

**EXECUTIVE MEETING #4**

February 24th 2016 6:10pm- 7.50pm Location: Macquarie University Campus

**Present:** Ryan Thalari (President), Anneliese Cooper (Secretary), Sarah McCabe (Treasurer), Lachlan McGrath (President Emeritus), Alex Feolifoff, Andrew Fischer, Mathew Duardo

**Agenda Items:**

The aim of the meeting was to approve trial policies for all major tournaments in 2016. Therefore the order of items was to be as follows:

1) Adjudicator trial policy

2) Worlds Trial policy

3) Australs Trial policy

4) Women’s Trial policy

5) Easters Trial policy

Further items to be discussed:

6) Mac Micro

7) Easters payments

8) Australs teams

**Meeting commenced: 6.10pm**

**AGENDA ITEM ONE: Adjudicator Trial Policy**

Ryan: Hopefully everyone has had a chance to look over the trial policies I sent out during the week. I had drafted an adjudicator trial policy because I noticed that we didn’t have one and I think this is important. It outlines the processes we use for major tournamets every year but I thought it would be important to codify it. Are there any objections?

Mat: I think we should have a novice quota. We have said before that we want to encourage adj culture by training up novices and encouraging participation early. We can do this well by introducing a novice quota for tournaments like Easters.

Andrew: I agree. I think we should be working to foster adj culture because it’s every important.

Ryan: I think adjudicating is the kind of thing which people migrate towards as they get older. I didn’t adj until I was in my thrd year of debating.

Lachlan: We can only create this culture change by encouraging experienced members to opt into adjing. We can do this best at Internals

Ryan: Leaving adjudicating development to Internals means that we can mentor adjudicators better as well.

Anneliese: I think it is best done at Internals because provided we get a panel or something so that inexperienced members can be trained by older ones, Internals is the best place to foster development.

Mat: At UTS Internals they allocate people to debate and adjudicate each week with less regard for their preferences. Maybe that’s something we could also do?

Ryan: I think it’s important that we allow people to choose what they want to develop especially in the lead up towards major tournaments when debaters want to practice debating and adjs want to practice adjing.

I think this is something we should keep thinking about but for now I think we have decided that changing adj culture can be done best in Internals.

I therefore propose we adopt this Adjudication Trial Policy as it exists now?

**Ryan proposed:** Adoption of Adjudicator Trial Policy

**Seconded:** Lachlan

**Votes in favour:** 7

**MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY**

**AGENDA ITEM TWO: Worlds Trial Policy**

Ryan: I move a motion to adopt the World’s Debater Trial Policy which I emailed through this week. It has not changed from last year.

**Ryan proposes:** Adoption of World’s Debater Trial Policy

**Seconded:** Andrew

**Votes in favour:** 7

**MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY**

**AGENDA ITEM THREE: Australs Trial Policy**

*[Sarah arrived: 6.40pm]*

**Ryan:** I propose that we adopt the Australs Trial Policy which I sent out this week. It has not changed from last year.

**Ryan proposes:** Adoption of Australs Debater Trial Policy

**Seconded:** Lachlan

**Votes in favour:** 7

**MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY**

**AGENDA ITEM FOUR: Women’s Trial Policy**

**Ryan:** I propose that we adopt the Women’s Trial Policy which I sent out this week. It has not changed from last year.

Discussion occurred so that everyone understood what would occur during the Trial process. This discussion mirrored what is written in the Trial Policy. Discussion about the processes and participants last year also occurred so that new members were informed of previous discussion surrounding this policy.

*[Sarah arrived: 6.40pm]*

**Ryan proposes:** Adoption of Women’s Trial Policy

**Seconded:** Anneliese

**Votes in favour:** 8

**MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY**

**AGENDA ITEM FIVE: Easters Trial Policy**

Ryan: I would like to propose that we adopt this updated version of Easters Trial policy. The changes I have made are:

a) I removed the section which said that novices should be trialed by 2 Internal Selectors and 1 External Selector so that it now requires novices be trialed by 2 Internal Selectors and the experienced debaters trial in front of an External Selector. This is what has actually happened every year since 2012 when we decided that we should trial novices and experienced debaters separately.

b) The old policy said that experienced debaters are to be selected on the basis of their trial performance and the responses in their Mentor Questionnaire are only to be considered after they’ve been selected and are being put into teams. I had suggested that an External Selector should rank all debaters based on how they go in their trial and then gives those rankings to the Internal Selectors. The Internal Selectors then use these rankings + responses to the Mentor Questionnaire to determine the final rankings of the experienced debaters.

What dos everyone think of this?

Mat: Firstly I suggest that we have an AA policy because there doesn’t seem to be one in this policy.

Everyone: Yep, agreed.

Affirmative Action policy was added to the Trial Policy. This AA policy was directly in line with AIDA requirements which are as follows:

*The Society shall comply with the following Affirmative Action (AA) Policy:*

* 1. *A minimum of one third of debaters attending the tournament and one third of debaters in the top three teams must be female.*
  2. *Further, a minimum of one third of all members in the contingent (i.e. the total number of debaters and institutional adjudicators) must be female.*
  3. *Where one third of debaters or of the contingent does not constitute a whole number, the number shall be rounded up to the nearest integer.*
  4. *However, in the event that one third of the contingent is a number less than one, no minimum requirement will apply.*
  5. *The Affirmative Action Policy is subject (but not limited) to the requirements of the Australasian Intervarsity Debating Association (AIDA) Constitution.*

Ryan: Now that that’s settled, what does everyone think of the Mentoring application requirements for pros? To what extent should it be considered in the trialing process?

General consensus was that the policy determined mentoring capacity well.

Ryan: I think it is good that the Internal Selectors have to consider the speaker’s mentoring abilities because mentoring is more than just being able to just train up novices during Easters. I think the hope is that that mentor can continue to have a relationship with their novices throughout the year by taking them to mini’s etc. We would also lose less people after Easters as well because then they would be more likely to participate in minis.

Andrew: Yeah, I think it’s a good thing to consider how much that mentor will invest in their novices considering that a lot of development could be done after Easters.

Ryan: Perhaps we should have a system based on merit, almost like a brownie point system, where we consider your contributions to the MUDS, how often you come to Internals etc. so that it indicates the likelihood of your mentoring ability after the Easters as well.

It was agreed that an extra question should be added to the Mentor Questionnaire so that it read;

*VIII) Please briefly list your service to the Society (e.g. any previous mentoring, contribution to MUDS events like Schools Days or O-Week etc).*

Sarah: In regards to the weight that should be given to that question, I don’t think it needs to be explicitly stated. It doesn’t necessarily need to be a third category. Instead, it can just be in the back of the Selector’s mind as they consider all of the other requirements.

Alex: Perhaps we could write:

“*In the event that it is still not possible to distinguish between applicants on these bases then their service to the Society (as outlined in their mentor application) may also be considered.”*

The above statement was then added to the policy after it was agreed that this wording accurately represented the aim of that specific criteria.

**Ryan: I propose to adopt this Easters Trial Policy based on the changes made in this meeting.**

**Seconded by:** Sarah

**Votes in favour:** 8

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**AGENDA ITEM SIX: Mac Micro**

Ryan: I want to have a discussion about whether or not we can hold Mac Micro this year. I was thinking about having it the Saturday before Easters.

Anneliese: I’m in favour of putting our efforts into a Tournament which we know have a likely chance of success. I don’t think we can hold Mac Micro the day before Easters considering that everyone will be busy packing to fly to Melbourne as well as the logistics of having to organise a comp so soon.

Ryan: What if we held it after Easters?

Anneliese: Considering how many tournaments are being held in the lead up to and following Easters I’m a bit concerned that we won’t get the interest we need.

Sarah: Let’s not hedge our bets. I don’t want to lose any money.

It was decided that instead of Mac Micro, we would host Mac Fall. Discuss was deferred to a future meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: Discussion about Easters payments**

Ryan: We have a problem with making payments for Easters. We firstly need to decide how we are going to make our second payment of $2.5K by the 6th March and secondly how much we are willing to subsidise on registrations.

Full registration cost per debater is $370 and that’s before flights.

It’s important to note that we can apply for one round of funding, the deadline for which is on the 3rd March but we won’t get that money in time to pay for Easters. I can ask for an extension for the money we don’t have but we should note that this is an extended deadline already.

Andrew: In regards to subsidies, it’s pretty important that we advertise that we are giving bigger subsidies to first-years. When I was in first-year I didn’t know that there was a subsidy let alone a larger one for me.

Anneliese: Same for me.

Mat: Perhaps we can ask for a full registration payments from debaters on the basis that we will refund them their subsidy. This way we get the money now and they are acutely aware of the fact that they are getting a subsidy. They are also them more likely to hang around in MUDS after Easters.

Anneliese: I’m worried about the logistics of refunding them as well as hesitance with trusting us to refund them. I worried this might act as a disincentive to attend and will overcomplicate it regardless of whether it’s signed and in contract form etc.

Sarah: We’ve also then got issues with the deadline in which we refund them and I think it will be logistically very hard to actually transfer them that money back.

I also think that this is our problem as the Exec and we shouldn’t be burdening others with this problem by making them pay more than they should. We can’t assume that everyone has the money to pay for that rego now.

Ryan: In regards to subsidy amount I propose that we charge $250 to first years (a subsidy of $125) and $280 for pros (a subsidy of $95).

Mat: I don’t think we are being strategic enough in the way we are spreading this out. $30 to an individual is not going to be the barrier between attending or not attending.

Anneliese: I agree. I think we can afford to subsidise less because it gets to a point, particularly for a pro where you’ve already decided that you are or aren’t attending Easters and the amount you pay doesn’t play into that decision that much.

Ryan: I don’t want to charge pros more than $280 in rego because this is before flights.

Sarah: I think it is okay that we are charging more than we normally do for Easters because historically rego cost for Easters has increased every year.

Mat: Is there a way we could package it with flights? If we spoke to Student Flights perhaps we could get a cheap deal and book flights so that the price we show to participants looks better because it is inclusive of flights.

Ryan: That is something we can look into.

Lachlan: I think we can get Student Flights to book us discounted flights if we approached them as a group but I don’t think we can make that decision pre-emptively. We don’t know when everyone is going to want to fly down, some might want to go early to look around, I know I’m not flying until Sunday night because I want to work Saturday. We can’t make a definite package, it’s logistically too hard.

Alex: How does everyone feel about charging $270 to novices and $300 to pros?

Mat: I think we could package it better

Anneliese: I agree. I think we could make it look more discounted.

Ryan: What about $269 for novices and $299 for pros?

Anneliese: Now I’m worried that it makes it look like we are trying to hide the cost too much. I would look at that and worry I was being ripped off. I’d be happier with $275 for novices and $300 for pros.

Numbers were tossed around a bit. Discussion occurred.

**Sarah: I propose $270 for first-years and $300 for pros.**

**Seconded by:** Alex

**Votes in favour:** 7

**Votes against:** 1

**MOTION PASSED**

Ryan: Ok, now we need to talk about how to get raise the money for the next payment. Is anyone able to pay it knowing that you will be reimbursed as soon as funding comes through?

No one was able to volunteer.

Ryan: I suggest that the Exec pays registration early. There are 9 of us and if we pay $300 each now instead of after trials then we’d have $2700.

Discussion was had about whether or not individuals would be able to pay early. Discussion was deferred to a later date so everyone could consider it.

**AGENDA ITEM NINE: Australs teams**

Ryan: Registration for Australs is coming up soon. I propose that we reserve a place for 3 teams and 2 adjs.

Mat: I don’t think we will get enough interest to fill those spots.

Sarah: We have typically reserved more places and then been refunded when we have reduced those numbers. I’d rather aim high and pull out a team/adj spot later.

Alex: I think we can talk about this again later, after Easters.

**Ryan proposes:** We reserve places for 3 teams and 2 adjudicators for WAustrals 2016.

**Seconded by:** Sarah

**Votes in favour:** 6

**Votes against:** 0

**Abstentions:** 2 (Mat and Andrew temporarily not present).

**MOTION PASSED**

**Meeting closed: 7.50pm**