

- I. The meeting was called to order by President Prefontaine at 9:31 a.m.
- II. Steve Pettit, substitute secretary for Chuck Ballingall, called the roll.

Absent: Chuck Ballingal, VP Public Relations Fernandez, Janet Nuton, Marianne Rosen (Curriculum Rep from Area 3), Stephen Caperton, Dave Chamberlin, Greg Osborn

Proxy: Hoon Ko for Area I Curriculum Rep, Janet Hansen, Ticha Patanarapelers for OCSL President Steve Pettit

- III. Minutes from September 2008 meeting were circulated and called for approval.
Move to accept as corrected: M/ Abad , S/Munsell, passes unanimously

IV. Officer Reports

President Prefontaine

Nothing to report

Thank you to all of the proxies to ensure that we have a quorum.

Vice President of Activities Kamel

State seems to be going well.

Everything is electronic this year. All registration forms and school information will be on the website or sent by email. Dinner dance and state adds will be purchased through Joy of Tournaments website and one check will be sent to the Area Chair. You may still write multiple checks but all of them need to be sent to the area chair. Price of dinner dance tickets is going down this year. \$20 per student. \$10 per adult. A \$5 penalty will be assessed if you are buying tickets after the entry deadline.

There are three options for hotels. All of the information was sent to the league presidents via email. Roughly the prices are \$80, \$89, \$99. All of the hotels have a parking fee of approximately \$12. Bus parking is \$30. Make sure that you try to avoid the 405 freeway when going to the State tournament.

The cover sheets are available now on the website.

Vice President of Curriculum Prichard

Met Friday and all of the TI videos have been distributed to the league presidents. We have finished all of the dubbing for the video. We are doing a CD to go along with the DVD that is going to help with some creative writing lessons.

We need two days at the May meeting because we need time to create the materials and prepare all of the written documentation for the videos. Distribution information was given to the League Presidents. The copyright laws are very specific on this issue. We cannot sell it, and it has to be used for education purposes. We are going to distribute at the state tournament and then once again in May for those people that are not at the state tournament. The release form for the dvd usage is online as well. If you making copies for the members of your league you must submit a release form. Please submit those to Ron Underwood.

For the OPP DVD we need your help. If there are any coaches that are good in OPP and are willing to be interviewed please let us know. Also if you know any professional creative writers that are willing to be interviewed that would be helpful as well. They must work for free but they will gain the notoriety from the DVD.

UC approval forms have changed a lot. We have updated the web page to help you as best we can, so please give us any feedback that you can.

We have also added the judges guide book online. We have also added a link to separate instruction for competition instruction and regular speech instruction. Eventually all 4 dvd previews will be online.

Gay Brasher will be presenting at CATE this year. She will have students from multiple ages competing and showcasing the benefits of speech.

The Congress distribution needs a little bit of clarification. Originally it says in the minutes that the Congress DVDs would be sent to the member schools. Unfortunately 80 schools paid late and I need some clarification of whether we can spend \$480 from the CHSSA budget to provide this free of charge or should we charge the individual schools for the DVD.

Motion to pay for the DVD congress distribution. Not mailed, M/Prichard, S/ Kamel, passes unanimously.

Motion to add an additional day (May meeting) for Curriculum Committee to prepare all of the materials for distribution, M/Prichard, S/ Munsell, Approved voice vote

Treasurer Barembaum

Some bad news. The country has had some issues with banking. 20th century fund was in money market accounts, there is a charge of \$664.99 as a loss of principal fund.

Option of online form to forgo judge bond for State fee for the following year. There is a by-law change that I am going to propose in New Business.

Scholarship fund emails need to be sent to Neil Barembaum ASAP.

Vice President Kamel

This (The Radisson LAX) is one of the hotels for the State tournament. The dinner-dance will be held here.

The May meeting is here. The September meeting is in Northern California.

Thank You to Natalie Weber and Carmendale Fernandes for the dinner dance and hotel material and information. They were pivotal in getting all of those things in order for this organization.

Upcoming meeting schedule:

May 7-9, 2009 Radisson LAX

Discussion of sites for September and January meetings. Motion to visit the State tournament site in September to avoid fog, and switch the site in January to San Jose or Sacramento. M/Kamel, S/Munsell Approved by voice

September 11 – 12 TBA (Area II – site of State 2010)

January 8 – 9, 2010 TBA (San Jose or Sacramento)

April 23 – 25, 2010 2010 State Tournament, Bakersfield

May 7 – 8 , 2010 Radisson LAX

Secretary Report: Steve Pettit (sub for Ballingall)

Contact information sheet will be circulated and updated. There are still some issues with email circulation. We will make sure that those problems are fixed.

Editor Walton

Fall 2009 Bulletin was circulated. Should we mail to member schools? Change postage to non-profit. We are going to send fall bulletin to all schools in the State with some marketing material about the State tournament.

A big thank you was extended to Marcus for his effort. The next bulletin will be circulated after the State tournament in the Spring. Please keep the articles coming in. The more diverse the material is the better the bulletin will be.

Historian Underwood

Three things:

1. Tracking State Champions. We would like to get as much information about the past state champions. If you know anyone please give us the update or if you also know how to reach them we will contact them for an in depth report. I would like to do this during this school year.
2. I will be sending a mailing to all of the members of the Hall of Fame the September bulletin, the new bulletin, their ballot for the hall of fame, and the where are they now report sheet.
3. Hall of Fame videos. Retired Historian Donovan Cummings got 17 of them done and we would like to continue this process and get some more of them. We are going to edit them and make a highlight DVD. It will be one per league and one per hall of fame member. New business request for money to make the DVD.

V. Area Chair Reports

Area 1 Chair Keller – Firestone

We need more schools to “pony up the money” for CHSSA dues.

Area 2 Chair Darling

Official site for 2010 will be Bakersfield College April 23-25.

Entry deadline will be March 25th for the 2010 tournament.

Hotel information is in the making as we speak.

The speech classes at the college will be making it part of their class requirements to judge at the State tournament, so this should help alleviate the judge problems.

Area 3 Chair Novak

We are set for 2009 at Culver City High School.

Forming committees now to work out the details necessary to host the tournament.

Parking at the site is free and plentiful. IT IS A GO!!!!!!

Area 4 Chair Munsell

Thank you for all of your concern about the recent fires.

2011 we have approached 6 sites. Three are receptive.

We have gotten all of the material for Nermin.

We have some budget concerns. We need to think about more money for our tournament host because as the budget gets tighter the schools are becoming less and less effective.

We need more programs to pay their CHSSA dues, but our numbers are looking much better this year.

VI. Committee Reports

IE Committee Reports (Darling)

Preview of By-Law revisions to be brought up in New Business:

1. Elimination of the source requirement for
2. Expos real discussion. Some people consider vampires are real. The IE committee found that fabricating evidence to support your EXPOS is the main problem.
3. Liked the new cover sheets.
4. OI language needs to be changed so that your speech cannot be posted on the internet by someone that is related to you or your school.

Debate Committee Reports (Wolfe)

Wolfe: Requested President Prefontaine to announce the vote on the referendum.

Prefontaine: 32 yes 44 no; thus computers are still allowed in policy debate.

Wolfe: The committee has brought forth a motion to expand the evidentiary challenge procedures for questionable material presented in the debate. This will be brought up in new business. There was some discussion about expanding the laptop and internet usage amongst the general body, but debate will continue on the by-law revision under new business.

The committee did consider the motion for sign off sheets for debate, but this will be presented under new business when the motion is brought to the floor.

Pinza: It was suggested by my league to approach a computer company to donate some laptops for the state tournament.

Wolf: We could also ask some different companies to provide a discount or rebate for laptops through CHSSA as well.

Congress Committee (Matley)

We went through all of the bills. All of the different leagues got one bill in and also all of the different topic areas are represented this year. The due date for the bills is a little awkward. It is right after thanksgiving holiday and it ends up being pushed back and done at the last minute. Anything that you can suggest would be helpful.

Pinza: In our league we have done a few things new with congress. The bills are submitted by the students and then our league VP edits them and turns them in. The interesting thing is that the students are very excited that their bill could be debated at the State tournament.

The one thing that we would encourage you to do is to review the by-law changes that we did in the fall. There have been a few changes and we would like to help keep the State tournament running smoothly and protest free.

The congress manual has no changes really. The only thing that we really added is we came up with CHSSA specific approved motions that they can make at the State tournament. It will be on the website. The congress committee is trying to figure out the best way to assign NFL points for the State tournament, but we really have not figured out one yet. We will try to get some feed back by May and I will hopefully be presenting something at the next meeting.

Curriculum Committee (Prichard)

Nothing new to report.

The only thing that comes to mind is there are some members of this group that have helped us in our yearly goals but they are not tied to a school anymore. Thus, we would like to send these DVD products to the Hall of Fame members or members of the body that do not work at a school. General discussion followed.

VII. Old Business

Recognition of Mr. Cummings for all of his service to the council.

VIII. New Business

- ***Motion to allocate \$1000.00 for the creation and distribution of the "Hall of Fame" DVD***

M/ Underwood, S/Keller-Firestone

Passed by voice vote.

● **Voting for Hall of Fame**

- Ballots were circulated and collected.
- McCoy spoke for Don Oberti
- Keller-Firestone spoke for Neil Barembaum
- General comments of praise from various members

The leagues will submit their votes to the historian. Each league will have two votes by February 15th. They should send those ballots to the historian Mr. Underwood via email.

President Prefontaine declared the meeting in recess at 11:20 to resume at 12:45.
The meeting was reconvened at 12:50 pm.

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-A: M/Johnson, S/Barembaum

Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph K; Section 3, Paragraph F, Section 4, Paragraph H, and Section 5, Paragraph G. Familiarity with Rules:

Contemporaneous with submittals of Individual Event Manuscripts to Area Chairs, Presidents shall submit for each debater who has qualified for the State Tournament within the League, a statement signed by both the student competitor and the student’s coach which shall contain the following language:

“I have read the rules relating to the debate event for which I have qualified to participate at the State Tournament, agree to comply with those rules at the State Tournament and understand the risks and penalties should I fail to do so.”

Signature of the Student:

“I have provided a copy of the rules relating to the debate event for which the student signing above has qualified to participate in at the State Tournament and I have also read those rules and understand that, if my student fails to comply with those rules, s/he will be subject to the risks and penalties contained therein.

Signature of Coach

Johnson: I have meant to write this for awhile. We have expressed rules that the students just don’t know. In IEs the students must sign that they understand the rules, but in debate we have no such mechanism. The purpose of this motion is just to help clarify the rules.

Minick: Kids in our league are arguing about the rules. I am not sure if this change will antagonize this.

Munsell: We do not do this for Extemp and Impromptu.

Johnson: I would like it for all of the events.

Wolf: No from Debate committee.

1. No penalty mechanism in this change.
2. Signature is redundant. The competitor is bound by the rules already.
3. Existing rules are very clear in by laws. If rules are broken then you can mount a protest. This by-law revision does not change this.
4. This extra paper only increases the amount of work for league presidents and area chairs.
5. Management of paper might only complicate matters of protests.
6. Signatures for I.E.s are only present to reduce law suit potential from objectionable material. This does not apply to debate.
7. The philosophy requests of the students is not an invitation to the judge to break the rules but is an adaptation device used by the students. We want our students to adapt and this would create a chilling effect on this.

Graber: How does signing a piece of paper change anything?

Wolf: It does not. It is just the debate committee's opinion that there is no pressing reason to change current practice.

Graber: This would not be too much more work for anyone. Why is signing a piece of paper going to cause such drastic effects?

Marcus: It is simply that debate should not be singled out. No other event has to sign a piece of paper saying I know the rules. Thus, I think this becomes a coaching issue. Let the coaches coach. It seems to be seen that the teams that adapt better to judges do the best at the State tournament. We need to be more understanding and inclusive with our rules and policies.

Johnson: I have disagreements about debate but that does not mean that expressing my opinions is an ad hominem attack on the people on the committee. I simply want the rules to be enforced by this committee and we cannot do that if the students have not read the rules.

Keller-Firestone: I would vote no because I don't want to have to collect more papers and file them and know where they are for the entirety of the State tournament.

Prichard: I know that it is a nightmare to collect things but I have judged at State and have had kids ask me about "Tag Teaming" and "Flex Prep" which are rules. I feel a little uncomfortable responding to this. The students should know. My OI students know what they have to do, why should debate be any different?

Minick: There is a big difference between rules and style. Let's make sure that we are not enforcing style preferences but the actual rules.

Kamel: I am all for collecting extra paper if it serves a purpose. I think that we already have a rule and a violation in place. Making this by-law change does nothing to amend the rules or change the violation. With this by-law revision we still have the same enforcement.

Underwood: Don't let the paper work be a deciding factor.

Matley: Easier solution would be to have an email sent out to the students upon qualification that encourages the students to read the rules instead of collecting more paper.

Johnson: Manuscript coversheets are not to just check content but checks MLA as well. This has nothing to do with in round performance or content of the actual script. This is a rule. We follow it. That is the meaning of this by-law revision. I just want them to do is read and follow the rules.

Unfortunately, the students are starting to erode the rules and violate them without any reply from CHSSA.

Wolf: Some rules do have some interpretation to them. Having a slavish interpretation of the rules forces worse debate at the State Championship. If one student has a better answer to a question, it helps increase the education level of debate. That is why we "discourage" but do not ban this action [tag teaming]. The better place to enforce this rule is in the round with the ballot. If the students ask for a judge philosophy they just want to try to comply with the judges' preferences. I also don't think that there are any effective reasons to pass this by-law revision. We have some rules that are hard and fast -- this is not.

Pinza: Policy debate is not the only event that has a different way to of running. Different invitationals do things different ways but on the State level we do need to have a blending of ideas. In IE's and in Congress there is some blending of competition issues.

Motion to remand this to the Executive Committee to come up with a blanket statement to read the rules. M/Johnson, S/Underwood

Barembaum: No reason to do this because we are blowing this out of proportion.

Minick: This is more to check the scope and have this fix for the entirety of the State competition.

Johnson: Does that mean that the Executive committee will be the deciding factor?

Pinza: No. The executive council will make a statement and then bring it to this body.

Marcus: Something on every event levels the playing field and does not single out one group.

Barembaum: All I.E. events already do it. This would just be to include extemp and Impromptu and thus I don't think that it will be a big deal.

Wolf: I call to question on remand.

Remanded to Executive Council, 13 in favor, 11 opposed

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-B: M/ Read, S/ Underwood

Article XI, Section 4, Paragraph A

Topics to be used in the State Championship will be representative of all three areas (value, policy, fact) listed in the by-laws.

The Debate Committee shall contact each league for input on topic wording by February 1. Each League may have the opportunity to submit one topic per area of Parli Debate.

Read: Debate committee let me bring this issue up. But the debate committee may not be standing for any length of time but I wanted to have debate be much like the congress topics.

Wolf: Debate did not have a chance to talk about this.

Motion to remand to Debate Committee. M/Wolf S/Walton

Wolf: We'd just like the opportunity to come up with specifics of proposal.

Minick: Please look at the date if it is remanded so that the resolutions could be chosen in a timely manner.

Graber: How many people write the topics?

Wolf: One coordinates and the rest of us check the topics.

Graber: Chuck is a policy person and why should one person have all the power of decision?

Nermin: I have designated that power to Chuck by virtue of being the tournament director.

Hamilton: I know that we all reviewed the topics and they seemed fine to me, so one person may create them but we all review them.

Matley: It has been typical of this topic that all by-laws go through the debate committee.

Remand to Debate committee, passes.

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-C: M/ Read, S/ Johnson

Article XI, Section 4, paragraph C page 7

2. Students may consult ~~other competitors~~, dictionaries, reference materials, and prepared notes during the preparation period.

2. Students may consult **their partner**, dictionaries...

Read: Use prep time more effectively instead of having one person come up with arguments.

Underwood: Other materials are ok, right?

Prefontaine: Yes, that's correct.

Read: In the prep room it became team prep instead of individual entry preparation. It should not be the entire school prep. It makes the tournament unbalanced. Practice is one thing, but the State tournament is another. Parli is not an unprepared event. They need to know all of the types of topics, learn to organize their speech, know definitions. Without this education then we are missing out.

Johnson: The rule is in place to prevent coach preparation or calling other individuals. I think that it is difficult to know who they are talking to during prep if there is not rule.

Minick: I support this.

Passes, voice vote

Kamel: The same sheet of paper of materials was accepted last year and, since it has not been changed by the debate committee, it is still functioning this year.

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-D: M/ Read, S/ Underwood

Article XI, Section 4, Paragraph C, Page 7

During Preparation time, Parli Teams will report to a designated Prep Room and remain there until dismissed to go to their rounds.

Nermin: Friendly amendment to change Prep Room to Prep Area(s) [eliminate “a”]

Prefontaine: Acceptance from the author?

Read: Yes, I accept the friendly amendment.

WORDING OF MOTION 09-10-D WITH AMENDMENT: During Preparation time, Parli Teams will report to designated Prep Area(s) and remain there until dismissed to go to their rounds.

McCoy: That means that we are pulling out coaches from the judging pool to supervise.

Prefontaine: That is tournament functionality.

Minick: Call the question.

Motion passes as amended.

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-E: M/ Pinza, S/ Minick

Article IX , section 3, paragraph *various*, page # *various*

A – 1 – d: (p. 9)

“Identification of the selection: The title of the selection, name of the author, ~~and appropriate source cites~~ shall be given by the contestant when the selection is introduced. ...”

B – 1 – d: (p. 11)

“Identification of the selection: The title of the selection, name of the author, ~~and appropriate source cites~~ shall be given by the contestant when the selection is introduced. ...”

C – 2 – a: (p. 15)

“Identification of the selection: The author, title, ~~source~~, and place and date of original delivery...”

D – 1 – d: (p. 16)

“Identification of the selection: The title of the selection, name of the author, ~~and appropriate source cites~~ shall be given by the contestant when the selection is introduced. ...”

D – 2 – c: (p. 17)

“Performance: The thematic selections must be interpreted from a manuscript in the hands of the contestant. ...Introductory, explanatory, and connective material shall include the name of the author and title of each selection ~~and appropriate source cites~~, and must be delivered in the contestant’s own words. ...”

Pinza: Eliminates the need to name the source in the I.E. events.

Minick: This is just in response to a rule that has not been followed.

Barembaum: Just because it is not enforced and the kids do it then that is not a reason to vote for it.

Munsell: There are a few contradictions in our language and this motion is to clear that up.

Kindred: This is more of a housekeeping issue.

Nermin: We are just clarifying the second reference that is not needed.

Motion passes by voice vote.

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-F: M/ Underwood, S/ Pinza

Article IX, section 3, C – 1 – f (p. 14), A-1-f(p.9), B-1-f (p.11), D-1-f (p.16):

“Published” as used in these rules means materials commercially printed, published, readily available, and nationally distributed **by an entity that is in no way affiliated with the contestant, his/her coach, or his/her school.** Selections available only on...

Article IX, section 3, Paragraph C-1-f , pg #14

The Internet may be used with the following stipulations: **The material may not be originally posted on a social networking website, personal website or similar.** Only the original printed source...

Pinza: The intent from the committee is to further clarify what it means to be published. There are some students that are taking audio recordings, transcribing them, posting them to the Internet and claiming that it is a legitimate piece. Students have also been composing pieces and publishing them on the Internet via Facebook or what not and then using them in DI or DUO. The first paragraph clarifies where they can get the material

from. The second paragraph addresses the issue of posting a speech to a face book. The main goal is to strike affiliation of the publishing party.

Minick: The Internet part is specific to OI because it is the only interp that you can get online.

Pinza: Friendly amendment....the first paragraph applies to all interps while the second is specific to OI.

Johnson: Is self publication, even on a national level, off limits?

Pinza: Friendly amendment.....entity or person.

Graber: What about my kid whose father is a comedian?

Pinza: It is about the company that is publishing the material. The publisher is not related to the student.

DeBoer: I think that if the information is available to all competitors and thus there is no competitive edge.

Nermin: If you wait too long and then publish it then there is still the edge.

DeBoer: I think that we should focus on the competitive edge.

***Motion to divide the motion: M/Kamel, S/Underwood
Passes***

PART I - MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-F: M/ Underwood, S/ Pinza

Article IX, section 3, Paragraph C-1-f , pg #14

The Internet may be used with the following stipulations: **The material may not be originally posted on a social networking website, personal website or similar.** Only the original printed source...

Johnson: If Facebook and what not is the offending party then we should have language that deals with this. I think that the relationship should be stricken.

Kamel: Friendly amendment.....Social Networking or personal sites.

Pinza: I just don't understand the amendment.

Kamel: The material may not be posted on the Social Networking or personal website or similar.

Pinza: Accepted.

Matley: There needs to be more discussion in committee before we implement this in a State tournament that is just a few months away. ***Motion to remand to committee.*** M/Matley, S/Patanarapelers

Underwood: There is one script that is out there that is under the caution of CHSSA.

Kamel: I think it would be a mistake to remand because this was always the intention of the rule itself. There is nothing about commercially published.

Johnson: What is going on in the leagues to justify this rule?.

Kamel: We do not want something only on CD to be typed and placed on a social networking website.

Minick: Other teams are doing this and it is a issue that needs to be justified by CHSSA.

Matley: I did not know that there was one competitor that is going to do this and I don't think that it is a good thing that we are actively working to keep them out.

Johnson: I have scripts due on the 25th of January. I think that this rule is too late to change for this year. I favor the remand.

Marcus: I don't favor the remand because I don't want to say that people are doing things unethically to win. I don't want to think that we as educators would go out of our way to break the rules to win or to allow our students to break the rules.

Underwood: I don't think we are changing the rules. We are just clarifying them. I think we are saving them from being DQed at state.

Kamel: I don't think that the rules allow for this but I don't think that the interpretation is very clear.

Hamilton: I think it should be remanded. There has been some big changes to this bill and I want it to be clear.

DeBoer: I know that we can fix this with our leagues. We can tell our leagues and just say that it will not make it through the grievance committee.

Kamel: No one is saying that social networking websites are ok. I just think we need to clarify this.

Johnson: ***Marcus persuaded me.***[Historic moment noted by Mr. Johnson himself]. It is really addressing a moral issue than a word issue. It is pretty simple now but I think that it is adequate.

Vote to Remand Fails, 5 in favor, 17 opposed

Discussion.

Motion to end debate, M/Pinza, S/Patanarapelers

Part I of Motion Passes, Voice Vote, Hamilton abstains

PART II - MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-F: M/ Underwood, S/ Pinza

Article IX, section 3, paragraph C – 1 – f (p. 14), A-1-f(p.9), B-1-f (p.11), D-1-f (p.16):
 “Published” as used in these rules means materials commercially printed, published, readily available, and nationally distributed **by an entity that is in no way affiliated with the contestant, his/her coach, or his/her school.** Selections available only on...

Keller-Firestone: If Speech Geek publishes a script for my kid does this mean I cannot use it?

Kamel: No. The publisher is not affiliated with your kid.

Matley: There was an issue last year and we are just trying to avoid the self-publication. The problem is how can we deal with this and ensure that it doesn't hurt everyone.

Minick: My big issue is why can a coach publish a script for a kid instead of just doing a legal event like OPP? I just don't think that this language fixes this issue. We should remand this.

Matley: I don't know if this hurts Speech Geek, but I think it fixes the date.

Johnson: I think we should just label the problem and fix it.

Motion to remand to IE Committee: M/Johnson, S/Kamel, passes

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-G: M/ Barembaum, S/ Keller-Firestone

This revision will be a:
 . Deletion from By-Laws:....Article I , section 1, paragraph A, page #1
 . Addition to By-Laws:.....Article I , section 1, paragraph A, page #1

Specific revision: [exact wording is required]
 A. School Assessments: All member schools shall pay ~~two cents per student enrolled per the Fall average daily attendance report. Junior high schools shall pay two cents per average daily attendance for ninth graders only. Each school shall pay an additional \$50.00 assessment. (Example: A school with 1,500 students shall pay an assessment of \$30.00 plus a \$50.00 membership fee for a total of \$80.00 yearly assessment.)~~ **a one-hundred dollar yearly assessment.**
 1. Upon receipt of the official assessment statement from CHSSA . . .

Barembaum: This is something I have wanted to do for a long time. For those coaches who qualify for state then they can have their judging bond apply to their dues next year. However, this motion is specific to a flat fee. There is no reason why the large schools should be supporting more of CHSSA. This is a fee increase. We are doing more than we use to do and things cost more than they use to as well. This helps alleviate those issues. It will affect some leagues more than others but they will also get an increase in allocations.

Munsell: I think that it would be easier as an area chair.

Abad: I would like to be able to discuss it with the schools in my league. I think that the allocations are a little prickly for my member schools.

Barembaum: This is synonymous to if you have a lot of small schools in your league then you will benefit, but if you have a lot of big schools then you will lose out. I would like to apply the “veil of ignorance” and decide if it is a good idea for all.

Wolf: I can see the benefits, but can we not change how the allocations are distributed.

Johnson: I think that having the allocation based on total population is a bad idea and having it all on an equal basis is a good idea.

Wolf: But the role should be given to the leagues to work with the bigger schools and get more people involved.

Barembaum: More schools does not mean that those schools must be big.

Minick: In my league the best schools are really small. Thus the original rule was meant to get large schools to bring more competitors to our leagues but that it not the reality.

Underwood: Just for clarification purposes that in the past allocations were just a nightmare. The current system was put into place because it was a mathematical calculation.

Ko: I am not sure if the correlation that we are drawing here is correct. I think that the number of people served should necessitate a bigger allocation.

Kamel: I think that the two things that are being talked about here are two separate issues. Everyone seems to think that the \$100.00 flat fee is fine but the other issue of allocations is something completely different.

Graber: Without changes to allocations then I don't think that we can divorce the issue.

Barembaum: This would not be a huge change because allocations are averaged over three years.

Minick: NFL does it this way. My small school is the same as your big school. I just want fairness.

Abad: This is a significant issue. I would really like to take this issue back to my league before I vote on it.

Motion to postpone till May for Discussion.: M/Keller-Firestone, S/ Minick

Kamel: We can pass it or wait because there is nothing that is going to change immediately.

Motion to postpone, passes by voice vote, Barembaum abstains

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-H, M/ Read, S/ Abad

This revision will be a:

Addition to By-Laws: Article XIV, Section 2, paragraph D1, pg #2

Other change: Article XIV, Section 2, paragraph D1, pg #2

Specific revision: [exact wording is required]

those coaches involved in the operation of the State Tournament shall be credited the equivalent of ~~12~~ **8** rounds of judging. **The tournament director at his/her discretion may choose to award more rounds of credit to individuals who serve larger roles in the operation of the tournament.** Each coach not involved in the operation of the state tournament will be required to judge a minimum of eight rounds and may be required to judge more in the event of severe judge shortages.

Kamel: This is just a major housekeeping issue. If you are a state official then you are supposed to get credit for two judges. But in the council we are getting more need for people to work at the tournament but we cannot take them out of the pool. This is also ok with the tournament director giving more credit to some sensitive jobs in the tab to get more credit.

Johnson: Move to divide the motion, S/Graber

Johnson: Fair is fair and square is square. Without time clock then we should have a universal rule about jobs at state. There should be one rule.

Motion to divide the motion fails by voice vote.

Matley: Clarification. Currently it is 8 rounds for one judge but right now we give credit for 12 rounds.

Minick: I don't think that we should have a random person deciding who works harder than others, but I think that it should be a standard.

Graber: How many judges per entry? If we changed the current rule for how many judges the schools can bring per entry will that help?

Kamel: We cannot do that. There are already issues.

Barembaum: I think it is possible to determine how much work one person is doing at the state tournament. I think that it is ok for a director to be in charge of that as well. However, it is hard for me to know how many people need to be judging so that I can refund that issue.

Marcus: I think that the issue is ridiculous that we cannot come up with one more judge.

DeBoer: Scheduling of judges is not difficult. We should help the tournament out as much as possible.

Pettit: I just think that the judging issue could be more complicated for the judging house organizational wise.

Underwood: I also think that the larger schools have a hard time bringing those extra bodies especially if state is not in the area.

Hamilton: I am only one person. I should only count as one spot. If we cannot get judges, then this rule does not actually solve this problem. I think that this council needs to look at the actual root cause. It may not solve the problem but I think that it may make it easier to place the blame.

Pritchard: I think that the big issue is travel and logging of the extra judge. We may want to pay judges to get those extra bodies.

Minick: I know I am only one person but I feel as if I am doing more work than one person.

Previous Question: M/Ko, S/Munsell

Motion Passes - Abstaining: Johnson, Minick, Pettit

Kamel: February 10th is when the league presidents need to give us the names of your state workers.

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-I: M/Wolf, S/Ko

This revision will be an

Addition to By-Laws: Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph H1

H. Validity of Evidence

1. 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 Xerox copy 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 telegrams shall not be admissible as evidence. **Evidence acquired from the use of the Internet during the round is not valid.**
2. Evidence challenges
 - a. The burden of proof rests with the team or individual that challenges the validity of any evidence.
 - b. The 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. Decision 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 a 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.**

Wolf: We now need to expand the way we use the internet to our rules and by-laws so that we can regulate computer usage in debate rounds.

Underwood: Why not required to give up evidence?

Wolf: If I don't use the computers than I wouldn't have to do it.

Johnson: If the judge has a laptop then will they take the evidence and scan them in their computers?

Kamel: They shouldn't. If they do, then we will chastise the judge, and proceed from there.

Matley: Currently the judge cannot look at the information and with the current motion it would remain the same. The information is simply collected and sent to the committee for challenges.

Johnson: This is one of the reasons why we need to have people read the rules.

Barembaum: Can judges use laptops in round?

Ko: Yes they can but I think that three judges could self regulate.

Graber: How do we define laptop computer? Is it a blackberry?

Marcus: You just have to prove that you did not use the internet in a speech.

Graber: How does the judge verify that?

Prefontaine: All protests need to be brought to the committee.

Nimick: Have we talked about judges' instructions to be playing at the tournament?

Prefontaine: No, but I'd like us to have a changes flyer in bright colors to go with reg materials so that we can keep people in the loop at the State tournament.

Call the question M/ Ko, S/ Patanarapelers

Motion Passes by Voice Vote

Abstentions: Darling and Nimick, Nay: Johnson

MOTION TO REVISE THE BY-LAWS 09-10-J M/Kamel, S/ Ko

Article XII, Section 3, Paragraph E , pg #2

E. Precedence in Pairing. In odd-numbered rounds competitors should be distributed Affirmative or Negative randomly. Competitors pulled across in any even-numbered round according to the process below should be balanced Aff or Neg in the following round. The following procedure applies for even-numbered rounds. Leaving the affirmative cards on the left, shuffle them and place them face up in vertical rows. Shuffle the negative cards and turn face up one at a time in sequence opposite the affirmative cards, being sure to match undefeated against undefeated prior to quarter-final rounds. Do this matching one at a time noting the following priorities and shift the pairings to avoid:...

Underwood: Is this so that the balance is maintained and that round three is random round 4 is correct and five is random again?

Kamel: Yes. We don't want to have to change the tab code and what not.

Nimick: All debate, right?

Kamel: Yes.

Prefontaine: Debate tabulation is all the same; thus, it is for all of them.

Nimick: Is this how it always is?

Wolf: No. Sometime it is forced on how we have to pair rounds. This frees us up a little for pairings.

Motion Passed by voice

Nermin: The last motion we are not considering today but I would like you to think about it in your leagues. In debate we want to have debates hit the same school and also people in the same area.

Munsell: Motion to appoint Ad Hoc committee to create a contract to be used between CHSSA and the host site. This would be to guarantee the site and keep the host site from "bumping" us from the site. Need product by September. S/Driggs

Munsell: I would like a few lawyers to help us out here too.

Passes by voice

Perfontaine: Chair = Munsell, Abad, Kamel, Hamilton. Conducted via computer. And should be enacted by 2011 state tournament.

Motion to increase food allocation to \$5000 and to increase to \$2500 for the host site. M/Kamel, S/Underwood

Passed by voice.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Steve Pettit (sub for Chuck Ballingall)

CHSSA Secretary