

NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION

BUSINESS MEETING

Wednesday, August 20, 2024: 9:00 pm PDT

VIRTUAL

Meeting Zoom Link: <https://mercer.zoom.us/j/2775160924?omn=98931836291>

AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order (Kyle Pryor-Landman) - 9:05 am**
- II. **Approval of Minutes (Spring 2024) (Approved)**
- III. **Reports**
 - A. Executive Council (20 minutes)
 - i. President - Adeja Powell (Mercer University)
 1. Putting out a call for 2026 bids this Friday, preference to NPTE and NPDA on consecutive weekends, or with co-host than can host one or other within a reasonable distance
 2. Call for SHO at 2025 NPDA Nats. Adeja has a conflict of interest in holding it. If you know someone, please let us know! :)
 3. Able to populate outreach committee! Chaired by Brent Nicholson, on the committee, Kiefer Storrer, and Konrad Hack, understanding growth and decline. Working on discussions and projects for NPDA!
 4. The website is great, and the tournament is calendar up!
 - ii. Vice President - Fiker Tesfaye (Mercer University)
 1. There is interest in trying to get summer camp/coop running, hosted, or involved with NPDA, creating resources for teams that need more help. Novice filebooks, updates to Parli Prepbook. The community is stabilizing, and interest is growing among people interested in NPDA. Help in stabilizing.
 - iii. Executive Secretary - Kyle Pryor-Landman (San Diego State University)
 1. Make sure to keep sending your sanctioning. Return dates on results are flexible, but we want to get you awards! Please don't send me your results before nationals, and I know you have them. We made the process easy!
 - iv. Treasurer - Shannon LaBove (Rice University)
 1. The cost of NPDA was \$9051, total approx \$14k, took in \$12k from Speechwire; thank you to Jeannie for keeping host costs low <3, trophies approx \$3k, judges about \$3k, tab about \$400.
 - B. Other Reports -

- i. Webmaster - Kyle Pryor-Landman (San Diego State University)
 - 1. Website works! Please make a login. If you want to help, let Kyle know.
- ii. Outreach - Brent Nicholson (McKendree University)
 - 1. There was a lack of clarity on what NPDA is! Get people to discuss what NPDA is and ought to be. Testing waters on value topics as codified requirements. Novice round robin, starting points for figuring out what we want NPDA to be.
 - 2. Constitutional convention! Lots of extraneous bits; the topic committee is broken because it takes out of the prep room, for example. Big discussion focused on constitutional changes.

IV. Action Items

A. BYLAW CHANGES

- i. **Update Gender Neutral Language**
 - 1. Submitted by Brent Nicholson (McKendree University)
- ii. **Add New Awards to the National Tournament**
 - 1. Submitted by Brent Nicholson (McKendree University)
- iii. **Reduce Scope of NPDA Sweepstakes Awards**
 - 1. Submitted by Adeja Powell (Mercer University)
- iv. **Add Novice Round Robin to the National Tournament**
 - 1. Submitted by Brent Nicholson (McKendree University)
- v. **Add True Junior Varsity to the National Tournament**
 - 1. Submitted by Kiefer Storrer (Whitman College)
- vi. **Reduce Number of Preliminary Rounds at National Tournament**
 - 1. Submitted by Joe Blasdel and Brent Nicholson (McKendree University)
- vii. **Add Value Topics to the National Tournament**
 - 1. Submitted by Kiefer Storrer (Whitman College)
- viii. **Modification of Rules about Electronic Flowing**
 - 1. Submitted by Fiker Tesfaye (Mercer University)

V. Discussion

- A. **David Worth will be putting out a call for Distinguished Service awards sometime soon!**

VI. Adjournment

Roll Call

Baker Weilart-Pekar (Whitman)+

Brent Nicholson (McKendree)+

David Worth (Rice)+

Steve Farias (UOP)+

Shannon LaBove (Rice)

Kyle Pryor-Landman (SDSU)+

Adeja Powell (Mercer)+

Fiker Tesfaye (Mercer)

Malia Frerking (CU Nebraska)*
Brittany Hubble (El Camino)*
Anthony Rodriguez (Urban Texas) *
Joseph Provencher (UT Tyler)* +
Konrad Hack (CU Irvine)*+
Darren Elliot (KCKCC)*+

Appendix - Full NPDA Bylaw Proposals

Novice Round Robin

Submitted by: Brent Nicholson

Adeja Moves to table; Brent Seconds

x. National Tournament Operation Procedure...

D. Novice

1. 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:
 - a) Students with previous competitive experience in high school or intercollegiate debate formats would be ineligible for novice status.
 1. High school debate formats include, but are not limited to, Cross-Examination (CX) Debate, Lincoln-Douglas (LD) Debate, Public Forum (PF) Debate, and Parliamentary Debate.
 2. Intercollegiate debate formats include but are not limited to, Parliamentary Debate (such as NPDA, APDA, CUSID), CEDA/NDT, NFA-LD, NEDA, ADA, BP, IPDA, and College Public Forum.
 - b) Each novice student is eligible for novice standing for no more than one NPDA Championship Tournament.
2. Coaches may identify students who qualify for novice status so that they may be tracked for novice awards and a **Novice round robin to be held during elimination rounds of the open bracket.**
 - a) The coach should identify novice competitors and novice two-person teams at the time the entry is submitted to the Tournament Director.
 - b) For a two-person team to qualify for novice status, both members of the pairing must be novice competitors.
3. The tabroom staff at each NPDA Championship Tournament will track the performance of novice competitors and novice two-person teams.
 - a) Certificates, plaques, or other appropriate awards should be given to the top five novice speakers.
 1. 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.
 2. Novice speaker awards will be announced at the normally scheduled awards ceremony.
 - b) Certificates, plaques, or other appropriate awards should be given to the top **four** novice two-person teams.

1. Both members of the two-person team must be novice competitors in order to receive a novice team award.
2. The teams should simply be ranked by **most round wins in the Novice Round Robin and, in the event of a tie, by head-to-head record in the Novice Round Robin**. 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.

...

G. Debates

...

1. Following the preliminary rounds and the first elimination round, **there will be a novice round robin of the top 4 Novice teams to be held during elimination rounds of the open bracket**. Any debate partnership where both debaters are eligible for novice status according to the NPDA bylaws in the Fall of the academic year and who did not advance beyond the first elimination round of the open bracket of the NPDA championship tournament are eligible for the Novice round-robin. Trophies will be provided to each breakout participant.
 - a) **Each team in the Novice round-robin will be paired against each other team for one debate with ~~three judges~~ one or three judges, at the discretion of the Tournament Director, to be announced at the beginning of the Novice Round Robin rounds.**
 - b) **The team with the most round wins in the round robin will be named Novice National Champion.**
 - c) **In the event of a tie-in round wins, the team with the better head-to-head record will be awarded the Top Novice Team award.**

...

L. Awards

...

3. All teams, both members of which are novices (no more than one semester of interscholastic high school debate experience in their first year of intercollegiate 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 **four** 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 **round wins in the Novice Round Robin**.
 - b) If a tie still exists, the **head-to-head record of tied teams in the Novice Round Robin** will determine placing.
 - c) If a tie still exists, the seeding of the tied teams after preliminary rounds will determine placing.

Discussion

Concerns about judging burden from schools. Brittany has concerns about novice participation, i.e., going 2-6 and then debating more. JV division is the norm, if less, go to RR.

Adding New Awards

Submitted by: Brent Nicholson and Adeja Powell

As amended: Votes: Call: Second: (

Bylaw changes:

XI. Service Awards Committee

A. NPDA Distinguished Service Award

1. The award need not be given yearly but should be awarded at the national tournament when awarded.
2. The Distinguished Service Award Committee should be chaired by the Vice-president of NPDA and composed of individuals appointed by the President.
3. Criteria for the award:
 - a) Past or present association with NPDA is required.
 - b) Contributions to the advancement and development of NPDA.
 - c) Evidence of direct service to the NPDA community.
 - d) Formal and/or informal leadership in the NPDA community.
4. Nominations should be solicited by the committee and should be received by a deadline established by the committee.
5. Nominations should include a one-page summary of the nominee's accomplishments, a nomination letter, and signed supporting letters of recommendation.

B. NPDA Coach of the Year Award

1. The award ~~should~~ need not be given ~~annually~~ yearly but should be awarded at the national tournament when awarded.
2. The Coach of the Year Award Committee should be chaired by the Vice President and composed of individuals appointed by the President.
3. Criteria for the award:
 - a) Current association with NPDA is required.
 - b) The Coach of the Year must be a full-time employee of their institution.
 - c) Contributions to the advancement and development of NPDA.
 - d) Evidence of excellence as a coach and/or educator.
4. Nominations should be solicited by the committee and should be received by a deadline established by the committee.
5. Nominations should include a one-page summary of the nominee's accomplishments, a nomination letter, and signed supporting letters of recommendation.

C. NPDA Critic of the Year Award

1. The award ~~should~~ need not be given annually at the national tournament.
2. The Coach of the Year Award Committee should be chaired by Vice President and composed of individuals appointed by the President.
3. Criteria for the award:

- a) Current association with NPDA is required.
- b) Evidence of excellence as a judge and/or educator.
- 4. Nominations should be solicited by the committee and should be received by a deadline established by the committee.
- 5. Nominations should include a one-page summary of the nominee's accomplishments, a nomination letter, and signed supporting letters of recommendation.

Constitution changes:

Adding Award committee language.

Article IV Section B.3. The Vice President's duties are:

- a. To conduct elections for officers of the Association, for amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws, and for other issues as directed by the Executive Council;
- b. To chair the Championship Tournament Committee;
- c. To chair the Nomination Committee;
- d. To serve as a voting member of the Executive Council;
- e. To assist as needed in the administration of the annual Championship Tournament;
- f. To assume the office of President at the conclusion of the term of Vice President, or upon vacancy in the office of the President.
- g. To prepare and present bi-annual reports to the membership on the state of the organization at each Business Meeting.
- h. To serve as a member of the Topic Sub-Committee of the National Championship Tournament Committee.
- i. To serve as an ex-officio member of the Site subcommittee of the National Championship Tournament Committee.
- j. To chair the All-American Award committee and collect nominations from District Representatives.
- k. To chair the Service Award Committee and collect nominations from member organizations.
- k. l. To maintain records appropriate to ~~her or his~~ **their** activities and to submit those to ~~her or his~~ **their** successor at the close of ~~her or his~~ **their** term

Discussion

- 1. Kyle asks about funding, not necessary. Shannon notes that it would be around \$200, limiting JV/Novice awards. Not be a super detrimental cost. David asks to change the award to need not be given. Adeja agrees and submits a friendly amendment to adjust

the language. David also asked for a section to add a new coach award. Adeja would be OK with adding that to the coach of the year; how many years out, FT? Shannon asks if this is student-led or community lead.

Gender-Neutral Language

Submitted by: Brent Nicholson

Votes: Shannon Call, Adeja Second (All in Favor)

Consent item – Article XIII, Section G, point 4.

Replacing “her or his” and “his or her” with “their” and “he or she” and “she or he” with “they” and making corresponding changes to subject-verb agreement.

JV Breakout

Submitted by: Kiefer Storrer

Kyle Moves to Table; Brent Seconds

Article X, Subpoint D:

All instances of "Novice" in subpoint D. get replaced with "Junior Varsity", EXCEPT verbiage specifically codifying novice semifinals and finals. The new Junior section would also include the following language, pulled from earlier in the by-laws -

2. To be eligible for Junior Varsity:

- a) The student should be in the first four semesters of intercollegiate debate.
- b) Once the student has won six elimination rounds (including byes) in Junior or Open, they are no longer eligible for the Junior division.
- c) Eligibility is determined prior to the start of a tournament.

Value Topics

Submitted by: Kiefer Storrer

Move to table, 1 against

Addition of Value Topics for the NPDA Championship Tournament

Section X, Article H, **add** Subsection 1: "The Topic Selection Committee will draft at least 5 Value Resolutions, with preliminary rounds having 2-4 value resolutions as topics, to the discretion of the tournament director, and 1 value resolution to be used in elimination rounds."

Discussion

David opens the discussion to concerns about having the TC create more resolutions than necessary, and that the upper limit is unnecessary. Baker echos this, warns that it could shift norms too quickly. Adeja notes regional norms would limit other teams. David notes that nothing limits value topics anyway, but that there is not definition of either fact or value in parli, notes concerns with fact res being undebatable. Shannon notes that member of EC should be on topic committee, and that we need to be careful with the TC selection, as the way we write res change how we debate them. Brent notes that IPDA does value, NPDA also used to, but gave up the trichot at some point. We can do it well if we commit to doing it well, and can have academically rigorous discussions, but requires commitment. Steve echoes notes about facticity, what a resolution ought do is different than practice. Norcal doesn't do value because students don't get it. Steve wants to enshrine trichot. Adeja suggests language in topic committee calls for topics to emphasize trichot. Bylaws only implicate national tournament. If no other nat cir tournament does it, then there is no point.

Reduce Number of Rounds at National Tournament

Reduction in Preliminary Rounds for the NPDA Championship Tournament

Submitted by: Joe Blasdel & Brent Nicholson

Moved by Adeja, Consent, All in Favor

Section X, Article G, Subsection 1: There shall be eight preliminary rounds of debate if there are 65 or more teams; six preliminary rounds if there are 64 or fewer teams.

Rationale:

1. Since 2020, the NPDA Championship Tournament has had fewer than 65 but more than 33 teams, and, most likely, will fall within that range in 2025. Mathematically, six prelims is the correct number of prelims to sort a field of 33-64 teams.
2. Given constraints based on previous matches, this leads to a greater possibility of pull-ups in rounds 7-8.
3. Six preliminary rounds, along with five elimination rounds, would produce a more comfortable schedule of four rounds on day 1 (Rds. 1-4), four rounds on day 2 (Rds. 5-6, doubles, octos), and three rounds on day 3 (quarters, semis, finals).

Discussion

Joe is concerned is higher weight of random matching rd 1 and 2. Powermatching concerts develop into a bylaw proposal, need to

Reduce Scope of NPDA Sweepstakes Awards

As Amended: Moved to vote: Adeja (All in favor) - Consent

1. 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.~~

(2) The top ten schools competing will receive Championship Tournament Sweepstakes Awards if there are 64 or fewer teams; if there are 65 or more teams the top twenty schools will receive the 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 won (including advancement by a 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 in addition to any elimination round points earned.

(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) The top three two-year colleges competing will receive Two-Year College Champions Tournament Sweepstakes Awards if there are 64 or fewer teams; if there are 65 or more teams the top five schools will receive the Two-Year College Champions Tournament Sweepstakes Awards.
- (4) 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 teams that count for tournament sweepstakes will be set at the number of teams that every school was allowed to enter.
- (5) 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.

2. Season Sweepstakes

- a) Both Overall Season Sweepstakes and Two-Year College Season Sweepstakes will be determined by the criteria outlined in the NPDA ByLaw 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.~~
- b) The top ten schools shall receive awards in the Season Sweepstakes competition if there are 64 or fewer teams; if there are 65 or more teams the top twenty schools will receive the Season Sweepstakes awards.
- c) The top three two-year colleges shall receive awards in the Two-Year College Season Sweepstakes competition if there are 64 or fewer teams; if there are 65 or more teams the top five schools will receive the Two-Year College Season Sweepstakes awards.
- d) Teams must be in attendance at the NPDA National Championship Tournament to receive an award.

Discussion

Modifications to Electronic Flowing

Moved to table

A. During the debate

1. 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 the notes that the debaters themselves have prepared, material written by the debaters themselves during preparation time, ~~including material typed on electronic devices and/or handwritten only 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. Debaters may also communicate in-round written material to one another, their competitors, and the judge(s) in the round. Competitors should be prepared to provide preparation materials and flows for review by judges and/or tournament staff.
 - a) Debaters may be permitted to bring material typed on electronic devices into the debating chambers with written permission by the tournament director. To obtain an accommodation, a written request explaining how the debater would be benefited by being permitted to use an electronic device to prepare written material must be sent to the tournament director no later than a week prior to the first day of competition. The request need not be based on a medically-documented accommodation or include any personal health information, however, the request may not be on the basis of a competitive advantage when the debater can reasonably prepare written arguments without an electronic device. If the request is denied, the debater may be disqualified from the tournament for bringing notes typed on an electronic device into the debating chamber to be used during the debate.

Discussion

Baker is concerned about nonverifiable, questions legitimacy of student ability. Moving activity to be more exclusive, and paper flowing causes arthritis. Also concerned that it doesn't stop cheating. Based on normative of what able body can produce. Doesn't think that this should change midseason. Anthony has anecdotes about refusing to adapt to new rules, actively taking away entries because other formats do. Also notes people have been using it for two years. People are passionate about using laptops, notes that students will have to relearn. David says that people don't handwrite anymore. Steve notes when bylaw proposed, the conversation

surrounds living in online world, but people needed accommodations. Parli not meant to be textual event, both leader speeches are scripted. Would like parli to be more extemporaneous. Steve also notes classism, some low-income students cannot afford a laptop, know how to type to be successful in debate only. Further notes laptops as an exclusionary practice, access to tech has made easier to move away from parli. Shannon says that laptops more accessible thru laptops rather than finding legal paper because laptops go into research, some prep on phones. Makes TD have due process issue, big issue on fairness if TD has to make decisions. ADA legally gives brightline for accessibility. Easier to type than write even if no ADA. Allows people to memorize things that doesn't take into account neurodiversity because now can't write it out. Puts us at dangerous precedent of creating a bad legal and moral brightline. Brent notes that NPDA should be rigorous extemp speaking, but reading prewritten PMCs are not extemp. This creates more well developed args, rather carded evidence debate. Trying to enforce this model of debate, parli with laptop is the same as uncarded LD, what is the net benefit. Adeja notes that not about pre-prepping, but more pedagogically valuable. Better coaching staffs benefit more from laptop. Harder is good, understand that there are necessary accommodations, language written to move majority of event on paper, required deep understanding of args. Need a system for need, but think that it creates a competitive disadvantage.

Adjourned: 11:17 PST