

- I. The meeting was called to order by President Prefontaine at 9:27 a.m.

A list of the members of the standing committees was passed around, and people made/requested changes in their committee assignments.

- II. Secretary Ballingall called the roll.

Absent: Editor Reed Niemi, OCSL President Sal Tinajero, Area 4 Curriculum Rep Thomas Gomes, Area 4 Rep at Large Dave Chamberlain

Proxies: Bruce Jordan for GGSA President Terry Abad  
Chris Wardner for CFL President Tim Case  
Carole Green for CFL President Chris Wolf  
Matt Fraser for Area 1 Curriculum Representative Janet Hansen  
Bob Stockton for Area 4 Chair Suzanne Munsell

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

- III. Minutes from January 2012 meeting were discussed

*Accepted without objection*

- IV. Officer Reports

President Prefontaine

Thanks to all who worked so hard, particularly those from Area 1, at the State Tournament.

There was only one protest, which was in fact a case of mistaken identity.

Thanks to those who helped arrange sponsorships.

Sending thank-you letters to the Safeway Foundation, Mr. Stone of Microsoft (who came up with software packages and the X-Box given at awards). Thanks to Stanford Debate for their donations of scholarships and cash awards for students.

Sent letter to Derek Yuill thanking him for suggesting the school participation plaques.

We are trying to think of ways to streamline the Awards Ceremony... runs on too long. Johnson: one coach who attended suggested eliminating semifinalist awards. Kopecki: could a smaller assembly be held? Prefontaine: being a State semifinalist is a big deal, should be recognized.

Osborne: Awards Ceremony should focus on the kids, maybe move coaches' awards to another time, a dinner perhaps?

A general discussion of the Dinner-Dance ensued.

Declarations of candidacies: Prefontaine for President, Kamel for VP Activities, Prichard for VP Curriculum

Vice President of Activities Kamel

Thanks to all for your hard work; it's truly a 30 day marathon to the tournament. Thanks to Area Chairs and League Presidents.

Thanks to Ron Underwood for filling in for Suzanne Munsell as Area 4 Chair, did a fabulous job, above and beyond the call of duty.

A discussion of the mechanics of returning scripts to schools ensued; no decision reached.

Thanks to Terry Abad for his amazing efforts.

Hotel situation: schools dropped 20 rooms at one of the tournament hotels right before the tournament; this endangers our low rates and we almost had to pay a fine for those dropped rooms.

Brent Hinkle did a great job, but we are very reliant on him; would people be willing to undertake training over the summer so that we have a group of people who can help during the tournament?

Prichard: We should do something significant for Brent, at the next tournament.

Next year: no close venue large enough for the Dinner-Dance. Looking into Magic Mountain; could be in a section of the park from 8-12, on rides from 9-12. Would a \$25 cost including a food voucher be appropriate? (General agreement that it would be).

Next year's State Tournament is April 19-21

Deadlines: Entries are due online on March 14, mail-in portion must be postmarked by March 21.

Upcoming meetings:

|           |  |                       |
|-----------|--|-----------------------|
| September | possibly in Sacramento, possibly San Jose                      | Most likely Sept. 7-8 |
| January   | In Valencia, fly in to Burbank Airport                         | Most likely Jan 11-12 |
|           | (January date had 17 votes in favor, 5 opposed, 4 abstentions) |                       |
| May       | Location LAX   | May 17-18             |

More and more people are having trouble getting off work Friday, should we reconsider the overall schedule of meetings?

One possibility: Start the Council meeting from 6-8 Friday, go to dinner, Committee meetings Saturday morning, Council meet for New Business Saturday evening.

Send suggestions for changes to Sharon.

Vice President of Curriculum Prichard

Curr Committee completely revised Coaches Handbook, streamlined it  
DVDs were sold at State, new DVDs had titles printed directly on DVDs

OI is the last of the "California Suite" DVD, in process of completing

Will need \$500-\$800 to have an inventory of DVDs available for new coaches, anyone who wants to buy

***Motion to approve funding passes unanimously***

In the fall, we will be talking about long term goals

Driggs: What about debate events? Prichard: We're considering Parliamentary

A sample of the OI video was shown, and as usual, was excellent.

Historian Underwood

I enjoyed my time as Area 4 Chair.

Hall of Fame; Given that 5 ran, no one received a sufficient vote for reelection. They can be resubmitted.

Continuing to track state champions, will try to contact and write about them.

Treasurer Barembaum

Treasurer's Report was distributed in advance by email.

## V. Area Chair Reports

Area 1 Chair Keller-Firestone

State Tournament went very well. Chris Wardner will be joining the Council as CFL President.

Area 2 Chair Darling

June Read will be stepping down as president; San Joaquin Delta is possible 2014 site.

Area 3 Chair Kindred

Introducing Allison Hunsaker from West Ranch HS, who is the coach at the State Tournament host school.

2013 site: West Ranch HS in Santa Clarita, April 19-21.

Area 4 Chair Bob Stockton, substituting for Suzanne Munsell

No report.

VI. Committee Reports

Curriculum Committee (Rita Prichard)

Report given previously

Congress Committee (Matley)

Will be introducing an item for new business.

Joy of Tournaments software still has issues, results that are published are wrong.

We need to meet with Brent to try to work through issues.

At State, there was an issue with a student using a visual aid... these are not allowed, either to be used by competitors or the Presiding Officer.

From now on, we don't want students to shake hands with judges.

General commentary that shaking hands with judges in rounds in any event is to be discouraged (and that this should also be happening at the league level).

At the September meeting, will have motions to eliminate the 4th preliminary round and also for a new system of power matching POs.

Debate Committee (Ballingall)

Will have several items for New Business, one is housekeeping, the rest are substantive.

Public Relations (Caperton)

Spent yesterday putting together a sponsorship packet to be given to prospective sponsors

This summer the CAHSSA website will include space for sponsors

Brief discussion about the use of the CHSSA name by invitationals (talk to tournaments that say they "use CHSSA rules" to make sure that they do indeed use CHSSA rules)

The CHSSA School Tube channel is now up and running; the final round speeches will be uploaded soon.

Johnson: Was the last Bulletin published in Fall 2011?

Prefontaine: Any data supporting the importance of speech, especially as it relates to the Common Core Standards, send it on to Reed.

Individual Events Committee (Darling)

Some discussion about visual aids (perhaps something for judges instructions)

Discussion over the final rounds in extemporaneous; will formulate By-laws revisions for September.

VII. Old Business

There were no items of Old Business.

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

The meeting resumed at 1:06 p.m.

VIII. New Business

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS:**

A white ballot was moved and seconded

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

*This slate was elected unanimously*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-A M/Barembaum, S/Underwood**

Article VII, Section 4, Paragraph K2b2, Page 8 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):  
2) A student who transfers from School A to School B without a change of residence on the part of parents or guardians from the attendance area of School A shall become eligible at School B after one year.

- a) Exception: School district mandated transfer.
- b) Exception: Approved transfers from School A attendance area to School B attendance area within the same school district.

Barembaum: In some situations, students have a common attendance area for several schools (a "zone of choice). The current language would make a student ineligible to compete if they move from one school to another within these zones of choice; this change would permit students to be eligible as long as the district approves the transfer.

*Passes, voice vote*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-B M/Keller-Firestone, S/Underwood**

Article VII, Section 5, Paragraph C, Page 8 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):  
C. The coach of each contestant qualified for the State Tournament shall send notification of participation with delivery confirmation by the designated due date. Notification of participation includes completed entry forms and a check for entry/judging fees. The judging fee shall be \$100.00. Checks must be school checks or certified personal checks or money orders. Entry fees for contestants dropped from the State Tournament less than two weeks before the State Tournament will not be refunded. **[ Each school with debate entries must provide one designated judge for every three debate entries in addition to IE & Congressional judges. Schools with IE or Congress entries only will provide 1 judge for every 6 entries or fraction thereof.]** Schools with more than six **[IE & Congressional debate]** entries must provide a qualified judge for each additional six entries or fraction thereof (e.g.: 7-12 entries = 1 additional judge; 13-18 entries = 2 additional judges). The \$100 judging deposit per school shall be refunded only when all school judges have satisfactorily and substantially completed their judging assignments. **[Missed rounds will be fined \$100.00 per round missed.]**

SKF: Difficult to get debate judges; schools aren't required to bring enough judges to cover debate entries.

Kalashian: Who are the know shows? Coaches or guest judges?

Kamel: Last year (2010) was the first year of the \$100 per round penalty; about 10 schools had one missed round, only one school had major problems with rounds missed. This year (2011) the process was much more transparent, and seemed to work well. The no-show problem is greater with community judges, especially since the coach-community-college pools are intermixed. SKF's proposal has merit, but raises from questions.

Graber: Could we use the word qualified, or experienced?

Wardner: We need more judges. Case has some proposals; can we postpone until September?

SKF: Don't intend to limit the judges to these; want to increase the number of judges.

*Postponed to September*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-C M/Ballingall S/Johnson**

Article XII, Section 1 , Paragraph B , Page 1 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

**Round 6. 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.**

*Passes unanimously*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-D M/Kamel S/Keller-Firestone**

Article XII, Section 10 , Page 5 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

**Section 10. Release of pairings. Once the pairings ffor the first round Sunday morning or each round in each debate event have been determined and approved by the supervising tournament official, they should be posted physically at the tournament site and electronically as soon as is practical.**

Kamel: Pairings are made Saturday night but not posted; all competitors

Johnson: Oppose the amended revision even more; large schools are at a much greater advantage if everyone knows the prelim rounds pairings. The underlying rationale is that we can't trust the people in the Tab Room, and there is no evidence that there needs to be that lack of trust.

Kalashian: If you can't trust the people, don't give them the jobs. We sink or swim together.

When pairings are released in advance, the big schools are at even more of an advantage.

Fraser: The main argument isn't that people in tab are giving information to others; the key is transparency. The trust issue cuts both ways. There are only a small number of coaches involved that late in the tournament; why shouldn't those not in the tab room also be trusted?

Green: Why not pair in the morning and not at night? I don't think that releasing the pairings the night before makes things fairer, because large programs will always have more resources than small programs.

Kopecki: Uncomfortable with the notion of back-tabbing; the practice is unethical - students shouldn't prep the night before, and shouldn't be prepped. We should behave under the presumption people will behave ethically.

Kamel: We already make rules to ensure people behave ethically. Where can we create transparency wherever we can? Create trust, people will believe in what we're doing. Protects tab staff as well, puts them above reproach.

Green: Do we as an organization encourage students to prep all night by releasing the pairings? We send the wrong message.

Kalashian: This is against the "culture of CHSSA." We don't have to do what other organizations do nationally.

Johnson: If the tab room decides to pair in the morning, then this rule doesn't apply and the problems would still remain.

*Motion fails, 5 in favor, 14 opposed, 7 abstentions*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-E M/Wardner, S/Caperton**

|  |        |    |                         |                         |
|--|--------|----|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Article XIV ,section 3 , paragraph B , page 4 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken): |        |    |                         |                         |
| Ranking  | Policy | LD | Parliamentary           | Public Forum            |
| 1 <sup>st</sup>  | 18     | 12 | <del>10</del> <b>18</b> | <del>10</del> <b>18</b> |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup>  | 14     | 10 | <del>8</del> <b>14</b>  | <del>8</del> <b>14</b>  |
| Eliminated in Round 8  | 10     | 7  | <b>10</b>               | <b>10</b>               |
| Eliminated in Round 7  | 6      | 4  | 6                       | 6                       |
| Eliminated in Round 6  | 4      | 3  | 4                       | 4                       |
| Eliminated in Round 5  | 2      | 2  | 2                       | 2                       |

Wardner: Sweepstakes points need to be updated, which hasn't happened since Parli and Public Forum were expanded to 48 entries.

Osborn: This increases the inequity between points awarded to debate and individual events.

Wardner: There is no rationale in the by-laws for how points are awarded; this is just an attempt to update the points, based on consistency with debate and partnered vs. individual debate events.

Alexander: Every event should be counted the same.

Johnson: No urgency to this, should revisit in September.

Ballingall: We need to solve the whole problem, not just a piece of it, realizing that we need to fix the "hole" as part of the bigger picture.

Graber: I need more information, and an unbiased account of the arguments on both sides.

*Remanded to the League Presidents*

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-F M/Case, S/Graber**

|  |
|--|
| Article <u>XI</u> , section <u>3</u> , paragraph <u>D2e &amp; F</u> , p. 5 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):  |
| D. Validity of Evidence...2. Evidence challenges:  |
| e. The challenging individual 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. <b>Evidence provided to a judge in digital format (e.g., CD, USB drive, flash drive) prior to the beginning of the round will be 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.</b> |
| <b><i>F. Prohibition regarding electronic device</i></b>   |
| <del>1. Debaters shall not be allowed to utilize computers for any reason during the debate round. Debaters shall not be allowed to use the Internet during the round. Other than an electronic timing device that has no functioning capability other than to count time, the debater shall not access or activate any other electronic devices during the round, including, but not limited to, cell phones. Penalty for violation of this rule shall be automatic forfeiture of the round by the offending team.</del>  |
| <b>1. Internet devices on any computers used in the round must be disabled. Other than two computers per debater (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 debater, and one electronic timer per debater that has no functioning capability other than to count time, the debaters shall not have access to or activate any other electronic device during the round, including, but not limited to cell phones.</b>  |

Wardner: This proposal would allow computers in L-D

Keller-Firestone: Computers are a fact. Ludicrous not to be able to use computers the L-D and Public Forum.

Johnson: Tired of the 21st century argument. Things still happen on paper. Arguments used to support computers in policy don't apply to these events. Even though individual computers are inexpensive, getting them for an entire program is very expensive. There is a big disparity between poor and rich schools in this matter. One detriment to computers in rounds is that it has added time for the exchange of evidence on flash drives. Both of these forms of debate should be different from policy; both should be more audience oriented.

Green: To teach our students to communicate in the world, they should have laptops. Having a laptop allows for greater evidence storage, in case evidence is challenged.

Graber: Johnson's argument about equity is an important one; had to fund raise to get students to State, my students down own laptops. Saw the LD semifinals this year, an incredible round, great oratory, would've been diminished by computers. They can use computers until the moment the round starts.

J. Osborne: important for kids to have the option to use it. If kids really want to use one, they'll get one.

Kamel: Common core standards include 21st Century learning. If this activity is going to survive, we can't fight this, we have to go along with it. Programs are emerging to get students inexpensive laptops. Fraser: We still want to give students a choice; it's not necessarily an advantage.

McCoy: It's possible to get these resources; we can send the kids out to use their skills to get these resources through donations, etc.

Kalashian: I'm leaning towards abstaining. Event uniqueness is important. We don't want all the events to sound the same.

Barembaum: Kids don't need their speech teacher to teach them technology, they need them to teach communication.

Ballingall: Having computers doesn't change the speaking style in rounds, doesn't contribute to the blurring of the events. The laptop is a tool that facilitates research and argument construction.

Johnson: Computers give an advantage, even if perceptually. We are not responsible for teaching these skills. There is a comparative advantage for students without laptops.

Kopecki: The teaching of paraphrasing is valuable; do computers take away from that?

*Motion passes: 11 in favor. 10 opposed, 2 abstentions*

#### **MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-G M/Case, S/Johnson**

Article XI ,section 5, paragraph C & F, p. 9 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

C. 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 during each round by the opponent, complete citations for each piece of evidence introduced to include 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, or ellipses may be shown on cards, if the original source or a photocopy is present. 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 email shall not be admissible as evidence.

1. Evidence challenges

- a. The burden of proof rests with the **team or** 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 judge 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 challenging individual.**

**e. The challenging 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 or 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. Evidence provided to a judge in digital format (e.g., CD, USB drive, flash drive) prior to the beginning of the round will be 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.**

**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. Teams 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 team a win and disqualifying from the tournament the team found guilty of using falsified or distorted evidence.**

**d.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 presentation. The round following the contested round may not begin until the dispute is resolved.**

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

~~1. Debaters shall not be allowed to utilize computers for any reason during the debate round. Debaters shall not be allowed to use the Internet during the round. Other than an electronic timing device that has no functioning capability other than to count time, the debater shall not access or activate any other electronic devices during the round, including, but not limited to, cell phones. Penalty for violation of this rule shall be automatic forfeiture of the round by the offending team.~~

**1. Internet devices on any computers used in the round must be disabled. 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 timer per debater that has no functioning capability other than to count time, the debaters shall not have access to or activate any other electronic device during the round, including, but not limited to cell phones.**

***Motion to divide the motion into parts C (evidence challenges) and F (computer use)  
passes by voice vote***

**Part F: Computer use in Public Forum**

***Motion fails, 11 in favor, 12 opposed, 1 abstention***

**Part C: Evidence challenges**



Caperton: This will require teams to have evidence files available, not all do.  
 Green: NFL rules for evidence in PF are the same as LD; we should have standardized evidence rules.  
 Probably even more reason to have evidence challenge rules available for Public Forum. PF shouldn't be treated any differently as far as academic integrity goes.  
 Kalashian: Current procedures are murky.  
 Fraser: Don't need a more formal procedure.  
 Green: Many tournaments have rounds Monday, including NCFL.

***Remanded to Debate Committee, 9 in favor, 9 opposed; president's vote is to remand***

**MOTION 12-05-H (regarding the tournament schedule) M/Wolf, S/Ballingall  
(attached to these minutes)**

Fraser: Many questions. Where do we get hotels? What about awards? Monday is an issue.  
 Ballingall: Should at least consider alternatives.  
 Kopecki: Monday is still a problem, potentially more days out of school.  
 Wardner: Wolf trying to make a more sane schedule, with more time available.  
 Graber: Judges have commitments Monday, wouldn't be able to judge.  
 Prefontaine: Going to a hotel room would potentially make the audience smaller.

***Remanded for further discussion in the Fall***

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-I (M/Matley, S/Stockton**

Article XIII, section 18, p.7 (new text in bold, deleted text stricken):

**18. Evidence**

**All evidence used is subject to verification. Honesty and integrity are of utmost importance in legislative debate. Falsification or deliberate misuse of evidence may result in the legislator being suspended by tournament officials.**

***Passes unanimously***

**MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 12-05-J M/Jordan, S/Kalashian**

Article XI, Section 4, paragraphs G and H

G. Points of Information:

~~These are common practice in parliamentary debating.~~ 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.

1. Points of Information are **only** allowed in ~~every speech in the debate~~ **the first four speeches of the debate.**
2. Points of Information must be concise statements or questions lasting no more than fifteen seconds.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. ~~No other parliamentary points are permitted.~~

**H. Points of Order**

Points of order are allowed on a limited basis. To make a point of order, a member of the opposing team rises and states "point of order." The debater must state and provide any proposed rationale in no more than 15 seconds. The opposing team may respond to the points of order as they choose but their response comes out of their allotted speech time. 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.

1. Points of Order are allowed in only the two final speeches of the debate: the Opposition Rebuttal and the Proposition Rebuttal.
2. A point of order is only allowed to claim that the opposing team has introduced a new argument in rebuttal.
3. Points of Order must be a concise statement lasting no more than fifteen seconds, and the responding team may answer the Point of Order during their speech time as they so choose.
4. Points of Order may be made at any moment of a rebuttal; in other words, there is no protected time.
5. 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.

Kalashian: Important for teams to be able to point out new arguments in the last rebuttal.

Matley: Points of order are an important part of Parli, as they are with Congress

Kopecki: Students don't understand the rules currently and don't use them properly. New arguments are bad, but other forms of debate have to deal with them. This can be used to throw off the opposing speaker.

Kalashian: No cross-examination in this event, need Points of Order and Information.

Matley: Less potential for harm if the negative abuses his point of order than if the affirmative makes new arguments.

***Passes, voice vote*****IX. For the good of the order**

Johnson: Do we ever need to reevaluate league configurations? Our league facilities are getting too small for our league. Who would look into this? Also, is there a chance of getting permanent State Tournament sites on a rotating basis, perhaps that we would pay a fee to.

Kamel: Middle school State tournament? We should look at this.

Possibly 3rd weekend if May, emphasis can be on whatever your District's focus is on the middle schools.

***Motion to give support to the idea of a junior high school State Tournament - without objection***

Graber: Still a problem that speech isn't a UC approved class

**X. The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.**