

I. The meeting was called to order by President Prefontaine at 9:15AM

II. Roll Call

Absent: Nermin Kamel, Rita Prichard, Minnia Curtis, Mikendra McCoy, Terry Abad, Kristine LaPierre

Proxies: Bob Stockton (for Minnia Curtis (SDIVSL), Ben Cummings (for Mikendra McCoy)

III. Minutes from September 2014 reviewed and approved.

IV. Officer Reports

President Prefontaine

We have a set of proposals that will go through letter J.

Executive minutes are being shared out, please review.

Graber: Will there be a DVD at State this year?

Peroff: We will have a Parli DVD at State. It is in the last editing process.

Johnson: I would like to see it before distribution.

Peroff: I don't see why.

Johnson: There have been errors in the past. Many eyes, many minds help.

Prefontaine: Please remember the Expos scholarship available this year from the California School Librarians Association is generous and exciting. After students qualify and before they go to State is when the application is due. They will present the \$1000 to the winner at the awards ceremony.

Stockton: Carmendale's memorial was in Turlock for past students, colleagues and the like. Scott Wunn was present along with Don Crabtree. People shared memories and it was nice to meet so many people who were touched by Carmendale.

Underwood: The real Carmendale was well represented. Scott Wunn shared that he wished to speak.

Prefontaine: Congratulations to Natalie Weber [CHSSA Hall of Fame member), who just won the Oberle Award, Bob Stockton will explain.

Stockton: The award is prestigious and a true treasure. NCA backs the award through a portfolio-based evaluation. It is difficult and a truly respected award. It is national...to win is a coup.

Prefontaine: Timelines have been tightened this year. Please get the word out now so that non-punctual people meet deadlines. Executive notes have been distributed to all through email and should replace the Area Reports below.

Vice President of Activities Fraser

(See Executive Council minutes attached)

Vice President of Curriculum Prichard

Treasurer Barembaum

(Treasure report attached)

Barembaum: Nothing to add.

Prefontaine: Honorariums?

California High School Speech Association

Barembaum: This will mainly be on Reed [IE pit boss], as each event is completed, the winner's name will be written on the check and distributed at awards. I will be there until 6PM.

Secretary/Editor Niemi

Niemi: Please send me any Parli articles! We need material for the bulletin and I would like to publish one soon on Parli specifically. I have received a great piece from Bruce Jordan and Bryan St. Amant that will be in there. I would like to have it out sooner than later but I need submissions.

Historian Underwood

Underwood: I would like to pass out a handout of HOF DVD's. Three have been added online: Carl Adams, David Matley, and Sandra Maguire. I have a dream to have them all. Please help. We will be voting for HOF later today, please read up on them. You get two votes -- you may place them however you want. Your league also has two votes. I have never seen more than six leagues vote. February 15th is the deadline for league votes to be sent to me. 60% of the vote is required to be selected.

TOM VAVRA

Barembaum: Tom is from WBFL. A great supporter and been around forever. Ran the Loyola program for years and is still involved there. He is trying to get IE's and Congress back up and running. He has had champions in the past. Most importantly, a HOF person should be one who has devoted time and life to the activity. He is well respected. Honest guy, nice guy, and deserving.

Munsell: I have known Tom for years. He served on Council and was very effective. He concentrated on debate and Congress. Very solid individual.

Stockton: He represents CHSSA but he also showed incredible classroom practices even though he retired.

Johnson: Tom's NFL points have never been tracked accurately. If they had been, he'd have many diamonds.

BILL HEALY

Keller-Firestone: Bill Healy has been in the CFL for years. He has run Extemp prep for decades. It takes time and detail to be effective in prep. He has champions at all levels in league, state, and nationally. He has worked with the NFL on Extemp as well.

Ko: Bill is one anyone would want in their league. His ethics are the highest. He has worked Extemp prep for years. He had an opportunity to help ALL students. He became great friends with Extempers from all the schools in the league. The other schools' students wanted to have a party for him because they felt like he was their coach. He wanted all students, regardless of program, to be their best. He looks out for all students. In prep, he figured out how to encourage new coaches to start-up in Extemp. Overall he was many things, but mainly he was a teacher. In California, there is no coach close to his level of champions coached. 80 state finalists. 29 state champions. In the HOF we value both service and competition -- Bill is the best example.

Johnson: I remember five years ago we had a great selection. Tom is the only coach re-nominated from that incredible list. Please take that into consideration.

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

Keller-Firestone: Todd Newkirk, welcome as Rep at Large. We're waiting for confirmation of the site for 2016.

Area 2 Chair Darling

Nothing to report. Area 2 rocks.

Area 3 Chair Kindred

Nothing to report.

Area 4 Chair Munsell

Munsell: Regarding State at Vista Murrietta: It is a commute from the hotels, nothing close. It is a beautiful campus and they will keep you happy. Please try to avoid going to the hotels between rounds. Get there and stay there, commute traffic can be bad. Nermin will release the hotel rooms March 1, 2015. Please spread the word to students and leagues to take care of our host campus.

VI. Committee Reports

Debate Committee (Underwood)

(See Executive Council minutes attached)

Public Relations Committee (Cummings)

Cummings: The AV person at State 2015 site wants to help make the awards ceremony the best ever. We have been developing things to do for students prior to awards. We want to make a slide show, photo booth, and so on. It will be monitored to insure nothing inappropriate will be posted.

We would like to get a Mail Chimp account in order to communicate more effectively. We need \$300 a year to pay for it.

Underwood: Will we have to sign up?

Cummings: It will be the affirmative duty of schools to sign-up. Lastly, we have a new website link and it will be chssa.org. It will be up soon! Thank you, Neil. Any suggestions for the website would be appreciated.

Graber: Debate ballots are not on the website. Is that being fixed?

Prefontaine: We are taking care of that in the ad hoc committee. Are the appendices to be considered worth voting on? The ballots and cover sheets matching by-laws -- that is a Nermin question.

Barembaum: We need a stipend for the website?

Willford: That was from PR, not Curriculum

Cummings: We are asking for money for Mail Chimp. *[No motion ever made]*

Barembaum: Is it possible to make the videos available only for members only on the web?

Cummings: I think so.

Individual Events Committee (Novak)

(See Executive Council minutes attached)

Congress Committee (Matley)

(See Executive Council minutes attached)

Curriculum Committee (Wilford)

Martha: We are working on a judging video. Have any of you created an instructional video for judges in the past? We would love to see it.

Prefontaine: All of the videos are subject to review. The written instructions are the best codified instructions. These will be reviewed and vetted properly.

Keller-Firestone: Will there be a disclaimer at the end of the videos? We need one.

California High School Speech Association

Peroff: We have not updated any videos thus far. Rita probably will update.

Graber: Rules get outdated quickly.

Prefontaine: So we hope that it will be general.

VII. Old Business**14-01-C Reuse of Pieces (Remanded to IE Committee)**

WITHDRAWN until May

14-09-F Definition of "Piece" (Remanded to IE Committee)

Johnson: The existing rule is vague. A selection is a quotation from a larger work, or less that is complete. If the poem is less than 150 words, you must use the whole poem. I am trying to clarify language to show intent.

Novak: We reworded it. You should have it in your email box.

Johnson: I am fine with that. Thank you. I withdraw my original motion in favor of the IE committee's revision submitted as 14-09-F.

MOVE TO ACCEPT THE LANGUAGE FROM THE IE COMMITTEE

JOHNSON MOVES NOVAK SECONDS

KINDRED CALLS THE QUESTION NOVAK SECONDS

VOICE VOTE **PASSES**

14-09-I U Unfilled State Qual Spots (Remanded to Standing Committees)

WITHDRAWN UNTIL MAY

VIII. New Business**10-01-15A Fix dates for By-Law Change**

Moved by Niemi, Second Underwood

Niemi: This is meant to level the playing field for all. I have not introduced legislation in over a decade and I hope that shows how important I feel this issue is.

Johnson: Speaking in favor of this, the October 1 date is appropriate. Why do we change rules mid-season?

Graber: What if a mistake is discovered?

Niemi: Interpretation is key as in any rules regulating organization. That is the purpose of the Protest Committee.

Underwood: What about Parli topics motion?

Niemi: It would take effect after this meeting.

Johnson: If in effect later, then why pass it? This is why not to change it. We need a set of set rules by October, yes. But, we can uphold the gentlemen's agreement and only change rules when necessary.

Kindred: If you don't want things to change then vote no.

Karson: I understand the comments, but I think one thing this does is force business to be voted on in September and May. We need to be tough about this.

Cummings: Constant changing is difficult for us. We need a set of rules at the beginning. It is hard to keep the document updated when we change it so often and creates multiple versions.

California High School Speech Association

Niemi: I do not think it is unreasonable to have a single set of rules for the year and then change in May and/or September. I feel it is fairer. Changing our by-laws in January is similar to us teachers changing our syllabus mid-semester.

Matley: We lose sight of students and coaches not present here. Please think about this when voting. We need to be fair to all parties around the state.

Johnson: Legislative bodies need to know the stuff in advance, and we are getting better at that.

The Protest Committee can interpret the problems. These kids need to know the rules.

Prefontaine: That is why there is a review committee now. The language could be unclear. Having a fixed document gives us time to fix the problems.

**KARSON CALLS THE QUESTION UNDERWOOD SECONDS
VOICE VOTE **PASSES****

10-01-15B Revise CBSR Boundaries

Moved by Pielstick, Second Niemi

Pielstick: We made a mistake and found an error in the By-laws insofar as boundaries and geography. I feel the rationale of the motion is best to look at for a full explanation.

JAMES CALLS THE QUESTION GRABER SECONDS

PASSES

10-01-15C Clarify Expos Timing Rules

Moved by Johnson, Second Graber

Johnson: I have noticed that Expos students change the room around before the round starts. How our current rule reads does not cover this. This makes a difference between what is in the room versus what the speaker brings into the room.

Wilford: Your concern is moving the room around?

Johnson: Yes, this is to avoid confusion.

Peroff: Why are we creating rules for something that is not a problem?

Martha: We should not wait for this to be an issue. Let us be pro-active. The later speakers are at a disadvantage from the early speakers when it comes to timing set-up.

Novak: How often has this been a problem?

Larsen: Moving furniture is part of the time and it should be fixed after speaking.

Graber: Expos is the only event with visual aids. Martha is correct, the students are not responsible for the room they are assigned. I feel Einar's motion is required. There is a lot of confusion about how to time Expos. This is a typical issue and this clarifies the timing even more.

Prefontaine: Clarification question. Any furniture? What about furniture being used BY the student for boards rather than furniture being moved for creating the staging area? Are both excluded from time?

Johnson: We do not want to time any furniture moving in timing. I do not crank legislation out for no reason. This occurred to me because of watching Expos and I feel this is a loophole. It can be amended, but we need to codify our timing vagueness in the rules.

Matley: Would this give me an opportunity to bring stuff in that I would not have under the status quo rule?

California High School Speech Association

Johnson: Yes, as when I bought a table for one of my speakers in the past.

NOVAK CALLS THE QUESTION WILFORD SECONDS
DIVISION OF THE HOUSE 9/12/4 **FAILS**

Recess at 11:25AM

Reconvened at 12:48PM

10-01-15D Revise Distribution of Unfilled Slots

Moved by Johnson, Second Larsen

Johnson: In September we talked about this and the immediate need due to penalties from 2014. The purpose of this motion is a band-aid and does not preclude other solutions later. We just don't have anything regarding penalties in the bylaws now.

Graber: This just adds the penalty piece to the status quo?

Johnson: Correct. This solves it for now and if we want to discuss the larger issues later, let's do it.

Karson: We intend to bring forward a different proposal later.

Johnson: Yes. This is functional for now only.

Ko: There were two problems trying to be solved by Nermin's proposal. The fix was trying to address the penalty scenario but also address the fact that the spots are going to the same leagues regardless of size or strength.

Johnson: There are many people who do not like how in Nermin's proposal spots do not stay in the Area.

Barembaum: What about just turn the arrows in different directions depending on penalties and non-entries (unfilled) so that weak leagues aren't giving spots to the same league for both.

Sarvey: I don't think penalties indicate a strong or weak league. Penalties can happen in any league.

Johnson: I just don't want to rush something else. This is just a quick fix for now. Nermin feels that a floating spot should go to the top school in the state. That philosophy is based on only the best should go to State. My position is different. It should stay in the Area. I am only adding a procedural fix to suffice until a new proposal is brought forth in the next meeting.

CUMMINGS CALLS THE QUESTION KARSON SECONDS
VOICE VOTE **PASSES**

10-01-15E Modify Cross-Examination Rule concerning Oral Prompting

Moved by Johnson, Second Stockton

Johnson: Historically, I know a lot of what has happened on Council. When Ballingal put this language in the by-laws this caused much discussion. Prompting is new. Circuit-style is where this got "weirded out." I feel Ballingal's concerns have been answered in September by the motion passed regarding protests and the protest committee. If a student prompts a partner once in the round, the Protest Committee can discern. The entire CX being answered by one debater is not tolerable or educational. We have flexibility to allow the Protest Committee to adjudicate, but this is at least means a protest can be made. This is circuit versus normalcy.

Newkirk: Policies that delete judge jurisdiction are not good. They need to decide what is good and bad in the round. The judge can adjudicate.

California High School Speech Association

Matley: The judge can use this as a factor. This is not in our judging instructions. Judges use all type of factors when judging. Without this, the judge can still decide. Einar made a clear point; this is up to the Protest Committee to decide. I like the motion.

Underwood: The Debate Committee supports this proposal.

Karson: Judging subjectivity is important, but we need to have rules that are enforceable. The rule says, no tag-teaming. Educationally speaking, if you have two speakers sharing a burden in debate, they need to share that burden in order to grow better together.

Newkirk: When I read this, I see some problems with punishing young teams that are learning.

Partners need to communicate in the round. We need to allow judges discretion, but this makes more problems for parent-judges. Just because a cop catches you speeding does not mean you will get a ticket.

Pielstick: I agree with Todd.

Johnson: In Duo we require balance. Also, in September we passed a by-law concerning the Protest Committee (Johnson read from protest committee debate from the September minutes). How this rule reads now, I drop teams as a judge because the rule allows me to.

Newkirk: Asking paradigms before a round is a good thing. Adapting is key.

Johnson: I vehemently, philosophically disagree. Adaptation is not normal in the real world.

Barembaum: Adaptation is important. As a judge though, I have seen students ignore paradigms.

Multiple judges in the round though is the rub.

Newkirk: So one picks their judges they are going for.

<p>LARSEN MOVES UNDERWOOD SECONDS DIVISION OF THE HOUSE 15/7/4 PASSES</p>

Graber: POI--When does this go into effect?

Prefontaine: Next competitive season. 2015-2016.

<p>10-01-15F Modify Timeline for Script Protests</p>

Moved by Kindred, Second Novak

Kindred: As the language reads currently, one has until December 31st to protest a script. That date is too far out. We would like to limit it and that it is the intent of this motion.

Barembaum: If a person hears the piece in the finals, can they file a protest?

Kindred: It would be performance, not script.

Underwood: Why would you eliminate semis and finals protests?

Keller-Firestone: How many of you would like to gather around after awards and gather the parties involved in the protest?

Novak: As a former Area Chair, Shirley is correct. We discussed a protest for an hour after awards.

Underwood: I have done that, too. But should we make guidelines based on convenience? I understand what you are trying to do.

Prefontaine: This affects sweepstakes, final standing, and many other issues.

Graber: We have had speeches in finals that are illegal, how can we protest it?

Matley: It seems to me that Area Chairs finalize the script, why are we then DQing the student?

Cummings: This is not about us, it is about the students. It is on the coach, league president, and area chair.

California High School Speech Association

Karson: The coversheet is signed by student, president, area chairs, etc. All these steps are made to avoid the final round protest. Many people are targeting the best speakers at times. We are always worried about the negative.

Kindred: Some people may have special knowledge, but not all of us. I voted no on some protests because there is no way we would know it is illegal.

NOVAK CALLS THE QUESTION DRIGGS SECONDS
VOICE VOTE **PASSES**

10-01-15G Motion to Revise By-Laws for Student Eligibility
Kindred moves Novak seconds

NOVAK CALLS THE QUESTION KINDRED SECONDS
VOICE VOTE **PASSES**

Barembaum: I would appreciate a reintroduction of this topic to discuss later.

10-01-15H TI Clarification
Moved by Larsen, Second Kindred

Larsen: Citation of material is a fragment sentence. We would like to strike it.

Prefontaine: *Read from IE Rules Article IX, section 4, paragraph B, 4, b page 9* This is a typo, I will fix it.

Larsen: We will **WITHDRAW** this, thank you.

10-01-15I TI Alignment
Moved by Novak, Second Graber

Graber: This came up in December. An empty binder was used and we checked and it was empty. "may" makes the script optional, "must" is what we require in the by-laws. We are aligning the language with the rules.

Darling calls the question Driggs seconds
VOICE VOTE **PASSES**

10-01-15J Parli Topic Selection
Moved by Underwood, Second Johnson

Underwood: I am sorry you received communication from Nermin prior to the introduction of this proposal. I apologize. I hope you read the motion. Debate Committee took the proposed motion from

California High School Speech Association

Nermin and merely extended it. We tried to make it clearer. I don't see the problem. Debate Committee was unanimous.

Johnson: The root of this is: do you want the best possible topics at State? An evenly balanced resolution is required in debate, but not impromptu or Extemp. This is unique. In tab rooms, it happens three minutes before the round. This is not good because it makes a weak topic. Nermin says it is her right to select every topic for every event in State. My problem with her position is that her procedure can be viewed as suspect. More hands in things with more checks and balances is good. In our league we use vetting procedures and come up with three topics for a round and put them in envelopes. This proposal says the five possible resolutions are vetted by the debate committee, three are selected, and a blind draw for the resolution is from the three selected by the committee. No one knows for sure what the topic is going to be. Nermin doesn't have to do all this herself; the committee can write the 45 resolutions. We are happy as committee to do this. The tournament director is telling us we cannot do this. The debate committee needs a say in the topics.

Willford: Is this for this year?

Underwood: If this passes, I will give you the topic areas after the vote. We send these to Nermin, and she creates the topics.

Munsell: We already have this parallel with Congress. We trust that those coaches will not share the bills. Why do we not trust the Debate Committee?

Newkirk: Who produces the resolutions?

Underwood: We decide the areas, Nermin writes the topics.

Sarvey: Anyone can write these for Nermin as a designee. This is less than the number of topics for impromptu or extemp, but it could be similarly outsourced. We want more resolutions so three strong ones are in the blind draw and there is not last minute resolution revision in case one is found not to have equal ground. We are asking that people invested in debate are allowed to help ensure resolutions with equal ground and relevance because sometimes resolutions sound great until they are evaluated for equal ground by multiple eyes.

Peroff: Designee could be anybody, right? The language does not restrict Nermin.

Willford: Not at all.

Pielstick: We are trying to write good policy for the organization, not just Nermin. This returns some authority to the Debate Committee.

Newkirk: Having balanced topics is good and needed.

Karson: We are trying to avoid the appearance of impropriety.

Newkirk: What is the exact language of this proposal? What if only two of the five are good or one?

Johnson: Sealed envelope topics need to be strong. Starting with five will give us three. The more randomness in the selection of topic is good. Go with the way it is and we can fix it later if three becomes a problem but three keeps the blind draw more objective.

Underwood: The draw of three will be done in the tab room by a tournament official.

<p style="text-align: center;">KARSON CALLS THE QUESTION PEROFF SECONDS VOICE VOTE PASSES</p>

Parli Topic Areas State 2015

- Round 1 Education
- Round 2 Environment
- Round 3 Politics
- Round 4 Technology
- Round 5 National Security
- Round 6 Health

Round 7 Media
Round 8 Right and Liberties
Round 9 Economy

IX. Good of the Order

Hall of Fame ballots handed out and voting took place

Middle School Students

Johnson: I hope everyone here knows that you get four years of high school competition. With middle school students, they should be ineligible after grade 10.

CD Liner Notes

Graber: I have been telling students to download the sheet music. Please share out with your leagues as this is very helpful.

50 Words Quoted in Piece

Graber: It must be identified verbally in your speech. Check the by-laws for details.

Central Valley Meeting

Cummings: May we have a meeting in the Central Valley, please? We always spend more money traveling than any other area. Sacramento is still two hours from us. Fresno would be best. Yes, Fresno.

League Presidents' Meeting on Fridays

Karson: We did not have a lot come to our league presidents' meeting. Thanks to the three that came. It is good to talk without others being around. We can get different ideas about how to do things in leagues. Very helpful. More need to attend.

Number of Meetings in the Year

Karson: Do we need three meetings in the year? Can we visit this at some point?

Munsell: There is a large tournament against this weekend. Ontario might work better in January.

Upcoming meeting dates and locations

May 15-16 Meeting: Los Angeles, details to follow and check the CHSSA website.

September 11-12 Meeting: San Jose

January 8-9, 2016 Meeting: San Diego

Meeting adjourned at 2:28PM
Respectfully submitted by Reed Niemi
CHSSA Secretary



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to Limit Changes to the By-Laws.

Submitted by: Reed Niemi

Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

- ★ Deletion from By-Laws: Article XVII , Section 1
- ★ Addition to By-Laws: : Article XVII , Section 1

Specific revision:

ARTICLE XVII: Amendments

Section 1. Changes in these By-Laws shall be in effect when approved by a majority vote of the CSSC members at ~~a~~ **the September meeting. Changes made at the September meeting will be effective October 1. The By-Laws may be amended at subsequent meetings in the same season, but no changes will take effect until the next season.** A copy of the change indicating exact wording and location of the change shall be delivered to the Secretary before ~~a final vote on the change.~~ **the proposal is brought before the council.**

Rationale:

By limiting the time for making changes to the By-Laws, CHSSA members will have the rules from the beginning of the season. A fixed set of rules for an entire competitive season will benefit all coaches and students. The requirement for the secretary to have a copy of the proposal before it is brought before council better ensures that all council members will be able to see a copy prior to discussion.



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to: Clarify CBSR boundary

Submitted by: Erik Pielstick

Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

- ✓ Deletion from By-Laws: Article V ,section C , paragraph 2 , page # 2
- ✓ Deletion from By-Laws: Article V ,section D , paragraph 2 , page # 2
- ✓ Addition to By-Laws: Article V ,section C , paragraph 2 , page # 2
- ✓ Addition to By-Laws: Article V ,section D , paragraph 2 , page # 2

Specific revision:

Article V.

Section 1

C. Area 3

2. Schools in the following geographic areas shall be eligible for membership in the Southern California Debate League:

- Western boundary: Los Angeles River to Interstate 5, north to the northern city limit of Glendale, across to the southern boundary of Angeles National Forest
- Eastern boundary: ~~Hwy 57 to Hwy 210, north to the Angeles National Forest;~~ **West boundaries of the Pomona and Bonita School Districts**
- Southern boundary: Los Angeles County line

Article V.

Section 1

D. Area 4

1. Schools in Orange County shall be eligible for membership in the Orange County Speech League.

~~2. Schools in Orange County shall be eligible for membership in the Citrus Belt Speech Region if located:~~

- ~~• east of Hwys 57 and 210 and all of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties~~
- ~~• upper Mojave Desert, east of Hwy 395 to Kern County.~~

2. Schools shall be eligible for membership in the Citrus Belt Speech Region if they are in Riverside County, San Bernardino County, or those areas of Los Angeles County within the physical boundaries of the Bonita, Claremont, and Pomona School Districts.

3. Schools in the following group of counties shall be eligible for membership in the San Diego Imperial Valley Speech League: Imperial, San Diego.

Rationale: Restores original and intended boundary and keeps all Pomona, San Dimas, and La Verne schools in CBSR and Area 4.

First, the boundary listed in Article V. section 1 (D) for CBSR makes no sense and was most likely a mistake. There are no areas of Orange County that have ever competed in CBSR. There are areas of Los Angeles County that have been competing in CBSR for at least 40 years. Someone made a cut-and-paste error at some point prior to 2009.

Second, using “east of Hwys 57 and 210” as a boundary obviously refers to Los Angeles county but makes no sense because since 2003 the 210 frwy no longer turns south as it once did.

Third, the CBSR boundary established in the CBSR constitution more than 40 years ago established the west boundary of CBSR as “Kellogg Hill”. The summit of Kellogg Hill marks the point at which one leaves the San Gabriel Valley and enters the Pomona Valley. It is also the boundary of the Pomona School District and, extending north, the boundary of the Bonita School district. Using the 57 frwy (in Los Angeles county!) as the boundary cuts off a few square miles of the Pomona School district and a few square miles of the Bonita School District making the freeway a poor choice for a boundary.

Fourth, keeping all schools within a small school district or city in the same debate league makes sense. This issue came to light when iPoly High School, which is on the campus of Cal Poly Pomona, East of Kellogg Hill and within the physical boundaries of the City of Pomona and the Pomona School District, contacted the debate coach at a Pomona District school and asked about joining CBSR. CBSR granted membership to iPoly based on our reading of our Constitution. I poly wishes to remain in CBSR and CBSR wishes to reestablish the logical boundary at the Pomona and Bonita district lines.

Fifth, current language in the By-Laws places the town of Ridgecrest in CBSR. This makes them the only Kern County town in CBSR. It is more than 2 hours away from the nearest CBSR school. There is no team competing from Ridgecrest, but if there were we believe they would prefer to be in the same league as the Bakersfield schools.



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to: Clarify CBSR boundary

Submitted by: Erik Pielstick

Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

- ✓ Deletion from By-Laws: Article V ,section C , paragraph 2 , page # 2
- ✓ Deletion from By-Laws: Article V ,section D , paragraph 2 , page # 2
- ✓ Addition to By-Laws: Article V ,section C , paragraph 2 , page # 2
- ✓ Addition to By-Laws: Article V ,section D , paragraph 2 , page # 2

Specific revision:

Article V.

Section 1

C. Area 3

2. Schools in the following geographic areas shall be eligible for membership in the Southern California Debate League:

- Western boundary: Los Angeles River to Interstate 5, north to the northern city limit of Glendale, across to the southern boundary of Angeles National Forest
- Eastern boundary: ~~Hwy 57 to Hwy 210, north to the Angeles National Forest;~~ **West boundaries of the Pomona and Bonita School Districts**
- Southern boundary: Los Angeles County line

Article V.

Section 1

D. Area 4

1. Schools in Orange County shall be eligible for membership in the Orange County Speech League.

~~2. Schools in Orange County shall be eligible for membership in the Citrus Belt Speech Region if located:~~

- ~~_____ • east of Hwys 57 and 210 and all of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties~~
- ~~_____ • upper Mojave Desert, east of Hwy 395 to Kern County.~~

2. Schools shall be eligible for membership in the Citrus Belt Speech Region if they are in Riverside County, San Bernardino County, or those areas of Los Angeles County within the physical boundaries of the Bonita, Claremont, and Pomona School Districts.

3. Schools in the following group of counties shall be eligible for membership in the San Diego Imperial Valley Speech League: Imperial, San Diego.

Rationale: Restores original and intended boundary and keeps all Pomona, San Dimas, and La Verne schools in CBSR and Area 4.

First, the boundary listed in Article V. section 1 (D) for CBSR makes no sense and was most likely a mistake. There are no areas of Orange County that have ever competed in CBSR. There are areas of Los Angeles County that have been competing in CBSR for at least 40 years. Someone made a cut-and-paste error at some point prior to 2009.

Second, using “east of Hwys 57 and 210” as a boundary obviously refers to Los Angeles county but makes no sense because since 2003 the 210 frwy no longer turns south as it once did.

Third, the CBSR boundary established in the CBSR constitution more than 40 years ago established the west boundary of CBSR as “Kellogg Hill”. The summit of Kellogg Hill marks the point at which one leaves the San Gabriel Valley and enters the Pomona Valley. It is also the boundary of the Pomona School District and, extending north, the boundary of the Bonita School district. Using the 57 frwy (in Los Angeles county!) as the boundary cuts off a few square miles of the Pomona School district and a few square miles of the Bonita School District making the freeway a poor choice for a boundary.

Fourth, keeping all schools within a small school district or city in the same debate league makes sense. This issue came to light when iPoly High School, which is on the campus of Cal Poly Pomona, East of Kellogg Hill and within the physical boundaries of the City of Pomona and the Pomona School District, contacted the debate coach at a Pomona District school and asked about joining CBSR. CBSR granted membership to iPoly based on our reading of our Constitution. I poly wishes to remain in CBSR and CBSR wishes to reestablish the logical boundary at the Pomona and Bonita district lines.

Fifth, current language in the By-Laws places the town of Ridgecrest in CBSR. This makes them the only Kern County town in CBSR. It is more than 2 hours away from the nearest CBSR school. There is no team competing from Ridgecrest, but if there were we believe they would prefer to be in the same league as the Bakersfield schools.



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to: Clarify Expos Timing Rule

Submitted by: Einar Johnson Second by:

This revision will be a(n):

Addition to By-Laws: Article IX, section B1, paragraph c, page # 4
Added words in bold italics

c. Time: The ten-minute time limit shall include time to set up and remove aids. Speakers are allowed to pre-set aids/easels along the room perimeter prior to the beginning of the round. Time spent pre-setting aids is not limited. If the speaker chooses to pre-set aids, that pre-set must also be along the room perimeter. Set-up for first speaker may NOT be in the central staging area. Time begins once the aids are set down in the central staging area. Time ends when the last aid or easel is removed from the central staging area. This includes the last speaker in the panel. ***This rule does not apply to movement by a competitor before the timing of his/her presentation begins of desks or tables that were already in the competition room when the judge(s) and competitors entered the room.***

Rationale:

The rule is quoted with language passed in the September meeting. It has occurred to me that Expos competitors frequently reconfigure desks or tables in the room to facilitate the presentation. I felt it prudent to make clear that such reconfigurations are not to be timed so there is no argument downstream of whether items in the room could be construed as "aids" that must be pre-set within a speaker's time.

Number: 10-01-15D



Disposition: **PASSES**

A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to: Include Lost Qualifiers from Penalties In Unfilled Qualification Slot Rules

Submitted by: Einar Johnson

Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

Other change: Article VII, section 5 , paragraph D

Specific revision:

If a League cannot fill the number of qualifiers they have been awarded, ***or if a League loses a qualifier in an event due to an assessed penalty***, then those unfilled slots will be given to other leagues within their Area as per rotation set up in Article VII, Section 5, Paragraph D2.

Rationale:

This is a simple modification to address the problem which was raised at the last meeting as the basis for a much more far-reaching redistribution under this Rule through use of bonus system criteria. My understanding was the identified "problem" was that there was no rule in force to address re-distribution of slots lost to penalties.

This is, therefore, a simple alternative to a September proposal that was remanded because the Council, in my opinion, and consistent with my own views, did not want a modification of the redistribution system that would transfer qualifying slots from one Area to another.

This simple fix solves the identified problem. Obviously, any Council member could hereafter seek a change to another system through advanced submission of a rule change, but the simple problem presently presented should not be a justification to overhaul the existing redistribution system.



Number: 10-01-15E

Disposition: **PASSES**

A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to: Modify Cross-Examination Rule re Oral Prompting

Submitted by: Einar Johnson Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

Other change: Article XI ,section1 , paragraph H,I(a), page #5

Specific revision: Modify the following Paragraph by eliminating the strike through language:

a. In Policy Debate, both members of a debate team must participate as a questioner and respondent during cross-examination, but only one member of each team may do so within an given cross-examination period. ~~Oral prompting by a participant of either the questioner or the respondent should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate. Oral prompting by the speaker's colleague while the speaker has the floor in debate should be discouraged, and may be considered by the judge as a factor in deciding the debate.~~

Rationale:

The language to be stricken was added by motion made by Chuck Ballingall a few years ago. Mr. Ballingall explained that he was not seeking to modify the cross-examination rules, but instead just wanted to eliminate the "death penalty" for "inadvertent" oral prompting. Those that opposed the provision, myself included, expressed concern that this provision would lead to increased oral prompting. Based on Mr. Ballingall's assurance that the specified language was intended solely to address the penalty for "tag teaming" and not to encourage or allow it, the language was approved. However, since the addition of the language, even some members of the Council have argued in other contexts that there is no rule against tag teaming and reference the specified language that this motion proposes to strike.

Because the Council, in my opinion, never intended to change the Policy Debate cross-examination format, and now that we have passed a specific rule addressing penalties in debate that permit evaluation of a number of factors if a protest is filed, there is no purpose for this language, even for those that agreed with Chuck. No other CHSSA rule I know of discourages a rule violation but makes the judge the sole person to decide whether a deviation from the rules is acceptable. Allowing that circumstance can result in the variation of rules from one round to another so the rules no longer provide an even and predictable playing field for all students.



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws To Modify The Timeline For Script Protests

Submitted by: Area Chairs Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

- ★ Deletion from By-Laws: Article IX ,section 4, paragraph B, C , page # 9-10
- ★ Addition to By-Laws: Article IX ,section 4, paragraph C, page # 10

Specific revision:

Section 4. Certification of Materials

- A. All material used in original composition or oral interpretation of literature and submitted for state qualification tournaments and the State Tournament must have a CHSSA cover sheet attached to each manuscript.
- B. CHSSA cover sheets for each contest event in original composition or oral interpretation of literature must be utilized and include all required information for each manuscript and all required signatures. Scripts which do not comply with the rules in these By-Laws shall be returned for correction. Failure to have properly prepared materials may result in disqualification from state qualification tournaments and/or the State Tournament. Cover sheets must be dated.
[Appendix E]
- C. If a student competes at the State Tournament with an illegal script (an illegal script is one which does not substantially meet the CHSSA State Tournament manuscript requirements), the League that student represents shall lose a qualifier in that event for the following competitive year. ~~Discovery can take place up to December 31 of that calendar year. Script protests shall first be presented to the I.E. Committee who will rule on the legitimacy of the protest. Access to scripts shall be at the discretion of the Vice President Activities or designee.~~ **must take place prior to the semi-final round of the tournament. Established protest procedures must be followed. Access to the scripts shall be at the discretion of the Area Chairs. The VP of Activities shall retain all scripts at the end of the tournament.**

Rationale: Prior to semi-finals, a script has been vetted by a coach, a league president, an area chair and three rounds of judging and observation in the state competition without protest; therefore, it is reckless to allow a script protest so long after the tournament has ended. There is no reason, post-tournament, for anyone to be reading through scripts. In addition, there is no process in place by which the parties involved can be brought together, face-to-face, including the Protest Committee members per the protest guidelines in the by-laws nor is access to evidence readily available.

Number: **10-01-15G**

Disposition: **PASSES**



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to further Define Student Eligibility

Submitted by: Ad Hoc By-Law Committee Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

- ★ Addition to By-Laws: Article VII ,section 5 F, paragraph F , page #____
- ★ Other change: Article VII section 5 F, paragraph 1-4 Renumbering

Specific revision

. Student eligibility

- 1. A student must physically reside in the state of California.**
2. A student who first enters the ninth grade of any school following the student's completion of the eighth grade in any school may be eligible for competition during a maximum period of time that may not in any way exceed eight semesters of attendance at that school or any other school.
3. A contestant must be a bona fide student at the school s/he represents at the state qualification tournament. Bona fide student means the student has not graduated and is enrolled in and passing at least four classes at the school s/he represents.
4. No student or team shall be allowed to pass final registration at a state qualification tournament or the State Tournament unless accompanied for the duration of the tournament by a certified staff member from the school or an adult sponsor designated in writing by the school principal.

Rationale: With the proliferation of online schools, it is possible for students to attend an online California school, but not be Californians. Students ought to reside in California if they compete at the California state championship

Number: **10-01-15 H**

Disposition: **WITHDRAWN**
(TYPO ONLY)



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to: Clarify TI Rules

Submitted by: IE Committee Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

☒ Deletion from By-Laws: Article IX ,section 4 , paragraph B.4.b , page #9

 Addition to By-Laws: Article _____ ,section _____ , paragraph _____ , page # _____

 Other change: Article _____ ,section _____ , paragraph _____ , page # _____

Specific revision: *[Exact wording is required. Show strikethroughs original language that is deleted and put any added/changed language in **bold print**]*

b. The original material may comprise up to one-third of the total presentation. ~~By title and author and cited in the manuscript according to MLA guidelines.~~ No more of 150 of these added words may be embedded within the contestant's selections.

Rationale:

This is an obvious typo from when the rules were cut-and-paste into the new format. Original material cannot be cited in MLA format.

Number: **10-01-15 I**

Disposition: **PASSES**



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws to: Clarify Contents of Binders in TI

Submitted by: IE COMMITTEE Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

- ☐ Deletion from By-Laws: Article _____ , section _____ , paragraph _____ , page # _____
- ☐ Addition to By-Laws: Article _____ , section _____ , paragraph _____ , page # _____
- ☒ Other change: Article IX , section 4 , paragraph B.4.a(4) , page #9

Specific revision: *[Exact wording is required. Show strikethroughs original language that is deleted and put any added/changed language in **bold print**]*

4) The intact manuscript may be used by the contestant as a prop so long as it remains in the contestant's hand(s) at all times. Other than the manuscript, no costumes or props are permitted. The contestant's handheld manuscript ~~may~~ **must** contain only text from the selections and original materials and shall contain nothing else, including, but not limited to, any materials that would be intended for use as a visual aid.

Rationale:

The contents of the binder are mandatory. "Must" is a clearer word, whereas "may" makes it sound like the contents are negotiable.



A Motion to Revise the By-Laws for Parli Topic Selection.

Submitted by: Ron Underwood Second by: _____

This revision will be a(n):

★ Deletion from By-Laws: Article XI, Section 1.A.3

★ Addition to By-Laws: Article XI, Section 1.A.3

Specific revision:

3. Parliamentary Debate.

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

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

· Value: Both sides push for their value in the topic as superior to the other team's value.

· Policy: Proposition shows there is a problem and offers a solution (plan) to the problem. Both sides debate the appropriateness and/or merits of the problem and solution asserted by the Proposition.

· Fact: Both teams debate the circumstances under which the topic would be called a true statement.

ADD:

The topics for each round will be in a distinct topic area not to be used in any other round for the duration of the tournament. The topic areas and resolution type by round will be determined by the Debate Committee and communicated to the tournament director at the January meeting. Only topic areas will be announced at the January meeting. Five resolutions based on each topic area will be written by the tournament director or designee and vetted by a majority of the debate committee prior to the start of the state tournament. Three final resolutions will be selected for each topic area and placed into a sealed envelope by round to be used in a blind draw for topic selection each round.

Rationale:

- 1) The deleted portion becomes repetitive with the explanation of topic areas and resolution selection. All other language in the article currently highlight key aspects including preparation period, announcement and description of resolution types.
- 2) Establishing topic areas and resolution types at the January meeting will allow the tournament director time to construct and update resolutions without revealing resolutions before the tournament.
- 3) Extemporaneous speaking also uses topic areas by round for the state tournament. Topic areas will be used similarly and broad. Proposing broad areas prevents students from predicting exact resolutions and does not violate the spontaneous nature of parliamentary debate.
- 4) The debate committee can vet resolutions for wording, timeliness, and equal ground using the proposed resolutions provided by the tournament director which will help with topic construction issues without giving the debate committee power to write resolutions or affect objectivity. Using five proposed resolutions allows the committee to choose three acceptable resolutions to be chosen in the blind draw in case there are issues with any proposed resolutions.
- 5) Resolution selection will be a blind draw which eliminates issues of resolutions being known or leaked before rounds. No individual or committee decide the resolution for the round which also increases objectivity.