

- I. The meeting was called to order by President Prefontaine at 9:23 a.m.
- II. Secretary Ballingall called the roll.

Absent: Editor, Area 1 Curriculum Rep, Area 2 Curriculum Rep, Area 3 At-Large Rep, Gregg Osborn (Area 4)

Proxies: Hoon Ko for Chris Wolf, Eric Larsen for Rita Prichard, Chris Wardner for Paul Pinza, Reid Niemi for John Cardoza, Mike Newbold for Dave Chamberlain

A roster was distributed and people were asked to provide current information.

- III. Minutes from January 2010 meeting were circulated

***Move to accept as presented: M/ Kindred, S/Abad , passes unanimously***

- IV. Officer Reports

President Prefontaine

Commended Mark Hamilton and the State Tournament Committee, and the Culinary Arts people who fed us. All in all, an outstanding tournament.

CHSSA website (cahssa.org) – members should check the home page; there is a survey there that all should fill out, which includes collection of data about member schools and the State Tournament. Also on the home page, congratulations to Carl Adams, newest Hall of Fame member. Also, a summary of changes in By-laws since January, and a summary of protests lodged at the State Tournament.

5 protests (summaries on the CHSSA webpage at [http://www.cahssa.org/pdf/summary\\_of\\_protests\\_2010.pdf](http://www.cahssa.org/pdf/summary_of_protests_2010.pdf) )

All coaches need to be very conscientious about what is submitted. Discussion of “What is Poverty?” OI selection; most commonly used copy is one that was published as an essay and is therefore illegal; the only legal version is in a book, which states that the selection was given as a speech. This version is legal.

Tab rooms operated smoothly, in part because of access to technology (lap tops and printers); this will be an issue in the future for CHSSA.

Parliamentary Debate expansion referendum failed, 37-22.

Vice President of Activities Kamel

Thanks to pit bosses, Chuck, Reid, Derek Yuill, and David Matley. Technology allowed us to run without cards, much more efficient. Congress went straight to computers without transition, tribute to David Matley's leadership.

Thanks to Brent Hinkle, for all of his help, for the time and talents he has devoted to CHSSA.

Thanks to our Protest Committee, and the wonderful job they did.

Many things went very well, Dinner-Dance, Donovan Cummings recognition, Award to Gay Brasher.

2011 State Tournament will be April 15-17. Possible sites: Cypress College, La Costa Canyon High School, Redlands High School. All 3 areas are near hotels, airports, etc.

2012 State Tournament will be in Area 1, probably the weekend of April 20-23.

<u>CSSC Meeting</u>	<u>Tentative Date</u>	<u>Site</u>
September	September 9-11	San Jose
January	January 6-8	Near State Tournament site
May	TBA	Los Angeles

Vice President of Curriculum Prichard

Given by Shirley Keller-Firestone for Rita Prichard. Committee met, accomplished a great deal. Will present more information during the Committee report.

Treasurer Barenbaum

Presented itemized report, listing current inflows and outflows. There are some inaccuracies on the income statement, they will be corrected. Don't have information yet for judging refunds. Cut-off date March 1 for dues payments to count for allocations.

Historian Underwood

Did another Hall of Fame interview at State. Will try to get them posted on the new website, when it goes on line..

V. Area Chair Reports

Area 1 Chair Keller-Firestone

Possible State sites (for 2013): Santa Rosa Junior College, Lowell High School (San Francisco)

Area 2 Chair Darling

Thanks to Mark Hamilton, etc  
2014 site: Possibly San Joaquin College  
Mikendra McCoy is expending a child

Area 3 Chair Kindred

Ashley Novak, departing Area 3 Chair: Thanks to all for allowing me to bring my children to State; congratulations to Jennifer Kindred, new Area Chair.

Area 4 Chair Munsell

Sorry we don't have a site yet; a reflection to some degree of the high turnover rate in our Area..

Lianna Koepfel of Cypress College wants to make it clear that while Cypress is looking into the possibility of being the State Tournament host, they have never committed to doing so.

VI. Committee Reports

Public Relations (Underwood, substituting for Cardoza)

Karen Meredith hopefully will edit the Bulletin, an edition to be published before summer

Small committee, working on some new ideas for expansion and making contacts with various relevant groups. Examining methods of contact, potential sponsors, others who might be interested in participating.

Individual Events Committee (Darling)

Met yesterday, discussed several matters. Had one prepared motion before the Committee dealing with TI, we will bring it forward to New Business but not recommend it for passage.

In addition, we will have two housekeeping motions and one other on extemp topics.

Debate Committee (Ballingall)

Parliamentary topics on CHSSA webpage. Description of process, which includes consultation with respected college parli coaches, and then suggestions from Debate Committee members at State.

22 By-laws revisions for New Business (really 13; 12 of them consist of 3 grouped resolutions).

Congress Committee (Matley)

Joy of Tournaments worked very well for us. Turnaround time went from 2 hours to 40 minutes. The few glitches were solved by Brent.

One problem at tournament – for one round, wrong number of judges went out. We will try to double check this more carefully in the future.

Would prefer to continue to leave judges instructions to the Judge Houses.

No By-laws revisions this time; but next fall, will propose that legislation from leagues will be voluntarily submitted; no mandatory submissions, no fines. We're optimistic that this system will yield high quality legislation.

Working on development of comment sheets for Congress.

Graber: At State, judge I judged with was very confused. Maybe need stronger judge instructions?

Caperton: When I instructed the judges, I explained as much of the procedure as possible.

Matley: Joy of Tournaments makes this somewhat easier, if they know how to use it. Having a hard copy ballot will help.

Graber: Need consistency among PO's in terms of keeping track of speech attempts, questions, etc.

Matley: We're working on codifying procedures for this. Will make available to leagues and through the website.

Curriculum Committee (Shirley Keller-Firestone, for Rita Prichard)

Committee met yesterday. Would like to do a judges DVD, with instructions for all events. Video to be posted on the website. Also will produce written instructions. Would require \$7000.

Talked about classroom instruction, didn't make any decisions about it.

Want to update the Coaches Handbook, distribute it, make it available online.

Main concern is to update the webpage:

Looks old, needs to be upgraded.

Would like to have pictures showing what DVDs available.

Also would like “toolkits” organized so resources are easily available.

Possibility of using PayPal for people to pay for materials.

Kamel: Webmaster is willing to post anything we send him, and upgrade the website.

Possibility of making time Friday afternoon at CSSC meetings for local coaches.

Prefontaine: Give suggestions to me for updates and upgrades to the website.

Johnson: One concern over judges instructions: rules change frequently, it would have to be revised frequently. Keller-Firestone: The instructions would be relatively basic.

VII. Old Business

Ad Hoc Committee on CHSSA membership (Munsell)

There is a website that lists schools in California.

Any school wishing to join CHSSA should be on this list, and therefore would be a registered public or private school (private schools require the filing of an affidavit on a yearly basis). We believe that afterschool enrichment programs would not qualify.

Submitting an amendment to the Constitution for first consideration, subject to discussion and voting in September.

Kamel: It shouldn't be possible to be a part of a public school and a home school group.

A discussion of the specifics of home schooling and of afterschool programs ensued.

This proposal was accepted as a topic under discussion and will be considered under the rules regulating First Consideration in September.

Amending the CHSSA Constitution - specifically Article III, Section 1 to read thus:

New text in boldface

Section 1. Membership shall be open to all California high schools and to junior high schools that include the ninth grade upon payment of any dues established and the filing of required membership application. **All member schools must be either recognized by the state of California as public high schools OR must have a Private School Affidavit on file with the California Department of Education for the current school year.**

President Prefontaine declared the meeting in recess at 11:36 a.m. to resume at 1 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 1:11 p.m.

VIII. New Business

Election of officers:

Candidates: President: Sharon Prefontaine; Vice President Activities Nermin Kamel;  
Vice President Rita Prichard.

Article IX, section 3, paragraph A-1-f, p.7, and paragraph B-1-f, p.9 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

***Election by acclamation: M/Ballingall, S/Munsell, unanimous***

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-A: M/Abad, S/Underwood**

Article XVI, p.1 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

ARTICLE XVI: Initiative and Referendum Process

Section 1. Any coach of a member school of the CHSSA may request a change in the CHSSA Constitution or By-Laws through a petition and referendum process.

Section 2. The coach shall submit a copy of the proposed change and/or addition to the CHSSA President prior to the time the initiative petition is circulated for signatures.

Section 3. Within 60 days of the time the proposal was submitted to the President, the initiating coach must submit a petition or letters signed by ~~40~~ **20%** of the coaches of CHSSA member schools supporting the proposal.

Section 4. The President shall verify the signatures and membership of those signing the petition/letters. If the petition/letters verified represent ~~40~~ **20%** or more of the total CHSSA member schools, the President **shall submit the proposed change and/or addition to the CSSC for prompt discussion and consideration. If the CSSC fails to enact a change in the CHSSA Constitution or By-Laws that satisfies the coach who submitted the proposed change and/or addition within one year of the date the qualifying petition or letters were submitted, then the President** must within thirty days of the expiration of the one year period mail or e-mail a ballot with the proposed changes and/or additions to the coaches of all member schools of the CHSSA.

Section 5. The ballot shall contain the wording of the proposed change and a reference to the section of the Constitution or By-Laws which would be changed or added to. The ballot shall also contain a maximum 250 word statement representing the reasons and rationale for and a similar statement against the change. The original initiator or a person designated by the initiator shall write the statement for the proposal; the President of CHSSA or a person designated by the President shall write the statement against the proposal. The deadline for returning ballots shall be on the ballot.

Section 6. The coaches of the member schools shall have fifteen days to vote, all returned ballots postmarked on or before the fifteenth day. If a majority of coaches voting favor the proposed changes and/or additions, the changes and/or additions shall immediately become a part of the Constitution and By-Laws. Votes shall be tabulated by the four Area Chairpersons at the time of the next scheduled meeting of the CSSC. The President shall announce the results of the voting, and the results shall become a part of the official Minutes of that meeting and printed in the next issue of the State Speech Bulletin. The initiator of the petition may be present for the tabulation of the votes.

Abad: Giving CSSC a year to address the issue contained in a referendum potentially improves the quality of the legislation.

Caperton: Don't agree with one year limit; violates principles of referendum.

Kamel: F/A: 750 word limit on pro and con statements (as opposed to 250); accepted by author.

Graber: When does the one year waiting period begin? Abad: After the 20% signature threshold is reached.

Johnson: 20% threshold is too high, requires a great deal of effort. 10% is a reasonable.

F/A: Proposal would go through CHSSA before the referendum is distributed to coaches.

***Divide motion: Exclude Section 4, consider the rest.***

Prefontaine: 20% is 50 votes.

Hamilton: System seemed to work, only 2 referendums in the past. This change doesn't lend transparency; will it be perceived as ignoring the will of the people.

Newbold: Perhaps it would require more than one league to approve the referendum, forcing a broader base of support.

Kamel: should be more than 25 people to get something on the ballot; too easy to get 25 signatures should come from a cross section.

***Passes, Ayes: 15 Nays: 8 Abstentions: 2***

***Motion to table Section 4: Passes, voice***

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-B: M/Johnson, S/Underwood**

Article XI, Section 5, Paragraph A, p.8 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):  
  
Final focus (2nd affirmative rebuttal): 4 **2** minutes  
Final focus (2nd negative rebuttal): 4 **2** minutes

***Passes unanimously***

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-C: M/Abad,  
To expand Parliamentary and Public Forum to 40 entries apiece  
*Fails for lack of second***

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-D: M/Johnson, S/Graber  
correct section 2 - "and during the round"  
(Article XI, Section 4, Paragraph D, pp. 6-7  
Relating to notes in Parliamentary Debate)**

Graber: Not being able to use ellipses takes too much time

Ballingall: Being able to exclude through use of ellipses has huge abuse potential.

Johnson: Also, not bad to make it difficult to use too much evidence; should require some effort.

Hamilton: What about quotes that are general knowledge?

Ballingall: Quotes don't have to appear on the prep paper; quotes that are general knowledge can still be used.

Graber: What happens if a student is caught faking a quote?

Johnson: Allow the debaters to debate the validity of evidence in the round, let's see what happens.

Kamel: This motion doesn't concern validity of evidence challenges that would go before an outside committee; challenging evidence would take place in the round in front of the judge.

Johnson: I explicitly left out a challenge mechanism to avoid the problems involved with this.

Graber: Whose time does this come out of?

Prefontaine: During the course of the debate.

*Remanded to the Debate Committee*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-E: M/Abad, S/  
Regarding rules changes in Parliamentary Debate  
Withdrawn**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-F: M/Johnson, S/Caperton**

Article XI, Section 3, Paragraph H, p.6 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):  
(As amended)

**H. Value debate -- no plan permitted. No plan shall be presented by either debater in the round. A plan is defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation.**

Matley: Shouldn't legislate content of speeches.

Caperton: Hate plan texts; should legislate against them. Policy judges bring their pro-policy bias.

Ballingall: Plan could be banned but undefined; overly restrictive.

Niemi: Shouldn't legislate debate theory.

Johnson: Debaters are too concerned about what judges want, and take advantage of what judges will allow them to do.

Keller-Firestone: Friendly amendment: first sentence only. Johnson accepts.

Graber: Friendly amendment: Use the plan definition from Motion H. Johnson accepts

Wardner: Plan definition is the same as the NFL; good to make events similar

Ballingall: NFL doesn't have this prohibition

***Ayes: Wardner, Darling, Read, Driggs, Graber, Johnson, Caperton, Hegner, Newbold,  
Barembaum, Underwood***

***Nays: Abad, Ko, Matley, Niemi, Hamilton, Kindred, Rosen, Munsell, Ballingall,***

***Abstain: Keller-Firestone, Gomes, Kamel***

***Passes 11-9***

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-G: M/Johnson, S/Kindred  
Article XI, Section 5, Paragraph D5, p.9 (regarding clash in Public Forum)**

Underwood: This wasn't the original intent; always could do either one from the beginning; clash is better.

Kindred: Since we don't flip the coin, shouldn't be necessary to advocate one vs. the other.

Wardner: Am I banned from clashing in any way? Potential for abuse.

Driggs: Trying to be educators. What's wrong with debaters deciding for themselves?

Munsell: Getting too proscriptive.

***Fails, voice vote***

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-H: M/Johnson, S/Underwood**

Article XI, Section 5, Paragraph I, p.9 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

**I. No plans/counterplans. In Public Forum debate a plan is defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Neither the affirmative or negative side is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan; rather they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.**

Graber: Not in favor of restricting in Public Forum. Public Forum resolutions are policy oriented. Makes Public Forum too theoretical.

Matley: In favor in this case, it is the NFL rule.

Caperton: Protests not difficult.

Johnson: Forwards the audience friendly demeanor of Public Forum.

Passes, voice vote, unanimously

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-I: M/Ballingall, S/Johnson**

Article VII, Section 4, Paragraph D, p.3 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

D. Distribution of Public Forum and Parliamentary Debate entries: There shall be ~~thirty-two~~ **forty-eight** entries in both Public Forum and Parliamentary Debate. Each Area shall receive ~~eight~~ **twelve** Public Forum and Parliamentary Debate entries.

Kamel: Logistical problems

Ballingall: Not ill considered, been thinking for awhile. BUT, making this work logistically will require dropping the third guaranteed round for Policy and LD

Read: Need to act now, logistics are always the excuse.

Caperton: Many people voted against the referendum because we promised that we would address this.

Johnson: Just find a site that can accommodate the logistics.

Kamel: Shouldn't act so hastily

Hamilton: Coaches in my area are overwhelmingly in support

Barembaum: Logistics has to support whatever change we make; 40 entries without any logistical issues, would only require 10 rooms

Munsell: Need judges, they are scarce

Barembaum: Amendment: M/40 entries in each event S/Graber

Johnson: 8 additional slots not a lot of change; the 3<sup>rd</sup> round is pretty meaningless for the competitors.

Underwood: Defeat the amendment, then go to 48.

Graber: Would lose site if we have to have 48; student competitors eliminated earlier

Ballingall: In that sense, CHSSA is serving as a baby sitter

Kamel: Would ask that we not vote to get rid of 3rd round, if this passes I want to consider other alternatives for scheduling first

*Amendment fails: 7 in favor, 15 oppose, 1 abstention*

**On the main motion:**

*Ayes- Keller-Firestone, Abad, Ko, Matley, Darling, Read, Neimi, Hamilton, Kindred, Johnson, Rosen, Caperton, Newbold, Larsen, Ballingall, Underwood*

*Nay – Wardner , Graber, Kamel*

*Abstain – Munsell, Hegner, Gomes, Barembaum*

*Passes, 16-3*

M/ Barembaum S/Hegner

Suspend the rules to allow meeting to continue, business passed must have at least 13 votes (majority of the required quorum) **Passes**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-X: M/Kamel S/Underwood**

Article VII, Section 5, Paragraph H3, p.7 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

Students may double enter at the State Tournament in Parliamentary debate and an Individual Event or Public Forum and an Individual Event, **except no student may enter in both Exptermoporaneous and Parliamentary Debate.**

Read: Driggs and I have done Prep Room several years. This has been an issue for years.

Niemi: Move the extemps to the other pattern? Kamel: They hit one way or the other.

Johnson: Extemp and Parliamentary are similar; limiting double entry not so bad. Forces students possibly to do other events.

Passes, unanimously

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-J: M/Johnson, S/Barembaum**  
**Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph L, p.4, regarding word count limits for policy debate 1ACs:**

Johnson: We should be promoting communication

Ballingall: Word count grossly unfair to aff; shouldn't regulate words within speeches

Newbold: Agree with the idea; how do you regulate? This is regulated through judge practice.

Caperton: Don't want to have to do a word count in every speech.

Munsell: Don't want to check as in scripts.

Keller-Firestone: LD finalists- can do both, knew they must adapt to the judges, that's how they talk

1980 San Jose tried to regulate speed (though the no flow rule); it was a complete disaster. Can't regulate speed in debate.

Johnson: Kids are disadvantaged when spread is used against them in

If we don't end this practice now, you'll see it in the State Tournament. Outrounds with 2 spread judges, my teams lose.

Barembaum: Not an onerous requirement. Assume they're sincere.

Gomes: Try it in your league?

Johnson: Have a guideline against spread debate

Ballingall: Have you counted words in your league?

Kamel: Two schools of policy debate. Limiting of spread won't grow the activity.

Barembaum: Only be able to do debate the way it should be; spread debate killing debate.

*Fails, voice*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-K: M/Johnson, S/Barembaum  
Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph L, p.4, regarding word count limits for LD 1ACs:**

*Fails, voice*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-L: M/Johnson, S/Barembaum  
Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph L, p.4, regarding word count limits for Public Forum 1ACs:**

*Fails, voice*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-M: M/Johnson, S/Barembaum  
Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph L, p.4, regarding speaking speed in Parliamentary Debate:**

*Fails, voice*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-N-Q  
Regarding communication with outsiders during round  
Remanded to the Debate Committee**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-R**

**Remanded to Debate Committee**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-S: M/Johnson, S/Hegler**

Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph J, p.4 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

~~Evidence challenges.~~ **Internet access prohibited; Electronic devices restricted.** Debaters shall not be allowed to utilize the internet during rounds; internet devices **on any computers used in the round** must be disabled. **Other than one computer per debater, one printer per team, and one electronic timer per debater that has no functioning capability other than to count time, the debaters shall not have access to or activate any other electronic device during the round, including, but not limited to, cell phones. Penalty for violation of this rule shall be automatic forfeiture of the round by the offending team.**

Newbold: This works in our league

Kamel: What is the penalty?

Hegler: Disqualified 3 debaters in league over having cell phones out; new rules have left discretion to appeals committee.

Caperton: F/A Violation means automatic loss. Accepted by Johnson.

Newbold: Our league doesn't distinguish intent of the use of electronic device

Keller-Firestone: Agrees with Johnson

Kamel: If a kid pulls out a phone and reads the time off of it, does s/he lose?

Several: yes

**Passes, unanimously**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-T: M/Johnson, S/Hegler**

Article XI, Section 3, Paragraph E3 & F, p.6 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

~~E3. Debaters shall not be allowed to utilize computers for any reason during the debate round.~~

**F. Prohibition regarding electronic devices.**

**Debaters shall not be allowed to utilize computers for any reason during the debate round. Debaters shall not be allowed to use the internet during the round. Other than an electronic timing device that has no functional capability other than counting time, debaters shall not access or activate any other electronic devices during the round, including, but not limited to, cell phones. Penalty for violation of this rule shall be automatic forfeiture of the round by the offending debater.**

**Passes, unanimously**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-V M/Johnson, S/Hegler**

Article XI, Section 4, Paragraph C2, p.6 new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

4.C.2. Students may consult their partner, **and no one else**, dictionaries, reference materials, and prepared notes during the preparation period. **Debaters shall not utilize computers for any reason during the preparation period or the debate round. Debaters shall not be allowed to use the internet during the preparation period or the debate round. Other than an electronic timing device that has no functional capability other than counting time, debaters shall not access or activate any other electronic devices during the preparation period or the debate round, including, but not limited to, cell phones. Penalty for violation of this rule shall be automatic forfeiture of the round by the offending team.**

**Passes, unanimously**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-V M/Johnson, S/Hegler**

Article XI, Section 5 Paragraph F, p.9 new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

**F. Prohibition of computer use and electronic devices.**

**Debaters shall not be allowed to utilize computers for any reason during the round. Debaters shall not be allowed to use the internet during the round. Other than an electronic timing device that has no functional capability other than counting time, debaters shall not access or activate any other electronic devices during the round, including, but not limited to, cell phones. Penalty for violation of this rule shall be automatic forfeiture of the round by the offending team.**

**Passes, unanimously**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-W: M/Johnson,  
Regarding rules for Thematic Interpretation  
Remanded to IE Committee**

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 10-05-Y: M/Darling S/Kindred  
Regarding rules for Oratorical Interpretation and the definition of "public address"**

Graber: Definition could be better. "Public oration" is superior to "public address."

Barembaum: What's wrong with the dictionary definition?

Johnson: Would a story be allowed? Shouldn't be.

Gomes: Humorous commencement speech? Several: It's acceptable under this definition

Barenbaum: Maybe "address" is a better word

Kamel: Can we leave here with the understanding that our intent is for OI to be a formal speech, not something like an open mike comedy night.

**Remanded to IE Committee**

**MOVE TO ADJOURN:  
Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.**