

- I. The meeting was called to order by President Prefontaine at 9:20 a.m.**
- II. Secretary Ballingall called the roll.**

Absent: Liz Harlacher (Area 3 At-Large)  
 Proxies: Bruce Jordan for Janet Hansen (Area 1 Curriculum); Karson Kalashian for MiKendra McCoy (Area 2 Curriculum); Derek Yuill for Brett Alexander (SCDL President); Heather Floyd for Allison Huntley (Area 3 Curriculum)

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

- III. Minutes from January 2011 meeting were circulated**  
 Correction: Johnson: on p.9, amendment to proposed By-laws amendment 11-01-H was actually moved by Barembaum, seconded by Johnson.

*Accepted as corrected: without objection*

**IV. Officer Reports**

President Prefontaine

Thanks Nermin Kamel for all her efforts at State; bringing in new technology, tournament booklet, managing the larger tournament; some challenges, but overcome. Congratulations to Nermin for being chosen Principal at Alhambra HS in Martinez.

Protests (and rulings) will be posted on the CHSSA website, cahssa.org.

Thanks to Steve Caperton for all the work he's done on the website. Many upgrades including a survey we would like everyone to take. We need more data about the educational benefits of speech, as well as information about the State Tournament.

Idea to be considered for the future, to make our meeting more efficient: continue to start at 2 pm Friday, start with old business, then do league meetings, submit new business to committees, committees meet from 8-11 am Saturday, new business after lunch. Day might be extended, but better drafting in committees might reduce debating time in the new business section.

Discussion of January date took place; there are tournament conflicts each of the 3 weekends in January under consideration. Do we need a January meeting? Should we do a meeting over the internet?

<u>CSSC Meeting</u>	Tentative Dates	Location
September	9-10	San Francisco
January	6-7	TBA (Internet or San Jose)
May	18-19	LAX

**Committee list corrections:** Brett Alexander added to Congress Committee, Gregg Osborn moves from Congress to I.E.

Vice President of Activities Kamel

Thanks to Gregg and Jennifer Osborn for the amazing amount of work they did for the 2011 State Tournament, also to Suzanne Munsell for her help. Thanks to Tim Case for all of the work he did as technology coordinator for the tournament.

Judges room computerization needs improvement, but we will work on that. Texting pairings announcements worked well, thanked Steve Caperton for scanning all the ballots.

Hopefully in the future we can get more sponsors for the booklet. Dinner-Dance had over 700 people in attendance.

Need input on how we continue to have a larger tournament while meeting our logistical needs.

Concerned that some schools turn down entries to avoid moving up to a different sweepstakes level; also, the sweepstakes results announced this year were wrong; corrected results will be posted and schools will be notified.

2012 State Tournament: April 27-29 at Lowell High School, San Francisco.

Due date for entries for 2012 State: March 22 for online entry, March 29 postmark deadline for mailed forms and payment. Reminder to leagues that schools must pay CHSSA dues 2 weeks in advance of their first State Qualifier to be eligible to compete at the qualifiers.

Vice President of Curriculum Prichard

Met Friday morning, had 4 members at the meeting. Each area has a Curriculum Rep, and they must be at the meeting, or they must send a proxy. Meetings begin at 9 am. CHSSA pays expenses for Curriculum Reps, which means that reps need to be at the meeting.

Treasurer Barembaum

Judge deposits were given to league presidents.

Case: Many problems tracking who showed up for rounds, and who should've been penalized for missing rounds.

Kamel: People need to show up for what they sign up for. Schools need to stay within the restrictions we place on their judge assignments.

New check out form (including option to have deposit put towards next years dues) can be filled out at a different time, perhaps at registration.

Historian Underwood: No report.

## **V. Area Chair Reports**

### Area 1 Chair Keller-Firestone

Looking forward to hosting the 2012 State Tournament; Area 1 assessments are up, a good sign. Tournament dates are April 27-29.

### Area 2 Chair Darling

Welcome to Karson Kalashian, who will be replacing Andrew Scherrer. We are continuing to pursue San Joaquin Delta College as the site of the 2014 Tournament.

### Area 3 Chair Kindred

2013 State Tournament site: West Ranch HS in Valencia, dates still TBA.

### Area 4 Chair Munsell

Extremely grateful to Gregg and Jennifer Osborn for their help before and at the State Tournament; also to Dr. Sharon Taylor and the SDSU students who helped out, and to the SD and OCSL coaches who helped.

Osborn: Many helped, including Andrea Cartwright and Thomas Gomes.

## **VI. Committee Reports**

### Individual Events Committee (Darling)

Had a good meeting yesterday; we worked on the by-laws, working on making the rules as consistent as possible.

Remanded motion regarding computers in extemp - suggest that we wait until Nationals and see how their new rules work out this year.

Remanded motion to allow newspapers in extemp - the Committee is thinking that if we write California topics, to take them from up to 5 specific newspapers.

Discussed eliminating timing of speeches in semis and finals.

Discussed combining the 2 extemps - would like leagues to discuss this.

### Curriculum Committee (Rita Prichard)

Worked on revising the Coaches Manual, will try to edit, and put it online, including links between cover sheets on line and the Manual. Many additions to the website are forthcoming.

Event videos are now posted on YouTube in their entirety (except for TI, due to copyright issues). Niemi: Can they be posted on SchoolTube? Caperton: Yes.

Also online: instructions for submitting courses that meet the UC f and g subject requirements.

Sold over \$500 of DVDs on the various events at the tournament. Had a fair number of people who wanted something on impromptu and/or extemporaneous. Would like to produce our next DVD on impromptu. The OI DVD is almost ready.

Congress Committee (Matley)

Much of the committee meeting was spent discussing Joy of Tournaments, and the difficulties of using it during the tournament.

Worked on comment sheets for Congress; looked at the NFL format for the comments; would like to make some changes in their form.

Handed out a document written by the committee, for the Coaches Handbook, and posted online, giving people instruction in getting started with Student Congress.

Debate Committee (Ballingall)

We discussed the need for and the possibility of a meeting of Parli coaches at the September meeting. There are issues worthy of discussion, such as the nature of evidence and the rules regarding evidence, topic selection, and whether topics or topic areas should be revealed in advance, and other things. We probably would need a bigger room for this meeting, whether it took place in the morning or at 2 pm.

Yuill - online discussion group for NFL - could we use that model here?

Discussed Bruce Jordan's proposal on points of order in Parli; amended it, will have amendment printed after lunch.

On remand: Johnson proposals:

1. Banning outside contact, will continue to work on this -- will have it in Sept.
2. Nature of Parli evidence. Would like to meet with coaches first and get feedback. The colored paper part has been implemented as a tournament administration decision by Nermin and is not a rule.

We had two other proposals - a housekeeping rule covering the drawing of byes, and a proposal to define what a "round" is, for the purposes of rule enforcement.

Public Relations (Caperton)

Website was very popular last month; 14,000 views on the Saturday of the State Tournament; over 34,000 hits for the month of April (an average month: 6,000). Caperton will continue working on the site over summer vacation.

Over the summer, the Committee will get ready for next year. Reed will take responsibility for the Bulletin, and will obtain a mailing list of all public and private high schools in California to mail to. We will work on outreach to migrant student debaters, county offices of education, NFL schools that aren't CAHSSA members, and county Offices of Education. We also need to survey member coaches to compile information about programs.

President Prefontaine declared the meeting in recess at 11:36 a.m. to resume at 1:00 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 1:05 p.m.

**VII. Old Business**

Computers in extemp: Will be discussed after NFL Nationals.  
All other matters under New Business .

**VIII. New Business**Election of officers

For President: Sharon Prefontaine; For Vice President-Activities: Nermin Kamel; For Vice President-Curriculum: Rita Prichard

Slate elected unanimously

Prefontaine: Reid Niemi has been appointed Editor; Steve Caperton has been appointed VP/Public Relations

Niemi: I will produce a published Bulletin, as opposed to one strictly disseminated online.

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-A: M/Underwood, S/Ballingall****Article VI, Section 3, Paragraph E, p.1 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):**

E. 4. ~~Those voting~~ **Council members, leagues and Hall of Fame members** may vote for zero to two candidates on the ballot.

New E. 5 **The CHSSA President should notify candidates of results by March 1.**

Underwood: This motion makes our process clearer; same process we've always used. Everyone who has a vote has 2 votes; a voter can cast no votes, a vote for either or both candidates for the Hall of Fame, or 2 votes for one candidate.

*Motion passes unanimously, voice vote*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-B: M/Barembaum, S/Graber****Article VI, Section 3, Paragraph E, p.1 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):**

1. Schools in the following **geographic areas counties** shall be eligible for membership in the Tri-County Forensic League: **San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura, and those parts of Los Angeles County outside of CBSR, WBFL and SCDL.**

- ~~Western boundary: LA County line from the Pacific Ocean to Hwy 126~~
- ~~Northern boundary: Hwy 126 east to the San Gabriel Mountains~~
- ~~Eastern boundary: Hwy 118 to Angeles National Forest, including Tujunga, and the southern and eastern borders of the city of Burbank and will also include cities in the following counties: San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura.~~

Barembaum: According to the current By-laws, much of LA County isn't actually assigned to a league. This motion would add this territory to TCFL, and would allow Acton HS to join CHSSA as a member of that league.

*Motion passes unanimously, voice vote*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-C: M/Jordan, S/Ballingall**

**Article XI, Section 4, Paragraphs B, G3, p.6 & 8 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):**

B. Length and order of speeches

Opposition Rebuttal	6 minutes
Proposition Rebuttal	6 minutes

G. 3. **In constructive speeches** debaters may or may not take points of information at their discretion. **In rebuttals, the speaker must take at least two points of information, if offered.** The speaker accepts a single point; the opposing speaker is not allowed to make following questions or arguments unless again recognized by the speaker holding the floor.

Johnson: Why is Parli special? No other event gets to object to new arguments.

Jordan: Parli is special in that it already has procedures such as points of order and information to deal with some of these issues.

Kalashian: Functionally points of order operate differently; why go this route?

Wolf: The issue of judge instructions/training to be able to start/stop time, and deal with the procedure.

Unlimited points of order could extend rounds, be used for gamesmanship to distract speakers.

Caperton: Why mandate in rebuttal and not constructive?

Read: Students can refuse to accept in rebuttals and not be allowed to point out new arguments.

Hegner: Needs to be some sort of procedure put in that allows evidentiary challenge; judges won't catch evidence problems in rebuttals.

Kamel: What is the penalty?

Wolf: Should be in judges instruction, judge can include it in their decision.

Kamel: Would like to see this spelled out; not a protestable offense.

Keller-Firestone: Could this be in a rule that says that it's up to the judge to consider it?

Johnson: Debaters can address this in their rebuttal speeches; again, why is Parli special in this regard?

Caperton: How will this be put? Jordan: Are you aware that this argument is new? Wolf: Can be made as a statement.

Caperton: The abuse argument will be run in every round.

Kalashian: In theory, a point of information is different from a point of order. Teams will be asking two questions every speech, it will break up the flow of speech.

Kamel: Two in rebuttal seems a lot.

Hegner: Why not points of order? Jordan: Originally thought that this could be handled through points of order, but was convinced that approach had too many difficulties, so changed to this approach.

*Motion fails, 12 - 12. President abstains.*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-D: M/Johnson, S/??**

**Article VII, Section 1, Paragraphs A2(b) & B4(b), p.1 & 2 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):**

A.2.b. Spontaneous Speaking

- ~~International Extemporaneous~~
- ~~National Extemporaneous~~
- **Extemporaneous (with National and International topics)**

B.4.b. Spontaneous Speaking

- ~~International Extemporaneous~~ = .....101-156
- ~~National Extemporaneous~~ = .....201-256

*Remanded to IE; will seek guidance from leagues by September.*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-E: M/Ballingall, S/Hegner**

**Article XI, Section 6, p.11 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):**

**Section 6. Definition of a round.**

**For the purposes of the rules listed in this Article, a round shall begin when the first speaker in the debate begins his/her speech, and shall end when the last speaker in the debate ends his/her speech.**

Ballingall: This will help avoid confusion over when the rules apply; this was at issue in an appeal at the recent State tournament.

Matley: Will this cover roadmaps?

Ballingall: No.

*Passes unanimously, Voice vote*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-F: M/Ballingall, S/Wolf**

**Article XII, Section 1, p.1 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):**

Section 1. Drawing of Byes

**A.** If the tournament is paired according to the procedures outlined in this Article, no byes should be necessary before Quarterfinals **in events with 64 entries, or before Round 5 in events with 48 entries.** If some unforeseen circumstance occurs (i.e. fewer than 64 or ~~32~~ **48** teams/individuals competing in Round 1, a team dropping from the tournament due to illness, the awarding of double wins as a result of a protest, etc.), it may be necessary to draw byes in preliminary rounds. ~~If this is the case, any bye should be drawn from the bracket with an odd number of teams init, so as to best maintain the integrity of each won-loss bracket throughout the tournament. If a bye is necessary in round one, it should be drawn at random.~~

**B. Byes in Rounds 1 through 6 should be drawn from the following brackets:**

**Round 1. The bye should be drawn at random. All teams/individuals are eligible for the bye.**

**Round 2. The bye should come from the one-loss bracket, and should be drawn so as to minimize the number of teams/individuals that have to be drawn to even up sides, as outlined in Section 3, Paragraph E.**

**Round 3. The bye should come from the two-loss bracket.**

**Round 4. The bye should come from the one-loss bracket, and should be drawn so as to minimize the number of teams/individuals that have to be drawn to even up sides, as outlined in Section 3, Paragraph E.**

**Round 5. The bye should come from the one-loss bracket.**

**Elimination rounds. Rules for byes are outlined in Section 3, Paragraph G4.**

Ballingall: This is a housekeeping amendment.

*Passes unanimously, Voice vote*

<b>MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-G: M/Yuill, S/Niemi</b>
---

**Article XIV, Section 3, Paragraph A, p.3 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):**

Section 3. Awards.

A. Grand Sweepstakes: Sweepstakes awards will be presented to the **15** schools gathering the highest number of points on the basis of the point system outlined below. ~~Awards of appropriate size shall be given according to the following guidelines:~~

- ~~1. Three schools with an entry of four or fewer will be given suitable awards of recognition based on sweepstakes points earned. These awards shall be labeled "Division A Sweepstakes Awards".~~
- ~~2. Five schools with an entry of not less than five and not more than seventeen will be given suitable awards of recognition based on sweepstakes points earned. These awards shall be labeled "Division AA Sweepstakes Awards".~~
- ~~3. Five schools with an entry greater than seventeen will be given suitable awards of recognition based on sweepstakes points earned. These awards shall be labeled "Division AAA Sweepstakes Awards."~~

Yuill: Problems with sweeps, problems with divisions (4 entries, 17 entries) What is sweepstakes? Reward schools for having high caliber programs Award top 15 schools overall - smaller and medium schools would still be recognized. Can still market top 15 in State to administrators.

Niemi: Did you originally want the 3 divisions? Yuill: No.

Case: Not every program is created equally. At a school of 800 kids, it's impossible to make the group of top 15, the 3 tier system protects smaller schools.

Kalashian: Bad practice to keep students from competing to stay in a lower division.

Administrators aren't impressed with finishing in lower end of top 15.

Hegner: Schools can and do pull entries to stay in lower divisions, which is unethical.

Caperton: More impressive to be able to say "1st in State"

Matley: Big schools don't really have a problem; small schools should get their own division

Yuill: School size doesn't really matter; big programs go against bigger schools. What does sweepstakes mean? We can give everyone a plaque for participating.

Kamel: Administrators know the context when schools win Sweepstakes awards.



Johnson: Our principal is impressed by things other than simply Sweepstakes award; our current system “incentivizes” bad behavior by coaches.

Wolf: Current system works for some schools; we shouldn't be trying to legislate ethical behavior on the part of coaches. Better way to deal with this concern is to discuss, educate coaches.

Case: Also want to be able to market to students; being able to show success through these awards and through progressing through these divisions

Munsell: CIF divisions use very objective measure; our system allows coaches to choose.

Osborn: Difficult to move up to the larger division.

Ballingall: Everyone can benefit from receiving these awards, small programs and large programs. Why not keep both?

Derek: Solves the ethics problem. What is the purpose of sweepstakes?

Hegner: Shouldn't let coaches choose their divisions; recognizing top 15 or 20 is more recognition.

Wolf: Can have top 20, and 3 divisions, not mutually exclusive.

Keller-Firestone: Can legislate ethics, we do with all rules we have.

Floyd: If you're getting one of these rewards, you're bringing home another trophy that would be marketable.

Driggs: People from different areas aren't the same.

Prichard: Should speak to our membership.

Yuill: We can and do legislate ethics.

Case: Marketing may have a negative connotation, but team-building is important.

Kalashian: Some combination of the two is good. Could create the separate categories after the tournament entries are all in.

Barebaum: Giving the smaller schools the ability to promote themselves is good. The current cutoffs are artificial, and don't reflect the size of the program or the school.

Johnson: Sweepstakes awards haven't been necessary to the growth of the programs in Torrance.

Wolf: Move to amend: Grand sweepstakes top 20, top 5 in each of the divisions. Seconded by 1/3.

Niemi: Accept a friendly amendment to post only on the website?

Keller-Firestone: Doesn't address the problem of the bad coaches behavior.

Kamel: Awards already too long. Schools rejected spots to stay in their category.

### *Amendment fails*

Friendly amendment by Caperton to move the number of schools recognized to 20, accepted by Yuill.

Graber: Divide the entry into thirds, based on entries that year.

Yuill: This debate will always come up. Determine what sweepstakes mean first, then design a system to achieve those goals.

### *Motion Passes, 18-6*

## MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-H: M/Yuill, S/Niemi

Article XIV, Section 3, p.5 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

**D. Plaques: Every school shall be presented with an appropriate plaque at Registration indicating their participation in the CHSSA State Championships.**

*Passes, unanimously*

## MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 11-05-I: M/Yuill, S/Kamel

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

4. Bonus entries: A bonus of seven entries per existing individual event will be added (one panel), using the following formula (Appendix G: worksheet):
- a. Based on the previous three years' State Tournaments and total league entries, the number of sweepstakes points earned shall be divided by the total number of allocated league entries. In the event of a tie, the tie will be broken in the same manner but done based on the previous four years, five years etc.
  - b. This number is to be used to rank the leagues in order.
  - c. **To be eligible to receive additional entry(ies) to an event at the State Individual Events Tournament, a League must average .5 sweepstakes points over the past 3 years in that particular individual event, or .75 points in Duo Interpretation.**
  - e. **d. The seven bonus entries shall be distributed to each eligible League, in rank order. Any remaining entry(ies) shall be distributed to the Leagues with the greatest average wins per entry, in rank order.**~~The top seven leagues shall each receive one bonus entry.~~In the event of a tie, the tie will be broken in the same manner but done based on the previous four years, five years etc.
- 

Yuill: Same as debate, must average 2 wins to get a bonus, 4 leagues get bonuses in each debate for 8 bonuses. In IE, 1 out of 4 entries must average making semifinals for a league to get the bonus.

Johnson: Why? Yuill: For a league to receive a bonus, you should be successful. This at least requires a minimum level of success for each league to achieve.

Kamel: The bottom league receives the same number of bonuses (1) as the top league

Graber: This is consolidating the wealth;

Yuill: If you take the extra entry, you have to support it

Underwood: Original intent of the bonus was to reward leagues that are better, this would do that, probably a minimal number of qualifiers.

Wolf: Makes it easier for leagues that don't receive bonuses to qualify in the future

Osborn: Can make it easier for small schools in leagues to qualify students

*Motion passes, voice vote*

## IX. For the good of the order

Kalashian: At State, there is a timing issue in Semis and Finals in HI and Duo. Audience laughter counts against total time. Possible proposals:

1. Don't time semis and finals.
2. Two timers: one times, the other times laughter breaks.
3. Extend grace period.

Rationale: Students in these late elim rounds shouldn't be time violated. Workability issues to this proposal, but discuss with your leagues, discuss on the forum.

Yuill: the example this year in Duo was late during the entire tournament.

Gomes: DI had more time violations than HI and Duo.

**X. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Chuck Ballingall  
CHSSA Secretary