## 1. Meeting Opened

* It was determined that quorum was present.
* Meeting declared open at 13:22
* **Attending**: Doug Burbidge (chair), Jack Bridges (Treasurer), PRK (elected board member), Sarah Parker (elected board member), Anna Hepworth (administrator), Steve McGlone (elected board member), Lexi Hemsley (elected board member)
* **Observers:** Kat Griffiths (SwanCon 2015), Samara Morgan (SwanCon 2014)
* **Apologies:**Cathy Cupitt (elected board member) – intends to telecommute for a section of the meeting, but is not well enough to attend for the full meeting.
* **Absent:** David Cake (elected board member)

## 2. Previous meeting minutes

Meeting of 2014-03-30

* Minutes accepted without changes.

Doug has not prepared minutes from the meeting immediately following the AGM – those will be presented at the next board meeting.

Samara asked Doug if she could have the AGM minutes so that she can prepare them for distribution.

## 3. Matters arising from the previous minutes

Doug: has not filled out the forms for the Battye for materials to submit. Has downloaded the form! – carry forward.

## 4. Correspondence

* Nil
* SwanCon 2014 convenor (Samara) has passed on the WASFF post office box key to SwanCon 2015 convenor (Kat).
* Kat still needs to know where the post office box is located – Doug will follow up.

## 5. Matters arising from correspondence

n/a

## 6. Report from chair

* Doug welcomes new people to the building, and gives basic safety advice (please don't set the alarm off in the lobby unless you have to; fire escape stairs are not alarmed; bathroom and kitchen location)
* Doug welcomes new people to the board – please note that the constitution requires board members must read the constitution, the bylaws, the regulations and the Act [Corporations Act 2001]. Please note that the constitution/regulations/bylaws are on line at wasff.sf.org.au (eg. wasff.sf.org.au/constitution). Action: new board members to read constitution
* Culture of WASFF – volunteers are very important to our organisation. Often we have different needs pulling in different directions – administrative correctness vs not burning out volunteers, in particular for those who have very demanding positions such as con chairs. A few years ago, the trend was towards getting the admin correct and criticising where people went wrong. Recently, we have moved the focus and to helping and supporting our volunteers. Supporting volunteers is an important part of the culture – that we show them that we value the volunteers more than the administrivia.

Doug then canvassed the room – what have we done right/wrong in terms of culture, both in the last year and more

* Lexi – in the last year – treasurer support was more than adequate
* Doug – this is partly that the WASFF treasurer is doing a fabulous job; CSC treasury is the one that works, see above
* Samara – when there was an issue within the con committee there was mediation (tension within the con committee)
* Jack – this is a change in community
* Doug – contrasted this with a previous experience where the board should have dealt with the problem sooner, rather than waiting to see if it resolved spontaneously.
* Doug – while imperfect, we are getting better on this score. As individual board members, if we see a mistake, then please bring it to the attention of whoever will be constructive to the process.
* Jack – WASFF board 2013 dealt with issues between community members – this was dealt with much better than the previous incident brought to the WASFF board. As a result there is a documented process which can be then followed. In addition, there are now by-laws and regulations that allow us to refuse or revoke a membership in a similar situation, and there is also a process to follow if someone feels that there is a threat to their safety.
* Doug – this applies at all sub-committee levels, not just at the board level. We should be dealing with issues sooner rather than later.
* Jack – better job of diversity across the committees.

## Report from administrator

* Outgoing administrator (Samara) – has handed over All The Things that Jack gave her earlier in the year, plus dust.
* Incoming administrator (Anna) – Nil.

## Report from treasurer [Jack]

Bank account balances, as per internet banking report 10th May 2014 3:08:48 PM AEST

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Account/Card Number** | **Current Balance** | **Available Funds/ Available Credit** |
| WASFF account | 451533495 | $3,486.93 | $3,486.93 |
| SwanCon 2014 | 451535781 | $24,521.15 | $24,521.15 |
| SwanCon 2015 | 451539752 | $18,990.34 | $18,990.34 |
| High interest | 505487641 | $20,158.38 | $20,158.38 |

Resulting discussion

* Lexi – separating the cash intake by day during the convention was very useful.
* Doug – Lexi highlighted that we don't have a safe process for getting money back from the hotel to the bank after the convention. Kat will look in to that.
* Sarah – do we have a night safe approach? Generally – we use the hotel safes, but not always easy to get the money back from them.
* Samara – one of the issues is taking the money to the bank. That we trust the treasurer!
* Jack – we have cash insurance for $20 000.
* Sarah – do SunCorp have a night safe service that we can access?
* Jack – for once a year, is it worth the cost?
* Kat – will get Helen to look in to that.
* Anna – is this a better option, as we still have to walk down there, and if we do it nightly, then we are in the situation of doing this four times.
* Jack – one option is to pay for a courier company to move the money. Not in favour of this option, but it is something that Could Be Done.
* PRK – perfectly fine to have a few people take a walk with a lot of money in a back pack – don't look like a target!
* No time issue though – stay in the hotel Monday night, get it back from the safe on Monday morning, walk down to the bank and deposit it – not that hard!
* Jack emphasizes: always remember that the people are more important than the money – just hand it over in the hope that no one gets hurt.
* Doug is pleased that Jack has implemented briefing/training both in terms of ticketing and doing it early. This was also useful as a dry run (Sunday before the con) as the wifi hot-spot failed with five laptops connected, which would have been problematic during registration.
* Samara – would be good that the cash handling briefing is a mandatory. Jack points out that this has been happening for some years.
* Jack – uses the CDEP briefing forms.

## Report from CSC chair [outgoing chair: PRK]

* There was a convention and it was awesome
* There was a launch and it was awesome
* Financials – look good, as Jack has reported
* Guests have reported having a good time
* Everything is swell!

## Process for formation of SwanCon 2016 committee

Cathy joined the meeting via Skype (13:59).

* From the motion: "WASFF board canvass the community and form a subcommittee for SwanCon 2016"
* Doug has been appraising the board via email of what he has heard. The following prospective convenors have spoken with Doug
  + Coman, initial interest, now withdrawn
  + Isabel White – has gained several members of Coman’s propose committee.
  + Owen Godfrey – admits his bid has people that are not experienced in
  + Jay Watson
* There are also people interested in specific jobs, including Helen Jakobsen for treasurer.
* Doug has emailed out to everyone who he is aware of a 'when things will happen' email, which was discussed on the WASFF list, such that an agreed upon email was sent out.

Should this be a WASFF or a CSC question?

* PRK, representing CSC – we are the steering committee, this is what we are here to do. If the Board set terms of reference, then the CSC can go and follow up on this, and then present a recommendation to the board to decide on this.
* Doug – is this going to be working because the CSC is smaller, or because of experience with the concoms?
* PRK – the two current convenors are on the CSC, and these are the people who want to drill down on the topics.
* Samara – who is it that would be making the decision if it is the CSC? Given that most of the CSC people are here, why can't we make the decision now? Dave Cake is the missing voting member of the CSC
* Conclusion: the board are happy for CSC to do data collection, but we would like to have some input in the decision.

Progress so far

* There has been communication with the community that there was no bid, and that we are going to have to do something.
* No formal canvas has happened.
* Doug is hoping that that we can do the formal canvas on Monday.
* Anna suggests that what we have is decision making meetings back to back, so that CSC get to talk before a full meeting.
* Should we have a face to face presentation with the people interested in being on the board?
* Sarah: put out a general call on social media, with requests for submissions.
* Cathy – could we have someone read through the paperwork that gets submitted, and then create a short list of people who are invited to a meeting, or offered particular jobs.
* Cathy- if we set some minimum requirements that everyone has to meet, then if we find an obvious issue that contravenes the rules, or if we don't know who they are, then we wouldn't necessarily involve them.
* Anna – not recognising someone as being in fandom isn't a reason to omit them from the process.
* PRK – prefer that the CSC put a call out, collate the results, then put a recommendation as to who we should look further at to the board, and then those who pass muster get invited
* Anna – we shouldn't be accepting individual positions, even though we think that they are the only ones interested, because we shouldn't be making those decisions for the con com.
* Doug – sometimes there are people on a bid that the board/community aren't happy with – is this an option for doing things differently?
* Anna – sometimes including someone is done for other reasons than the amount that they are going to be seen to do – their role on the committee is not a public persona.
* Samara – can we run the bid differently, so that people bid for positions.
* Doug - we don't have to ask bids for groups.
* Similarly, sometimes people put a lot of effort in to bids, and then if they fail to get accepted, and then we lose the people's enthusiasm.
* Sarah- no way to avoid this, as there are always going to be people who don't get what they want, and there really isn't a way to avoid this.
* Sarah – previously, con bidding has been combative, but I think that this is changing, and so we are seeing winning bids incorporating people from other bids in a way that wasn't usually seen.
* Doug – no opposition to the CSC doing the canvassing and data collection, and then do a bid super-meeting between CSC and WASFF.
* PRK – we should do that after the CSC have reviewed and provided a written document that is WASFF confidential, so that conversation can happen prior to that meeting. Then those come to talk to us.
* Kat – is this mixing the Genghiscon model with the existing model?
* Samara – this sometimes really works, but it doesn't always.
* Sarah – how do we run this meeting?
* PRK – suggest that we don't interview the people who nominate for a role, but we do invite the convenors to bid.
* Anna – alternatively, I think that we could get all of the nominating people together in a room, get them to make very fast presentations, including those nominating for a role, then let them all talk over tea and bikkies (while WASFF board members wander off so that they can all talk), and see what kind of super-bid comes out of that.
* Cathy – this would allow more canvassing of the community, and goes towards meeting the spirit of the motion as well as the words.
* ?: should we have an SGM?
* Doug – From the AGM minutes – this was floated immediately before the motion happened, so it doesn't need to be done that way. SGMs are a pain in the ass, so as we aren't required to, so lets not.
* Doug – if we have a meeting where all of the committees are involved, we may not end up with a committee, which would mean that we would still have to do this.
* PRK – worried that we will end up with a very confident committee but we might not get a competent one
* Sarah – suggests that we get this done ASAP.
* PRK – are we in favour of a big community hall approach? Doug – if we think it will work. Anna – worst case is if we get a decent presentation. PRK – rather have just the convenor and vice-convenor come and present to the board.
* Cathy – I think this plan is the better one.
* General response around the table – the big meeting doesn't appear to be what was meant, although that was the original interpretation of some of the board members.
* **PRK – suggests that a canvas email goes out in the next week (after CSC drafts it), then there is a two week (Cathy emphasises that this should encompass two weekends) submission time frame, then one week for CSC to peruse, send out questions as necessary and formulate a position paper for the board, to be discussed at a meeting that will allow for the convenors to present with a decision to be made by the end of June. Exact timing to be sorted via email list.**
* Steve – do we make the bids public? Given that normally they would be public at the AGM.
* PRK – we just publicise the successful bid, with a statement along the lines this was really hard process, lots of worthy people, thank you for everyone who got involved. Yadda yadda.
* Cathy – criteria for the CSC – Sarah, Doug, doesn't look necessary. PRK - looking for competence or experience (background suitable). SwanCon experience, community experience, life experience, vision. Also some idea of their workload.
* Anna: one thing that I think we should be asking in the bids is a statement about the diversity of the bid, including a wish-list of guests and how this is diverse. Sarah – should we be explicitly stating that we are after diversity? Cathy – we should be doing this.
* PRK – a wishlist of guests with why. Cathy – really, this is about vision, so while a guest list is useful, it isn't the be-all and end-all.
* Jack – How does this con reflect the value statement?
* Cathy – as well as theme, guests, could also include program framework.
* [short break while Doug opens the door so we can get some fresh air and everyone gets distracted]
* Doug – any other directions?
* No other directions were forthcoming.
* [Sarah – we tell them to do all the work!]

## General Business

* Doug – is there any general business?
* Kat – me!
  + We have a budget, and Jack has reviewed it for presentation to the CSC and WASFF.
  + Ticket pricing changes tomorrow
  + Jack – we could just deal with the ticket price change.
  + PRK – would like to get the updated figures from Lexi,
  + Kat – I'm looking for pre-approval on ticket price change, given that WASFF approved the launch prices, but we don't have approval for the price change.
  + PRK – moves that we approve new ticket prices $260 full/$190 concession, for SwanCon 2015, to go in to effect tomorrow (11th May)
  + Cathy seconds.
  + Doug – do we need to debate?
  + Carried unanimous.
* Kat is happy with the above
* Sarah – asked Cathy whether she has had response on the small grants.
* PRK – this is an action point that I'd forgotten about, as it isn't on the WASFF website
* Jack – has one response; PRK has heard from Brendan (these turn out to be the same), Sarah has also heard from Brendan. He would like some money to spend time working on LiveCon. Cathy – this would be great.
* PRK – he isn't interested in commercialising, so there isn't an IP issue.
* Steve – logo – what's happened? Doug – has not heard back from Rowan. PRK – will follow up with email now.
* Sarah – she and Fe would like to put money in for a bunch of Lego. This would be for the family stream. Jack has volunteered to donate some. There may be enough there. Sarah would be happy with that.
* Anna flagged that we have issues with the number of tween aged kids that are coming along, and the way that we are dealing with this at the moment isn't good.
* Cathy – returning to the ConCom conversation: as we have to report back to the AGM on the how we pick the committee, maybe we should include information about how this goes. Now we have an opportunity to make some of these things as part of our regular practice.
* Sarah – so should we start calling for bids two months earlier? Do you want to put out reminders?
* Cathy – maybe that is something for the CSC to think about. What we should be doing is track what we are doing, and see what is successful, and then we can recommend anything that find is successful.
* Sarah – should we have a program item about being on committee? Anna – or a social event. Cathy – maybe have an open ask box on the website.
* Sarah – there is already a contact form on the website. Need to make it more friendly! Will look in to that later.
* Samara – “Welcome to the SwanCon” lunches aren’t well attended.
* Sarah – website probably needs a list of resources that newbies can access.
* Cathy – calls for volunteers that come out just before the con are good, but we aren't seeing a similar kind of public volunteer call. But, this is something different that we are trying, and there is good reason to track what response we get.
* Kat – I like the idea of putting out a public call well before the Convention happens
* PRK – see how this year goes, and if it is really successful, and people are happy, then it might be an opportunity to change the way that things are done. Maybe we don't have to have it at the AGM? We can do the pre-screening, or talk to people in advance.
* Doug – it is fine when there is only one bid, if they are a good bid. Anna – so we need to be proactive about bids. Doug – table until after the 2016 recruitment process.

Any other general business?

* Scheduling next meeting
* Need to schedule the CSC first, because they have to meet before WASFF.
* PRK proposes 14th June for next WASFF at 1pm – pencilled in. May need to vary, depending on progress of CSC. Also two members do not have rosters.

Meeting closed: 15:22