

## EXECUTIVE MEETING \#7

Tuesday $30^{\text {th }}$ August $2016 \quad 6.11 \mathrm{pm}-7.54 \mathrm{pm} \quad$ Location: Macquarie University Campus
Present: Ryan Thalari (President), Anneliese Cooper (Secretary), Sarah McCabe (Treasurer), Alex Feolifoff, Samantha Marshall, Mathew Duardo, Angelene Norman, Andrew Fischer

## Agenda Items:

1) Women's
2) Worlds
3) AGM Date
4) Schools Portfolio Update
5) Rotary
6) Holiday Social
7) Finance Update
8) Inter Society Debates
9) Facebook Group for MUDS
10) CA's for Mac Mini
11) MUDS Ball
12) Camp

## Meeting commenced: 6.11pm

## AGENDA ITEM ONE: Womens' Tournament (Confirmation of Contingent)

Ryan: We can now confirm that our Women's Contingent is
Mac 1: Georgia Chahoud and Samantha Marshall
Mac 2: Mounisha Moddedu and Ashleigh Lister
Adjudicator: Anneliese Cooper
Sarah: Really glad that we filled all the spots because Women's convenors told me that we wouldn't have had refund or onsell options or at least they would have been very limited.

## Action Item: Externals Team to send participants email with confirmation of team allocations and payment requirements.

## AGENDA ITEM TWO: World's 2016

a) Trials dates

Ryan: I was thinking that we could hold World's trials on the $9^{\text {th }}$ and $10^{\text {th }}$ of October which would be our $2^{\text {nd }}$ week back at uni.

General discussion occurred surrounding everyone's personal availabilities and the availabilities of potential External Selectors considering USU Worlds Trials on the same weekend.

Ryan proposed: World's Debater Trials to be held on the $9^{\text {th }}$ October and adjudicator trials to be held on the $10^{\text {th }}$ October during Internals.

## Seconded by Sam

In favour: 7
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

## b) Worlds Subsidy Amounts

Sarah: The full cost of registration at the moment is 695.44AUD per person.
Alex: Is it worth putting out an EOI form to gage interest
Anneliese: I feel like we have the same discussion every time we have a major tournament and that previous EOI forms have proven not to be that useful this year.

Sam: If we are worried about interest we could just open rego earlier
Ryan: We're relatively aware of interest at the moment. We know that at least 2 people want to debate, 2 people want to adj and I am applying as an independent. Therefore we know that we have enough interest to send a full contingent.

Sarah: In regards to subsidies I think it is our fault that we were not able to provide more team or adj spots this year and therefore we should be providing large subsidies

Anneliese: I'm all for providing large subsidies but not at the expense of being able to heavily subsidise Easters next year. We really need to grow the size of MUDS and we know that the best way to do that is through Easters.

Mat: $\quad$ Because spots are competitive we don't need to subsidise that much. We should spend less on Worlds where only three people attend for the sake of being able to provide greater subsidies to the 20 people who attend Easters.

Anneliese: I think we should regardless, or at least competitiveness shouldn't be a consideration, because we have subsidies in order to make debating tournaments accessible with minimal burden on the individual. We exist to provide subsidies.

Sarah: The best way to make Worlds competitive in the long run is to get people to Easters so that our Society gets better debaters etc.

Alex: The other thing we need to ask is whether we subsidise people who want to go as an unsubsidised IA especially in light of it being our fault that we have so few teams?

Ryan: I'm applying as an IA and it's likely that I won't get subsidised. I'm happy to say that we should only subsidise IA's who are current Mac students and would otherwise be eligible to debate as a member of the MUDS contingent. At Monash and USU for example they offer IA's subsidies.

Ryan proposes the motion: any MUDs person who receives an IA spot and meets the eligibility criteria to debate for MUDS should receive a subsidy the same as any other member of the MUDS Worlds Contingent.
Noting that this motion is not binding on future Execs and does not set precedent for future years.
Sam seconds motion
In favour: 7
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

| Sarah: | I think we should have a process for this in terms of how the funds are transferred between MUDS, the IA and Worlds convenors. It's probably best if the IA sends the invoice to MUDS who then pays Worlds and receive the remaining payment from the IA. |
| :---: | :---: |

Ryan proposes: Independent adjudicator should send their invoice to MUDS who will then pay the Worlds convenors. The independent adjudicator will then pay the remainder of the money to MUDS.
Sarah seconds
In favour: 7
Against: 0

## MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

Ryan: I think we should provide subsidies so that participants only have to pay $\$ 500$ AUD.

Anneliese: Our subsidy amounts need to be communicated in foreign currency because if there are fluctuations we could end up paying way more than we intended and vice versa.

Sarah: Let's say that subsidy will be capped up to the amount of \$250AUD.

## Andrew arrived 6.42pm

## AGENDA ITEM THREE: AGM Date

Ryan: I propose that we hold the AGM on Monday the $\mathbf{2 4}{ }^{\text {th }}$ October during Internals ( $\mathbf{6 p m}$ ). This gives us enough time to meet constitutional requirements in terms of notice as well as the fact the university now needs to approve our Constitutional Amendments before they can become valid. We are still unsure if this means that they approve them before or after the AGM but either way could take time.

## Seconded by Anneliese

In favour: 8
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

## MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

Ryan: We also need to start preparing for handovers. I am thinking we could get together for a chilled day to work on portfolios together so that we get some good handovers going. When is everyone free to do this?

Action Item: Ryan to create a poll to determine this date

## AGENDA ITEM FOUR: InterSociety Debates

Sam: There are Societies (e.g. MULS, MUPS, Health Science, Political groups) who want debates for people who don't normally debate. Our role in this would be mediating, providing topics, adjing perhaps providing a debating teammate. We're not trying to cause a civil war, it's just casual and fun debates between societies on topics that have some form of middle ground. I'm open to suggestions if people have ideas about this because it's still being figured out.

Sarah: It's important that you convey to the Societies that it's not a platform to advocate for an ideology but rather it's about who can argue better

Ryan: We could do what has been done before where you put Societies on the side of the topic that they are most likely to disagree with.

Anneliese: Yeah that could work as long as the topics have a fair bit of middle ground.

## Sam left meeting 6.55pm

Ryan: Sidenote that Friday $21^{\text {st }}$ October is Student Group Award Night so keep that night free.

Sarah: $\quad 7^{\text {th }}$ October is Sarah's birthday so keep that night free.
Andrew: We could combine the two and do a handover at Sarah's $21^{\text {st }} \ldots$

## AGENDA ITEM FIVE: Schools Update

Anneliese: ISD is $20^{\text {th }}$ Sept. Please be there. Last time we ran a big and successful tournament but a lot of responsibility fell onto very few people. The only thing stopping us from running bigger tournaments is finding more adjudicators. We also have about 6 potential teams registered so far.

Future Students at Mac Uni has also required us to provide contact details of the schools that have registered. This is confidential info and I'm not comfortable with doing this so will talk to them about whether we actually need to do that. Future Students needs to be notified whenever we run events with Schools.

## AGENDA ITEM SIX: Rotary

| Anneliese: | I really don't see any benefit to us continuing to do Rotary adjudicating. We <br> haven't had the capacity to provide adjudicators over the last few weeks and <br> they're just getting angry at us for not being able to provide them. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Angie: | When you adjudicate the teachers give you no guidance however sometimes <br> it's good because you do get approached for paid coaching opportunities. |
| Anneliese:The only benefit I can think of with this is that if we had a large Society this <br> would prevent people from being locked out of adjudicating and is a good way <br> for them to get started with adjing. It's how I started. This is my only <br> hesitation with us stopping Rotary adjudicating however I can't really justify <br> this tiny benefit considering how annoying it is and how disinterested people <br> tend to be. I also don't think our capacity to provide adjs is going to increase if <br> we move it to another day other than Tuesday, either. |  |
| Ryan: $\quad$The Secretary has this issue every year |  |
| Alex:I can see the benefit of goodwill etc but if we can't fulfil our obligations then <br> it's doing more harm than good. |  |
| Andrew:It's hard enough to get people to adj at Schools Days |  |
| Anneliese: $\quad$Okay, is everyone generally okay for me to start talking to the coordinators <br> about us not being involved next year for both primary and high school <br> divisions? |  |
| Everyone was generally in favour of this |  |

## AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: Mid Semester Social

Ryan: We should have a mid-semester social. Any ideas for what this might look like or when to have it? I'm thinking Monday $19^{\text {th }}$ Sept instead of Internals.

Anneliese: That's the day before Schools' Day. Does that matter?
Andrew: Let's do it on Tuesday after Schools' Day. It could give us some more adjs.
Sarah: Everyone is too tired after Schools' Day
Mat: $\quad$ We should move it closer to semester because there is about a four week period were a bunch of people won't be involved in debating things due to Worlds Trials etc.

Anneliese: Is there a reason why we can't host it on the public holiday? ( $3^{\text {rd }}$ Oct)

```
Angie: \(\quad\) There's a \(10 \%\) surcharge on drinks etc. Will that matter? Otherwise we could have a picnic in the park.
Sarah: I don't think the surcharge is going to be the difference between people coming or not.
Ryan proposes: Mid Semester Social on \(3{ }^{\text {rd }}\) October
Sarah seconds
In favour: 7
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
```


## MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

## Action Item: Social team (Lachlan and Angie) to figure out a location.

## AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: Finance Update

Sarah: Only person who has paid their rego for Australs is Alex.
Action Item: Sarah to chase up people who haven't paid for Australs rego 2016.

## AGENDA ITEM NINE: MUDS Facebook Group

Ryan: Is this something we are going to do?
Anneliese: I'm worried about being exclusive. At what point do we add people?
Angie: I'm opposed to this idea because of how heavily the uni monitors Facebook pages and because of the way it creates conflict in Internal politics

Anneliese: There are other ways we can solve that e.g. just delete people or if it gets too bad we'll just delete the page and we can warn people about the way it should be used.

Ryan: Heaps of other institutions have page and it's always been fine. It would just be used as an informal way of communicating, people asking for teammates etc.

Mat: I want to express my concern about having an opt out system in light of the Exec adding people to the group. It should instead be an opt-in system rather than people being added to a random group and having to opt-out. People shouldn't be invited en-masse.

Ryan proposes: that we have a Facebook group for MUDS monitored by Big Three Alex amends that it should be monitored by Exec as a whole

## Sarah seconds

## In favour: 5

Against: 2
Abstentions: 0

## MOTION PASSES

## AGENDA ITEM TEN: Mac Mini

Ryan: I'm chasing up the CA's for Mac Mini. We want an all female adj core but I can't confirm who that will be yet. Social will be at the Chelsea most likely.

Mat: $\quad$ We should have a CA from Mac. We are talking about favouring development but we aren't training up our own people. We have plenty of people who could do that.

Ryan: We need a competitive CA because UTS and WS are either side of Mac Mini. I would rather push people at Mac to adj

Angie: Even though some MUDS people wouldn't have adj experience, they'd probably be skilled enough if they're with a strong panel

Anneliese: I think this is a great idea in a year or two. We have a young Exec and our members are hugely experienced at the moment. Glad we had this conversation though and we should keep having it, just next year.

Ryan: I think it's important that you adj tournament before you CA
Angie: $\quad$ We don't self-promote enough and we really too heavily on outside affirmation of our own worth as a society. We should have confidence that we have skilled debaters who would make great CAs.

Alex: We also should advertise the CA's with fun spiels about who they are when
we promote the event.
Discussion to be continued amongst Competitions Officers

## AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN: MUDS Ball

Ryan: Next year our Society turns 50 and I think we should have an event to recognise that. We could also invite MUDS alumni.

Andrew: Yeah we could have goon sacks in the park.
Angie: We could have a masquerade ball

Sarah: I like this idea but we should try and host it on campus. We don't have the

## Meeting closed: 7.57pm

## Post-Meeting Note Re Clarification of Australs AA violation:

Macquarie's 2016 Australs Contingent did not meet n-2 AA requirements because
a) 2 female participants withdrawing from contingent ( $100 \%$ of the femaleidentifying members who had registered to trial were offered spots but withdrew for reasons beyond the Society's control) and
b) AA requirements being rounded up rather than down as was expected. Our Executive were not made aware of this prior to the Tournament and were not able to apply for an AA exemption.

MUDS was able to find a female-identifying debater, and so the team we sent met AA, but the contingent didn't meet AA requirements because of the two-male-identifying adjudicators that were sent. At that point, the only way to meet $A A$ would have been to send no adjudicators.

AIDA Pre-Council determined that we didn't meet any of the criteria upon which an AA exemption could be granted. Macquarie's contingent was then ineligible to make the break because of this violation.

