

- I. The meeting was called to order by President Prefontaine at 9:24AM
- II. Secretary Niemi called the roll.

Proxies: Chris James for Jennifer Kindred; Kristin Plant proxy for Terry Abad; Bob Stockton for Matthew Brandstetter

Absent: David Matley

- III. Minutes from May 2013 meeting were circulated (the amended minutes will be posted online)
Johnson moved, Driggs Second

Minutes accepted as corrected

IV. Officer Reports

President Prefontaine

PREF: We have done a lot of formatting changes in Debate and IE. They were sent out a week ago to all council members. Embedded in the reformatting are some word changes that may imply bylaw change practices, please think carefully about these changes. The committee over summer did a lot of work to make the bylaws more accessible to newcomers. At current time the Protest Committee adjudicates these matters and we would like to avoid having that body make many of these decisions. At the League level please reflect on how scripts are vetted in order to avoid violations. We may not be able to control the performance in the round BUT we can make sure scripts are legal. We wish for our students to maintain integrity. These changes are so massive that we may want to receive feedback to the committees from all. We may want to remand. On line one may view the changes made—we desire transparency. This is our organizational mission. We wish to rid the ambiguity in our rules.

We are keeping a close eye on Nermin! Please notice her throughout the day.

GRABER: She looks glowing!

Vice President of Activities Fraser

FRASER: Sorry about the last minute switch...we lost our meeting room. I apologize. In January we are in San Diego (January 10-11, 2014).

OSBORN: If it is in the minutes and posted online then we can book?

FRASER: Book your flights, the dates are hard. Hotel could change, but time and location will remain the same. Save money, book now.

PREF: Once Nermin gets your info on the net-form, you will have a reservation.

FRASER: Hotels will always have an airport shuttle.

PREF: First weekend after Labor Day in September. Second weekend in January. Weekend after Mother's Day in May. These are the traditional dates.

KARSON: May meeting?

FRASER: LAX Raddisson. Problems with Oakland? If it is good then we should try to keep Oakland in the future.

FRASER: State tournament is in Modesto this year. There are some true veterans in the League that can pull this off. Nearest airport is Sacramento. I will be booking more Thursday night rooms—also some more Sunday night rooms. Once I receive it from YFL I will send out preferable travel routes as suggested by the league.

Vice President of Curriculum Prichard

PRICHARD: We have a long meeting period. We will be working through Sunday. Thank you committee members. We have some new members. Jessica is now married and has a new last name, Peroff. New Area II

Cur Rep, Martha Managahas, she teaches at Chavez HS, she was a State Champ and a product of Mr. Cummings. Also Area IV At-Large, Rachel Krause—Torrey Pines HS. Thank you both for your commitment. We are focusing on the Common Core. We spent yesterday about our role in speaking and listening portions of the Common Core. We are developing essential questions as they relate to listening and speaking. We are incorporating the language of the Common Core. We are going to develop lessons in all the subcategories of the CC. We are going to continue our meeting after the General Council to continue our work.

Parli tape is in development and should be completed by January.

UNDERWOOD: How is this different than what you have done in the past?

PRICHARD: We are going to pitch it to the classroom with CC language. We do not want to reinvent what already exists. We decided to focus on a wider range.

JOHNSON: Parli is the first debate we have made. I do not want to see spread debate.

PRICHARD: We are aware and are taking the necessary steps.

JOHNSON: That is my real concern, thank you.

PRICHARD: Chapter 3 on all the DVD's are the rules. We can easily edit the third chapter. We can easily adjust the DVDs accordingly. We are attempting to get all the videos posted on line.

BAREMBAUM: We are making some income on this project, by the way.

PRICHARD: That is correct.

PEROFF: We have no curriculum on listening and speaking. That is why we are focusing on that specifically.

KARSON: I like being able to say that we have materials for new programs. Do we have a timeframe?

PRICHARD: There is one lesson posted currently—advocacy. Point them that way. The next unit is direct instruction with rubric. It will be available in January meeting.

Treasurer Barembaum

BAREMBAUM: (*PAGE 12*) You should have gotten two emails from me. \$13,000 deficit last year. Most of that came from bills from the beginning of 2014 for the Lowell HS State tournament. It was put on the current books. We are not going to produce DVD's after the Parli video. I am going to ask to decrease the scholarship monies. We are going down in scholarships claimed.

GRABER: Are the scholarships that have not been paid off will be paid off?

BAREMBAUM: Yes.

KARSON: \$7,000 short after that?

BAREMBAUM: Budgeting is an odd science.

KELLER-FIRESTONE: Raise entry fees?

BAREMBAUM: Yes, possibly in the far future.

KELLER-FIRESTONE: We charge the least in the state. What is the harm in raising fees?

BAREMBAUM: We are dealing with schools and dwindling budgets for teams. We would like to wait on this...as long as we can.

PREF: We have alternatives?

BAREMBAUM: Yes.

FRASER: I just was working with proposals to decrease fees with programs, dance, etc. I am actively looking at other avenues of budget reduction.

GRABER: I am only going to be giving Neil some bills from State 2013...the host budget does not seem to be enough.

PREF: Alice still needs notes for what she did and the hit she took. Terry Abad sent chocolates. If you have the opportunity to send a note it would be nice. Please take the time to send it. Words of praise and thanks.

PRICHARD: Is there a way to make a list of essential etiquette for coaches to read to their students?

FRASER: Coaches reading it are not the coaches of students that are causing problems.

STOCKTON: Is it possible to send letters to all the admin at the site after the tournament?

FRASER: What about bad letters though?

KARSON: May be a sample praise letter...but not a template. Preventive medicine, why not send something to Enochs before the tournament? May be they will think we are good people then.

PREF: Got that PR McCoy?

JAMES: We allocated money and brought in food for the staff that hosted.

Secretary/Editor Niemi

NIEMI: I need reports and content for the bulletin please.

PREF: Committees should give some content to the Editor. Committees should give materials.

NIEMI: Send me stuff, please....text and photos.

PREF: Staff development, common core, your opinions...your material does not have to be restricted. It may be broad in general. Administration and choices of activities, how you succeeded in making it, speech classes. How did you do that? Any UC a-g rating that is not g, how did you do it. We want to avoid being a non-departmental entity on campuses.

MANAGAHAS: Can we have a feedback form? May we collect data?

PREF: That is privy to PR Committee. New teachers are asked to do extra....BITSA, credential class; we cannot add something like this on new teachers. Retention is key. I agree.

FRASER: Less than 5 years, is the largest group of coaches. Over 10 years is dropping at the State tournament. After that, it goes down even faster.

PREF: Anything, send it to Reed.

Historian Underwood

UNDERWOOD: I really need your help to capture all the HOF members that have not been recorded. I am attempting. Please see me if you wish to help record any of these. I am trying to complete Mr. Cummings project. November 15 is the deadline for HOF nominations for this year.

V. Area Chair Reports

Area 2 Chair Darling

DARLING: Welcome Caiti Sarvey, YFL President. State this year is a great facility. Lots of parking and rooms. Best news is that school will be out on Friday! (*much yeahs were had*)

GRABER: If we start on Friday morning then we must arrive Thursday.

WARDNER: Was there discussion about additional entries in debate?

PREF: That is a bylaw proposal rule and has not been submitted at this time.

DARLING: Karson is league president now in the Southern Valley.

Area 1 Chair Keller-Firestone

KF: We are still getting along.

Area 3 Chair Kindred

MR. JAMES for KINDRED: No report.

Area 4 Chair Munsell

MUNSELL: We have a lot of new coaches. La Verne is where we are looking for State in 2015. They are excited.

VI. Committee Reports

Debate Committee (Wolf)

WOLF: We met to standardize the rules so that they are easily found and understood. We wanted to match what we do to update. Einar made a page accordion of rules in debate, thank you. The result was a group of rewording motions in the hope of clarity. The committee would like to thank Einar for all his hard work. As a result of his work we could easily review what we needed to house clean. The result is the nine page document that I sent out this morning that would replace Article 9 of the rules.

GRABER: We will be voting on this today Chris?

WOLF: That is the hope.

FRASER: Is there anything on it that shows the changes?

WOLF: Yes, the bold are the changes. Unless there was a major rule change. We are replacing it in bulk.

FRASER: May we see the wording changes?

JOHNSON: There was some word changes made. My rule changes will be presented later to decrease confusion.

PREF: Clarifying language is passive to active. It may not be a substitution of words or terms. Is that correct?

WOLF: The language is in bold on the original.

FRASER: I am worried about long debate over this wording. We need to see where and how they were made.

WARDNER: Look at the table, because we went through all the areas. The table is very handy.

PREF: You have time to review this during break.

KARSON: We had some great people in the meeting. All of us talked through this and when we hit anything controversial, we tabled it.

PREF: Were all four areas represented?

FRASER: Where are the changes?

GRABER: Can this exist alongside the current rules for a year? People are use to going to the rules and looking. Are we going to cause confusion?

FRASER: The chart is the bylaw revision.

WOLF: We need to adopt one set of rules.

GRABER: Are these new rules?

WOLF: No.

GRABER: This is confusing.

PREF: This was a request I made to streamline the rules to reformat and consolidates those rules and areas. It is a matter of committee credibility. That was a large group. No personal agenda could be advanced. We discover errors in our own language of rules anyways. We are trying to expedite the process to increase transparency. It needs to be effective to find changes in rules. We need to trust the committee. The chart shows you. If want that level of detail then it is present on the form.

MCKINNEY: We tabled all the controversial issues.

FRASER: Sometimes housekeeping is not housekeeping but rather rule changes. We need to postpone until January. We should take it to the league for input. We debate things for a reason. We have not had enough time to review and vet.

KELLER-FIRESTONE: I think we are on target. Go for it, what the hell?

GRABER: To dovetail on Nermin, topic and issue word choice was huge in IE Committee. My point is discussion is merited.

JOHNSON: One clarification, evidence challenge rules did not exist prior. They now do for purposes of consistency.

Individual Events Committee (Darling)

DARLING: We spent three days of summer vacation to reformat.

PREF: I am expecting the same arguments about Debate housekeeping will return.

KARSON: Look at IE and Debate committee reports during lunch.

PREF: I think in the IE Committee meeting I feel they did have rule changes.

DARLING: We only got to bylaws. We are not yet finished.

PREF: It is possible that this work will not be completed this year.

Public Relations Committee (McCoy)

MCCOY: We have been talking about the face of CHSSA. We have been working on logo work in committee. We are passing out the three logo designs we liked. Teri will create all our logo brand gear if needed. With a new face of CHSSA we want to make it web based. We have a lot to do. Ben Cummings, CHSSA webmaster. We would love your input about the website to streamline and offer what you need. Growing schools is the first and foremost goal of PR. We have a two prong attack: website and coach packages for communication and advocacy. Ben created an automatic response for schools. Today alone we have had six emails seeking membership. If you have stuff for new coaches, send it to Ben.

KARSON: What do I say to a new school inquiry?

MCCOY: Talk to them and/or send them to me.

PREF: You as the local will have the calendar and so on. Every school has a school site council. They decide funds dispersion. We felt that was the best body to design materials for. That was our intended target.

MCCOY: We are excited about a two year plan. We need coach workshops. Two a year is our desire. Additionally, sponsorship is key. We have consulted with a previous student of Sharon's to develop this element. Last night we received a gift from Jack in the Box. Very nice. We are doing both school growth and sponsorship growth.

PREF: Thanks to Teri Turtine (t-shirt lady at State) for all her help. She did this for a very low price. Thank you, Teri. She will also copyright or trademark what we decide to select. She also sent me a sample of letterhead and business cards. We will be an official group ☺ she has been a great help.

Recess for lunch at 12:20 p.m.

Meeting resumed at 1:24 p.m.

Congress Committee (Stockton for Matley)

STOCKTON: We are not making any proposals at this meeting due to the work of Debate committee. On the web and minutes (*page 29*) we will have the list of topic areas for State 2014. Find area designations on the list.

(Much discussion and consternation was had concerning postponement, tabling, and what to do about the motions submitted)

PREF: Never mind, five Congress motions will be presented under New Business. Congress Committee please caucus and decide now how to proceed.

Curriculum Committee (Prichard)

(See above VP Curriculum report)

VII. Old Business

(None)

VIII. New Business

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-A Visual Aids in Congress

JAMES: This is because students were using other things to write on making for a competitive advantage.

Second by Johnson

GRABER: Students are using clothing for this type of thing. What is the penalty?

JOHNSON: Most do not have penalties.

PREF: Protest committee would adjudicate then.

FRASER: IE's have a penalty. Congress does not.

PREF: There is no guidance to the Protest Committee then for what do we do?

JOHNSON: Correct.

PREVIOUS QUESTION JOHNSON SECOND STOCKTON

FRASER: We are clarifying for students so that they are not in violation.

JOHNSON: Clothes are props.

Passes, voice vote

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-B Adding awards for semi finalists Presiding Officers

GRABER: So this just amends the awards?

JAMES: Yes.

JAMES SECONDS

PREF: Find this in the bylaws please.

LARSEN: Read the by law. This would add 14 SF and two PO's as award recipients.

PREF: This is an insertion under Administration Section III Awards. No major rule change.

PREVIOUS QUESTION KARSON SECOND LARSEN

Passes voice vote

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-C Presiding Officer Byes

JOHNSON: We had no rule to see what we could do if a PO did not show up. How do we figure this?

The PO without a competitor would get the bye then average the scores. The bye would count as a win. Currently the PO voting is by the students and the judges votes are used for breaking ties.

FRASER: So a bye would be 15 ballots?

JOHNSON: No. We would average.

JAMES SECONDS

FRASER: We discussed some other alternatives at State 2013. Why did we not go in that direction versus this one?

STOCKTON: Because of the stress on the kid who would be doing it twice.

FRASER: Who is POing the second half of the round?

JAMES: You would PO the whole round.

FRASER: Is there a value of having a second PO in the room?

JOHNSON: This is Dave's and he should answer the intent. We need a rule. Once made, lets' look at it and work it out.

PREF: If there is a concern about a single PO being used for a whole round?

JOHNSON: Not examined.

PLANT: Second PO would it be tabbed with byes? You need to observe the round to see which PO who has spoken.

FRASER: No.

STOCKTON: Move to remand to Congress Committee.

SECONDED FRASER

FRASER requests a division of the House.

9 in favor 18 against

PREVIOUS QUESTION JAMES SECOND KELLER-FIRESTONE

Passes, voice vote

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-D P.O. Voting

PREF: This is just an insertion it seems.

STOCKTON SECOND

OSBORN: What happens if all ballots are tied?

JAMES: It is impossible.

JOHNSON: It is not possible.

STOCKTON: I withdraw the motion.

WITHDRAWN BY AUTHOR

PREF: If you wish, take this back to your league in case it comes back out in January please do so.

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-E Paneling in Congress Chambers

JAMES: The plan is instead of switching houses each session they would stay in the same chamber for the prelim. JOT cannot move the students. We want to make it more like real Congress. Better chamber experience. Power protecting is not making a difference.

PREF: And not glad handling.

UNDERWOOD: I do not like to change rules just because of computer programs.

OSBORN SECOND

UNDERWOOD: So this is the only event we do not move students. Do we change the seating chart?

JAMES: Yes.

OSBORN: Under the status quo (SQ) do they get new cards?

JAMES: No.

OSBORN: So I could move to a house under the SQ and not be able to speak in the new chamber. The SQ does not make sense.

NOVAK: Our league just decided the reverse this procedure because we would qual students from a weak house and in the strong house quality would be lost. We voted in May to go the SQ.

PLANT: More potential for game play if they stay in the same chamber. Power protecting is key.

GRABER: Why can't we shake up the houses and get rid of power protecting. Why power protect at all?

FRASER: JOT does tab Congress but some movement is necessary just like in Debate tab and IE tab. Third round of Congress is powered, one and two are random.

JOHNSON: Power protecting is not what the rule says. When we had cards it was easy to visualize.

This is less of a headache because we are not moving the students. The seating charts would change.

MOTION TO REMAND BY JOHNSON SECOND STOCKTON

REMANDED

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-F T.I. Nonfiction requirement

WARDNER: This is from TI coaches. This makes it better for classrooms.

JOHNSON SECONDS

GRABER: I feel this is too prescriptive to require one piece of nonfiction

PEROFF: I feel this is too restrictive.

NOVAK: As a league president I do TI last because it is so difficult to check. It is very time concerning to add one more element is excessive.

DARLING: How does the judge know which one is nonfiction?

SARVEY: We all use speeches in the classroom. This is restrictive.

BAREMBAUM: Not hard to enforce. We just need a new checklist box added. But I am against this because it should not be required.

PREVIOUS QUESTION LARSEN SECOND NOVAK

Fails, voice vote

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-G eScripts

GRABER: This streamlines the process with which we select scripts. Ms. Plant has had problems with this.

PLANT: *Shared a story of script procurement.*

KELLER-FIRESTONE: A receipt from the internet is legal.

GRABER: A printed PDF script is illegal. This expands our variety of scripts and expedites the process of making scripts legal. Another issue is the use of Kindle books. *Rationale for motion was read by Graber. See Motion 13-09-G*

PEROFF SECONDS

CUMMIINGS: One cannot share books on eBooks. To print it is to break the copyright of the material. This program does not work though.

GRABER: Step four meets your concerns.

CUMMINGS: How do I get a copy of the highlighted type?

OSBORN: All photocopies break copyright.

JOHNSON: I checked with a copyright attorney that said educational use trumps copyright laws.

CUMMINGS: My point is that you can strip the DRM of its licenses. That changes the item you purchased. You have now created it.

PEROFF: I understand what you are saying but photocopies of a book are also an alteration.

PIELSTICK: Options exist for eScripts. For some scripts it is pretty difficult.

BAREMBAUM: A Kindle is a different beast than eScripts. Electronic form material is bad.

FRASER: I gave this to Derek (*Yuill*) to see what he thought. He shared that the NFL does not allow PDF's because of script changes. Internet pages okay, downloaded is not allowed. Site must be around for two years. Derek recommended using the NFL guidelines.

PLANT: We (*IE committee*) thought the NFL was too restrictive. We need to educate students and in this age many books are electronic only. I hope you keep this in mind.

JOHNSON: Copyright area of law is not my strong suit. *DRM rights are then read by Johnson.*

CUMMINGS: I want to move forward with this but altering the DRM is bad.

GRABER: If eReader content were removed from this motion would you support it?

KARSON: I don't think that anyone wants to be sued and we want to be leaders. If it is only a Kindle portion then we should drop that and pass this and move on.

PREF: The NFL being restrictive might be because of litigation.

JOHNSON: Looking at the copyright law right now on line I am scared.

PREF: Do we need legal assistance?

PREVIOUS QUESTION JOHNSON SECOND DARLING

Division of the House

14-11 to REMAND

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-H Replace Entire Article XI see CHSSA website for full and current version

WOLF: I just emailed the proposal with title. This is what we discussed this morning. We all ready discussed why before lunch.

SECOND KELLER-FIRESTONE

OSBORN: We need to discuss this not vote on it.

KARSON: We came here to work and we are good people. This is good legislation. Most people that care are on the Debate committee. This is as harmless as possible.

FRASER: I do not agree, all committees work hard when it comes to this body it is this body to thoroughly think about what we want.

JOHNSON: In consolidation of four types of debate it is a tough assignment. We should publish this and then allow discussion. If there is some minor language adjustment to it so be it in debate.

PLANT: I had some issues but I think those elements were removed.

JOHNSON: They have been removed.

GRABER: This needs to be made public so that all coaches in the state can familiarize themselves with it.

KELLER-FIRESTONE: This is not a difficult document to read if you are a teacher. We do not need to change the bylaws yet. We need to vote on this now. If there are problems then change it in January.

FRASER: This is an odd process. I am unsure about why we make changes if we are going to change it again in January. Why are we rushing this?

MCKINNEY: We did not change anything. We tabled all debatable items in the motion and went forth with an easier format.

PREVIOUS QUESTION KARSON SECOND DARLING

Roll call vote
22-1-4 PASSES

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| Pref Yes | Kalashian Yes! |
| Fraser No | Managahas Yes |
| Prichard Yes | Driggs Yes |
| McCoy Yes | Kindred Abstain |
| Barembaum Yes | Graber Abstain |
| Niemi Abstain | James Yes |
| Underwood Yes | Novak () |
| Keller-Firestone Yes | Peroff Yes |
| Plant Abstain | Johnson Yes |
| Wardner Yes | Munsell Yes |
| Wolf Yes | Osborn Abstain |
| Hansen Yes | Pielstick Yes |
| Darling Yes | Stockton Yes |
| Larsen Yes | McKinney Yes |
| Sarvey Yes | Krause Yes |

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-I Evidence exchange in debate events

WOLF: This is to make it so that students give back evidence rather than hold it in the round hobbling the other team. Judges would not be able to call evidence.

JOHNSON SECONDS

GRABER: I can call the Parli debater flow to see if the cite is correct.

FRASER: We would rather have the judge gather the evidence, not read it, and bring it to the tab room.

WOLF: This is about evidence exchange, not challenges though.

MCKIBBIN: This is here because a debater has no redress to look at evidence.

OSBORN: I don't do Parli, what cited evidence can a Parli debater have?

KARSON: We made Parli more legit by making evidence allowed. But in Parli one cannot have physical material besides colored paper in the round. If you are going to cite something in Parli you have to have a list of sources used.

SARVEY: Definitional debates are key and dictionaries would be included in this.

FRASER: My concern is that the color paper might preclude.

JOHNSON: To clarify, if one wants to quote in Parli they must write it down in its entirety.

MOVED TO DIVIDE THE MOTION MADE, no SECOND

PREVIOUS QUESTION KELLER-FIRESTONE SECOND KARSON

Passes voice vote

MOTION TO REVISE THE BYLAWS

13-09-J IE Replace Article IX

SECOND BY STOCKTON

GRABER: We moved some things but it should be rather clear because of notations. The bolding and annotations that were already there.

PREF: The bolds represent previous changes.

GRABER: We hoped to make it easier for new coaches to read.

PREF: If the time is recorded, then it does not matter if a judge did not note it.

WOLF: In the general rules in A4, the language is current?

FRASER: Yes. That was not added, it has always been there.

GRABER: The point is that a speaker may not start his speech from his seat but must be in front of the room.

PIELSTICK: Time signals?

FRASER: Moved to A2 in judging.

PLANT: The good news is we are trying to track changes we made. The problem is that all are unaware of where it was moved to. It may seem hard to read but we are trying to make it transparent.

PREF: It probably should be referenced to the original bylaws.

KARSON: Thank you IE Committee for your hard work. Debate committee was not believed because it was so clean. IE committee is having a hard time now because it is too transparent. On page 10 there seems to be a nebulous.

PREF: We should focus on the whole document as Chris recommended.

FRASER: The purpose of this body is to answer these questions and IE committee did a great job discerning how to present. It seems that the time violation is gone from judge's power.

GRABER: Correct, you removed the time violation on the ballot without a vote.

FRASER: We voted on that and I did not simply change the ballots.

JOHNSON: Lets' do the same as the debate committee did and vote on this and then visit it in January if it there is a problem.

FRASER: The alternative is to look at it and make friendly changes. If we wait until January then the committee may make these friendly changes.

KARSON: Debate did not have substantive changes per se. IE seems to have many. They worked hard and we should not throw this out.

KELLER-FIRESTONE: My Area wants the coversheets now.

KARSON: Can they fix these things now?

OSBORN: I do not recall us striking these things. That took me for surprise. We did bylaws by practice. Is that wrong?

FRASER: We fixed it.

OSBORN: There was no intent made.

**JOHNSON MOVES NIEMI SECONDS
ROLL CALL CALLED FRASER
8-9-11**

Pref Yes	Managahas Abstain
Fraser No	Driggs No
Prichard No	Kindred Abstain
McCoy No	Graber Abstain
Barembaum Yes	James Abstain
Niemi No	Novak ()
Underwood No	Peroff Yes
Keller-Firestone Abstain	Johnson Abstain
Abad Yes	Munsell Yes
Wardner No	Osborn Abstain
Wolf Abstain	Pielstick Yes
Hansen Abstain	Stockton No
Darling Yes	McKinney ()
Larsen No	Krause Yes
Sarvey Abstain	
Kalashian Yes!	

**FRASER MOVES TO REMAND SECOND NIEMI
Voice vote passes**

FAILED THEN REMANDED TO IE COMMITTEE

IX. For the good of the order:

Discussion had concerning format for submission of changes. Debate committee did a great job and set a high bar for evaluation.

IE Committee revised Article IX review legislation (13-09-J) decision:

All postings on line will be up by October 15th, 2013.

Feedback due by November 15th, 2013.

There is a lot of business to be completed in January. Please remember to attend for the entire assigned time.

X. Meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

September 7, 2013

**Minutes from the
California High School Speech Association**

Page 12 of 32

Respectfully submitted by Reed Niemi
CHSSA Secretary

NEXT CHSSA MEETING JANUARY 10-11, 2014 IN SAN DIEGO

9/6/13

CHSSA Financials

Balance Sheet	1-Sep-12	16-May-13
Assets		
Checking	\$14,962.15	\$9,818.55
Savings	\$15,626.49	\$12,630.38
Cash	\$520.73	\$520.73
6-Month CD	\$13,456.94	\$13,463.58
30-Month CD	\$7,639.67	\$7,794.93
Scholarship		
Checking	\$4,564.76	\$66.12
Savings	\$7,761.45	\$7,763.39
Scholarship Total	\$12,326.21	\$7,829.51
21 Century Fund		
Earnings	\$4,431.17	\$4,454.54
Principle	\$14,111.51	\$14,111.51
21 Century Fund Total	\$18,542.68	\$18,566.05
Total Assets	\$83,074.87	\$70,623.73
Assessments		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Area I		
CFL	\$3,900	\$1,400
GGSA	\$5,800	\$1,500
Total Area I	\$9,700	\$2,900
Area II		
Cap/VL	\$2,200	\$700
So/VL	\$1,800	\$500
YFL	\$1,900	\$1,100
Total Area II	\$5,900	\$2,300
Area III		
SCDL	\$2,600	\$1,100
TCPL	\$2,900	\$1,600
WBPL	\$2,100	\$1,100
Total Area III	\$7,600	\$3,800
Area IV		
OBSR	\$1,500	\$500
OCSL	\$1,900	\$200
SDVSL	\$2,900	\$1,200
Total Area IV	\$6,300	\$1,900
Total Assessments	\$29,500	\$10,900

Notes
Scholarship requests
2013 2012 \$2,011.00
10 18 \$22.00
DVD expenses will zero out in 2014-2015
Website will reduce to 3000 in 2014-2015
Hospitality in 2013 includes amounts from 2012
Tournament Supplies in 2013 includes amounts from 2012

Income Statement	Last Budget	NewBudget	2012-2013	Percent
Income				
Assessments	27,000	30,000	\$29,700.00	110%
Contributions	1,500	500	\$0.00	0%
Interest and Dividends	200	200	\$196.96	98%
Misc Income	1,000	2,000	\$2,085.00	209%
Sponsorships	100	400	\$475.00	475%
Program Income	3,000	3,000	\$3,294.30	110%
Dinner Dance Income	12,000	15,000	\$15,472.86	129%
Tournament Fees	27,000	24,000	\$23,647.25	88%
Other Tournament Income		500	\$450.00	
Total Income	71,800	75,600	\$75,321.37	105%
Expenses				
Operating Expenses				
Bank Charges	40	40	\$35.00	88%
Bulletin				
Postage	40	40	\$0.00	0%
Printing	200	100	\$0.00	0%
Total Bulletin	240	140	\$0.00	0%
CSSC Meetings	20,000	18,000	\$17,941.67	90%
Curriculum				
DVD-Expenses		8,000	\$5,251.42	
DVD-Reimburse		(2,000)	(\$2,175.00)	
DVD		\$5,000.00	\$3,076.42	0%
Other Curriculum		800	\$177.42	0%
Total Curriculum	8,800	\$5,800.00	\$3,253.84	37%
Historian	200	1,000	\$31.39	16%
Misc	100	100	\$671.98	672%
National Fed Mtg	800	500	\$409.02	51%
Postage-Shipping	100	100	\$191.72	192%
Print-Office-Clerical	100	100	\$128.09	128%
Public Relations	1,000	1,000	\$1,045.93	105%
Scholarships	10,000	3,000	\$5,000.00	50%
Supplies	25	50	\$34.87	139%
Web Site	300	4,200	\$138.49	46%
Total Operational Expenses	40,705	\$35,030.00	\$28,881.91	71%
State Expenses				
Dinner Dance	8,000	15,000	\$16,088.23	201%
Hall of Fame	150	150	\$141.70	94%
Insurance	950	950	\$972.47	102%
Host fee	5,000	8,000	\$5,000.00	
Hospitality	5,000	5,000	\$8,491.31	
Program Production	5,000	5,000	\$4,681.55	
Tournament Misc	2,000	2,000	\$4,949.79	247%
Tournament Supplies	4,000	600	\$1,317.44	33%
Trophies	10,000	14,000	\$14,248.11	142%
Total State Expenses	40,100	\$50,700.00	\$58,890.60	147%
Total Expenses	80,805	\$85,730.00	\$87,772.51	109%
Total Expenses/Income	(9,005)	(\$10,130.00)	(\$12,451.14)	-17%



September 7, 2013

**Minutes from the
California High School Speech Association**

Page 14 of 32

Date: 9/7/13

Number: 13-09-A

Disposition: Voice

Aye: x

Nay:

Abstain:

A Motion to revise the By-Laws: Congress Visual Aids

Submitted by: Congress Committee

Second by: _____

This revision will be: Article XIII , section 1 ,

Paragraphs:

A. Add to the end of the last sentence: for purposes of information or speaker identification.

Rationale:

Clarifies the fact that visual aids include those used to help identify speakers in the round.



September 7, 2013

**Minutes from the
California High School Speech Association**

Page 15 of 32

Date: 9/7/13 Number: 13-09-B
Disposition: Voice
Aye: x
Nay: _____
Abstain: _____

A Motion to revise the By-Laws: PO Semi-Final Award

Submitted by: Congress Committee _____

Second by: _____

This revision will be: Article XIV , section 3,

Paragraph:

C. ADD "and two presiding officers" after "The 14 semi-finalists"

Rationale:

Better adjusts Congress awards in relation to other events.



7, 2013

**Minutes from the
California High School Speech Association**

Page 16 of 32

Date: 9/7/13 Number: 13-09-C

Disposition: Voice

Aye: _____

Nay: x

Abstain: _____

A Motion to revise the By-Laws: PO Bye

Submitted by: Congress Committee

Second by: _____

This revision will be: Article XIII , section 10 ,

Paragraph A.

Add to end of the paragraph. "In the case of a no-show presiding officer, the remaining presiding officer in the round shall be awarded a bye similar to debate and this bye would count as a win. PO votes for the bye round shall be averaged from the other two preliminary rounds to determine total number of PO votes. Byes shall be drawn randomly from presiding officers who have not received a bye yet in the tournament unless the PO pairings were made before the discovery of the no-show presiding officer."

Rationale:

This would create a process to deal with a no-show presiding officer. A process currently does not exist in our By-laws.



September 7, 2013

**Minutes from the
California High School Speech Association**

Page 17 of 32

Date: 9/7/13 Number:13-09-D

Disposition: **WITHDRAWN**

Aye: _____

Nay: _____

Abstain: _____

A Motion to revise the By-Laws: PO Voting

Submitted by: Congress Committee

Second by: _____

This revision will be: Article XIII , section 10 ,

Paragraph E.

a. Add "and judges" after "Students"

Paragraph G.

a. Add "and judges" after "student"

STRIKE "Ties shall be broken by judge's preference."

Rationale:

Increases the amount of judge votes to determine semi-finalists and finalists to help offset any perceived favoritism in student vote. Eliminates the chance of a tie in semi-finals.



Number: 13-09-E
Disposition: **Voice/Remanded**
Aye: _____
Nay: _____
Abstain: _____

A Motion to revise the By-Laws:

Submitted by: Congress Committee

Second by: _____

This revision will be: Article XIII , section 5 ,

Paragraphs:

A. STRIKE AND REPLACE WITH: There shall be three preliminary legislative sessions of ninety minutes each. Each chamber shall be balanced to avoid to the extent possible contestants meeting from the same school, the same League and the same Area. Students will stay in the same chamber for all three preliminary rounds.

-
- B. Placement of students on the seating chart shall be random.
 - C. STRIKE ALL
 - D. STRIKE ALL

Rationale:

1. Creates a better chamber experience for students both in getting to know other students and in determining what it takes to break
2. Less potential protests since JOT cannot meet the demands of power protecting for so many students
3. Based on the results from the last two years, power protecting made little difference in determining chamber difficulty. Nearly all sections had at least 4 students who broke to semis and never under 3 or over 6.

Number:13-09-F

Disposition:VOICE

Aye:_____

Nay: **x**

Abstain:_____

A Motion to revise the By-Laws

Submitted by: Chris Wardner Second by:_____

This revision will be a(n):

Addition to By-Laws: Article_IX, section 3, D2, paragraph_a, page 15

2. Specific Rules: Thematic Interpretation

- a. The contestant is to present a program of interpretation based on a theme of his/her choice. The themes that have been used by the contestant in tournaments in previous competitive years shall be disqualified. Each program is to contain three or more separate selections, **one or more of which must be non-fiction** or cuttings from different works. Anthologies may be considered multiple sources.

Rationale: This change would align the literature used in a thematic interp with the common core. Such a requirement could possibly encourage teachers to include a TI assignment where appropriate in their curriculum.



Date: Sept.7, 2013 Number:13-09-G

Disposition: DIVISION TO REMAND

Aye: 14

Nay: 11

Abstain: 1

A Motion to Revise the By-Laws:

Submitted by: Linda Darling, Kathy Graber, Gregg Osborn, Kristen Plant

Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

√ Addition to By-Laws: Article IX, section 3 (General Rules)

Electronically-sourced literary works, such as text published in online literary journals and magazines*, PDFs and e-reader content, are permitted as long as

- i) they are commercially and readily available;**
- ii) they are nationally distributed and accessible;**
- iii) the text has not been not been electronically altered or manipulated;**
- iv) the submitted manuscript follows the preparation requirements for all interpretation events, including highlighting, legibility, added-words restrictions, etc.**

Proof of rules compliance should accompany the electronically-sourced script in one or more of the following forms:

- i) Title, Author, Table of Contents, Copyright page(s) and ISBN # if available (preferred)**
- ii) A receipt of purchase (if a copyright page does not exist, identical to the allowances made for texts from Script City, Book City, Hollywood Collectibles, etc.)**
- iii) A paper print-out of the website page from which the text was obtained, i.e. the company order page showing the option to purchase the text electronically**
- iv) A photograph or screenshot of any of the above**

Restrictions: Online-sourced text must originate from a verifiable website that can be accessed universally by any user. The website and/or the electronic version of the digital text must be available for comparison with the printed script if challenged. Unacceptable online sources include but are not limited to:

- Personal websites (social network profiles, blogs, etc.)**
- Publish It websites (those with one-click uploads or those which accept and post submissions without an editorial selection process)**
- Unmarked or casual websites where individuals can easily post compositions**

***An example of an acceptable online literary magazine is The Adirondack Review (www.theadirondackreview.com) which describes itself as “an independent online quarterly magazine of literature and the arts dedicated to publishing poetry, fiction, artwork and photography.” While it does encourage submissions, it posts its editorial guidelines for publication which makes this website an acceptable source.**

Rationale: The publishing world is rapidly changing to meet the demands of electronic devices such as e-readers, tablet and laptop computers, etc. More and more texts are now exclusively available as digital content. Furthermore, many acceptable texts for CHSSA interpretation events are available for purchase as instant downloads which can be easily printed from a personal computer. These texts are identical to the scripts that we are currently required to have shipped to us. The current prohibition against downloaded scripts (typically in pdf) does not prevent illegal alteration of scripts, which can be done even to scripts photocopied in the traditional manner. The NFL has changed its policy regarding electronically sourced scripts; CHSSA needs to keep pace and enable coaches and students to more easily access a wider array of legitimate interp material.

**A Motion to revise the By-Laws
governing the requirement to exchange evidence in debate events**

Aye: Voice

Nay:_____

Abstain:_____

Submitted by: Chris Wolf for the Debate Committee

Second by:_____

This revision will be a(n):

(If new by-laws) Deletion from By-Laws: Article XI ,section J , paragraph 2

J. Evidence Exchange/Note-Taking.

1. Judges may not request nor be given any evidence or written material from teams/individuals except when the evidence is challenged as illegal by the opposing team/individual during the round. The evidence in question should be collected by the judge and delivered to the Tournament Committee.
2. ~~In Policy Debate, Lincoln Douglas Debate, and Public Forum Debate, teams or individuals may request evidence from opponents during cross examination/cross fire or preparation only and must return the requested evidence prior to their opponent's next speech if requested. In Parliamentary Debate the opposing debaters may ask to see the debaters' notes containing any cited material as part of a Point of Information and the team reading the cited materials must show the handwritten notes, with citation, upon such request.~~

(If old by-laws) Deletion from By-Laws: Article XI, section 2, par I, subparagraph 2

Deletion from By-Laws: Article XI, section 3, par. E, subparagraph 2

Deletion from By-Laws: Article XI, section 5, par. C, subparagraph 2, subsubpar. b

I. Evidence Exchange/Note-Taking

1. Judges may not request nor be given any evidence or written material from teams except when the evidence is challenged as illegal by the opposing team during the round. The evidence in question should be collected by the judge and delivered to the Tournament Committee.

sharon prefontaine 2/8/13 6:50 PM

Comment: 1/2009Article XI – State Tournament – Debate Rules 4

2. ~~Teams or individuals may request evidence from opponents during crossexamination or preparation only and must return the requested evidence prior to their opponent's next speech if requested.~~

E. Evidence exchange/note-taking.

1. Judges may not request nor be given any evidence or written material from individuals except when the evidence is challenged as illegal by the opposing team during the round. The evidence in question should be collected by the judge and delivered to the Tournament Committee.

~~2. Individuals may request evidence from opponents during cross-examination only and must return the requested evidence before the next speech.~~

2. Evidence exchange/note-taking

a. Judges may not request nor be given any evidence or written material from either debater except when the evidence in question should be collected by the judge and delivered to the Tournament Committee.

~~b. Each side may request evidence from the opponent during crossfires only and must return the requested evidence before the next speech.~~

Addition to By-Laws:

(if new by-laws) Article XI ,section J , paragraph 2

(If old by-laws) Article XI, section 2, par 1, subparagraph 2, Article XI, section 3, par. E, subparagraph 2, Article XI, section 5, par. C, subparagraph 2, subsubpar. b

2. In Policy Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, and Public Forum Debate, teams or individuals may request evidence from opponents during cross-examination/cross-fire or preparation only. The specific evidence cited must be provided. The requesting team must have access to the evidence during their subsequent speech but must return it at the conclusion of that speech if requested. In Parliamentary Debate the opposing debaters may ask to see the debaters' notes containing any cited material as part of a Point of Information and the team reading the cited materials must show the handwritten notes, with citation, upon such request.

Rationale: The old by-laws do not require that the requested evidence must be handed over. Handed over evidence is necessary for debaters to engage in accurate and careful assessment and debate over the content and quality of evidence in the round, particularly since CHSSA by-laws prevent the judge from requesting and seeing the evidence. Requiring that evidence be handed over acts as our primary, in-round check against falsification, exaggeration, and inaccurate paraphrasing evidence. Handing over evidence is a fundamental action of good debatespersonship.

ARTICLE XI: The State Tournament - - Debate Rules

Section 1. Rules for All Forms of Debate.

A. Resolutions.

1. Policy Debate.

The policy debate resolution shall be the national high school debate resolution.

2. Lincoln-Douglas Debate.

The NFL Lincoln-Douglas topic for September-October shall be used for the Fall California topic; the National Forensic League Lincoln-Douglas resolution for March/April shall be used as the second California Lincoln-Douglas resolution from February 1. However, leagues may opt to follow NFL bimonthly rotation of resolutions. The State Tournament shall use the NFL March/April resolution.

3. Parliamentary Debate.

Resolutions are different for each round of debate and are issued at the beginning of the twenty preparation period of the round.

a. Resolutions for each shall rotate through the following types:

- Value: Both sides push for their value in the topic as superior to the other team's value.
- Policy: Proposition shows there is a problem and offers a solution (plan) to the problem. Both sides debate the appropriateness and/or merits of the problem and solution asserted by the Proposition.
- Fact: Both teams debate the circumstances under which the topic would be called a true statement.

4. Public Forum Debate.

Resolutions will correspond to those published by the NFL.

B. Debate Both Sides of Resolution as Assigned

Over the course of the tournament, each team or individual in Policy Debate, Parliamentary Debate, Public Forum, and Lincoln-Douglas Debate may be assigned to uphold either side of the resolution in any given round.

C. Number of Participants.

In Policy, Parliamentary, and Public Forum Debate teams consist of two members only. The two members of a team who qualify to the State Tournament from a league state qualification tournament must debate as a team in the State Tournament. In Lincoln-Douglas Debate only one person debates each side of the resolution. In all forms of debate, including Public Forum, the affirmative/proposition side will always begin the debate. In Public Forum the negative side will always conclude the debate. In all other forms of debate the affirmative or proposition side will always conclude the debate.

D. Length and Order of Speeches in Each form of Debate.

1. Policy Debate.

1 st Affirmative Constructive	8 minutes
Cross Examination of 1 st Affirmative	3 minutes
1 st Negative Constructive	8 minutes
Cross Examination of 1 st Negative	3 minutes
2 nd Affirmative Constructive 8 minutes	8 minutes
Cross Examination of 2 nd Affirmative	3 minutes
2 nd Negative Constructive	8 minutes
Cross Examination of 2 nd Negative	3 minutes
1 st Negative Rebuttal	5 minutes
1 st Affirmative Rebuttal	5 minutes
2 nd Negative Rebuttal	5 minutes
2 nd Affirmative Rebuttal	5 minutes

2. Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-examination	3 minutes
1 st Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
2 nd Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes

3. Parliamentary Debate

1 st Proposition	7 minutes
1 st Opposition	7 minutes
2 nd Proposition	7 minutes
2 nd Opposition	7 minutes
Opposition Rebuttal	5 minutes
Proposition Rebuttal	5 minutes

4. Public Forum.

1 st Affirmative Speaker	4 minutes
1 st Negative Speaker	4 minutes
Crossfire between First Speakers	3 minutes
2 nd Affirmative Speaker	4 minutes
2 nd Negative Speaker	4 minutes
Crossfire between Second Speakers	3 minutes
Summary (First Affirmative Speaker)	2 minutes
Summary (First Negative Speaker)	2 minutes
Grand Crossfire (All speakers)	3 minutes
Final Focus (Second Affirmative Speaker)	2 minutes

Final Focus (Second Negative Speaker)	2 minutes
---------------------------------------	-----------

5. Speaking Time.

A speaker's time begins as to any given speech when she/he begins to speak. All speaking time must be timed, including "thank you's" and "roadmaps".

E. Constructive vs. Rebuttal Speeches. *[existing language in Public Forum rules only]*

1. Constructive Speeches: All arguments a team intends to present during the debate may be presented in the following speeches:

- a. Policy Debate, Parliamentary Debate and Public Forum Debate: First Four Speeches.
- b. Lincoln-Douglas Debate: First two speeches.

2. Rebuttal Speeches:

- a. A team's formal response to opponent arguments from constructive speeches or an extension of their own arguments; the synthesis of a side's argument.
- b. No new arguments may be introduced in rebuttals. However, new analyses of prior arguments are allowed in rebuttals.
- c. In Public Forum the first rebuttals speeches are known as "Summary" speeches and the last rebuttal speeches are known as "Final Focus" speeches.

F. Preparation Time Allotted.

1. Policy Debate.

No more than eight minutes of total preparation time shall be allowed each team during the debate.

2. Lincoln Douglas.

No more than three (3) minutes of total preparation time shall be allowed each debater during the debate.

3. Parliamentary Debate.

No preparation time is permitted during the debate presentation period before the judge(s). Twenty minutes of preparation time is allotted to be used before the debaters report to the judge(s). During the presentation period the next speaker must get up to speak within 20 seconds of the preceding speech.

4. Public Forum Debate.

No more than two minutes of total preparation time shall be allowed to each side during the debate

G. Use of Preparation Time.

1. Policy Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, and Public Forum Debate.
 - a. Each team/individual may allocate this time as they/she/he see(s) fit during the round, utilizing time prior to speeches for their side.
 - b. Speakers may not use prep time to make prefacing remarks to their speeches. A speaker's time begins, and prep time ends, when he/she begins to speak.
 - c. No team may forfeit cross-examination time to gain additional preparation time. Preparation time begins for a team as soon as the previous speaker has finished with a speech or cross-examination.
2. Parliamentary Debate.
 - a. During preparation time, Parli teams will report to designated Prep areas and remain there until dismissed to go to their rounds. In the preparation room a topic shall be presented to the teams simultaneously. The teams have 20 minutes of preparation time from the announcement of the topic to prepare for each debate.
 - b. Students may consult their partner, and no one else, dictionaries, reference materials, and prepared notes during the preparation period. Each Parliamentary debate contestant may make use of an electronic retrieval device to store and to retrieve their subject files. Electronic retrieval devices are defined as laptop computers, netbooks, iPads, or other portable electronic retrieval equipment. Secondary devices such as flash drives or external hard drives are allowed as well. Cell phones or smart phones are prohibited. Power plugs or outlets may not be used in the prep room at any time. All computers used in the prep room must be battery operated at all times. Contestants shall not access the Internet or to communicate. All wireless capability must be turned off. Penalty for violation of this rule shall be automatic forfeiture of the round by the offending team.
 - c. At the end of 20 minutes of preparation time, debaters shall be released to go directly to their assigned rooms. In transit to the assigned rooms no communication should occur with anyone other than a student's partner or tournament officials. The First Proposition speech should promptly begin after the debaters and judges are all present in the competition room.

H. Examination of Opponents.

1. Policy Debate and Lincoln-Douglas Debate.
 - a. In Policy Debate, both members of a debate team must participate as a questioner and respondent during cross-examination, but only one member of each team may do so within an given cross-examination period. Oral prompting by a participant of either the questioner or the respondent should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate. Oral prompting by the speaker's colleague while the speaker has the floor in debate should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate.
 - b. In both Policy and Lincoln-Douglas Debate
 - i. The questions must be directed to the speaker who has just completed his/her constructive speech and must be answered by that speaker alone.
 - ii. Questions must pertain only to materials and arguments offered by the opposition.
 - iii. The respondent may decline to answer only if a valid reason is given for doing so.
 - iv. The questioner controls the time and may interrupt a lengthy reply. Any form of time-wasting is considered unethical.
 - v. Cross-examination time may not be yielded for the purpose of gaining additional preparation time.
2. Parliamentary Debate: Points of Information.

To make a point of information, a member of the opposing team rises for recognition by the speaker. The speaker then has the discretion to accept or refuse the point. If the point is accepted, the opposing team

member directs a statement or question to the speaker. The speaker is technically yielding time from his/her own speech for the point of information and the time for the point is deducted from the speaker holding the floor.

- a. Points of Information are only allowed in the first four (4) speeches of the debate.
- b. Points of Information must be concise statements or questions lasting no more than fifteen seconds.
- c. Debaters may or may not take points of information at their discretion. 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.
- d. The opening and closing minute of each speech are “protected;” i.e., no Points of Information are allowed. Points may be made after the first minute and before the last minute of each speech. The judge should tap the desktop to indicate that one minute has elapsed and points of information may commence. The judge should then tap the desktop when one minute remains in each speech to indicate that no more points may be attempted.
- e. Both members of a debate team must participate as a questioner and respondent during cross-examination, but only one member of each team may do so within an given cross-examination period. Oral prompting by a participant of either the questioner or the respondent should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate. Oral prompting by the speaker's colleague while the speaker has the floor in debate should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate

3. Public Forum: Cross-Fire.

- a. In crossfire, the team who finished speaking receives the first question.
- b. In the first two crossfires, both participating debaters may ask and answer questions of the other. Only the speakers indicated above may participate.
- c. Grand Crossfire: All four debaters may participate. All may ask and answer questions.

I. Validity of Evidence in All Forms of Debate.

1. Definition of Terms:

- a. Evidence is quoted information read in the round.
- b. Distortion of evidence exists when the evidence itself contains added or deleted words which do not clarify but in fact change the position of the author with respect to the issues in question.

2. Evidence Rules Specific to Parliamentary Debate.

The intent of Parliamentary Debate is to encourage an extemporaneous or impromptu argumentation. Reference to “outside materials” should be limited; instead, students should rely on general knowledge, common sense, and application of logic and analysis. Nevertheless, the use of “outside materials” is allowed within the following parameters:

- a. No published materials or materials prepared prior to preparation time may be brought into the debate round for the debater’s use or reference. The debaters shall be allowed to bring to the round the notes they have made on colored paper provided during the preparation period as referenced in subparagraph 3 below, and nothing else
- b. Debaters are not permitted to read published materials in the speeches of the debate to support their argument claims from anything other than their handwritten notes prepared during preparation time. Those notes may contain specific factual information (such as statistics) and/or hand transcribed quotations from published materials so long as full quotations are included in the notes as opposed to ellipsed versions of quotes (ellipses occur after the first word of the quotation and before the final word). Full citation to the referenced information or quotation must be included. The citation must include the name of the author, the source title, and the date. The opposing debaters may ask to see the debaters’ notes containing any cited material as part of a Point of Information and the team reading the cited materials must show the handwritten notes, with citation, upon such request.
- c. During the debate, students may consult only notes prepared during the preparation period on the colored paper provided in the prep room for each round.

- d. Debaters may take and use notes during the debate only on the colored paper provided in the prep room for each round.

3. Responsibility for Evidence.

Debaters are responsible for the validity of all evidence read in the debate. In all rounds of debate, all debaters shall have available, if challenged by the opponent during any round, complete citations for each piece of evidence introduced including the name of the author, qualifications, complete source title, complete date and page number. Lack of a full citation shall void any effect of that piece of evidence in the round. Either no internal ellipsis (ellipses occur after the first word of the quotation and before the final word) may be used in evidence cited on a card (this must be the case in Parliamentary Debate since no outside materials other than notes on provided colored paper may be brought into the round), or ellipses must be shown on cards, if the original source or a photocopy is present. In Policy Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, and Public Forum Debate the evidence may be read in ellipsed form, but the entirety of the evidence must be available in one of the two ways cited. Personal letters or telegrams shall not be admissible as evidence.

4. Evidence challenges – all forms of Debate.

- a. The burden of proof rests with the individual that challenges the validity of any evidence.
- b. The individual/team challenging evidence must indicate prior to the conclusion of the round a challenge will be made and indicate the specific evidence to be challenged.
- c. The round will be completed and the judge(s) will withhold decisions, returning ballots to the tournament tabulation room. Decisions will be rendered on the ballots only after the protest has been resolved by tournament officials. The judges may be asked if the evidence in question was or would have been significant in their decision.
- d. The evidence challenge must be made within thirty minutes of the conclusion of the round by the adult sponsor or designated representative of the individual/team who initiated the challenge.
- e. The challenging individual/team must be able to provide proof of the charge, within a reasonable time as set by tournament officials, through the use of either original copies of photocopies of the source in question or be able to demonstrate that there is reasonable cause to believe the evidence is nonexistent through the use of photocopies of books in print, periodical guides or other types of bibliographical resources.
- f. The tournament committee will adjourn to a private area with the two individuals and examine the charges and evidence along with materials presented by the challenging individual. Adult coaches or sponsors may be present during the examination.
- g. Individuals utilizing "handbook" evidence rarely have available the facilities to check all sources found in those handbooks. Handbook evidence proven inaccurate will be disallowed in the round, and judges instructed to not consider the evidence in rendering a decision.
- h. Evidence proven to be falsified or distorted from the original source will be grounds for awarding the challenging individual/team a win and disqualifying from the tournament the individual/team found guilty of using falsified or distorted evidence.
- i. If the evidence challenge is not upheld, the judges will be asked to render a decision and turn in their ballots after they have been informed that the evidence in question was not found to be falsified or inaccurately presented.
- j. The tournament committee has one-half hour to hear arguments and examine evidence and must render a decision within fifteen minutes of the conclusion of the presentations. The round following the contested round may not begin until the dispute is resolved.

J. Evidence Exchange/Note-Taking.

3. Judges may not request nor be given any evidence or written material from teams/individuals except when the evidence is challenged as illegal by the opposing team/individual during the round. The evidence in question should be collected by the judge and delivered to the Tournament Committee.

4. In Policy Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, and Public Forum Debate, teams or individuals may request evidence from opponents during cross-examination/cross-fire or preparation only. The specific evidence cited must be provided. The requesting team must have access to the evidence during their subsequent speech but must return it at the conclusion of that speech if requested. In Parliamentary Debate the opposing debaters may ask to see the debaters' notes containing any cited material as part of a Point of Information and the team reading the cited materials must show the handwritten notes, with citation, upon such request.

K. Computers and Electronic Devices.

1. Computers are allowed in Policy Debate and Lincoln-Douglas Debate subject to the rules set forth herein. Computers are allowed in Parliamentary Debate only during preparation time subject to the rules set forth herein.
2. In all forms of debate, Debaters shall not be allowed to utilize the Internet during rounds; Internet devices on any computers used in the round (where computer use is permissible) must be disabled. Evidence acquired from the use of the internet during the round is invalid.
3. In Policy Debate other than three computers per team (a computer is defined as a laptop, netbook, iPad, or other portable electronic retrieval equipment; devices such as flash drives or external hard drives are not considered computers for the purposes of this rule), one printer per team, and one electronic timing device 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 side. In Lincoln-Douglas Debate the same restrictions apply except that only two computers are allowed per debater (computer being defined the same as in the previous sentence).
4. In Parliamentary Debate computer use is allowed during the preparation period only (computer is defined the same as in Subsection 3). During both the preparation period and the competition period, the debaters shall not have access to or activate any other electronic device during the round, including, but not limited to, cell phones, with the sole exception that and each debater may have one electronic timing device that has no functioning capability other than to count time.
5. In Public Forum Debate debaters shall not utilize computers or the internet for any reason during the debate round. Other than an electronic device that has no functioning capability other than counting time, no debater shall access or activate any other electronic devices during the round, including, but not limited to, cell phones. Penalty for this rule shall be automatic forfeiture of the round by the offending team.
6. In Policy Debate and Lincoln-Douglas Debate the debaters are permitted to provide to a judge in digital format (e.g., CD, USB drive, flash drive) prior to the beginning of the round, for the sole purpose of, and as the most efficient way to demonstrate that questioned evidence was not acquired during the round via the Internet. Competitors are strongly encouraged to follow this practice.

L. Definition of Round.

For the purposes of the rules listed in this Article, a round shall begin in Policy Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, and Public Forum Debate 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. In Parliamentary Debate a round shall begin when the resolution for the round is released and the round ends when the last speaker in the debate ends his/her speech.

M. Restriction of Communications.

During a round, a debater shall not communicate through any method with anyone other than that debater's partner (if applicable), the opposing debater(s) and the judge(s).

A. Lincoln-Douglas Debate : Value Debate – No Plan Permitted.

No plan may be presented by either debater in the round. A plan is defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation.

B. Parliamentary Debate.

1. Rebuttals must be given by the first speaker for each side
2. Heckling is not allowed.
3. Points of Order.
 - a. Points of order are allowed on a limited basis. Points of Order are allowed in only the two final speeches of the debate: the Opposition Rebuttal and the Proposition Rebuttal
 - b. To make a point of order, a member of the opposing team rises and states “point of order.”
 - c. The debater must state and provide any proposed rationale in no more than 15 seconds.
 - d. The opposing team may respond to the points of order as they choose but their response comes out of their allotted speech time.
 - e. The judge simply observes the point/s of order. The judge/s may take the point of order into account in their deliberations as they choose and no new arguments in rebuttals are allowed; both of these points shall be noted in the judging instructions.
 - f. A point of order is only allowed to claim that the opposing team has introduced a new argument in rebuttal.
 - g. Points of Order may be made at any moment of a rebuttal; in other words, there is no protected time.
 - h. A point of order is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor violations, nor shall it be used as a tactic to disrupt the opponent’s speech, and these expectations shall be noted in the judging instructions.

C. Public Forum Debate.

1. 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.
2. On both sides, the Summary (First Rebuttal) is given by the first constructive speaker and the Final Focus (Second Rebuttal) is given by the second constructive speaker.

Email legislation to: David Matley
dmatley@aol.com (Please attach emailed copies in Microsoft Word format)

All Leagues are encouraged to submit as many bills and/or resolutions as they choose on the topic areas below. Leagues, schools, or individuals may also submit legislation on any of the topic areas below. Legislation must be typed, properly formatted and received by Jan 1, 2014 to be considered.

Please include the following information on each piece of legislation:

- Title of legislation
- Area you represent
- Name of league
- Topic Area of legislation

<i>Example</i>	Topic Area 4: Health & Welfare
A Bill to Provide Comprehensive Health Care	
	Submitted by Area 3 Mar Monte League

1. Middle East Policy

Intervention, Israeli-Palestinian peace process, Iraq, Iranian nuclear program, Syrian civil war, Palestinian Authority, Hamas, Egypt, oil, foreign aid, Gulf States, ethnic profiling.

2. Social Welfare

Education reform including common core standards, urban slums, same sex marriage, gun laws, assault weapons, school shootings, marijuana laws, childhood obesity, energy, green energy, rich poor gap, entitlement programs, pollution, mental health services, veteran services, homelessness, drought aid.

3. Science, Technology, Communications

Political advertising, nanotechnology, cyber security enhancement, space travel, networking and internet access, cyber privacy, STEM opportunities, weather forecasting and improvement, telecommunications regulation, digital literacy, Arctic research

4. Economics and Public Finance

National debt, deficits, tax policy, tax breaks, corporate bailouts, tax reform, debt ceiling, federal budget reform, unemployment, job creation, student loans, education grants, minimum wage laws.

5. Political and Constitutional Issues

NSA spying, civil rights, classified documents and public access, Patriot Act, voting rights, equal rights amendment, official misconduct, eminent domain, selecting of electors for president and vice-president, gerrymandering, campaign finance, term limits

6. Immigration and Native American Issues

Agricultural workers, STEM visa, Native American assistance, establish Office of Tribal Relations, tribal casinos, tribal recognition, refugees, border security, National Museum of the American People, electronic verification, birthright citizenship, citizenship for military service.

Area 1

Coast Forensic League--Areas: 1,3,5
Golden Gate Speech Association--Areas: 2,4,6

Area 2

Southern Valley League --Areas: 1,3
Sacramento League--Areas: 2,5
Yosemite Forensic League--Areas: 4,6

Area 3

Southern California League--Areas: 1,6
Tri-Valley League--Areas: 2,4
Western Bay League--Areas : 1,5
Mar Monte League--Areas: 3,6

Area 4

San Diego Imperial Valley League--Areas: 2,5
Citrus Belt League--Areas: 1,6
Orange County Speech League--Areas: 4,3