2019 MUDS Executive Committee Meeting 2 - Minutes:

**Date:** 04.02.2019

**Location:** Presentation Pos 1, Level 1 [Library]

**Commencement:** 1901

**Minutes by:** Udai Kamath - Secretary

**Attendance:** Amelia Taylor (AT), Udai Kamath (UK), Bethany Burns (BB), Georgia Chahoud (GC), Tom Frankham (TF), Taris Watson (TW), Sascha Solomon (SS) and Henry Baldwin (HB), Annya Reshty (AR):

# Goals:

**AT:** If your portfolio needs to do something this year, then start planning now when motivation is high. We don’t just want to do the same things as last year – try to grow MUDS. Please put updated versions of documents on the Google Drive – that way everyone always has access.

# Easters:

**AT:** Easters Trials will be on the 25th of March.

**GC:** Is that both Pro and Novice trials?

**AT:** Yes. Both pro and Novice trials. Adj trials are the week after [1st of April]. Our External Selector will be Kevin Lee. Our internal Selectors will be Dan and Rob. We have a trial policy prepared. Does anyone have any problems with it?

**UK:** Section 2.4 doesn’t make grammatical sense. It also refers to make-up trials – something we have never done and I don’t think we really ever want to do.

**AT:** Cool. Let’s scrap 2.4.

**UK:** I also want to point out that Section 4.2(a) is new and wasn’t in last years trial policy, so perhaps we should discuss it. It requires that the top three ranked teams meet AA independently.

**AT:** Are you sure this wasn’t in last year’s trial policy.

**UK:** yes.

**BB:** I think it is a good idea.

**UK:** This seems difficult to enforce since only the top two teams are ranked.

**AT:** We can ask the selectors to give them us a ranked list of all teams to confirm.

**UK:** could the selectors lie about who the third ranked team is to meet this requirement.

**AT:** We should probably trust the selectors.

**GC:** We could apply this requirement to only the top two teams - since they are ranked, but that might reduce team flexibility a lot.

**AT:** Seems fine as is.

*Amelia Taylor moves a motion to pass the trial Policy.*

*Bethany Burns seconds the motion.*

*The motion passes unanimously.*

**AT:** We also have an Adjudicator trial policy. Any Questions.

**UK:** Instead of requiring interviews to occur in the inverse order to ballot submissions I think it would be preferable to hold them in a randomised order.

**BB:** Does anyone have a problem with random order?

**AT:** Everyone seems fine with it.

**UK:** The policy states that participants will not find out their ranks. I think participants should be able to ask for where they ranked in trials.

**AT:** I don’t think the policy states you can’t find out your rank – just that it won’t be given.

**UK:** For Australs trials last year everyone was told their rank. Can we add a section 2.6 to clarify this.

**AT:** Sure.

*Amelia Taylor moves a motion to pass the Adjudicator Trial Policy.*

*Bethany Burns seconds.*

*The motion passes unanimously.*

**AT:** Expectations for Easters. Everyone here is a mentor. Be nice to novices and make sure they have a good time. Try not to focus on stuff that has in past years. Focus on new things we can include novices in. Don’t scare novices when they hit good teams.

**UK:** I have a proposal. This might not be a problem this year, since there is a large number of Pros available, but in the past there has been many all novice teams. I was on one such team in my first year, and the experience is very different. I think we should adopt something the USU does and give these all novice teams a dedicated mentor. This should be someone who is adjudicating and therefore available at the tournament who can help them prepare in the lead up to the tournament, debrief them after rounds and answer questions.

**AT:** Seems like a good idea. We just haven’t had enough Pros in the past.

**AR:** This year we will have a lot of experienced adjudicators who have been debating for a while and would have a lot of knowledge to pass on.

**GC:** Last year we were short on Pros and Dan was a CA.

**UK:** Dan was DCA in 2017. In any case we have enough Pros this year. I think it’s important to assign a specific Pro to each team rather than telling people they can approach anyone. It’s a lot less intimidating to approach someone who has been assigned to help you and has worked with you for several weeks.

**AT:** We can ask the mentors to seek out their team after rounds rather than the other way around.

**SS:** Last year we were told we could talk to anyone in the society – but often people were in conversations, so we just stood there.

**AT:** Great. Let’s implement this.

**BB:** Cost of Easters. We have more Pros and less Novices this year so we can afford to have a greater subsidy than last year. Let’s offer $250 for Novices to put it in-line with Law Camp, and we can bring down the cost for Pros to $330.

*Bethany Burns moves a motion to pass the Easters subsidy.*

*Udai Kamath seconds.*

*The motion passes unanimously.*

# O Week:

**BB:** O week is different this year, it is not a whole week now. Stalls are only on Thursday and Friday. Monday to Wednesday we can get tables. O week is good. We should get newbies keen and promote the demo debate and Easters. Everyone should put their availabilities on the sheet so we can allocate people. If you can’t answer a question someone asks you, you can message marketing.

# Demo Debates:

**AT:** Demo debates are bad. They aren’t interactive. Being funny is hard. Let’s jump into internals

**SS**: what about speaking games instead?

**AR:** Novices are often apprehensive about giving a formalised speech on the first day, but are happy to have discussions and voice their opinions amongst each other, so speaking games would probably be a lot more engaging than putting them straight into debates.

**GC:** I grappled with this issue last year and at the end I realised you kind of need a demo debate. People need a low commitment entrance to the society. People want to see how a debate works before doing one.

**UK:** I would be fine skipping the demo debate, but there are other people who are to scare to speak off the bat.

**GC:** Many people have never debated and have no clue what to do. They come to debating to get better at speaking.

**AT:** Well they have to speak at some point – why not throw them into the deep end?

**GC:** What if we do an interactive demo debate. Split people up into groups of four and have them create the arguments together. A pro can then deliver a speech using those arguments.

**AT:** Sounds good.

# O week (PT II):

**BB:** SRC will pay us for a sausage sizzle. We should do one.

# Fee Waivers:

**AT:** I have written a fee waiver policy. Some people have made some edits. The policy outlines a few different types of cost-reduction measures that can be handed out by the competitions portfolio. A Partial Fee Waiver grants the applicant free registration for the tournament but precludes them from eating tournament food. A Full Fee Waiver grants them free registration with no conditions. A Fee Reduction requires an applicant only pay half the registration cost – this is for people who are only coming to one day of the tournament.

**GC:** I don’t like the idea of Partial Fee Waivers. This seems incredibly difficult to enforce.

**UK:** I think Partial Fee Waivers should be reserved for cases where due to allergies or diet of a participant the tournament is incapable of providing them with suitable food. This won’t be for people who just don’t like the food or want to save money.

**AT:** We should trust that people will use the system fairly.

**BB:** We can require that people caught abusing a Partial Fee Waiver be required to pay the full cost of registration.

**UK:** They should also be ineligible to receive any sort of Fee Waiver in the future.

**AT:** That sounds fine. Let’s add that in.

**UK:** We should remove section 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 and replace them with a section that explains that there is a high burden for the granting of fee waivers. We should also remove the appeals process spelled out in 2.5 as it seems time consuming and unnecessary.

**AT:** Sure, can you make those edits?

*Amelia Taylor* *moves a motion to pass the 2019 Fee Waiver Policy.*

*Bethany Burns seconds.*

*The motion passes unanimously.*

# Receipts:

**BB:** It is a requirement we have receipts. No receipt no refund. Macsysnc is bad and so we need to apply for money four weeks in advance for every small event. That means event requests need to go up earlier than this so the budget requests can go in.

**UK:** That reminds me, didn’t we have a school’s day planned for early February?

**AT:** No one signed up for it.

# AWDC Update:

**AT:** we need sponsors. If anyone has ideas? More money would be good. No problems with AWDC.

# Equity:

**UK:**  The equity team has written an equity policy for 2019. Some people might say it looks suspiciously similar to the 2018 equity policy. This is obviously not true.

*Udai Kamath moves a motion to pass the 2019 Equity Policy.*

*Annya Reshty seconds.*

*The motion passes unanimously.*

# Novice Development

**HB:** I’m putting together a survey of past novices – what did they like and didn’t like.

**TF:** I’m updating the scavenger hunt.

*Meeting closes 2019*