

TEAM PROBLEM SOLVING MASTER (PRELIM A, PRELIM B, SEMI)

2018 National Convention AM Prelim Round
Team Problem Solving Practicum

Directions:

Assume that the following scenario transpired during a recent meeting. As a team, provide a professional parliamentary opinion to the questions posed by composing your answers on the computer provided in word processor. Please be sure to provide appropriate citation of your parliamentary authority. You may use both the digital Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised as well as your own books as reference material

Scenario:

Last Monday the standing chapter activities committee met to discuss plans for the upcoming school year. The discussion ranged from organizing donkey basketball activities in the fall to greenhouse plant sales in the spring. MEMBER A realized that she needed to be home by 7:30pm. At 6:30pm, MEMBER A moved limit and close debate so that the question be put to a vote at 7pm.

The committee chair called for a vote to limit debate and the motion failed 2 in favor and 3 opposed.

The committee was discussing a chapter pizza party. There was a main motion on the floor to hold the pizza party on Dec. 12th. At 6:45pm, MEMBER A move to adjourn the meeting at 7pm. The motion was seconded, but the committee chair ruled it out of order. Discussion about the pizza party resumed.

At 6:55pm the committee was discussing the motion to host a Valentine's Day dance. MEMBER A felt like there was a lot of business still left to be conducted. Therefore, she moved to fix the time to which to adjourn and reconvene the meeting tomorrow right after school. The motion was seconded and passed with a voice vote. With another meeting time set, MEMBER B moved to adjourn the meeting. It passed, and the meeting was adjourned.

Questions

1. Was the chair right to handle MEMBER A's motion to limit debate? Why or why not?

No. The motion to limit debate was out of order. Limit debate is not allowed in committees.

See [RONR (11th Ed.), p. 191, ll. 18]

2. Was the chair correct to rule MEMBER A's motion to adjourn out of order? Why or why not?

Yes. When the motion to adjourn is qualified in any way as in the case of a motion to adjourn at a future time it is not a privileged motion and is treated as any other main motion and out of order while business is pending.

See [RONR (11th ed.), p. 234, ll.9-29]

3. At what point will business at the meeting tomorrow be taken up?

Because this is a continuation of the same session, business will be taken up at the point it was left off right after a brief reading of the minutes.

See [RONR (11th Ed). p.85 ll. 30; p.94 ll.11-15]

National FFA (@NationalFFA) Parliamentary Procedure Leadership Development Event

2018 National Convention PM Prelim Round Team Problem Solving Practicum

Directions:

Assume that the following scenario transpired during a recent meeting. As a team, provide a professional parliamentary opinion to the questions posed by composing your answers on the computer provided in word processor. Please be sure to provide appropriate citation of your parliamentary authority. You may use both the digital Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised as well as your own books as reference material

Scenario:

The chapter currently has six constitutional officers (president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, reporter, and sentinel). Several members would like to add a parliamentarian to the officer team. But this would require an amendment to the bylaws.

The bylaws do not currently have provisions or a procedure for amendment. During the September meeting MEMBER A announced that he was planning to propose a bylaws amendment to add a parliamentarian. This agenda item was included in the call for the October meeting that was emailed to all members and it included proposed wording for the bylaw amendment.

At the October meeting MEMBER A moved to amend the bylaws and add the officer role of parliamentarian.

The FFA chapter has 80 members. However, only 40 members attended the October meeting. The amendment to the bylaws was adopted with a vote of 30 in favor and 10 opposed.

Immediately after the bylaws amendment passed, the chair proceeded to take nominations to fill the officer role of parliamentarian. MEMBER B was subsequently elected to serve as parliamentarian.

Questions

- 1. MEMBER C was not able to attend the October meeting. She said that the bylaws amendment was not in order because the vote was not a majority of the entire chapter membership. Is she right?**

No. If no provision for amendments is provided in the bylaws, bylaws can be amended by a two-thirds vote if previous notice has been OR by a majority of the entire membership. Because the chapter took a two-thirds vote and previous notice was given, the chapter acted correctly.

See [RONR (11th Ed.), p. 581, ll. 4-7]

- 2. MEMBER C argued that because MEMBER A didn't provide the text in writing at the September meeting that previous notice wasn't properly given. Is she right?**

No. A requirement of previous notice means that announcement that the motion will be introduced -- indicating its exact content as described -- must be included in the call of the meeting. Previous notice was given adequately, and the chapter acted correctly.

See [RONR (11th ed.), p. 121, ll.21-35]

- 3. MEMBER C was interested in serving as parliamentarian. She argued that the bylaw amendment shouldn't have gone into effect until the end of the meeting and that the chair should not have called for nominations to elect a new parliamentarian. Is she right?**

No. An amendment to the bylaws goes into effect immediately upon its adoption. The chapter was within their rights to elect a parliamentarian to fill the newly created role.

See [RONR (11th Ed), p.597 ll. 2-3]

**National FFA (@NationalFFA)
Parliamentary Procedure Leadership Development Event**

2018 National Convention Semi Final Round Team Problem Solving Practicum

Directions:

Assume that the following scenario transpired during the chapter meeting that was just held. As a team, provide a professional parliamentary opinion to the questions posed by composing your answers on the computer provided using the word processor software. Please be sure to provide appropriate citation of your parliamentary authority (page numbers, only). You may use both the digital Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised as well as your own books as reference material.

Scenario:

The local City Council is taking up a resolution (R2018-04-32). After an hour of debate, in which each member of the Council had multiple opportunities to speak, the Mayor asked if there was any further debate. Councilmember O made a brief statement for the resolution as it currently stood and moved to end debate. The Mayor turns each way to see if there is an objection or anyone else wishing to speak. Seeing no one attempting to speak, the Mayor takes a vote on R2018-04-32, which is adopted 8-1.

Several months later, a "Letter to the Editor" appeared in a local newspaper, calling into question the legitimacy of R2018-04-32. The letter writer, while not a member of the City Council, is politically astute, and well-respected for his knowledge of parliamentary law. His letter to the editor states that the adoption of R2018-04-32 is "in parliamentary limbo." He states that because there was no second to the motion to end debate, and no vote on that motion, all debate and votes that followed it, including the vote to adopt Resolution 2018-04-32 were "in doubt."

Questions

1. Was the motion to end debate handled correctly?

No. The motion to end debate (previous question) requires a second and a 2/3 vote for adoption.

See [RONR (11th ed.), p. 198]

2. Is the letter writer correct that the adoption of R2018-04-32 is “in limbo”?

No. A point of order must be raised timely.

See [RONR (11th ed.), p. 250-251]

3. If the letter writer had attended the meeting, could he have raised the point of order?

No, he is not a member of the Council, and even if he is a resident of the City, he has no right of membership, including the right to raise a point of order.

(See [RONR (11th ed.), p. 249]