committee’s work will be held over until the summer. The committee will be looking at subset of bylaws concerning disability and sexual harassment. Our goal is to revise bylaws to keep consistent with NPTE/NPDA . If you would like to be on the committee, email Mike.

E. Questions - *Mike* asked for any additional comments from committees.

F. Student Rep Report – *Student Rep Carmen Terlage St. Mary’s College* . Carmen would like to bring attention to the Equity Forum which occurred before the meeting. “We would like to have student voices represented here.” Two of the most significant topics in the forum concerned sexual assault and rape culture. She feels it is important to recognize student voices and have their perspective on rape culture. It’s a question of accountability. Students have been asking how we become more accountable with sexual assault and predators. Other issues discussed were smaller schools, disabilities, etc. Students want to be apart of conversations. How do we bridge the gap? The Equity Forum is one way to do that.

G. Questions - Mike –Carmen is on both committees. We will be getting a new Student Rep at this tournament. They will also be on these committees. Carmen has been great. Please talk to/encourage your students to run for the position if they would like to be involved in these topics.

H. Tournament Director Report - David. Thanks for sending in your documents. We are looking at how to streamline that for next year. Prep rooms are listed on parlitournament.com. Cal State Long Beach is in full class session. Plan accordingly. Prep rooms on Monday will change. Walks could be long. Check out location before topic announce. *Nick* shared that the way the internet system is that if you or a student are downloading inappropriate material it will disable your connection. Everyone has a unique log in to use on one device. Don't share logins.

David - There will be no roll call. We will start at posted times. Topic announce will be I PH1 – 228. After Round 3 topic announce will move to after PH 131. Forfeits occur at 33:01. Triples and Doubles will occur Saturday night. Hurry to lunch after Round 2 as Dining will be crowded. No smoking butts on ground. Reminder there is a training for Title IX at 8:20am in MMC 100 and MMC 200. The info will be presented in both rooms.

IV. Action Items - There are no action items.

V. New Business

A. Membership and Sexual Harassment/Violence Awareness & Prevention Training

1. Rationale - Participating in efforts to prevent sexual harassment and violence should be a primary concern for NPDA. Currently, we have a policy aimed at ensuring that protections and recourse exist in the event of an instance of sexual harassment. This addition to the bylaws couples that policy with an affirmative effort to prevent such incidents between and within member programs, as well as at the national tournament.

2. Current Bylaw versus Proposed Change

a. Current Bylaw

Membership Dues: Annual dues in the National Parliamentary Debate Association for the year September 1 to August 31 will be \$50 for regular membership, \$20 for affiliate membership (affiliate membership applies to schools that did not enter teams in any NPDA sanctioned or national competition during the previous year), and \$10 for individual membership.

b. Proposed Bylaw Change: Membership Dues & Requirements:

1. Annual dues in the National Parliamentary Debate Association for the year September 1 to August 31 will be \$50 for regular membership, \$20 for affiliate membership (affiliate membership applies to schools that did not enter teams in any NPDA sanctioned or national competition during the previous year), and \$10 for individual membership.

[ADDITION]

2. *Each regular member of the NPDA must also provide documentation annually verifying that students, coaches, and judges representing their institution/program have participated in sexual harassment/violence awareness and prevention training. Typically, universities and colleges make such training available through their campus Title IX office, or its equivalent. If this is the case, documentation submitted by members should include a letter from that office on their campus providing a brief description of the training provided. In the event such resources are not available to a particular member program, NPDA will furnish online training at no cost to the member program.*

In either case, documentation that such training has been completed shall be provided no later than September 30th of each competition season. In addition, all representatives of member programs must receive such training prior to being eligible for participation in the national tournament.

3. *Member programs that fail to complete the requirements outlined in Item B above will not be eligible to receive sanctioning for any tournaments they host, to receive season-long sweepstakes points, and/or to attend the national tournament until the requirements outlined in Item B are fulfilled.*

c. Discussion

Mike - To be a member school of organization, we are proposing the requirement that all schools have training in sexual violence and gender equity topics in order to compete at and NPDA sanctioned tournament. Title IX at your school probably already offers this training. NPDA/NPTE are working on being able to provide this training that can be completed online. With the change of bylaws, either will fulfill.

Dylan - How does this effect private schools? Is there a course equivalency that applies to private schools?

Mike - Two things are driving housing the training via NPDA/NPTE because some schools may not have a TITLE IX office or capacity to offer training. Second, it will allow programs that have students that enter the year late an easy opportunity to receive the training. The disadvantage to online is that we like on campus training because problems are just not at tournaments, sometimes they are inside ones' team. Having access to resources on campus helps us reach goal. We encourage campus trainings, but an alternative gives access as well.

Jeannie - Federal law says all campuses must have Title IX training access.

d. Voting

Rob - Moves to action item.

Kyle - Seconded.

Mike - Moved to action item. Voting will occur at NCA Fall meeting.

Question asked if we have quorum.

19 schools represented.

Voting moving to action item: Vote was 18 For.

One abstention.

e. Moved to Action Item - Discussion

Adam - How will this effect schools on quarter system?

Matt - First tournament of the year may be Sept 21st

Mike - Not a disadvantage to pick start date.

Geoffrey - Could we certify by Sept 30th? Would that be good enough?

Jason - Or a certain number of days after school starts?

Mike - It would be that no participation could occur at a NPDA tournament before training. If we wanted to change or adapt that, an amendment would have to be presented and voted on.

Shannon - In regards to the quarter system, we start mid - September.

Steve - What happens if we pick up a student during the year? Can we do training at national and then do afterward. There may be some push back.

Phil - I have concerns about not giving sanctioning to a tournament and then schools that competed do not get points.

They may not know that the host didn't meet the requirement.

Geoffrey - Nothing in this language doesn't say that we could not state that tomorrows' training provides certification for all

programs in attendance for the next year. Admin could provide training at nationals which is an opportunity to certify every program for the next year. Am I incorrect?

Mike – My hope is that every new class of students and returning students would receive the training.

Jason – So NPDA will be making training accessible online?

Mike – Yes. We are looking at how we can do that.

Jason - Doesn't that resolve what Steve is talking about.

Kyle– Some of this conversation is why I did abstain. I do think TITLE IX is good – but, moving full speed ahead could give us a problem with date of implementation and how to get training. I would be worried about training and private schools. I would be worried that private schools would not handle the topic of trans appropriately. NPDA would be good. It would be difficult to ask for it to be implemented by Sept 30th.

Phil – I would hope that if this is passed this might encourage that September tournaments provide a training to get all students and schools qualified.

Greg – Online training would be uniform and is most compelling. It also answers problem with scheduling. We would probably need to provide a caveat that if the training is not working by a certain time then Is that a possibility?

David – Uniformity is good but has to be hosted somewhere. If we go that route, we need a committee to find out how much it costs. We need someone to invest the time to research.

Dylan – Voting to implement without it being in place seems irresponsible.

Joe –This language actually requires NPDA to have the program in place before having a consequence to happen. If the training is not available, it would cause problems with the entire implementation of the clause itself.

Adam – How can we know if that is a valid interpretation?

Mike – A valid interpretation is that in the event you can't get Title IX on campus, there is a range of things we can make available to ask students to review. NPDA training could be come more robust as time goes on. We could put this in place and you as director could certify that you interacted with a PowerPoint as a team. Lot of options available. Right now we are talking about having the best rather than some sort of training documents that could then be built on.

Jeanie – We could do this progressively.

David – Is there a potential harm for a bad one? Is there a liability question for the body?

Geoffrey – I think it does. The decision that makes the most sense is that tomorrow's training applies to the Nationals for

2017. Between then and now you need to figure out what constitutes training. We could interpret the rule that the first year's training is here at NPDA. Only risk is that we are getting people trained.

Phil – A friend of mine is an online provider. He states you can set up a free course that takes a PowerPoint that makes it available, then they take a quiz. It keeps record of who take its. Company name - Udemy.

Jeannie – I'm all in favor of that option (training tomorrow qualifies). We are recommending people to come but not requiring it. We will not be able to take into account schools who don't come. We will still have to let other schools do this. Gives them a year to figure it out.

Kyle – The rule requires every competitor and persons. But we can't certify.

Joe – Some schools are only partially represented. Tomorrow's training is important. But still a training in a short amount of time on a morning of a national tournament when people are distracted will probably not be 100% effective. It doesn't replace the need for training.

Dylan – We have to consider freshman coming in.

Dena – Did we record Jeannie's training from NPTE?

Joe – No.

Darren – Could NPDA create a document where there is a requirement that the document be presented, read and agreed to by all members of squad? Until members get training the coach is held accountable. This solved the problem of schools getting it done before a date. Then programs get training as soon as they can. In fact federal financial aid allows schools to complete it very far into the semester. This allows the organization to take a stand but allow some grace in getting it completed.

Joe – A question. If that document is created, I am not sure that it can't be in an Udemy format. We could make that document a part of online training.

Darren – My point is this could be done tomorrow.

Joe – Documents could be online.

Mike – At end of day we certainly can't be the first group advocating that Title IX training is needed. There is probably content available and resources that we can translate to our context. If the only thing is that the training won't suit our goals, that doesn't seem appropriate. I am not convinced we can't do it before competitive season starts.

Kyle – The requirement of Title IX training became my policy two years ago. But, it raises question that trainings are of

differential qualities. I have seen Utah's and my institutions. Overall, I have been disappointed in the overarching experience.

Greg – I agree with interpretation that training comes from NPDA if not provided by the school. If we vote it in, we got to have it done. If not, it is invalidated.

f. Voting

Kyle – Question Called

Rob – Called.

Mike – We are voting to make amendment to bylaws. Executive Committee must insure it is available. If not, it invalidates the rule until it happens. This also requires member schools to fulfill training.

Final Vote Total: 20 votes Yes. One vote per school.

No votes: 0

No abstentions.

Motion Passes

Mike - Thank you for the conversation. If you are interested in participating in the committee, let us know. Talk to other folks that are not here. We want it to be reflective of what is needed.

B. Season Sweepstakes Awards

1. Rationale - NPDA currently offers only “guidelines” about divisions of competition for regular season tournaments. This creates substantial ambiguity in terms of what qualifies or disqualifies a team from participating in a novice and/or junior division at any given tournament. As a consequence, programs have a competitive incentive to stretch the eligibility of their competitive teams at various divisions below open to achieve higher season long rankings. This practice both undermines the pedagogical value of novice and junior divisions and damages the integrity of the season-long ranking system used by NPDA. The proposed change creates a competitive disincentive for maintaining teams at a lower division beyond the period of time when their learning can best be supported in that environment. Additionally, a competitive disincentive is a more reasonable method of addressing this issue than changing divisional “guidelines” into “requirements,” which would create an extraordinary burden for the Executive Secretary who would be charged with determining the divisional eligibility of hundreds of teams.

2. Current Bylaw (III.B.1-2) versus Proposed Bylaw (III.B.1-2):

A. Current Bylaw

1. Points will be accumulated for sweepstakes according to the following formula:

1. Teams will receive a preliminary round point total equal to the decimal percentage of preliminary rounds won, multiplied by five. Preliminary round point totals will be calculated to two decimal points. Teams will accrue two points for a win for the all elimination rounds that meet NPDA sweepstakes specifications.

2. Each of the four teams for which a school receives credit toward season long sweepstakes at a sanctioned tournament will receive at least one point, even if they win no debates at all.

B. Proposed Bylaw Change (III.B.1-2):

1. Points will be accumulated for sweepstakes according to the following formula:

1. Teams will receive a preliminary round point total equal to the decimal percentage of preliminary rounds won, multiplied by five. Preliminary round point totals will be calculated to two decimal points. Teams will accrue two points for a win for the all elimination rounds that meet NPDA sweepstakes specifications.

Once these points are calculated, the following multiplier will be applied based on the division of competition in which each team participated:

Novice = .50, Junior = .75, Open = 1.0.

2. Regardless of division, each of the four teams for which a school receives credit toward season long sweepstakes at a sanctioned tournament will receive at least one point, even if they win no debates at all.

3. Discussion

Mike – This addresses a phenomena currently occurring in debate in regard to the ways in which entries occur over season. We have guidelines for divisions that are not binding. They are suggestions. Even so, it is a significant burden for in Exec Sec to validate the competition experience of every person. It is prefatory divisions. Our problem seems to be that schools use the suggestions to advance competitive aspirations. The proposal is about applying qualifiers. Currently, we are only having discussion. It would move to an Action Item in November.

Neeson – I would request that tonight we don't make it an action item. We would be bypassing all the junior colleges not in the room at the moment.

Phil – In response, they will they be at NCA.

Jeannie – Community college attendance at NCA is very high.

Phil – I would hope that when voted on there is representation.

Neeson – That would give them time to respond.

Shannon – I am concerned that Junior Colleges don't have money to go to NCA. If we have a proxy option that would be cool. If member - can submit proxy vote.

Mike – The agenda is posted 30 days beforehand. Schools would have time to identify their proxy. You don't have to be there. Only need to be a member.

Brent – Question for Mt. Hood – What's your perspective?

Shannon - I hate it.

Jeannie – There are 13 colleges community here at tournament. There are 75 usually at NCA community college meeting. If I know we are voting, I can take proxy votes as well.

Storey – I believe that clear standards on how to define divisions would be a better move.

Darren – What is the process for providing a counter proposal?

Mike – Submit business item for next agenda.

Darren – I wrote this for CEDA as it was a problem there. There is a clearly delineated standard now for divisions. Also, there are separate awards for divisions. But a school could still win a national championship with lots of novices. I would write counter proposal. I have seen this happen before. I am uncomfortable communicating novice or JV as lesser. Most of the participation in JV and Novice divisions are minorities and women. This could send message that their competition is not worth it.

Mike – My concern is that there is a competitive incentive to create a bad experience for younger divisions. Schools seem to hold students in a division longer than needed. Some programs seem to have the goal of picking up points rather than competition or education experience. This then negates the value of Novice and JV accomplishment. This may not be best way but how do we achieve solving the problem?

Darren – We can eliminate the problem if we don't allow the participation beyond appropriate level.

Phil – If we give the same size trophy, coaching and love we are not directly devaluing their participation. If the goal of moving up students in division is accomplished, we are providing better access and better learning We can talk about the reason it is bad, but there are pedagogical reasons.

Jeannie – I disagree. We don't give same love, coaching and attention to novice students. That's wrong. Yes, students get crushed by a team but usually by a judge. Pedagogically, you don't get better unless you debate better teams.

Neeson – I think we can solve the problem with hard definitions. I would love to see a JV only or Open only national award. Giving out more trophies is not a negative.

Joe – I think Bill is right. There are two problems that have been in conflict for some time here. Some regions provide access to junior and novice divisions and others don't. This has created inequality. Second, there are different pedagogies. Some programs want to put students in Open as soon as possible. We try to find a balance right now between pedagogies. Maybe we should have different awards that value different regions and different pedagogies.

Matt – Better definitions of novice is good. Open is not what it used to be. We should find ways to develop mechanics we want them to have for open.

Steve – Question about different awards. Would there be four sweepstakes divisions? At some point all that bifurcation means winning national champion is different.

Darren – I think we are philosophically on same page. With half points but lots of good novice teams will still provide points to win. CEDA had novices but there was still winning lots of trophies. Are the stringent definitions where we need to go? I just can't tell novice woman that she is only worth half the points.

Romanelli – At CEDA there was a cap on trophies. There were not half points given to anyone. But, if someone won quite a bit, then they move up.

Greg - What happens if we are at a tournament and divisions collapse? This is a student question. Another student has commented that in wrestling we have different weight class champions. It is not that difficult to explain.

Rob – It just seems like the season sweeps is terrible across the board. It seems not to only establish lots of work for the Exec Secretary, but provides the pedagogical incentive to game the system. I get trophies are good for admin. But, the current method seems to be bad for students and bad for organization.

Dan – We already exclude religious institutions and exclude smaller tournaments by not counting points already. We already have a ton of tournaments where points are not counted by organization. The system is already flawed. Let's keep proposal that keeps the most schools involved. Right now we shouldn't do the proposal. Err on side of counting points.

Neeson – Every seven years, we do this proposal. Last time it was addressed was '05 . Everyone got mad, and we came back to the current rules.

4. Voting

Phil - Motion to close discussion

Seconded

Mike – It will move to action item in November. Can be amended or replaced with alternative proposal. Are there any items from floor?

VI. Motion to adjourn

Attendance:

1. Dylan Brugman	Abilene Christian University
2. Dan Schabot	Tarrant County College – NE
3. Kristy McManus	Western Wyoming Community College
4. Shannon Valdivia	Mt Hood Community College
5. Phil Sharp	University of Nevada – Reno
6. Storey Clayton	Tulane
7. Tim DeCutis	Tulane
8. Rob Layne	University of Utah
9. Greg Thomas	NWC
10. Jason Jordan	University of Utah
11. Darren Elliott	KCKCC
12. Adam Testerman	Texas Tech
13. Nicholas Russell	CSU, Long Beach
14. Bill Neeson	Irvine Valley College
15. Konrad Hack	Concordia Irvine
16. Geoffrey BrodakSilva	Cal State LA
17. Kyle Cheesewright	Idaho
18. Joe Gantt	Lewis Clark
19. Mat Swanson	SMC