

**Email Minutes**

This document is a record of all motions moved by Executive members 2016 via email.

**Nov 28 2015 8:26pm – Nov 30 2015 9:34pm**

**Emailed to:** Ryan Thalari, Anneliese Cooper, Sarah McCabe, Lachlan McGrath, Andrew Fischer, Angelene Norman, Alex Feofiloff, Mathew Duardo, Samantha Marshall

**Subject:** EGM Proposal

Sat, Nov 28, 2015 at 8:26 PM, Ryan Thalari:

I'd like to propose that we hold an EGM on Monday, 13 December 2015 at 6 p.m. on campus.

This EGM is primarily for the purposes of formally and publicly ratifying a new Constitution based on the template provided by the University to ensure it aligns with the University's affiliation requirements for 2016.

Any current financial member will also have the opportunity to propose additional constitutional amendments to be discussed and voted on at this EGM.

If this motion passes before this Monday (November 30), then we can provide notice on that date of the EGM date in a constitutionally valid timeframe (14 days' notice).

We would just need to provide notice of the EGM on November 30 (although I am currently working on the draft for a new Constitution based on the University's template and am happy to include a copy of that draft in that EGM notice).

We will have until the following Monday (December 6) to work on updating the Constitution using the University's template and having it approved by the University.

On December 6, we would email the Society the final copy of the updated Constitution to be voted on at the EGM the following week (i.e. on the 13th).

Attached in this email are the Meeting Minutes from this Monday if you would like to take that into consideration before voting. I would also encourage you to read through the earlier emails in this thread for additional views regarding this matter before voting if you haven't already done so.

28 Nov 2015 – Samantha Marshall:

Thoughts on EGM in December, etc:

Keep in mind I wasn’t able to make the first Executive meeting and thus the following doesn't have context of the meeting.

I think we need an EGM in December.

It’s helpful to have this conversation as a society, yet not polarising enough to require full and undivided attention, which would be the effect of postponing an EGM.

At best case, we would have everyone present and it passed with constructive comments (and a quick EGM), at worst we would have quorum to vote it in, in the most basic way, and could table comments on it’s execution at a later EGM upon revision. I think at worst, we have largely the same outcome as voting on it at an Executive level and leaving discussion for later, yet this way we provide the opportunity to present ideas at it’s point of invocation. I get the availability concern, but if it is so undisputed then what is the harm of an EGM?

29 Nov 6:38pm – Alex Feofiloff:

I object in the strongest possible terms to holding an EGM in December.

We fulfill our obligation to the university by granting Executive approval for the reformatted Constitution.

This I believe is a point of limited contention.

Additionally an EGM for the society to formally accept the reformatted Constitution with the societies highest decision making body is probably also a point of limited contention.

What currently is an area of disagreement is when we as a society should hold such an EGM.

 Accepting the Constitution at an Executive level and then informing the university that we have, as well as telling them if we wish to also have a vote at a later date and creates no meaningful conflict. This is the most efficient method as we do not have to be dragged out, for something that will have no practical impact on running of the society.

Notifying the society at large of our re-affiliation with the university, we inform the society of the requirements the re-affiliation, which if felt unfulfilled prevent the existence of MUDS. This notification dispels any notion that we operate in the shadows. Also to hold such an event when university is over is to catch people off guard, exams will be over and people shall be busy with other commitments and will not be expecting to attend anther General Meeting.

Sun 29 Nov 2:52pm – Lachlan McGrath:

My position is that we should advise the university that we will be operating under the new constitution (which has no operational changes to our current constitution) and then adopt the new constitution at a full EGM after Easters

Why?

1. This is the largest change to the constitution in our time and if we put such a large emphasis on the importance of this document (a 5 hour AGM would suggest we do) then a complete reformatting should include as many members of the society as possible and be as transparent as possible.

2. The norm of holding EGMs with very limited quorum and outside the university year is one i would like to avoid. Whilst there is currently no reason for this format to be used nefariously i would seek to avoid establishing the norm of holding EGMs in this fashion.

3. I would prefer to institute these changes on our own terms and through the proper channels instead of pushing it through an 11th hour backroom EGM

Based on these points I would suggest that we inform the University that we will be operating under their new constitution form under official adoption at an EGM post Easters, similar to what Alex suggested

30 Nov, at 12:03 PM - Sarah McCabe:

I am in favour of a December EGM given the following:

1. The constitution needs to be aligned to the university's policies regardless of our personal opinions on timing.

2. Postal votes ensure everyone's vote will be considered if they so wish.

3. We have a huge amount of work we need to focus our efforts on during the alternative proposed time (e.g. Schools day for Easters funding, trials, camp) which leaves minimal time for planning and a very small window of opportunity.

4. I think it is to everyone's future detriment if we delay this, given we have the opportunity to do it in the near future efficiently and fairly. It is unnecessary.

5. We will effectively be running on an invalid constitution for several months, which is an avoidable situation.

Mon 30 Nov 12:47pm – Samantha Marshall:

In confirmation of the position I presented in my last email, I vote in favour of a December EGM.

Mon 30 Nov 1:09pm – Mathew Duardo

I am in favour; aligning with Sarah's point on issues of timing and priority. This formatting of the constitution is relatively minor given the actual practical tasks we need to make groundwork on - e.g affording Easters by having a schools day

Mon 30 Nov 1:32pm – Anneliese Cooper:

I vote in favour of holding an EGM in December.

My reasoning is that these changes are something we have to adopt and therefore the best thing we can do is ensure the highest level of transparency possible (I don't think that's contentious). This can be best achieved by holding an EGM (those who cannot attend can postal vote and everyone can be informed of the changes through other notices anyway). More than adequate notice can be given, that's not a problem.

Additionally, we will be operating under this Constitution until April during which we would have participated in Easters and Worlds. An EGM would ensure clarity, facilitate discussion etc about the amendments before everyone is operating under it at major tournaments (particularly considering the notification we have to give to the uni about under age members who would then be competing at Easters etc).

Mon 30 Nov 2:13pm – Angelene Norman

In favour for all the reasons already outlined.

Mon 30 Nov 6:02pm – Andrew Fischer

I vote in favour of the EGM (Sarah’s reasoning swayed me).

Mon 30 Nov 9:34pm – Alex Feofiloff:

Just here to correct for the record that the proposed date is for Monday 14th December at 6:00pm, as this has not been done yet in this email thread but has been cited in other email threads.

**RESULT:**

***7 votes for***

***2 votes against***

**Motion passes.**

**March 8th 2016 12:50am – March 9th 2016 12:44am**

**Emailed to:** Ryan Thalari, Anneliese Cooper, Sarah McCabe, Lachlan McGrath, Andrew Fischer, Angelene Norman, Alex Feofiloff, Mathew Duardo, Samantha Marshall

**Subject:** Easters Trials Update

Tues 8th March 12:50am – Ryan Thalari

Hey everyone, I know I’ve already talked a little about this to some of you who were at Internals tonight, but for the purposes of transparency I figured it was best that everyone was informed about this.

Basically, just so everyone's aware, there are two novices trialling for Easters by video, whereby they’re both unable to attend trials on Sunday and rather than relying solely on a CV which just says “this person has debated in high school” or “I’ve never debated before, but I know how to make sentences out of words”, their speeches at Internals tonight were recorded (with their consent) and the Selectors will watch those speeches and use those videos to compare those novices to the other novices who’ll debate live on Sunday. The two novices were in the same debate and on different teams, with one speaking 1st Aff and the other speaking 1st Neg, and the conditions were similar to what they’d experience if they trialled in person on Sunday (i.e. 30 minutes of prep time and debating in teams with novices).

The purpose of this email is to make everyone aware this is happening given that this wasn't previously discussed with the executive. For context as to how this all started (spoiler alert: it’s my fault), during the first Internals last week, one of the novices told me that they wanted to attend Easters in person but couldn't make it to Trials. I told them that they could trial by CV, but also mentioned that it might be possible for them to trial during Internals either if one of the Internal Selectors was at Internals or possibly by recording their speech during Internals. Since we haven't confirmed Internal Selectors yet, “possibly recording their speech” ended up actually happening.

I realise this isn't something we discussed at the last exec meeting, and so I apologise for inadvertently making a unilateral decision (this isn't something I ever intended to do). In my mind, I figured that novices trialling for Easters by video recording was analogous to non-conventional ways used to assess novices trialling for Easters used in the past, such as Internal Selectors using their own personal knowledge about a novice to determine what team they should be put in (Easters 2015), one of the Internal Selectors watching a novice debate at a Training Day and comparing that novice’s speech on the Training Day to the performances of other novices who debated live on the day of Trials (Easters 2014), or this exact situation (i.e. recording a novice who couldn’t attend Trials on the day giving a 1st Aff speech beforehand and comparing that video to other novices trialling live; Easters 2012).

Experience has shown us that having experienced debaters trial by CV can sometimes lead to messy results, and so my logic was that these novices who wouldn’t have much to put on their debating CV (one of the novices has only debated in high school and the other novice doesn’t have any debating experience) should be allowed to have their raw debating skills taken into consideration. Even if debating CV’s could give an accurate impression of whether or not a novice should be selected to debate at Easters, since Easters Trials are also designed to determine who should debate with who, I figured that a video recording would help give the Selectors a sense of their debating style, and subsequently who they should debate with at Easters (assuming they’re selected).

Ultimately though, while I personally think allowing novices to trial for Easters by video is justified, I do understand if people have issues with how I’ve handled this in so far as my not discussing this with the exec earlier means that we we weren’t able to advertise this as an option that was available to all novices (insert concerns about fairness here). I think that trialling by video is something that should be discussed by executives in future, ahead of announcing trial dates (whether it’s included in the Easters Trial Policy next year is ultimately up to the 2017 MUDS exec though). For the purposes of Easters Trials this year though, I hope that despite my mistake (which I do freely admit) in not discussing this with the exec earlier, that nobody has a problem with allowing those two novices to trial by video in the spirit of what the Trial Policy of having Internal Selectors consider a number of factors when deciding teams (vs. just basing teams on trial rankings) aims to achieve.

Regards,

-R

Mat - Tuesday, 8 March 2016 3:24 pm

After reading through this at length I have some thoughts to add; given that I am usually the more outspoken one who is less concerned with breaking procedure where appropriate.

• I think whilst this solution makes sense and is the most practical in a time constrained setting, it is still in breach of our trial policy that we set out.

• Whilst part of me sees the value in giving all the opportunity to trial, I still think we are doing an injustice because a breach of the trial policy will almost always mean someone is unfairly enriched or diminished.

• Whilst as mentioned this is ‘in the spirit’ of the trial policy, it is still an explicit breach of the trial policy, which only allows for trial by CV or on the day.

• I think it probably does vest for further discussion as an open issue at the next exec meeting - if this is for the purposes of transparency then it is best this issue is discussed amongst the executive rather than informed to the executive.

• I would like clarification whether or not ‘this is happening’ or if the entire executive is going to vote to approve this.

To explain some of this in more detail, starting with 1 - I think we have to stick by the policy we set, even if its unfair to individuals. As you said, failings of the policy are to be corrected by the 2017 Exec, not on an ad-hoc basis once we have approved our policy. Many of the stupid things we waste time doing - e.g. sending the trial policy around exactly 48 hours before to ensure everyone can read it, noting exactly who votes for, against and abstains the motion, ensuring we have quorum, ensuring someone seconds the motion, approving the minutes where the trial policy was decided etc are all a HUGE waste of time if people can breach the policy and make exceptions to the rule when convenient with no disclosure to the executive.

2 - I think we can never eliminate all bias from allowing someone to trial at a different time. For example - the people in question had just seen a 1 hour seminar on international relations. This means they are probably much more prepared for their trial debate than someone who does a social policy debate they have never heard about on a Sunday morning. Similarly the fact we are recording this person, making a fairly isolated example of them, and attaching a debating cv to their application probably will give them a grander view in the mind of the selector. Thirdly, I understand at least one of those teams had a ‘pro’ during prep time, which would adversely affect their ability to prep a debate compared to someone who had to prep a debate with two other novices. This is particularly pertinent when they are trialling as 1st aff and neg, where the pro may have spoon-fed them the most important content in the debate.

3 - This is self explanatory - we set policies for a reason - the fact we breached them in the past on numerous occasions isn’t ‘precedent’; its just examples of MUDS being shit at following the policy. E.g. breaking the law doesn’t set a precedent that breaking the law is allowed or permissible - its just people straight up breaking the law.

4 - Again probably doesn’t need much more explanation.

5 - I don’t think one individual has authority to change the policy, I would suggest however that the executive as a whole can use its discretion where possible to vote on exceptional circumstances to trials. I think in fairness that video trails should be voted upon before being accepted.

To reiterate, whilst I am probably someone who takes least issue with making practical changes where necessary, I do think there are significant issues of fairness which we should consider before allowing this person to trial via video.

Mathew Duardo

Tue March 8th 3:53pm – Sarah McCabe

Hi all,

Presently I hold serious reservations about proceeding with trials/using the recorded footage in trials without pursuing meaningful discussion, holding a vote etc. Many of my concerns are reflected in Mat's previous email, however I also hold additional concerns about the fairness of this method and furthermore how it will skew the outcome of the trial process.

Overall, I am uncomfortable with what happened and would like to stress again the need to have a formal discussion/vote before trials. At this point in time (ie before trials) both debaters filmed should probably be trialed by CV.

Sarah

Tue 8th March 6:26pm – Ryan Thalari

Hi all,

Given that there isn't a clear consensus on this matter, I agree that a discussion is needed before we proceed any further.

I've already outlined the reasons why, in the interests of selectors being best able to gauge which team novices should be placed in, a video of a speech should be taken into consideration with the same weighting as if that had speech had been delivered live in front of the selectors. However, I agree with the concerns that Mat and Sarah have raised so far about procedural fairness given that this method of selecting novices wasn't previously discussed by the executive, and subsequently not included in the Trial Policy.

As such, I would like to propose the following compromise which I believe best balances both of these interests (i.e. creating the best outcomes for team formation and upholding procedural fairness):

A) The two novices in question trial by CV. The selectors review their CV's, and compare them to the other novices who trial in-person on Sunday. Their CV's will be the only thing used to determine whether or not those novices will be selected to be in the pool of novices chosen to debate at Easters.

Justification (#ProceduralFairness): This is in line with what the Trial Policy, which we discussed and approved, says (Section 2, Subsection (c)).

B) Once the selectors have determined the pool of debaters who will debate at Easters, they then need to organise teams and sort out who will debate with who (Section 3, Subsection (c)). If any of the novices who trialled by CV are selected within the pool of debaters to debate at Easters, only then can the selectors be shown the video of them debating at Internals. The video would just be so they can get a clearer idea of their debating style for the purposes of helping the selectors determine which team mates they are likely to work well with (e.g. this person lacks confidence - they need a supportive mentor, or; this person is TMTH - maybe don't put them in a team with an introvert).

Justification (#OptimalTeamFormation): While the Trial Policy doesn't explicitly say anything about using video footage in this context, it does say "Novices will debate together (i.e. with no experienced debaters) in front of the two Internal Selectors. Novices will be ranked by performance, but the rankings are to contribute only to the broader picture of that speaker’s abilities and will not be solely determinate of which team they will be placed in or who their teammates will be." (Section 2, Subsection (a)).

So as long as the videos aren't used to determine whether or not those novices are selected to attend Easters, I think that allowing the selectors to use the video recording just to help determine who their team mates should be (assuming their CV's are good enough to get them selected in the fist place) helps achieve the goal of creating teams in a way that facilitates novice development (Section 3, Subsection (c) (i)) while maintaining fairness and without unfairly skewing the outcome of the trial process.

If people are amenable to this proposal, I'm happy to propose it as a motion so everyone on the executive can vote on this issue.

Obviously, if anyone has any other concerns, issues or suggestions they would like to raise, feel free to do so as well.

Tues 8th March 8:20pm – Angelene Norman

I feel this has been

1) a huge breach of trial policy

2) fairness to other novices

3) improperly and reckless use of executive power that under our constitution doesn't exist

Tue March 8th 8:57pm – Andrew Fischer

Hi all,

I would also be supporting Option A - ad-hoc adjustment of trial policy wouldn’t be justified even if they had had no prior knowledge of the topic area or an experienced debater in prep, as other novices did not know about this option/were not offered it (as others have said). I think with both of these additional factors considered, the videos can’t be used. I don’t mind if they’re used for team selection, that seems to me a much lesser harm.

Cheers,

Andrew

Tues 8th March 10:03pm – Alex Feolifoff

1. I believe as of Monday Night we only had 10 novice debates for 12 novice spots it is unlikely that this will remain the case come Friday midnight but this may totally resolve the problem for us.

2. Do we even have a selector to do anything?

3. When was the video idea taken on?

3.1 Yesterday I was operating under the idea, that the external people decided to allow the one person to trial yesterday and the problem was it had not been cleared to trial two? Totally believe that it was only a natural course of action to add one, if it had all ready been cleared before internals to trial just the one, but I don't think it should have ever been cleared in the first place, before hand.

3.2 I think the lapse of judgement of one person on the night in the heat of the moment is the collective responsibility of all exe present to correct the mistake, greater still the collective responsibility of the other members in that portfolio, But if you guys agreed to have the one person trial, I don't like it but its your jig & I'll stand by your decision.

4. No trial process is ever any good, I personally have grievances with every part, but any and all systems have problems. CVs are shallow, people can stuff trials up, have a really uncharacteristically good set of speeches. side note, any team if I were able to make trials would have an advantage in regards to case setting and moral boost + other side probs be intimated slightly.

5. Point 1. a of the trial policy covers all the additional info of working well together, skill in prep & other stuff, so I don't see what point the videos have at all, even in setting teams.

 6. I vote in favor of just CV's, \*\*disclaimer\*\*\* I am trialing by CV so my vote may not be counted.

6.1 My CV is I think terrible and there are many school kids who have better CV than me.

6.2 Remember, I caused you all much grief last time over rules and regulations.

7. If we don't go ahead with the video, we now have a problem where these people believe that will count towards their trial but won't, I think we should tell them but because of point 1.a they still have shoot, even if their CV is lacking.

Alex

Tues 8th March 10:22 pm – Lachlan McGrath

Hi all,

I support Ryan’s compromise position for a number of reasons

1. Accepting that the use of a video would be an unfair advantage due to reasons already established the videos should therefore NOT be used to determine whether or not the novices are selected in the pool of debaters for Easters

2. Accepting that novices will have a similarly empty CV whilst having wildly different capacities makes teaming up novices and mentors difficult

3. This plan allows us to use the videos ONLY to better place these novices into teams and NOT to decide whether or not these novices should be able to attend easters

I think that the procedural fairness is mostly for who is selected to ATTEND Easters much more so than the teams in which they are put and therefore this would be a fair policy

tl:dr

No videos for trialling for greater pool of debaters

Videos used when allocated these debaters into specific teams

Cheers

Lachlan

Tues 8th March 10:50pm – Sarah McCabe

Hey guys, just thought I'd also quickly address this issue raised in discussion: If we accept that filming novices is a legitimate way to discern their general ability/personality/potential, can we please address the fact that this option was NOT made available to all candidates. In other words, if watching video footage is a good way to gain additional information about a candidate, isn't that a blatant advantage over candidates? To be legitimate this option should have been made available to everyone in an equal capacity.

Tues 8th March 11:41pm – Mathew Duardo

Hi All,

I think with 5 clear votes against the use of video footage for trial purposes (Sarah, Angie, Alex, Andrew, and Myself), the issue is now closed.

Obviously the downside to this is we will need to communicate this to the two candidates who are thus far under the impression their videos will be used constructively for their trial. It is possible, however unlikely that they may revise their availability in light of this. Correct me if I am wrong but I was under the impression Georgia merely did not want to miss USU Grandslam when I first made contact with her, which would not seem a hugely justified reason for missing trials (given I’m sure many others would also liked to have attended USU Grandslam).

I think the remaining issue of what everyone thinks about using videos for team formation is still important discussion. I anticipate it may be more difficult however as team formation is incredibly more vague than selecting if someone gets a spot at Easters. Teams are formed considering things such as someone’s competitive drive, their personality, their motivating factors, the need for development, and their compatibility with a mentor. I personally have some reservations regarding using a video as a determinant factor because I have principled issues with using subjective opinion to form teams rather than an objective reflection of the trail that occurs. I would think issues of personality would only be considered where we felt there was a strong clash in personality that would make a working relationship untenable; and not merely in cases where two people might not bond as well as two others in our limited opinion.

I think broad discussion has been really helpful in resolving the previous issue with a variety of documented views, so this is maybe something we all want to revisit tomorrow if we feel there is value in resolving the issue on whether or not the footage should be used for team allocation purposes.

Tuesday, 8 March 11:42 pm – Ryan Thalari

To clarify some things:

• The Externals Team is working on finding selectors - we'll let the exec know if the search gets dire and we require more assistance.

• The Externals Team didn't discuss/approve letting people trial by video - hence this email thread. I told one of the novices that trialling by video could be a possibility and had every intention of discussing whether or not that was acceptable with the exec (or at the very least, gauging the idea with the rest of the Externals Team). I've had a lot on my plate and completely forgot to discuss it (with anyone), which is how this situation was created. Again, I am sorry for not discussing this earlier, it was never my intention to make a unilateral decision to amend the trial policy or to deliberately create unfair trial conditions which disadvantaged others.

• The compromise I proposed earlier in this thread wasn't "Option A or Option B", but rather "Part A and Part B". Part A (only CV's are used to determine whether they're selected in the pool of debaters to attend Easters) isn't really up for discussion since that's literally just what the Trial Policy says and requires no further interpretation. What I proposed (Part B) was about whether the executive is willing to allow discretion in letting the video(s) be used to help the selectors determine who their teammates should be (should they be selected under Part A).

My logic is that a video tells a selector more about the person - a piece of paper that says "I debated in high school" or "I have no formal debating experience" doesn't say anything about what their development needs as a debater are, who they would get along well with or which mentor they could learn from.

That being said, I do understand if, in spite of that, people still feel that in this context (i.e. this wasn't previously approved by the exec, no notice of this trial option was advertised to other prospective triallists, concerns about the conditions of an Internals debate being different to the conditions of a debate on the day of Easters Trials) that Part B would be allowing too much discretion.

So for the purposes of clarity, could everyone please frame their responses in terms of whether or not they support Part B of my earlier proposal (i.e. if any of the two novices in question are selected to be in the pool of debaters to attend Easters solely on the basis of their CV, then the selectors can watch the video[s] solely for the purpose of determining who they should debate with).

Correct me if I'm wrong (seriously, correct me if this is incorrect - I'm drawing conclusions here), based on the comments so far it appears as though the way voting on this proposal currently stands is:

• 2-3 votes in favour of Part B (Ryan and Lachlan - possibly also Andrew based on his last comment about videos just being used for team selection, although confirmation is needed here)

• 4 votes against Part B (Sarah, Mathew, Angie and Alex)

• 2 votes yet to be cast (Anneliese and Sam)

If the vote to allow the video(s) to be used doesn't pass, I'll contact the two novices in question and update them about how trials and team selection will proceed (i.e. just based on the trial policy, without the use of videos).

-R.

Wed 9th March 12:01am – Sarah McCabe

To clarify for the official vote, I am not in favour of video use.

Again, I reiterate that the issue of whether or not the video is helpful is part of a greater discussion on fairness: Allowing 2 novices to provide a video trial because they could not make it on Sunday, whilst telling literally every other novice they could only provide a CV if they could not make it on Sunday, is unfair and inconsistent. If we believe that the current process does not provide enough information on debaters, that probably speaks to a need to revise our policies, not to ignore them and make exceptions on whim.

Sarah

Wed 9th March 12:31am – Anneliese Cooper

Hi All,

Apologies for not replying earlier.

I am not in favour of using the videos at trials. All of my reasons have already been stated (see pretty much everything Mat said) but namely I think;

a) It's not in the Policy (which we passed only a few weeks ago) and therefore we can't arbitrarily amend Trials process to suit us in hindsight. Regardless of whether or not videos were used in previous years, we can't justify amending policy last minute and without an Exec vote, particularly considering that this policy has been published for a while and when everyone registered to trial, they did it in agreeance with that written policy.

As an Exec we should be upholding Trial Policy as sacrosanct because that's the whole point of considering/writing/editing/publishing such extensive Policy. It exists to enforce consistent standards. At the beginning of the year we all talked about putting in an effort to not make last minute decisions as well as aiming to abide by Constitutional requirements better (and I think the same principle applies to Trial Policy). MUDS has a history of not following procedure (eg videoing for Trials in previous years) and we should be actively trying to change that.

Regardless of trying to justify Part B as being technically allowed because of the way Policy is worded, I don't think it is a fair interpretation of the Policy as we intended it and I don't think we can justify otherwise.

b) Even if we agree that we have discretion as an Exec to change Trials processes as we see fit, I don't think the way this has happened is fair to other novices because it wasn't advertised, some novices prepped with pros etc. [Insert previously stated arguments here].

Provided this motion doesn't pass, I agree that the two novices who trialled by video should be contacted individually, apologised to and told how trials will work from here on in.

- Anneliese

Wed 9th March 12:37am – Samantha Marshall

Hi all

1. The use of this video at all is an advantage for these debaters against other trialling novices (new or otherwise).

1b). I also think is completely unfair for the debaters in question to now potentially miss a trial due to their understanding that they had already trialled via video. I know they have the option of CV trialling, but to give them an opportunity only to take it away does not seem desirable either.

2. Initially I was in support of using the video as I had assumed it had been discussed in my absence via the trial policy discussions/by the externals officers. I maintain that it's a good idea in theory, assuming there was some achieve able consistency, and should be looked into in the future.

3. The biggest concern here is that a trial policy existed, and has specifically been violated. What's the point in having a policy?

So thus I believe that usage of this video trialling procedure is invalid, however in fairness to the speakers who believed they had trialled, I would accept Ryan's compromise of only using the video for grading purposes. This would have to be done in a way with every disclaim, advantage, and special consideration declared if it were to be acceptable.

As this is something that has happened, and already been communicated, I think it needs to be dealt with in the most sensitive way in regards to the debaters who 'trialled'.

Sam

Wed 9th March 12:44am – Ryan Thalari

Alright, thanks everyone for your comments. The motion doesn't pass, video footage won't be used in any way in the trial process for selection or team formation purposes.

I'll contact the novices in question and let them know that their CV will be all that's used.

**RESULT:**

***3 votes for***

***6 votes against***

***0 abstentions***

**Motion does not pass.**

**March 10 2016 11:07pm – March 132016 5:39pm**

**Emailed to:** Ryan Thalari, Anneliese Cooper, Sarah McCabe, Lachlan McGrath, Andrew Fischer, Angelene Norman, Alex Feofiloff, Mathew Duardo, Samantha Marshall

**Subject:** URGENT: Discussion about Easters Teams and Adjudicators

Thurs March 10th 11:07pm – Ryan Thalari

Hey everyone,

As you may already be aware, we haven't had as much interest in Easters Trials as we would have hoped. Although we've been allocated 6 teams (18 debaters) and 6 adjudicator spots, we currently only have 12 novices, 4 pros, and 3 adjudicators registered to trial (those numbers are including everyone who's trialling by CV). Considering that N-1 adjudicator requirements place a limit on the number of teams we're able to send, it's also worth noting that 8 of those 16 debaters are only interested in trialling as debaters (i.e. half of the triallists won't trial as adjudicators if they don't get selected as debaters).

Consequently, we may need to have a discussion about reducing the number of teams and adjudicators that we'll be sending to Easters. Registration for Easters Trials will remain open until 11:59 p.m. on Friday night, and so while we should wait until Saturday to have this discussion in case we do get more registrations, it seems likely that we won't have enough people trialling for us to be able to fill 6 teams and 6 adjudicator spots. Given that Easters Trials are on Sunday, it would be best if we could resolve this on Saturday so that we can approach Easters Trials with a clear idea of how many people will be selected.

So with all of that in mind, please think about this between now and Saturday, and please be ready on Saturday to discuss this so we can have this resolved promptly.

Regards,

Ryan.

Sat March 12th 2:25am – Ryan Thalari

Hey everyone,

At the close of registration for Easters Trials, we have registered:

* **5 pros**, with possible interest from 2 more (only 2 of the registered pros have clearly expressed interest in trialling as an adj if they're not selected)
* **16 novices** (only 7 have clearly expressed interest in trialling as an adj if they're not selected)
* **3 adjudicators** (this is just how many people registered as ‘adjudicator only” - we can get more adjudicators after debater trials since some people who didn’t get selected as debaters may trial as adjudicators)

I've spoken with Mikaela (the convenor of Easters), and she said that as long as we confirm the number of teams and adjudicators that we're sending on Tuesday (March 15 - the day after we hold adjudicator trials), then it's fine if we need to reduce the number of teams and/or adjudicators we send.

We should probably have a discussion about how to proceed from here. Some things to note:

* As I mentioned in the previous email, the number of teams we can send is linked to the number of adjudicators we can send because of N-1.
* Some people (maybe just 1 or 2) may flake out on Easters Trials. This has happened occasionally (although not often) in the past, even with the Externals team sending them reminders about trials through email, text and even sometimes by calling people on the day.
* At least one debater has pulled out of the Macquarie Easters contingent before Easters for 4 out of the last 5 Easters, which means that someone pulling out of the contingent before Easters is statistically likely.

**So what does this all mean?**

If we aim for sending 6 teams, we’ll need at least 5 adjudicators. Although I’d love for us to send as many adjudicators as possible to Easters, I don’t think we should try and send more than 5 adjudicators to ensure that we have a couple of reserves in case anyone who’s selected pulls out of the contingent before Easters.

Also worth considering: Normally we announce teams the night of debater trials so those who didn’t get selected as debaters know they have the option of trialling as an adjudicator the next evening. My concern is if we tell people “Congratulations, you made it into Macquarie 6” on Sunday night but can’t find 5 adjudicators on Monday night, then we’d have to say “Sorry Mac 6, change of plans, we have to dissolve your team so we don’t violate N-1”.

Is the executive fine with the Externals team telling the triallists that we’re sending 5 teams, with potential to send a 6th team **if**, on Monday night, we can confirm 5 adjudicators?

Logistically, the way this would work would be:

**Sunday Night:** The Externals Team announces (just to the triallists) who's in Macquarie 1-5, while also announcing Macquarie 6 as a “Reserve Team” pending confirmation of 5 adjudicators the following night. When announcing teams, we’d also implore anyone who didn’t get selected as a debater to trial as an adjudicator.

**Monday Night:** We hold adj trials during Internals. If we can find 5 adjudicators, the Externals Team announces the adjudicators who’ve been selected + we inform Macquarie 6 that they’re confirmed as debaters. If we can’t find 5 adjes, we announce the adjes anyway and break the news to Mac 6.

**With all of this in mind, I’d like to propose that:**

* **Macquarie sends no more than 5 adjudicators to Easters 2015**
* **The Externals Team is able to announce Macquarie 6 as a “Reserve Team pending confirmation of at least 5 adjudicators” on Sunday night when informing triallists of the results of trials.**
* **If we can’t find at least 5 adjudicators by Monday night, that Macquarie only send 5 teams to Easters 2015**

Do I have any seconders (or would anyone like to propose a different number)?

Regards,

Ryan.

Sat 12th March 8:33am – Anneliese Cooper

I second

Sat 12th March 11:31am – Alex Feofiloff

I like point 2 regarding the "Reserve team" & point 3 is sort of dependent on N-1.

We might, but I believe it rather unlikely only have 3 adjs or something so point 3 is more of a "lets on violate n-1 by sending more teams with out supporting Adjs"?

Now turning to point 1....

a) Don't we already have a cap on the number of adj spots we have?

b) If we don't then why cap it and slow adj growth?

c) Totally understand the "Reserve adj" idea but if we have 10 people who want to go as adjs and 5 pull out then are we not still fulfilling "n-1"?

Alex

Sun March 13th 10:20am – Ryan Thalari

Thanks people who've replied so far. Everyone else, please respond ASAP.

Sun March 13th 5:16pm – Samantha Marshall

Am happy for this to occur- however I don't understand the capping of adjs.

But it's probably realistic.

Sam

Sun 13th March 5:39pm – Ryan Thalari

Adj capping means that we can either have N-1 or N (i.e. 6 teams can = 5 or 6 adjes, 5 teams can = 4 or 5 adjes. We can't do 5 teams and 6 adjes.

**RESULT:**

***4 votes for***

***0 votes against***

***0 abstentions***

**Email chain not responded to by other Executive members.**

**Motion passes.**

**March 12th 2016 12:15am – March 12th 2016 7:09pm**

**Emailed to:** Ryan Thalari, Anneliese Cooper, Sarah McCabe, Lachlan McGrath, Andrew Fischer, Angelene Norman, Alex Feofiloff, Mathew Duardo, Samantha Marshall

**Subject:** URGENT motions to be discussed re; Easters Trials

Sat 12th March 12:15am – Anneliese Cooper

Hi everyone,

The following email is to keep you updated about the Trials situation and to move two motions in light of that context. I have attached our current Easters Trial Policy for reference. I write this email on behalf of the Externals Officers.

**MOTION ONE:**

Trial Policy requires us to have two Internal Selectors (to trial novices and determine teams) and one External Selector (to rank pros and give those rankings to the Internal Selectors). We currently have Dan Dummer as an Internal Selector and Ben Jackson as our External Selector. We have not been able to find a second Internal Selector as required by policy. Please believe us when we say that we have tried our best but our contact list is completely exhausted and at this point, we cannot find a second Internal Selector.

To increase our chances of finding someone to act as a second Internal Selector, **I propose that we allow a Selector from outside of MUDS (and hence being external by definition) to act as the second Internal Selector.**

BUT WAIT! THERE'S MORE…  **MOTION TWO:**

We currently have 4 out of 7 pros opting to trial via CV meaning they are unable to attend trials. Ben (External Selector) is not able to physically attend trials on Sunday however, in the event that all pros trial via CV, he is able to review those CV's, rank the applicants and send that information to the Internal Selector/s who would then determine the teams from there.

Please take note that;

* this approach to Trials will only go ahead if all pros consent to trialling via CV (so far all are happy to and we are only waiting on a response from one).
* Trials/CV's for pros are only considered to the extent that they determine initial rankings. Mentor applications can override these rankings.
* Getting all pros to trial via CV rather than just 4 out of 7 would increase fairness and consistency
* We do acknowledge that obviously we would prefer every pro to trial in front of an External Selector and that this wouldn't set precedent for the future – it's just an unfortunate and unavoidable situation that we are trying to resolve.

This is the situation we are aiming for at the moment.

If we end up needing to host a trial debate for pros and therefore have to find a different External Selector, I propose that we allow that External Selector to act as both an External Selector and our second Internal Selector. The External Selector would therefore rank pros (by considering those who physically trialled and those trialled via CV) as well as reviewing mentor applications so that both they and Dan finalise teams.

Our schedule would therefore look like this:

1) Novice Debate 1 Dan + External Selector watches

2) Pro Debate External Selector watches

3) Novice Debate 2 Dan + External Selector watches

Again please consider a few things;

* It is highly unlikely that we will be able to get two extra people to act as External and Internal Selectors for Sunday (at the moment we will struggle to even get one). By implementing this motion, we would be able to use one person to fill both those roles
* Having two Internal Selectors is probably better than one (because you have a better chance of eliminating bias etc)
* Having the External Selector watch both debates could benefit the selection process in that we have a better indication of which pros/novices would be best suited to each other.
* Again, this isn't being suggested with the aim of setting precedent, we recognise the importance of having separate Selectors and that this goes against policy, we are just trying to manage an unfortunate situation.

**I therefore move a motion to allow for the Easters Trials External Selector to act as both an External Selector and an Internal Selector.**

Please indicate whether you are in favour, against or abstaining from voting on both of these motions in turn. Obviously by voting in favour of Motion Two, you also kind of approve Motion One, but I still think it's important that we consider and record discussion around both options.

Please note that if the Exec passes both these motions, the Externals Officers will apply the most relevant motion according to the situation.

Thanks,

Anneliese

Sat March 12th 12:32am – Mathew Duardo

1. I'm happy to act in an internals selector based off cv trials - I won't be available for physical viewing of trials at 9am-12pm - maybe not helpful but an idea. In the event that we can't find anyone I think having me review cvs with additional comments from Dan at least acts as a check and balance on what I don't doubt is good feedback. I'd argue Dans feedback is probably more valuable on its own than dans + a random external we find last minute and probably have to pay.

2. I have no issue with pros trialling by cv. As pros I think we already have a knowledge of how they debate in person; I'd throw it in there (and I know it's too radically different from our trial policy to implement immediately) but interviews or something akin might be an idea for future years.

All that said:

If we have exhausted all options, then we really have to be realistic about the options available. If we can find an external selector this short notice it makes sense. Although it's dog to Ben id argue we get better value from having someone available on the day rather than only to review cvs.

I'd move in favour of both motions.

Mat

Sat 12th March 12:43am – Samantha Marshall

Out of necessity, I vote in favour of both motions.

I think the hierarchy of best to worst case scenarios explained by Anneliese shows that externals have considered the most equitable methodology for proceeding in this circumstance, and display a clear reluctance for this in the future. Sounds fair and unavoidable.

Sam

Sat 12th March 1:37am – Ryan Thalari

I vote in favour of both motions.

I'd also like to note:

* Mat, I'm not opposed to your idea of you helping Dan review the CV's of novices who trial + watching the 1:30 p.m. debate if we can't find anybody else, but given that 50% of the novices are trialling in-person before 12 p.m. I would prefer having a selector (even external) who's available the entire day to judge all the novices.
* I like Mat's idea of including an interview-type component to pro trials (as something for future consideration, given that we can't do that now)

Ryan.

Sat 12th March 1:40am – Lachlan McGrath

I vote in favour of both motions

Lachlan

Sat 12th March 10:58am – Alex Feolifoff

I vote in favour of both motions.

Alex

Sat 12th March 11:20am – Sarah McCabe

Voting in favour of both motions. Happy to discuss methods we can use in the future to prevent/deal with comparable scenarios in the future at the next exec meeting. :)

Sat 12th March 7:09pm – Andrew Fischer

I vote in favour of both motions!

Andrew

**RESULT:**

***8 votes for***

***0 votes against***

***0 abstentions***

**Motion passes.**

**March 15 2016 12:22pm – March 16 2016 9:42am**

**Emailed to:** Ryan Thalari, Anneliese Cooper, Sarah McCabe, Lachlan McGrath, Andrew Fischer, Angelene Norman, Alex Feofiloff, Mathew Duardo, Samantha Marshall

**Subject:** Easters 2016 Contingent – Please Confirm

Tues March 15 12:22pm – Ryan Thalari

Hey Exec,

Last night we had 5 people confirm their interest in adjudicating at Easters.

I would like to propose that we approve the following Easters contingent:

**Macquarie 1:** Jacob Rock, Anneliese Cooper, Georgia Chahoud

**Macquarie 2:** Andrew Fischer, Alex Feofiloff, Melinda Liang

**Macquarie 3:** Anupam Parashar, Faaris Khan, Muhammad Shadman Yusuf

**Macquarie 4:** Himmi Cheruvu, Mary Mounisha Mondeddu, Mitch Flitcroft

**Macquarie 5:** Ryan Patrick Thalari, Dan Schofield, Samantha Marshall

**Macquarie 6:** Jessica Smith, Preet Mankad, Stephanie Rigney

**Adjudicators:** Angelene Norman, Chui-Ann Lee, Kelly Qu Yingying, Lachlan McGrath,

Sam Bradshaw

All those in favour? Once voting has concluded, the Externals Team will contact the adjudicators and Mac 6 to let them know, and I’ll confirm the size of our contingent with Melbourne.

Regards,

-R.

P.S. This contingent is 52% female-identifying and 48% male-identifying!

Tues 15th March 12:26pm – Mathew Duardo

approve

Tues 15th March 12:28pm – Anneliese Cooper

I second :)

Offt that ratio (y)

Tues 15th March 12:34pm – Sarah McCabe

Approved!

Tues 15th March 1:47pm – Samantha Marshall

Approved by Sam

 (yay)

Tues 15th March 1:48pm – Lachlan McGrath

Very excited to approve

Wed 16th March 9:42am – Andrew Fischer

Approved!

Go team!

**RESULT:**

***7 votes for***

***0 votes against***

***0 abstentions***

**Motion passes.**

**April 13 2016 2:43pm – April 18 2016 4:00pm**

**Motion moved via Facebook post to ‘MUDS Executive 2016’ page.**

**Proposed by:** Ryan Thalari

**Sent to:** Sarah McCabe, Anneliese Cooper, Lachlan McGrath, Alex Feoliffof, Andrew Fischer, Samantha Marshall, Mathew Duardo and Andrew Fischer.

**Subject:** New proposed date of Mac Fall

13th April 2:43pm – Ryan Thalari

Hey exec

So I know that at yesterday’s meeting we agreed to host Mac Fall on Saturday the 28th May, but after talking with the Comps Team I’d like to propose that we hold Mac Fall on Sunday 29 May. When we were talking about this I forgot that Zedtown would be hosted on campus on May 28. For context, imagine paintball episodes of Community, but with Nerf guns instead of paintball guns and people dressed up as zombies.

I just talked to StudentHQ, and they recommend we change the dates since:

* Zedtown is a campu-wide event, which they said would significantly reduce our capacity to book rooms
* They have concerns about students from other unis who might come to Mac Fall getting caught in a Nerf firestorm.. Apparently insurance covers people participating in the event, but it’s a grey area about civilians getting unintentionally drawn into crossfire because of a student group event.

Since Zedtown and Mac Fall are just one day events, we figured that we could just push Mac Fall from the Saturday to the Sunday

Does anyone second the motion?

13th April 2:59pm – Sarah McCabe

Sure, I’ll second

13th April 6:49pm – Anneliese Cooper

In favour

!8th April 3:19pm – Anneliese Cooper

Unless people vote on this, the motion technically hasn’t passed…

18th April – Ryan Thalari

Sam, Andrew and I agreed to the date change before I posted here – plus you and Sarah makes for 5 people in favour.

18th April 3:36pm – Samantha Marshall

Maybe next time we should do this via email. For the sake of transparency – in favour

**RESULT:**

***5 in favour***

***0 against***

***0 abstentions***

**Motion passes.**