EXECUTIVE MEETING FOR THE 23rd OF JULY

*Meeting Opens: 13:04pm*

*Executive Present: Amelia Taylor, Annya Reshty, Georgia Chahoud, Bethany Burns, Tom Frankham*

*Executive Absent: Anneliese Cooper, Despina Bouletos, Liam Hot and Udai Kamath*

1. **Waive the notice requirement**

**AT: I propose to waive the notice requirement for our Women’s trial policy**

*Seconded: GC*

*Passes Unanimously*

1. **Women’s trial policy**

*UL and LH arrive at 13:08pm*

GC: Womens is a development tournament, no captains pick. Ranked list of pros and novices, match them up. Because women’s is early, novices wont have as much experience with BP. So, the proposed change is to separate the pros form the novices and make it an opening half debate.

BB: We should definitely make it opening half. Its first years who have only being dong 3v3. They will struggle with new extension material. Everyone is suffering fromm the same handicap if we make it opening half.

AT: I think opening and closing balance each other quite well. Opening half wont think of all of the material, easier to grab at from closing. All positions have handicaps, this just makes things harder.

UL: Opening half is equally as challenging as closing half, we want to rank people based on their ability to do bp, otherwise we would do 3v3 trials.

BB: We want to give everyone the same handicap to make it as fair as possible.

TF: You will probably freak them out if you ask them to run an extension, there is a lot of pressure there.

LH: The problem is that if we only let them do opening half they will lose an opportunity to develop

AT: There’s no such thing as the same handi cap, otherwise why don’t we make everyone do PM speehces

GC: I don’t see it as a massive disadvantage, they can just get up and give rebuttal if they can’t think of an extension.

BB: I think it will freak them out. There will still be other opportunities for development. Its more new than doing an extension. How do we know the triallist can account that extensions are different?

AT: We need to design this policy trusting that our triallists know how debating works

BB: I don’t see a harm in doing it, it only makes trials slightly more difficult

UK: Pm is hard. Extensions aren’t that hard.

**Motion: only hold opening half debates for novice trials**

*Proposed: Beth*

*Seconded: Annya*

*For: Tm, Beth and Annya*

*Against: Amelia, Udai, Liam and Georgia*

*Motion fails*

GC: Lts do the 13th. Theo and Dan are gonna be triallists.

1. **World’s trial policy**

**UK: move a motion to waive the notice requirement.**

*Second: BB*

*Passes unanimously*

UK: Start off with straight ranks. Move between teams if people want to change around.

GC: how does this process work? Do we all go in a room to discuss it after?

UK: Melbourne thing is a bad idea. You tell the rego officer that you want to change, they ask the people, if they agree, then the swap happens.

GC: what happens if everyone wants to move, except one person?

UKi: back to straight ranks

GC: I think we want to minimise conflict. Captains pick isn’t perfect. Rogue trial rankings happens all the time. I think its harder for people to hear, it harsh because more people are involved.

LH: I think it’s more like “I would prefer to be with this person”, not that harsh

TF: I think a lot of the harms aren’t an issue, most people already agree on the teams beforehand

UK: if you don’t want to be in that team, you drop out in captains pick. I think its just as offensive when you skip over people.

BB: People are dicks, they can pressure each other.

AT: As if someone will consent to drop from the first team to the second team. I think it hurts more because more people are involved. I think it also sucks because if it fails, its super offensive, because three other people agreed you needed to move and now dislike you for ruining their teams

GC: I think its important to pick people that you want to go with. People who are ambitious are more likely to be fixed on their team, lower teams will be miffed but will still go, they will drop out of the contingent.

*Despina arrives 1:40pm*

TF: the alternative is captains pick

AT: it’s a lot of money

GC: it costs us heaps to lose a team

UK: I think its equally as likely that people will drop out, if not more for captains pick

LH: I think this policy is better

AR: I think its much harsher and is unlikely to get the results you want e.g. people will pressure each other, so no one will be happy wit their teams

AT: agreed

BB: I think people at the bottom of the list, they are likely to be novices, the people at the top get the manipulate

GC: the real problem is that people will have a preference, I just think it hurts more people

UL: an alternative, you trial as a team

GC: how does that work if you have randoms who don’t have a team, people who are left over. Lets not discuss that.

**Motion: for the proposed change in World’s trial policy.**

*Udai: proposed*

*Seconded: Liam*

*In favour: LH and UK*

*Against: BB, GC, AR, TF, DB and AT*

*Motion fails*

1. **Demo debate**

GC: I think it should do serious speeches that are entertaining to watch

UK: that would should allow artists to get money from resale?

GC: I think it should be a simple topic, very accessible

1. **Student exec meeting**

BB: all the student execs are getting together to have a meeting, funding cap is bad, should be able to get money, process is slow

AT: access more info on how campus engagement works would be nice

UK: all societies get access to equal amount of money, we should change that

BB: we should ask the uni directly for changes in funding practise, other societies won’t like that suggestion

1. **Socials update**

TF: picnic worked really well

LH: should we do a post womens social?

TF: we can do another picnic and then an end of year social

GC: we should do awards at the end of the year, that’s nice

1. **Schools**

AT: the uni is being difficult, we may not be able to run any more schools days.

UK: would could use UTS

AYT: would we have to split it with them

LH: we could give them a commission fee, and say no if they ask for more money

UK: it would be an 80:20 split

AT: we should be sensitive when dealing with them, lets cross that bridge when we get to it

1. **Women’s bid update**

GC: they seemed keen. Will be checking with big boy events. We must use the catering company, can get college for a discount, can get dinner at the college. Will send out a follow up email on Wednesday

1. **Comps update**

BB: its good, we are running pro-am

UK: we haven’t confirmed CA’s, Jess has said yes

AT: I think we should be careful about having heaps of Mac Cas

GC: socials?

BB: get BBQs

1. O-Week

AR: we are having stalls. We need people for this Friday. Please put stuff on the roster in the drive

*Meeting is over: 14:02pm*