

# World Universities Debating Council

## Minutes: preliminary meeting

28 December 2010

### Executive Committee:

Chair: Duncan Campbell

Registrar: Steve Johnson

Secretary: Joe Roussos

### Agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Roll call and voting status
3. N-1
4. Eligibility
5. ESL/EFL
6. Bids for 2013 (moved to last due to technical difficulties)
7. Agenda for Council on 1 Jan 2011

### Welcome:

Meeting opened at 13:54. Duncan welcomed all delegates. Duncan began explaining that he is sitting in for Sam Greenland (elected at Koc), and that Steve Johnson has agreed to help us as registrar.

### Roll call:

Steve ran through the preliminary voting status roll call that was compiled from registration information. Duncan explained the voting system of Council. Roll call was taken, and quorum was achieved.

### N-1 rule:

The adjudication core listed institutions violating the N-1 rule. These institutions were encouraged to contact the DCA team to rectify the issue. The adjudication core asked for other violations not yet known to them. Representatives of institutions who are in violation need to contact the adjudication core. Applications for exemptions were opened. The following universities applied for exemptions: Belgrade, Brac, Bates, Hong Kong University. The others resolved the issue by "borrowing" judges from institutions with N or more.

- Initially only Belgrade asked for an exemption due to the high costs associated with the tournament. They have an observer, but s/he cannot act as a judge as s/he is not a debater. Logan stated he would rather not have an uninterested judge. Belgrade asked to talk to their observer. Duncan pointed out exemptions are given now, so this is not feasible. England proposed the motion below.

Motion	
Proposed: England	Seconded: Germany
<i>That Belgrade University be granted an exemption from the N-1 rule.</i>	
Votes for:	Votes against:
<i>Motion withdrawn, on discovering that there are four applications, not one.</i>	

Malaysia asked the adj core to clarify how many judges they can lose. Logan replied that there is an exact fit currently, so there is no room to lose judges. Australia commented that the point of the N-1 rule was conceived of with the high cost of Worlds in mind. The rule exists to restrict the number of universities who bring too few judges, whatever the reason. Clarification was sought on the number of teams seeking N-1 exemptions. The four institutions listed above indicated their intention to apply.

- Slovenia re-proposed the motion. England pointed out that Belgrade's specific case was such that forcing the observer to judge would be harmful, so they would support the vote. Proposed that we consider formalising the conditions under which exemptions are granted.

Motion	
Proposed: Slovenia	Seconded: Ireland
<i>That Belgrade University be granted an exemption from the N-1 rule.</i>	
Aus called the question. Vote conducted verbally.	
<i>Motion passed</i>	

- Bates judge is stuck in a snow storm and so cannot attend. The judge registered in good faith, rego was paid. Exemption asked for.

Motion	
Proposed: United States	Seconded: Scotland
<i>That Bates University be granted an exemption from the N-1 rule.</i>	
US called the question. Vote conducted verbally.	
<i>Motion passed.</i>	

- Hong Kong is missing two judges. HK Uni has visa problems – the two judges hold Chinese passports, they applied for transit visas, but needed full visas. They were given incorrect advice by the embassies they consulted with in HK.

Motion	
Proposed: Malaysia	Seconded: Phillipines
<i>That Hong Kong University be granted two exemptions from the N-1 rule.</i>	
England called the question. Vote conducted verbally.	
<i>Motion passed.</i>	

- Brac University from Bangladesh then applied. They contacted the adj core early to explain their case. Their reason is the high cost of bringing people. They had a backup plan to adopt a judge from another Bangladeshi university, but in the end only one institution arrived. There was a plan to bring another judge, but the travel plans were hampered by the org com, who did not send the visa waiver letter soon enough. Austria asked for clarity that they still are below N-1. They are.

Motion	
Proposed: Malaysia	Seconded: Australia
<i>That Brack University be granted an exemption from the N-1 rule.</i>	
Scotland called the question. Vote conducted verbally.	
<i>Motion passed.</i>	

The adjudication team had an announcement: one DCA has withdrawn – James Drey is unable to attend due to work commitments. He could spend too little time in the country, at too great a cost, to be useful. Vivek Ramsaroop has replaced him, on an executive call by the adjudication team. Vivek has an extensive debating CV in SA, and was DCA on the last two PAUDCs. Logan asked for Council’s blessings. Granted by applause.

Eligibility issues:

Grandfather rule

Duncan began by asking the adj team and org com if they know of violations. Logan knows of 1 issue: Petar Bezjak (Uni Split, Croatia) has debated at 5 worlds for different institutions. Petar stated that his understanding was that the rule concerned *breaking* and not competing. He apologised for the misunderstanding and offered to become a judge if Council recommends. Joe read out the relevant article of the constitution (22.1). Venezuela asked why we are discussing this, considering the

accused is willing to switch his registration. Ireland commented that this is important for precedent and clarifying the meaning of the clause. Slovenia asked why Petar broke at last Worlds, if his interpretation concerned eligibility to break at four competitions. Petar responded that he hadn't considered the rule until recently. He has debated for different institutions and believed it was four times (breaking) for each institution. He recognises this is not the case and will follow Council's recommendation. Australia asked how many times he broke (once, his fifth attempt). Qatar said he also interpreted the article as did Petar: that he can debate as many times as he likes. From the fifth attempt on, he cannot break. Australia proposed the motion below:

Motion	
Proposed: Australia	Seconded: Canada
<i>That Petar Bezjak be allowed to debate, so long as he understands that he cannot break.</i>	
Scotland called the question. Vote conducted verbally.	
<i>Motion withdrawn following the discussion below.</i>	

There followed some discussion on the import of a motion confirming the status quo. It was decided that this motion interprets the clause in the Constitution. Ireland commented that this is an interpretation question, and that this is a negative interpretation considering the problem with too few judges. Germany argued that the spirit of the clause is that a team debates four times, and that Petar should judge. Joe mentioned that the problematic phrase "teams eligible to participate..." appears in a number of places in the Constitution and any interpretation would carry over to all instances. Netherlands pointed out that Petar broke when ineligible, he should voluntarily judge. Petar volunteered to adjudicate. Discussion closed.

Composite teams:

None are known.

ESL/EFL registration:

Logan: Registration is underway, under the guidelines on the website. Interviews are being conducted. The process will close on the 30<sup>th</sup> of December. There are currently approximately 180 individuals applying.

AOB:

Equity policy (Netherlands)

Netherlands: Previous appeals committee rules problematic. The Appeals committee is made up by the CA, Equity officer, etc. This tournament has too much duplication – Joe and Ahyoung are both on the equity team and in line for the appeals committee. Duncan is helping with equity too, meaning there is no separation. Joe clarified that he is the tournament equity officer, and fourth in line to the appeals committee, but agreed this is an issue. To deal with the problem, Joe proposed that the regional representatives be co-opted onto the appeals committee, should there be clashes with the Chair and Registrar. [Edit: During the tournament the equity team was expanded, and Duncan and Ahyoung were no longer involved in the tournament equity team, but were on stand-by for the appeals committee.]

### Tournament complaints

Australia: There have been problems with shuttles, buses, visas etc. Would be good to get some comment from the Org Com on how these issues are being resolved. Org com were not present to comment. Duncan supported the proposal, but stated that the solution may just be to encourage better communication as to the progress of these issues as they unfold.

Israel talked to the buses issue – bus logistics can be dismissed, but safety issues are important and should be dealt with, above and beyond saying that the bus company is problematic.

Bangladesh related a problem regarding visas – the visa waiver letter did was not sent early enough, which led to them not being able to come. Philippines had a similar problem: transit visas were not organised. Information regarding them was very late, so it was impossible to resolve the issue privately. Would like compensation, in the form of refunds for registration. Duncan asked that this issue be tabled until the full Council meeting, as Pre-Council is for immediate issues.

Europe: It was not stated that we needed towels. Many people don't have one.

Philippines: there are no shower curtains in the showers.

Malaysia: Org com is renegotiating buses, fine. But please put up the lists of people departing, so that these details can be confirmed.

Wales: we can't contact the right people. We can't get to the correct org com members. The TD (Gabriel) responded that this was an isolated case and they would work to improve communication.

### Council meeting agenda for Jan 1 2011:

Duncan: Delegates are to prepare written motions before the Council meeting. The rules are as follows:

- 3 minutes to propose/introduce a motion
- After this, each delegate has 30s to talk on a motion

- Only answers to direct questions will interrupt the speaking order

In the past there have been issues with having enough time to discuss a motion. Duncan stated he will distribute copies of two motions (registration reform and expanding the break) to all Council reps so that they can be read and discussed before the meeting. When the meeting on the 1<sup>st</sup> happens, we will all be on the same page.

#### Agenda for the meeting:

A proposed agenda was distributed. Duncan read it out, and asked for additions/comments. IONA asked if we could discuss participation at Worlds, in order to clarify the so called "Grandfather rule". Slovenia asked if there could be a separate issue for financial compensation to delegates who have suffered due to organisational mishaps. England asked if PhD candidate could give a 2min presentation on a research report on Worlds. Ireland proposed we discuss judge funding. Venezuela asked for a vote of support for the World Universities Debating Championships in Spanish – this will occur in the regional report. Oceania clarified that countries may not vote by proxy, rather each country must be represented at the meeting.

#### Bid presentations:

WUDC council has agreed in Koc to hold bid presentations at the pre-council to allow efficiency and better discussion in the course of the Tournament, prior to the main council.

- *Coin flip* - Germany decides to go second
- Asia rep : should competing bidders should leave the room to ensure fairness?
- Duncan : both bidders may be present during presentation of bids.
- Presentation of bids are to last 10 minutes, followed by 15 minutes of Q&A which can be extended by another five minutes if needed.

[Due to technical issues, the venue for the bid presentations were changed. Q&A was not minuted, as both bids undertook to provide documentation committing to what they said in their answers at the main Council meeting. Documentation from Berlin (winning bid) is attached to main minutes. ]