

## 2008 NCA Business Meeting - NPDA

Officers present:

Kevin Minch - President (KM),  
Renea Gernant - Vice President (RG),  
Brent Northup - Treasurer (BN),  
Danny Cantrell- Executive Secretary (DC),  
Josh Seefried - National Student Rep (JS).

**Meeting called to order 8:11am KM**

**Approve minutes: MSP**

**Reports:**

KM, RG - none,  
BN: -> Marty w/ finance,  
DC: first set of results up

**Committees**

Nomination:

VP: Marty Birkholt (Creighton), Marlin Bates (UoP)  
Mention "last date" in post for election email

KM: discussion of business meeting procedures

**Discussion Items**

**A) Eliminate Season Sweepstakes**

Michael Dreher:

- 1) Spring 2008, proposal ruled out of order
- 2) Just a clean up and down irrespective of divisions, other issues

Seconded, John Meany

*Discussion:*

Skip Rutledge: what's support for the motion?

Michael Dreher: Regional bias, regions without JV/Novice so those with divisions = additional opportunities for points

Glenn Prince: Taking away anything a school can point to that points to a school's success in this environment is a bad idea. Schools can use it for PR leveraging tool.

John Meany: To describe basis of season sweepstakes as a rubric = no methodological foundation, shouldn't be doing things before we examine them for meaningful consequences. PR advantage for only 10% of the schools that participate

Chris Joffrion: economy constraining budgets = current method = benefit only schools with big budgets or in regions that benefit.

Glenn Prince: USC = 6 kids, find ways to compare. Don't think Deans will ask for econometrics of methodology

KM: increase number of bankrupt awards? Happy to sell debate indulgences for price

Gina Lane: 1) not reliable, not useful b/c not updated enough. 2) renders sanctioning moot

Gary Rybold: sure, have more trophies. Done any questions for what students want?

DC:

1) trophies different from awards - at UCSD we said we went from 103 -> 60 and admin happy

2) controlling done to increase validity of season sweeps to compare reasonably like tournaments, didn't make sense to me that season sweepstakes would

Skip Rutledge: 1) regions could put an effort into novice and junior which make stronger healthier senior divisions. 2) absent some effort that says nov/jr equally valid - our league becomes a 'top team' league rather than saying a full squad helpful. More learning happens at the lower divisions.

JS: helps teams grow and focus on novices

Marty Birkholt: don't define novice/jr. Finite number of awards and without definitions.

Michael Dreher - **move to extend 3 minutes, without dissent**

Rolland Petrello: removing seasons sweepstakes radical whereas minor changes could address problems. Seasons sweeps different measure of success that is of value to team

KM: moving forward to debate at spring meeting

**B) Proposal to change the TOP regarding paper**

Kasey Gardner: reorder D in front due to traffic concerns with respect to Marlin Bates (submitter)

**Move to Item D: Clarify sanctioning**

## **D) Sanctioning**

DC: reason for the policy = to undue the idea that controversy areas allowed

Seconded, BN

Rolland Petrello: what is affiliate member?

DC: reason for policy = make the same and encourage the extemporaneous nature of the debate.

Glenn Prince: topic areas worst middle ground - either no topic areas or release the resolution.

With competitive equity make basis for current events / broad or just release the resolutions

Bill Neesen: controversy areas = give actor and direction. Try new things and still be sanctioned

Gina Lane: drew to organization embracing experimentation. People know before going to tournament what rules will be - let programs with regions

Kevin Garner: people saying losing educational opportunities - controversy areas allow for greater education

Aaron Donaldson: research poorly worded topic areas, still read a lot about health care, extemporaneous debating important but don't see extemporaneous topics

Gary Rybold: novices - have to guess generically broad area - you don't know anything about 'this' and I'm doing all the prepping. Question about breadth and depth - focus on everything so no focus whatsoever. Ask students what they like?

Marty Birkholt: varsity debaters preferred without topics. NPDA shouldn't say what regional tournaments do - don't want EXS have to enforce what students are, etc... We do need playing field level if we have seasons sweepstakes

JS: topic areas forcing out of the activity, we don't have the time to do so much research

Chris Joffrion: 1) intent = reg. season consistent with NPDA then policy doesn't go far enough, 2) this policy sets up slipperly slope, each year keep expanding

Brian Danielson: market will solve - all have choices where we go, options out there

Joe Allen: participation and inclusive, tournaments = research intensive, exclusionary to say don't go to these tournaments. - market solves

Michael Dreher: Move to extend by 10 minutes

Katherine Preston: Josh S. not representing students, topic areas improve quality of rounds

Last year at NPTE the problem was too many topic areas that were not specific enough

Kevin Garner: w/o topic areas the research do

Steve Woods: 20-30 debaters, most recruit from classes - novices ask what are the topic areas.

This goes ideological towards an activity that "anyone will win." No topic areas privileges big schools. Tough school not reason... NPDA tournament dictate own philosophy but not rest of season. Smart teams/students will win. Even with topic areas still have nothing to say. Novices like topic areas

Michael Dreher: careful with generalizations. Many students IE students first and debate second.

Demography - college getting more expensive, working more hours to afford college, maintain participation do so in a way that allows for realistic time demands

Glenn Prince: handful of people on n-b don't represent the will or consensus of organization

JS: lots of students did contact me and support. Not better debate more specific debate. W/ more specific topics if I don't do research = can't compete at all. Should be able to read the news and debate I parli

John Meany: market is speaking that NPDA is neutral or negative - substantial growth for impromptu arg. Forms in BP/APDA - sig. growth. Absence of divisions in those formats. May be the case that extemporaneous that involve research have benefit - instruction in policy debating the learning outcomes neutral or negative.

**Move to extend 10 minutes**

Lisa Ashby: 1) philosophy taken out. Important change b/c we are debating what is the philosophy of NPDA? Research based form of debate? Liberally educated ppl doing argumentation? Or something in the middle. 2) competition basis, sanctioning in order to get points, if don't believe in season sweepstakes shouldn't be concerned - this is linked together 3) can you have a debate without research? 4) practicality of enforcement

Jeannie Hunt: market doesn't work all regions - some have trouble

Katherine Preston: do know a lot of people in NPDA and vast majority of people interact support option to allow topic areas. Promote more evidentiary style of debate - any more type of increasing education should be allowed.

Gina Lane: debate -> topic areas. In status quo topic areas being sanctioned, controversy areas sanctioned or not? Nothing clear in constitution what is allowed or not? This is best to allow for experimentation. What the organization has always been about.

Aaron Donaldson: Gina and Katherine right - people define participation differently - include people to participate

Joe Gantt: modeling of npda championship tournament - invitational different focus - experimentation through different ideas.

BN: Jim worked hard b/c saw divide and need for bridge.

Time expired - arguments known

**Move to make it an action item** (requires 2/3 vote)

**Moved, Seconded** -

Fails to move to action item 20 votes in favor, needed 22

**ITEM A FAILS TO MOVE TO AN ACTION ITEM. WILL BE TAKEN UP AT SPRING MEETING AS ACTION ITEM PURSUANT TO REGULAR NPDA BUSINESS MEETING PROCEDURES.**

(Move back to Item B)

## **B) Tournament Paper**

Marlin Bates: its about access and equality, people who write large, X amounts of paper, the implementation is the biggest problem,

### **Seconded.**

Glenn Prince: changing size of paper will matter - people will cheat

Aaron Donaldson: rate of delivery, jargon, change activity won't change - make it more confusing and harder for TD

JS: coaches and judges are not enforcing - had to debate that in a round. If Judges not enforcing, why should students have to decide

KM: committee did nothing on this, so exec council brought it up

Jeannine Hunt: Went to USAFA - didn't work, no paper left, didn't like color of paper

ML: taking a hatchet when scalpel would be better - violation of ADA regulations.

Kristine Clancy: ADA violation

DC: of course make ADA accommodations like everything else we do

BN: make more problems for the national tournament

John Meany: many outreach programs, more than 100 tournaments that use colored paper,

MSPDP exclusively for special ed and participate successfully

Melissa Franke: why be ADA exception to use bigger paper to use bigger paper - terrible hand writing, post-it notes

Marlin: anyone in support?

Derek Beuscher: people circumventing the changing resolutions, nature of debate. Perhaps more caveats Question about cheating = lose unique aspect of parliamentary debate

Brian Danielson: big waste of paper - people have it memorized anyway - this won't solve

Chris Wells: create culture of honesty - this encourage cheating to continue, find another way

Kevin: will it be placed on tournament host

Skip Rutledge: already taken care of problem that we are looking at this. Will slow tournaments down further

Rolland Petrello: whack-a-mole, doesn't accomplish what intended

Joe Gantt: no true npda test

Michael Dreher: put this in invite.

### **Move to action item- second.**

**PASSED unanimously**

### **Reset clock - move to vote, second.**

**Final Vote: unanimous**

**ITEM B PASSES - tournament paper is revoked**

### **C) Constraints policy**

Marlin Bates: other situations for legitimate constraints. If situation can be addressed by body. If eliminate gaming system, people gaming won't line up to argue with TD.

#### **Second.**

Bill Neesen: no sex harassment exception, allow these changes

Steve Woods: not referendum on action taken / objection to personality. Cool President took action.

KM: glad it got people to care again - people listening

JS: Discussion with TD then OK with this.

Rolland Petrello: great many more reasons why judge should not judge teams, legal issues

Chris Joffrion: problem with rubber stamping - allow for impartiality - what does and does not representing legitimate constraint.

JS: Judges still can constraint themselves against teams

Marty Birkholt: Joe rubberstamping then we should look for another TD

#### **Amendment: add "both by the Tournament Director and Ombudsperson"**

DC: against it b/c ombudsperson now involved in every decision

Glenn Prince: good idea b/c ombuds

Michael Dreher: what if I don't like Joe - this gives me someone else to go to have case heard

Rolland Petrello: 1) call of TD, 2) ombuds there in case of appeal, 3) ombuds = no one unbiased that if team complains.

KM: National Tournament Committee - next step

Marty Birkholt: 1) not grammar, 2) 2 people so if disagree = split

Chris Wells - El Camino: good idea to keep it split

Chris Joffrion: other team unfair

Joe Gantt: allows teams to go for cherry picking

Jeannine Hunt: should go to TD -> Ombuds -> Next level

Lisa Ashby: take ombudsperson out 2) change the "TD" to "team"

#### **Question called - amendment rejected**

#### **Rolland Petrello - strike "or ombudsperson" and "justified by the team"**

Chris Joffrion: no mechanism to protect the other team.

Kristine Clancy: already in place - not harming the problem

Joe Gantt: approve all cases, person appointed TD would not just approve all constraints

Marty Birkholt: not a problem

David Wells: one scenario: judge not having to disclose the reason 2) plenty of judges

**Skip Rutledge: call the question** - second, move to vote on amend

#### **Amendment passes**

Michael Dreher: should be a check on the system

Chris Joffrion: some check on approved constraints

Marlin Bates: Joe looks at constraints and doesn't know why 2) situation to bring 20 constraints to Joe and don't see world that happens

Rolland Petrello: 1) if got 20 constraints = bigger issues, 2) to require them to be judged = problematic

**Move to close debate - approved**

**Move to make action item - second, PASSED**

**Question called - second -**

**ITEM C PASSES: constraints clarified.**

**FINAL WORDING:**

**3. No team will be judged by someone associated with either member of the team or the team's school for the past four years. All teams and judges registered for the tournament should note such conflicts on their entry. At registration, judges will be provided a team list to return to the tab staff marked with any teams they feel they should be constrained against. Any constraints entered by a team in effect for the tournament will need to be justified and accepted by the Tournament Director based on the following categories: former coaches, former team members, romantic relationships, or other cases as approved on a case-by-case basis justified by the team to the Tournament Director.**

## **E) Membership**

DC: clarify when a school is a member.

Second

Michael Dreher: amendment, language

**Add “until the national championship tournament” to replace “for the current school year”**

**AMENDMENT passed.**

**Move to action item- second. PASSED unanimously**

**ITEM E PASSES - Addendum E approved to send to membership for constitutional change for vote.**

Final Language:

### **SECTION C: Membership Dues and grace period**

- 1. Membership shall be made annually to the NPDA treasurer.**
- 2. Schools whose membership was in good standing as of the previous NPDA championship tournament will be considered members for all organizational purposes and shall be entitled to all benefits of membership *until the national championship tournament.***

## **F) Institutional support:**

RG: justification for policy

Seconded.

Dan Schabot: schools with completely separate programs

## **AMENDMENT: “a” forensics organization**

Glenn Prince: goes against the intent of the amendment

Katherine Preston: perhaps “NPDA” forensics organization

Michael Dreher: Call the question on this amendment - **Amendment fails**

Amendment: **“and any existing NPDA organization”**

Chris Joffrion: have to be existing member so the Rice break off team would not be sanctioned

Gary Rybold: BYU go rogue - campus does not support debate, not even as student run org.

## **Question called - amendment passes**

Rolland Peterello: issues are separate from this motion

Steve Woods: BYU debating on Sunday, seemed official to me, why would we exclude them?

If students want to go and pay, problem is coach, why should rogue students be excluded?

Marty Birkholt: sometimes bad things happen on way to/from or at tournaments. Org legally responsible is there school. School says BYU not supportive of activity, and NPDA says they can come - we then become agent for *bad* happens to those students

John Meany: provision that the org. have that it approves independent agents if they had insurance and post bond.

Dan Schabot: legal things and don't want to gut Director's decision on who travels - shouldn't allow organization to circumvent director's decision. If bad director = go different school or go through that school's appeals process

Geoff Brodak: student can enroll in another school now.

Brian Danielson: leave oppty for student run

DC: student-run team's still be allowed if official team - this is for the case that the school says NO to a team.

Brent Northup: Sports - BYU have extracurricular gutted - have to honor institutions but still be political to get program reinstated

Derek Beuscher: 1) support student-run program - language says no 2) liability for organization that needs to be dealt with and discussed.

Marty Birkholt: right now = acting policy, vote to reject this = determination to allow those schools to participate and w/o any provision.

John Meany: not just liability, institution and host for national tournament = issue for that school too - Risk management vetoing org. decisions

Gary Rybold: - question about what support means

**Amendment - replace support with approval: amendment passes:**

**Call question - second, passes**

**Move to action item - second, PASSED**

**ITEM F PASSES: institutional support clarified.**

**Final Language (only part VI.A.1 changed):**

**1) a student must represent a recognized degree granting institution and participate with the full knowledge and *approval* of that institution, its officials, and *any existing NPDA affiliated organization* operating within that institution.**

Tournament Host Report (Marlin Bates): nothing germane or important

Open Comment period:

Kevin Minch: Chronic problem of participation w/ committees and to participate. Urge members to show up at business meeting.

Marlin Bates: echo thanks, if you are so afraid org going in wrong direction, then you need to be a part to prevent change or cause change that you view as necessary. District meeting = only 6-7 schools represented.

Kevin Minch: thank students for coming = not highest student participation, thanks Josh for participation and activity as Student Rep

Brent Northup: hardest thing = good listener and work hard to reestablish bridges - willing to talk, dialogue important and reassuring.

John Meany: colleges/org that are not well organized and don't have prof. development, experiencing growth - org. are organized and inclusive, experiencing relatively stable /decline

Brian Danielson: GSL/NAU tournament, invitation almost done

**Meeting adjourned 10:45am.**