

NCA--NOVEMBER 2016, NPDA BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

LIST OF PROXIES:

College of Idaho—Mike Middleton (as per Kyle Cheesewright)

IVC—Darren Elliott (as per Bill Neesen)

Loyola—Darren Elliott (as per Dave Romanelli)

Carroll College—Phil Sharp (as per Brent Northup)

PLNU—Darren Elliott (as per Skip Rutledge)

El Camino College—Darren Elliott (as per Francesca Bishop)

Western Washington—Darren Elliott (as per Steve Woods)

AGENDA:

- I. Call to Order at 12:03pm by Mike Middleton
- II. Approval of Minutes moved by Rob Layne Seconded by Greg Thomas—unanimous approval
- III. REPORTS
 - A. President—Mike Middleton: Jeannie and I have worked on backup Title IX training. Best way to accomplish that is on your own campus to connect with local resources. Over the summer we finished the last major revision of website. Moved to paypal for online commerce. This will decrease fees for the organization
 - B. VP—Jeannie Hunt: Site calls will go out in January. Would love to talk about you before that. Would love to have a site prior to Nationals this year. Colorado Springs this year. Elections this year the VP is up for election. We have 2 nominees so far. Dec 1st nominations close then a ballot goes out. Currently David Worth and Kathryn Starkey. Title IX Training we made a free online training. Worked hard to have it put up online. Received input from many people. At least 32 schools have complied with onsite training. Over 300 have done online training.
 - C. Treasurer—Brent Northup: Cash on hand dropped \$4,000.00 for legal fees and insurance and still fighting a reception charge at the hotel and an unusual comp room formula they used (\$888.00 it cost us). Good sized tournament so it turned out ok. Phil picked up boxes from Brent in Montana. Setting up paypal and bank accounts to transfer to Phil. Thank you for 20 years as Treasurer. Enjoyed it and will remain loyal to the NPDA. Phil—Brent has been wonderful in the transition and will continue to be there as I have questions. Good mentorship. Rob Layne-question about the overage on the reception. Brent—this is unusual. Included their gratuity when it should have been rolled in.

- D. Executive Secretary-Darren: Learning the points system for NPDA. Recommended further discussion about centralized tournament website (similar to tabroom.com) to make it easier to track down tournaments and automate point calculation. Would also help to serve as a place to track participation trends. Input from Brent Northup and Steve Woods provided.
- E. Tournament Director: Dave Worth. Met with Julian and Sarah. Looking forward to returning to Colorado College next year. Armstrong is a good central building to be headquartered out of. Prep will probably be 25 minutes. Dining hall access for food hopefully. Should be enough judging. Will have them test wifi. Konrad Hack will tab and use e-ballots again. Working on timing issues to make sure it is fair for both sides. Simplifying the invite. Mike—added a judge check in button like on tabroom. Dave—new invite will offer an encouragement for judges to be in their round.
- F. Student Reps—Dallas Phillips and Arielle Stephenson: Four issues to discuss.
 - 1. University/Community College Divide—Social discrepancy between how teams are viewed. Maybe a welcome letter in an email about how to register for tournaments and various facebook pages and net benefits. End of the year report/semester data for participation among novices and community college teams specifically. Important for all teams to receive this. Student reps could compile it. Important to share the data. Useful for schools who are fighting their administration. Better advertisement for things like the pre-national tournament (the tournament hosted at the host location prior to nationals). Judges sometimes are not as nice to novices as they could be. Clarify to judges in tournament invites how to deal with different skill sets.
 - 2. Social Media—Great platform for competitors and directors and we want to ensure everyone has access to information posted online. Some schools do not even know Net Benefits existed. Create an email chain for students and a student opt-in similar to the executive council email change. Not a lot of students are on facebook anymore. (Rob—what info might be applied to this? Arielle-students should get to opt in to tournament info, NPDA rules and changes are not known as well. Phil-I have been interacting with tabroom.com and each student can enter their email and phone # and can get all tournament info sent that way. Arielle—text is very helpful as well. Derek—multiple platforms of info is smart. Encourage students to sign up for Parli-L. Steve—Many schools do multiple forms of events, so maybe the IE-L as well, and get a list of all of those for students). Facebook group for just tournament updates. People post in both groups and it can get lost in the 100's of other posts on the page.
 - 3. Sexual Assault Prevention—Separate from the current training. Considering having 1 or 2 student officers or Ombuds in addition to the Sexual Harrassment Officer. If a student does not want it to go farther who would they talk to. Dan—Sexual Assault Advocate may be the term you are looking for. They can help guide them through the process. Arielle—I would feel safer overall reporting to a peer on my level initially. Steve—We might consider if we do this an official form of training, and it

would have to be sanctioned by the Executive Council. Also does the member institution recognize this person as qualified and are they in any way legally responsible. Mike—The other thing happening at other invitationals are the local Title IX reps are being made to be on call during the tournament. Dallas—Does the Title IX coordinator show up at the beginning meeting to see who they are. Mike—Due to financial constraints we are retiring the Irish Debate and using that time for more training and Q and A session during that time. Arielle—Is it going to be mandatory? Mike—It will be highly encouraged. Some people may not make it based on travel schedule to Colorado but the night before means it is not rushed. Derek—Important point to have someone who is not a mandatory reporter. Arielle—What things do we need to answer if we were going to try this this year? Rob—Since it is a student position, what happens if that student gets pulled away to be the student advocate? Maybe a person who is a student but not competing. Along with what Steve was talking about with training, maybe it is more unofficial and advertised by students and not the organization specifically. Arielle—If it is student run and not officially sanctioned by anyone and designate someone who could be your advocate. Phil—For me the difference between sanctioned and not sanctioned is if you organically organize this model and properly advertise is and receive training and are not obligated in any other way to the tournament and is not prepping and not coaching. Arielle—if not affiliated with tournament will be hard to get them to fly there. Derek—Maybe have the host school be responsible for providing someone. Arielle—If they are not known or tied to the community not sure how that would work. Arielle—If you are in round as the student advocate you would wait until there was an available time. Steve—Derek’s commentary about sanctioning tournaments it would have to be official. If it is unofficial is good to have students there but if it works itself up to the Tournament Director that person would need to know immediately what is going on if it will impact someone’s participation in the National Tournament. Mike—If the Exec Council endorses someone they take on the liability for any action they take. Do you want decisive action to be able to be taken by the tournament or more freedom in responding? Jeannie—Liability goes beyond the tournament. If a student comes from a school then that school needs to take on their liability. Also what happens to that student if they spend all day dealing with an intense issue? What happens to a student when the individuals involved are both friends or from schools you have good relationships with? There should be someone available to talk to but we need to discuss the emotional and legal challenges. Steve—Given the CC and University divide you mentioned, you may want to have 1 from each for representation. Phil—Think about ways to gather funding for the person who is coming. Also, when advertising it there are consequences of private groups that people who are not “in the know” won’t get the information. Arielle—we envision this as advertised as possible. To move forward we would need to decide if we should make it official or unofficial, then after that not sure the next step. Mike—If official it is a long

conversation we need to have. If unofficial think consciousness raising as a model. What it looks like and how it is organized can be left up to that direction. Dallas—my concern about an unofficial representative how do we make sure the community has a say in it and it is not a popularity contest? Dan—Going back to Steve’s comments colleges and universities already have student peers trained and could be a part of the framework. Jeannie—I don’t think you can get away from the popularity contest unfortunately.

4. Student Run Teams—We do not know the finances behind most tournaments but there is concern from student run teams about a model for financial ability for students to attend tournaments. Some teams cannot attend with as many students. Mike—In the Spring we should consider maybe the Irish fee could be changed to an opt-in fee, that is a discounted fee. I have seen a lot of generosity among tournament directors. Darren—I helped write the CEDA amendment on new and emerging programs. We could do that here as well. New and Emerging get entry fees waived and half price at invitationals. If we have extra judges or hotel space we will share it. Others will as well. But do people know that? Include that as part of your email and outreach efforts. Phil—I will look into seeing about an app for extra judging for tournaments. Steve—Opt in option for people is good. Rob—At Portland State Nationals we passed a rebate for student run teams. I know that existed. Maybe a sub committee on a resource book would be helpful to get all of this information put in one place. Phil—I am wondering if this requires any action on the part of the membership but can we enter on the invoice a checkbox to donate extra judging, and a checkbox to indicate we are a new and emerging program? Mike—I think that is easy enough to do.
- G. Dan—We have a journal. Will have another one soon. I have 1 article in the que, so I need your good work for the Spring Journal.

IV. Action Items

- A. Season Sweepstakes Award—Arielle asked for proxy vote desires. Read by Darren. Arielle—At many colleges Novice and 1st years are considered the same and you may not be able to go to NPDA until later. Winning things like sweepstakes awards means we could say we do well. I also think it will decrease participation in the activity and women make up a majority of participants and saying their wins only count as half is a problem. Dallas—Changing the makeup for Juniors is problematic and lack of clarification as to who applies to what they will just flood junior potentially. Phil—Anyone want to speak in favor of the amendment? Steve—I don’t want to speak in favor but I want to speak about the problem which is sandbagging. Phil—We leave it up to the guidelines in the bylaws so it is tournament by tournament. Sometimes two year schools do not want universities to win junior. Darren—I authored various versions of the amendment for CEDA and firm definitions helped there.

Joe—One problem with firm definitions is multiple organizations have different rules for what a junior or novice is. PSCFA and NCFA and others have made us hesitate to have this absolute definitions as a problem.

Darren—CEDA ran into this with ADA but for CEDA sweeps only counted teams meeting the CEDA definition.

Arielle—So the problem is one might say you can be a novice forever and another doesn't allow that?

Joe—Needs to be highly advertised.

Jeannie—Who is going to monitor this? Who will enforce it?

Rob—One thing that comes to this discussion is that as long as tournament notes divergences from NPDA rules then we make that ok if a part of the invite. You would have to set a new standard for what counts or not counts.

Dallas—To address enforcement, if there are already these discussions and complaints and qualifications for certain teams are already happening, standards will allow for natural self enforcement.

Arielle—Teams would self police I think.

Steve—NCFA has a stricter definition than National guidelines

Rob—Calls the question. Motion to call the question passes

Mike roll call vote on the Action Item to change the points formula—

NWC—No

Central Wyoming—No (proxy with Jeannie)

Nevada—No

Carroll—No (proxy with Phil)

W. Washington—No (proxy with Darren)

U of P—No

SIU—No

Utah—No

Rice—Yes (proxy with Mike and Jeannie)

Lewis and Clark—No

W. Wyoming—No

KCKCC—No

PLNU—No (proxy with Darren)

El Camino—No (proxy with Darren)

Loyola—No (proxy with Darren)

Irvine Valley College—No (proxy with Darren)

All proxies are No votes

15 No, 1 Yes, 1 Abstention (Puget Sound)—FAILS

V. Discussion Items

- A. Sexual Harrassment and Violence Policy Changes and change to TOP
Mike introduces and explains.

Move to Action Item by Jason and seconded by Bob

NWC—Yes

Nevada—Yes

U of P—Yes

SIU—Yes

Utah—Yes

W. Wy—Yes

L and C—Yes

KCKCC—Yes

3 abstentions not present

Carroll, Puget Sound, Rice

Discussion—

Steve—If a person no longer affiliated leaves a program and goes with some other program, who is responsible for that person?

Jeannie—The new school would be.

Steve—Concern about FERPA rights and waiving them and has the organization looked at the legal liability?

Jeannie—If we allow a student to compete who has an open investigation against them that is also a liability.

Steve—If it is reported but the home institution says they can still compete until the investigation is completed, doesn't NPDA still have that liability?

Jason—Already requiring people to violate FERPA rights to release they are in good standing. We already do this to make people compete and why are we discussing this when it might prevent them from going to tournaments. If my student is accused of sexual violence, the question of traveling that student during the investigation should not come at the expense of safety. I am not convinced there is not a benevolent DOF that they could not do that and it still be punitive.

Arielle—Can we clarify questions as to students accused or the accuser.

When does the policy go into effect? Mike—If passed today we could say it goes into effect Dec. 1st.

Steve—The question of a legal situation is important, and this comes from our Title IX Director. It is ok to file an informal complaint? We can create a record of documentation this way and here is a long set of informal situations to pass on to other institutions, then if a formal complaint is filed NPDA can say here is the information we have.

Jeannie—At what level is it informal vs no tangible issue related to? Does a vague facebook post count?

Steve—On our campus, create documentation when informal issues arrive. When our competitors do not feel comfortable about a judge it may not rise to a Title IX issue but maybe we could email a TD about it. Maybe amend the document to compel members to do those sorts of things and send us informal documentation.

Arielle—Should encourage students to do that as well.

Mike—In the document and on the training an official complaint form is specific. If you want to file an informal complaint but not seeking immediate relief you could amend this to move D. to an E. and create a new D. to say informal complaints can be emailed to a member of the EC.

Joe—The reason we chose to have a mandatory reporter is for legal reasons so if it gets reported to an officer it would be reported.

Jeannie—I think Steve is talking about things that may be uncomfortable but do not rise to a level of persistent, pervasive, or severe.

Steve—A judge might comment on someone's outfit for example.

Jeannie—Perm would be to include informal unless rises to a level of mandatorily reportable.

Greg—If there is an informal complaint against you, would you be notified?

Jeannie/Phil—No.

Phil—Instead of informal reporting language may be title D. as documenting instances of concern.

Mike—How much trust do you want to place in the people on the EC. Could say there is an amendment for an informal reporting mechanism, pending legal review.

Darren—Are we making it clear to a student especially if they come to a member of the EC it would be mandatorily reported?

Joe/Jeannie—The legal wording is before you tell me anything you need to know I am a mandatory reporter.

Arielle—We need to publicize this and have a simple version explaining the process clearly.

Dallas—It may cause them to accidentally report when they didn't want to.

Mike—A lot of that is in the training. We can also put slides out and make sure people know that they retain agency over the situation.

Arielle—Need a list of people you could report to, not even names, but positions in the community, a friend, another coach, a judge you like, etc. Would also be useful to publicize here is what happens to the accused in the process (Dallas—and what their rights are as well).

Rob/Steve amendment—Move D to E and create new D—reporting instances of concerns. (emailed and read by Darren)

Joe—In the amendment change it to harassment or violence to be consistent with the documentation.

Steve—Clarify legal to look at it.

Rob—Language came right out of section A including harassment and sexual discrimination.

Joe—Needs to include harassment and violence removing the word "sexual" from all 3 things.

Jeannie—Do you need little a and b. Seems they are the same.

Arielle—For the sake of specificity they should disclose before the discussion.

Phil—Cannot disclose if someone sends me an email.

Steve—The disclosure part is in little c. If someone sends you an email it is existent in the document.

Rob—Do we need an amendment to remove the term “sexual” from the language?

Steve—I move to strike the word “sexual” from the part of the amendment. Rob seconds. Unanimous approval.

Joe—Previous question and Rob seconded. Unanimous.

Mike—Now voting on the motion as amended. Unanimous approval of those in the room (moved to an action item so no proxy votes were tallied).

Arielle—This will get updated on the website? And does it get emailed to people?

Mike—It will take 24-48 hours to do the legal review. Once that happens there will be a message from me and Darren saying new policy in effect.

Arielle—We are free to post that anywhere then?

Mike—Yes. We post on Net Benefits, and the Parli-L, and the website. Disseminate as much as you would like.

NEW BUSINESS

Rob—Move to create a committee concerned to collecting resources for new teams.

Steve—seconded.

Mike—I will serve.

Arielle—Dallas and I will both serve. Do we want to open it up to people on student run teams?

Mike—Does not require anything, I can appoint committees on my own. Committee will begin getting formed.

Phil—3 things I noted today.

1. We come away with a lot of ideas but then no legislation gets created. Proposal about new and emerging programs regarding fees for NPDA Nationals.
2. Redefining divisions to address concerns in points discussion today.
3. Creating a new category for a season award. (Arielle—please clarify. Phil—season long sweepstakes awards). Rob—sounds similar to something at the last business meeting Darren talked about, Novice, Open, Season Long, etc.

Rob—how much are sweeps trophies? Phil--\$75 for plaques, about 200-300 for the sail awards. Always our philosophy those awards deserve that quality. Steve—I will work to help on the language. We should try and eliminate redundancy. Mike—a new way of calculating points doesn't resolve the ruining part of educational pedagogy. Steve—Going back to part #2 I would like to create a committee for defining divisions. Darren—Mike can appoint. Mike—Appointing Steve, Phil, Rob, Jason, Chief. Will send out email chain making this happen.

Darren—How long since a trophy bid went out? Discussion.

Darren—We have a list of standing committees, is there a plan for those committees to be active?

Mike—Many of those committees have been folded into the job of other EC members. Rob is looking at By Laws to create a more tournament focused one and one that is external.

Darren—Recruitment and Retention is important. Data collection and assessment projects are important. Students talking about data collection is important. As of today 88 schools have competed in and earned NPDA points. Contrast that to NDT/CEDA as of today 60 schools have competed and earned points there. With the growth of NFA LD, and BP, bifurcation will continue. Now is a time to work on recruitment and retention.

Arielle—Surveying students about the importance of debate to students and their success.

Phil—Looking at a committee of individuals to support scholarship. Those who have navigated the research and publishing projects. Annual NPDA presentation of undergrads and faculty presenting research and publishing.

Arielle—Important to have that opportunity.

Bob—There is not a lot of depth right now in forensics research, we need some real research to present.

Jeannie—Even though NPDA does not have slots, Argumentation and Forensics gets slots, and we could overlap.

Bob—Working on a project to contact alumni of programs who have been out at least 10 years and interview to see how they've used forensics in their life. I may email people around this table and put out a general call.

Arielle—Data should not be just about comm students but people like Dallas and I are in other fields.

Bob—Looking for people in other fields to see how forensics experience applies.

Motion to adjourn—Rob

Seconded—Steve

Unanimous