

## **NPDA By-Laws**

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

*Proposed changes are of two forms. Those coming from the Executive Council are noted as follows:*

*Additions to the NPDA Bylaws are in yellow.*

*Deletions to the NPDA Bylaws are in red strike-through, and are not highlighted.*

*Parenthetical comments will suggest whether the strike-through is from a particular member - it should be assumed from the Executive Council if not otherwise noted.*

*Proposals coming from the membership are highlighted in light blue.*

### **Statement of Principles:**

#### **NPDA Statement of Principles**

We, the members of the National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) believe that leaders and members of our organization benefit from a shared sense of purpose. Toward that end, as individuals and institutions coming together to constitute and sustain this organization we affirm the following principles.

#### **The Educational Value of Forensics**

Forensic activities are valuable educational experiences that make an important contribution to student, faculty, institutional and community growth and development. All forms of forensic activities, including the full range of debate activities, individual events and public events are of equal value to a range of constituents and are deserving of community support. Limited preparation formats of debate, emphasizing quality in content and delivery, are an important component of the broad-based mission of the forensics community to provide educational experiences to students. The NPDA chooses as its mission the promotion of this aspect of the forensic community's broader educational project.

#### **The Role of Forensics in the Broader Educational Experience**

Forensic activities are a component of a broader educational experience involving a range of curricular, co-curricular, extra-curricular and life experiences. As leaders and members of the forensic community, we share a responsibility for facilitating balanced educational experiences for students. These responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- Promotion of timely progress toward graduation by all students, including a preference toward confining the forensic experience to the home institution's expected timeframe for the completion of a degree.
- Humane expectations for the frequency of practice, travel and research that leaves room for other educational and life experiences and promotes a sense of wellness.

## The Role of Wellness in Forensics

Forensic activities should not have a negative impact on the physical or mental health and wellness of those that participate in them. Coaches, students and tournament directors should work together to seek more healthful and humane ways of organizing and scheduling practices and competitions to the benefit of all.

## The Role of Ethics in Forensics

Forensic educators and participants should seek to promote ethical communication and competitive practices, both in and outside of the competitive environment. This sense of ethics should be guided by respect for the autonomy of individuals and institutions with a concurrent expectation of responsible actions by them. We encourage the promotion of ethical values and actions including, but not limited, to:

- A sense of honesty and fair play;
- Respect for opposing students and coaches;
- Respect for audiences and their sensitivities;
- Respect for property, tournament hosts and host communities;
- Recruiting practices which demonstrate respect for other institutions, their students, staff and traditions.

When negative ethical experiences occur, students and coaches should aim to use these experiences as tools for learning, promoting discussion about ethical practices and seeking to correct those practices and inequities when they arise through improved future conduct.

## The Promotion of Diversity in Forensics

Members of the NPDA community should strive to promote diversity, in all its forms, in the forensic community-both in the form of persons and ideas. Members should seek to encourage participation of previously non-involved students, educators and institutions in forensic activities. Members should encourage experimentation in forensic practices, respecting differing views regarding what constitutes good argumentation. Members should aim to refrain from denigrating alternative approaches to communication and argument at the same time they choose to embrace those activities they enjoy.

An important component of appreciation for diversity is the constant striving of all members to eliminate all forms of discrimination or harassment based on race, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation and current or former military service.

## Force

No element of this Statement of Principles should be deemed to have the force of law, nor be construed as a rule of the NPDA.

### **I. Membership Dues:**

Annual dues in the National Parliamentary Debate Association for the year September 1 to August 31 will be \$30 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.

### **II. The National Parliamentary Debate Association Season:**

The National Parliamentary Debate Association season begins September 1 and ends with the NPDA Championship Tournament.

### **III. Executive Secretary's Office:**

~~The Office of the Executive Secretary shall submit an annual budget request to defray the telephone and mailing expenses connected with doing National Parliamentary Debate Association business.~~

*All other items would be renumbered appropriately.*

Rationale: The item is redundant.

### **IV. Season Sweepstakes Awards:**

Section 1. The National Parliamentary Debate Association will confer sweepstakes awards on outstanding schools that participate in sanctioned tournaments during the season.

Section 2. Points will be accumulated for sweepstakes according to the following formula:

Points will be accumulated according to the following formula:

- a. One point for each debate win (including a win for a bye and a win by forfeit) by a team in the final ~~four~~ **six** preliminary rounds of a National Parliamentary Debate Association sanctioned tournament and two points for a win by a team ~~the first two~~ **for each of the appropriate** elimination rounds.

Proposal to change item a above by changing four to six prelims by Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene.

Purpose: This would reverse the action taken at the last business meeting to count only the last four rather than the last six preliminary rounds for NPDA sweepstakes points.

Rationale:

Many members look to NPDA documents and actions as advisory norms for planning tournaments. The primary rationale for the proposed return to the traditional practice of counting the last six rounds of debate rather than just the last four rounds is that six preliminary rounds of debate provide considerably more learning opportunities than do

four preliminary round tournaments. Absent this proposed change, I think many tournaments will be switching to a four round format. This robs students, especially beginning students of one third of their traditional learning experience.

Additionally, six round events also provide a much better gauge for which teams are deserving of advancing to the elimination brackets. And the enormity of a rough preset draw, the random bullet judge, or the bye all increase drastically.

Proposal to change item a above by changing two to “each of the appropriate” by Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene.

Purpose: This would reverse the action taken at the last business meeting to count only the first two elimination rounds rather than all of the appropriate elimination rounds for NPDA sweepstakes points, as this and other intercollegiate debate organizations have traditionally accommodated.

Rationale:

The current wording seems to devalue the importance of any elimination rounds beyond the first two. This makes very little sense. In truth, the further a team advances through the elimination bracket, the higher the level of competition and the difficulty of debate and the more difficult the wins are to achieve, meaning that they should be rewarded at least as much as the earlier elimination rounds for determining yearlong accomplishments.

The earlier action to reverse this traditional practice and count only the first two elimination rounds was I think well intended, but hastily arrived at and ill advised. The goal was to recognize that some regions run tournaments on a week day afternoon with only one or two elimination rounds, and that those efforts do not reflect well with the traditional sweepstakes formula. While I am sympathetic to those concerns, a one afternoon tournament with 3-5 schools and two elimination rounds is not the same level of difficulty as is a two to three day tournament with thirty or more schools, and four to five elimination rounds. Nor should it be treated as the same.

One adverse result is that many other, larger tournaments may consider just canceling all elimination rounds past the second since NPDA is saying that those rounds are no longer valued, which would deny students many invaluable learning opportunities.

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

~~c. Teams entered in Junior and Novice Divisions will only count for one-half of the points they would earn according to point (a). Only Open division will be counted for full value.~~

Proposal to change item c above by Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

**Purpose:** This would reverse the action taken at the last business meeting to count novice and junior as only half of the worth of senior contributions toward the yearlong sweepstakes race, and continue the traditional practice of counting the competitive accomplishments of all debaters equally, regardless of division.

**Rationale:** There are multiple rationales:

- Recognizes the contributions of all team members for this team wide award.
- Encourages inclusiveness both in the organization and within different squads by valuing the beginning debaters.
- Encourages outreach to new programs, which will likely begin at the novice and junior levels.
- Sandbagging can be and has been discouraged in more appropriate ways, such as better definitions of what true novices and juniors should be.
- Recognizes that team members help to peer coach and mentor novices and juniors, and encourages this practice to continue.
- Discourages programs from concentrating resources just on one or two senior teams, when invaluable learning can take place at the beginning levels if the organization encourages this.
- Recognizes the values of community colleges in parliamentary debate, which feel snubbed by the past action of devaluing the novices and juniors.
- This author believes that the highest learning curve is probably amongst the novices and juniors just breaking into debate, and this encourages them.

**Section 3.** Final sweepstakes awards will be based on the total points accumulated at the four sanctioned tournaments at which each school has gained the most points during the season.

**Section 4.** Ties will be resolved by tie-breaker points based on places won at the tournaments at which the school has won the most points, at the rate of five points for a first place, three points for a second place, and one point for a third place (or a tie for third).

**Section 5.** When students from two different schools combine to form a team at a sanctioned tournament, the total points earned by such a split team will be divided between their two schools.

**Section 6.** Should a school enter more than four teams in a sanctioned tournament, the rounds of only that school's four best teams will be counted toward sweepstakes.

**Section 7.** Should two teams from the same school reach a final round in a division of a sanctioned tournament, their school will receive two points for winning the round, even if the debate was not held. The same rule shall apply whenever two teams from the same school meet in other elimination rounds, even if no actual debate occurs. If two teams

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

from the same school meet in a preliminary round, the school will be awarded one point for winning the debate even if no actual debate occurs.

Section 8. Teams from a host school may enter competition in their own tournament. Wins by those teams will count toward NPDA sweepstakes and those teams may also compete for whatever trophies are awarded in that tournament.

Section 9. At tournaments in which teams in elimination rounds are given byes, a team receiving a bye shall be awarded two points for a win.

Section 10. To be counted for sweepstakes points, the National Parliamentary Debate Association division of a tournament must contain at least six teams from a minimum of three schools.

Section 11. Any errors or omissions in the National Parliamentary Debate Association reports of tournament results and sweepstakes point totals must be brought to the attention of the Executive Secretary no later than fourteen days prior to the commencement of the NPDA Championship Tournament. Any mistakes made on tournaments held within two weeks of the NPDA Championship Tournament must be corrected during the first day of the NPDA Championship Tournament.

Section 12. 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:

For semi-finals, there must be a field of 8 teams in the division;

For quarterfinals, there must be a field of 15 teams in the division;

For octa-finals, there must be a field of 29 teams in the division;

For double-octa-finals, there must be a field of 58 teams in the division;

For double-double-octafinals, there must be a field of 115 teams in the division.

Section 13. A team must be present and must debate in more than half of the preliminary rounds as a team in order to count for the purpose of determining the number of teams in a division as part of the determination of the appropriate number of elimination rounds that earn National Parliamentary Debate Association sweepstakes points.

**~~V. Code of Ethics:~~**

~~The National Parliamentary Debate Association, as an organization and as a body of forensic educators, endorses the Preface of the AFA Code of Forensic Program and Forensic Tournament Standards for Colleges and Universities and endorses those parts of the AFA Code applicable to the National Parliamentary Debate Association organization: Competitor standards, Competitor practices (excluding the individual events section), and Tournament practices (excluding the individual events section).~~

**VI. Institutional Agreement:**

Institutional members of the National Parliamentary Debate Association agree, by joining the Association and paying the membership fee, to follow the Constitution and By-Laws of the National Parliamentary Debate Association in their participation in National Parliamentary Debate Association sanctioned activities.

**VII. Criteria for Sanctioning NPDA Tournaments:**

Tournaments meeting the following general criteria will be designated as counting for sweepstakes points:

Reletter points as needed.

~~A. Unless hosted by a national or regional organization, the host of an NPDA sanctioned tournament must be a member of NPDA.~~

A. Sanctioned tournaments are those for which

1. There is prior notification made and received by the Executive Secretary. Notification should be made no less than 30 days in advance of the tournament.
2. There is support for the purposes of the organization both in philosophy and by paying dues.
3. Results are submitted in a timely fashion and formatted as requested by the Executive Secretary.

B. In accord with A, unless hosted by a national or regional organization, the host of an NPDA sanctioned tournament must be a regular or affiliate member of NPDA."

Tournaments held in Canada and run by Canadian schools do not require NPDA membership to have their tournaments sanctioned, although they are encouraged to become NPDA members.

[Original proposal by Michael Dreher, Bethel University. This has been continued from the Spring 2004 Business Meeting]

C. Unless hosted by a national or regional organization whose rules specify invitation of members only, the tournament shall be open to all members of NPDA and must be included in the NPDA calendar. The NPDA calendar will be prepared no later than June 1 by the Executive Secretary based on applications submitted from tournament hosts. The Executive Secretary may prepare addenda to the NPDA calendar later in the debate season.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- D. Unless exceptions are clearly noted in the tournament invitation, sanctioned tournaments must follow the NPDA “Rules of Debating and Judging” in By-Law XII.
- E. The tournament must be attended by at least six teams from a minimum of three NPDA member schools.
- F. Copies of the results of the tournament must be sent in a timely manner to the person designated to count sweepstakes points. Unless precluded by the date of the tournament, copies of the results of the tournament must be sent to the person designated to count sweepstakes points within 21 days of the conclusion of the tournament. For tournaments that take place within 21 days of the NPDA championship tournament, all results must be in the hands of the person designated to count sweepstakes points no more than three days subsequent to the completion of the sanctioned tournament.
- G. If the Executive Secretary (or other person designated to count sweepstakes points) fails to receive tournament results during the time period mentioned in item 5 above, the tournament shall be placed on a probationary status for the following school year. The tournament would still count toward season sweepstakes, but a notation shall be placed in the tournament calendar to indicate the tournament's status.
- H. If a tournament fails to submit results in a timely basis for two consecutive years, then the tournament will be assessed a \$50 fee (in addition to membership) in the subsequent year in order to be sanctioned. However, if there is a new tournament director, the denial of sanctioning may be lifted.
- I. Appeals of sanctioning decisions may be made to the Executive Council. A 2/3 decision of the council is required to reverse a decision.

**VIII. Student Eligibility Standards:**

- ~~A. Participation in NPDA is open to undergraduate students pursuing course work at an accredited college or university. Except in special circumstances, a student must be enrolled for at least six hours or the equivalent of two regular classes and should be making progress toward the completion of a degree in his or her chosen field.~~
- ~~B. Generally, students who possess a baccalaureate degree are not eligible for participation in NPDA. A student is considered as possessing a baccalaureate degree upon his or her completion of requirements toward that degree and/or having been approved for graduation by his or her respective school. While midyear graduates and graduate students may possess a baccalaureate degree,~~

~~they may be granted consideration for limited competition.~~

- ~~1. Mid-year graduates may compete at the NPDA Championship Tournament in the Spring after their graduation at the discretion of the program's Director of Forensics, but may not participate in invitational tournaments leading up to the Championship Tournament during the term following their graduation. In other words, those who graduate in December may compete during the Fall and may attend the Championship Tournament, but may not compete at invitational tournaments after their graduation.~~
- ~~2. In unusual cases, graduate students who possess a baccalaureate degree may petition for one "tournament year" of eligibility. A "tournament year" shall include any year in which the student attends any national speech and/or debate tournament.~~
  - ~~a. Graduate students making such a request must have no previous experience in intercollegiate speech and/or debate activities of any kind, and must require involvement in competitive speech and debate for a specific type of degree, certification, or other professional requirement.~~
  - ~~b. Coaches who have a student deserving of consideration must submit a request in writing to the NPDA President prior to entering the student in competition. The request should explain the student's specific degree-related need, certify that the student has no previous experience or provide a detailed description of the student's previous experience, and outline the student's prior academic associations including other schools he/she attended and degree(s) earned. The President, in concert with the Executive Council, will consider each request and issue the "tournament year" of eligibility in writing if satisfied that the request is appropriate.~~

Replace with:

- A. Participation in NPDA is open to officially enrolled undergraduate students in good standing at the college or university they are representing and meeting the criteria below.
  1. A student needs to be seeking a baccalaureate degree at the institution they are representing unless competing for a two-year honor, in which case, pursuit of associate's degree or equivalent two-year certification at said institution is sufficient.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

2. Possession of one of one of the aforementioned degrees precludes further competition for those respective honors at the national tournament.
  3. "Good standing" and definition of degree pursuit are defined by the institution the student is representing.
  4. A student is limited to competition in four NPDA National Championship Tournaments.
- B. Midyear graduates may compete in the NPDA National Championship in the spring after graduation at the discretion of the member school. The NPDA will not accept points accrued by midyear graduates at regular season tournaments after their graduation.
- C. In unusual cases, graduate students who possess a baccalaureate degree may petition for one "tournament year" of eligibility. A "tournament year" shall include any year in which the student attends any national speech and/or debate tournament.
1. Graduate students making such a request must have no previous experience in intercollegiate speech and/or debate activities of any kind, and must require involvement in competitive speech and debate for a specific type of degree, certification, or other professional requirement.
  2. Coaches who have a student deserving of consideration must submit a request in writing to the NPDA President prior to entering the student in competition. The request should explain the student's specific degree-related need, certify that the student has no previous experience or provide a detailed description of the student's previous experience, and outline the student's prior academic associations including other schools he/she attended and degree(s) earned. The President, in concert with the Executive Council, will consider each request and issue the "tournament year" of eligibility in writing if satisfied that the request is appropriate.

(Renumber the old 3 to D)

- D. For tournament directors who desire definitions of novice and junior, the NPDA suggests the following guidelines:
1. To be classified as a novice

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- a. The student should have no 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 a junior varsity division:
    - 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.
- E. No person shall be allowed to participate in more than four NPDA Championship Tournaments as a contestant.
  1. Undergraduate students are limited to no more than eight semesters of eligibility.
    - a. A semester is considered “used” when a student competes in three or more tournaments during the semester.
    - b. The number of semesters in which a student competes is superseded by the number of national tournament years in which the student competes. In other words, a student competing in no more than one or two tournaments during a semester retains eligibility for that semester, providing that he or she does not attend a national tournament during the course of that year. Once a national tournament is attended, that year is “used” regardless of the total number of tournaments in which the student has competed that year.
  2. Contestants are limited to four national tournament years.
    - a. A national tournament year is one in which a student competes in a national tournament sponsored by any national forensic organization including but not limited to: AFA-NIET, NFA-IE Nationals, Novice IE Nationals, NDT, CEDA, NEDA, Phi Rho Pi, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, Pi Kappa Delta, Interstate Oratory, APDA, and any other nationally recognized organizations and tournaments that may be added to this list.

- b. The number of national tournament years in which a student has competed supersedes the number of semesters in which he or she has competed. Thus, if a student does not compete in the Fall or attends only a limited number of tournaments, he or she has still used a tournament year of eligibility if he or she attends any national tournament in the Spring.
  - c. The intent of this standard is to exclude students from competing in national tournaments for more than four years. During their four national tournament years, students may attend as many national tournaments as they wish or as their programs' budgets allow, but they may not compete in four AFA-NIET nationals or four CEDA nationals, for example, and then move on to compete in four NPDA Championship Tournaments over the course of several more years.
- F. Protests related to eligibility should be directed to the President and the Executive Council of the NPDA. The President will contact the coach(es) of the student(s) in question.
- 1. The responsibility for demonstrating eligibility falls upon the student's program. The Executive Council may require written documentation delineating the student's competitive experiences as well as written statements from past coaches in order to certify that a student is eligible to compete.
  - 2. Coaches are encouraged to keep written records of national tournaments their students attend. Furthermore, coaches may want to obtain a letter from the former coach of any transfer student to ensure that there are records of the student's attendance at previous national tournaments.

**IX. Novice Awards:**

- A. For purposes of the NPDA Championship Tournament, a novice shall be defined as an undergraduate student who is in his or her first year of participation in intercollegiate competitive debate and meets the criteria below:
  - 1. Students with previous competitive experience in high school or intercollegiate debate formats would be ineligible for novice status.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- a. High school debate formats include, but are not limited to, Cross Examination (CX) Debate and Lincoln-Douglas (LD) Debate.
    - b. Intercollegiate debate formats include, but are not limited to, Parliamentary Debate (such as NPDA, APDA, CUSID), CEDA/NDT, NFA-LD, NEDA and ADA.
  2. Each novice student is eligible for novice standing for no more than one NPDA Championship Tournament.
- B. Coaches may identify students who qualify for novice status so that they may be tracked for novice awards.
  1. The coach should identify novice competitors and novice two-person teams at the time the entry is submitted to the Tournament Director.
  2. The coach should identify any and all debaters who qualify for novice status on the entry since each novice debater will be in contention for novice speaker awards.
  3. The coach should identify each two-person team that qualifies for novice status. In order for a two-person team to qualify for novice status, both members of the pairing must be novice competitors.
- C. The tab room staff at each NPDA Championship Tournament will track the performance of novice competitors and novice two-person teams.
  1. Certificates, plaques, or other appropriate awards should be given to the top five novice speakers.
    - a. The speakers should simply be identified from the overall rankings for speaker awards. So, it is conceivable that a novice could receive a regular open division speaker award as well as a novice speaker award.
    - b. Novice speaker awards will be announced at the normally scheduled awards ceremony and/or banquet.
  2. Certificates, plaques, or other appropriate awards should be given to the top three novice two-person teams.
    - a. Both members of the two-person team must be novice competitors in order to receive a novice team award.

- b. The teams should simply be ranked from the overall rankings for team awards. Consequently, if more than one novice team advances to elimination rounds, the awards for top novice teams would be held until those teams are eliminated from competition.
3. To ensure the privacy of the novice status of teams or debaters, the novice status of any two-person team or individual competitor will be only known to the tab room staff, Tournament Director, and other relevant parties associated with tournament administration.
  - a. Tab room staff and others who may be aware of a team or debater's status will maintain confidentiality with regard to a team or debater's status until awards are announced.
  - b. The novice status of any two-person team or debater may be included with post-tournament materials such as lists of awards and results.
4. Novice competitors and novice teams will be treated no differently than other teams or competitors for purposes of team and season sweepstakes awards at the NPDA Championship Tournament.

## **X. Sexual Harassment Policy:**

### **A. Preamble:**

The National Parliamentary Debate Association maintains that parliamentary debate should be a contest of knowledge, wit, and argumentation conducted in a setting of civility and mutual respect. The organization maintains that all eligible members should have access to debate activities without regard to race, creed, age, sex, national origin, sexual or affectional preference, or non-disqualifying handicap. These principles should guide the behavior and conduct of all members and participants of the organization. While the policy at hand is directed at sexual harassment particularly, the principles herein shall be considered a model for dealing with all forms of harassment. The National Parliamentary Debate Association designed this policy in an attempt to eliminate specific behaviors and situations that may arise while participating in the activity and to provide a forum for resolution of conflicts. The organization does not assume that this policy or any other will eliminate all discomfort or intimidation that arises when ideas are in conflict or positions taken are uncomfortable to one or more participants, nor does the organization assume the responsibility of dictating good taste or social posture. The National Parliamentary Debate Association assumes these to be part of the learning and educational process and encourages the open discussion of these concerns as a means to educate.

1. Debate, Free Expression, and Harassment

Academic debate provides a forum for the expression, criticism, and discussion (and for the tolerance) of a wide range of opinions. Participants are encouraged to develop skills in reasoned and supported argument while avoiding the pitfalls of faulty argument. Academic debate does not provide a license for demeaning actions and it does not tolerate sexual harassment. Any participant who suffers discrimination or harassment as part of the activity is denied the guarantee of an equal opportunity to work, learn, and grow in the arena of academic debate and may be harmed in mind, body, and performance.

2. Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is a form of discrimination and consists of verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, imposed on the basis of sex, that has the effect of denying or limiting one's right to participate in the activity, or creates a hostile, intimidating, or offensive environment that places the victim in an untenable situation and/or diminishes the victim's opportunity to participate fairly. Sexual conduct can become discriminatory and harassing when the nature of the interaction is unwelcome, or when a pattern of behavior that is offensive to a "reasonable woman" (or man, as the case may be) exists. These definitions, which comply with EEOC and other legal definitions, rely strongly on the perceptions of the complainant and it is important to recognize that differences in social position between the complainant and the accused can compound the degree of threat or potential harm perceived in a situation.

3. False Accusations

Deliberate false accusations will not be tolerated.

B. Options in dealing with harassment

1. General principles in all situations

- a. Keep a written record of the event, the persons involved, witnesses, and attempts at resolution. Keep this record private or between persons directly involved in the resolution.
- b. Do not take the matter to the general public through listservs or general discussion until the matter has been dealt with through formal or informal intervention.

2. Informal Intervention: Direct, private resolution

- a. If the harassed believes it is possible to resolve the situation one-on-one, participants are encouraged to do so. This approach may

clarify situations in which there are misperceptions and can serve to educate and prevent rather than penalize.

1. Indicate to the “harasser” that the comment or activity is unwanted and ask that it not be repeated. If the “problem” ceases, consider the incident resolved.
  2. Write a letter or note to the harasser clearly describing behaviors or statements that are seen as harassing or discriminatory. Indicate what actions need to stop and why. Keep a copy. If the “problem” ceases, consider the matter resolved.
- b. If one-on-one resolution is not possible or feasible, consider the involvement of one other person to serve as a mediator.
1. If the event occurs during a debate, raise a point of personal privilege and ask the judge to rule on the issue.
  2. Ask another person (a coach, a friend, a trusted colleague, the judge in the round) to accompany you to talk with the person and to help mediate a conflict resolution session. Talk through differences in perception and ideology.
3. Formal Intervention
- a. In the event that informal intervention is not feasible, the following procedures should be followed.
  - b. Structure and membership of the formal intervention system
    1. The President of the National Parliamentary Debate Association will appoint a Sexual Harassment Officer (SHO), who will chair the Committee on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment (CDSH). The CDSH will consist of no fewer than five representatives of active NPDA schools including at least two students. The CDSH will be provided with adequate and appropriate training about what constitutes harassment, the policy and implementation of said policy.
    2. The CDSH shall facilitate and review an educational program annually, informing members of the NPDA debate community about the definitions and interpretations of

discrimination and sexual harassment and about procedures for initiating complaints. The CDSH shall also serve as a resource to coaches and students who wish to conduct intrasquad harassment education.

- c. Procedures in Cases of Discrimination or Sexual Harassment
  1. Complaints may be brought by any member of the NPDA community. Complaints will not be pursued when more than one year has elapsed following the alleged incident.
  2. At any point during the proceedings, any of the parties involved may choose to be accompanied by an adviser or a member of the CDSH. All parties are free to consult with an attorney, if they choose to do so, but the investigation and hearing procedure is not a legal proceeding and attorneys may not be present or participate.
  3. At all times throughout the procedures outlined below, confidentiality will be preserved carefully whenever appropriate.
  4. All written records pertaining to the case shall be kept permanently in a confidential file held by the NPDA President and not released unless required by law.
  5. Procedures
    - a. The complainant submits a detailed complaint, in writing, to the SHO.
    - b. Once the complaint has been filed and accepted by the SHO, the complainant shall be considered solely as a witness in an investigation by the CDSH.
    - c. As expeditiously as possible, the SHO and CDSH (or appropriate replacements) will investigate, meet with all parties involved, and ensure that the accused has an opportunity to see and respond to all statements made against him or her.
  6. If the CDSH finds that no discrimination or harassment has taken place, the matter will stop at this point and the immediate parties shall receive notification that the case will go no further. Copies of this report and other relevant

information will be kept on file permanently in the office of the NPDA President.

7. If the CDSH is convinced that discrimination or harassment has occurred, it will prepare a complete report including its findings, the statements of the accused party as well as the other witnesses, and its conclusions about the nature and seriousness of the event that has taken place.
  8. This report shall be submitted to the President, who shall review the evidence and, if necessary, request additional information.
  9. In consultation with the CDSH, the President shall determine an appropriate sanction. Depending on the severity of the event, this sanction may include any of the following (this should not be viewed as an exhaustive listing of all possible sanctions, just the most likely): oral reprimands; written reprimands to be sent to directors of forensics and/or Deans of Faculty or Students and/or College or University Presidents; removal from future participation at the NPDA Championship Tournament (either competing or judging); removal of NPDA points; or suspension of membership in NPDA.
- d. Appeals Procedures
1. If the individual(s) found guilty of discrimination or harassment wishes to appeal the President's decision, he/she or they may request that a hearing be held to review the decision. Ordinarily, such an appeal will be possible only if the individual(s) involved can present new evidence not previously considered or evidence of procedural violations during the formal procedures.
  2. The Appeals Board will consist of those members of the Executive Council, not previously involved in the formal hearing and not having conflicts of interest. Replacements may need to be appointed by the President to produce a board of at least five members.
  3. The Appeals Board shall review the written evidence in the case, consider new evidence provided to them, interview witnesses as they deem necessary, and shall consider the

proposed disciplinary action in relation to the evidence provided.

4. The findings and recommendations from the Appeals Board are considered final.
  5. All reports are to be filed permanently with the Executive Secretary.
- e. Protection of Participant's Rights
1. Attempts at retaliation, slander, or abuse on the part of any party during or after resolution will be subject to the most strenuous penalties of the policy.
  2. During intervention proceedings or resolution, participants may negotiate with the President of NPDA (and through him/her with tournament directors), limited or no contact agreements. The organization recognizes that there are certain limitations to these agreements, given the nature of the typical tournament setting. Nonetheless, until resolution is achieved, attempts to preserve no contact agreements should be made.
  3. All participants will be asked to keep the proceedings confidential during intervention and after resolution.

C. Epilogue:

This document draws heavily from the structure and procedures of the CEDA harassment policy. Thanks to the authors of that policy for their exhaustive work. Resources used in preparing the CEDA document include: *Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: Concepts and Issues*, NEA, 1992; *Sexual Harassment: It's Not Academic*, Dept. of Education, 1984; *Sexual Harassment*, Cornell University, 1990; Statement on Discrimination and Academic Freedom, Carleton College, 1990; and Whitman College Staff Handbook, 1992.

Additional sources used in preparing this document include: *Honor One Another: a Program to Prevent Sexual Harassment and Abuse*, Concordia University Press, 1994; "Assessing Sexual Harassment: A strategy for changing the Climate in higher education," *NASPA Journal*, 1994.

**Proposal to Sever By-Laws XI and XII from this document, and create them as separate documents.**

### **XI. NPDA Championship Tournament Operating Procedures:**

In March or April of each year the Association will host a Championship Tournament. The Tournament Site Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee should take into consideration religious holidays in determining the date and place of the Championship Tournament.

The following procedures provide guidelines for conducting the annual NPDA Championship Tournament. Throughout these procedures, two-person teams competing in the tournament are referred to as “teams” and the colleges or universities they represent are referred to as “schools.”

#### **A. Tournament Staff**

1. The Tournament Director shall be appointed by the President with the approval of the Executive Council and shall serve at the pleasure of the President.
  - a. The Tournament Director shall oversee all aspects of the tournament, and shall be responsible for administering the tournament according to the Operating Procedures contained within this and related NPDA By-Laws.
  - b. In extreme circumstances, the Tournament Director may deviate from the Tournament Operating Procedures when his or her decision to do so is supported by a majority vote of the National Championship Tournament Committee. Any such deviations and the reasons for making them must be reported to the membership of the Association in a timely manner.
  - c. Tournament personnel should incur no net financial loss by working on the tournament - and personnel may apply to the ~~Finance Committee~~ Treasurer for reimbursement of costs above and beyond those that would have been incurred had they not served on the tournament staff.
  - d. ~~Members of the tournament staff shall not be counted as judges from entering schools; although, they may be used as judges in the elimination rounds.~~

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- d. Members of the tournament staff shall not appear on the strike sheet as judges; although they may be used as judges in the elimination rounds.
2. The tournament director shall appoint the staff necessary to administer the tournament. The staff shall consist of an administrative staff and a tabulation staff.
    - a. The administrative staff shall consist of the President, the Vice President, the Treasurer, the Executive Secretary and other persons as deemed necessary by the Tournament Director. The administrative staff shall be responsible for registration, calculation of sweepstakes awards, and other duties assigned by the Tournament Director.
    - b. ~~The tabulation staff shall, to the extent possible, consist of persons not currently associated with schools entered in the tournament.~~ The tabulation staff shall be responsible for pairings, judging assignments, and results.
    - c. The tabulation staff shall be divided into two groups. Following each debate, each group, working independently, shall enter results of the debates and determine a rank-order of teams. The rank orderings produced by each group will be compared in order to check for errors in the recording of results. Pairings and judging assignments for the next round shall not be released until the two sets of rank-orderings are in agreement.
- B. Entries
1. On or about December 1 prior to the tournament, the Tournament Director shall send a tournament invitation to all member schools. The tournament invitation shall announce a deadline for entry that is approximately six weeks prior to the Championship Tournament. The tournament invitation will include a maximum number of teams that each school is allowed to nominate.
  2. All schools shall be permitted to nominate no more than the maximum number of teams allowed for each school. The Tournament Director shall note the order in which the nominations are received. A complete nomination must consist of the number of teams, the number of judges, the names of teams and judges (although names may be changed prior to the tournament), and a deposit to be applied to entry fees. Deposits will be returned only in the events that changes are made prior to the entry deadline or if the tournament is unable to accommodate all of the

nominations. Otherwise, deposits are nonrefundable.

3. On the date of the deadline for entry, the Tournament Director shall compare the number of teams nominated for the tournament with the maximum number of teams that can be accommodated by the host school. If the number of nominations is equal to or fewer than the maximum number of teams that can be accommodated, the Tournament Director shall enter those teams in the tournament.
  4. At the deadline, if the number of teams nominated exceeds the maximum number of teams that can be accommodated, the Tournament Director shall enter the first team from each school, then the second, and so on. Once it is impossible to complete a movement through the list and accommodate at the tournament site, the total number of applicants for slots in the tournament, the Tournament Director will return to the top of the list and count the number of teams at this point. The director will then subtract that number from the total number of slots possible for the tournament. That number of teams will then be selected randomly from a pool consisting of one team from each school still applying for slots. After this process, the Tournament Director will notify all schools of the final number of teams they will be allowed to enter in the tournament and will return deposits for all teams that cannot be accommodated in the tournament. The Tournament Director will then continue the process, to rank the unentered teams in priority for a waiting list.
  5. At the deadline, if the maximum number of teams that can be accommodated is not exceeded, the Tournament Director may accept additional teams that may be charged an additional fee for late entry.
- C. Debater Eligibility
1. All entering schools must be members of the NPDA.
  2. Eligibility to participate in the tournament is defined by NPDA By-Law VIII. Each nomination must include a statement by the registrar (or other appropriate university official) testifying that the debaters are enrolled in the institution as prescribed in NPDA By-Law VIII.
  3. Ordinarily a team will consist of two persons from the same school. Hybrid teams (with one member from each of two different schools) are also permitted; although, no school is permitted to have more than one debater participating as a member of a hybrid team. Hybrid teams will be entered as if they are a separate school. Thus, a hybrid team is eligible to debate against teams from the schools of which its membership is composed. The performance of hybrid teams will not be included in the

calculation of sweepstakes awards.

**D. Debates**

1. There shall be eight preliminary rounds of debate.
2. To the extent possible, all preliminary rounds should be paired to give each team an equal number of rounds on both sides of the motion.
3. Following the preliminary rounds, an appropriate number of single elimination rounds will be held until one team is deemed the champion.
4. Both members of each team must participate in each debate. If one or both members of a team fails to show up for a scheduled debate round, the team will be considered to have forfeited the round.

**E. Topics and Topic Announcement**

1. In addition to the responsibilities indicated under the Championship Tournament Committee, Subcommittee duties, the Topic Selection Committee shall select an appropriate number of topics to be debated at the tournament.
2. A different topic will be announced prior to each debate.
3. Debates shall begin a specified number of minutes after the announcement of the topic. That specified time shall be fifteen minutes plus the amount of time needed to walk to the furthest building in which debates are being held.

**F. Scheduling of the Debates**

1. Geographic Diversity. Upon entry, each team will be given a designation to correspond with its geography. This designation will correspond with the recognized NPDA Districts.
2. Randomly paired debate. The first debate shall be paired randomly except that care shall be taken to ensure that teams from the same geographic regions do not meet.
3. Power-matching
  - a. Rounds 2-8 will be power matched based on each team's cumulative record through the previous round.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- 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 down.” The uneven bottom of the upper bracket is moved to the top of the next lower bracket. Care should be taken to avoid second “pulldowns.”
  - d. For the purpose of power-matching rounds 2-5, 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
  - e. For the purpose of power matching rounds 6,7, & 8, team order shall be determined by the following criteria:
    - 1) Number of Wins
    - 2) Adjusted Speaker Points: Adjusted by dropping the high and the low scores
    - 3) Total Speaker Points
    - 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
4. Tab Room Disclosure.  
After tabulating the results of each preliminary round 1-7 and releasing

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

the pairings for the subsequent round, the tabulation staff will post the results of the previous round by listing each team name followed by an asterisk (if that team won) in a common area accessible to all tournament participants.

5. Scheduling elimination rounds
  - a. All teams with winning records (5-3 or better) will advance to the single-elimination rounds. The initial seeding order of teams advancing to elimination rounds will be determined by the following criteria:
    - 1) Number of Wins
    - 2) Adjusted Speaker Points: Adjusted by dropping the high and the low scores
    - 3) Total Speaker Points
    - 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. If more teams have winning records than can be accommodated with a standard elimination round, a partial elimination round will be held to determine seedings for the subsequent elimination round.
  - c. Those teams with the lower records will debate in the partial elimination round for seedings in the subsequent elimination rounds. Those teams with better records will receive an automatic bye into the next elimination round.
  - d. In the event that two teams from the same school meet in elimination rounds, the Tournament Director or his/her staff will break brackets according to the following criteria:
    - (1) protecting the higher seed;
    - (2) changing the fewest number of brackets;
    - (3) preserving original bracket order
  - e. Sides in the elimination rounds will be reversed if the teams have met in the preliminary rounds. If the teams have not met before,

sides will be determined randomly.

G. Judge Assignment

1. Each preliminary round should be adjudicated by one judge. Each elimination round prior to the quarter final round will be adjudicated by no fewer than three judges. The quarter final and semi finals will be adjudicated by no fewer than five judges. The final round will be adjudicated by no fewer than seven judges. At the discretion of the Tournament Director, each team in the final debate may be allowed to remove one or more judges from a tentative panel. In this case, the Tournament Director has the right to name one or more judges who cannot be removed by either team.
2. All strikes and constraints that have been received by the deadline shall be administered by the tabulation staff and Tournament Director before the start of round one. The number of allowed strikes for each individual team shall never be less than 15% of the entire judging pool.
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.
- ~~4. All judging assignments will be made at random from a pool that excludes judges who, according to the perception of debaters, judges, or the Tournament Director have a conflict of interest.~~
4. All judging assignments will be made at random from a pool. Judges and program directors should identify obvious conflicts of interest and exclude those judges from judging teams impacted by that conflict
5. All judges are committed to judge two rounds past the elimination round of their last competing teams, or octafinals, whichever is later. The Tournament Director will print a list of the judges being used for morning elimination rounds.
6. A financial penalty of fifty dollars for each preliminary and one hundred dollars for each elimination round will be imposed against any and all judges who fail to be available to judge all rounds to which they are obligated.
  - a. Until fines are paid, the judge's affiliated or hiring school will be suspended from NPDA membership.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- b. All fines are subject to appeal to the NPDA ~~Rules and Ethics Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee~~ **Rules and Standards committee** on the basis of extenuating circumstances.
7. Judges should strive to judge debates on the basis of student performance, avoiding rendering decisions based on the judge's personal prejudices.

#### H. Enforcement of Tournament Rules

1. Enforcement of Section 4 of the NPDA Tournament Rules (section entitled "During the Debate") shall be the province of the judge (or in the case of multiple judge panels, of the Speaker of the House). All judges adjudicating at the Championship Tournament shall affirm, ~~through electronic signature~~, that they have read, understand and agree to abide by the NPDA rules and guidelines for judging, including the Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Policy, prior to submitting their required judging philosophy. ~~In extreme circumstances, paper signatures can be accepted with submission of required judging philosophy."~~
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 may give up to a maximum of five minutes grace before declaring the debate a forfeit.
3. Enforcement of all other sections of the NPDA Tournament Rules shall be the providence of the Tournament Director in consultation with the ~~Ethics and Rules Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee~~. **Rules and Standards committee.**

#### I. Awards

1. Each debater advancing to elimination rounds will receive an award. Each member of the team will receive an award appropriate to their placing in the tournament (Quarterfinalist, Semifinalist, etc.).
2. The top twenty speakers at the tournament will receive an award as determined by the speaker points assigned to them in the preliminary rounds. Speaker order shall be determined by the following criteria:
  - a. Adjusted Points: Speaker points after dropping high and low scores
  - b. Total Points: Total speaker points

- c. Double-Adjusted Points: Speaker points after dropping the two highest and the two lowest scores
  - d. Judge Variance: The average number of points greater or fewer that each judge gave the speaker relative to all other speakers to which the judge assigned points
  - e. Number of Wins: The speaker's number of wins in the preliminary rounds
  - f. Opposition Wins: The strength of the speaker's competition as defined by the number of preliminary round wins earned by the speaker's opposition
  - g. If all the speakers involved in a tie are indistinguishable based on all of the above criteria, then an "unbreakable tie" will be declared.
3. All teams, both members of which are novice (in their first year of debate competition with a year of competition being defined as two tournaments in each of two semesters), will be eligible for the Top Novice Team award. The top three novice teams will receive awards. The top novice teams are also eligible for regular team awards.
  - a. Placing will first be determined by a team's placing in elimination rounds.
  - b. If a tie still exists, the seeding of the tied teams after preliminary rounds will determine placing.
4. All novice debaters (those debaters in their first year of debate competition) will be eligible for the Top Novice Speaker award, regardless of the status of the person with whom they debate. The top five novice speakers will be recognized. The top novice speakers are also eligible for regular speaker awards. Speaker order shall be determined by the following criteria:
  - a. Adjusted speaking points
  - b. Total speaker points
  - c. Double adjusted speaker points
  - d. Judge variance
5. Tournament Sweepstakes
  - a. Championship Tournament Sweepstakes
    - 1) All schools participating in the tournament will be eligible to receive a Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Award.
    - 2) The top twenty schools competing will receive Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards.

- 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 advanced (win, lost or 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.
- 4) The order of Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards will be determined using the following criteria, listed in order of importance:
  - a) The greatest cumulative number of preliminary and elimination round points as enumerated in 5. a. 3)
  - b) The greatest number of teams advancing to the first elimination round. When the first elimination round is a partial elimination round, this tie-breaker is the greatest number of teams advancing to elimination rounds, including both those teams participating in the partial elimination round and those teams receiving a bye into the second elimination round.
  - c) The greatest number of teams advancing to the second elimination round.
  - d) The greatest number of teams advancing to the third elimination round.
  - e) The greatest number of teams advancing to the fourth elimination round.
  - f) The greatest number of teams advancing to the fifth elimination round.
  - g) The greatest number of teams advancing to the sixth elimination round.
  - h) The greatest number of teams advancing to the seventh elimination round.
  - i) If all of the schools involved in a tie have at least four teams whose records are used in calculating sweepstakes awards, then the greatest cumulative number of preliminary round wins for those teams after each school's best and worst team's

- preliminary round records are thrown out (“adjusted”).
- j) The lowest cumulative speaker award placings for the school’s four highest placing individual speakers.
  - k) If the schools involved in a tie are indistinguishable based on all of the above criteria, then an “unbreakable tie” will be declared.
- b. Two-Year College Tournament Sweepstakes
- 1) Those schools designated as two-year colleges that participate in the Championship Tournament will be eligible to receive a Two-Year College Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Award.
  - 2) The top five two-year colleges competing will receive Two-Year College Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards.
  - 3) Ordinarily, the records of the four teams from each school with the highest number of preliminary round wins will count toward the determination of sweepstakes awards. However, in the event that all schools wishing to enter four teams at the Championship Tournament cannot be accommodated, the maximum number of teams that count for tournament sweepstakes will be set at the number of teams that every school was allowed to enter.
  - 4) The order of Two-Year College Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards will be determined using the following criteria, listed in order of importance:
    - a) The greatest cumulative number of preliminary round wins of up to four teams.
    - b) The greatest number of teams advancing to the first elimination round. When the first elimination round is a partial elimination round, this tie-breaker is the greatest number of teams advancing to elimination rounds, including both those teams participating in the partial elimination round and those teams receiving a bye into the second elimination round.
    - c) The greatest number of teams advancing to the second elimination round.
    - d) The greatest number of teams advancing to the third elimination round.

- e) The greatest number of teams advancing to the fourth elimination round.
- f) The greatest number of teams advancing to the fifth elimination round.
- g) The greatest number of teams advancing to the sixth elimination round.
- h) The greatest number of teams advancing to the seventh elimination round.
  
- i) If all of the schools involved in a tie have at least four teams whose records are used in calculating sweepstakes awards, then the greatest cumulative number of preliminary round wins for those teams after each school's best and worst teams preliminary round records are thrown out ("adjusted").
- j) The lowest cumulative speaker award placings for the school's four highest placing individual speakers.
- k) If the schools involved in a tie are indistinguishable based on all of the above criteria, then an "unbreakable tie" will be declared.

6. Season Sweepstakes

- a. Both Overall Season Sweepstakes and Two-Year College Season Sweepstakes will be determined by the criteria outlined in the NPDA By-Law IV.
- b. The top twenty schools shall receive awards in the Season Sweepstakes competition.
- c. The top five two-year colleges shall receive awards in the Two-Year College Season Sweepstakes competition.

## **XII. NPDA Tournament Rules: (Modified March 2005)**

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 Subcommittee to review and rule on the decision. If the violation is upheld the Rules and Standards Subcommittee 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

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

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 made 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: 7 minutes

First Opposition Constructive: 8 minutes

Second Proposition Constructive: 8 minutes

Second Opposition Constructive: 8 minutes

Opposition Rebuttal: 4 minutes

Proposition Rebuttal: 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.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- 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 **Tournament Director** ballot staff. The judge should not give oral comments before the ballot is completed and returned to the **Tournament Director** ballot staff.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- 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.

**XIII. Duties and Responsibilities Associated with Running the NPDA National Championship Tournament:**

- A. Host Responsibilities: Any amenities and associated expenses not required by the NPDA but elected to be provided by the Host will be the financial responsibility of the Host.
  1. Facilities: Tournament Host is responsible for providing the following facilities and assuming any fees associated with them, such as facility rental fees or clean up fees, etc.:
    - a. Debating rooms, ideally at least 100 rooms
    - b. At least one large assembly hall, sufficient to seat all participants including debaters, coaches, critics, and special guests
    - c. At least four tournament management rooms, to include:
      - 1) Two tabulation rooms, preferably adjacent, for mirror tabulation
      - 2) One ballot stuffing room
      - 3) One NPDA administrative room for year-end administrative work
    - d. Participant gathering area, central location for participants to gather between rounds, and from which announcements can be made and postings provided and/or topics announced
    - e. Ballot pick up and drop off area, preferably adjacent to participant area and not too far from tabulation rooms
    - f. Host should make arrangements for all audiovisual needs, such as sound projection
    - g. The tournament shall provide opportunities for religious observances for interested parties at or near the tournament site
  2. Tournament Hotel: Tournament Hotel(s): Host will work with the Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee and the President to locate the most appropriate hotel(s) to serve NPDA needs taking into consideration hotel(s) size and amenities, proximity to campus and other area attractions and dining opportunities, affordability of rooms, and willingness of hotel(s) to work with NPDA on minimizing hotel facility expenses. If it helps to negotiate more affordable room/night rental rate, the Championship Tournament Committee, in conjunction with the President, can require attending schools to stay at the tournament hotel(s) as a condition of participation in the tournament. Any gratis or complimentary rooms go against the NPDA hotel room needs. If any complimentary rooms are made available to the NPDA, the Host will be awarded one

complimentary room for their use throughout the tournament though this room may be shared with other tournament personnel. The President of the National Parliamentary Debate Association should sign the hotel contract.

3. Meal Arrangements: Host is responsible for the following meal arrangements:
  - a. The Host and Site Development Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee should investigate the impact of eliminating the banquet and replacing it with a reception that merges opening ceremonies, the student reception, etc. when negotiating hotel contract(s)
  - b. The host is encouraged to provide other social opportunities for the gathering of debaters, coaches, and critics throughout the tournament, but will be responsible for paying for them.
  - c. If on-campus or campus-bordering, eating places are not available for quick meals for breakfasts or lunches, host shall also be responsible for arranging for meal packages to be purchased at the time of entering the tournament.
4. Entry Commitments: The Host is responsible for meeting its own entry fees. Like any other school the Host must either provide judges to cover its commitment or pay. However, the NPDA will cover the judging commitments for the host school for up to four teams as commensurate with equivalent personnel handling hosting responsibilities.
5. Participation Gifts: It is recommended that some type of host gift memorializing the tournament, such as a tournament mug, glass and/or something more creative be provided for each participant. However, the host is entirely responsible for any gifts they wish to present to the competitors, officers, or tab room staff.
6. NPDA will be responsible for operating expenses directly related to the Championship Tournament competition such as ballot production and copying, copier rental, schematics, copying, etc. The expenses for these materials will be reimbursed by the NPDA upon presentation of receipts. The host school will be responsible for expenses related to the site such as custodial charges, maps, poster board for directional signs, etc.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

7. Local Judging Pool: Host will work with the Tournament Director to provide sufficient local qualified judges to meet tournament needs. These hired judges will be fairly compensated by NPDA as detailed below.
  8. Student Help: Host will work with the Tournament Director to provide sufficient student workers to help as ballot stuffers, runners, directional assistants, etc.
  9. Sales Items: Host will be entitled to offer for sale select tournament promotional items, such as T-shirts, caps, and/or sippers; or snacks and refreshments. Host is entirely responsible for financing these items and may keep any revenue generated from their sale to help offset other tournament expenses. Items should be cleared through President to assure they are appropriate.
  10. Shuttle Services: The host will pay for whatever shuttle services are provided.
  11. Video Production: Host will be responsible for videotaping the final round of debate with a two camera set up and good sound quality. Host should attempt, if facilities are available on campus, to produce and edit good quality videotape. NPDA will be responsible for duplication and distribution of that tape. If host school lacks the facilities and expertise to edit the tape, NPDA will assist in its production.
- B. NPDA Financial Responsibilities: The below expenses are anticipated in running most tournaments. It is a partial, but not exhaustive list of all possible tournament expenses. Should other tournament related expenses arise during the course of the Championship Tournaments that are not itemized in this document, the Vice President and/or the Tournament Director can authorize payment for those as well on behalf of the NPDA.
1. Topic Committee expenses:
    - a. Members of the Topic Committee are reimbursed for one night's lodging at the hotel and other expenses incurred because of participation in the Topic Committee.
    - b. Meals will be provided to members of the Topic Committee during the day spent on the topics. These meals will ordinarily be paid from the NPDA President's funds but may also be paid by the NPDA Treasurer.

2. Administrative Staff expenses:
  - a. The NPDA will apply a 'no net loss' policy to officers, allowing them to apply to the Finance Committee for reimbursements for expenses above and beyond what they would have incurred. Officers will count toward their school's judging commitment.
  - b. The President and/or Tournament Director will submit a budget request to the Finance Committee to pay ordinary expenses during the tournament. These expenses may include, but are not limited to, meals for tab room, Topic Committee, meetings of officers, etc.
  - c. The NPDA will provide a rental van for the NPDA Treasurer for the purpose of transporting members of the administrative staff.
  - d. The NPDA will provide operating expenses for the administrative staff including assistance with computing, office supplies, and other operating expenses deemed appropriate.
3. Tabulation Staff expenses:
  - a. The NPDA will apply a 'no net loss' policy to tabulation staff, allowing them to apply to the Finance Committee for reimbursements for expenses above and beyond what they would have incurred. Tabulation room staff expenses will count toward their school's judging commitment.
  - b. The NPDA will provide a rental van for the NPDA President for the purpose of transporting members of the tabulation staff.
  - c. The NPDA will provide operating expenses for the tabulation staff including office supplies, ballots, copying, and other operating expenses deemed appropriate.
4. Direct tournament expenses:
  - a. The NPDA shall provide for the cost of a banquet and other meals for contestants at the tournament.
  - b. The NPDA shall provide for the cost of a Presidential

reception for tournament participants.

c. The NPDA shall provide for the cost of trophies and other awards.

d. The NPDA shall provide for the cost of preparing and mailing distributing or faxing invitations, confirmations, and other materials related to the NPDA tournament.

5. **Hired Judges:**

a. **Imported Judges:** The President will approve a specified number of Imported Hired Judges each year (as opposed to Local Hired Judges provided by the host). Each of the officers may offer up to two judges for possible approval by the President. In addition, the President will select additional judges as needed.

- 1) An imported hired judge has round trip transportation paid by NPDA.
- 2) An imported hired judge has motel expenses paid by NPDA, but must stay in rooms with other hired judges if NPDA pays.
- 3) An imported hired judge pays his/her own food expenses and other expenses at the tournament, except that NPDA will purchase whatever meals participants are required to eat on campus, including the banquet, meal packages, etc.

b. **Host School Arranged Hired Judges:** The tournament host will provide the number of qualified judges requested by the Tournament Director. One month prior to the Championship Tournament, the Tournament Director will notify the Host of the anticipated need for hired judges.

- 1) NPDA will pay these judges for their service to the tournament an amount to be determined by the President in accordance with normal judge hiring practices.
- 2) Hired judges shall be provided with the same meals mentioned above for imported judges, but shall be responsible for all their other meals.
- 3) Local hired judges will be responsible for providing their own housing, or trying to make arrangements with the tournament host for local rooming if they

do not live close enough to commute.

6. Tournament Publications:
  - a. Judging Philosophy Books: Participants in the National Tournament are responsible for printing their own Judging Philosophy Booklets from the database. The Host will be responsible for obtaining the judging philosophies for local hired judges. The Tournament Director will be responsible for obtaining judging philosophies from all other judges.
  - b. Registration Books: The tournament host shall be responsible for compiling and copying a registration book that will provide participants with helpful information about the tournament, the campus, and the surrounding area.
    - 1) Contents should contain, but not be limited to, welcome letters from NPDA President, host, and various campus, local, state, or national dignitaries; a list of tournament participants; a campus map highlighting tournament locations; a tournament schedule, historical notes on past participants and noteworthy accomplishments; guides to local restaurants and attractions with directions; and other helpful information.
    - 2) Funding for this book is the responsibility of the host, but may come from advertisements from local businesses, campus, or alumni groups, etc. . Additional revenue received beyond actual expenses may go to host to offset other expenses assumed by host. Discretion should be used in accepting advertisements, and where questionable should be submitted for approval by President. The purpose is not to overly commercialize this important event, but to help offset legitimate expenses with tasteful ads.

**XIV. NPDA All-American Award**

- A. Rationale: This award is designed with the intent to recognize students beyond the area of competition. While achievement in the forensic activity is taken into account, equal weight should be given to scholarship and service. This award should serve as a crowning touch to those seniors who have demonstrated outstanding qualities in all three areas.
  
- B. General Qualifications for Nomination: Nominees should have demonstrated personal qualities that show their understanding of the role of intercollegiate forensic competition in a liberal education. They should show evidence of success and good conduct in the forensic activity, excellence in their classroom studies as evidenced not only by grade-point average, but also by the range and challenge of study and show a commitment to the betterment of their community through their forensic and non-forensic activities.
  
- C. Specific Criteria for Nomination:
  - 1. The nominee must be designated as a senior at their four-year institution (or in their last year of competition at a 2-year school) and attending their last NPDA as a competitor.
  - 2. The nominee must be competing at the NPDA during the year they are nominated.
  - 3. The nominee must have a minimum 3.5 cumulative GPA in their college coursework. The nomination must include an unofficial copy of the student's college transcript of grades.
  - 4. The nominee must provide documentation of parliamentary debate success including a resume of awards earned during the nominee's forensic competition. Also, there should be letters of support that convey the value the individual has added to the NPDA community in general such as mentoring, good sportsmanship, etc.
  - 5. The nominee must provide documentation of service work. This can include forensic related service. Service outside of the forensics community will also be a significant criterion. Non-forensic service venues may include the community, civic organizations, the school, etc. The nomination must include a letter of support that addresses the student's work in providing community service to their university and the community at large.

(Updated August, 2005 with editorial changes; October, 2005 proposals)

- D. Nomination Process: Nominations must come from a program director/coach and be submitted to the District Chair. District Chairs will inform member schools of deadlines for submission. Each District Committee will select one recipient from their respective district, and forward up to three additional nominations from their district to the Chair of the Selection Committee. A school can submit at most two nominations to their district, but only one nomination from each school can be forwarded to the National Chair of the All-American Team Selection Committee. There will be at least one recipient from each of the NPDA districts and at-large recipients who may come from any district. District chairs must submit all nominations to the Chair of the All-American Team Committee no later than March 1.