

MSDL Board Meeting
Monday, August 27, 2018 at 6:30 PM
Abi Lab, 27 Strathmore Road, Natick, MA

Board Members Physically Present:

Joyce Albert (Natick), Josh Cohen (Newton South), Greg Cunningham (Needham), Sue Hennessey (Acton-Boxborough), Jim Honeyman (Newton South), Lisa Honeyman (Newton South), Sheryl Kazmeraz (Lexington), Adam Nir (Needham), Amanda Parker (Natick), and Paul Wexler (Needham).

Board Members Present via Phone:

Marc Rischitelli (Shrewsbury), Chris Sheldon (Bancroft School)

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 PM by the president, Amanda Parker.

1. Novice Tournament – October 20, 2018.

Jobs for the novice tournament and who will do them:

- Invitation: Joyce
- Ballot Printing: Joyce
- Buttons: Sue Hennessey
- Radio Copy: Joyce & Greg
- Group Tutorial & Prompts: Greg Cunningham
- Extemp Questions: Lisa Honeyman (and the extemp committee)
- Impromptu Prompts: Sue Hennessey
- Congress Workshop: PJ Wexler
- Judge Training Workshop: Lisa & Jim Honeyman
- Exhibition Round: Chris Sheldon
- Greeter: Amanda
- Open Forum – Joyce will schedule, probably after the speech judge training is over

2. Coach Gathering before/after a meeting this fall? (Greg)

September 24, 2018 – “Open House” in Natick – Greg will send a note out to the league.

3. Scheduling board meetings for the year in advance so we can open them to the public. (Amanda)

Every other month on Mondays. Amanda will put out a poll regarding which Mondays board members are available and will then publicize meeting dates to the league once dates have been selected.

4. Election year. Encouraging new people to join the board, try out different roles. (Amanda)

We want to be sure to announce that it is an election year early on so that anyone who wants to run has time to think about it and make their wishes known. Our rules require that we have a

nominating committee. (Only people who are not running for elected office can be on the committee.) Amanda Parker, Adam Nir, Sue Hennessey & Marc Rischitelli will be on that committee. Anyone interested in running for an office should contact one of these folks.

The committee will publicize the fact that this is an election year at meetings and tournaments.

5. **Under Article IV of the by laws, add a second paragraph: At the annual meeting, any school in attendance but not represented on the board of directors may designate one designee as an associate member to be granted voting rights. Motions shall pass when a majority of the board of directors and appointed associate members vote in favor. Since it's a by law change, we would most like have to vote on it at the next annual meeting, but I'd like to discuss whenever we meet next. (Greg)**

Greg said that he read our bylaws thoroughly and we (the board) have the right to create a voting committee. We could make this proposal the first item on the agenda on the Spring meeting. If it passes, then the rest of the meeting would be run using these new rules. It gives schools a voice, but satisfies the legal requirements that our lawyers have told us we need to meet. This rules change would only apply to the Spring meeting. It should have the added benefit of encouraging all schools to send at least one coach/representative to the meeting in addition to giving every program a direct voice in league matters.

The board was unanimous in the support of this proposal. (Yay, Greg.)

6. **In the rules and policies document, add section 3.2.1.16: Any event designated as a "novice" event shall not accumulate points toward sweepstakes awards. This one I think we can vote on at the next board meeting. (Greg)**

The only event we're talking about is NX at speech tournaments and the only tournament the board has jurisdiction over is States, which doesn't offer NX. We could vote on a resolution to recommend that tournament directors not count NX towards sweeps, but it couldn't be required. If tournament directors feel the same way as Greg does, then they could go along with this. If not, they are free to use whatever formula they want for sweepstakes – or not offer sweepstakes awards at all. We discussed how this might affect NLD and NPFD, as well.

After some discussion, we decided not to vote on this proposal.

7. Rules & Regs Review: [Lisa's doc](#)

- a. **Joyce: 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.1.8 - Didn't we decide to take out references to author intent? I'm thinking that this might have been done via an email vote at some point last year or the year before. Or perhaps there was a discussion but no vote. Lisa: I vaguely remember a discussion, but I don't remember a vote about author's intent and it's not in the minutes. If we did it by email vote, I don't have a record of it.**

We discussed whether or not we would be able to remove the wording from our current rules now or if we would have to wait and vote on this later.

We don't think that judges need to be the ones that should be making the determination about whether or not author's intent has been violated – and therefore there isn't anything on the ballots about 'author's intent'. But, some folks believe that it's not O.K. to completely change the story an author told when creating cuttings.

None of us can ever remember a time when we have disqualified a student for this reason, so we're wondering if this is really a big enough issue to spend a lot of time discussing.

We decided to leave this alone for now.

- b. **Joyce:** 3.2.1.3 - With a student doing the same material in more than one event, do we DQ from all, or just make them choose one event to continue in? I guess I see this as a violation made out of ignorance rather than malice and would equate it to someone inadvertently violating a double entry restriction. In the latter case, we would have the kid choose an event and drop out of the other event(s), so I would think this would be the result here as well. If I am forgetting that there was a vote on this, then please disregard. **Lisa:** 3.2.1.3: In practice, I believe we have been giving students a choice about which event to drop the first time it's an issue with that student, under the assumption that the violation is out of ignorance. I don't remember a case where we found a student using the same material in 2 events at the same tournament a 2nd time, but if we did, I'm imagining it would change the conversation. I do not believe we have the consequence codified anywhere, though. Maybe that's something we should discuss and vote on?

We discussed tracking violations of this rule to see if it is a serious problem and also to see if there are repeat offenders.

Proposed: Change the last line in section 3.2.1.3 of the Rules & Procedures document to: "Students who are found to be in violation of this rule shall be sanctioned, up to and including disqualification from both events."

Motion: Cunningham

2nd: Nir

Passed unanimously.

- c. **Joyce:** On the points that you raised, I agree that we should handle breaks to semis the same way as breaks to finals. Given the amount of discussion we had about the use of visual aids in INFO, I'm not sure that we should link our rules to the NSDA rules. I think most of the board has expressed interest in keeping our independence from the rules that other leagues put in place, so we will just have to monitor the NSDA rules.

The rules, as they are currently written, are consistent with this sentiment.

-
- 8. I was reading the MSDL meeting minutes and got curious about the new event rules... Could one individual break in two events into the JV OI final? The rules don't seem to

prohibit it? On one hand, it would probably be unfair for someone to compete twice in a round (albeit with different pieces) and it would be a perceptual advantage. On the other hand, they still would deserve both their state bids from the breakout... It would be a huge perceptual advantage for a student if they competed twice in the same round.

Inexperienced parent judges would be inclined to rank that student very well because they think that they would be doing something wrong if they didn't. It might also be confusing to keep track of which piece is which. Probably two possible solutions (other than letting someone break twice):

- Student breaks in event they pref prior to tournament and receives bid in both. You break someone else to make a 6 person round (and they bid too).**
- Student breaks in event with lower prelim ranks and gets a bid in both. You break someone else to make a 6 person round (and they bid too) (Lisa)**

It doesn't make a lot of sense to have students entering the JV final in more than one event. We also have no way of tracking prefs for the tournament. We agreed that if a student would advance in two events, the student will compete in the one event that they did better in using existing tie breaking rules. In the event of an exact tie (cume, recips & quality points), the student will be allowed to pick which of the events they would prefer to do.

This wording will be added to section 6.6.2 JV Oral Interp Final for clarification purpose:

"Students may only compete in the JV OI Final in one event. If a competitor would advance in two events, they will compete in the one event that they did better in using existing tie breaking rules. In the event of an exact tie (cume, recips & quality points), the competitor will be allowed to pick which of the events they would prefer to do."

NEW BUSINESS

PJ Wexler – worked on the MSDL history over the summer. He is tracking winners of events at States going back as far as he can. He has gone back to 2004 in many events, but would love more information. If you have information to add, contact PJ.

Amanda Parker would like to put out a newsletter in September. If you have anything to include, let her know soon.

Jim Honeyman will contact teams about dues. Deadline is December 8, 2018 for both the form with principal/head signature and \$50 fee.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

--Lisa Honeyman

VP/Secretary