**NATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ASSOCIATION**

**BUSINESS MEETING**

**Thursday, November 8, 2018: 11:00AM-12:15PM**

**Hilton, Topaz – Second Level**

**AGENDA**

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Attendance:** Mike Middleton, Travis Cram, Steve Farias, David Cram-Hellwich, Jason Jordan, Joe Gantt, Bob Becker, Jeannie Hunt, David Worth, Kyle Cheesewright, Rob Layne, Lauren Schaffer, Ashley Nuckles-Cuavas, Gina Jenson.
3. **Approval of Minutes (Spring 2018)-** 
   1. Bob Becker Moved & Steve Farias Seconded
   2. Passed by unanimous voice vote.
4. **Reports**
   1. Executive Council (20 minutes)
      1. President—Jeannie Hunt, Northwest College
         1. Both President and Treasurer: We are financially solvent, we have a host, things are moving swimmingly, 589 completed Title IX trainings.
         2. Individual Title IX verification reports will be sent out in December.
      2. Vice President—David Worth, Rice University
         1. Need nominations for Vice President; seeking them by 11/30. Message will be posted.
         2. All American Nominations; Due on March 1, earlier is fine. District Reps will be included. These are great CV/Resume builders for students.
         3. Topic suggestions will be solicited for NPDA. Ask for people to vet (try to ensure ground on both sides) topics, so that they make sense. It makes the topic committee more effective and representative. Think about students who don’t know what a topic is, and see how long it takes to research it.
      3. Executive Secretary—Kyle Cheesewright, The College of Idaho
         1. All sanctioned tournaments that have occurred thus far this year have been entered for sweepstakes, please check for errors.
         2. Tournament sanctioning is being enforced. Requires affiliation with NPDA and the completion of Title IX training verification.
      4. Treasurer—Shannon LaBove, Rice University
         1. Missed flight
         2. Some past things from Phil’s departure still need to be worked out.
         3. Budget should be posted on NPDA website next week.
         4. We have a national account, which should make treasurer transitions easier in the future.
         5. Dependent on outstanding bills, we may or may not have paid out from reserves last year; we will not be doing so this year, because of cost-savings associated with the SLC national tournament.
   2. Committees
   3. Tournament Director—Michael K. Middleton
      1. Konrad Hack will be tabbing again.
      2. Registration on website should open tomorrow.
      3. New building means little to no walking. University President is providing constant coffee and water, as well as breakfast each morning.
5. **Consent Items**
   1. Numbering Errors & Accidental Omissions in the Bylaws
      1. Passed without objection.
      2. Bylaw updates should be posted next week.
6. **Action Items**
   1. Constitution Proposal: Changing How NPDA Conducts Business
      1. Removed from the Table; passed by unanimous voice vote.
      2. Weirdness surrounds the passage at the Spring Business meeting.
      3. This doesn’t effect current meeting, because it requires an electronic vote following the meeting
      4. Question Called (Steve Farias); Seconded (David Worth)
      5. Passed via voice vote, with no objections and one abstention.
   2. Constitution Proposal: Voting On Organizational Business and in Elections
      1. Un-tabled—moved Farias, seconded Cram. Passes.
      2. Description of what rule means.
      3. Farias: Question—Could schools try to earn points but not be able to. Sanctioning irrelevant.
      4. Cheesewright: This is a bad policy, it excludes people.
      5. Jenson: We are disenfranchized now, and step out of the door. How are sweepstakes points earned?
      6. Hunt: By attending sanctioned tournaments.
      7. Jordan: This is an example of structural inequality and shouldn’t be passed.
      8. Layne: Was this voted on at the Business meeting? Answer: No, it was discussed.
      9. Worth: Vote this down, it is like requiring presentation at NCA to teach communication classes.
      10. Hunt: Doug Hall from Casper indicated that this policy would disenfranchise folks.
      11. Question called, Becker. Seconded Farias. Fails without any support, one abstention.
   3. Constitution Proposal: Makeup of the Executive Council
      1. Untabled, Farias. Seconded. Worth. Passed over one objection.
      2. Hunt: Offers description of the proposal.
      3. Gantt: This policy would exclude any person who runs for Vice President from ever having a student run for national rep.
      4. Cram: Don’t exclude capable individuals who can serve. This would probably have massive unintended consequences.
      5. Becker: Adding members to the EC would make more sense than banning folks from participation.
      6. Worth: Persuaded during the last meeting that you can vote, which provides a check on abuse in this legislation.
      7. Hunt: Hard to get folks to run at all. This legislation would make this even harder.
      8. Becker: Also proposes that institutional cohorts have lockstep views or perspectives.
      9. Farias: Politics of running—attacked for running, and falsely accused of breaking the law. Important to remember that institutions and people are being targeted because of stuff they can’t/won’t speak about publically.
      10. Jordan: NPDA is an organization without a ton of human diversity. Limiting institutions limits the potential diversity of the NPDA executive council.
      11. Question Called, Nuckles-Cuavas, Seconded Gantt.
      12. Fails with no support and one abstention.
   4. Bylaw Proposal: Publishing a List of Voting Members
      1. Was not removed from the table. It falls of the agenda as a result.
   5. Constitution Proposal: Voting Privileges for Institutional Membership
      1. Moved to un-table, Farias, seconded Gantt. Passes 5-4.
      2. Schaffer: We need to have conversations about how to improve human diversity. Policy proposed because of a desire to have these conversations, and told that needed institutional amendment. People in the community treat marginalized folks like shit—look at the room.
      3. Nuckles-Cuavas: Thanks to Lauren for proposing. Is there any way to help support human diversity? What can we do outside of trying to do this on an individual level?
      4. Farias: Spirt is good—two concerns, ocularcentric—mixed race native person who passes as white means that often diversity doesn’t get recognized. Folks de-legitimatized by debaters and others, debaters force out diverse judges and coaches. Diversity in the back, institutionally the students drive out folks because of perceptions about competence.
      5. Jordan: Human Diversity & Forensics Diversity. Different ways to approach judging and participation—particular aesthetics are driven out by folks because of hesitation to discussing a diverse set of beliefs.
      6. Schaffer: Both and—I can’t deny that Todd denied me a job because I am woman. I will be perceived as a woman in debate based on ocular centrism. I work to break the normative trends, need to have these conversations in all parts of the community. Bitterness about NPDA board—despite the fact that it’s the most diverse NPDA board we have ever had.
      7. Nuckles-Cuavas: Resolutions in particular I like—reach out for diverse resolutions, lots of flack about changing up resolutions. Students who competed ran a critique in the finals round because non-traditional resolutions were strongly disliked. Need to have these discussions. Hired non-binary, non-white individuals. Try to make intentional choices.
      8. Schaffer: New to meetings, appreciate that folks are clear about why they speak. But, folks can’t avoid ocularcentrism, and results in cheating. Did EC ever ask if folks new what they were doing when they filed appeals? Have these conversations and try to break out the practices, we need to have more diversity. Also, shameless plug for mentoring program—need to develop diverse norms.
      9. Hunt: Appeals process—no appeal about “cheating” since she has been on the EC. The NPDA developed approaches proactively. Topics—spend a lot of time on topics, really great even division between Aff/Neg splits; try to have different topics.
      10. Cheesewright: I think that these conversations need to be had with students—and when these conversations need to happen, it often results in backlash.
      11. Schaffer: Tournament schedules should add this.
      12. Gantt, Moves to Table, for additional discussion with students. Seconded, Nuckles-Cuavas—passes with unanimous consent.
7. **Discussion Items**
   1. Bylaw Proposal: Ensuring Competitive Integrity and Pre-Prepared Materials
      1. Layne: Proposal to initial/sign materials prepared during debate—complaints and charges, spurious or not, happen because there is no verification of the creation of pre-prepared materials.
      2. Jordan: Perception across NPDA = a way to police black debaters. It might prove something not happening, but it is becoming a cop to prove you can’t be a cop.
      3. Hunt: Community Colleges get accused of cheating.
      4. Cram: Anti-surveillance because it effects those on the margins.
      5. Worth: Forces students to be cops, and will become link arguments and the debate will no longer be about methods, but what ought to happen in different times when they sign papers.
      6. Farias: Ability and Race. What you wrote in prep time can prevent folks with disability from participating. Continues to cement the normative approach.
      7. Move to end discussion—Jordan.
   2. Bylaw Proposal: Making Title IX a Biennial Requirement
      1. Nuckles-Cuavas: Horrible precedent to set, institutional checks to make accessible. Plenty of ways to provide this training. Why is it ever a bad idea to mandate yearly training? It is worthwhile extra-work, and rhetorically sets the precedent that this is not something that is that important.
      2. Farias: Completely agree—expand the ranges at which we offer this—we could require particular types of training. The nuisance factor is helpful to remind folks.
      3. Worth: There will be people at the tournament who haven’t been trained.
      4. Schaffer: We should do a different type of training.
      5. Close discussion Jordan, Farias Seconds.
8. **Adjournment**
   1. Move to adjourn. Unanimous passing.

Section One: Consent Items

**BYLAW PROPOSAL: Numbering Errors & Accidental Omissions in the Bylaws**

***Rationale—***there are several numbering errors, as well as sections of the bylaws that appear to have disappeared over the years. This proposal works to correct these errors. As such, I am not going to chronicle the current language—only to document the clerical alterations I have made the Bylaws. All of these changes have currently been made, but if this is subject to objection, they can easily be reverted.

1. Fix Lettering of Bylaw “III. Season Sweepstakes Awards”
   1. Rationale: During regular updating of the Bylaws in pursuit of legislation passed in the Business meetings, I discovered that Bylaw “III. Season Sweepstakes Awards” began its lettering based on the lettering of Bylaw “I. Membership Dues & Requirements.” Additionally, the final bylaw was lettered correctly based on the objective numbers of items in the list, but incorrectly alphabetically, resulting to two section “M”s.
   2. Start the lettering of Bylaw “III. Season Sweepstakes Awards” at A, rather than D, and adjust all sections of Bylaw “III.” to reflect the correct lettering.
2. Bylaw VII: Rules of Debating and Judging back into the Bylaws
   1. Rationale: In Spring 2018, “A Proposal to Standardize Flex Time” was passed by the membership—but it was not directed toward a currently existing Bylaw. At the same time, the current Bylaw’s suggest that Bylaw VII is “Rules of Debating and Judging”
   2. Add Bylaw “VII. Rules of Debating and Judging.”
   3. Standardize Bylaw Numbering with the rest of the Bylaws
      1. Level 1: Capital Roman Numerals [VII. Rules of Debating and Judging]
      2. Level 2: Capital Letters [A, B, C . . .]
      3. Level 3: Numbers [1, 2, 3 . . .]
      4. Level 4: Lowercase Letters [a, b, c . . .]
      5. Level 5: Lowercase Roman Numerals [i, ii, iii . . .]
      6. Level 6: Numbers in Parenthesis[(1), (2), (3) . . .]
   4. Shift Bylaws down 1 Number:
      1. “VII. Sexual Harassment and Violence Policy” becomes “VIII”
      2. “VIII. NPDA All-American Award” becomes “IX”
      3. “IX. National Tournament Operation Procedure” becomes “X.”
3. Standardizing Language in Bylaw III(N)2
   1. Removed the word “cumulative” and added “in each division” to the bylaw passed in the Spring 2018 Business meeting to make the Bylaw consistent with III(N)2[a].

Section Two: Action Items

**CONSTITUTION PROPOSAL—Changing How NPDA Conducts Business**

**Rationale—**there is a lack of clarity in the minutes from the Spring 2018 Business meeting regarding the precise language of this proposal, it’s manner of passage, and who was responsible for motions resulting in the passage of this amendment. Additionally, as a Constitutional Amendment, it was not distributed to the NPDA membership as mandated by the Constitution, based on a transition miscommunication between the previous and current Executive Secretary. As such, we are moving it back into the Action Item category for the Fall 2018 Business Meeting.

**Original Rationale—**NCA is incredibly expensive to attend. It is nearly impossible for schools with small budgets, and certainly unattainable for student run programs to have representation there. The Fall 2017 meeting had 8 schools in attendance. 8 schools should not be setting, or creating policy for an organization with over 100 members. The 2017 meeting has created a lot of heartburn especially among schools who may be at the margins of remaining a part of NPDA. Most organizations use a business meeting to get items up for consideration, then have a period for electronic ballots and mail ballots. For the same reason we do not hold elections at a business meeting of 8 people, we should not conduct business this way. This policy would make our By Law changes consistent with our Constitutional changes.

**CURRENT LANGUAGE**

Article IX. Amendments to the Constitution and By Laws

Section B: Amendments to the By-Laws

1. An amendment to the By-Laws may be initiated by any member school.

2. Amendments to the By-Laws must be submitted to the Executive Secretary no later than thirty days prior to a Business Meeting to be considered at that meeting. The Executive Secretary will communicate proposed amendments to the membership no later than fifteen days prior to the Business Meeting.

3. A majority of the schools represented and voting at the Business Meeting will be necessary for enactment of the amendments to the By-Laws.

**PROPOSED LANGUAGE**

Article IX. Amendments to the Constitution and By Laws

Section B: Amendments to the By-Laws

1. An amendment to the By-Laws may be initiated by any member school.

2. Amendments to the By-Laws must be submitted to the Executive Secretary no later than thirty days prior to a Business Meeting to be considered at that meeting. The Executive Secretary will communicate proposed amendments to the membership no later than fifteen days prior to the Business Meeting.

3. A majority of the schools represented and voting at the Business Meeting will be necessary for ~~enactment of the amendments to the By-Laws~~ *a proposed By-Law amendment to be sent to the membership. Action items adopted at the spring business meeting will have interim force until an electronic or mail ballot is collected.*

*4. Within ten days following the Business Meeting, the Executive Secretary will distribute by mail or electronic form a ballot containing all proposed By-Law amendments. Balloting on these will cease at midnight thirty days after the date of the Business Meeting.*

**CONSTITUTON PROPOSAL—Voting on Organizational Business and in Elections**

***Rationale***—There is concern among members that organizational business and elections should be dictated by those who are competing at tournaments throughout the season, and that non-members or affiliate members should not be effecting the outcome of elections and organizational business if they are not participating. The constitution already prevents affiliate members from having voting privileges. This fortification of the current bylaws will prevent gaming the system by those with a desire, or financial means to do so.

***CURRENT LANGUAGE***

Article III. Membership

Section A.

1. Regular Institutional Members pay annual dues and are eligible to participate in all functions of the organization.

***PROPOSED LANGUAGE***

Article III. Membership

Section A.

1. Regular Institutional Members pay annual dues and are eligible to participate in all functions of the organization. *In order to be eligible to vote in any organizational election, or vote on organizational business the member institution would need to have earned NPDA Sweepstakes points in either the previous academic competition year, or the current academic competition year. Any institution that does not meet this requirement is automatically considered an affiliate member until such time NPDA sweepstakes points are earned.*

**CONSTITUTION PROPOSAL—Makeup of the Executive Council**

Rationale—Currently the EC only has 4 officers and many parts of the constitution calls for 2/3 majority votes of the EC. Other issues the EC grapples with may require a majority vote of the EC. If 50% of the EC is controlled by one member institution there is certainly the possibility for them to control critical votes. Those votes should be dispersed among more of the membership than 1 institution. This would also eliminate even the appearance of impropriety. This is something that was likely never considered a possibility before. It seems highly unlikely this would occur in most organizations. Since the NPDA did not foresee this, it is time to correct this possible imbalance. Policies should not be written about people currently in office—this is no way is to implicate the fairness of David or Shannon. Quite the opposite given the effective date. But just because the community is comfortable with the possibility this time, it may not always be so. Given the current makeup of the EC it seems fair to allow these terms to run their natural course, hence the 2021 effective date.

**CURRENT LANGUAGE**

Article IV: Officers -- Elected

Section A: Election

1. The officers of this Association shall be a President, a Vice President, an Executive Secretary, a Treasurer, and a National Student Representative. The President, Vice President, Executive Secretary and Treasurer shall be elected on staggered, two-year terms with the offices of President and Vice-President running concurrently and with the offices of Executive Secretary and Treasurer running concurrently. The National Student Representative shall be elected for a one-year term. These officers shall constitute the Executive Council.

**PROPOSED LANGUAGE**

Article IV: Officers -- Elected

Section A: Election

1. The officers of this Association shall be a President, a Vice President, an Executive Secretary, a Treasurer, and a National Student Representative. The President, Vice President, Executive Secretary and Treasurer shall be elected on staggered, two-year terms with the offices of President and Vice-President running concurrently and with the offices of Executive Secretary and Treasurer running concurrently. The National Student Representative shall be elected for a one-year term. These officers shall constitute the Executive Council. *No institutional member school should occupy more than one officers position during any one year (effective date: Conclusion of the NPDA Championship Tournament, Spring 2021).*

**BYLAW PROPOSAL—Publishing a list of voting members**

***Rationale***—To maintain transparency and keep temperature of the health of the organization it is in the best interest of the membership to know who is engaged and voting. This would allow members to reach out to schools and find out what can be done to help them become active and vote. Many schools indicated this last election, after the fact, they were unaware of the election or unaware of how to vote. Publishing the list will also ensure that every member school knows their vote was received and recorded. There is currently no mechanism allowing this verification. It would also ensure that voting members are indeed full participating members of NPDA and not affiliate or non-members. Transparency good.

***CURRENT LANGUAGE***

I. Membership Dues & Requirements

A. Annual dues in the National Parliamentary Debate Association for the year September 1 to August 31 will be $50 for regular membership, $20 for affiliate membership (affiliate membership applies to schools that did not enter teams in any NPDA sanctioned or national competition during the previous year), and $10 for individual membership.

***PROPOSED LANGUAGE***

I. Membership Dues & Requirements

A. Annual dues in the National Parliamentary Debate Association for the year September 1 to August 31 will be $50 for regular membership, $20 for affiliate membership (affiliate membership applies to schools that did not enter teams in any NPDA sanctioned or national competition during the previous year), and $10 for individual membership. *A complete list of each member school voting on organizational business, both during business meetings and mailed/electronic voting, and voting during elections, will be published at the same time results are published. Individual votes will not be published, but rather a list of those schools voting.*

**CONSTITUTION PROPOSAL—Voting Privileges for Institutional Membership**

***Rationale***—Parliamentary debate is a predominantly White, able-bodied, and/or Male population. The majority of present and past director of forensics/debate in the NPDA are White, able-bodied, and/or male. The majority of present and past assistant and graduate coaches in parliamentary debate are White, able-bodied, and/or male. Until its most recent election the past majority of the NPDA’s officers are White, able-bodied, and/or Male. NPDA has continued to see declining participation of women and/or persons of color, particularly at the varsity level, deep out rounds of national tournaments, and coaching staffs of universities. Some parliamentary debaters and coaches have expressed a desire for a more diverse and inclusive environment through a myriad of avenues in the last decade including but not limited to, walkouts, collective community based documentation of discrimination, organizations and awards targeted at inclusivity, online discussions in social media outlets (such as facebook, and net-benefits), and the authorship and defense of debate positions related to issues of diversity and inclusion in debate. NPDA has recently drafted policies pertaining to sexual harassment and assault in response to the treatment of women in the debate community, but has not made similar efforts to increase the participation of women. Additionally, research indicates that a diverse body of representatives begets a diverse constituency reflective of inclusive practices. To enforce the proposed policies, the NPDA board members should, in consultation with members, develop a procedure for enforcement of this amendment within a calendar year of the proposal passing.

***CURRENT LANGUAGE***

Article III: Membership

***PROPOSED LANGUAGE***

Article III: Membership

ADD:

*Section E: To be eligible for voting privileges, Regular Institutional Members should, provide proof that*

1. *they provide equitable scholarships, funding, and opportunities to members and graduate coaches of their team without regard to their race, sex, gender, creed, age, ability, or other consideration*
2. *they offer equitable scholarships, funding, and opportunities to potential debaters without regard to their race, sex, gender, creed, age, ability, or other consideration that are representative of the United States population*
3. *have a history of hiring more than White, able-bodied, and/or men as their assistant and graduate coaches.*

Section Three: Discussion Items

**BYLAW PROPOSAL—Ensuring Competitive Integrity and Pre-Prepared Materials**

Rationale – Both formats of parliamentary debate have seen an uptick of complaints/charges against teams of utilizing pre-prepared materials that violate the rules and norms of NPDA debate.  This proposal seeks to add a check against pre-prepared material usage, while also protecting teams that are unfairly targeted by charges of cheating.

**CURRENT LANGUAGE**

VII. Rules of Debating and Judging

E. After the debate

1. After the final rebuttal, the Speaker of the House will dismiss the teams, complete the ballot and return it to the ballot staff. The judge should not give oral comments before the ballot is completed and returned to the ballot staff.

**PROPOSED LANGUAGE**

VII. Rules of Debating and Judging

E. After the debate

1. After the final rebuttal, *both teams will exchange all materials produced prior to and during the debate.  Those materials will be signed and/or initialed by one member of the opposing team in a way that does not make the material unreadable.*The Speaker of the House will dismiss the teams, complete the ballot*,* and return *the ballot* to the ballot staff. The judge should not give oral comments before the ballot is completed and returned to the ballot staff.

**BYLAW PROPOSAL: Making Title IX Training a Biennial Requirement**

**Rationale—**Several Directors have requested training be mandated by the NPDA on a bi-annual, as opposed to yearly basis; bringing NPDA policy into line with their institutional Title IX policies. The following proposal imagines one potential path to this goal.

**CURRENT LANGUAGE:**

Bylaw I. Membership Dues and Requirements

B. Each regular member of the NPDA must also provide documentation annually verifying that students, coaches, and judges representing their institution/program have participated in sexual harassment/violence awareness and prevention training. Typically, universities and colleges make such training available through their campus Title IX office, or its equivalent. If this is the case, documentation submitted by members should include a letter from that office on their campus providing a brief description of the training provided and a list of all individuals who received the described training. In the event such resources are not available to a particular member program, NPDA will furnish online training at no cost to the member program. In either case, documentation that such training has been completed shall be provided no later than one week prior to a school’s participation in an NPDA sanctioned tournament or September 30th, whichever comes first, of each competition season. In addition, all representatives of member programs must receive such training prior to being eligible for participation in the national tournament.

**PROPOSED LANGUAGE:**

Bylaw I. Membership Dues and Requirements

B. Each regular member of the NPDA must also provide documentation ~~annually~~ biennially verifying that all students, coaches, and judges representing their institution/program have participated in sexual harassment/violence awareness and prevention training. Schools are responsible to provide immediate training and verification for any new students, coaches, or judges who join their programs as soon as possible, abiding by the requirements outlined below. Typically, universities and colleges make such training available through their campus Title IX office, or its equivalent. If this is the case, documentation submitted by members should include a letter from that office on their campus providing a brief description of the training provided and a list of all individuals who received the described training. In the event such resources are not available to a particular member program, NPDA will furnish online training at no cost to the member program. In either case, documentation that such training has been completed shall be provided no later than one week prior to a school’s participation in an NPDA sanctioned tournament or September 30th, whichever comes first~~, of each competition season~~. In addition, all representatives of member programs must receive such training prior to being eligible for participation in the national tournament.