

NDT Committee Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, November 11, 2009 – Chicago, IL
12:00-3:45pm
Palmer House Hilton/Indiana Room

I. Approval of Minutes from the Austin NDT Committee meetings.

The Minutes are attached.

Perkins – moved
Approved

II. Chair's Report – O'Donnell

question of quorum

Present

d5 – Fitzmier for repko

d6 – Hester

d7 - Hall

d8 – Perkins

AFAE – T. O'Donnell

AFA-S – Davis for Lee

d3 – Eric Morris

d1 – Stables for Achten

Tournament director – John Fritch

Stevenson – written proxy

Perkins for Guevera – limited proxy

Perkins for Cram Helwich – limited proxy

NDT BOT in attendance

Additional in attendance

V.Keenan, C.Burke, H.Hall, S.Basuchard, Decker, Kastulus

- ENMU – Minutes should reflect, they request move to D3
- Election of the topic rep – will occur at the spring meeting (at UT)
 - Mancuso will serve through summer meeting, need to elect

through the spring.

- Eligibility letter – and a post-tournament eligibility process

III. Board of Trustees – Rowland/S.Hall

- Endorse tenure standards by BOT – seeking endorsement by NDT Committee

S.Hall – Treasurer Report

(Include attachment of fees and budget)

Projected \$100 per team fee

\$35 per participant

\$130 per observer (actual cost for all food)

Some costs still to be resolved, due to local issues, including

1) Custodial fees due to furlough days. UCB negotiating with university now. Agreed event will occur and hourly costs will not holiday hours.

Tournament fees will not be adjusted if NDT occurs additional costs. NDT reserves will instead be used.

2) Banquet fees – UCB not agreeing to provide any of the banquet costs as agreed to in the bid. Use of outside catering, including staffing. Testing the vendors during the California Swing. Fees detail outlines banquet costs. Estimated of 400 attendees used to generate totals.

Perkins – Refer to T. Goodnight policy of requiring a university letter of invitation from a senior university official.

IV. Tournament Director - Fritch

(Document – to attach) – should state proposed as actual

Speeding up 2nd rounds

Trying to create permanent weekends for district tournaments

Report on 2009 NDT

Generally went well

Use of ordinals – Try to do no worse than any panels in the old system

2010 NDT

On track. Registration 3/19. Prelims next three days. Elims continue on Tuesday

Discussion of 100 point scale. Committee should decide. Director not feel his perspective to decide.

Transition concerns – about folks with limited judging experience with 100 point scale.

Perkins – Eventually tournament will need to go to 100 pt scale. 2011 seems clear. Question of 2010.

Hester – Committee will need to discuss.

Experiments will continue – WGA tournament – 5 point scale

O'Donnell - Tournament procedures committee - needs to discuss this issue. That committee needs a chair.

Perkins – Respectfully disagree with that interpretation.

O'Donnell – Future discussion should be after the subcommittee reviews it.
2 members of the committee. 2 members of committee at large.
Brushcke and Larson added. Stables at large. Other at-large seat is open.

Hester – Can the committee look at it before Austin.

Fritch – Not believe it in the standing rules.

Hester – Community consensus emerging as part of Tournament Director Committee.

Fritch – Wake Summit - best practices committee - endorse 100 point scale.
Edwards will want some lead time, such as the number of digits.

Stefan – Concern now about variance, but panels would reduce concern about variance.

Morris – No reference in the rule to 30 point scale.

O'Donnell – Clarification for districts.

Hester – Value in voting.

O'Donnell – If procedures committees sees value then committee wants a vote?

Hester – Direct the committee to come to a conclusion. Have a recommendation before that meeting.

O'Donnell – Committee wish to have input on this.

Perkins – Somebody needs to decide. Responsibility for the committee to determine.

Morris – Support for Harvard's effort to enforce the norming of the scale. Greater possibility for being done at the tournament.

Fritch – Wiling to support the publication of it. Not support making the decision.

Keenan – Discussion of the average (numerical average vs. average performance for a debater). Role of paradigm of debating.

Bauchard – Larson indicates instructions important. Have to determine the instructions. Whose responsibility to convince judges to give ballots within the scale.

Fritch – Not the tab room's responsibility.

Fritch - Similar concern about judges with limited experience with scale or without normative points. Not the tab room's role to persuade judges to assign points within a scale.

O'Donnell – Refer to the tournament procedures committee for a report by February.

Stables – confirmed

Burke – Part of the 100 point scale – not given the same points to debaters in the round.

V. Host Report – Achten

S.Hall - 2010 NDT

- Fees (see above)
- Test run food for hotel and campus
- Confidence in internet works
- Provide feedback to Greg or Sherry after the swing (testing the logistics)
- Shuttling – Hotel parking, \$21 per day, \$5 per day for school.
 - Exploring daily options shuttle
 - Stables – discussion of shuttling. Importance of getting help from districts to help get support for early decisions by school.

VI. Future Host Report – Hall

S.Hall / C.Burke– 2011 NDT

- BOT unanimously endorse the UT Dallas – March 23-28, 2011
- Westin Park Central – tournament hotel – used for NDT, CEDA, St Marks. Hotel agreed to used 2007 room rates and food costs (\$99 per night for rooms). Free internet for rooms. Same internet clause without paying for the expanded internet capacity. Hotel very easy to work with.
- Debate important to the university – want to promote the school and show off the campus. 20K pledge from the university.
- Free parking at the hotel and campus.

Perkins – Move to endorse.

Unanimously approved by the committee.

VII. Committee Reports

A. Standing Subcommittee on Tournament Procedures: Edwards, Brusckke, Stables, Partlow-Lefevre, Larson, M. Hall

B. Standing Subcommittee on District Bid Allocation: Partlow-Lefevre (Chair), Morris, and Cram-Helwich

C. Standing Subcommittee on Appeals: Perkins (Chair), Hall, Arnett, Morris, Stannard

D. Standing Subcommittee Committee on Media: Perkins, Morris, M. Hall

E Ad Hoc Committee on Tournament Hosts: Perkins, Arnett

F. Ad Hoc Committee on Scouting: Ed Lee, Becky Opsata

G. Electronic Bid Coordinator: Bruschke

H. Topic Selection Representative: Mancuso

Looking for papers and ideas.

I. Rankings Director: Hanson

Hanson – Interest in recording 'movers' in the rankings?
Let him do what he does

J. Tournament Archivist: Bellon

K. Web Director: Bruschke

IX. Old Business

From District 8: Call for a second vote on the Hybrids proposal. At the February 2009 Committee meeting in Evanson, the Hybrid proposal from Keenan/Ellis passed on a 7 to 5 vote with two abstentions after several friendly amendments. The proposal, as amended is as follows:

Rule II.A.2. (and renumber) "Team eligibility: Hybrid Exception Waiver"

A. An intra-district hybrid team composed of two debaters from two different schools may petition the NDT Committee Chair for a waiver from the Appeals Committee of Standing Rule II.A.1.(b) to participate in District Qualification for the NDT if:

- 1) Two-thirds of the member schools of the District in question vote to approve participation of the team in question, AND
- 2) The hybrid team meets all of the following criteria:
 - a. The individual hybrid team has 24 preliminary rounds of varsity or open collegiate competition TOGETHER on the topic over 4 tournaments with at least 6 teams from 4 different schools.
 - b. The schools represented by the individual debaters historically and currently operate a joint program demonstrated by, but not limited to, a shared budget, coaching staff, travel, and meetings/practices.
 - c. The schools for the debaters are traditionally represented as the same "program" for the purposes of competition, either by competing under one school name or consistent representation as the hybrid, unless prevented from doing so by individual tournament registration or tabulation procedures.
 - d. The ability for at least one program of the two schools represented to participate in

intercollegiate competitive debate would be jeopardized without the combination of resources, documented by either the lack of an official coaching/director position within the educational institution, a program budget of less than \$3000 excluding coaching/judging compensation, or a lack of an established/recognized debate program in either a department or student organization.

e. One student in the hybrid team is the ONLY Open collegiate debater from their college.

f. A hybrid team provides evidence of substantial program development efforts at one or both of the team member's home institutions.

3. The submission to the NDT Committee Chair must be made by the February 1st immediately preceding the NDT in which the team wishes to participate, and will be forwarded by the Committee Chair to the Appeals Committee. The Appeals Committee will respond within one week of the submission of the request for the waiver.

B. These rules do not overrule any other eligibility requirements in number of rounds or tournaments attended for determining bids. Districts may make additional considerations or constraints on the participation of hybrids at their qualifier tournaments. The validity of any hybrid team qualifying for the NDT may be challenged through the normal petition process with the Appeals Subcommittee of the NDT as outlined in the Standing Rules of the NDT Committee, Section IV (Rules of Procedure) if it can be substantiated that such a partnership is in violation of the above criteria. Otherwise, a team granted such a waiver is considered eligible to compete in the NDT if they qualify through the District Qualification process and will count towards the total number of teams in the District for purposes of Bid Allocation.

C. Intra-district schools in such a hybrid must BOTH have either an institutional membership in the AFA or have a director who has an individual membership in the AFA and must pay NDT dues for BOTH schools. (This is not a JOINT membership). The qualification of such a hybrid teams would count against the total number of qualifying teams for BOTH schools.

D. Schools may only petition for this exemption a maximum of 5 times. Schools may no longer petition for the waiver after qualifying for the NDT through this process.

According to Rule IX, of the Standing Rules for the Operation of the National Debate Tournament, the Standing Rules may be "amended by a two-thirds vote of the AFA NDT Committee, or a simple majority in two consecutive academic years." Since the hybrids proposal did not pass by a two-thirds vote, it will need to pass by a simple majority again in the 2009-2010 academic year. The roll call vote was recorded as follows:

No - District 1 (Arnett)

Yes - District 2 (Hardy)

Yes - District 3 (Morris)

Yes - District 4 (Cram-Helwich)

Yes - District 5 (Repko)
No - District 6 (Holbrook for Hester)
No – District 7 (Hall)
Yes - District 8 (Perkins)
No - District 9 (Crowe for Stannard)
Yes - AFA W (Partlow Lefevre)
Yes - AFA MW (Stevenson)
No - AFA S (Lee)
Abstain – Tournament Director (Fritch)
Abstain - AFA E/chair (O'Donnell)

Perkins – Not moving his motion

X. New Business

None.

Rowland - Formal endorsement of the AFA Guidelines on Tenure

Resolution – from O'Donnell (insert)

Approved unanimously

XI. Discussion Items

1. The future of debate governance. Gordon Stables, chair of the working group on governance from the summer conference will kick start the discussion (see the attached post conference report).
2. NDT Round eligibility requirement. There is no formal proposal, but I have gotten several queries about revisiting this discussion.

Discussion of reviewing the 32 round rule

Move to change the current rules – 5 years?

Eligibility interpretations

- Running clock or any 5 years?
- Does attending any one of the AFA sanctioned national tournaments (NDT, CEDA, ADA, NIET) count as one of the four years of national competitions? Or can you debate as long as you don't attend of those individual tournaments more than 4 times?
 - CEDA not sanctioned – not count as such

Fritch - Question of discussion time for NDT elims

Stables - Role of paperless debate

Adjourned