

Ratified Minutes of

THE MEETING OF THE DEBATE SELECTION COMMITTEE

3rd Week Trinity Term 2019

Monday 13th May

Morris Room, 12:15

Present: The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee (Lee Chin Wee, *Trinity College*), The Standing Committee Delegate (Beatrice Barr, *St Peter's College*), The Access, Communications & Equity Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer (Dominic Brind, *Magdalen College*), The Externals Officer (Jason Xiao, *Wadham College*), The DSC Deputy Secretary *cum* Librarian (Sara Singh Dube, *St Hugh's College*), The Internals Officer (Brian Wong, *Wolfson College*), The President (Genevieve Athis, *Christ Church*)

Attending:

Apologies: The Director of Training (Rachel O'Nunain, *Trinity College*)

Absent:

Late: The DSC Treasurer (Bryan Yan, *Keble College*)

The meeting opens at 12:23

The Standing Committee Delegate asks the President for permission to record the meeting on her personal laptop, for the duration of the meeting within the Morris room. The President accepts.

Apologies

Requests to Pass Absences from Previous Meetings

Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

Changes to the composition of DSC [All]

Regional Rounds SO Change [Dom]

In camera criteria Rules Change [Chin]

Chief Adjudicators for Oxford IV [All]

Business of the CDSC

Change to Oxford Schools Regional Rounds Standing Order

The DSC Treasurer enters at 12:24

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer explains that the Standing Order change is a proportional and sensible measure, which ensures that any individual who wishes to trial for EUDC in the Trinity Term following Oxford Schools must judge three Oxford Schools regional rounds. He notes that this will be brought to TSC this afternoon should it be passed by DSC.

The CDSC asks what substantive changes are proposed. He asks if the regional round requirement applies to WUDC.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer responds that this does not apply to WUDC, due to the distance in time between Oxford Schools rounds and WUDC trials. He notes that debater's levels of involvement tend to fluctuate from year to year, making it unfair to make somebody ineligible for WUDC based on their involvement the previous year.

The Externals Officer agrees that individuals are likely to know what they are doing in the following term, but not the following year.

The Externals and Internals Officers express support for the proposal.

The CDSC says that he will explain the changes made in this week's DA.

In Camera Criteria Rules Change

The CDSC explains that this pertains to a change to Rule 23, which would allow for the discussion of a corporate objection to go *in camera*. He notes the problem that the rules do not obviously allow for DSC to go *in camera* when discussing this, despite the typically personal nature of corporate objections.

He adds that while this rules change allows for any discussions of the composition of DSC to go *in camera*, but that it is aimed at corporate objections. If the person concerned wished not to have their objection discussed *in camera*, this would be permitted.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that the crucial word in this motion is 'may', meaning DSC is not forced to go *in camera* for such discussions.

The CDSC asks for any questions or comments, and offers to do any admin arising relating to this rules change.

The President suggests that this change is brought to the Week 4 Public Business Meeting.

The CDSC supports this.

Chief Adjudicators for Oxford IV

The CDSC requests an update from all involved DSC members on the selection of CAs for the Oxford IV.

The Externals Officer mentions that he may have to pull out of his position as ACA, as he may have to coach a Team Canada schools competition in Germany the weekend of the IV. He notes that it would be fairer for him to pull out now than at the last moment.

The CDSC proposes the Internals Officer as an alternative ACA candidate.

The Externals Officer asks whether the Director of Training should be pulled down to ACA, and the Internals Officer or another candidate made CA. He suggests that this may, however, be unfair to the Director of Training.

The CDSC agrees that this would be unfair especially given gender balance concerns and the fact that the Director of Training has already been appointed.

The CDSC moves that the Internals Officer (Brian Wong, *Wolfson College*) be selected as ACA for the Oxford IV 2019.

The President seconds.

The motion passes nem. con.

The Externals Officer mentions that Ms Ameera More has accepted the offer of a CA position, and asks whether DSC has reached out to Ms Emma Lucas.

The CDSC responds that he has attempted to contact Ms Lucas, but has had some difficulty. He suggests he will ask Ms Gigi Gil to reach out.

He adds that Mr Ashish Kumar will be unable to CA.

The Internals Officer asks if Mr Kumar will be attending the Cambridge IV. The CDSC responds that he likely will.

The President asks why individuals choose the Cambridge IV over the Oxford IV.

The CDSC explains that Mr Kumar is himself a Cambridge alum, and once the university's best debater.

The President expresses that she understands this choice.

The CDSC assures DSC that he will chase Ms Lucas, and update DSC.

Changes to the composition of DSC

The Externals Officer requests more time to calculate the competence points of the candidate for DSC.

Business of the DSC Deputy Secretary

No business

Business of the Access, Equity and Communications Officer

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer explains that Debate Mate has contacted the Union requesting help organising a competition at the Union in July.

The CDSC responds that this is not his decision.

The President suggests that the Debate Mate representative should email the Union, CC'ing the President-Elect. She notes that rooms tend to be booked out quickly in July.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks whether DSC would be happy with this from a theoretical, access-based point of view.

The CDSC says that he would be, and that he would be happy to ask people to help and assist with admin. If there are rooms for the competition, he would be happy to support it.

Business of the President

No business.

Business of the Internals Officer

No business.

Business of the Director of Training

No business in her absence.

Business of the Externals Officer

The Externals Officer says that he will open selections for the Bristol IV, which will take place on June 8th.

The CDSC asks if the Externals Officer has signed up three teams and two judges.

The Externals Officer responds that he has registered the teams and judges, but has not paid.

The CDSC says that he will open selections.

The Externals Officer suggests that DSC discusses Oxford IV CAs while waiting for DSC application competency points to be calculated.

The Externals Officer suggests continuing discussion on Mr Archie Hall.

The CDSC agrees. He asks what Mr Hall's reputation is like in North America in comparison to Mr Danny DuBois.

The Externals Officer responds that while Mr DuBois is better respected as a debater, Mr Hall has the credibility of WUDC.

The Internals Officer agrees that Mr Hall's connection with WUDC is a good selling point to foreign teams, and adds that Mr DuBois' reputation would not rival that of any member of the Cambridge CA team.

The CDSC suggests that Mr Hall is approached, first via the Ex-Director of Training (Rosa Thomas, *St Anne's College*). He suggests approaching Mr DuBois in the case that Mr Hall rejects the offer.

The Internals Officer asks if DSC have any back-up North American judges in mind.

The Externals Officer suggests Mr Harry Elliot, with whom he will CA NAUDC.

The CDSC agrees, if Mr Elliot has sufficient time.

The Externals Officer asks two questions about the calculation of competency points. First, if the applicant has broken at an international competition after the term in question, whether they are considered an internationally-breaking speaker. Second, what the procedure is if no category is available for a tournament.

The Internals Officer responds that if they have yet to break, it is not counted, and that DSC estimates categories of competitions where necessary.

The CDSC asks for clarification that for North American CAs, DSC is proposing Mr Hall, followed by Mr DuBois, followed by Mr Elliot.

The CDSC asks who should replace Ms Lucas should she be unavailable.

The Internals Officer notes that Ms Lucas is the best choice for a European ESL woman, as the only other choice is not a good judge.

The Internals Officer suggests Ms Romée Lind, but notes that this may be seen as tokenism. They also propose Mr Milos Marjanovic as an ESL option.

The CDSC responds that a CA team made up of the Director of Training, Ms More, Mr Marjanovic and Mr Hall would work.

The Internals Officer notes that Mr Marjanovic and Ms O’Nunain do not get on well.

The Externals Officer agrees.

The President suggests that they should still be able to work well together.

The Internals Officer agrees.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks the Internals Officer the category of Glasgow Ancients.

The Internals Officer asks the year in question. The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer responds that he is referring to this year.

The Internals Officer responds that it is category B.

The CDSC suggests that the conversation of CAs is temporarily paused.

The CDSC asks the DSC Treasurer for the DSC expenses for the week.

The DSC Treasurer attempts to respond with his mouth full.

The DSC Treasurer announces DSC expenses of £736.73.

The CDSC asks where the majority of these expenses were incurred from. The DSC Treasurer responds that they are largely from the Paris Open.

The DSC Deputy Secretary asks if DSC plans to reimburse the travel of Ms Olivia Railton, who was unable to attend the Paris Open at the last minute having forgotten her passport.

The CDSC says that DSC should not, because it was Ms Railton’s mistake.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks for an explanation of the exact circumstances.

The CDSC explains that Ms Railton realised upon arrival at Oxford Station that she had forgotten her passport, and had not given herself enough time to return to get it while still catching the Eurostar.

The President asks why Ms Railton did not take a taxi or bus instead.

The CDSC suggests that it would have been cheaper for Ms Railton to find a cheaper alternative route and be reimbursed for the Eurostar cost.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks for precedent for refusing to reimburse Ms Railton.

The Internals Officer proposes that Ms Railton should not be reimbursed, based on precedent. The CDSC agrees, citing extraordinary circumstances as the only legitimate reason for last-minute non-attendance at an international tournament.

The Internals Officer recalls not being reimbursed for travel to Helsinki on Union business because they had forgotten their passport.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer expresses his concern that the reputation of Ms Railton for being disorganised might affect perceptions of DSC's response.

The President suggests that the decision of DSC not to reimburse Ms Railton will be supported in TSC and Finance Committees, while the opposite would likely be rejected by TSC.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks if Ms Railton has been in touch about this reimbursement issue.

The CDSC responds that she has been told and has accepted this.

The CDSC asks whether helper points ought to be conducted from Ms Railton. The Externals Officer and President suggest that they should.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer cites the relevant Standing Order.

The President notes her hatred for violations of justice.

The CDSC asks if there is precedent for the discussion of the removal of helper points.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer suggests that there is not, as the rules are simple on the matter.

The Externals Officer and CDSC agree that this is a clear-cut issue.

The CDSC notes his genuine sympathy for Ms Railton, but concludes that Ms Railton must be deducted 6 helper points.

The Externals Officer asks if Ms Railton should be forced to reimburse the Union for her registration fee.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks what happened to her partner due to her cancellation.

The President and Externals Officer agree that Ms Railton did not behave well towards her partner in making this mistake.

The DSC Treasurer suggests that, on a question of principle, how DSC would act if individual debaters had been asked to pay the fee in the expectation of future reimbursement and Ms Railton had failed to attend the competition.

The Internals Officer asks why DSC should take up Ms Railton's registration cost.

The Externals Officer adds that registration for the Paris Open cost €50 per person, or €30 for judges. This means that there was an expenditure of €100 for a value of €30, as Ms Railton's partner was demoted to judging.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that DSC does not have the power to fine people.

The President and Standing Committee Delegate agree that it would be unnecessary and punitive to expect Ms Railton to cover the cost of her partner's registration decrease.

The CDSC asks for precedent.

The DSC Treasurer responds that this depends on notice: if an individual who drops out of an international competition gives reasonable notice, a replacement could technically be found. As such, the Union must reimburse the member.

The CDSC notes that, although DSC cannot fine Ms Railton, it might be a good idea to suggest that those who wish to compete for the Oxford Union should compete.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer suggests that it is punitive and extortionary to expect Ms Railton to cover both she and her partner's reg fees.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer suggests that the CDSC email Ms Railton, and allow her to present any grievances she may have to the next meeting of TSC.

Changes to the Composition of this Committee

The Externals Officer explains that Mr Xavier Redmond has enough competency points from competitions, but not enough overall.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that by his account Mr Redmond has been sponsorship officer for 2 terms, OrgComm for 2 terms, and regional convenor. He asks whether the majority might deem these duties to have been discharged to an unsatisfactory degree.

The Internals Officer offers a distinction between competency and debate achievement. The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer responds that this is not how competency points work.

The President leaves at 12:52

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that two terms as Sponsorship Officer is worth 14 points, bringing Mr Redmond to a total of 24 points.

He adds that Mr Jamie Johnson is ahead, on 33 points.

The CDSC asks if Mr Johnson is higher or lower than Mr Prescott. The Externals Officer responds that he is lower. The Internals Officer adds that he is higher than Mr Redmond.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks if Mr Prescott's participation in Leiden was in the Novice Final.

The Externals Officer responds that he is not counting Leiden in the total of Mr Prescott's points.

The Internals Officer explains that they are counting Maastricht, the Externals Officer adds that they are counting Warwick.

The Externals Officer notes that Mr Prescott and the Internals Officer were selected as a Union team at Warwick, but that he is unsure whether this was the case for Maastricht 2018. He notes that even if Mr Prescott was not selected by the Union for this competition, his participation in the finals of the Cardiff Open would give him the requisite points. He adds that he does not believe the Union has records of this.

The Internals Officer notes that both competitions discussed were at least Class C. The Externals Officer responds that discussion pertains only to whether Mr Prescott was selected by the Union for these competitions.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks if DSC is sure Mr Prescott was selected by the Union for Cardiff. The Internals Officer responds that they are.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer suggests that Cardiff might have been a Pro Am, given that Mr Tan Teck Wei competed with Mr Prescott.

The CDSC and Externals Officer state that this is a good point.

The Internals Officer expresses shock.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer explains that, since Cardiff counts as a Pro Am, it will be worth fewer points.

The Internals Officer expresses their surprise and suggests that Mr Johnson may have the most points.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer recommends that DSC refrain from discussing the individuals implicated before dealing with technicalities.

The Internals Officer agrees.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer explains that participation by an 'Am' in a Pro Am is three places below Mr Prescott's previously presumed participation in Cardiff.

The Externals Officer expresses frustration that there are no records from the tournament in question, but notes that inference would suggest that it was a Pro Am. He suggests asking Mr Prescott.

The CDSC proposes making it mandatory to write the tab level of a competition on applications for DSC positions.

The Internals Officer notes that it is hypothetically the role of the DSC Secretary to keep a list of all tournaments and their classes. They note that this is in the Standing Orders, but is an excessive requirement.

The CDSC asks the Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer for an update.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks if the Warwick IV was a Pro Am. The CDSC says it was.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer asks about the class of the Maastricht Final and Maastricht Semi-Final.

The Externals Officer asks if UCL and London were Pro Ams for Mr Johnson. The Internals Officer suggests that they were.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that these competitions should therefore also be bumped down.

DSC passes a motion determining that this was as an am speaker, pursuant to standing order H1 (3) (c)

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer says that this leaves Mr Prescott with 18 points. The Externals Officer adds that this means he is now beaten by Mr Redmond.

Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer reiterates that individuals should not be discussed.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer suggests that DSC move onto discussing Mr Johnson's competitive achievements.

The Externals Officer notes that there is no selection data stating that Mr Johnson was selected as an 'Am' for UCL. The Internals Officer responds that Mr Johnson had broken at the LSE Open by this point.

The Externals Officer asks if Mr Johnson's partnership with Mr Kit Mercer was a Pro Am. The Internals Officer responds that it was.

The Externals Officer asks if it matters whether Mr Johnson and Mr Mercer were selected as a Pro Am. The CDSC responds that it does not matter, if the competition is a Pro Am.

The Externals Officer notes that Mr Johnson's points are now reduced to such an extent that Mr Redmond wins the selection.

The Internals Officer asks if Mr Redmond has listed any Pro Ams on his CV.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer responds that Mr Redmond has not claimed any Pro Ams, only competency.

The CDSC asks how many points Mr Prescott is now on. The Externals Officer responds 18.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that 5 of these points were claimed as a regional convenor, a role which was fulfilled as part of being a convenor.

The Externals Officer asks the location of Sponsorship Officer in the Standing Orders.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer responds that it is there. The Externals Officer adds that it was passed.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that this puts Mr Redmond on 24, Mr Prescott on 18, and Mr Johnson on 23.

The CDSC attempts to clarify the allocation of points for regional rounds. The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that, even were 5 points added to his total, Mr Prescott would still not have as many points as Mr Redmond.

The CDSC moves that Mr Xavier Redmond (*Magdalen College*) is be appointed to DSC.

The Deputy Secretary seconds.

The motion passes nem. con.

The Deputy DSC Secretary asks if applications will be opened for DSC Sponsorship Officer. The CDSC responds that they will.

The CDSC asks the Deputy DSC Secretary to update helper points records based on the Paris Open.

The Access, Equity and Communications Officer *cum* Deputy Returning Officer notes that the names of those who competed are in last week's DA.

The CDSC closes the meeting at 13:00