

- I. The meeting was called to order by VPA Nermin Fraser at 9:24am
- A. *No friendly amendments according to Robert's Rules. We can postpone a vote until later in the meeting.*
 - B. *When a question is called, it is a vote to vote with 2/3 of the body agreeing to vote. Previous question must be recognized prior to moving (no shout-outs)*

II. Roll Call

Absent: Greg Osborne SDSVSL (proxy Michael Orfield), Brittney Marques OCSL (proxy Doug Miller), Erik Pielstick CBSR (proxy Vepa Vepa)

III. Minutes from May 2015 offered for review, edit, and comments.

Moved to approve by Curtis, second Underwood. Unanimous approval

IV. **Officer Reports**

President Prefontaine

Lynnette Williamson needs our prayers.

I am concerned about our purpose. What are we about? What direction are we going? We must create a sense of unity as we move forward. What type of competition do we encourage? The demands on teachers are huge and revenue has decreased. We are volunteers...your time is critical. Where do we fit? January will not be legislative in nature. I welcome your input on how you envision using that time in January. Break-out groups are a possibility. You will have a quick-write after lunch. It will not be graded. Relax. We spend so much time word-smithing one word that we are not looking at the larger issues. Please take this survey as an evaluation of the big picture.

Vice President of Activities Fraser

Google document is circulating (emailed). It will be updated shortly.

Vice President of Curriculum Prichard

Prichard: We worked hard this weekend. Judge DVD is wrapping up. It will be distributed to league presidents in January. We offer a DVD and post on the website. Big news is a coaches' and teachers' workshop during State Champs 2016. We will focus on debate across the curriculum, focusing on SPAR debate. We are targeting Area 1 schools, due to location of State Champs and the numbers (programs) in their area. We may have a small group year one, but will grow after that. When the workshop is complete, we will post all the papers handed out. For younger coaches and teachers, we can explore some type of judge credit to allow coaches to not judge at State in lieu of attending.

Graber: What about salary points for teachers?

Prichard: Yes, that is what we are exploring now, but it is difficult to get authorized since it is decided at the school district level. We are working towards that, though. Thank you.

Treasurer Barembaum (*Treasure report emailed one week prior via email*)

Barembaum: We take credit cards now.

Secretary/Editor Niemi

Niemi: No report

Historian Underwood

Underwood: No report

V. Area Chair Reports**Area 1 Chair Keller-Firestone**

Keller-Firestone: We are working on the location but do not have a contract as of yet. We will have it in place by November 1.

Area 2 Chair Darling

Darling: Area 2 still rocks. State in Sacto in 2018. Yipee.

Area 3 Chair Kindred

Arcadia HS host State 2017

Area 4 Chair Munsell

We have new members, welcome! 2019 State will be somewhere, thank goodness we have time.

VI. Committee Reports**Debate Committee (Johnson)**

Larsen: NFHS topic selection in New Orleans was great. Some states have more say than the grand state of California. *Eric shared the topic areas.* We are leaning towards India. Vote due October 15. Please let me know what the desire of the body is.

Johnson: Thank you Ron for chairing. I directed the meeting. Sorry I was late. Caiti started it for me. No new legislation for today. In January we will focus on equalizing the debate entries and reformat the two downs format. Expect the motion in May. Please speak to your leagues now.

Vepa: Debate committee needs a chair and agenda.

Fraser: Please speak to CHSSA President.

Abad: Can you let us know where you guys are headed?

Johnson: 64 in all events, have 8 prelims.

Sarvey: We were planning to try to get it out in January.

Kalashian: We need a little feedback. Simply, we want to reduce judge strain (2 judges per round), and rooms and allow more teams. 4 rounds, 2 judges, break to Octos...

Graber: You are going to have it out in January? We need something in writing please.

Johnson: We are disappointed that the data was not shared out with the committee earlier. It is a survey, not a vote.

Cummings: I sent out the results from the PF survey just now. No one asked for it earlier, my apologies.

Public Relations Committee (McCoy)

McCoy: We worked on marketing (*passed out flyers*). We are doing a new webpage. Facebook is getting a face-lift. We are going to go towards Mail Chimp to act as bulletin. I will be speaking to the UC Chancellor in October. Last, we are going to work on three promo videos from footage we have captured over time thanks to the Curriculum committee.

Individual Events Committee (Novack)

Graber: UC a-g accreditation for VPA speech and debate. "f" requirements are hard for students to meet. I can email out the approved format for a VPA UC a-g.

Keller-Firestone: Do not mention the school that received accreditation. The application will be denied and it will draw attention to existing accredited programs.

Fraser: A checkbox on the form asks if another school had it approved.

California High School Speech Association

Pritchard: Make changes, they use a plagiarism check, so please rewrite it.

Congress Committee (Matley)

Matley: Thanks to the committee for helping pound out topic areas for State 2016. We were trying to be more specific. We used a word or phrase to help guide the writing of the bills/resolutions. Please share out the topic areas so we can have more selections. We worked on by-law house cleaning per the President's request.

Curriculum Committee (Prichard)

(Above)

VII. **Old Business**

14-01-C Reuse of pieces

Novak: We did not address this.

Curtis: If we do nothing, what happens?

Fraser: If I re-cut the same piece, I can re-use it. If nothing happens, then that is the status quo.

Johnson: We have read this differently. I understand that we cannot use the same piece.

Fraser: By-law committee spoke to it in the revisions. Same piece in two events as long as it is a different cutting. That is why it came up for discussion.

Larsen: (Reading from section 3 of by-law). Selection is work or cutting?

Motion to remand by Graber, second Abad

Fraser: Emailed to you just now. Please review. The motion on the floor still stands.

Kalashian: We remanded it when discussion was confused. The IE committee was to address it.

Johnson calls the previous question, second James (2/3 vote needed)
Voice vote REMANDED

05-16-15D Allow computers in PF

Prefontaine: Survey was conducted.

Johnson: Committee recommends the motion be passed. I was the sole dissent. The survey shows support to the survey. It ignores the dissenting opinions. I do not have ready access to computers. This clones the problems of other debates. I wrote an article in opposition and have revised it. I stand on the previous oral commentary.

Motion to remove it from the table Fraser, Curtis seconds
Voice vote passes to un-table

Curtis motion, Underwood second
Fails 13-9-2

Curtis: We have talked about this for many meetings. It is going to happen but it is a matter of time. We just needed to see the data. We have discussed this to death. The state wants to see this.

Vepa: 79% supported the proposition.

Barembaum: I am not sure how this is an indicator. How many member schools voted? We wanted to do data-mining. We have not been allowed that ability.

Kalashian: We have discussed this to death. We are getting league pressure to allow this. We need to vote. We sent it out to everyone. What else can we do? Further review of data is a waste of time.

Newkirk moved to end discussion; McGuinn second
2/3 in favor of ending discussion

**Voice vote passes
(computers without internet or plugs allowed in State 2016)**

Johnson: We want the data be available to everyone.

Fraser: All names must be removed before distribution. Include comments with blacked-out names please.

Prefontaine: Ben, you have permission to share.

05-16-I has been withdrawn in light of revisions.

Prefontaine: Does anyone object to simply moving on?

Curtis: May we read the new one?

Graber: I agree

**Motion to postpone Fraser, second Kalashian
Voice vote passes**

05-16-15J Congress bills (remanded)
Abad moves remand, Curtis seconds
Johnson moves previous question, Peroff second
(2/3 needed) 24-1-1
Vote to remand passes voice vote

**05-16-L2 Parli topic selection process (postponed)
Fraser moves to postpone to May, Kalashian seconds**

Abad: I think best practices is general is to allow the committees to weigh in.

Graber: I would normally agree, but since we cannot pass anything in January, we need to discuss this now.

Johnson: I believe this supports the vision of the committee.

End discussion moved by (*someone and seconded by someone over the roar of the crowd*)
Voice vote fails

Keller-Firestone moves to postpone until after lunch second Abad
Voice vote passes

Sarvey: The purpose is to clarify the language. This is not a new process. We all ready approved the language. No change in process.

VIII. New Business**09-12-15A Quorum**

Prefontaine: From the by-law committee: Constitution and by-laws don't match.

Kindred: Our constitution says a quorum is 3/4. The by-laws say 2/3. So you can pass this motion and make the by-laws match the constitution. Or you can amend the constitution to say 2/3. It is hard to change the constitution.

Johnson: This was to eliminate the council from voting on legislation when people left early. That is the history.

Fraser: There was a second motion on this from Walton. 3/4 is too high, that is why we went to 2/3. They changed it only in one place.

Curtis: Do we really need to vote?

Kindred: We were worried if we did that y'all would be upset.

Curtis: We can do this easier.

Johnson: Do not ignore your constitution, if it goes through the by-laws, it is a poor practice.

Kindred: The easy way is to match the by-laws.

Barebaum: I do not see a problem with 3/4's with a 2/3.

Wear: Article 6 is specific. Do we want to vote away the by-law revision?

Johnson: We should not be concerned.

Prefontaine: By-laws say 2/3's.

Larsen: SQ is 3/4 at the beginning, stop the meeting when it goes down to 2/3.

Abad: The by-laws are clear. To begin a meeting we need a quorum, but if people leave as you long as 2/3 but cannot vote or change rules until we have 3/4.

Barebaum: Terry is probably correct. *(Read from the by-law)*

Larsen: We need consistency between documents.

Orfield: Quorum is beginning to end of the meeting. Probably have to go back to the constitution and change that.

Matley: We should vote and move on.

Wear moves to end discussion second by Matley
 Voice vote PASSES

09-12-15B Increase travel compensation rate

Kindred: We want to match mileage to the Fed rate.

Barebaum: Which government?

Kindred: \$0.56 rate.

Abad: The IRS publishes the Standard Mileage Rate. We should use the business rate.

Kindred: I **withdraw** and I will be bring it back.

Barebaum: This table is for deductions.

09-12-15C HOF nomination process

Underwood: Section E, you eliminated secret ballot.

Kindred: That was not the intent.

Underwood: This makes it open to all...that may not be good.

Underwood: E5, means someone not selected is not notified?

Miller: No.

California High School Speech Association

Underwood: Both should be notified, winners and losers, at the same time.

Graber: Are we able to have the HOF speeches not during awards?

Fraser: Procedural fix.

Wear: I think it is good to discuss the possibility to give a deceased person's award to their family.

Fraser moves to table the motion to allow some additions- James seconds.

PASSES

Tabled

09-12-15D School transfer between leagues

Moved by Kindred Johnson seconds

Kindred: The intent is that a school may not move leagues if they have not paid.

James: Current in payment? So if I have a school that moves leagues, pays for which membership?

Abad: Our dues are owed 11/1. So if they transfer?

Kindred: Leagues have interpretive say in this.

Vepa: I am wary if it should pay two league dues for the year.

Johnson: I favor it because it should not be easy to move league to league. This is a logical rule.

Keller-Firestone: This is current practice...it is just on paper now.

Prefontaine: Both leagues must be in agreement. So is it fair to trade-off the payment?

Kalashian: League presidents need some autonomy. Both leagues need to agree.

Kalashian moves, Underwood seconds PASSES closing discussion

Voice vote PASSES

Lunch recess at 12:01pm

Reconvene at 1:07pm

5-16-15L Parli topic selection

Underwood moves Keller-Firestone second

Johnson: We had the format before at State. This is the described language by the committee. Debate committee supported this motion. As Caiti said, we did this last year. We have to rewrite sometimes because they were similar. Some people writing topics did not know how to write them. Adjusting a resolution language is not bad.

Newkirk: Can we potentially resolve both sides -- Either more topics to choose from or allow the committee to write them?

Fraser: I respectfully disagree that the topics were the same. The people asked to write the topics are distinguished debate coaches in the country.

Johnson: There were four coaches looking at the resolutions and they agreed with what I have shared with you. People on the Debate committee viewed the topics and did not agree with the type of resolutions.

Fraser: There were words changed. If the committee wants to reword, fine. The committee changed them all. Is that what the body wants?

Johnson: Some were tweaked to make them better. I do not see the sin in that.

Kalashian: This was to bring checks and balances to the process. There need to be steps along the way. I know that now we have a process. This is better than it has been.

Newkirk: Why can't the process just include more topics? I have not heard a response yet.

Fraser: I was not at the meeting when you decided to do this initially. Delegating it out was a compromise. This process worked out well, especially with 45 topics written. We can find people to write them. There needs to be transparency in the process, no one may share the topics written. Before the tournament, no one but me had seen the topics. I feel this motion breaks the original intent.

Johnson: My wording in the motion is open for more topics to be written. We choose 5 for each round but we could have more.

Abad: Writing topics is hard and people who write them get beaten up. In Parli prep, some of the topic wording changes were odd.

Newkirk: My point is not just more topics but to trade-off so that they do not need to be re-worded. This is not an accusation.

Sarvey: For clarification, no vetting participants had a team in Parli. Kalashian and I were excused from the selection. No one picked a topic with a team in the tournament.

Kalashian: I am not opposed to Einar's argument. We just want transparency and the Debate committee involved.

Underwood: I agree with Kalashian, it became very tedious. Some needed changing, but what Terry said about a better wording topic, all people around this table would not agree with wording. We would have 31 interpretations.

Larsen: Anybody could give Nermin topics. There is too much detail in the motion

**Bosch-McGuinn Divide the Issue, second Fraser.
Voice vote PASSES. Motion Divided at "vetting by the committee"
Part one of division: adding people to the vetting committee if one has an entry in Parli at State.**

Fraser: Why is the debate chair excluding some from the committee.

Johnson: Hoon was not happy because he had other obligations at the tournament.

Abad: I am still okay with the language as long as the language is reflective that all committee members be included.

Kalashian: Sometimes we spend too much time over words.

Keller-Firestone: This is a waste of time.

Larsen: I do not appreciate the distrust which this shows.

Perloff: We get caught up in "what-ifs." Intent is clear.

Wear: Any time we spend on this, we need to make sure we have correct wording.

Question called Newkirk, second Martha to end discussion
PASSED

**Part one of motion to the word VETTING
Division of the House called 17-7-3 PASSES**

Move previous question of part two
Johnson moves Newkirk seconds

**Part two of motion after the word VETTING
7-19-1 FAILS**

12-15-E Area Chair elections

Kindred: We no longer elect Area Chairs with league presidents. We want to align to current practices
Newkirk seconds

VOICE VOTE PASSES

09-12-15F Deadline for electing Area Chairs

Kindred: This is housekeeping.

Larsen moves James seconds
VOICE VOTE PASSES

09-12-15G Election process for elected offices

Kindred: Same language as you agreed to one minute ago.
Newkirk second

Orfield: Term limits?
Body: No

Newkirk calls Larsen seconds
VOICE VOTE PASSES

09-12-15H Resignation of office

Kindred: This is a process procedure. Please review it quickly.
Newkirk seconds

Vepa moves Newkirk seconds
VOICE VOTE PASSES

09-12-15I Scripts for OI

Novak: To prove a public address is difficult if not impossible. That is the purpose of this motion.
Barebaum second

Motion to divide the motion Curtis --- "originated" to "been delivered"
Barebaum seconds
VOICE VOTE PASSES

Curtis: As the one protesting, I have to prove it has not been delivered. This would shift the affirmative duty to the protester.
Graber: An example was offered, Primo Levi piece.

California High School Speech Association

Johnson: You can't do this. I looked at the original rule. The language is missing -- language to make it make sense.

Cummings: This does not make slam poetry okay or legal.

Larsen: It only happens if we pass both halves.

Sarvey: This was brought forth from our league. Many speeches did not originate as public address.

Wear: OI is cloudy and vague.

Fraser: Section A is key. *Reading from the rules and motion*

Martha: If we go only to "deliver" does that open the door for problems?

Kalashian: I agree with Nermin. This would make the life of an Area Chair easier...and coaches. This is a good idea.

Novak moves James seconds the previous question to end discussion
20-3-1 PASSES

Voting on whether to add the phrase "has been delivered" over "original."
Division of the House PASSES 15-11-1

Part two of the motion now being discussed.

Barembaum: This is the section that removes the burden of proof on the student.

Peroff: The burden of proof should be on the protester.

Bosch-McGuinn seconds

Kindred: The responsibility is on the protester. I am not in favor of this.

Miller: If the burden of proof is on the delivery, then the language of the previous ought to be changed.

Curtis: Students still have to turn it in and prove it. It is not fully disengaged.

Cummings: Area Chairs' job is to verify the script.

Kindred: There is no way to prove it.

Bosch-McGuinn: This is only specific to OI. That is not fair.

Graber: The introduction is the time to verify. Having this made my job easier as league president.

Fraser: This is the only event that one does not have show copyright, etc. The speaker ought to prove it is a speech. There needs to be a word change.

Matley: Passing the first part makes this easier for the second part.

Johnson moves to amend and change the language the language from originated to has been delivered.
FAILS for lack of second

Barembaum: We are still looking for a manuscript.

Graber: The script has no information about where/when it was delivered.

Wear: We as coaches sign off on this. Do we want the student to take an extra step? I am suggesting that the student still have to prove. Voting no.

Kalashian: We used to not have to worry about this. As we adopted language through this, we need less things for the league president to be responsible. Before, we either trusted people or cheaters were not caught.

Bosch-McGuinn-It is easier to prove it was not delivered.

Matley: How does one prove it does not exist?

Graber: Victim impact statements are not always delivered. Some are written statements. If this goes away I cannot ask for that proof.

California High School Speech Association

Wear: Proof is in the text or location delivered.

Johnson: I vote that we go with the deletion. Public address is defined later in the rule event.

Prefontaine: Currently, the only requirement is the text. There is nothing else to prove it was delivered.

Vepa: The affirmative burden should not lie with the student.

Larsen: There are two paper trails that exist.

Kindred calls question Peroff seconds concerning the second part of the amending
VOICE VOTE PASSES

09-12-15J Search engine for OI (source validation)
Second by Peroff

Graber: This would address the problem of dead links. This would allow a screen shot of a search engine to show it is legitimate.

Fraser: For context, when we added the Internet as being legal in OI, we felt that if an out-of-print source is bad, then a dead link should also be illegal.

Matley: I agree. We had a problem like this. Readily available is key to make a level playing ground.

Barembaum: If the search engine shows that it is on the website, then it exists.

Vepa: This motion is about using the cache available.

Johnson: I would vote against this. There is already a fix in the status quo.

Miller: It seems to me that this is the same requirement as other interp events

Graber: *Example of difficulty in finding bad links...*

Previous question Johnson second Larsen
Division of the House
PASSES 13-10-4

09-12-15K Change "some" Congress rules

Matley: Housekeeping stuff really. We give five priority cards for prelims. We want to combine two sections into one section. By-laws say scores up to 10. We want to be able to go higher for tie-breaking purposes only. This rearranges the wording for priority cards. I was hoping we could do this with By-law committee, but Congress committee was forced to present it.

Johnson Seconds

Johnson moves Newkirk seconds
VOICE VOTE PASSES

09-12-15L Transparency in elections

Vepa: The purpose comes from Area Chair elections from when we voted for ours'. The Area requested vote count and was denied. This would remedy the problem we had in May when we asked for election results. The point of transparency is good.

Second by Abad

Vepa: The coaches in our district support this.

Fraser: I was opposed to disclosure. With small volume of voters, there needs to be some sensitivity. It creates anxiety. Leagues get torn apart by vote counting.

Bosch-McGuinn: It is unethical for us to not disclose.

Barembaum: I agree with the motion and Nermin, but we are able to determine individual vote counts.

Kalashian: When we vote in this body we disclose our vote. We need to make CHSSA look beyond reproach.

Peroff: Names were asked to be on the ballot how I understand it. It is not an anonymous vote. It will be contentious regardless.

Cummings: Obviously the Exec Council knows the vote count. One candidate sits on that council and knows the results. We need a separate process maybe.

Newkirk: Some of these issues could be avoided with a better process. A different area could audit the count. That may add faith in the body.

Keller-Firestone: When we vote here for HOF or state officers, it is a ballot.

Fraser: The only reason the number of votes is relevant, is because we need to have faith in our process.

Vepa: There are two reasons, coaches feel disenfranchised not knowing the results and second to determine whether or not to run again.

Johnson: I like the idea of an independent audit. I will vote against and ask that we make a process.

Vepa: Feelings are not as important as ethics.

Prichard: I am here to vote as what is best for the organization, not hurt feelings. We need to make us look better as an organization.

Newkirk: I agree with Rita. If we are distrustful about ethics, how will numbers solve that?

Fraser: The league had a hard time because of the elections.

Cummings: Hurting feelings is bad. But we are talking about a league that does not trust their area chair.

Fraser: Will a vote count fix that?

Miller: First, feelings are valid. Second, a small group, area is not a league, it is three leagues. Third, how can numbers alone fix the distrust?

Newkirk: I expect to propose an audit system in January.

Underwood: I was not going to speak to this, but I have to. At least five people voted and asked that their vote be secret. Probably because names were on the ballot. I still have the ballots. If needed, I can produce those ballots without names. I feel that I am being challenged. I will never again collect ballots. I feel attacked and accused.

Newkirk moves second by Bosch-McGuinn

DIVISION OF THE HOUSE

12-13-2

Prefontaine: I vote no because the Historian does not have those powers. I have designated him to do that.

Underwood: A simple motion out of order at this time?

Prefontaine: Yes, because we will have an audit motion brought forth in January.

Vepa: I am discouraged because I was not aware of that.

Prefontaine: I could not do anything right for you at this point, obviously.

Postpone HOF discussion until May. PASSED

California High School Speech Association

IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER

Fraser: I am having a problem with booking hotels due to unions and meal options.

Barembaum: If no other choice we could do it, but it would cost us.

Curtis: How many will be at the January meeting?

Fraser: January will be a working meeting.

Prefontaine: Maybe January meeting is only one day.

Vepa: We have voted to eliminate the January meeting in the past.

Prefontaine: Do you have a better date?

Vepa: January 2-3?

The Body: "Winter vacation"

Matley: Congress manual we give out before State I wanted to give you a head's up. Specifically we have had clunky procedures. We fixed that so please make note and let your coaches know.

Underwood: November 1st is the deadline for HOF nominations.

Cummings: Today was emotionally intense. I feel proud to be in this body. I have a lot of trust in all of you.

Abad: We need to approve Neil's budget.

Fraser moves second Abad PASSES
VOICE VOTE PASSES

Next CHSSA meeting to be announced. Check the website

Meeting adjourned at 4:10PM

Respectfully submitted by Reed Niemi

CHSSA Secretary