

November 11 2016
Philadelphia, PA
NCA National Convention
Marriott Downtown Room: Grand Salon E
Phi Rho Pi Executive Committee Meeting
THIS DOCUMENT IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY
MINTES TO BE APPROVED AT THE 2017 NCA Convention

Executive Members in Attendance: Jeff Przybylo (President), Duane Fish (Vice President of Tournament), Jolinda Ramsey (Vice President of Association), John Nash (Recording Secretary), Wade Hescht (Secretary-Treasurer), Cynthia Dewar (Comptroller). In addition – 16 members were present.

I. Call to Order – Jeff Przybylo
Call to Order at 8:07 am.

II. Officer Reports

A. Secretary Report – John Nash

1. Presented minutes from Las Vegas, NV, November 2015 (NCA). **MSP with a 6-0 vote.**
2. Minutes from PRP Business Meeting in Costa Mesa, CA and Las Vegas, NV have been posted on the website for membership perusal. Updated the PRP Webpage: Links to PRP Facebook and National Tournament Host webpage are there. Updated the PRP webpage with membership. Updated the PRP list serve.

B. Treasurer Report – Wade Hescht

1. Total Income: \$52,960.49. Total Expenses: \$52,236.80. Net Ordinary Income \$723.69. Net Income \$2,768.62. **MSP with a 6-0 vote.** Commented that we had a healthy tournament.

C. Comptroller Report – Cynthia Dewar-Kudsi

1. Full national implementation of the Dodd Frank Act has forced us to change how we hold our money and conduct our meetings.
2. The bank that currently holds the PRP Trust no longer wants to serve as the Trustee. It has been difficult to find a bank in Texas to agree to hold the money. The bank that holds the Trust has taken action to dissolve it. We are working to take such action and will need to ask the Executive Board to convene to vote on necessary actions related to the Trust.

D. Vice President of Association Report – Jolinda Ramsey

1. NCA – next year – went to the Planning Committee meeting – NCA will be 11/16 – 11/19 in Dallas, TX. Legacy Training Series will be occurring at NCA. Slam Poetry event will occur at NCA. Same number of slots as this past year. We are remaining constant with slots. There will still be a day of service at NCA.
2. Accepting bids for 2019 Phi Rho Pi.
3. CRAFT is in this same room directly after business meeting

E. President Report – Jeff Przybylo

1. The Executive Committee has worked really hard this past year. They have been meeting and working to make sure the PRP Tournament hotel situation is resolved and that the Trust / bank situation is resolved.

F. Vice President of Tournament – Duane Fish

1. Site Visit – many issues with the initial visit. Hotel came up with an alternate suggestion to move us to a neighboring hotel. Nathan Carter has worked extremely hard to help make this occur. Sheraton Hotel has many more benefits (much more fast food – walk to train station is shorter at about 4 minutes – much more convention space – more practice space prior to start of tournament – better for the students – downside is that the hotel is not as grand as the original hotel).
2. Still working on the brochure for the tournament.
3. Changes sent out to the membership on the list serve.
4. Nathan Carter added that there is a poll on the host webpage to vote for the PRP guest speaker. He mentioned the airports and shuttles available are explained on the host webpage. Free Parking. Walmart nearby for shopping.
5. RFP – working to upgrade our RFP with hotels to make certain that future tournaments don't have issues
6. Software Update – Will continue to still use Joy of Tournaments.

III. Committee Reports

- A.** Rules – Change rules in breaking Interpreter's Theatre (see below for rule change). Jeff Przybylo explained the exec board has temporarily passed the rule change. The membership will be able to vote on the rule change at the PRP 2017 business meeting. Rule Change passed with 6-0 vote from the exec committee.
- B.** No other committee reports.

IV. Old Business

- A.** None

V. New Business

- A. The Executive Board discussed the terms of the PRP Trust. Comptroller Dewar-Kudsi talked with a financial advisor who clarified that the terms of the Trust specify that it can only be used to support the PRP National Tournament. The Executive Committee is committed to the intention of the Trust. The Comptroller suggested that a percentage of money would go to enhancing the student experience at Nationals. The Executive Board discussed several ideas such as the reduction of fees for students, free t-shirts, and providing coffee for students, etc.
- B. Motion (Dewar-Kudsi): To proceed with dissolving the Trust and using an estimated \$6,000-\$9,000 of the Trust money to pay for legal and court fees. Motion was seconded by Duane Fish. Motion passed with a 6-0 vote.
- C. Duane Fish – mentioned that if programs need help financially to let him know.

VI. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 8:52 am.

Respectfully Submitted by:



John Nash, Recording Secretary

Phi Rho Pi National Tournament and Convention
2016 COMMITTEE RESOLUTION PROPOSAL FORM
NAME OF COMMITTEE: **Rules Committee**

COMMITTEE CHAIR'S SIGNATURE:

Phi Rho Pi coaches and students who wish to propose rule changes, new rules, constitutional changes or additions, etc. MUST COMPLETE THIS FORM and present it at the appropriate committee meeting. All proposals presented at the General Business Meeting must come out of committees. Each proposal presented will be designated as either recommended or not

recommended by the committee. Additional Committee Resolution Proposal Forms may be acquired from the Recording Secretary or the Committee Chair.

Completed Committee Resolution Proposal Forms must also include:

1. The correct wording of the proposed resolution

Delete Section II Competition Rules VIII Debate and Interpreters' Theatre Eliminations

A. When a Debate or Interpreters Theatre event has LESS than 16 entries:

1. Elimination rounds must be held.
2. All teams with a 4-2 record in Debate or an 8-4 record in Interpreters Theatre will be guaranteed advancement to an elimination round. The next highest ranking Debate or Interpreters Theatre teams may be added to fill out a bracket, as long as no more than half the field advances to elimination rounds. A bracket shall be divisible by four.
3. If there are more than four (4) entries in the first elimination round, but not enough to complete a bracket, the top teams will be protected.
4. Typically, there shall be two (2) GOLDS, two (2) SILVERs, and the rest BRONZE. This may be adjusted for very small events in which case there may be 1 gold, 1 silver, and 2 bronze awards.

B. When a Debate or Interpreters Theatre event has MORE than 16 entries:

1. Two elimination rounds must be held.
2. All teams with a 4-2 record in Debate or an 8-4 record in Interpreters Theatre will be guaranteed advancement to an elimination round. The next highest ranking Debate or Interpreters Theatre teams may be added to fill out a bracket, as long as no more than half the field advances to elimination rounds. A bracket shall be divisible by four.
3. All teams losing in Elimination round 1 will receive BRONZE. All teams losing Elimination round 2 will receive SILVER. Those winning in Elimination round 2 will receive GOLD.

Replace with the following: Section II Competition Rules: VIII Debate and Interpreters' Theatre Eliminations

- A. Debate Eliminations: All teams with a 4-2 record in Debate will be guaranteed advancement to an elimination round. The next highest ranking Debate team(s) may be added to fill out a bracket, as long as no more than half the field advances to elimination rounds. No more than three teams may be added to fill out a bracket.
- B. Interpreters' Theatre Eliminations: All teams with a 7-5 record in Interpreters' Theatre will be guaranteed advancement to an elimination round. The next highest ranking Theatre(s) may be added to fill out a bracket, as long as no more than half the field advances to elimination rounds. No more than three theatres may be added to fill out a bracket.
- C. Typically, there shall be two (2) GOLDS, two (2) SILVERs, and the rest BRONZE. This may be adjusted for very small events in which case there may be 1 gold, 1 silver, and 2 bronze awards.

- D. If there are more than four (4) entries in the first elimination round, but not enough to complete a bracket without going over the 50% rule, the top teams will be protected.

2. Rationale FOR the resolution

- There has been confusion about the current rule and the delineation of advancing teams. This has resulted in controversy, conflict, and ultimately feelings of arbitrary application of the current rule.
- Interpreters' Theatre is the ONLY event that does not advance based upon a winning record. For Debate a 4-2 record is a winning record. For individual events a 6 is a winning record and we have even moved as a body to guarantee a 7 in individual events. With two judges in each round, winning 7 of 12 ballots is a winning record and should be advanced to the elimination rounds.
- Having higher standards for IT makes it more difficult to recruit entries to that event. We have seen a decrease in entries in that event over the years from a high of 27 nine years ago to just 16 this year. Having a level playing field may encourage others to put together entries for this event.

3. Rationale AGAINST the resolution

- This would add sweepstakes points to those theatres that receive 7 ballots, but did not receive 8 ballots

THE COMMITTEE X RECOMMENDS THE COMMITTEE DOES NOT RECOMMEND

PROPOSAL RATIONALE FOR THE RESOLUTION:

1. Decisions like this are really left up to the Tournament Director under our Constitution and By-Laws. However, the issue of the breaks in IT have always been extremely delicate. The committee believes that breaking all winning records is fair (7-5). The 50% rule is NOT to go OVER 50%. It is perfectly fine to take up to 50% and we feel certain PRP Tournament Directors have done that in small fields of CX Debate and perhaps IT before.
2. The current wording of the rule has been confusing under certain circumstances and it is time we made it clearer.

PROPOSAL RATIONALE AGAINST THE RESOLUTION:

1. I am not sure the claim of confusion and controversy (the main justification it seems) is large scale. We should take it seriously if there is true controversy and

confusion in the membership about PRP Rules. Statements that there is significant confusion and controversy should be supported. In the proposal I do not see evidence of this and based at looking at the effect this rule would have I am inclined to vote against since there doesn't seem to be a "trend."

2. There are two principals at play here. The notion that all winning records (4-2 in debate and 7-5) in IT should advance VS. the principle that at a National Tournament breaking 50% of the field is generally frowned upon. I think if we approve this rule we will likely see other proposals that other events should consider breaking 50% of the field. I think that would be bad for the tournament. I do not think we should make a special accommodation for anyone event when it comes to breaking. If the norm for all events is to never advance 50% of the field, we should hold that notion.
3. I believe the past two years there were tough breaks in IT (my own team was victim of this two years ago); though sympathetic to that unfortunate result, I do not see the "current" rule as something that triggers tough breaks. The data I looked at suggests our existing rule operates just fine as is.
4. The crux of the proposal argues there needs to be clarity about what the rules are. The proposal "claims" that there is assumption that breaks in IT are determined subjectively. I do not see that as the case. It appears the existing rules were always followed as printed. Further, this new rule does not seem any clearer to me nor does it result in more IT breaks (past application analysis shows this).

I think it would be bad to set a precedence that encourages 50% of the field at the National Tournament to advance to elimination rounds. I am not persuaded we will see a decline in IT participation due to the existing rules. There are so many other factors and variables that determine if a school brings an IT or not, I do not see evidence that this break rule is a major determining factors. And I also think that if there is confusion about any rule, we should first seek to clarify the rules to those who are confused or under the assumption that the tournament has operated using subjective analysis to determine breaks as opposed to the clearly printed rules.