

MFEA- 2009 Spring Meeting
Friday, March 20, 2009 – am session

Libby Oliver (LO), president, called meeting to order. Welcomed everyone.

- ~ Committee schedules reviewed.
 - ~ Each committee chair has a packet with agendas, any proposals submitted prior to this conference.
 - ~ 1st thing on the committee agenda is to elect a chair.
 - ~ List of committee members: please update the contact information & indicate who is present as an interim member. Even if you are not a committee member, all coaches are encourage to attend provide input.
 - ~ Reminder: all motions must pass through the committee to be brought to the main body unless there is a 2/3 majority of the body to discuss it.
 - ~ Be sure to give notes from each committee to Dee so they can be entered into the minutes.
- General session recessed for committee meetings until 4:00pm.

Friday, March 20, 2009 - pm session

Libby Oliver (LO), president, called meeting to order. 4:00 pm

- ~Reminders: Return Committee folders to Libby with contact information. This session is just for interim reports. Save motions for general meeting on Saturday.
- ~Committee members from each division were reviewed & updated.
- ~If you have a set a date, it is a commitment. When we take this home to our schools, our ADs start planning calendars for this next year.

STATE REPORTS

AA State Meet Report: Libby Oliver: Hosted by Billings West; all 14 schools attended; meet went fairly smooth.

Team results: 1st: Flathead; 2nd: Bozeman; 3rd: Glacier
Moved to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

A State Meet Report: Dave Stonehocker: Hosted by Butte Central. Thank you to coaches who help set up some things that weren't set up at the start.

Team Results: Speech: 1st: Columbia Falls; 2nd: Whitefish; 3rd: Havre.
Drama: 1st: Corvallis; 2nd: Polson; 3rd: Big Fork.
Moved to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

BC State Meet Report: Bonnie Ortner: Hosted by Huntley Project (just look for the trailer park). Thank you to all coaches who stepped up to help out. We had more debaters than we've had before. Awards were held at Skyview. 1 judge had to be thrown out; we had several rules challenges.

Team Results Class B: Speech: 1st: Loyola; 2nd: Three Forks/Manhattan; 3rd: Cut Bank.
Drama: 1st: Three Forks/Manhattan; 2nd: Baker/; 3rd: Huntley Project.
Team Results Class C: Speech: 1st: Gardner; 2nd: White Sulfur Springs ; 3rd: .
Drama: 1st: Simms; 2nd: Joliet; 3rd: Gardner.
Moved to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

INTERIM REPORTS

AA Interim Report: Presented by James Maxwell (Bozeman) Thursday, March 19, 7pm

Schedule for 2009-2010 Season (See Schedule)

Jan. 29-30 – STATE Bozeman: James is working on options to start state early to accommodate 5 prelim rounds and octas at state. LouAnne reminded people that bus drivers are getting adamant about their driver regulations. Make sure there is enough time between round 3 and 4.

Feb. 12-13 – NFL Missoula

Talk of adding a fee for each team in addition to registration to offset rising costs – NFL is no longer sending ballots; host school must incur that cost now. Proposed to add a \$10 fee printing fee per school. No opposition.

Committee Member updates: Unanimously approved to replace Cindy Clapp with Vicki Hyde (Flathead) on Memorized Committee

Proposed Business

1. Proposal by Billings Central to require a 2/3 majority to make changes MHS A handbook
 - a. Discussion: we feel 2/3 is not a good idea because it would make it almost impossible to get changes.
UNANIMOUSLY OPPOSED
2. Proposal by Billings Central to have term limits on Rules committee members
 - a. UNANIMOUSLY OPPOSED
3. Proposal by Charlotte Hanson for creating a rotation for state
 - a. The AA already has one.

New business

1. James Maxwell (Bozeman) introduced a rule to prohibit competitors from being in competition rooms without an adult present (i.e. judge or coach). Kala wanted clarification about the draw room – we agreed that was not a competition room. AA PASSED THIS MOTION UNANIMOUSLY.
2. Sam Trammell (BSHS) wanted clarification of rules of PF plan/ counter plan; Tom Cabbage (CMR) –It's judge's discretion per NFL; discussion on Flathead tournament; Tom suggested putting more information on judge's handbook to help judges.
 - a. Motion: Put item 3b-4c on the PF part of the judge's handbook. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY AA.
3. Discussion on computer software. Should we change to Joy of Tournaments? Not user friendly, expensive, but great for team management. We don't have to use Edward's program. Someone may try it next year, but would be better at a kickoff. Josh Munro (Glacier) will look into it. We will ask for info at nationals as well.

Moved to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

A Interim Report: Presented by Dee Hallock (Hamilton) Thursday, March 19, 7pm

Doug McConnaha elected to chair meeting.

Discussion: Meeting with MHS A

Doug named members of this committee and explained back ground & purpose of meeting.

Vote on reunification last year didn't make it to the ADs

Class A: ADs ready to do it; Class BC ADs didn't know about the issue

Communications between coaches & ADs is a problem: We need to do a better job of communicating with our own ADs.

If we pass an item here, don't assume it will be passed on to MHS A or the ADs.

MHS A committee want roll call vote as to whether or not we should open up the discussion process to reunite A & BC.

Written vote will be taken.

At this meeting we were given 3 options.

a. Super divisional: least favorable. Doug explained doesn't solve anything

b. Straight to State: Which means no divisionals; this option doesn't lead to the best going to state.

c. Double Entries: This option makes the most sense. Discussion on raising numbers of entries, logistics, etc.

ADs like the double entry idea & if we pass this then we will stay in the 4 divisions.

MC- JoAnne Austin went to the different AD meetings & asked them if they were aware of the result of the vote last year on reunification. So they did a survey: Administrator/AD/coaches depending on who answered the survey. Results for reunification: 20 for; 17 con; 2 undecided; 20 schools who received the survey who did not respond. We need to know what we want & inform our ADs. Biggest problem: lack of communication.

New Business:

1. Double Entries

Motion: Lyla Dumke moved to look at double entry: Judy Woodland 2nd.

Proposal (submitted by Doug McConnaha): change to J. Double entry (AA and A only)

1. A student will be able to enter two speech events or two drama events in each contested round... elimination rounds.

For Class A Divisionals and State: students can only double enter in two speech events or two drama events. Rational: allowing double entry within either two speech or two drama events (not one of each) would help to make divisionals and state more competitive and increase the number of entries at both tournaments.

Discussion: logistics, student responsibility, tabbing, pairings.

DM: Debate cannot get to double enter because of the logistics. It would be too difficult to manage it.

Motion: Moved to amend the motion to exclude debate from double entry. 2nd. Motion carried.

More discussion on logistics

Question: 26 for; 2 against. Motion carries.

~How do you deal with Impromptu when they leave the room they say something to their friend outside about the topic?

DH: When a meet director is setting up rooms, separate the impromptu rooms across the school so that they can't share topic w/ teammate.

2. Rules changes requiring 2/3 majority to pass.

Proposal: Billings Central: Chuck Carroll proposed that any rule changes to the MFEA handbook for speech and drama must be approved by a 2/3 majority of members voting at the MFEA spring Meeting. 2nd. (Note: this would be a constitutional amendment (addition). No section currently addresses this situation.

CC: Rational: Mark Elison believes that if we have 2/3 majority then we have changes be more consistent from year to year. Wind of change comes like a hurricane some times. Sometimes things change, then a few years later, we change it back. If an overwhelming majority is for the change, then we may have fewer changes.

Discussion: Trudy moved to recommend this proposal to the full body: 2nd. Passed unanimously to be heard by full body.

3. Term limit on MFEA committees

Proposal: Billings Central: The maximum time that anyone may serve on the rules committee shall not exceed 4 years consecutively. Commencing immediately, if any member of the rules committee has served for more than four years, they must resign their position. If the rules committee has more than one member with four or more years longevity then the individual with the most seniority shall resign this year and the same in subsequent years until the committee has no member with more than four years of service. Anyone wishing to serve on the rules committee must have been a coach and member of MFEA for a minimum of ten years. Deviations from this rule may be made by a majority vote of 2/3 of the MFEA members present.

(This is a change to the constitution – current section reads that each division may select members to committees in whatever method they desire.)

CC: Rational: I recognize that everyone is professional, but don't particularly like some of the rules that come out of the rules committee. I'm not convinced that anyone that has sat on a committee for a long time would have the same forward looking ideas as they did 10 years ago. Some else should be able to serve as a chair. I was on the interp committee because I felt I was not contributing as much as I was 3 years before. After a while some people become stale & decisions made may not be in the best interest of the students. Mark wanted to speak to this issue.

Discussion for & against this proposal.

Tim (Havre): I move to defer to this question to the body. 2nd

In favor: 13 for; 8 against. Motion carried to take to floor.

4. State Rotation

Proposal: Charlotte Hanson- Shelby: That the host schools for state meets be determined 2 years in advance of the meet rather than during the spring meeting of the previous season.

Doug: State meet rotation is determined by ADs.

Charlotte: motion withdrawn

5. Participation in invitational prior to Divisionals

Proposal : Lyla Dumke: **Moves to add to:**

VII The Divisional Tournament for Classes A and BC pg 24; A. Entries: **Add a new # 4 of # 5**

No team may enter a participant in any event in which the participant has not previously competed in during at least 2 previous (maybe a person wants to go 1) Invitational Competitions. Exceptions will be made for duo or policy debate entries where 1 partner becomes ineligible the week of Divisional Tournament. 2nd

Rationale: I believe that divisionals should be the culmination of a season's worth of competition. We as organization need to make this event a respected event. It says: I don't have to practice; I don't have to work; but those that work get beat by someone who hasn't worked for it. It doesn't show a quality program. Divisional & State trophy shouldn't be the reason that we go to compete. It sends the wrong message.

Discussion: many speeches for & against.

Lyla: withdrew motion.

STATE A Tournament 2010

Doug McConnaha talked about schedule for next year's tournament in Corvallis.

Rounds will begin in the afternoon, Corvallis; Saturday times changed to 9:00 am; 11:00 am;

State Meet Awards Assembly: It is important & classier if competitors stay dressed until after awards. Also all teams must stay until awards are over. It is disrespectful to those who are still receiving awards.

Lyla Dumke-Dillon: gave reference to Stevi not making it to podium to get trophy because everyone wanted to get out of there. 15-20 minutes will not make a difference.

Maria (Dillon): kids, on the way home, commented on pajamas on podium.

CC: as long as we are airing things: I believe that the trophies should be picked up by the coaches not kids. For professionalism of it, it should be the coaches not students. When taking pictures, of trophy winners, some have coaches holding trophies & some kids.

Doug: referenced that he reviewed historical rulings: 1990 rule was passed that awards requiring competitors remain in professional attire. It is a rule that was passed 20+ years ago. It's just not been enforced.

~Put it in the invitational the expectations for the meet.

MC: With respect to all of you, if you have a kid in an event, you should not be judging. I don't want any of you judging my kids. We have been colleagues for a long time, it was testing this year. We are not supposed to be observing (it's in the rules)

Doug: at state meet, kids don't go into room until judge shows up.

Darren Means-Hardin: when 2nd place is announced, can't hear name because 1st place team screaming. Instill respect in students throughout year that they don't drown out 2nd place.

It's a way to make our awards assembly better but still fun.

Moved to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

BC Interim Report: Presented by Bonnie Ortner (Huntley Project) Thursday, March 19, 7pm

Bonnie requested to wait until Saturday morning to give report as there were still some issues that needed to be covered.

ABC Reunification Issue Discussion:

Bonnie: (1 school – 1 vote) BC: 9 for 12 against 2 abstain (informal vote because there are many people not here)

MC: explained what is needed: every coach present needs to have a vote to see if this vote represents what the coaches want or does it represent what the coaches are voting.

Clarifying: what are we voting on?

Coach at Walker's meeting: was under the impression that all A & BC wanted reunification. He was surprised when the BC Ads were voting against it. He wants to know if BC coaches want it or not. It would seem that there is a communication problem between programs & ADs.

MC: What are the concerns for BC school re: reunification?

BC school: have seen some growth in the programs when the split happened, more encouraged to participate

Kari B. (get her notes). Read

MC: Dwayne is sincere in fighting this battle for reunification if it is what is wanted. Then Joanne would be contacting your body to make sure there is representation from each division.

Sarah Jennings: wanted informal vote so that they could think through some of the arguments that they haven't heard before. Some votes may change after discussion.

~We need to talk to our ADS

MC: talk with the ADs so that they can understand how complicated the issue

April: one of the problems is that some of the coaches don't talk to their ADs. This shows that there is a communication problem

Doug: explained the process: review minutes for rules. These minutes should be reviewed with your ADs so that they know what is going on at these meetings.

MC. We will be sending a rep to the meetings in June & in November. They know sports but not this event

Bonnie O: not so much as ADs, talked a lot about how it helps A, but not how it would help BC & their own programs. Encouraging us to work & talk with one another. & how it benefits both programs.

Dave Stonehocher: I came from a C school. I voted against the split. In C school, kids winning against A school & there was a lot of pride. It is an individual event. Think about that. I was in those shoes at one time.

MC: I coached at a small school. Went to GF & remembered that made it to finals at AA meet & class A was going home early. People make assumptions. We don't have a curricular program, like many others. AAs have the curriculum & are coming out of those classes.

~Have never changed my vote, it is better for our program

Nancy : White Sulfur: voted against the split but since the split it has helped my program. We get recognition from our community now.

John Labonty-Glasgow: spoke for split. It has helped our schools' program. We don't compete equally

Hardin: we went to divisionals with 11 kids. We had a lot of kids go to state but weren't close in sweeps. Right now it is the school that has the most kids gets the team trophy.

Matt Stergios: give it time. First year coaching, I unclogged toilet because kicked a few kids off the team. Building a team takes time, if you work on it to build. If you pay your dues you will get there. Do the work what it takes.

BO: Why don't you (Class A) want to go to the AAs.

DM: They don't have drama. We are not competitive with the same events.

MC: Our debate is being coached differently. There are some significant differences in philosophy. A & BC far more in tuned to the educational aspect.

Irene Crest: Why not say how many would be bringing into the A. The numbers have grown in BC

DM: I ran the last ABC state. The numbers are pretty much show that statistically the finals are fairly well represented.

Lorrie Tatsy-Browning: AA have 2 day meets, & only speech. & distances are further

BO: We have brought up a lot of questions: but in favor of reunification. But programs ebb & flow. We graduate 13 seniors, next year 1. I'm a good enough coach to qualify kids for state. Have faith in my coaching, my kids & my school. You have to earn your way to state. But isn't that's what it is about? The North is really suffering. The south sent all

Sarah Jennings: 9th placer at divisionals took 1st at state.

CC: from a small school (300 kids), but we have a dedicated group of kids. We have 4 coaches but I don't get paid. I just like coaching. We are worried when Gardner shows up, they offer good competition.

April: I want to rejoin with Class A. 1st time coaching came to state with 4 kids & took state in drama. In class C. Would love to beat class A.

~ We try to support class A in our region.

MC: if you evaluate your students' performances over the past years & see what is happening.

Concern about the numbers qualifying out of divisionals. Also quality & level of competition at State.

In the interest of our students for creating an opportunity for the kids to have the best level of competition. We don't have the magical argument to persuade BC.

Why do A want us to join with BC?

~Our numbers on down in A we have lost 2-3 programs (Anaconda, & Big Fork has drop to B).

~New coach: student coaches & coach position in the old south, was good at what she did. Make it to state once. With sheer Numbers people cancel each other out. Placed 3rd at regular meets. With huge numbers, come

Kari Blalock: undecided because wanted to know if we have solved the problem for the reunification.

We are a school that never knows which division we are in.

Charlotte Hanson: you are only as strong at the competition against you. We have so few schools.

We have so few meets in the north, and are weak. We need more competition. More schools are not hosting meets....

DM: one of things we talked about was the large south. We were in the process of solving the problem when the MHSAA stepped in & solved it for us. We will not go back to what we had. If we reunify, then we work to solve the problem.

~It wouldn't happen this next year.

Matt Stergios: explained the south is no longer the same as the old south.

We have no guarantee that these problems would be solved. We may still have some unresolved issues. Would like to know what is set in stone. Tired of flip flop. Another split reason is no one would host divisionals in the south because of size.

Leslie: we are moving in a positive direction in terms of communication, we will be in a better position.

Trudi Downer (Laurel): MHS A came in to solve the problem in spite of our decisions & it back fired. Now they are handing out an olive branch because they know what it takes to run these programs.

Doug Mc: we will sit down & solve the problem work the maps etc. But don't want to do the work unless reunification is what we want

Leslie: one way or another, BC is going to have some change. The South is going to change because the numbers are up again.

Matt Stergios-Loyola: don't mandate how many round prelim rounds. Should not be difficult to reintegrate back with the A.

Discussion about hosting state; Doug stated number of rooms needed to host..

Jon LaBonty- Glasgow- this is a healthy discussion. Lines of divisions will be constantly changed because towns come & go away. Things change continuously.

BO: Need to have the vote by the end of the session; asked that all BC have their votes registered by Saturday am.

Meeting adjourned.

Saturday, March 20, 2009

Session called to order.

BC Interim Report: Presented by Bonnie Ortner (Huntley Project) BC interim report.

Vote on reunification: vote is split

2/3 majority- not supported

10 year on rules committee: not supported

Withdraw the rotation.

Want a permanent committee to review division lines annually so the competitors would be more equitable.

Moved to accept report, 2nd motion carried

MOTIONS:

MOTION: James Maxwell moves to add: G – Ethics: new #9: No competitor shall be in competition rooms without a judge present. If caught in room without judge present, competitor will be disqualified from competition for the meet.

Polson: does that mean kids cannot go in & set up props prior to judge showing up?

JM: yes, we have had problems & complaints about damages to classrooms, teachers desks. Idaho has put this on & it was successful.

Joann-Helena Capital: Helena High declined having tournaments because of damages. At NFL we tried this & it was 100% successful.

BO: I see this as cumbersome for Drama, though good for speech. Friendly amendment: add 'or coach.'

JM: friendly amendment accepted.

~Suggest that penalty is separated from the rule to the end of the section to the end & make it true for all of the above.

New #9: No competitor shall be in competition rooms without a judge or coach present. Motion passed.

MOTION: Friendly amendment: add #10: any competitor violating any of the above rules will be disqualified from competition. 2nd. Discussion

Whitefish: Ethics are standards. Putting penalties with ethics.

Vicki Flathead: ethics is a set up as group of rules imposed & have penalties.

DM: if we have #11 then on #7 a kid leaving the room would be disqualified.

This #11 did not go through committee. The other was with cell phones & ipods not as a consequence for all of the rules violation under ethics.

MC: we can make this as part of the motion.

MOVE to add #11 to G: any violation of the above standards may result in disqualification from the meet.

Polson: what does it mean Disqualified?

DM: it means you are done with the meet.

Whitefish: give the tournament director some discretion.

DM: word 'may' handles this situation.

April Gilstrap - Simms: if a kid destroys something in a room, it comes out of my check, so I am in favor of this rule.

Steve Hamilton: it's like the kid who misses a bus, you leave him behind & he doesn't do it again.

Question: 2nd. Motion carries.

MOTION: Greg Adkins: Judges' handbook adding rules plan/counter to handbook.

CC: this has already been handled in the handbook committee.

Motion withdrawn

MOTION: Doug McConnaha move to add to double entry, on page 18: J. Double entry (AA *and* A Only) 1. A student will be able to enter two speech events or two drama events in each contested round...elimination rounds. For Class A Divisionals and State: students can only double enter in two speech events or two drama event.

Rationale: Allowing double entry within either two speech or within two drama events (not one of each) would help to make divisionals and state more competitive and increase the number of entries at both tournaments. 2nd.

Dave Stonehocker- Butte Central: I am opposed because of the discussion of reunification. This would affect the reintegration of BC & A.

DM: I just looked at the vote, the vote is split. Without a vote significantly in favor of reunification, it won't happen.

Mark Elison-Billings Central: opposed: We have pairings based on the premise that speaking order is important, this would have an impact on speaking order. They would speak first & last. The specialness of the order would be lost for speaker walking in & out of the room.

Tara Norick- CFalls: we do hand tabbing at NFL it is possible to randomize speaking order; they can be in the middle. With the time at state there is time to randomize the speaking order.

LouAnne Foley: there may be a perception of special rating to speaking first or last. If they speak well they speak well, and speaking order will not make a difference.

Lorrie Tatsey-Browning: If we make a decision on ACB reunification, will this change?

MC: We are not voting for reunification, just clarification for Dwayne Walker. This is not set in stone.

LO: this is a survey to see who is interested in reunification.

April Gilstrap: concerned about that Northern division are not here.

That's why we are asking for names and vote so that those who are not here can be contacted for their input.

Darren Means-Hardin: keep order

Shelly Fisher-Libby: We are trying to increase numbers in class A. I have some who wanted double enter. Not all students have to double enter, it's a coach's decision.

Charlotte Hanson- Shelby: we're not A-AA we're Shleby. If A BC would reunite, we might want to consider double entries.

DM: based on the discussion at this meeting Thursday, this is the best way to solve our problem.

Jane Morisset-Hardin: When you do double entries are you restricted to 3 per event?

DM: Yes, it just means you can fill more of the allowed slots.

Question: carried. Motion carried

MOTION: Mark Elison Billings Central: *We move the following:*

The maximum time that anyone may serve on the rules committee shall not exceed 4 years consecutively. Commencing immediately, if any member of the rules committee has served for more than four years, they must resign their position. If the rules committee has more than one member with four or more years longevity then the individual with the most seniority shall resign this year and the same in subsequent years until the committee has no member with more than four years of service. Anyone wishing to serve on the rules committee must have been a coach and member of MFEA for a

minimum of ten years. Deviations from this rule may be made by a majority vote of 2/3 of the MFEA members present. This is a change to the constitution-current section reads that each division may select members to committees in whatever method they desire. 2nd.

Mark Elison: Rationale: Rules committee is made up of awesome people, and do a lot of work; possible future hall of famers. In most committees, there is not as much work throughout the year, except for Short Prep. Having said this, there is some callousness toward decisions made rather than the taking the time to investigate. There was a debate protest where the coaches were not listened to (Note: one of the coaches attempted to object to this reference.) There was a protest about a visual aid which was not checked out thoroughly. At state, there were rules imposed by rule committee members to review all finals postings by tabbers, even experienced ones, before the results were posted. There needs to be a rotation of people on the rules committee.

Another problem: rule book has never been free of error or omissions or complete of the interpretation of the rules. Over the course of time we need to be allowed to interpret the rules. This morning we passed a rule with the word “may” which is subject to interpretation. There is no rule that says we can remove a judge. If a rules committee member has the right to remove a judge so we are not being adequately protected. I do not believe that they do it out of malice aforethought. A new person on the committee would approach the question with due diligence, trepidation. All I’m saying that you as a division have the right to select who you want to serve, but if we allow new people filter in...

If you want that member in perpetuity on the committee then it needs to be that way.

Darren Means-Harding: friendly amendment to change it from 10 years to 6 years.

Charlotte Hanson-Shelby: we already have term limits. This is my 4th year on the rules committee. I’m just figuring this out. We have seen a new face every year. It takes time to learn the ropes. The rules committee doesn’t meet during the year. Most decisions are made at the meet by the tourney director, if there are issues then we meet electronically to make decisions. In the BC, 10 years is really long, because of the turn over.

Sarah Jennings-Loyola: friendly question: how many people are chomping at the bit to get on the rule committee?

Dave Stonehocker-Butte Central: I would have like to have been on the committee. We are getting more coaches with more experience who could serve on the rules committee.

Judy Woodhouse-Polson: having a bit of a problem with this. Sounds like there might be a bit of an agenda. Last night we have all of these wonderful things said about us. We have people willing to sit on this committee. If they have 50 years experience & willing to serve then great, in our division we go through & select who wants to be on each committee. If you want to be on this committee then say so. Our division votes that person to serve. Term limit is decided by the each division.

Darren Means: opposed to term limit, but seeing that sometimes we get bogged down. As time goes on, we tend to get lackadaisical, in this rare case, the problem of voting down some one who may be intimidated by powerful person.

Question: debate ended.

Motion: fails

MOTION: Mark Elison Billings Central: *We move the following:*

Any rule changes to the MFEA handbook for speech and drama must be approved by a 2/3 majority of members voting at the MFEA spring meeting. This would be a constitutional amendment (addition). No section currently addresses this situation. 2nd. Rationale: This doesn’t include the housekeeping changes. Every year we passed several rules, and then we have to look for where it was. We continually change rules to fix things that happen. Every time we look to fix things, then we have problems figuring out what we need to do. Example of mime signs change by vote of 23-28 then next year overturned. We keep flip flopping every so many years.

Lyla Dumke: question: I have 3 votes at this meeting; some schools have 5 votes, some schools only one vote. Is this rule going to shut out those schools that have fewer coaches?

Darren Means: it actually helps you rather than hurt. You would have a better vote.

Charlotte Hanson: conversely smaller schools can be at a disadvantage.

DM: Would this take effect this year?

Lyla Dumke: question not answered yes or no

Sarah Jennings: large difference between what happens at AA & ABC. If I want something to pass I can talk to the AA coaches to care about. On the other hand if you're from a smaller school you may not be able to get through.

Brian Sharp: I want this because it would help us from the constant changes. Maybe barely pass something. If it is a true need then 2/3 majority will insure it would pass.

Nancy: if there are abstentions, those people don't care about the issue.

Trudy Downer-Laurel: I can see where this would help us with MHSA, they want to know when they are putting things in the rule book is making a difference. With 2/3 majority we could have some cooler heads when making decision.

Mike Poser: in favor of the 2/3, I think one of the strengths shows we can be adaptable. We tend to vote this.

CC: we are going to be discussing rule about coaches going in to watch rounds. I was the one talked it up & got it voted in. It was right then, but it would not have been voted in with 2/3 then. We wouldn't have had to change the rule book. We would have had the issue taken care of for the future.

Question: debate closed. Since this a change in the constitution must have a 2/3 majority to accept this change.

For: 62 against: 19 abstain: 3

Point of order: do not need to count the abstentions

This does not go into effect until next year until this is approved by the MHSA.

Doug: our constitution doesn't say that we have to it approved by them.

Break: Libby will call MHSA to clarify point.

MEETING RESUMED

LO: Beg forgiveness ahead of time. MHSA doesn't have governing over our constitution. The change in the constitution requiring 2/3 majority goes into effect.

BC interim motions:

MOTION: Bonnie Ortner: Move to create permanent committee for proposed division reapportionment for BC with 1 rep from each B and C division. etc..

Matt Stergios-Loyola: what if there is a school who doesn't want to change divisions, is that discussed in committee?

BO: recommendation to level out numbers (North v south)

April Gilstrap: how can we increase our numbers if we are losing schools? So let's revisit

Nancy: is that representation from all Bs or all Cs? Schools change class size.

Question: discussed ended.

Motion carried.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Financial Report: Kari Blaylock

Dues are \$20 by December 1. \$5.00 penalty for dues received after this date. Dues notice to be sent on MHSA mailer in the fall to save money. There will be no other reminders.

JoAnne will have a list of coaches & contacts for each program

Kari could send a reminder to the coaches who host the 1st tournaments of the season.

5-\$200 scholarships were awarded, to be paid out after the completion of 1st semester in college.

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

Rules Committee: Doug McConnaha, Chair

Members present: Michael Christensen-CFalls; Greg Adkins-Glacier; Tim Leeds-Havre; Trudi Downer-Laurel; LouAnne Foley-Skyview; Tom Cabbage-GF CMR; Charlotte Hanson-Shelby; Rosemary Weber-Fairview; Steven Hamilton-Three Forks.

The committee meeting was convened with all representatives (AA, A, B, C) present. LouAnne Foley nominated Doug McConnaha for committee chair. The nomination was seconded and no further nominations offered. Doug McConnaha

was elected as committee chair. The committee updated the committee contact information, and then moved on to the agenda prepared by Doug McConnaha.

Old Business:

Issues that came before the committee during the year were presented to the committee:

1. Sam Trammel of Missoula Big Sky presented information on the Plan vs. Counter plan issue in Public Forum Debate.
2. The next order of business was the discussion of the issue from the Missoula Loyola Meet in which an MPA judge came back after judging another round to ask to change the way the students were ranked.

Rules Committee reports from each of the three State Tournaments were presented.

1. Class AA held at Billings West had very few issues. There were some students left off of postings which were corrected, and a computer problem was corrected, and there were no protests.
2. Class A held by Butte Central at Montana Tech encountered logistic problems with wrong room numbers, room conflicts and judge issues which ended in one judge being escorted from the site and which required coaches to judge events in which they had competitors. The Rules Committee repaired events. Because of low numbers ten events did not fill and an alternate pairing was needed. There were three protests. First an Extemp delivered her speech in the wrong room where the first competitor had already presented the same topic. The competitor was moved to last in that round. Second there was a challenge that a team had used a visual aid. The committee visited with the judge; the protest could not be verified so the protest was denied. Third, a protest was registered that a team falsified evidence and failed to produce. The committee visited with the judge. The violation could not be substantiated so the protest was denied.
3. Class BC held at Huntley Project encountered four protests of inappropriate material. There was one timer malfunction and a question of appropriateness of a competitor borrowing a timer and stool from another competitor. There was the use of a cardboard gun as a prop. All were handled by the rules committee according to code. Finally, an LD competitor forfeited a round and walked out in protest. After consultation with the Class A rules committee, the competitor received the loss and given points as judged because nothing in the rulebook addressed this issue. All in all, the meet went much smoother this year.
4. A Debate Issue from December was presented. A team asked another team to hand over their case, and the team refused. This issue was passed to the Debate for clarification of evidence vs. case structure. In addition following presentation and discussion, the Debate Committee was asked to address the issue of a tie for a bye and the issue of decimals when averaging debate points.
5. Two pantomime issues presented during the season – What is permitted on a Pantomime sign? Can a mime touch hair, face, put finger in mouth etc.? – were passed to the Drama Committee for discussion and clarification.
6. The issue of whistling and/or sound effects in Interp was referred to the Interp Committee for discussion and clarification.
7. Class BC noted that there was not a matrix for a four-round state. Doug McConnaha stated that this was a housekeeping issue because such a matrix existed in a past rule book. That matrix will be reinstated.
8. Doug McConnaha stated that he had created a document which outlined the MFEA rules casebook. He asked the committee and general membership to look it over and decide if anything needs to be codified. Nothing was pointed out. Doug was thanked for the excellent document which will assist all coaches.
9. Doug McConnaha outlined housekeeping which had been taken care of during the season: Clarification of AA Debate tabbing on page 35 4. B. (3) which should state. “The software...established in Section 1. D. then on page 33, under section C. Pairing Procedures – Debate, 1. D. should read:
 1. W Wins
 2. H High low points
 3. P Total Points
 4. O Opponent winds
 5. J Judge variance
 6. X Random Number

(This matches the terms in the computer program.)

The other change is under HOI and SOI on pages 16 and 17. Rule #3 should be changed to reflect the ballots. It should read “Manuscripts must be held in hand and appear to be read.”

New Business:

The committee moved on to the proposed business items received in advance of the meeting which was referred to the Rules Committee.

1. From John LaBonty, Glasgow: Due to the awarding of speaker points in debate events, we suggest that Debate be a separate scoring category and not be included in Speech Sweepstakes. Doug pointed out that this was an MHSa jurisdiction issue that MFEA cannot address. Mike Christensen moved to table; the motion was seconded and passed by the committee.
2. The issue of the MPA ballot at the Missoula Loyola tournament resulted in a request of the Rules Committee to address the issue – At what point can a judge change a ballot? It was pointed out that there is no mention of this

- in the rule book or case book. The details of the incident were presented. Discussion ensued. Rosemary Webber of Fairview said that she felt that once the ballot left the judge, it is final. Tom Cabbage stated that he felt the issue was addressed on page 7 when it outlines when protests can be filed. LuAnn Foley pointed out that on page 13 in Debate, a change is not retroactive. Michael Christensen of Columbia Falls stated that page 13 does not apply to the issue. Tim Leeds of Havre stated that he could see the point, but felt that a blanket rule could mean that an honest mistake could not be corrected. Matt Stergios explained the situation as it happened and stated that he ruled that the original ballot stands even though it impacted his student because of the look of impropriety. Steven Hamilton of Three Forks stressed that we need to keep in mind that often ballots need to be changed to fix an error. Bonnie Ortner of Huntley asked if this happened often enough to legislate. Doug McConnaha stated that this discussion has to take place to get the issue into the casebook even if legislation doesn't happen. Greg Adkins stated that we need to trust our judges. If coaches overrule judges, why have them judge? Rosemary Webber stated that it would be easier on Tournament Directors if there were rules. Marianne Prewitt of Roundup questioned if there could be pressure on the judge by others causing the change. Chuck Carroll of Billings Central said that perhaps the lines is that once the ballot is checked for errors and tabbed, it should be final. Sarah Jennings of Loyola stated that she felt once the next round started, and it is tabbed, the ballot is set. Doug McConnaha gave the example of an incident at Class A state where a judge realized after he left and went on duty at work that the ballot he had turned in was wrong. He called and worked with Doug to correct the ballot. Tom Cabbage stated that he felt that the issue should be addressed case by case. He moved that the issue be moved to the body for discussion with no recommendation from the committee. The motion was seconded and passed.
3. Mike Christensen of Columbia Falls proposed to add on page 7. G. 4 : This ethical standard applies to invitational tournaments unless otherwise specified. The issue concerns the question of coaches watching rounds. He asked that this change be added for clarity and to decide if new coaches should be allowed to watch to learn. He said he felt that veteran coaches watching is a distraction. There should be an ethical standard at all meets. LuAnn Foley of Billings Skyview asked if there would be an exception for new coaches. Mike clarified that the exception was new coaches. Tom Cabbage of CMR stated that all coaches should be allowed to watch for three reasons – It is a public event – The meet is a training ground – It allows a check on questionable student action without protest. Charlotte Hansen of Shelby pointed out that observing during the season could help to limit rules violations at Divisional and State Tournaments because they could be seen and addressed early in the season. Mike Christensen pointed out that page 3. C. 1 states that State and Divisional rules apply at Invitational tournaments too. This clarification is needed to allow coaches to observe during the season. He stated that observing should be codified. Adding page 3 to page 7 clarifies. Tom Cabbage suggested that eliminating page 7 would clarify. LuAnn Foley pointed out that most invitation letters state MHS rules will be followed. Doug stated that Mike is asking for a clarification. Sam Trammel of Big Sky pointed out that often coaches are asked to judge during the season. LuAnn Foley cautioned that many rules carry coaches names. We can't control all actions; we need to be careful of over-legislating. Charlotte Hansen pointed out that 9 on the same page covers the issue. Jeff Lowe from Hamilton pointed out that other activities allow scouting. He stated that observation should not disrupt rounds and would be a valuable educational tool. Mark Elison pointed out that the only coaches are banned from observing; anyone else can watch – it doesn't make sense. Bonnie Ortner pointed out that the problem stems from unethical coaches. Sarah Jennings of Loyola felt that it is self-regulating since folks ask permission. Doug McConnaha asked that discussion be brought back to the issue of clarification. Tom Cabbage stated that the issue could be solved by dropping 7. G. 4. He made this motion. It was seconded. Mark Elison pointed out that observation could solve many things not picked up by judges. The motion was passed by the committee for referral to the body.
 4. Doug stated that #10 and #12 concerned the BC matrix have become housekeeping because the matrix existed in a previous rule book and would be returned to the next rulebook.
 5. Bonnie Ortner pointed out a housekeeping issue on page 28. B. 6 requires four tab persons per event while BC has only three divisions Doug stated this would be corrected.
 6. The resolution from William Dohle from Columbus was requested to be withdrawn by the Columbus School District. She stated that the area of "appropriate" is a gray area that needs to be addressed. The issue was sent to the Drama and Interp committees for clarification.

Proposals from the floor:

1. Bonnie Ortner presented the proposal to add to p. 7 G Ethics: When possible, coaches will be given specific tabbing assignments. Coaches will be expected to tab their tab assignment. In addition, coaches are expected to observe at least one round of the event they are tabbing with the exception of Debate. After questions of clarification from members of the Rules Committee, Tom Cabbage moved that the proposal be moved to the body without recommendation. The motion was seconded and passed.
2. Bonnie Ortner of Huntley Project pointed out a housekeeping issue on page 24. 7. B/ 1/ That the meet should be Divisional rather than State since this rule is under the ABC Divisional Tournament section. Tom Cabbage moved that the change be made. It was seconded and passed.

3. *Kimberly Lindsey of Plentywood asked that cell phones, i pod, etc. used during a round result in disqualification and not sweepstakes points for the tournament if verified. Shelly Fischer cautioned that it be verified because an insulin pump had been mistaken in the past. Tom Cabbage suggested that the legislation be placed under ethics. He moved that it be sent to the body with no recommendation. It was seconded. Doug stated that it should be clarified before being presented to the body. Bonnie Ortnier gave examples from BC State and stress that there is a need for a rule with a penalty. The motion passed.*
4. *John LaBonty of Glasgow proposed a change on page 23 E. A and BC Sweepstakes. Duos and Policy Debate should be awarded same sweepstake points as an individual event. Tom Cabbage moved to send to the body without recommendation. The motion was seconded and passed.*

There was not further business. The meeting was adjourned.

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

MOTION: to take of Housekeeping issues as 1 motion.

- A. Clarification of AA Debate tabbing on page 35 4. B. (3) which should state. “The software...established in Section 1. D. then on page 33, under section C. Pairing Procedures – Debate, 1. D. should read:
 7. W Wins
 8. H High low points
 9. P Total Points
 10. O Opponent winds
 11. J Judge variance
 12. X Random Number
 (This matches the terms in the computer program.)
 - B. under HOI and SOI on pages 16 and 17: Rule #3 should be changed to reflect the ballots. It should read “Manuscripts must be held in hand and appear to be read.”
 - C. Page 24. 7. B/ 1/ the meet should be Divisional rather than State since this rule is under the ABC Divisional Tournament section.
 - D. Page 28: B. 6 requires four tab persons per event while BC has only three divisions.
- 2nd. Discussion: none. Motion carried.

MOTION: James Maxwell (for Tom Cabbage) Moves to drop: under Ethics: section G #4. Re: coaches watching rounds. 2nd. Discussion:

MC: against: I am not confident the circumstances have changes.

LO: The rule currently reads just divisional & state.

CC: It does affect all of the coaches through out the competition year, because rules apply at all invitational meets.

LouAnne Foley- Skyview: MHSAs rules will be followed, we can put on our invitationals that coaches can watch. But against, especially debate.

April Gilstrap: we want to stop our kids from rules violation before divisional. Right now we cannot send a coach in until finals rounds to deal with rules violations.

Kim: it is a good idea to let coaches into rooms, however we don't want to turn this loose, maybe allow with permission from tournament director.

Sarah Jennings: we can observe a round under the current rule, if tournament director says it is allowed. We have, on a case by case basis, allowed coaches. If we allo

Shelly Fisher Libby: A coach went in & took notes on my kid only, it was not good. Don't they know who the coaches are? Are you going to catch misbehavior every time?

Trudi Downer: we need to be careful not to open this up. I agree with Loyola coach. Asking permission first is a good idea.

MC: page 3, C.1 reads: “...such rules will be followed unless specified in the letter of invitation.” This doesn't preclude coaches judging rounds & allowing coaches to watch rounds.

Greg Adkins-Glacier: against: most invitational we allow coaches to go in. If we adopt this we would be opening this up to divisional & state. We need to be more diligent about stating this on the

invitations. If we allow this I can't image the number of protests. Right now our judges & students are solving the problems. In AA, you are really opening this up for scouting in debate

BO: not only in BC do we feel we should be in the rooms; we should be assigned to do so at meets. We need to be in the rooms before state, we have protests at State. We need to police ourselves. As Shelley said, 'if we are in the rooms they are not going to misbehave' we need to be in the rooms so that we can see that what is going on before state.

Question: debate ended.

LO: clarified what the motion is.

For: 11 against: 54. Motion failed.

MOTION: Move to adopt corrected matrix seen in packet. 2nd

Discussion. For BC: matrix for 4 rounds at state- will use one that has been in use in a past rule book to be returned to the next rulebook. This is a rules change.

For: 82 2; abstain. Motion carried

MOTION: Bonnie Ortner moves to Add to page 7, G- Ethics. "When possible, coaches will be given specific tabbing assignments. Coaches are expected to tab their assigned event. In addition, coaches are expected to observe at least one round of the event they are tabbing, with the exception of debate." (possibly replacing #4 which bans coaches @ divisionals & State. 2nd).

Kelly -Broadwater: may not be realistic because some schools only have a few schools.

Lyla Dumke-Dillon: why are you proposing things that would go against what was past last time?

BO: We do have kids taking notes to disqualifying opponents at State. It was ugly; it could have been taken care of before state. We need to catch these violations.

Kari Blaylock- : would this be only for BC. Friendly amendment to add BC only.

DM: clarification: you as a tournament director can say who can go into rounds to observe.

Charlotte Hanson: We can send someone in the rooms & the kids know that they are being looked at & know that the someone is in trouble.

April Gilstrap : we are in this for the kids. We have new coaches who may not know the rules. Don't want to wait for state to disqualify him there when it could be an observer who could correct the problem prior

Lyla Beard: isn't this already addressed at the front of the book. At invitationals, please feel free to go into the rounds. Take care of this in the early part of the season.

Brian Shockley-Hardin: would this rule make it so that coaches would not be allowed in at Div & state. So it is in conflict.

Question: debate ended.

Everybody votes: abstain if you choose. BO reread motion with friendly amendment.

Motion failed.

MOTION: Kim Lindsey- Plentywood: add to page 7, G Ethics 9d: Student competitors shall not use cell phones, iPods, or other electronic devices during rounds. This rule does not apply to devices used for props or for medical purposes. Any violation will result in disqualification from the tournament and receiving no sweepstakes points for that tournament. 2nd

Discussion:

Steve Hamilton: does this exclude for mimes using their CD players?

~Can I make a friendly amendment to say 'for performance' instead of props.

Motion carried with friendly amendment.

MOTION: John LaBonty-Glasgow: move to change on page 23 E. A and BC Sweepstakes. Duos and Policy Debate should be awarded same sweepstake points as an individual event.

Mike Poser: would this affect entry fees?

John: this is dealing with just sweeps points. Entry fees are to cover the cost of running meets.

April Gilstrap: don't cut points. Against the amendment.

LouAnne Foley: against. Points for AA debate are more than speech, speech can double enter.
Matt: track is different. Relay & can enter up to 5 events & team points are accumulated.
Question: discussion ended. Motion failed.

Drama Committee Report: April Gilstrap- Simms, Chair

Members present: Shelley Fisher-Libby; Lorrie Tatsey-Browning; Bonnie Ortner-Huntley Project; Lisa Carter-West Yellowstone; Tonia Fisher-Clark-Billings Central; Virginia Compton-Dillon.

Meeting call to order; Nominations for new chair person. April was nominated & elected as new chair.

1st order of biz nominate new chair person. April Gilstrap was nominated and passed as new chair.

Comments/Concerns from 2008-2009

- 1. Mime Signs — **Motion that mime signs be white with black lettering. No pictures or representative shape, title only. Add to rule book... replacing #2** under Pantomime rules which currently reads “A brief written title and no other words shall be presented.” The new rule would read “A brief written title on a white sign with black lettering shall be presented. No pictures or representative shapes, title only”. Much discussion took place . . . it was voted to send this to the body by a vote of 4 ayes and 3 nays.*
- 2. Can a Mime touch their face/hair, put fingers in mouth? No official motion was brought forth so the body moved we leave as is and not add any new rules pertaining to this issue.*
- 3. Duo Pantomime and Classical Solo Questions and clarification. **Motion that the rules the drama committee have prepared for these two events be presented to MHSa for review.** (see attached) We discussed this and decided on a 9 min maximum for Pantomime Duo and 10 min maximum for Classical Solo. It was passed unanimously to send the rules to the body for review and approval. If passed through body the Drama Committee ask that the rules please be reviewed at the April MHSa meeting (if possible) so that the new events can begin next season meaning the 2009 to 2010 season. If not, we ask that these events be approved and switched for the now existing Pantomime and Classical Duo to the new events for the 2010 to 2011 season. Then every other year the events will be offered.*
- 4. Stand-up comedy? **Motion that the language be added to under section A #9 from section b. #5 page 19 where it says the contestant must create a character** Discussion. Passed unanimously to send to body.*
- 5. Material Appropriateness. **Motion that Motion Picture Rating of PG be put in rule book.** Discussion. The committee decided to educate judges and made changes to judges handbook addressing this topic. The motion unanimously failed.*
- 6. **Motion to put “material must be appropriate for all audiences” under ethics in the rule book page 7 section g # 10.** Discussion. Unanimously passed to send to body for vote.*
- 7. Changes to judge’s handbook. The committee met and proposed changes (see attached) be sent to body. Unanimously passed to send to body. Meeting was adjourned.*

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

MOTION: replace #2 under Pantomime rules which currently read “A brief written title and no other words shall be presented.” The new rule would read “A brief written title on a white sign with black lettering shall be presented. No pictures or representative shapes, title only.” 2nd Discussion:
Lorrie Tatsey: we’re getting really nitpicky. They don’t have much time to present; the sign isn’t going to make much difference.

John LaBonty: oppose: the performances are based on development of story & character not the sign
Virginia Compton: I think it’s stupid

Darren Means: opposed. I am opposed to limiting it to black & white. We don’t want to limit the creativity. Gave ex. Not solving the problem

Question: debate ended. Motion failed.

MOTION: move to accept Duo Pantomime/Classical Solo rules & ballot changes be made:
Duo Mime/Classical Solo, pending approval of the rules, would go into affect this next season.

Jon LaBonty: Oppose these rules; need to give more time with the rules, which were just handed out yesterday. It was a narrow vote last year to put these events into place.

~ speaking for these events: it is hard to change, but kids are excited to see a change in the event.

Point of order: need to stick to the rules discussion not for/against the events.

BO: clarified the rules.

Virginia Compton-Dillon: we are not voting on the events we have already approved the events just the rules for the events. We cannot have the events without the rules.

Question: debate ended.

Division: for: 34 against 24. Motion fails due lack of 2/3 majority.

April Gilstrap: you guys are voting against these events.

Doug: we are voting to approve rules. MHSA says that these events were tentatively approved until rules are approved.

Kari Blaylock: this is a vote of no confidence for what we approved last year.

LO: suggest that a copy of the rules be given to coaches over the year & come next year with more information.

MOTION: Add # 9 to A- Duo Acting: The competitors must create character; stand up comedy is not allowed. 2nd

Shelley Fisher-Libby: This to get our rules consistent throughout the events. Motion Carried

MOTION: to put “material must be appropriate for all audiences” under ethics in the rule book page 7 section g # 10.

BO: This is just state it in the rules as well as the judge’s ballot to be appropriate to all audiences.

LO: would this effect debate discussion?

Doug: this would not affect the debate because the topic would be appropriate to those audiences.

Question; discussion ended.

Motion carries.

Memorized Committee Report: Vicky Hyde-Flathead High

Members present: Libby Oliver-Sentinel; Lyla Dumke-Beaverhead Co.; Sabrina Holland-Butte Central; Pat Mclaughlin-Whitefish; Janie Morissette-Hardin; Cara Pool-Powder River; Christina Cote-Gardiner; Bette Brown-Cut Bank; Stephon Maccartney-Billings West (interim)

Confirmed committee members

Selected Chairperson: Sabrina declined nomination – moving to Korea, Vicky Hyde chair nominated, accepted

Agenda

Old business from the season

Bette Brown: student tape recorded speech and played with posters, no rule on this.

Sabrina- can’t outlaw recordings in Expos (music)

Lyla – can we add 1 under expos will ORALLY present C1 p. 14

Bonnie Ortner if add the intent of the rule will help make determination

Do we add it elsewhere?

Nancy Heggen: sees point but look at p. 15 c, c does this cause a problem.

Amend to Contests will orally deliver p.14 C1. PASSED

New Business

Packet 17 – penalty for memorization in OO MPA, Bonnie Ortner

*Bette – how do we know? In rules, judge will know. But what about beginning of season? Address in invitational – example in October tournaments. But this would give you a rule (Cara). What happens if less than 8? Do all get 5? Yes? Tara Norick – do we need it? It is on ballots so we don’t need it – superfluous? Against motion. Bonnie would be like timing. Tara- but how do we patrol? Haggen – spoke to motion. Hallock – training judges memorized event so if script note on. Should we just put this in divisionals? Things can be taken care of internally – coaches, students. Question from Pat McLaughlin. **Vote – Motion fails.***

Expos p. 15 c2c – change to presentation should be memorized. Discuss mostly in favor. Lyla Dumke friendly amendment. Change to memorization is required. (second sentence)

Dee goes back to cards are a disadvantage and will be reflected. Believes should be memorized. Lila Beard – don’t fix what’s not broken. Trudi – we are trying to tap into different skills. Joanne Sherwood: trying to build up speech program. Expos is a good place for someone who doesn’t know how to memorize. Opposed to it. Steve McCartney – we give kids a penalty for doing it with notes in others. Expectation will be memorized. Lyla Dumke – life skills, what do we want to teach kids? Similar to powerpoints. Notes are good. Christina Cote – having notes is good here. Question – friendly amendment FAILS, original FAILS.

Proposal – Vicki Hyde

MPA – add language to judges’ instruction: The intent is not to duplicate the original performance of the speech but to deliver its message. Gender or native accent of the original speaker should NOT be a factor in judging the presentation. Discussion on it. Tara – does not preclude them from doing so. Then ok.

Greg – does this start to change what MPA is? Pat agrees it is another kind of event. Bonnie – likened it to costumes in classical duo. Christina doesn't see anything wrong with it. Vicky not intended to limit, just to not penalize those who aren't male giving a male speech (example). Question called. Voting on friendly amendment – PASSES.

Ballot should read

Paragraph 4 – strike “No particular style of presentation should be demanded by the contestant”

Paragraph 5 should now read. “The mechanics of the speech must be faithfully – poise, quality, and use of voice, effectiveness and ease of gesture, emphasis, variety and enunciation. The intent is not to duplicate the original performance of the speech, but to deliver its message. No particular style of presentation should be demanded by the contestant. Gender or native accent of the original speaker should not be a factor in judging the presentation.”

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

MOTION; Expository- page 14: C 1: add word ‘orally deliver’. 2nd. Motion carried.

MOTION: MPA – add language to judges’ instruction: The intent is not to duplicate the original performance of the speech but to deliver its message. Gender or native accent of the original speaker should NOT be a factor in judging the presentation. The intent is to not penalize those that can use accents, but also insure those that don’t have accents is not penalized. 2nd

MC: speech against the motion. Because the language may prejudice the judge against some of the speakers. Gave example

Question: discussion ended.

Division: for: 13 against: 42. Motion fails.

Debate Committee Report: James Maxwell – Bozeman, chair.

Members present: Jim Bennett-Sentinel; Jon Moore-Shepherd; Kimberly Leslie-Broadwater; Charlotte Hanson-Shelby; Mark Elison-Billings Central; Tom Cabbage-GF CMR; Kevin Shellengerger-Havre; Robert Northcott-Polson; Maria Hansen-Beaverhead

Elect Chair: James Maxwell—No opposed

Proposals from rules

- 1) Loyola tourney
 - a) 11 teams 2 teams tied at end of round one—tie breaker
 - b) Rule on page 26 applied to tie breaker
 - c) Clarify or codify the partial points issues
 - i) Reached by averaging scores not by judge
 - ii) Rules from case book from ABC state—average to a tenth
 - d) Page 26 b. sub 3—total team points including any “half-points” (.5)
 - e) Motion-No rounding up or down, record to the tenth, and fractional points awarded by judge be recorded—
 - i) To IIC2 (pg 28) fractional points be recorded to the nearest tenth (ABC only)
 - ii) Motion passes no opposition
- 2) Motion (Doc): Pg 25 IA3a –round 2 paring bracket-stricken and replaced by “if uneven number of teams ‘bye’ assigned randomly from all teams not previously assigned a ‘bye’”
 - a) Rational (Doc): news least exp teams getting less exp b/c they always sit, end up playing a % game of who did better, randomly assign by then issues of record are gone, any team could get it even top team
 - b) Against the motion: reason we put by at bottom is that kids on bottom usually don’t go to out-rounds, reason it was created worse team gets by twice with record 1-2 but still placing vs. team with 0-3 that debated all three rounds
 - i) Doc-could be cases that by propels team in to out rounds but at least then any team could get it
 - ii) Tom-if random then teams, no other system that adds random
 - iii) Sam Big sky-random then adds a comp factor—change rules makes more issues, if leave then only one or two tourney
 - iv) Speaker points adds issues of randomly
 - v) Don’t want exp debaters getting bye
 - vi) Sam Big Sky-team get by they will get quashed
 - vii) Ryan Sharp Hardin-Random every round makes it more equality
 - viii) Tom-Clarification—ABC by count as win? pg 28/29
 - (1) PG 26 Rule 7 bye runoff for state entry
 - ix) Tim Hardin—first round by should not effective you, if your team at very bottom but can dig themselves out why not let them in outs
 - x) Josh—Average speaker points for everyone instead of total number of speakers points
 - c) Motion vote: motion division—6 in favor, 2 opposed-motion passes

- 3) *Passed from rules committee—Clarification issue for handing over “item” (case/evidence)*
 - a) *Tom: sometimes no evidence in plan and aff team refusal to hand over plan*
 - b) *Situation-use plan as evidence sometimes*
 - c) *Sam—teams that will ask, not listing, then tear it up with prep time*
 - d) *Charlotte- Pg 12 D12, counter plan also evidence*
 - e) *Keith GFH-What is ruling at national tourney?-Tom similar*
 - f) *Pg 10 rule used to diff PF debate from other debate events*
 - i) *top pg 11 rules will be used*
 - g) *Adam Thane Boz: diff between PF and policy—PF don’t need to see plan b/c no counter plan—any item used as evidence includes the plan b/c it gets rid of advocacy and position shifting*
 - h) *April Gilstrap Simms—don’t like case handing over b/c of technology and cell phone pictures to pick apart case later*
 - i) *Libby- Nationals if team refuses to provide plan they should not be penalized*
 - j) *Rule is to determine the legitimacy of case and ability to “pin down during cross”*
 - k) *Kevin-understand the importance of flowing-other hand “here is my plan try to beat it”*
 - l) *Sara from Loyola—give case when its asked for—train to convince the judge on topic vs. having kids argue about the rules of giving over a case/evidence*
 - m) *Sam: strategy issue—prep time to go over the case*
 - n) *Kari Blaylock- Big timber—only question asked was for a copy of the case—b/c not taking notes and potential for no clash*
 - o) *Jim Bennett—other important things that happen in CX other than handing cards back and forth—nothing to hide and people use*
 - p) **Motion: Tom pg 12 E1 supporting debater claim “including text of plan”**
 - q) *Discussion*
 - i) *Sam you have to hand over plan text*
 - ii) *Adam-national tournament judges know how to flow and will ask for plan text, differing level of knowledge in judge rule—option of seeing plan text*
 - iii) *Jon Moore-motion does not address the issue of “case” handing over*
 - iv) *Charlotte—put info on judge sheet regarding definition of plan/case*
 - v) *Chair—Clarification-what is case and what is plan?—sake of convince to as for the “case”*
 - vi) *Jeeny Broutess—issues of everything, even if not presented, debate broke down into issues of ethics of debate*
 - vii) *Tim Havre-Don’t want issues of requiring undisclosed presentation before presentation*
 - viii) *Tom withdraw-second by Chair*
 - r) *Motion: pg 12 d3 strike “as evidence” in rule*
 - s) *Discussion*
 - i) *Sam—if team refuses and say what evidence*
 - (1) *Chair if used in previous speech they would have to hand it over*
 - ii) *Chair—Judge can ask for anything used in round*
 - t) *Vote-Fails →division →passes on 5 to 4*
- 4) *Issue in packet Number 20—For Debate Committee from Jon Moore, Shephard (ABC)*
 - a) **Motion: labeled as ABC only Debaters should not engage the judge in conversation/questioning before the start of the debate, penalty for this violation shall be loss of the round**
 - i) *Rational—attempt to address the issue of debaters trying to change their style to fit judge*
 - b) *Tom: police your own students to prevent arbitrary violation of this rule*
 - c) *April—nothing in rule book to prevent the questioning of judge*
 - d) *Lyla Beard Belgrade—simple conversation “put resolution on board” kid policing themselves then potential to kid pointing fingers*
 - e) *Sara Loyola—Clarify that debaters may not begin engagement, or prevent kids from saying my coach told me to ask your preference on judging style*
 - f) *Doc—calculated decision*
 - g) *Sam—judging instruction?*
 - h) *Tom—questioning does lead to better debate*
 - i) *Kevin—understand the problem but potential for false accusation*
 - j) **Vote: proposal fails**
- 5) *Issue in packet Number 21.2: Sarah Jennings Loyola*
 - a) **Motion: once a debate round has begun a student who fails to complete the round shall forfeit the round and the minimum number of speaker points (second)**
 - i) *Judges should be able to record what they saw in the round*
 - b) *Question called and seconded—ending debate*
 - c) **Vote: motion passes**
- 6) *Issue in packet Number 21.1: Sarah Jennings Loyola*

- a) **Motion** p. 28 sec 2 item d → quarter finals either uses all priorities for paring or none = Withdrawal
 - b) **Motion:** change p28 2d change semi finals to quarter finals
 - c) **Vote Motion passes**
 - d) Tim Havre—point of clarification, same school can hit in quarter finals
 - e) Tom moves to reconsider the motion—Chair → Reconsideration passes
 - f) Tim—move to amend the motion: pg28c2a quarter finals to semifinals and pg → same school cant hit until semifinals
 - g) **Motion passes with amendment**
- 7) Issue in packet Number 22: Jeff Lowe Hamilton
- a) **Motion:** committee accept that something the is offer into evidence that is proven to be falsification loses the round and received zero speaker points
 - b) Discussion
 - i) Doc—refer to pg 13F
 - ii) Tom → issues with author qualifications and date of the source should be given the first time each citation
 - iii) Chair → rules in place that are stronger
 - c) **Motion is withdrawn by Jeff Lowe from Hamilton**
- 8) Issue in packet number 23: Jeff Lowe Hamilton
- a) **Motion:** ABC state pg 28 C2c switch priorities for place 2 and 3
 - b) Discussion
 - i) Jon—massive complications for debate tabbing
 - ii) Doc → issue of back to using speaker points if tied records
 - iii) Jim → head to head still comes into play
 - iv) Jeff → speaker points is not as objective as head to head
 - v) Sarah → how to put it on the tab sheet?
(1) Jeff → spread sheet is put on it
 - vi) Tom → low point wins should be addressed
 - vii) Adam → clear delineation to when points are awarded in sports, vs. in debate speaker points which is an average over a tourney
 - viii) Jeff → can we agree that win carry more weight than points? Yes → problem is that points are not objective they are opinions
 - ix) Kimberly--> assume that win loss is not an opinion
 - x) Adam → go win loss record and speaker points—allows for quality over the entire tourney
 - xi) Mike → clarification AA drooping high/low speaker points—not dismissing head to hear
 - xii) Questions—debate has ended
 - xiii) **Vote: Motion fails**
- 9) Sam Trammell Big Sky
- a) **Motion:** pg 10 add con is limited to actions that are currently in place in the status quo
 - i) Rational: like to have the discussion here b/c not enough time to run a procedural plan in PF round
 - b) Discussion:
 - i) Josh → are bills in congress part of the status quo—can't define a plan or counter plan
 - ii) Jim → don't have a plan in PF b/c not supposed to advocate anything, topic specific, did the students press it in the round
 - iii) Tom → wording become in round decision and PF allows for multiple topics that forces kids to respond to all types of issues, don't want to limit students to one specific topic
 - iv) Josh → potential for multiple issues regarding the different issues,
 - v) Adam → difference in wording should be allowed for debating
 - vi) Question—debate ends on proposal
 - c) **Vote: motion fails**
- 10) From the floor April:
- a) **Motion:** Housekeeping: pg 10 B6 time schedule change final focus 1st speaker to 2nd speaker
 - b) **Vote: motion passes**
- 11) From the floor Josh:
- a) **Motion:** change pg 7 G4 to “in a debate event”
 - i) fairness to kids and judges and tabbing coaches, and future prejudice against judge/coaches
 - b) Discussion:
 - i) Tom → coaches should be allowed to judge
 - ii) April form Sims → at the divisional and state level observation is potential
 - iii) Sam → as coaches we should be provisional
 - iv) Adam → number 2 spectators will be allowed only if both LD and all four debaters agree (separate motion)
 - v) Josh → coaches are not unbiased
 - vi) Adam → point of clarification—observation/judging

- vii) Jim → only problem is no wiggle room if need a judge
- viii) Doc → cant prevent unethical behavior total
- ix) Sam → no opportunity to watch team b/c of size of team
- x) Josh → make amendment that coach should be allowed to
- xi) Question—debate ends

c) **Motion:** proposal passes

12) 09-10 Policy resolution

a) Resolution accepted

13) Doc—policy ballot issue

a) Kimberly—putting speaker points “suggestions” that exists on LD ballot on policy ballot but to mach the policy point distribution

b) Tom → move amendment discussion on policy ballot to next year

14) New Business-Tom

a) **Motion:** move the LD date resolution change from 9 November to 15 November

b) Discussion

c) **Vote:** motion passes

15) New Business—Pg 7 G

a) **Motion:** Pg 7G at additional tourneys coaches may attend any round that they don't have student competing in

i) Adam → don't need to make it a rule

b) Motion fails for lack of second

16) Motion to adjourn

a) Motion passes unanimously with great enthusiasm

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried.

MOTION: p. 28 2 C2- tie breaker mechanism for debate: ‘fractional points to the nearest tenth’ be added. 2nd. Discussion: none

Motion carried.

MOTION: p. 25: E. Pairings (2) a: In the case of uneven numbers, the bye will be drawn randomly every round: The bye counts as a win and points will be averaged. Decimals stay as figured. 2nd.

Discussion:

Trudi Downer: when we try to get this equitable participation but when assigned byes to weak kids, byes don't count, this rule will avoid penalizing kids. Random byes help distribute

Sarah Jennings: against the new rule. Right now we count every buy as a win. Now we are sending kids to out rounds with a win that wasn't earned. By awarding the bye to the bottom team we won't have to deal with the nightmare as often. Not mention that this will add much time to the tournament.

~: it's making all byes the same instead of just the first bye.

Question: end discussion

Division: For: 37 against: 26. Motion not passed: less than 2/3 majority.

MOTION: p 12 D 3- ‘any item used as evidence...’ (strike evidence)

MC: against. We teach students to learn to flow, note taking skills. If they can ask for the case so they can look at the case rather than flow, we're defeating the purpose.

Jim Bennett, Sentinel: appreciate it what you're saying. But I have the freshman boys, & they don't write down everything.

MC: did your kids ask their opponent to restate their plan?

~Are we changing the rule for the 1%. If they didn't get the info then don't they lose?

Darren Means: if you open a door, then people walk through it. We may create problem with everyone asking for each other's plans

Adam- Bozeman: notion that this is a way to not flow, this will not help for those who don't flow, cuz they don't have time to reread the plan to prepare a good rebuttal during limited prep time. If we can't come up & say can we see the plan, they can switch argument. We don't have the same trained judged pool as NFL, then we need to be able to see a written plan to make we have a written copy

Maria -Beaverhead: I am a real visual learner. Some student may need this so that they can see it more clearly. We should allow this proposal to pass.

Question: discussion ended.

Division: for: 41; against: 33; failed due to lack of 2/3 majority

MOTION: p 12: section C- add #2: “once a debate round has begun, the student who fails to complete the round, shall be given the loss as well as the minimum possible points for the round.” 2nd. Discussion. Question: discussion ended.

Motion failed.

change p28 2d change semi finals to quarter finals

MOTION: (when debaters can hit each other. Pairing procedures) p 28: 2. a: change the wording: teams would not meet each other until finals. & p 28: 2. d: teams that have met will not meet again until ¼ finals.

MC: unfortunately in class A we have a diminishing the number of schools who have debaters so will be beating each other in earlier rounds.

Sarah Jennings: we have a situation, where the top team is Loyola against #8 & brackets are adjusted so they don't meet.

Kim Lessing- Townsend: friendly amendment move to amend the change: just change d. semis to quaterfinals. 2nd. Accepted

Motion carried.

MOTION: Public Forum: Housekeeping: pg 10 B6 time schedule change final focus 1st speaker to 2nd speaker.

Motion carried.

MOTION: LD topic: move the LD date resolution change from 9 November to 15 November. 2nd.

Motion carried.

MOTION: to accept 09-10 Policy resolution: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States. 2nd. Motion carried.

James Maxwell: Last year was discussion about having a forum to discuss ethics in debate. I will talk to our tech person to set up this forum. If interested in getting accepted to this forum, will set up an account for you. More information to come.

Short Prep Committee Report: Dee Hallock – Hamilton, Chair

Members present: Leslie Haggard-Browning; Matt Stergios-Loyola; Kelly Wiles-GF high; Terri Belke-Butte; Susan Erlenbusch-Circle; Darren Means-Hardin; Tara Norrick-CFalls; Kala Loughheed-Flathead; Michael Poser-Hobson. Meeting was called to order by Dee Hallock at 2:59 pm. First order of business was to update committee information. Matt Stergios nominated Dee Hallock to chair committee, Tara Norrick second. Vote was unanimous.

Comments and concerns from the previous season: Tara Norrick proposed that revisions be made to the time requirement for submission of topics for divisionals. The current timeline does not allow time for feedback on topics. She proposes that the timeline be added under Section E, Number 3, Item F to read: Topics will be provided for the divisional and state tournaments three days prior to the divisional tournament. This makes topics available three days prior to divisionals, 10 days prior to state. Under Section F, Number 2, Item B, that the language be amended as follows: strike ten (10), add at least three days before the divisional tournaments.

Tara Norrick also asked that more feedback in the form of questions be provided by committee members for next year's divisional and state tournaments prior to the deadline.

Vote to accept language changes was anonymous.

Dee Hallock submitted a comment for the record, that she attempts to collect the used topics from every meet director in order to not have duplication in the divisional and state tournaments. It would be helpful if committee members would assist in collecting copies of topics and submit them to Dee.

Bonnie Ortner from Huntley Project suggested that it would be helpful if we had Dee's contact information to be able to submit topics more easily. Her contact information will be made available on the MHSAs website.

Matt Stergios submitted that focus needs to be more careful on keeping impromptu topics social and cultural, not political. Tara Norrick also reminded that the source of the quotations for impromptu must also be identified.

Proposals sent in advance:

None.

Proposals from the floor:

Judy Woodhouse asked about the sources for extemp. Tara Norick reminded that last year we synchronized our sources with NFHS. Many of these sources are available completely online.

Pat McLaughlin asked about the sources being provided on the MHSA website. Jo Austin is working on trying to get those links updated on the website.

Judy Woodhouse also said that it was nice to have the broader, general questions this season.

Review of the ballot sheets for accuracy:

Dee addressed the issue of incorrect cover sheet for impromptu. At the beginning of the season, the impromptu ballot still had not been corrected with the appropriate timing procedures. The cover sheet should now be correct on the MHSA website. What is currently in the MHSA handbook is NOT the correct cover sheet.

General information:

The committee clarified that the cartoon and/or quotation is not considered a prop. It may be shown or referenced.

Terri Belke commented that issues regarding electronic devices in the draw room has been dealt with on a case by case basis, with no major issues to report. Talking in the draw room has also been much better this season.

A general discussion was held about the future of extemporaneous speaking and the use of electronics in prep.

Michael Poser suggested that there is some discrepancy in how timing is occurring in cross examination. It was suggested that both the speaker and the questioner time the question and answer in order to ensure consistency. This is an issue that coaches should address with their short preppers.

Review of judge's handbook:

Tara Norick expressed frustration that the judge's handbook was not available online. This document needs to be made available online.

Greg Adkins expressed that he was not sure the committee approved the handbook, and that may be why it is not available online. This needs to be verified by the committee meeting later today.

The committee reviewed the short prep section of the handbook.

Kala Lougheed suggested the addition of the ballot language about sources be added to the judges handbook under the section beginning: "The best extemporaneous speech..." This language is as follows: "The extemporaneous speech should be an original synthesis of current fact and opinion on the designated topic as presented by numerous sources."

Language should be removed from the impromptu section about student observers leaving the room, as pursuant to the rule about all observers remaining in the room for the duration of the round (excepting double entered students).

Tara Norick advised that the reference to time of speech be deleted from the impromptu section, leaving only the information about the prep time. Other timing issues should be resolved in the tab room.

Dee Hallock recommended a housekeeping language change to revise grammar and add a complete sentence to the last section, so that it reads: Time is a very important element of Impromptu speaking. Three minutes of prep time is allowed prior to speaking.

Darren Means suggested a change to the impromptu cover sheet. The last paragraph should be changed to read: Do not allow any observer or contestant to leave the room before the end of the round unless that contestant is double entered in another event. Matt Stergios moved the change and Darren seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Being no further business to come before the committee, Matt Stergios moved to adjourn. Michael Poser seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Meeting was adjourned at 3:55 pm.

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried

MOTION: Tara Norick move to make the following change to Impromptu on Page 16: Impromptu E. 3. f: add "Topics for the Divisional and State tournaments will be provided at least 3 days prior to the divisional tournaments." And to F.2.b Extemp: should read: "... with source annotations to the ~~committee~~ Divisional and State chairpersons ~~ten (10)~~ at least 3 days before the divisional and state tournament..." 2nd. Discussion: This would allow time for the topics to be collected & be as recent as possible & still give the division chairs time to prepare the questions for the rounds. Motion carried.

Interp Committee Report: LouAnne Foley-Billings Skyview, Chair

Members present: Janette Baretta-Forsyth; Lance Quincer-Laurel; Melissa Kanbe-CFalls; Roger McCullough-Butte; Nancy Hegen-Joliet; Cath Johnson-North Star; Jeff Lowe-Hamilton.

Several discussions ensued in the Interp committee. The 'wehreas' discussion about making a list of forbidden words was withdrawn so wasn't discussed.

Marilyn Jenkins-Ennis: The motion to exclude any material that had been presented as stand up comedy. This died for lack of motion.

Bonnie Ormer-Huntley Project: SPOI was discussed, but AA coaches particularly felt that there would be a greater imbalance both speech & debate and some audience and committee members worried about losing 2 popular events and gaining one event. No motion was made, but several people said they would keep the event or offer it as an event at their meets to perhaps add at another.

Greg Adkins-Glacier, brought forth a change in number of transition and introduction words in interp. The motion was made and a friendly amendment was made to just apply this to duo interp in AA where most of the infractions lie. The motion passed and Greg will present this to this body.

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried

MOTION: Greg Adkins moved to change on page 18, Rule 1d under DUO interp: new wording “All original material (material not in the script) must not exceed 50 words. Original material includes all introductions and transitions not original to the script. Author and titles must be identified.” 2nd. Discussion. None. Motion carried.

Hall of Fame Committee Report: Greg Adkins-Glacier, chair.

Members present: LouAnne Foley-Billings Skyview’ Tom Cabbage-GF CMR; Trudi Downner-Laurel; Virginia Compton-Dillon; Doug McConnaha-Corvallis; Mike Christensen-CFalls; Matt Stergios-Loyola; Rosemary Webber-Fairview; Libby Oliver-Sentinel.

With this year’s induction we are caught up with all past coaches. Nominations from the floor to honor: Bernie Quilico from Billings in 2010 and Max Swan from Polson in 2011.

Date for the next 2 MFEA meetings: 3rd week-end (March 18-20, 2010 & March 17-19, 2011)

Site: Bozeman for next 2 years. Discussed changing the format from banquet to offering a no host hors d’oeuvres to be more cost effective and allow more people to socialize and be there to honor those being recognize.

Site: Bozeman next 2 years.

Changing format to be more cost effective: looking at no host, hors d’oeuvres to have more people & without dinner.

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried

MOTION: Greg Adkins moved to induct Bernie Quilico in 2010 & Max Swan in 2011 into the MFEA Hall of Fame. 2nd. Motion carried.

MOTION : Greg Adkins moved that MFEA spring conference to be held 3rd week in March next 2 years in Bozeman pending approval in the hotel. 2nd. Discussion

~Separate the vote on each separate year. Difficult to leave community on St Patrick’s day where it is a big to do.

Greg: we wanted to set the date 2 years out, because we found that some people have date conflicts as far away as a year. We do need to get approval of the site before it can be confirmed.

Motion carried.

COACH OF THE YEAR HONOREES

AA Coach: Terri Belke - Butte

A Speech Coach: Pat McLaughlin - Whitefish

A Drama Coach: Judy Woodhouse - Polson

B Drama Coach: Steve Hamilton – Three Forks/ Manhattan

B Speech Coach: Steve Hamilton - Three Forks/ Manhattan & Bonnie Ortner – Huntley Project

C Speech Coach: Class C: Nancy Heggen – White Sulphur Springs

C Drama Coach: Alana Darr - Gardiner

Education Committee Report: Libby Oliver for Ivanna Fritz – Glacier.

Members present:

MEA Conference will be held in Billings in October.

There will be several workshops offered: computer tabbing

Encourage new people to attend. If anyone is not on the list, please get your presentation proposals (can do online) by May...

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried

Scholarship Committee Report: Teresa Stergios – Loyola, chair

Members present: Janet Mann-Fergus; Mike Poser-Hobson; Kari Blaylock-Sweet Grass Co; Sharon LaBonty-Glasgow; Andrea Christen-Billings Skyview.

Last year: 7 scholarships were awarded 6 were paid out as 1 of the students did not complete the first semester in college. This year \$1000 was available for scholarships (from dues, late fees and donations). The treasurer will serve on the scholarship committee and be in charge of management of the scholarship account. The committee reviewed 16 applications, using a rubric, and awarded 5 - \$200 scholarships. Winners will be notified & will receive their money after completing their 1st semester.

Need more AA representation on this committee.

Applications are available on-line on MHSA website under MFEA scholarship. The following changes need to be made to the application guidelines: under application process: d. change the 'letter of intent' to 'personal essay & add '... benefit you in college and your future career?"; delete the year on the deadline date (so that it wouldn't have to be updated annually); add a line for city, state & zip on the cover sheet. (see attached)

It is suggested that these applications should be presented to coaches at fall meetings so that more can apply.

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried

MOTION: Housekeeping: Moved to accept changes to the scholarship guidelines. 2nd. Motion carried

Teresa read the names of recipients of last year's scholarships.

MOTION: Housekeeping: Charlotte Hansen moved to strike language on page 21- B, 6 & 7: the language is no longer needed. 2nd. Motion carried.

Judge's Handbook Ad Hoc Committee Report. Bonnie Ortner presented.

Members present: Chuck Carroll-Billings Central-Chair; Bonnie Ortner-Huntley Project; Dee Hallock-Hamilton; Teresa Stergios-Loyola; Adam Thane-Bozeman; James Maxwell-Bozeman.

We have 2 formats for the judges' handbook- they need to be morphed. Add to cover page to be used at MHSA. We need to add Public forum section to the handbook & make the various changes suggested by each committee. A big thank you to Chuck Carroll who spent many hours putting this together. Since the work of this ad hoc committee is completed, we would like to disband it. the president and secretary can be responsible for making any further updating.

MOTION: Move to accept report. 2nd. Motion carried

~Request that hand book be put on the web site. You need to get the changes to Libby so she can update.

MOTION: move to disband the judges' handbook committee and the secretary/President will now be required to insure the handbook is updated annually to reflect the changes/addition of various committees. 2nd. Discussion: none. Motion carried.

Doug McConnaha: clarification. (missed what he said)

Maria - Beaverhead: I want to stress the issue about importance of awards. It is hopeful that as coaches we can bring back the professionalism to the awards.

Libby: (Reviewed changes on the tentative meet schedule. She will send out a copy of the updates.) Please remember that if you are going to host a meet, let MHSA know as soon as possible. Please consider this a commitment to host so that ADs can prepare next year's calendar.

You need to be in contact with your ADs. They have to know what we are doing and why we are doing this. JoAnne had gone to the BC ADs' meeting & I had said he knew what was going on. If they know what we want then they can be informed & not just legislate.

Move to adjourns. 2nd.

Thanked lady speaking. 12: 34 pm Kim Lindsey & Lyla Beard won pool.

MFEA TREASURE REPORT
August 8, 2008 – March 26, 2009

Beginning Balance:	Checking	<u>\$3031.44</u>
	CD Savings	<u>\$2000.00</u>
Deposits:	MFEA Coaches Dues & Banquet Tickets	\$4600.00
	CD Savings (matured 2/8/09)	\$ 35.20
	Deposits from Spring Meeting	\$ 705.00
	Total Deposits:	<u>\$7340.20</u>
	Expenses:	
	Scholarships {3 @ \$150.00; 2 @ \$100.00}	\$ 650.00
	Check printing (set up new account)	\$ 13.45
	Miscellaneous (banquet refund)	\$ 30.00
	Awards (reimbursed Libby Oliver)	\$ 92.00
	Salaries (secretary)	\$ 100.00
	Spring meeting expenses	\$ 2600.44
	{Banquet, meeting rooms, miscellaneous}	
	Total Expenses:	<u>\$ 3486.09</u>
	Balance as of March 26, 2009	<u>\$ 6885.55</u>

Submitted by: *Kari Blaylock, Treasurer*

Date: *March 26, 2009*