



American Mock Trial Association
Meeting of Board of Directors
Toronto, Ontario
July 11–12, 2026
Meeting Minutes

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Members Present: Ben-Merre, Bernstein, Cannon, D’Ippolito, Detsky, Garson, Gelfand, Halva-Neubauer, Harper, Hauser, Henry, Heytens, Holstad, Jahangir, Kerwin, Langford, LaPrade, Leapheart, Leckrone, Michalak, Olson, Ouambo, Parker, Pickerill, Randels, Selcov, Smiley, Sohi, Thomason, Walsh, Warihay, Wilson, Woodward, Yeomelakis, Zarzycki (35)

Members Not Present: Schuett, Watt (2)

Candidate Members Present: Haspel, Nolte, Pruitt (3)

Candidate Members Not Present: N/A

Staff: N/A

Guests: Jakob Kramer, Maya Silberman, Alizay Tayyab, Ashuta Date

II. Welcome and Remarks (D’Ippolito)

III. Approval of Agenda

See Appendix A for an explanation of the agenda.

Motion by Cannon to amend to strike EC-12 from Appendix B

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion by Cannon to amend to add EC-15 to Appendix B

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion by Woodward to approve agenda as amended

Seconded

Motion passes

IV. Approval of 2025 Mid-Year Meeting Minutes

See Appendix E.

Motion by Olson to approve the 2025 Mid-Year Meeting Minutes

Seconded

Motion passes

V. Committee Reports

- A. Academics Committee (Leapheart): Written report.
- B. Accommodations Committee (Olson): Written report.
- C. Analytics Committee (D'Ippolito): Oral report.
- D. Audit Committee (Halva-Neubauer): Written report
- E. Budget Committee (Randels): Oral report in executive session.
- F. Civil Case Committee (Jahangir): Oral report.
- G. Competition Integrity Committee (Thomason): Written report.
- H. Content and Campaigns Committee (Selcov): Written report.
- I. Criminal Case Committee (Schuett): Written report.
- J. Development Committee (Bernstein): Written report.
- K. Disciplinary Committee (D'Ippolito): Oral report.
- L. Diversity & Inclusion Committee (Harper): Written report.
- M. Human Resources Committee (Cannon): Written report.
- N. NCT Case Committee (Bernstein): Oral report.
- O. New School Success Committee (Olson): Written report.
- P. Operational Excellence Committee (LaPrade): Written report.
- Q. Rookie Rumble Committee (Selcov): Written report.
- R. Rules, IP, and Ethics Committee (Smiley): Written report.
- S. Student Advisory Board Committee (Wilson): Written report.
- T. Tabulation Advisory Committee (Michalak): Written report.
- U. Tournament Administration Committee (Yeomelakis): Written report.
- V. Website Committee (Michalak): Written report.

VI. Tabled Motions

See Appendix A for an explanation of tabled motions.

See Appendix D for a list of motions tabled by committee.

Motion by Randels (with Parker, Walsh, Olson, Gelfand, and Ben-Merre) to untable EC-10

Motion to untable EC-10 passes

VII. Approval of Consent Calendar

See Appendix C for the motions on the consent calendar.

Motion by Jahangir to approve the Consent Calendar

Seconded

Motion to approve the Consent Calendar passes

VIII. Elections and Appointments

A. Human Resources Committee Appointment

D'Ippolito appoints Olson to Human Resources Committee

B. Human Resources Committee Member-at-large Election

Halva-Neubauer nominated by Cannon

Halva-Neubauer elected to Human Resources Committee

C. Disciplinary Committee Appointment

D'Ippolito appoints Langford to Disciplinary Committee

D. Disciplinary Committee Member-at-large Election

Thomason nominated by Harper

Thomason elected to Disciplinary Committee

IX. Motions

Number	Description	Result
BUDGET-02	Creates ad hoc hosting compensatory fund	Failed
BUDGET-03	Amends travel policy to increase AMTA representative daily food stipend	Passed
CIC-01	Authorizes the CIC to impose a sanction of forfeiture of a number of ballots that is less than the total number of ballots in the round	Passed as Amended
CIC-02	Requires teams complaining of improper invention to provide their own video footage	Passed
CIC-05	Limits in-tournament review policies for NCT to the championship round	Failed
EC-01	Amends NCT host bid rules to extend host bid to programs that earn an open bid to ORCS	Passed
EC-02	Establishes an exploratory committee on expansion and host-site model for AMTA championship series	Passed
EC-04	Increases the regional tournament registration fee for teams beyond a program's third ("C") team	Passed as Amended
EC-06	Provides for induction process into Coaches' Hall of Fame	Passed
EC-07	Authorizes and directs the President and Treasurer to sign the management representation letter regarding the FY25 audit	Postponed
EC-08	Authorizes a three-year contract with Nichols Accounting Group to conduct audits for FY26, FY27, and FY28	Passed
<u>EC-10</u>	Permits twelve members to compete on a single team	Failed
EC-11	Makes in-tournament review at NCT permanent	Passed

Number	Description	Result
EC-15	Sets date for December case changes for year-long case	Failed
EC-16	Removes ability of criminal defendant to invent facts outside of case materials	Failed
EC-21	Allows participation of accelerated high school students in AMTA-sanctioned competitions	Failed
EC-23	Requires consultation of the Executive Committee regarding the judges of the NCT championship round	Passed
EC-24	Establishes an AMTA archive at Furman University	Passed as Amended
EC-25	Requires timely submission of full text of motions	Passed as Amended
RULES-01	Amends rules regarding substitution in the case of illness or emergency to clarify hierarchy of substitution preference	Failed
RULES-07	Authorizes AMTA Representatives to pre-determine blue ballots to discount if there are more judges than scoring ballots	Passed as Amended
RULES-09	Establishes procedures for announcing that time has expired	Failed
RULES-12	Allows teams to seek interventions to provide a clarification of the rules	Passed
RULES-15	Enters committee as a whole to discuss scouting ban at regionals	Passed
RULES-18	Requires that an error be by AMTA for Act of AMTA relief	Passed
RULES-19	Clarifies what students must do to raise allegations of bad judging	Passed
TAB-01	Requires 23 minimum ranks to earn an individual award at AMTA-sanctioned tournaments with three blue ballots	Passed as Amended

Number	Description	Result
<i>TAB-03</i>	Swaps OCS and PD in the tiebreaker order	Failed
TAC-07	Amends regional waitlist process to address geographic considerations in waitlist process	Withdrawn
TAC-09	Reduces the number of teams per school that are guaranteed to compete at regional tournaments to two	Passed as Amended
TAC-10	Revises regional assignment waitlist procedures to bring into conformity with current TAC practice	Passed
TAC-11	Revises regional assignment waitlist procedure to prioritize a limited number of late-registered “A” teams over “D”, “E”, and “F” teams	Passed as Amended
TAC-12	Streamlines criteria for assignment to regional tournaments	Passed
TAC-15	Provides TAC discretion to remove tournament hosts without needing to wait two years	Passed as Amended
TAC-16	Selects 2028 NCT host	Passed as Amended

BUDGET-02

Motion by Schuett to add Rule 10.25:

Rule 10.25 Compensatory funds for hosts.

In the event that tournament facilities are damaged by AMTA competitors during a sanctioned tournament, the host may petition AMTA for compensatory funds to reimburse the host for any costs incurred in repairing damage caused by AMTA competitors to the host's tournament facilities.

Upon receipt of a complaint from a host under this section, the AMTA's Executive Committee shall review the host's petition and may issue compensatory funds as required. The host must clearly demonstrate damage occurred at the host's tournament facility because of an act of an AMTA competitor during a sanctioned tournament.

***Rationale:** Our entire competitive model relies on volunteer hosts to provide quality tournament facilities. Many hosts incur expenses beyond the host stipend provided by AMTA. Forcing our volunteer hosts to incur added and unexpected expenses because AMTA competitors damage the tournament facilities will undoubtedly create a chilling effect that will result in fewer volunteer hosts applying to provide quality facilities for sanctioned tournaments. AMTA should annually maintain no less than \$2500 in its Ad Hoc Hosting Compensatory Fund. Hosts bear the burden of requesting compensatory relief and proving such relief is owed. The fund should not create a financial burden for AMTA and likely will not need to be replenished on an annual basis but only as needed.*

Motion fails

BUDGET-03

Motion by Sohi (as amended by Committee) to amend the Travel Policy to read as follows:

Meals will be reimbursed up to \$75.00 ~~\$50.00~~ per day, inclusive of taxes and tips. Itemized receipts must accompany reimbursement requests for meals, including room service. No meal will be reimbursed without an itemized receipt. A maximum of 20% should be used when calculating tips. AMTA will not reimburse costs for alcoholic beverages.

Rationale: *This reflects inflation and increasing food costs in many of the cities where AMTA Representatives are assigned.*

Motion passes

CIC-01

Motion by Olson to amend Rule 9.10(2) to read as follows:

Rule 9.10 Penalties for Invention of Fact.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) AVAILABLE PENALTIES. Penalties for invention of fact violations may include the following, in order of severity: verbal or written warning, forfeiture of [one or more](#) ballots, forfeiture of individual awards, team or individual probation, or loss of bids. In rare cases, generally limited to repeated or flagrant violations of this rule, penalties may include suspension of an individual, team, or program from future competitions. [Verbal or written warnings,](#) forfeiture of ballots (any forfeited ballot shall be awarded to the other team with a +1 point differential), and loss of bids may be issued either mid-tournament or post-tournament. Forfeiture of individual awards, probation, and suspensions for invention may only be issued post-tournament.

[Subdivisions (3)-(4) omitted]

Rationale: *This edit clarifies that the CIC can indeed sanction a team by forfeiting one or more, but less than all, ballots won by that team.*

Motion by Woodward to change “forfeiture of one or more ballots” to “forfeiture of all ballots won by the penalized team in that trial”

Seconded

Motion to amend fails

Motion by Olson to amend CIC-01 to specify that in the event fewer than all ballots are forfeited, they are forfeited in order of highest point differential in favor of the sanctioned team to lowest

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion passes as amended

CIC-02

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 7.21(6)(b)(i) to read as follows:

Rule 7.21 Invention of fact.

[Subdivisions (1)-(5) and (6)(a) omitted]

(b) Procedures for Filing and Responding to Improper Invention Complaints.

i. Video or Audio Required. Any allegation of egregious Improper Invention must be supported by ~~an~~ the complaining team's own audio or video recording of the round unless recording is prohibited by the venue. This rule requires any team bringing an allegation of egregious Improper Invention to have its own recording. Teams may not rely on other teams for the recording. The Competition Integrity Committee may, in its discretion, seek a recording from the responding team, but only in extraordinary circumstances.

[Subdivisions (6)(b)(ii)-(vi) and (6)(c) omitted]

Rationale: Our CIC rules for NCT already require teams to provide their own recording. This rule makes clear to teams they are responsible for recording on their own and should not rely on the other team's recording.

Motion passes

CIC-05

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 9.11 to read as follows:

Rule 9.11 In-Tournament Investigation.

~~For the 2025-2026 season,~~ The Competition Integrity Committee may in its discretion investigate allegations of violations of Rules 6.11 and 7.21 during the championship round at the National Championship Tournament and, where appropriate, issue penalties in accordance with Rule 9.10. The committee need not be physically present ~~at a tournament at the championship round~~ to issue an in-tournament finding and/or penalty. In-tournament investigations and penalties require participation from at least three committee members. Committee members are not disqualified from this process by serving as an AMTA Representative at the tournament in question. The Competition Integrity Committee may establish procedures for submitting a request for in-tournament review, which must be explained to the championship round participants prior to the start of the round. ~~establish deadlines and procedures for submitting requests for in-tournament review, which must be publicly posted on AMTA's website no later than the date on which the National Championship Tournament Case is released. The Competition Integrity Committee may impose sanctions, including refusal to consider future requests, if it determines that a request for in-tournament review was frivolous. See Rule 9.28. The Competition Integrity Committee may defer complaints raised in-tournament to post-tournament review. Other than complaints raised in-tournament and deferred to post-tournament review, there shall be no~~ The Competition Integrity Committee will otherwise follow its regionals and ORCS procedures for post-tournament review for violations of Rules 6.11 or 7.21.

***Rationale:** In-tournament review for Rounds 1 through 4 at NCT is extremely time-consuming for the CIC panelists conducting in-tournament review, and in recent years has not provided students with helpful guidance during the tournament. Allowing a group, including AMTA Reps, to adjudicate during the final round will prevent what we are all most worried about.*

Motion seconded

Motion by Randels to enter committee of the whole

Seconded

Motion to enter committee of the whole passes

Motion by Leapheart to exit committee of the whole

Seconded

Motion to exit committee of the whole passes

Motion by Leapheart to call the question

Seconded

Motion to call the question passes

Motion fails

EC-01

Motion by Gelfand to amend Rule 12.7(2)(a) to read as follows:

Rule 12.7 National championship bids

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) HOST BID.

(a) General rule for host bid. The host institution at the National Championship Tournament, in the event that only one school is hosting, shall be guaranteed at least one bid to its own National Championship Tournament, provided that said host school had at least one team which qualified, **by a direct bid or an open bid**, to an Opening Round Championship Series Tournament. In no event shall a host receive a second bid to the National Championship Tournament under this rule if it has already received one bid out of an Opening Round Championship Series Tournament to the National Championship Tournament.

[Subdivisions (2)(b)-(c) and (3) omitted]

Rationale: Gone are the days when most five-win teams at regionals are receiving open bids to ORCS. Of the 18 open bids that were awarded, 16 were given to teams that had 5.5 wins or more at regionals. The two five-win teams that received open bids had CS's of 20 and 19 respectively. Indeed, one of the 2026 NCT host's own teams stood at the top of the open bid list at 6.5. Clearly, open bids have become sufficiently difficult to obtain that the teams that receive them have, that there is no rational reason to deny a host bid to a team that receives one.

Motion passes

EC-02

Motion by Olson (as amended by committee) to establish an exploratory committee on expansion and host-site model for AMTA Championship Series

Motion to establish an Exploratory Committee to evaluate various proposals for restructuring the NCT and ORCS structure. The Exploratory Committee should consider proposals related to expanding the Championship Series, proposals related to managing capacity in AMTA-sanctioned tournaments, and other proposals related to ensuring sustained and manageable operation of AMTA tournaments.

The Committee is authorized to seek feedback from stakeholders, including teams, coaches, hosts, alumni, and judges. The Committee shall produce a written report that includes a feasibility analysis (including budget impacts, stakeholder impacts, and necessary rule changes) for any proposals considered in-depth, as well as a list of proposals that were not considered in-depth and brief explanations for why.

The Committee shall include representatives with experience across the tournament pipeline and host operations, such as current or recent AMTA leadership; TAC and TAB Committee participation; ORCS hosts (or individuals with tournament operations experience); individuals with budgeting/finance expertise; and individuals with judge recruitment expertise.

Rationale: *The American Mock Trial Association (“AMTA”) tournament series has experienced sustained growth. Under the current structure, a large number of teams compete at Regionals, a smaller fraction advance to the Opening Round Championship Series (“ORCS”), and an even smaller fraction advance to the National Championship Tournament (“NCT”). At the same time, hosting the NCT is consistently described as burdensome, and the annual selection of a new host limits the development of institutional knowledge and repeatable best practices in venues, staffing, and judge recruitment.*

This motion would facilitate the development of proposals to ensure the sustained and manageable operation of AMTA-sanctioned tournaments, especially the Championship Series. The amended version of this motion provides greater flexibility for the Committee rather than cabining it to specific proposals, while still focusing its efforts on expansion and capacity issues.

Motion passes

EC-04

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 2.4(2) to read as follows:

Rule 2.4 Registration Fees.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) REGIONAL TOURNAMENT FEE PER TEAM.

(a) The first team from each school shall pay a regional tournament registration fee of \$125. ~~Each additional team shall pay a registration fee which increases by \$50, so that the second team's fee is \$175, the third team's fee is \$225, etc.~~ The second and third team shall pay a registration fee which increases by \$50, so that the second team's fee is \$175 and the third team's fee is \$225. Each additional team shall pay a registration fee which increases by \$100, so that the fourth team's fee is \$325, the fifth team's fee is \$425, etc.

(b) A New School shall pay no regional tournament registration fee for the first team it registers for Regionals. Additional teams from that school shall pay regional tournament fees at a 50% reduction from the schedule in subsection 2(a) above.

[Subdivisions (3)-(7) omitted]

Rationale: Programs with more than three teams already have the funds to keep their more than three teams competing. This may dissuade some programs from adding a D or E or F team, which will make regionals team assignments easier and potentially relieve hosts, who are frequently asked to if they can take on teams beyond their cap. And for the programs that still register D, E, and F teams, their increased registration fees will provide AMTA with more funds with which to provide all member programs with the AMTA experience.

Motion by Olson to amend to institute fee increases beginning in the 2027-2028 season

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion by Michalak to call the question

Seconded

Motion to call the question passes

Motion passes as amended

EC-06

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 15.16 to read as follows:

Rule 15.16 Coaches' Hall of Fame.

(1) PURPOSE. AMTA will recognize outstanding coaches by inducting them into a Coaches' Hall of Fame., ~~with inductees to be unanimously selected by the 12 most recently inducted member of the Coaches' Hall of Fame. Judges'; Hall of Fame Awards will be presented at the awards ceremony at the Championship Tournament.~~

(2) NOMINATIONS. Nominations shall be open and announced publicly no later than January 15th annually, and nominations shall have a deadline of March 15th annually.

(3) VOTING MEMBERS. The voting members shall consist of the 12 most recently inducted members of the Coaches' Hall of Fame and three Board Members appointed by the AMTA President. The most recently elected member of the Coaches' Hall of Fame shall serve as the organizer annually.

(4) PROCESS. The hall of fame need not have a new inductee yearly. All nominations are to be considered by the voting members and at their discretion, the voting members may solicit additional input from the community. Any inductee must obtain twelve out of the fifteen possible votes in order to be selected as an inductee. The inductee shall be announced no later than the conclusion of the annual National Championship Tournament, with the speaker for the announcement being selected by the AMTA President in consultation with the voting members.

Rationale: The process for induction into the Coaches' Hall of Fame is currently pretty shrouded in mystery and I think it's due for a bit of an update. It's not clear that the current voting members can, should, or do take public nominations or if they're proposing inductees only among themselves. Changing to a model that better tracks the Neal Smith may open up the Hall of Fame to individuals who the current voting members are unaware of. Additionally, changing the process from unanimous to 12/15 with 3 of the 15 being current board members may prevent situations in which one or two voting members prevent an otherwise qualified coach from being inducted every year for decades. This rule also currently references the Judges' Hall of Fame, which now falls under 15.24.

Motion passes

EC-07

Motion by Halva-Neubauer to sign the management representation letter regarding the FY25 audit:

Whereas Board Members are in receipt of the preliminary audit for FY2025 (five documents shared with the Secretary (Ryne Cannon) on June 30, 2025: (1) Audited Financial Statement; (2) Communication with those charged with governance during communication letter; (3) Management Representation letter; (4) Recommendation letter; and (5) Significant Deficiencies letter prepared by Nichols Accounting Group, Nampa, Idaho, the Audit Committee moves that AMTA Board members acknowledge receipt and review of these documents.

Additionally, the President (Michael D'Ippolito) and Treasurer (Maggy Randels Schuette) are authorized and directed to sign the management letter, and the executive team to take steps to continue to remove the significant deficiencies identified in the audit.

Upon adoption of this motion, Director Halva-Neubauer, in his capacity as Audit Committee Chair, will direct the auditors at Nichols Accounting Group to remove the watermark from the draft report and issue a final report to the Board.

Motion by Woodward to postpone EC-07 until such time as the FY2025 audit is complete

Seconded

Motion to postpone passes

EC-08

Motion by Halva-Neubauer to authorize a three-year contract with Nichols Accounting Group to conduct audits for FY26, FY27, and FY28

The Audit Committee recommends that the Board authorize a three-year contract with Nichols Accounting Group, Nampa, Idaho, to conduct audits for FY26, FY27, and FY28.

***Rationale:** The Audit committee is in agreement that the Board should reengage Nichols under the terms of the attached quote (distributed to Directors as a separate document). The prices are in line with what Nichols has charged in the past, and all who have worked with the Nichols team have been most pleased with their work, professionalism, and desire to really understand our organization through the auditing process.*

Looking into the future, however, the Audit Committee also believes that we should probably engage a new auditor after FY28 to secure the independence that is necessary for a non-profit that is following best practices. There is a rhythm and regularity that Nichols has established with us over the past two years, and that is going to be even more pronounced when they complete six of our audits. That's a good thing, but the coziness and easy of that relationship is why switching auditors after a few audits is a good thing. The Audit Committee does not think that the time is now, but it likely will be time to seek a new auditor in two more years, beginning with FY29.

Motion passes

EC-10

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 3.7 to read as follows:

Rule 3.7 Number of members on a team.

A team shall consist of no fewer than six members and no more than ~~ten~~ twelve members. No one may sit at the attorney table in the role of plaintiff or defendant unless that person is on the team's six to ~~ten~~ twelve person roster. Any team fielding more than ~~ten~~ twelve scoring team members will be disqualified from eligibility for team awards, individual awards and bid consideration. The record of the disqualified team will remain as initially recorded for tabulation and pairing purposes. No student may compete on more than one team for their school, unless the student is given permission to do so under Rule 3.10 by the AMTA Representatives at the tournament.

***Rationale:** Often newer teams need more members to effectively function. Most teams will not use this rule, but it will be beneficial to make competing more accessible to all, while also allowing more complicated cases.*

Motion by Randels to amend to make this change apply only at Regionals and ORCS

Seconded

Randels motion to amend passes

Motion by Olson to amend EC-10 to apply only to new schools as defined in the AMTA Rulebook

Seconded

Motion by Leapheart to call the question

Seconded

Motion to call the question passes

Olson motion to amend fails

Motion fails

EC-11

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 9.11 to read as follows:

Rule 9.11 In-Tournament Investigation.

~~For the 2025-2026 season,~~ The Competition Integrity Committee may in its discretion investigate allegations of violations of Rules 6.11 and 7.21 during the National Championship Tournament and, where appropriate, issue penalties in accordance with Rule 9.10. The committee need not be physically present at a tournament to issue an in-tournament finding and/or penalty. In-tournament investigations and penalties require participation from at least three committee members. Committee members are not disqualified from this process by serving as an AMTA Representative at the tournament in question. The Competition Integrity Committee may establish deadlines and procedures for submitting requests for in-tournament review, which must be publicly posted on AMTA's website no later than the date on which the National Championship Tournament Case is released. The Competition Integrity Committee may impose sanctions, including refusal to consider future requests, if it determines that a request for in-tournament review was frivolous. ~~See Rule 9.28.~~ The Competition Integrity Committee may defer complaints raised in-tournament to post-tournament review. Other than complaints raised in-tournament and deferred to post-tournament review, there shall be no post-tournament review for violations of Rules 6.11 or 7.21.

Rationale: *This year made clear in tournament review is necessary and needs to be permanent. Also, this just removes a reference to Rule 9.28, which does not appear to exist.*

Motion seconded

Motion by Olson to call the question

Seconded

Motion to call the question passes

Motion passes

EC-15

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 15.12 to read as follows:

Rule 15.12 Case Committee duties and procedures.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) CASE RELEASE DEADLINE. Each year's case will be made publicly available no later than August 15. Any changes made following the completion of fall invitational season must be released no later than December 15.

[Subdivisions (2)(a)-(b) and (3)-(5) omitted]

***Rationale:** Everyone needs set expectations on when December case changes will come out. This gives predictability to teams in a busy exam and holiday season and also sets a deadline for the case committee.*

Motion by Michalak to call the question

Seconded

Motion to call the question passes

Motion fails

EC-16

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend the requirement that every witness have an affidavit, with the exception of a criminal defendant. A criminal defendant may either have an affidavit or not. If a criminal defendant does not have an affidavit, she shall be permitted to build her testimony using only facts contained within other pieces of the case, but shall not be permitted to invent facts outside the case materials.

***Rationale:** Invention witnesses create the most confusion among teams, particularly new teams. This change would continue to allow creativity from students and promote the reality that a criminal defendant is not likely to give a sworn statement, but also provides guardrails and allows somewhat more predictability for teams (and the CIC).*

Motion seconded

Motion fails

Motion by Smiley to amend Rule 3.6(2) to read as follows:

Rule 3.6 Student eligibility requirements.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) QUALIFIED STUDENT DEFINED. “Qualified students” include and are limited to the following:

(a) Current undergraduate. This includes an individual who

- i. is not still enrolled in high school or any equivalent,
- ii. has not received a Bachelor’s degree or equivalent (unless otherwise specified in subsection (2)(c)(ii) of this rule),
- iii. is enrolled at a registered school, and
- iv. is enrolled at least on a part-time basis.

[Subdivision (2)(b) omitted]

(c) Accelerated program students. ~~This includes an individual who~~

i. Accelerated Undergraduate Programs. This includes an individual who

- A. has ceased enrollment in the undergraduate division because they have completed the coursework necessary for obtaining their undergraduate degree; and
- B. competes for a school that permits such continued participation; and
- C. is enrolled in a graduate or professional program, other than law school, that permits the student to complete the requirements of a master's or professional degree during the student's fourth academic year of college.

ii. Accelerated High School Programs. This includes an individual who

- A. has ceased all high school coursework; and
- B. competes for a school that permits such participation; and

C. is enrolled in a program that permits the student to complete undergraduate level coursework during the student's fourth academic year of high school.

[Subdivisions (2)(d)-(e) and (3)-(5) omitted]

Rationale: More students are pursuing dual-enrollment, early college, and similar programs that allow them to complete high school coursework early while beginning undergraduate coursework before formally receiving a high school diploma. Many of these programs also provide students with a more affordable path to earning college credit.

This season, three member schools contacted AMTA with requests to allow students in these programs to compete. In each case, the students had completed their high school coursework and were carrying a full college-level course load. They were also participating in the college's extracurricular activities in the same manner as other first-year college students. The key distinction was that, although they were functionally participating as college students, they remained technically enrolled in high school and had not yet received their high school diplomas.

Under our current rule, these students were not allowed to compete in our competitions. The proposed change would allow those students to be eligible for our competitions. This change does not open eligibility to all high school students taking college-level courses. Rather, it would apply only to students in dual-enrollment or early college programs who have completed their high school coursework and are functioning as full-time college students.

Although this issue has arisen occasionally in the past, the number and similarity of the requests received this season suggest that these programs are becoming more common. Allowing eligibility for this narrow category of students would allow AMTA's rules to account for these evolving educational pathways while preserving the general distinction between high school and collegiate competition.

To the extent there are concerns about these students being minors, the proposed change still does not affect our existing eligibility rules. AMTA's rules do not currently exclude students who are under the age of 18, and many students begin college before turning 18. If a member school has admitted the student, permits the student to participate in its extracurricular activities, and is willing to roster the student as part of its mock trial program, then the student's age alone should not make them ineligible for AMTA competition. The proposal would still require approval from the member school, consistent with AMTA's existing eligibility rules.

Motion seconded

Motion by Randels to amend to add subsection (c)(2)(D) that reads: "is not rostered on any high school mock trial team"

Seconded

Motion by Olson to amend the Randels amendment to replace “is not rostered on” with “is prohibited from competing for”

Seconded

Motion by Parker to amend the Olson amendment to replace “is prohibited from” with “is ineligible due to enrollment in college courses”

Seconded

Motion by Randels to amend the Parker amendment to read “is not rostered on a high school mock trial team or is not eligible to be rostered on a high school mock trial team”

Seconded

Motion by Smiley to call the question

Seconded

Motion to call the question passes

Randels motion to amend proposed Parker amendment fails

Parker motion to amend proposed Olson amendment fails

Olson motion to amend proposed Randels amendment fails

Randels motion to amend fails

Motion fails

EC-23

Motion by Harper to amend Rule 14.14 to read as follows:

Rule 14.14 Judges for the national championship trial.

Judges of the National Championship Round shall be assigned by the tournament host in consultation with the Tournament Administration Committee Chair [and the Executive Committee](#). The national championship trial shall be scored by an odd number of at least three. The presiding judge should not score if possible.

***Rationale:** The NCT Final Round is AMTA's crown jewel event. AMTA's leadership should be involved in the process of recruiting and assigning the judges for that trial.*

Motion by Randels to amend to put a period after "Tournament Administration Committee Chair" and to revise the following sentence to say "The Tournament Administration Committee Chair shall provide a list of final round judges to the Executive Committee for feedback."

Seconded.

Motion to amend fails

Motion passes

EC-24

Motion by Halva-Neubauer to establish Furman University as the site for the physical and digital archive of the American Mock Trial Association.

Rationale:

Why is it in the interest of the American Mock Trial Association (AMTA) to establish an archive?

Below is a summary of the reasons offered for non-profit organizations, such as AMTA, to establish an archive by archivists at Northeastern University in a paper published in 2000.

Demonstrating Impact: Archives provide evidence of an organization's work over time, which is crucial for proving effectiveness to donors and stakeholders.

Organizational Memory: Archives keep records of past activities, decisions, and successes accessible, ensuring continuity as staff or board members change.

Legal Compliance and Risk Management: Maintaining records helps manage liability and comply with legal requirements for retention.

Marketing and Branding: Historical materials are strong assets for marketing, public relations, and celebrating anniversaries.

Operational Efficiency: Organizing inactive records improves efficiency and frees up space, while protecting the organization's legacy, particularly if merging or closing.

Protecting Identity: Archives help secure the organization's unique story and place in history.

Why Furman University?

At present, many important documents are being held in Professor Halva-Neubauer's office at Furman University in Greenville, South Carolina. During the past year, he has held two conversations with Dr. Jeffrey Makala, who manages the special collections at Furman and serves as the University archivist. Makala has made a commitment to house AMTA's papers, and he has experience in working with organizations such as AMTA. For example, Furman is site for the papers of the Southeastern Theatre Arts Association, which has long been associated with Furman Theatre Professor Maegan Azar. Makala sees hosting these papers as an opportunity to preserve the story of important non-profit organizations that are attached to an academic community. Our conversations over the last year have led to a recent commitment to host the archive.

Dr. Makala has provided a standard deed of gift document, which is sent to Directors as a separate document.

Devil in the Details

Glen Halva-Neubauer remains committed to gathering materials for this project and encouraging others who have papers to send them to Furman so that more papers become part of the collection.

To my knowledge, there is no cost that Furman would impose on AMTA for serving as host for its papers, but that can be clarified with Dr. Makala.

I would envision that AMTA's papers would look much like those preserved at other archives. There would be a listing of the artifacts that would be public, and future scholars and other interested parties who wished to look at the papers would be allowed to do so, in accordance with AMTA's wishes.

Some materials might be considered controversial if released at the present time, so we could negotiate a seal on those papers so that they would be come public at a time certain in the future.

These details could be negotiated by the Executive Board with Dr. Makala and Furman. Makala is willing to appear via Zoom at the Toronto Board meeting if AMTA Board members would like to ask questions or seek clarification.

Motion by Woodward to amend to direct the Executive Committee to take all necessary steps to establishing the archive

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion as amended passes

EC-25

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 15.7(1) to read as follows:

Rule 15.7 Meeting agendas.

(1) FILING. A motion shall be filed with the Secretary no later than May 15, for motions for the Summer meeting, or October 15, for motions for the Midyear meeting. ~~Whenever possible,~~ Motions should contain the operative text to be added or amended as well as a statement of rationale for the motion. Motions may be filed only by a voting Director. A motion is deemed filed at the time it is emailed to the Secretary.

[Subdivisions (2)-(8) omitted]

***Rationale:** Rule 15.7(8) already provides an avenue for new business motions, which are subject to a heightened voting threshold. Directors should not be able to circumvent the intent of this heightened standard by submitting placeholder motions, which cause more work for the Executive Committee and for the Committee(s) to which these motions are assigned.*

Motion by Bernstein to amend to eliminate the requirement for rationale.

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion passes as amended

RULES-01

Motion by D'Ippolito on behalf of Hinckley to amend Rule 3.16(2) to read as follows:

Rule 3.16 Substitutions in case of illness or emergency

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) PERMISSIBLE SUBSTITUTES DEFINED. Permissible substitutes are:

- (a) other persons on the roster of the affected team who are not competing in that trial;
- (b) a person on the roster of a team that is from the same school as the affected team, but not competing in that particular round, only if there is no person meeting the requirements of 3.16(2)(a);
- (c) ~~a person on the roster of the opponent's team who is not already competing in that trial, but only if there is no person meeting the requirements of 3.16(2)(a);~~
- (d) any other person on the roster of any team competing in the tournament but not in that particular round, but only if there is no person meeting the requirements of 3.16(2)(a), and (b).
- (e) ~~a person on the roster of the opponent's team who is not already competing in that trial, but only if there is no person meeting the requirements of 3.16(2)(a), (b), and (c);~~

[Subdivision (3) omitted]

Rationale: Although this rule is rarely utilized, there should be more of a hierarchy to it at a minimum. As the rule currently reads, the first step is to search for a permissible substitute that is already rostered on the team that is affected. After that, the rule technically allows for either (b) or (c) to be invoked with no clear deference to either one, which means it would be at the discretion of the AMTA reps to either pull from the roster of the opponent's team or pull from anyone else at the tournament. At a minimum, this should be clarified to provide a specific hierarchy for reps to go through so this rule is consistently applied at all tournaments.

Although there is no clear deference to (b) or (c), one of my students' teams had an experience this year when the current (b) subsection was invoked, where an opponent's team member was pulled to compete with them. I would suspect that most reps choose to invoke the rule this way because (b) falls above (c) in the list, meaning reps are pulling from an opponent's team first, and if they can not, looking to the rest of the field to pull from. I don't think this is the best result for either team that is involved. For the team that is below six members, they must work with someone brand new to them who has an incentive to "tank" against their opponent since it is the team they are rostered on. For the team that is providing the member to compete, they are running the risk of their own teammate causing them to lose ballots.

Further, the teams that need this rule invoked have essentially had a semi-crisis occur during regionals weekend. They have lost one (or more) team members due to illness, injury, or personal emergency. That can be tantalizing for many teams, especially when they know the person they are getting to fill is from their opponent, and new every round. My students had this experience, and when debating whether they would return for the round the next day, consistently said they would've felt better about continuing if they knew they could compete with familiar faces during a stressful evening. It would be a better result for students to give them someone from their own school, or at least a neutral party.

The revision to rule 3.16 (2) would implement a clearer hierarchy that preferences students from the same school competing together. If a team has two schools at a tournament, pulling from the other team first minimizes conflicts of interest: the student added to compete for that round can never compete against their own school, and they have low odds of facing the other team again in future rounds. They also have a reason to support the team they are joining: it is their own school. If the new (a) is not an option, then the reps would then attempt to fill the spot with another rostered competitor at the tournament, giving the best "neutral party" option, and if that is not feasible, then the reps fill with someone from the opposing team as a last resort.

Motion by Olson to amend (1) the language in 2(b) to add the underlined language: "that is from the same school as the affected team, competing in that tournament, but not competing in that particular round"; and (2) the language following 2(d) to add the struck language from 2(c)

Seconded

Motion to amend fails

Motion by Jahangir to refer to Rules Committee

Seconded

Motion to refer fails

Motion fails

RULES-07

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 10.19 to read as follows:

Rule 10.19 Assignment of judges.

[Subdivisions (1)-(7) omitted]

(8) RECOMMENDED CONSIDERATIONS FOR DETERMINING THE PRESIDING JUDGE. To the extent any information about the judges is known to the person assigning judges:

(a) Judges are volunteers who bring their knowledge and skill to us free of charge on their days off from practicing, teaching, or studying law. Above all else, we offer them our gratitude.

(b) AMTA embraces diversity and understands our students benefit when they see themselves reflected in their judges. To the extent that judges are equally qualified and willing to preside, AMTA representatives may, in their discretion, break the tie by selecting as a presider a judge whose presence enriches the diversity of the judging pool unless such decision would deprive the students of that judge having a scoring ballot.

(c) The assigned presider should be willing to preside.

(d) ~~If it will not take a ballot out of their hands,~~ The most qualified willing judge should preside, subject to the following exception ~~d(i):~~

~~(e) In a situation in which not every judge will receive a blue ballot, so long as the less qualified judge is willing to preside, the most qualified judges should be holding blue ballots. There are two exceptions to this rule.~~

i. The presiding judge, in an ideal world, is someone unlikely to interfere with the outcome of a qualifying determinative round. If a judge is known to interfere with student performance such that it could affect the scoring judge's ability to accurately differentiate, the AMTA Representatives have discretion to consider this when assigning presiding judges to qualifying determinative rounds. This principle should be invoked sparingly by the AMTA Representatives.

~~ii. A round in the out bracket of round 4, or an 0-4 versus 0-4 round in round 3 becomes a "teaching" round. To advance the educational goal of the activity, the most knowledgeable judge should preside even if this means the most qualified judge will not hold a blue ballot.~~

(f) An actual or perceived failure to abide by these advisory principles is not a basis for seeking relief of any kind.

(9) RECOMMENDED CONSIDERATIONS FOR DETERMINING THE JUDGES WITH BLUE BALLOTS. The most qualified judges in the round should receive blue ballots. This may result in instances where a non-presiding judge's ballot is not counted. The AMTA Representatives may, in their discretion, decide to provide additional blue ballots for all judges in a round so that judges and students are not aware which blue ballots will not be counted. In that event, the AMTA Representatives shall predetermine which blue ballots will not be counted before the conclusion of the round and shall dispose of those blue ballots. Additional comment sheets may be provided to teams at the end of the tournament.

(10) NO RELIEF. No team may claim relief of any sort on the grounds that a judge was not assigned in accordance with these guidelines.

***Rationale:** The practice of giving all judges blue ballots and pre-determining based on judge qualifications which ballots to count has become common practice at invitationals and AMTA-sanctioned tournaments. This ensures that the most qualified judges both preside and score the round. It also avoids judges feeling like their time is wasted if they do not score. This motion would merely codify that practice.*

Motion by Woodward to amend as follows: In that event, the AMTA Representatives shall predetermine which blue ballots will not be counted before the conclusion of the round and shall ~~dispose of those blue ballots~~ seal any non-counted scoring ballots from inspection. ~~The non-counted scoring ballots may not be reviewed by the teams or AMTA Representatives, and the content of the non-counted scoring ballots may not be used as grounds for or evidence in any claim for relief.~~ Additional comment sheets may be provided to teams at the end of the tournament. ~~Prior to the tabulation of the ballots, a ballot that had been determined to be non-counted may be changed to counted only in extraordinary circumstances, e.g., a judge with a scoring ballot leaves early.~~

Seconded

Motion by Smiley to amend the amendment to remove the language “Prior to the tabulation of the ballots.”

Seconded

Motion to amend the proposed Woodward amendment passes

Motion to amend passes

Motion passes as amended

RULES-09

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 6.18 to read as follows:

Rule 6.18 Duties of timekeepers.

Each timekeeper shall accurately monitor the time elapsed. In order to assist their team in complying with Rules 5.4 and 5.5, the timekeeper may unobtrusively indicate to their team the amount of used or remaining time. The timekeeper shall announce ~~aloud~~ to the court when the time for any part of the trial has expired by visually displaying a “STOP” card. Timekeepers shall not announce aloud time has expired until at least ten seconds have passed after expiration of the allotted time. Timekeepers for opposing teams shall cooperate with and assist each other to ensure accurate timekeeping and to eliminate any interruption of the trial due to errors in timekeeping.

***Rationale:** Timekeepers announcing time aloud when someone is finishing speaking is one of the rudest things that happens during our trials. There is often gamesmanship on when to say “time.” This codifies a clear practice that enforces limits, but allows for slight discrepancies between timekeepers and keeps trial disruptions to a minimum.*

Motion fails

RULES-12

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 9.2(2)(b) to read as follows:

Rule 9.2 Interventions.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) WHEN INTERVENTIONS ARE PERMITTED. Interventions are permissible in the following circumstances:

- (a) to prevent the application of the all-loss penalty under Rule 5.5;
- (b) to provide clarification of rules ~~upon request of the judges~~;
- (c) to address a major and flagrant violation of AMTA rules (for example, if a judge decided a witness could not take the stand because the witness is irrelevant; or, that there is no need for a defense close because the plaintiff has not begun to meet its burden).

Rationale: *Often judges don't know they need clarification of the rules. Teams should be able to request this intervention as well (and I think in practice that is already happening, so this just conforms the rule to practice).*

Motion passes

RULES-15

Motion by Holstad (as amended by Committee) to amend Rule 5.13(2) to read as follows:

Motion to enter Committee of the Whole to discuss the issues of scouting at Regional tournaments, including whether a change to the rules is needed and the scope of any potential rule change.

***Committee Rationale:** The Rules Committee recognizes the rising frequency of scouting at Regionals before ORCS. In principle, many committee members agreed that a rule change may be needed to address this issue. However, the committee had concerns about the exact language of the original motion.*

The scouting ban for ORCS and beyond was created relatively recently and getting that language right required much discussion and multiple amendments. For that reason, the specific language of any rule change in this area matters greatly. Additionally, committee members did not reach consensus on how a scouting ban at Regionals should be structured, including whether it should apply to all four rounds or only certain rounds, and how to account for people who may want to observe rounds for educational purposes rather than scouting purposes.

Because this is a far-reaching issue that affects multiple areas of AMTA competition, the Committee believes it would be most beneficial to have a discussion with the full Board about the nature of the problem and whether, or how, it should be addressed through changes to our scouting rules. The intent is to receive guidance from the Board so that the Rules Committee can wordsmith the exact language for any rule change and present it at the mid-year meeting for review by the full Board.

Motion to enter Committee of the Whole passes

Motion by Michalak to exit Committee of the Whole

Seconded

Motion to exit Committee of the Whole passes

[Language of the original motion is below]

Rule 5.13 Open and public trials.

[Subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) EXCEPTIONS.

(a) During regionals and the first two rounds of any post-regional tournament, the only persons permitted to enter a courtroom to observe the round are 1) members of the judging panel; 2) official courthouse staff (deputies, etc.); 3) individuals affiliated with the teams competing in that round; or 4) AMTA Representatives or their official designees. Tournament hosts and their volunteers are prohibited from observing rounds unless they are affiliated with one of the teams competing in that room.

(b) AMTA Representatives or their official designees are permitted to limit observers in a courtroom due to health concerns related to the COVID-19 pandemic. A team member or anyone affiliated with a team's refusal to obey an AMTA Representative's request to leave a courtroom is subject to tournament penalties as set out in Rule 9.3 and/or sanctions under Rule 9.6.

(c) Nothing in this rule prevents competing teams from authorizing individuals ~~from teams not competing at that tournament~~ (“non-affiliated individuals”) to observe any round ~~their first and second round of post-regional tournaments~~. To observe a round otherwise prohibited under this rule ~~the first and second round of post-regional tournaments~~, non-affiliated individuals must obtain permission from the two competing teams in that round. Non-affiliated individuals cannot disclose the contents observed during those rounds to any other school until the conclusion of the Opening Round Championship Series Tournaments ~~during the tournament weekend~~.

Rationale: *This rule would extend the scouting ban to regionals.*

RULES-18

Motion by Harper to amend Rule 12.9(1) to read as follows:

Rule 12.9 Act of AMTA Relief.

(1) ACT OF AMTA DEFINED. An Act of AMTA is an error [by AMTA](#), beyond a team's control, that appears to have prevented that team from earning a bid or placement on the Open Bid list that the team otherwise would have earned. Allegations of "bad judging" shall not be deemed acts of AMTA. Acts of God which are beyond the control of the teams, AMTA, and tournament hosts shall also be considered, but shall result in the awarding of bids only in rare circumstances.

[Subdivisions (2)-(5) omitted]

Rationale: *That seems to be the intent of the rule and if so, it should be clarified.*

Motion passes

RULES-19

Motion by Harper (as amended by Committee) to amend Rule 6.20 to read as follows:

Rule 6.20 Fairness and Impartiality.

(1) Every mock trial judge shall strive to be absolutely fair and impartial in all evidentiary rulings, in scoring and in all other judging activities. In order to assure impartiality, school names shall not be used nor disclosed in any manner during a round. However, a judge or spectator, after submitting the scoring ballot, may inquire about the identity of the schools represented by the teams competing in any round.

(2) Allegations of “bad judging” or any other complaint regarding a specific judge should be brought to the attention of the AMTA Representatives who may, in their discretion, discuss the issue with the Tournament Host and may, in their sole discretion, take appropriate action consistent with these rules and the fair administration of the tournament, including but not limited to asking the judge to not return for future trials. These rules provide no additional relief for allegations of “bad judging.”

***Rationale:** The Act of AMTA rule makes clear that there is no Act of AMTA relief for bad judging, but our rules should make clear that there is no relief, other than what the Reps decide is appropriate in the moment, based on allegations of bad judging - period. We want students to have a positive experience, and certainly judges whose behavior falls below the standard of what can reasonably be expected should be brought to the attention of the host. But, AMTA should not provide relief under its rules because of an allegation that a judge performed poorly. And to the extent that relief is required, it should be addressed on site by the AMTA Representatives (who may, as with any issue, consult with other parties within AMTA including the TAC Chair, Tabulation Director, and President, among others).*

***Committee Rationale:** The Rules Committee agrees that there should be some clarity in what teams can do should they face a scenario where a judge's conduct is clearly unfair or fails to show the appropriate impartiality for this activity. How this has typically been handled is by the AMTA Representatives. Ballots can and have been thrown out on the basis of improper judging or unfair judging. This rule change codifies the process we are already using. Further, it puts teams on notice that speaking to the AMTA Reps is the path forward to deal with the issue. The reason why the Rules Committee moved the language from the proposed rule in the original motion to 6.20 is that the most student facing rules are in Chapters 6 and 7, as they contain the format and in-round competition rules. Therefore, we wanted this to be more visible to students rather than in Chapter 10 which has more to do with tournament Administration. This rule also seems to tie nicely to what we are trying to prevent, which is unfairness in judging.*

Motion by Woodward to amend to add after “AMTA Representatives” the language “within the time limit set forth by 9.1(2)”

Seconded

Motion to amend fails

Motion by Michalak to call the question

Seconded

Motion to call the question passes

Motion passes

TAB-01

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 13.10 to read as follows:

Rule 13.10 Opening round championship tournament individual awards.

Each opening round championship tournament shall award at least ten outstanding attorney and ten outstanding witness awards. Additional awards shall be given to students tied for tenth place. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no individual award shall be given to a student who has not attained at least 16 rank points [at tournaments with two blue ballots per round or 23 rank points at tournaments with three blue ballots per round](#). If ties create the need for additional individual plaques, the AMTA Representatives shall contact the AMTA office within one week of the tournament with the name, address, and award needed. When distributing the available plaques at the tournament, AMTA Representatives should withhold plaques from students whose teams are advancing to the national championship tournament or from students whose teams are coached by an AMTA director or officer.

***Rationale:** 16 ranks at a two-blue-per-round tournament equates to 24 at a three-blue-per-round tournament. This last year, different ORCS used different cut offs, which led to disparities between the number of awards given out at different ORCS. We should have something written into our rules that clarifies the cutoff, which I'm proposing at 23, not 24, because it is EXTREMELY difficult to get to 24 ranks and we should be giving out approximately 10+ awards, not 4 or 5.*

Motion by Selcov to amend to change 23 rank points to 22 rank points

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion passes as amended

TAB-03

Motion by Cannon to amend the Tabulation Manual to read as follows:

The tiebreakers, in order of application, are:

1. Head-to-Head victory (see above)
2. Combined Strength (“CS”) (greater sum is better)
3. Total point differential (“PD”) (greater positive differential is better)
4. Opponents’ Combined Strength (“OCS”) (greater sum is better)
5. Total PD after dropping each team’s most favorable and least favorable ballot differentials
6. Total PD after dropping each team’s two most and two least favorable ballot differentials
7. Total PD after dropping each team’s three most and three least favorable ballot differentials
8. (In a 3-ballot tournament only) Total PD after dropping each team’s four most and four least favorable ballot differentials
9. (In a 3-ballot tournament only) Total PD after dropping each team’s five most and five least favorable ballot differentials
10. Total raw points earned (140 points x 8 ballots = 1120 points maximum; 1680 points in a 3-ballot-per-round tournament)
11. Total raw points after dropping each team’s highest and lowest raw point ballots
12. Total raw points after dropping each team’s two highest and two lowest raw point ballots
13. Total raw points after dropping each team’s three highest and three lowest raw point ballots
14. (In a 3-ballot tournament only) Total raw points after dropping each team’s four highest and four lowest raw point ballots
15. (In a 3-ballot tournament only) Total raw points after dropping each team’s five highest and five lowest raw point ballots
16. Flip of a United States coin: “heads” results in the team with the greater team number winning; “tails” results in the team with the smaller team number winning.

Rationale: This motion was submitted last year and referred to the Analytics Committee. To my knowledge, there has been no follow-up on this motion from that committee. When I proposed

this motion last year, I did so not motivated in any way by data. Rather, I was motivated by the two arguments below, which I think still hold true and do not require testing by the Analytics Committee. This motion is ripe for a full Board discussion and vote.

1. Once normalized for strength of schedule, point differential means something. *If one team has a PD of +75 and another has a PD of +40 and they have the same strength of schedule, the team with the higher PD actually did perform better against teams of comparative strength. (By contrast, if one team has a PD of +75 and a CS of 12, and the other has a PD of +40 and a CS of 17, it would be impossible to use PD to meaningfully differentiate those teams--that's why this proposal keeps CS as a second tiebreaker.) Using PD as a tiebreaker only when teams have the same record and strength of schedule limits the use of PD to situations where it means something. Indeed, this is consistent with how running PD is used when pairing Rounds 3 and 4; it is a secondary tiebreaker after running CS.*

2. Point differential is more intuitive on several levels. *For one, students (and coaches) understand what PD is, while many are unfamiliar with OCS. As a follow-on to that, students' performance in-round directly contributes to their PD: if they score one point higher on their direct examination or closing argument, their PD is one point higher. OCS, by contrast, is not tied at all to students' actual performance in-round. This is one reason why students may get frustrated at the use of OCS as a tiebreaker; they have effectively no control over their OCS. (Though the same argument is arguably true of CS, students at least know that if they perform better in early rounds, they hit teams with better records in later rounds, and thus end up with a higher CS. OCS does not work that way, and even if it did, it's too remote to follow.) Finally, OCS has little if any competitive value even in isolation: OCS is a combination of sixteen teams' records, and given that most tournaments have around twenty-four teams, there is usually lots of overlap in which teams' records factor into the OCS math. It is not clear why Team A should outperform Team B just because Team A's R1 opponent faced a 6-win team in R3 while Team B's fourth-round opponent faced a 4-win team in R2.*

Motion seconded

Motion fails

TAC-07

Motion by Yeomelakis to amend Rule 11.4(2) to read as follows:

Rule 11.4 Waitlist.

[Prefatory language and subdivision (1) omitted]

(2) WAITLIST ADMINISTRATION:

- (a) The waitlist shall be administered at the discretion of TAC Chair.
- (b) Teams on the waitlist will be offered open regionals spots that are within 625 miles from the school's campus, unless they have stated that they are willing to travel a greater distance, in which case they may be offered a regionals assignment greater than 625 miles from the school's campus. ~~The first team on the waitlist will be offered its choice of any open regional tournament slot, regardless of geography.~~ Remaining slot(s) will be offered to the next team on the waitlist until available slots are exhausted. However, the standard rule that no more than two teams from a school may attend a single regional tournament remains in effect.
- (c) If a team declines all available regional tournament slots, the team shall remain on the waitlist in its present position, and remains "first in line" for new slots as they become available.
- (d) All teams accepting a regional assignment under this procedure do so understanding that, if they accept a geographically distant regional assignment, their bid to the opening round championship site may also be geographically distant, based on the current feeder assignments.
- (e) An offer of a regional tournament slot shall expire if acceptance is not received within 48 hours after the offer is made.
- (f) If AMTA is unable to offer a team on the waitlist a spot in a Regional Tournament within 400 miles from that school's campus as measured by distance from campus to the tournament site via Google Maps or a similar program designated by the Team and Feeder Subcommittee by 14 days before the start of the latest scheduled tournament, and that school does not choose to compete at a more distant regional, then the school will be entitled to a refund of the Regional Tournament fee and late registration fees paid for the team in question. The school shall not be entitled to a refund of the School Registration Fee. This subsection does not apply and no refunds will be paid to teams placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 2.10(3)(e).

Rationale: *This change brings this rule in alignment with current TAC practices. We do not offer the first team on the waitlist every available open slot for them to pick from, if we operated under that model, assigning teams off of the waitlist would take weeks. Instead, we offer open spots based on geography, but we also check with teams on the waitlist to gauge their availability and interest in traveling farther than 400 miles.*

Motion to withdraw as moot

Seconded

Motion to withdraw passes

Motion withdrawn as moot

TAC-09

Motion by Cannon to amend Rules 3.2 and 3.3 to read as follows:

Rule 3.2 School registration.

Any School, as defined in Rule 1.2(a), may register to compete in AMTA sanctioned tournaments. Timely AMTA registration, along with payment of team registration fees under Chapter 2, guarantees that there will be space in Regional Tournament(s) for at least ~~two~~ ~~three~~ teams from a participating school, unless the school's participation has been limited under Rule 9.6(3). A school shall not be allowed to participate in any sanctioned tournament if the school has any unpaid fines, penalties, or fees, unless written permission for an alternative deadline is received from the Tournament Administration Committee Chair, who should consult with the Treasurer on such decisions.

Rule 3.3 Number of teams eligible for regional competition.

Each school may register an unlimited number of teams for regional tournaments. However, no more than ~~two~~ ~~three~~ teams from a program will be guaranteed a space in a regional tournament. All additional teams from a program will be placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 11.4. No more than two teams from any given school may compete at any single regional tournament. During the 2022 competitive season only, the Chair of the Tournament Administration Committee can allow more than two teams from one school to compete at the same tournament, only if that tournament is a regional being held online and not in-person.

***Rationale:** In the 2025-2026 season AMTA was less than 50 teams away from capacity across 32 regionals when assigning the first three teams from every timely registered school. While this rule change is unlikely to matter immediately, it preserves AMTA's flexibility in case there is another year of unexpected growth. Rule 13.10 Opening round championship tournament individual awards.*

Motion by Jahangir to add a provision to Rules 3.2 and 3.3 that programs that host an AMTA-sanctioned tournament are guaranteed at least three teams

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion passes as amended

TAC-10

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 11.4 to read as follows:

Rule 11.4 Waitlist.

[Prefatory language omitted]

(1) PRIORITY OF TEAMS WITHIN TIERS:

(a) As between teams in the “tiers” described above, priority will be given based upon the date when registration is complete, with earlier dates taking precedence.

~~(b) As between any teams still tied based on the above criteria, priority will be given based on geographic factors. In other words, if California A and New York A are both on the waitlist, and both payments were received on the same date, California A has priority for available regional slots on the west coast; New York A has priority for available regional slots on the east coast.~~

(b) As between any teams still tied based on the above criteria, the TAC chair shall make open regional tournament slots available simultaneously. The first team to accept a slot is the recipient.

(2) WAITLIST ADMINISTRATION:

(a) The waitlist shall be administered at the discretion of TAC Chair.

(b) Teams on the waitlist will be offered open regionals tournament spots that are within 625 miles from the school’s campus, unless they have stated that they are willing to travel a greater distance, in which case they may be offered a regionals tournament assignment greater than 625 miles from the school’s campus. Spots that are declined will be offered to the next team on the waitlist. ~~The first team on the waitlist will be offered its choice of any open regional tournament slot, regardless of geography. Remaining slot(s) will be offered to the next team on the waitlist until available slots are exhausted.~~ However, the standard rule that no more than two teams from a school may attend a single regional tournament remains in effect.

(c) If a team declines all offered available regional tournament slots, the team shall remain on the waitlist in its present position, and remains “first in line” for new slots as they become available.

(d) All teams accepting a regional assignment under this procedure do so understanding that, if they accept a geographically distant regional assignment, their bid to the opening round championship site may also be geographically distant, based on the current feeder assignments.

(e) An offer of a regional tournament slot shall expire if acceptance is not received within 48 hours after the offer is made, unless otherwise expressed to the team in writing.

(f) If AMTA is unable to offer a team on the waitlist a spot in a Regional Tournament within ~~400~~ 625 miles from that school's campus ~~as measured by distance from campus to the tournament site via Google Maps or a similar program designated by the Team and Feeder Subcommittee~~ by 14 days before the start of the latest scheduled tournament, and that school does not choose to compete at a more distant regional, then the school will be entitled to a refund of the Regional Tournament fee and late registration fees paid for the team in question. The school shall not be entitled to a refund of the School Registration Fee. This subsection does not apply and no refunds will be paid to teams placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 2.10(3)(e).

Rationale: *This change brings this rule in alignment with current TAC practices. It also maintains consistency with how TAC considers geography (i.e., updating 400 miles to 625 miles, consistent with the three-team-per-regional rule).*

Motion passes

TAC-11

Motion by Cannon to amend the prefatory language to Rule 11.4 to read as follows:

Rule 11.4 Waitlist.

Due to factors beyond AMTA's control, teams may be placed on a waitlist for a regional assignment. Teams that register after the expiration of the annual registration deadline as defined by Rule 2.8, will be placed on a waitlist. They will be removed off of the waitlist as spots become available using the criteria listed herein:

- (a) The "A" team from any New Schools that register by the priority registration deadline;
- (b) Any "B" or "C" team that registers on or before the priority registration deadline that was placed on the waitlist pursuant to Rule 3.3.
- (c) Any "A" team that registers before Thanksgiving.
- (d) All remaining teams on the waitlist shall be divided into whether the waitlisted team would be the first, second, third, fourth, etc. team from that school. Priority shall be given in that order; in other words, Alaska A has priority over Hawaii B, which has priority over Montana C.

***Rationale:** This change allows TAC to prioritize assigning more programs over assigning additional teams from schools that already have three teams assigned at regionals. Historically, there is enough room for both the (b) and newly proposed (c) categories above, but as the activity continues to grow, my view is that we should prioritize access to regionals for a more diverse array of programs.*

Motion by Cannon to amend to strike subsection (a) and remove "B or C" from subsection (b)

Seconded

Motion by Randels to call the question

Seconded

Motion to call the question passes

Motion to amend passes

Motion passes as amended

TAC-12

Motion by Cannon to amend Rule 11.3(1) to read as follows:

Rule 11.3 Regional assignment criteria and procedure.

(1) ASSIGNMENT CRITERIA. The Tournament Administration Committee will assign every Member School's registered team(s) to one or more regional tournaments. Assignment of schools and teams to regional tournaments will be made after the close of registration. Assignment of teams to regional tournaments will be based on factors including, but not limited to, geography (including minimizing travel for New Schools), preferences of regional tournament hosts, balance of competitive power, and regional tournament size and capacity. Special requests by schools, including to travel outside their region or to compete on specific weekends, will be considered at the discretion of the Tournament Administration Committee if made prior to the registration deadline. Special requests by schools made after regional assignments have been published will be considered only in extenuating circumstances. ~~using the criteria listed below. The below-listed criteria are examples of factors that AMTA will consider; they are not listed in any particular order, and no one factor is singularly determinative regarding how AMTA will assign teams to regional tournament:~~

- ~~(a) assigning schools to a location within five hours of driving distance (according to Google Maps or a similar program designated by the Team and Feeder Subcommittee) when possible (not necessarily the closest geographic region). A school may voluntarily choose to travel further; however, this may result in the school's teams being assigned to any regional tournament or opening round championship tournament, regardless of distance and expense, even if there are tournaments closer to the school which do not conflict;~~
- ~~(b) implementing Board policy to equalize the number of teams at all regional tournament sites;~~
- ~~(c) assigning AMTA Representatives in such a fashion as to ensure that teams of the AMTA Representatives are not competing on the same weekend as their AMTA Representative assignments;~~
- ~~(d) considering requests for specific dates made prior to the registration deadline;~~
- ~~(e) assigning specific teams from a school (i.e. A team, B team, etc.) to better balance power among regional tournament sites;~~
- ~~(f) minimizing travel for schools new to AMTA; and~~
- ~~(g) accommodating schools who wish to move outside their region, only if doing so assists AMTA's Tournament Administration Committee Chair in implementing the criteria in subs. (a) (f).~~

[Subdivisions (2)-(7) omitted]

Rationale: *The current rule is confusing as to how much weight should be given to the various criteria listed, and whether the criteria are exhaustive. For instance, competitive strength is arguably not a factor that is currently weighed except as mentioned in subdivision (e) with respect to team designations. It is also confusing as to whether these factors are dispositive--for instance, the five-hour driving limitation is artificial (both under- and overinclusive, as many teams cannot drive five hours while some can easily drive six or seven). This rule change brings the rule more in line with current TAC practice.*

The reference to special requests by schools is necessary because these requests have proliferated in recent years, and many of the requests ignore AMTA Rule 11.3(3), which clearly states that "AMTA does not recognize winter, spring, quarter, or other breaks, recesses, or exam periods as conflict dates" unless there is a school policy prohibiting participation in sanctioned tournaments during these periods. Many teams also do not make timely requests, but instead seek changed assignments only once their assignments are released; these requests are often impossible to accommodate or at least require significant adjustments to multiple tournament sites.

Motion passes

TAC-15

Motion by Randels Schuette to amend Rule 11.9 to read as follows:

Rule 11.9 Regional tournament evaluations.

Each regional tournament will undergo a site evaluation process that includes (a) a report from the AMTA Representatives and (b) evaluations from all teams at that site. This information will be provided to the Tournament Administration Committee Chair, who, in consultation with the Tournament Administration Committee, will make a recommendation about the quality of all sites. The reports will be shared with each regional tournament host. ~~If a site has significant problems, the host shall be informed in writing by the Tournament Administration Committee about the nature of the deficiencies and given one year to remove them. If the host fails to remove the deficiencies for two years in row, the Tournament Administration Committee Chair, in consultation with the Tournament Administration Committee, may remove that school as a regional site.~~ The Tournament Administration Committee may, in its discretion, remove any host based on evaluations.

***Rationale:** We shouldn't have to wait two years to remove a host who is not hosting a quality tournament. This just gives TAC discretion to take action.*

Motion by Woodward to amend to remove the language “based on evaluations”

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion passes as amended

TAC-16

Motion by Yeomelakis to propose for the board to vote on the 2028 NCT host.

Motion by Cannon to amend to select the proposal from the University of Minnesota as the 2028 NCT host

Seconded

Motion to amend passes

Motion passes as amended

X. Approval of 2026-27 Budget

Board entered Executive Session at 9:22 a.m. EST on Sunday, July 12, 2026.

Randels presented the 2026-27 Budget in Executive Session.

Motion by Leapheart to approve the 2026-27 Budget

Seconded

Motion passed by unanimous consent

Board exited Executive Session at 9:45 a.m. EST on Sunday, July 12, 2026.

XI. Unfinished / New Business

A. Motion by Holstad to discuss in New Business a ban on scouting at Regionals and Rounds 1 and 2 of ORCS.

Seconded

Motion fails to achieve a 2/3 vote of Directors present.

B. Motion by Cannon to host the 2027 AMTA Board Meeting at the University of California, Santa Barbara in Santa Barbara, California.

Seconded

Motion passes

C. The Board commended by applause Smiley and the University of Toronto for hosting an excellent July 2026 Board Meeting.

XII. Adjournment

Motion by Jahangir to Adjourn

Seconded

Motion passes