

NPDA Business Meeting, Spring 2005
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX
Meeting held: March 17, 2005, 1:30 p.m.

Order of Business

- Call to Order
- Approval of Minutes (Fall 2004)
- Moved and seconded to approve.*
- Approval of Agenda and Procedures
 - Proposal to amend agenda order by grouping
 - Proposal to limit debate on proposal to 6 minutes with 1 minute per speaker
- Moved and seconded.*

Reports

- President – Sharon Porter
- Many items are carryover. We're going to try to expedite and get through as many as possible. Sharon asks faculty/student representatives to meet at the end of the business meeting.*
- Vice President – Ed Inch, Pacific Lutheran University

Four items:

1. *Elections were light – only one position. Kevin Minch = 2 years*
2. *90% of the committees turn over. If interest, Ed would like to know. There are vacancies on Finance, Publications, Championship, Tournament Administration, Rules/Standard, Host/Site Development, Research/Assessment, Professional Development, Ethics, Outreach... good way to influence governance.*
3. *Konrad will talk about tournament. If anything seems odd, strange, go to Konrad. He is the first line of explanation. If Konrad can't deal with it, then Ed Inch, as chair of Tournament Committee, is next.*
4. *Site selection. 2006 – Oregon State will be the host. 2007 – Only letter of interest = Truman. We would max out the campus and town!*
5. *Tentative date: 2006: March 24-27; 2007: March 23-26.*

Robert clarified: Willamette won't submit a bid, but will do it if needed. Believes 100-120 rooms (140 max). Trischa clarified: Don't have major hotel or banquet, but do have place for reception. OSU has 150+ rooms without department-dependent rooms.

Skip clarified: If interested in future years, please contact me.

- Executive Secretary – Renea Gernant, Concordia University
- There are 3-4 tournaments we're still missing. Still need complete for Kevin Twohy or UC-Berkeley results.*
- Treasurer – Brent Northup, Carroll College

At \$13,000 before collection. Down 35 schools (75 as opposed to 110); but with the reserves, we're fine. Ric helped with banquet. The Holiday Inn apparently tried to add a \$20 surcharge, but it didn't happen. Irish should break even; the organization won't be out anything. If there's a crisis with the hotel, contact Brent. Tournament will be at Convention Center on Sunday; 4 of the 16 double-octas at the hotel; the other rounds will be there.

Jason Steck: Will the Europe group be for this year too?

Robert replies that outreach was approved. \$3,600 was approved at NCA. Rest under finance committee.

- National Student Representative – Elizabeth Alquist, UC-Berkeley
 - 1. *Meeting time difficult because of flying in. That makes it difficult.*
 - 2. *Split in parli community around NPTE vs. NPDA. Who gets to make rules on what tournaments will do? As NPDA rep, if viability, need to create oversight rules to sanction tournaments.*
 - 3. *For students, would be helpful about making announcements to students. Could utilize a bit more.*
- Jason Steck clarifies that there's a parli-student mailing list that has been languished.*

Committees

Championship Tournament Committee – Konrad Hack, Azusa Pacific University

Software works. Gary on speed dial. 70% of all teams submitted. Those by 4:00 p.m., there will be a sheet that tells you who your strikes are. If you believe you've been assigned a stricken judge, talk to Konrad.

4:30 p.m. – Sheets will be available through Danny Cantrell. 220 teams in the tournament. Supplemental strike list – 6-8 who are added; 6-8 deleted.

Can make modifications until 9:00.

Steve – Judging philosophies for the new judges?

No regional constraints on judges.

Sharon at this point passed the chairmanship of the meeting to Ed Inch.

Host – Ric Shaffer, Texas Tech University

Food options on campus are limited. At 5:00 p.m. tomorrow, Student Union closed for fire testing and asbestos removal. There are places near campus. 19th St. is the best for fast food options. A barbecue place will set up around 10:30 for 7:00. Limited veggie options for the BBQ place.

We are sharing the hotel with the Municipal Judges conference. Be careful about activities at the hotel...

Site – Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University

Committee on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment – Lisa Ashby, Concordia University

No report as of now, will seek committee members at the tournament. Ric says, the policy is in the book.

Finance Committee – Robert Trapp, Willamette University

Current procedures call for report at NCA – that's what has always been done. Depending on where the tournament goes, we may have 200 team tournament, which substantially affects revenues. Depending on sweepstakes, there might be no more members, which means all funds come from the tournament. The relationship with IDEA, which has been pretty informal – there will be grants available. Jason asks, "Will this include for people over 25? International travel has been age-limited." Robert's response: Can host speaking event, apply for grant, get between \$250-500 per event. John Meany sponsored 7, Willamette did 12, PLU did 4.

John Meany's clarification – The grant came from the U.N. Foundation – will they continue? Robert says, "Yes, even larger through IDEA."

Robert adds – We need to think about how the organization will raise money. We are 2-3 sentences away from an IDEA presence on the Willamette campus. Sharon is trying to start an IDEA presence in Netherlands. They will have development officers (salaried IDEA employees) that will keep an eye out for projects that NPDA/IDEA could partner with. This could enhance the fiscal wealth of the organization. Have the grant writing capability and staff to do that.

Outreach Committee Kate Shuster, The Claremont College

Now Dir. of Debate at Occidental College. Started program as part of outreach program. 1-1.5 years ago, invitational email asking about "Each one, teach one." Formal invitations will be coming out. Will be preparing a packet in terms of starting new college programs. Report – proposal for \$4,000; no guidelines and no formal rules because of when the committee was started. There will be something in June. One person doesn't likely even now he is on the committee. New textbook out for middle school debate; willing to help including high school.

Jason asks, "What about those who can't attend the NPDA tournament due to financial reasons – i.e., U of Missouri, U of Puget Sound?" Kate says, "We approved something to help schools that can't attend."

Wants to see proposals for the outreach committee. There are two funding periods – NCA and at the Spring business meeting. There are two times. But, apply in the fall for money. Robert says, "Why not go to the Finance Committee and ask?"

Brent says, "There's an informal network of programs that are supportive of each other. This can be done more informally." Could ask specific programs to put their names on the list.

Someone says, "That network isn't accessible for student-run teams."

John Meany says, "I prefer institutional action rather than informal networks." There are liability and other issues that must be considered. John then pointed out most debate organizations don't really do enough to encourage development.

Sharon says, "If schools have problems, contact Kate or the Finance Committee."

Professional Development – Matt Taylor, California State University-Long Beach
Two items: No institutional research going on this weekend. Professional Development calls for an All-American award. Digital copy of the committee report – All-American Award. Award proposed: to final NPDA Tournament (could be 2-year or 4-year). Process similar to NIET – districts collect. Each district gets 1 automatic all-American, can forward up to 2 additional names. Final team will be announced here. Not reinventing the wheel...

Moved and seconded from committee, thus it is automatically considered.

Service often comes from pastor/other social work.

Robert makes an amendment to raise the GPA to 3.5. Discussion about the differences in schools, programs. Trischa says, "I've been on the NIET committee – it depends on the year. Would hate to see one bad semester harm. John Meany says, "The standard should be extraordinarily high."

Voting: 15 for + 2 proxies = 17. Opposed 9 + 7 proxies = 16.

Amendment passes.

Jason Steck amends, "Service requirement allows those who have full-time jobs to count as service requirement." Moved/seconded.

Steve Hunt says, "Leave it to the discretion to the committee. Shouldn't overproscribe."

Matt says, "Not the case. Service/commitment/sacrifices made. The committee's job should be to look at these issues."

Gary says, "Do you specifically exclude full-time work?" Matt, "Always been used in narratives/letters of the candidate."

Vote: 5 in favor, 15 against. 1 abstention.

Question: Will the GPA be the one that the institution calculates? Matt: Never once have we recalculated.

Trischa: Competitive success = successful nationally? Matt: It's up to the letters.

Vote on main motion as amended: Yes = 20 + 9 proxies. No = 1 + 0 proxies. Abstention = 1.

Webmaster's Note: This is now added as Bylaw 14.

Old Business

By-Law Proposals

Hosting and Site

Proposal #37: Revise By-Law XIII. A. to clarify Host responsibilities for the Championship Tournament.

Proposal #38: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to allow for more than one hotel to serve the Championship Tournament.

Proposal #41: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. by adding that the President should sign the hotel contract for the Championship Tournament.

MSP to group #37, 38, and #41. MSP to discuss as a group.

Gary: Since few schools, has the organization considered paying a hosting fee to the school?

Sharon: We haven't thought about that, but that's a good idea.

Elizabeth: Would be incredibly helpful. We can host, but we can't do the administrative aspect.

Charlie Ewing: President sign the hotel contract is necessary. The local host thought she'd be liable for \$13,000 for another large tournament.

Gary: If recommendation, #37 could add "Out of the \$5,000 hosting fee by NPDA. Could have for the next tournament?" Amendment: "... out of a \$5,000 hosting fee to be paid by the organization by the school."

Ric comments, "It's actually cheaper to host."

John says, "It should be \$7,500 to \$10,000."

Ed, "I hope that the budget is in balance. Let's take it to the finance committee and the treasurer. How much on the surcharges? Not a big fan of putting it into the bylaws of the organization."

Steve Hunt, "Should not be done on the fly. Study needs to be done."

Skip Rutledge, "Wording defeats the purpose of – certain expenses that the host takes on. What if it's more than \$5,000?"

Glenn Prince, "Could be \$140/school to pay. Student-run teams who have cost issues couldn't afford another \$140."

Kate, "Agree with Glenn. Fees for banquet rolled over to the host."

Gary, "Hasty, but for next tournament, have a whole year to fix it if it's bad. No host next year. Bad to ask host to give money."

Ric, "Clarification about banquet if appropriate. At NCA, we did pass this."

Glenn, "This year's banquet? Amounts?"

Ed, "Neither bid for 2006 has a banquet."

Elizabeth says, "We could host at UC-Berkeley."

Amended motion: Yes = 6+ 7 proxies = 13. No = 15 + 2 proxies = 17. 2 absentions. Amendment fails.

MSP #37, #38 and #41 by unanimous consent.

MSP to take proposal E out of order.

Vote to take out of order: 9 + 7 proxies = 16. Vote against: 11 + 2 proxies = 13. Fails.

MSP to group #7, 9, 14, and 36.

Eligibility, Rules and Enforcement

Proposal #7: Revise language in By-Law VIII. to consolidate rule enforcement with the Professional Development Committee.

Proposal #9: Revise By-Law VIII. D. to consolidate enforcement of rules with the Professional Development Committee.

Proposal #14: Revise By-Law XI. C. to provide a process for determining debater eligibility and an enforcement mechanism for violations.

Proposal #36: Revise By-Law XII. to bring language in conformity with current usage.

Sharon withdraws proposal #36.

Thus, the grouping is now #7, #9 and #14.

Ed comments: The decision making goes out of the Exec Committee, which is bad.

Michael withdraws the grouping motion.

Now, on to #7.

Ed, "There should be an appeal mechanism to the Executive Council. I would prefer 'President' replace 'Professional Development Committee.'"

Keith, "Is it current practice to delegate? Should remain in the hands of an elected body."

Jason, "To what powers does this refer? Are there decisions on eligibility?" Sharon says, "Yes. Every year there has been at least 1 issue."

Jason, "Under SQ or this change, what provisions exist for those discussions to be open to the people effected."

Sharon, "When an appeal comes to the Executive Committee, I contact the school & individuals involved."

Sharon, "There was ambiguity, so I copied both the Rules/Development and the Executive Committee, and received their input. Then we all put in our vote." One of the reasons for the proposal was that the Executive Committee was making too many decisions. Wanted more power in the rest of the organization. We don't want to feel that this is a body for all decisions.

Ed, "What has passed – more layers of committees and bodies. Article V, Sect. 2 says the President decides what upholds. Shouldn't undermine."

Charlie, "Am I included?"

Sharon says, "No."

Charlie, "I was elected as a member of the Executive Council at this committee."

Vote: Item #7: fails by 'voice vote.'

On to Item #9. Item #9 fails by voice vote.

Renea mentions that Comm. College representative is considered an officer.

Proposal #14. Fails due to a lack of a motion.

Proposal #36 withdrawn.

Proposal #8: Revise By-Law VIII. by adding guiding definitions for a novice and a junior.

*Gary amends to keep language in a2 in like means as b2.
MSP with the amendment.*

MSP unanimously.

Proposal #31: Revise By-Law XI. I. 4. to provide consistency in the definition of a novice debater.

Elizabeth says, "This would make for more fairness."

Ric asks, "What is the enforcement mechanism?"

Elizabeth says, "NFL online system = enforcement."

MSP unanimously by voice vote.

Tournament General

Proposal #30: Revise By-Law XI. H. 3. to consolidate enforcement of tournament rules with the Tournament Director and the Ethics and Rules Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee.

MSP unanimously by voice vote.

Jason says, "When ethical challenges happen, NPTE likes its board."

Group #35, 45, #46, and #56. MS.

Group #16. Fails for lack of second.

MSP on the group.

MSP unanimously by voice vote on #35, 45, 46 and #56.

Proposal #35: Revise By-Law XII. to charge the Tournament Director and the Rules and Standards Subcommittee with the enforcement of NPDA Championship Tournament rules.

Proposal #45: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 7. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for hired judges.

Proposal #46: Revise By-Law XIII. A .8. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for student help.

Proposal #56: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 5. b. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to work with the Tournament Host in arranging hired judges.

Proposal #16: Revise By-Law XI. E.1. to be less prescriptive regarding when topics will be written.

Currently, it's a problem as to when the topics will be done. The proposal would allow increased flexibility.

MSP unanimously by voice vote.

Proposal #32: Revise By-Law XI. I. 5. a. 3) to provide sweepstakes points for both preliminary and elimination round debates.

MS.

Would the tournament champion win sweepstakes?

Trischa says, "No."

Can it happen? It could. Trischa says, "It really doesn't affect things much."

Marty says, "Consider elim round performance."

MSP unanimously by voice vote.

Proposal #33: Revise By-Law XI. I. 5. a. 4) to include points gained from elimination rounds in the determination of Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards

MSP unanimously by voice vote.

Judges

Proposal #24: Revise By-Law #24: Revise By-Law XI. G. 2. to mandate that all strikes and constraints received by the deadline be administered before the start of round one and to ensure all teams received no less than 125% of the entire judging pool.

Amend to show that it's really 15%.

Steve Hunt rises to point of personal privilege: "Language of chair is intemperate."

MSP unanimously by voice vote.

Proposal #26: Add By-Law XI. G. 5. to advise judges to be judicially, politically and philosophically unbiased in rendering decisions.

MS.

Question: Enforcement mechanism to make sure that judges actually do this?

Elizabeth: Offers amendment: Ethics committee to review ballots. A team may send a ballot or written committee to the Ethics Committee for review, and can be stricken

Michael amends to include: "to the Ethics Committee and Championship Tournament Committee."

Gary says, "It's not OK to say that certain philosophical comments aren't acceptable."

Jason says, "There's ultimately politically skewed. What's left is professional ethics."

Keith says, "This is really what strikes are about. What is the threshold?"

Elizabeth withdraws amendment.

Back to the question.

John says, "Why put these in without other prejudices?"

John amends, "Judges should strive to judge debates on the basis of student performance, avoiding rendering decisions based on the judge's personal prejudices." Seconded.

MSP on the amendment and on the motion.

Webmaster's Note: This actually due to other proposals that have passed, will be Bylaw XI G 7.

Proposal #29: Revise By-Law XI. H. 1. to require judges at the Championship Tournament to affirm that they have read, understand and agree to abide by NPDA rules.

MSP unanimously by voice vote.

Point of Personal Privilege by Kate Shuster on the chair.

Motion to take out of order and second for considering item F.

Yes = 13 + 9 proxies = 22. No = 11 + 0 proxies = 11. Passes by 2/3 vote.

Skip moves to divide item F as: 1) do we reinstate? 2) do we use the Dorsi system?

MSP to divide the motion.

Part 1 to reinstate:

Skip speaks in favor, "Administrators have no basis of comparison. Taking away a tool that programs use to show why an academic endeavor could be important. Let's bring back a good thing. It does help."

Jason against, "Which programs? For large budget teams in opportunity-rich reasons. Equals subsidy by small programs for bigger programs."

Gary for, "Many ways to put out public relations. We use national champs to benefit. Why not advance team by taking about NPTE? Use every force that I can. Then, what's the point of checking the NPDA website?"

Marty against, "Issues beyond recognition. Duplicate set of awards. Burden an Exec Secretary with thankless job. Some regions – central US draws programs out of the region and to other tournaments. Second concern is novice = the definition is advisory. Exploited for point gains."

Elizabeth for, "Only counts 2 teams across division. If get rid of advantage, then vote Proposal F. No impact on regional competition."

Move to extend time by 4 minutes.

Jeremy Grace, "Second everything Marty says."

Steve Hunt speaks in favor.

John Meany, "Support in debate sweepstakes over time in other organizations = resource-intensive."

Southern Utah, Georgetown cuts. Real problem = advertise programs, then 200 schools = failures.

For: Elimination = doesn't recognize.

Patty Steck: Fallacious to say that season sweeps = only and best way to promote. Milk any success.

Move to extend time by 4 minutes.

Bonnie: If you're thinking administrators don't care about national ranking = you're wrong. Only student organization that is a signature program. One of the reason = national year long sweepstakes. Got money because Truman > CC. If here for pedagogical, fine. Why have competition?

Michael Dreher: This system fails to deal with 4-round tournaments and other kinds of alternative formats. Glenn's point – This means that we should amend.

Kate: If you're #75, 80, etc. how do use advantage? The largest point = pedagogical, if you're basing this on trophies, then you lose if you stop winning awards. Substantial evidence that creates disparities and reduce regional debate. Close to going down the same road as CEDA.

Vote on 1st half = reinstate sweepstakes.

Yes = 12 + 9 proxies = 21. No = 13 + 1 proxy = 14.

Point of order on the voting of proxies.

The time for the meeting expires.

Motion to adjourn. Seconded, fails.

Motion to extend debate by 5 minutes.

Now on the 2nd part of the motion.

Solution to problems with system = change the system. Many regions don't have novice/junior. Pressures to create open divisions.

Matt amends, by adding section 2 from proposal #4 under original proposals:

"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 preliminary rounds of a National Parliamentary Debate Association sanctioned tournament and two points for a win by a team the first two elimination rounds.
- 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.”

Gary amends the amendment to restore novice/junior at full value.
Move to extend time by 8 minutes. MSP.

On the amendment to the amendment:

Bill Sheffield says, “This destroys my novice.”

Jason says, “Admit regional disparity. The amendment to the amendment then allows CA schools to do.”

Charlie says, “No, this minimizes harm.”

Elizabeth says, “We’re limiting point totals now, so 4 points isn’t so bad. Isn’t the point to move JC kids to open?”

Skip, “Offended by perversion of the system comments. We’ve benefited. Any statement that diminishes novice is unfortunate. In favor because community colleges get a chance to celebrate. Let’s encourage novice division. CA is so big because the circuit encourages junior colleges to be in forensics.”

Steve: Everyone gets an award... 20 co-champions!”

Bill: What about separate awards for juniors/novices. We pass the rules about the times.

Patty: Opposed – can’t travel to junior/novice.

Matt comments – This also adds 4 teams, instead of 2.

Jason: Small teams in small regions already disadvantaged by lack of opportunities. When increase number of teams that count, they get no competitive access. 4 teams = budget issue.

Matt: Talking to programs – 4 not unreasonable.

John: Debating about numbers makes no sense – generation arbitrarily done. No meaningful way.

Vote: Restore junior and novice. 6 Yes + 4 proxies = 10. 18 No + 3 proxies = 21. Amendment to amendment fails.

Matt’s amendment passes by voice vote.

Now, back to Proposal F, with Matt’s amendment.

Motion to extend time by 5 minutes. Motion fails by voice vote.

On motion,

Reduce by ½ for junior/novice

Last 4 prelims + first 2 elims

Four teams/tournament

Vote: 17 + 7 proxies = 24 in favor. Against: 5 + 0 proxies = 5.

Move to extend meeting 2 minutes. MSP unanimous.

Move to get proposal B on the agenda. MSP.

Move to adjourn. Second and passed.

10 Round Tournament

- Proposal #15: Revise By-Law XI. D. to expand the Championship Tournament to ten preliminary rounds of debate.
- Proposal #18: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. a. to determine random and power matches rounds in the 10 round tournament.
- Proposal #19: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. to eliminate power-matching criteria for an 8 round tournament.
- Proposal #20: Revise By-Law XI. F. 4. to establish the tab room disclosure criteria for a 10 round tournament.
- Proposal #21: Revise By-Law XI. F. a. to advance the top 64 teams to single elimination rounds.
- Proposal #22: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. b. and c. to eliminate partial elimination rounds with the adoption of a 10 round tournament.

Held over from Chicago meeting – under New Business

- Proposal #6: Revise By-Law VII. Sanctioning of Tournament to promote outreach to Canadian schools.

New Business

Discussion Item

NPDA jurisdiction – Championship Tournament or all sanctioned tournaments.

Proposed Amendments

Constitution

- Proposal A. Article VIII. Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws – Sharon Porter
Eliminate Section 3. Further Amendment Procedures for the Constitution and By-Laws
- A. An amendment may be proposed by two-thirds of the Executive Council or by a petition of five percent of the current National Parliamentary Debate Association membership to the Executive Secretary and the President.
 - B. The proposed amendment shall be distributed to the membership. Members shall have forty-five days to send comments on the proposed amendment to the Executive Secretary.
 - C. Within sixty-five days of the publication of the proposed amendment, the Executive Secretary shall mail a ballot to the membership containing a copy of the proposed amendment, along with a statement of the arguments for and against the amendment. The author of the amendment shall have the opportunity to include a statement of the reasons for the amendment. The President may designate an individual to outline potential objections to the amendment. Both of these individuals shall have access to the comments received by the Executive Secretary. Ballots shall be due no later than three weeks after the mailing.
 - D. A three-fourths vote of all members voting will be required to enact an amendment initiated under this section.
 - E. A majority of the Executive Council may vote to exclude the time. From June 1 to September 1 from the time period in items b. and c. of this section.

Rationale: Section 3 seems to conflict with Section 1 and 2 which explain how Constitutional and By-Law changes can be made. This confusion was made clear when the Prescott proposals were advanced. Although the process for voting on the Prescott amendments were initiated through Section 3, at the business meeting we determined we could not proceed using Section 3 and reverted back to Sections 1 and 2.

By-Laws

- Proposal a: Article VIII. D. Student Eligibility Standards – Sharon Porter
Strike and replace with

- D. Protests related to eligibility should be directed to the Chair of the Rules and Standards Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee of the NPDA. The Chair will contact the coach(es) of the student(s) in question.
1. The responsibility for demonstrating eligibility falls upon the student's program. The Rules and Standards Subcommittee 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.

Justification: The Constitution Article VI. Section 5. C. 1.c. establishes one of the duties of the Rules and Standard Subcommittee "To hear and rule on complaints for violations, non-enactment or non-enforcement of established rules, including: 1) Challenges to eligibility of debaters; 2) Disqualification of judges or debaters; 3) The sexual harassment and racial discrimination policies of the NPDA;" Passing this proposal would eliminate the contradiction in our Constitution and By-Laws.

Proposal B: Article VIII A, Student Eligibility Standards – Michael Dreher, Bethel University and Keith West, Truman State University

Replace Article VIII A on eligibility standards and replace with the following:

1. Participation at the NPDA national tournament is open to undergraduate students pursuing coursework at an accredited college or university with the following stipulations:
 - a. Competitors may be enrolled in courses at no more than one institution with an NPDA-sanctioned debate program.
 - b. Exceptions to the above provision may be granted at the discretion of the Executive Council for the purpose of allowing students to take a small number of classes at a second institution in an exchange or study abroad capacity, or when courses required for the student's academic program are uniquely unavailable for a timely graduation. The student will be required to maintain the affiliation of her or his home school, for the purpose of competition, as designated by the institutions in question.
 - c. Competitors removed from participation in the NPDA via disciplinary action at their home school, or by their voluntary choice to leave that program, will forfeit all eligibility in the NPDA for the remainder of the season, regardless of school affiliation. This year will still be considered as "used" for the purposes of determining future eligibility.
 - d. Competitors may not possess a Bachelors degree or equivalent, nor may they possess any graduate degree, except for the exception allowed elsewhere in the bylaws.

Intent:

1. Clarify "disputed" or misunderstood sections of the NPDA eligibility rules.
2. Prevent students with "marketable" talent and institutions with funding and opportunistic mindsets from taking advantage of breaches of ethics and team policy for their own competitive advantage.
3. Protect individuals who affiliate themselves with a school other than their home school because their home school lacks an NPDA program.

Proposal c: Article VIII. A. Student Eligibility Standards – Sharon Porter

Strike and replace with

1. A tournament contestant is to be an officially enrolled undergraduate student in good standing at the college or university he/she is representing in competition.
 - A. A contestant is considered "officially enrolled" when he/she is duly registered in accordance with institutional regulations as an undergraduate student at the college or university he/she is representing in competition.
 - B. A contestant is considered an "undergraduate" if he/she is registered as a bachelor or associate degree seeking student at the institution he/she is to represent in competition and is not in possession of a BA degree.
 - C. "Good standing" shall be determined by rules and policies set by the institution the forensic competitor is representing in competition.
 - D. **If a student dual-enrolls in a 2 year college and a 4 year institution the rules governing participation by Phi Rho Pi shall be used to determine NPDA eligibility.**

Justification: In Article V. we say that we abide by the AFA Code of Forensics Tournament Standards for College and Universities. The above specifically reiterates the AFA Competitor Standard that is the least developed in our documents. The proposal adds a provision (in blue) which establishes an eligibility provision for community college students. If a student is no longer eligible to compete in Phi Rho Pi, they would no longer be able to compete at the NPDA for a 2 year college. Passing this proposal would ensure clarity and consistency in what we endorse.

Proposal D: Remove requirement for membership for tournament sanctioning. Proposed by Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University

It is proposed that NPDA no longer require NPDA organizational membership of tournament hosts wishing to be sanctioned for offering NPDA debating at their tournaments.

Strike Bylaw VII A. Relabel all other subpoints appropriately.

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

Rationale:

There may have been some value to requiring such membership when NPDA was in its infancy. It was a new event with strange rules and practices compared to dominant forms of debate. Such membership meant that tournament hosts would receive our mailing to learn about the activity. There is no longer such a need now that NPDA parliamentary debate is so mainstream. Additionally, the membership requirement provides an unnecessary impediment to sanctioning tournaments, and appears to be a bit officious and perhaps even a disingenuous way to artificially inflate membership numbers. The proposal spares tournament directors or hosts one more hurdle in putting on an event, and does not punish participants of tournaments attending an unsanctioned event that may not yield the same benefits as attending only sanctioned events.

Proposal E: Reinstate Season Sweepstakes. Proposed by Skip Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene University.

Proposal: Rescind action taken at the Fall 2004 business meeting and reinstate Bylaw IV, which is scheduled to be removed at the end of the 2004-2005 season.

It is proposed that NPDA reverse the action from the previous meeting removing the year long Sweepstakes race. The year long sweepstakes race will be determined in the way that it has been the last few years prior to the Chicago 2004 NCA, NPDA Convention business meeting.

Rationale:

The current, though soon to be eliminated, NPDA year long national ranking system benefits many programs by allowing them to provide administrators with some objective measure of a program's accomplishments. Most other collegiate programs competing with forensics (such as intercollegiate athletics) for scarce institutional resources have access to such measures to promote their cause, secure funds, increase support personnel, and insure proper promotion, tenure and advancement. The author of this motion is not opposed to improving upon the sweepstakes formula, but feels that it is better to have one in place and work on how to improve it, than it is to remove it entirely and hope to eventually replace it with a different measure sometime in the indefinite future.

There are many reasons to support the current yearlong ranking system, including but not limited to the following. Admittedly not all programs will find this system perfect, but that is true of any system. The reasons I like the current system are

- It can be especially helpful to small programs by showing if nothing else the larger universities with whom the smaller programs compete against regularly.
- Programs that are not ranked prominently would not suffer as this measure is not so well known or widely published that administrators are critical of not having a high ranking.
- Realistically, directors could use it as a tool if it helps them and not publicize it if it does not.
- It is good to reward Novices and Juniors as much as Seniors as all are learning and all are contributing to a team effort. There are other measures already in place to strictly recognize the contributions of the Seniors, such as the Tournament Sweepstakes, which only has a Senior Division. If people feel divisions are being abused the organization can address that with tighter definitions of what a true novice or junior should be.
- 6 rounds of preliminary competition should be encouraged to provide more learning opportunities than 4 round alternatives. It also provides a fairer basis for making elimination round cuts.
- Tournaments going to Octas or beyond are often more difficult than those just going to Semis, so I am not compelled by some of the equalizing measures being suggested as alternatives. A first, second or third place may not be of equivalent difficulty at all tournaments. The current system attempts to reflect that.
- The argument I have heard that teams will chase large National Circuit Tournaments and sacrifice local events doesn't seem to apply to our squad in that we hardly ever travel out of region, though we are blessed by a thriving local circuit. I think that is true by the way because we as a region try to encourage and nurture Novice and Junior levels of competition when we can. Team wide sweepstakes and honoring the contributions of beginning debaters may help create and nurture that environment. Additionally, I am not sure that sweepstakes considerations are the driving force on such decision to attend larger tournaments, as much as what the points are attempting to reflect - such as stronger competition leading to increased opportunities for learning and improving.

If the measure is less than perfect, then perhaps we should improve the measure. But please don't throw the baby out with the bath water. Pragmatically, I think it might be easier to work on improving what was /is already in place, rather than trying to start from scratch. If people want to devalue novices or juniors, then discuss that as a separate action. If we want to encourage shorter tournaments or longer tournaments, then discuss that as an amendment to a system already in place. Thanks for your consideration.

PROPOSAL F: Restore Previous System with one exception: make junior and novice worth half value, open division would earn points as per the previous system. Proposed by Mike Dorsi, UC-Berkeley.

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:

a. One point for each debate win (including a win for a bye and a win by forfeit) by a team in up to six preliminary rounds of a National Parliamentary Debate Association sanctioned tournament and two points for a win by a team in an elimination round.

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

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

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 two teams in a sanctioned tournament, the rounds of only that school's two 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 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.

PROPOSAL G: Amend NPDA Bylaws such that schools would be allowed to enter a minimum of two teams and allowing entries beyond two for teams that have reached elimination rounds in open division regardless of the number of entries by their school. Modified text shown below, added sections in italic, removed sections stuck.

XI. NPDA Championship Tournament Operating Procedures:

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.~~ *instructions to nominate two teams plus any teams that have reached elimination rounds in open division.*

a. Teams may count as having reached elimination rounds if either one of the debaters on the team has reached elimination rounds, regardless of it was with the partner entered for NPDA.

b. Elimination Rounds in Open Division must be reached at NPDA sanctioned tournaments, and elimination rounds must be appropriate. If a tournament has a larger than appropriate break, only the appropriate break will count for NPDA qualification.

c. Tournament results for qualification must be submitted by the NPDA entry deadline.

d. Schools should indicate which teams have qualified and which teams are filling the two guaranteed spaces.

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

a. first, find all schools who have at least two entered teams qualified by breaking and are also entering two teams that did not qualify by breaking, and inform those schools that they must reduce their entry by one team,

b. if that is insufficient in reducing tournament size, the tournament director shall find all schools that have at least two entered teams qualified by breaking and are also entering one team that did not qualify by breaking (this would include all teams who had to reduce their entry per part a) and inform those schools that they must reduce their entry by one team,

c. if this is insufficient, 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.

Recommended Actions:

Be it resolved that the NPDA endorses the efforts to include various forms and formats of parliamentary debate. Robert Trapp

Old Business (with Item Numbering):

Proposal #6: Sanctioning for Canadian Schools (originally proposed by Michael Dreher, Bethel University)

Revise Bylaw VII, Sanctioning of Tournaments.

Subpoint A:

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

Proposed addition: after NPDA, add: "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.

Justification: This would be a simple way to promote more outreach between US and Canadian debaters. It is hoped that this amendment would encourage more US schools to consider Canadian tournaments.

Proposal #7: Revise language in By-Law VIII. to consolidate rule enforcement with the Professional Development Committee.

Replace "President" with "Chair of the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee" and "Executive Council" to "Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee"

Justification: This would consolidate enforcement of rules into one body, relieving the President and the Executive Council of the task.

Proposal #8: Revise By-Law VIII. by adding guiding definitions for a novice and a junior.

Add "3. For tournament directors who desire definitions of novice and junior, the NPDA suggests the following guidelines:

a. To be classified as a novice

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

b. To be classified as a junior

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

Justification: This provides guidance to Tournament Directors who would like a uniform definition of junior and novice. Tournament Directors may use other definitions for junior and novice, and have those definitions count for sweepstakes/honor points, provided they make their definitions clear in the invitation.

Opposition: NPDA should not offer guidelines for the definition of novice and junior. That's outside the province of NPDA and should be left to tournament directors. Even a 'guideline' moves beyond NPDA's appropriate sphere of influence.

Proposal #9: Revise By-Law VIII. D. to consolidate enforcement of rules with the Professional Development Committee.

Throughout VIII. D. change "President" to "Chair of the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee" and "Executive Council" to "Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee."

Justification: This would consolidate enforcement of rules into one body. It would relieve the President, Executive Council and Tournament Director of this responsibility.

Proposal #14: Revise By-Law XI. C. to provide a process for determining debater eligibility and an enforcement mechanism for violations.

- Add " 3. The Director of Forensics or program director's signature will be required on entry forms certifying eligibility for the tournament and for the novice division.
4. Prior to the NPDA Championship Tournament, if an eligibility violation is determined by the Professional Development Committee, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee the following sanctions will be applied.
 - a. If the eligibility question deals with a novice debate, the student will lose the novice designation.
 - b. If the eligibility question deals with an open debater, the team will be given the option to fill in with another debater.
 - c. In either case, the school will be fined \$250. per violation.
 5. If a violation is discovered after the NPDA Championship Tournament, the following sanctions will be applied if the violation is reported to the Professional Development, Rules and Ethics Subcommittee within 21 days of the Championship Tournament.
 - a. The team's records will be eliminated. Any team awards will be returned, and any individual speaker awards for the ineligible debater will be returned. The other member may retain the speaker award she/he has earned.
 - b. The school will be fined \$250 per violation.

Justification: We want to be proactive, rather than reactive if possible.

Proposal #15: Revise By-Law XI. D. to expand the Championship Tournament to ten preliminary rounds of debate.

Change "eight" to "ten"

Justification: There are two predominate reasons for increasing to ten preliminary rounds. First, the current number of preliminary round debates is insufficient to sort the elimination round bracket. Increasing the number of preliminary rounds will better rank order the teams advancing to elimination rounds. Second, adding two more rounds adds more debates for all debaters at the tournament thereby increasing the educational value of the Championship Tournament (arguably the best laboratory all year for teaching argumentation and debate) for all participants, not just those advancing to elimination rounds.

If changed, would affect subsequent items.

Opposition: Our current system, advancing all winning teams, minimizes the interference of speaker points on the advancement process – and insures that all appropriate teams advance to out rounds. NPDA has gone on record opposing speaker points – the 64 team system most likely reinstates speaker points as part of our policy.

Proposal #16: Revise By-Law XI. E. 1. to be less prescriptive regarding when topics will be written.

Replace with "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."

Justification: This brings this section into conformity with the Topic Selection Subcommittee of the Championship Tournament Committee.

Proposal #18: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. a. to determine random and power matched rounds in the 10 round tournament

Replace with "a. "Rounds 1 and 2 will be randomly matched, while rounds 3-10 will be power matched based upon each team's cumulative record through the previous round."

Justification: This change would be necessary should a 10 round tournament proposal be approved. It determines what rounds will be randomly matched and which rounds will be power matched.

Proposal #19: Revise By-Law XI. F. 3. to eliminate power-matching criteria for an 8 round tournament.

Eliminate By-Law XI. F. 3. d. and e.

Justification: This power-matching criteria would not be used if a 10 round tournament is adopted.

Proposal #20: Revise By-Law XI. F. 4. to establish the tab room disclosure criteria for a 10 round tournament.

Replace with "After tabulating the results of each preliminary rounds (1-9) and releasing the pairings of 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 are accessible to all tournament participants."

Justification: The number of rounds would change with the 10 round tournament.

Proposal #21: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. a. to advance the top 64 teams to single elimination rounds.

Replace with "a. Following the conclusion of the last preliminary round, teams will be rank-ordered according to the criteria listed below. The top 64 teams will advance to the single elimination round."

Justification: The current number of preliminary round debates is insufficient to sort the elimination round bracket. Increasing the number of preliminary round allows for a better rank order of the teams advancing to elimination rounds.

Proposal #22: Revise By-Law XI. F. 5. b. and c. to eliminate partial elimination rounds with the adoption of a 10 round tournament.

Eliminate b. and c.

Justification: With a guaranteed two extra rounds and a more accurate breaking of brackets, partial elimination rounds would no longer be needed.

Proposal #24: Revise By-Law XI. G. 2 to mandate that all strikes and constraints received by the deadline be administered before the start of round one and to ensure all teams receive no less than 15% of the entire judging pool.

Replace with "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."

Justification: Although complications can and inevitably do arise, instances of inequity have been rampant in errors made on issues of strikes. In such instances, time has restricted the full addressing of these issues. We believe that it is more important for equal treatment to be received by each student, and therefore prefer a call to action for strikes to be honored.

Proposal #26: Add By-Law XI. G. 5. to advise judges to be judicially, politically and philosophically unbiased in rendering decisions.

Add " 5. Judges should always strive to judge debates on the basis of who they thought did the better debating, avoiding rendering a decision based on their own judicial political or philosophical bias."

Justification: Although this standard may be implicit, it is good to remind people. These guidelines serve as a tool for training judges at other tournaments.

Proposal #29: Revise By-Law XI. H. 1. to require judges at the Championship Tournament to affirm that they have read, understand and agree to abide by NPDA rules.

Replace with "H. 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."

Justification: There have been consistent complaints that some judges are unfamiliar with rules, and in the absence of familiarity, have been making up their own rules. At the very least, to require an affirmation that the rules have been read, especially with the proposed method for implementation, increases the accountability of the judges to those rules. In addition, it further protects us against sexual harassment claims when all judges verify that they are informed of their responsibilities as judges.

Proposal #30: Revise By-Law XI. H. 3. to consolidate enforcement of tournament rules with the Tournament Director and the Ethics and Rules Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee.

Replace with "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."

Justification: This change is necessary to consolidate the enforcement of NPDA Rules with one body.

Proposal #31: Revise By-Law XI. I. 4. to provide consistency in the definition of a novice debater.

Eliminate "" with a year of competition being defined as two tournaments in each of the two semesters."

Justification: As stated this conflicts with the definition of novice provided in By-Law IX. Novice Awards.

Proposal #32: Revise By-Law XI. I. 5. a. 3) to provide sweepstakes points for both preliminary and elimination round debates.

Replace with "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."

Justification: The old system only rewarded preliminary round performance. The proposed system recognizes a school's performance during the entire tournament. However, the committee felt that preliminary rounds should be weighted heavier than elimination rounds to reflect a program's breadth rather than just depth. So a school that advances four teams but all drop in early elimination rounds should have points that reflect the success of many teams opposed to a school that has one team that wins the tournament but has no other teams doing well at the tournament. This team has the award the team won for its individual accomplishment but should be additionally recognized for that singular performance.

Opposition: The sweepstakes system is complex with subtleties that deserve discussion – and, perhaps, revision. There is merit to counting only prelims – winning 24 of 32 rounds is a sign of a balanced team. Two teams, who both reach semifinals, could earn 28 or more by themselves! The balanced four-team accomplishment is more worthy of "sweepstakes" recognition. The two teams would be appropriately recognized with top national awards – a more fitting honor for two teams than 'school sweepstakes'".

Proposal #33: Revise By-Law XI. 1.5. a. 4) to include points gained from elimination rounds in the determination of Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards.

Replace with "a) The greatest cumulative number of preliminary and elimination round points as enumerated in 5. a. 3)"

Justification: This just reflects the new sweepstakes system as the first factor in determining sweepstakes. The rest of the tie breaking system would remain intact.

Proposal #35: Revise By-Law XII. to charge the Tournament Director and the Rules and Standards Subcommittee with the enforcement of NPDA Championship Tournament rules.

Replace paragraph 4 with "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.

Justification: This change is necessary to consolidate the rule enforcement with The Tournament Director and the Rules and Standards Subcommittee.

Proposal #36: Revise By-Law XII. to bring language in conformity with current usage.

Throughout By-Law XII. change "proposition" to "Government", "First proposition" to "Prime Minister", "Second proposition" to "Member of Government", "First opposition" to "Leader of the Opposition" and "Second opposition" to "Member of the Opposition".

Justification: The terms used in this section do not reflect current practice and consequently need to be changed.

Proposal #37: Revise By-Law XIII. A. to clarify Host responsibilities for the Championship Tournament.

Replace with "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."

Justification: Not all of the responsibilities included are financial. While the Host is required to provide certain items for the efficiency of the tournament any costs associated with extras should be incurred by the Host.

Proposal #38: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. to allow for more than one hotel to serve the Championship Tournament.

Replace with "2. 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

Justification: The original implies that only one hotel will meet NPDA needs. The proposed change may encourage schools in smaller towns that do not have access to a large convention hotel. This does mean, of course, that the school must be able to meet any room requirements for the entire tournament. In addition, under the new organizational structure, the Host and Site Development Committee and the Championship Tournament Committee will be more directly responsible for the tournament. In addition, the Host has long hours at the tournament and may live a distance from the school. The NPDA should shoulder some responsibility for easing the burden on the Host.

Proposal #41: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 2. by adding that the President should sign the hotel contract for the Championship Tournament.

Add "The President of the National Parliamentary Debate Association should sign the hotel contract."

Justification: There was is ambiguity as to who should sign the hotel contract and it was the feeling of those assembled, including two past Presidents, that the contract should be signed by the President.

Proposal #45: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 7. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for hired judges.

Replace "President" with "Tournament Director"

Justification: The Tournament Director is in the position to know the need for judges.

Proposal #46: Revise By-Law XIII. A. 8. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to determine the need for student help.

Replace "President" with "Tournament Director"

Justification: The Tournament Director is in the position to know the need for student help.

Proposal #56: Revise By-Law XIII. B. 5. b. to establish the Tournament Director as the appropriate person to work with the Tournament Host in arranging hired judges.

Replace with "b. "The Tournament Host will prove 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."

Justification: The Tournament Director is responsible for the operation of the Championship Tournament, including receiving the registration information, and should notify the Host of judging needs in a timely fashion.