

Exec Committee Meeting 6/27

Thursday, June 27, 2019 12:03 PM

Attending: (**bold** = committee members)

- **Ben Walker**
- Amanda Hoffman
- **Bill** Heinze
- Brent Mitchell
- David Brennan
- Justin Rudnick
- **Najla** Amundson
- **Scott** Wells
- Zach Oehm

Meeting Minutes:

- Call to order, 12:05 (Ben Walker)

I) Review of minutes from spring meeting

- Found in the repository (google drive)
- Shared to the listserv
 - Move to accept minutes (Bill)
 - Seconded (Scott)
 - Minutes were unanimously approved
- **Friendly amendment: add the language we missed from the spring meeting minutes:**
 - ARTICLE VI: AMENDMENTS1. All proposed amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws must be submitted in writing to the Executive Committee. Proposals may be submitted electronically.2. Constitutional amendments must receive a 2/3 majority of the membership to be enacted.3. By-Law amendments must receive a simple majority of the membership to be enacted. 4. Unless stated in the amendment, all amendments are enacted the following State tournament. 5. Although proposals for Constitutional and By-Law amendments may occur at biannual business meetings, debate, discussion, friendly amendments, and voting on the proposals may be conducted at the business meeting or electronically. 6. The Executive Committee will organize discussion and voting procedures.
 - Addition of these notes to the spring notes was unanimously approved; Ben will make the addition

II) Welcome to New Members

- Justin is taking notes today
- Committee is the same, with the addition of Bill Heinze (UofM). Welcome Bill!

III) Financial Report

- Questions about the money spent on the all-state awards
 - We ended up purchasing more plaques than we needed, which was an additional (and unnecessary) expense. We might need another process for determining and/or awarding this
 - In 2019, the tournament host was left to determine the awards. Perhaps we

- shift this to the exec committee?
 - Review of the budget looked good, but some concerns were raised:
 - After expenses, the MCFA only brought in \$90 of net profit
 - The financial report should be more detailed in the future. Specifically:
 - Itemized documentation of fees brought in (entries vs. uncovered slot fees)
 - Maybe trophy distribution? Individual vs. team vs. all-state?
- IV) MCFA 2019 Tournament Recap
 - a. New approaches:
 - Changed awards (dropped the MN-shaped plaques for indy medallions and cups for teams)
 - Why did the CLC award lose its name?
 - ◆ It was just an oversight in announcing (wasn't on the trophy either). We need to watch that next year
 - Most seem to prefer the MN-shaped plaques... but they're crazy expensive
 - Questions raised:
 - ◆ How much did the MN plaques cost?
 - ◇ Specifics are fuzzy, but Scott remembers around \$1600
 - ◆ Can we give fewer trophies?
 - ◆ Have we shopped around for prices?
 - ◇ Yes; previous exec committees haven't found a cheaper option
 - **Formed an ad-hoc awards committee (Najla, Bill, & Justin) to investigate options for MN awards**
 - Added the all-state award
 - Bumpy process this first year
 - Shift up the application deadline?
 - Few members had time to fully read through the files
 - How do we assist student-run teams to see & apply?
 - ◆ Do we provide a de-identified example?
 - ◆ Are letters of rec too restrictive?
 - ◇ No, as long as we keep a broad scope in terms of who can write those letters (teammates, high school coaches, etc.)
 - What we think will help:
 - ◆ A more generic award (cost effective & timely)? Perhaps send out engraved plates after the fact?
 - ◆ Earlier deadline?
 - ◆ Simplify or minimize the application process? (is it too rigorous?)
 - **The exec committee will work on a proposal to ease the application process; will propose at the fall CTAM meeting**
 - Dropped senior sendoff for a pamphlet
 - General support for the pamphlet
 - Moving forward, let's have the seniors come to the front for applause and a photo. Adds some pomp & circumstance without taking forever
 - Other award-related conversation:
 - Can we cut the top-3 IE team awards? They might not differ from the overall team awards
 - Sounds like we would still want to keep the top 3 debate team awards,

- to encourage the programs who do only debate
- **Let's have the ad-hoc awards committee investigate options with this**

b. Logistics

- Scheduling
 - Condensing for weather on Sunday wasn't ideal, but appreciated
 - Can we investigate condensing to 2 flights instead of 3?
 - ◆ This makes scheduling tricky. Some thoughts raised:
 - ◇ Do we limit # of entries per event? 3? 2?
 - ◇ Do we raise the cap? On events, or just make it an overall cap?
 - ◆ **We've formed an ad-hoc scheduling committee (Ben, Zach, Amanda) to bring possible schedules to CTAM for a vote then.**
- Judging
 - There were issues with judges not writing comments on ballots. What do we do about this?
 - ◆ All judges went through training;
 - ◆ Resources could be made available at the ballot table;
 - ◆ We should screen ballots (tab room and/or ballot table) for empty ballots, and prevent judges from further judging if they aren't writing comments
 - ◆ There also should be financial repercussions if they don't write ballots
 - **The exec committee should put together a plan for judge training to present at CTAM. Also include: tournament procedures for handling blank ballots in the tournament.**
 - Oratory only having 3 judges instead of 5?
 - ◆ 3 was used as expected; it's not documented anywhere how many judges are required. 5 might have been tradition, but 3 were assigned to limit judging burden
 - ◆ If we want to stick with 5, we should document that in the invitation so it becomes standard practice

V) Future Hosts

- a. 2020 Concordia
- b. 2021 University of Minnesota

VI) Moving forward

- a. Exploring judge requirements for schools? (#, %, clean, etc.)
- b. Creating an open discussion board in Google
 - i. Use this for proposals, discussion, and/or voting
- c. Continue discussing combining the state tournament with ND, SD, WI, etc.

- Moved to adjourn! (Bill)
- Seconded (Amanda)