

**MINUTES OF THE 2010 WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATING COUNCIL MEETING**  
**MARRIOTT HOTEL, DOHA, QATAR**  
**FEBRUARY 16, 2010**

**Chairwoman:** Claire Ryan (New Zealand)

**Minutes:** Roger Hatridge (Korea)

**Delegates:**

**Observers:**

**Opening Remarks**

Claire Ryan, the Chairperson of the World Schools Debating Council Executive Committee, opened the meeting. She reminded delegates to write their name and country on the attendance sheet being passed around. She also reminded everyone that the Scottish delegation was giving a presentation at 18:30 about progress on the 2011 tournament they are hosting in Dundee, followed by the South African bid presentation.

**Ratification of the Minutes**

The minutes of the 2009 Council meeting in Athens, Greece, were ratified unanimously without any amendments.

**Welcoming New Teams**

Council welcomed India, Mexico, Mongolia, and Qatar as full members. Council welcomed Scotland's new corporate status. Council congratulated new countries.

**Report**

Motion to move forward to the report (attached to the agenda) - Proposed by Ann (Israel), seconded by Andrej (Slovakia), carried unanimously.

**Secretary Resignation**

Geetha resigned from her position as secretary.

**Complaints Committee**

Only two nominated and others selected as well.

Daragh (Mexico): There was an obvious problem with confidentiality this year. We should not allow this to drift away. There could have been better management of the issue after the incident and we should limit the liability of the tournament as much as possible.

Beth James (Wales) as Complaints Chair: There is no way to fully identify who leaked the information, but it has been taken seriously. The committee asked people whether they passed it on. The difficulty is that unless someone volunteers information, it is hard to accuse. The degree of exposure was limited. I did what I could to keep the names in the complaint secret so anonymity of the individual that made the complaint was kept private, even from other committee members..

Daragh (Mexico): The issue is not with complaints committee, but with the person accused. That person would be in their rights to sue.

Beth (Wales): I had a lengthy discussion with the individual who tweeted about the incident and that person was willing to take the posts down.

Kelly (Qatar): All parties agreed that the more public it would be, the more disruptive it would be. All parties

affected wanted it to be discreet. All parties involved were content that it was dealt with as discreetly as possible.

Daragh (Mexico): Workings of complaints should be secret. But when confidentiality was breeched, it becomes a problem for the Executive committee. To the extent that the person who released the information has not been consulted is problematic.

Claire: That person has been consulted but is no longer here. It is not clear that any member of the Complaints Committee released information. A swirl of other matters were discussed around the tournament, but not all those matters were brought forward to Complaints formally. The Complaints Committee only acts on formal Complaints. The person that released information knew about the swirl of matters, but not exactly the substance of the formal complaint. An unfortunate coincidence. All Complaints members have been talked to and none disclosed. All confirm they have not said more than what was agreed to as a group response on the matter. We are not dealing always with adults. Some people don't like the rules and code of conduct, but they are there for protection and to help and reverent other people. On behalf of Exec I am disappointed in how this came to light. We all signed the code of conduct. There is a better way to change the rules than breaking them. It needs to be investigated further. Inappropriate for anyone in this room to pursue the matter in a public forum. Bad for reputation of host & WSDC. Thank you for raising that issue Daragh.

Beth (Wales): I agree with your concerns wholeheartedly. It is very difficult to hold an immediate meeting. Hopefully the committee will include reelected members to fully follow up on this issue. Complaints Committee worked very hard on this issue and I want to thank them. I do not think information came out from the committee, because events of speculation happened to match up well. Despite speculation that Complaints did not act fast enough, we did act within 24 hours of the formal written complaint.

Approval of Co-Adjudicator of Qatar. (No feedback)

Scotland approved unanimously for 2011. Applause!

Palestine - Any comments or should we leave for voting? (No comments.)

Eligibility. (No comments.)

Adjudication Working Group:

Irene (South Africa): With regards to consistency and scoring, there is a wide range of speaker marks in a debate. You want everyone to mark in the same standard. We had a speaker with 6 points gap between judges. It would help if CAs went through the video by discussing what scores each speaker would receive in the video debate used prior to the tournament debates. The closed ballot system does not allow for discussion, so perhaps the adjudicators could discuss their scores. CAP could discuss this first?

Daragh (Mexico): I have sympathy that an average speech should be an average speech. This is not a problem as long as there is consistency of scoring across the tournament. There is always a statistical possibility that not getting three points will cause a team not to break in a tight draw

(temporary secretary sighs about 2.5 points missed from making break for team Korea).

Philip (Slovenia): That assumes that there is fairness across the board. Korea missed breaking by 2.5 points.

Daragh (Mexico): Not large assumption. Judges distributed by how they mark. Not every team judged by same number of judges, but normal distribution needed. If judge marking randomly distributed, it should be fair. Wait and see Simon's research.

Michael James (Sweden): Result is important, but for ESL countries it is important to keep to a good standard. My kids are learning from feedback. If there is a difference of 6 or 7 points it creates confusion.

Beth (Wales): Could we pause this discussion so I can get Simon?

Sixto (Peru): I would like to add something else. The time some judges take to decide the result has sometimes been too long. In one debate, judges took 30 minutes. They could use less time. Some judges used their own knowledge to judge. This is basic that all judges should know that they should not project their knowledge to students. Judges should not suppose.

Claire: Were you able to raise this with CAP?

Sixto (Peru): I did not, but waited for this moment to express the concern. We need to overcome this problem.

Cameron (Scotland): Inconsistency in the rules about using your own knowledge. There is an ICJ example in the rules of how you are not to use your knowledge in a debate as a judge. But judges are required to judge what is a weak or strong argument. If a debater says there is no marital abuse on the moon, it applies that judges should recognize weak argumentation.

Mark (Sudan): As a new observer, I am in agreement with Sixto. If the other team can combat the argument about marital abuse on the moon, why wouldn't the other team refute? It is not up to the judge to intervene. Let the other team beat the argument.

Cameron (Scotland): Principle basis would be that opposition should point out invalidity of example, but judge is still using own knowledge to assess which side is correct.

Hayah (Israel): If you have specific knowledge, like a trial lawyer, that is the type of knowledge you cannot use. General knowledge is fine. (Much clapping.)

Kelley (Qatar): A rubric of speaker points would be helpful, especially for new countries.

Claire: Should we discuss this issue longer or move to adjudication working group?

Beth (Wales) as member of CAP: One process for CAP this year, I think that concerns are fair. There is a breakdown of marks on the back of the adjudication schedule. We did provide that information and it is on the website. I am happy to replace the abbreviated guide with a comprehensive guide. We have gone through feedback forms every night. We look at if a judge and coach provide feedback and they align, we act. Raising an issue two or three days later is hard to react. Next year, take it seriously, because we do take priority. We can't move people up and down. Complaints have been investigated as fully as possible. The two CAs this year have been generous in time. Simon's revolutionary system has been a mammoth workload. Fair to say thank you to CAs. (Applause.)

Debbie (England): Some of the issues we are discussing are not for CAPs at tournaments, but for Exec. "For a speaker to achieve a 68, the speaker must achieve X, Y, & Z," is not anywhere. Sometimes it seems we may have judges that do not follow the 40, 40, 20 model in allocation of marks.

Jess (South Africa): If teams make specific feedbacks on adjudicators, that team should not see that adjudicator again in the tournament. You could swap adjudicators for a specific debate. If complaint was specific, such as unjustified decision, is specific and the team should be clashed with the adjudicator for the tournament.

TJ (Thailand): Being a judge, we have to be aware of diversity of nations. Creating a benchmark would be helpful. Video perspective would be helpful to understand as a whole. In same panel, scores range highly.

Claire: Simon is here...

Kelly (Qatar): If rubrics created, please include people in the group that have given direct feedback to students. There need to be people in the group that have direct contact with students on a daily basis.

Claire: Those working groups are open to everyone. Working groups start with huge enthusiasm for a couple months after the event and seem to disappear. There are a number of people with educational background. I

think some of these matters will go to the working groups. Join netpals from the WSDC site. Discussions are absolutely important.

Peejay (Philippines): We're becoming a larger adjudication-working group. It seems like we are arguing about many specific things. Ask for specific concerns for discussions later on. Come up with a working paper for us to vote on at a future meeting online or not.

Chris (New Zealand): You said working groups wither and die, but there is a cathartic process here. We should not kick all issues to working groups since not much happens there.

Claire: The Adjudication working group is the most productive, but it is important that people contribute to those groups. There has to be a point at which this conversation stops.

Irene (South Africa): There needs to be two levels of testing and training. One is test of rules. The 20 question test was good, but it should be handed in and scored. Many adjudicators sitting around me could not answer half of the questions. Second part of watching a debate on video should also be a more extensive test. Back home you watch a video and give lengthy reasoning as to why you would score the debate the way you score. Specific CAP feedback on what should be marked would be helpful.

Claire: Simon is here now.

Simon (CA): First, about training and tests, a more specific test is a good one. We have to make sure people aren't talking to each other. We can move to a more rigorous process next year. On the more extensive video feedback, but we thought it might be dangerous of going too far or not far enough. Maybe we could have better clarified that. Last year we finished late and this year finished early. Setting aside more time and we can do it.

In terms of adjudicators using specific knowledge, we asked adjudicators to know the rules. We have responded to feedback on adjudicators.

On issue of strikes and other complaints, we were conservative. AS matter of principle we were conservative in strikes to not be unfair to adjudicators and do not want to give loudest complainers best panels. Also, we want random adjudicator placement. I understand there may be a policy where if a team emphatically disagrees, that could be a conflict.

Marking guide on back of sheet was for remembering marking range. That was not replacing the more detailed rubric people were told to read before the tournament.

Daragh (Mexico): Something I want to kick to working group: It became apparent to people that third opp could have a part in the split of the case. I think a copy and paste error has slipped into the rules. I am almost certain that was never passed by council. Rules now say the same as proposition third speech.

Claire: Not sure what's happened and why, but I take your point.

Debbie (England): Important that we say here what issues we want discussed. Council should say these are the key issues we want discussed. One more issue to discuss, but I wonder if CAP should have sole discretion on judge allocation or if council should have input. Can the CAP do exactly what they want with no guidance? Debriefing in Athens was particularly productive.

Claire: Productive to encourage them to do that. On issue of striking, it has come up previously and the working group was against it. Time to revisit?

Daragh (Mexico): As the organization expands, it puts pressure on us to train more judges. Attempt to limit randomness in adjudication was good, but many coaches feel they have had two competent judges that split and the third judge is a coin toss. I would rather have one adjudicator than be given a tight adjudication with a vast difference in points from a third adjudicator. Democratic process could fail. We need to expand judging pool beyond our current countries, but be part of a more rigorous judge training. It need not be the same

people judging every debate. Odd to have adjudicators go a different way. We need not extend to working group.

Irene (South Africa): Coaches should be required to be at the adjudicator workshop. When dealing with adjudicators, there is no entrance criteria. Perhaps there needs to be an online application process for judges that go to a second or more judge from a country. South Africa selects their judge somewhat randomly from many qualified judges.

Claire: That idea keeps coming up, but working group has discussed it and rejected it. But we can keep discussing it.

Sixto (Peru): Coaches perceive 3 types of judges: 1) Right decision & explained, 2) Wrong decision but explained, and 3) Right decision, but not explained. Judges should be clear, concise and positive.

Peejay (Philippines): Single adjudicator is too much power in one individual. Transparency: If we are bold enough to rank nations, we should be bold enough to rank judges. Tell adjudicators their ranking. Kids might pay more attention to A-level adjudicators in feedback.

Claire: Continue discussion of adjudication or refer to working group? (Show of hands overwhelmingly in favor of referring to working group.) Perhaps we should have timeline. Here are things I picked up as issues: 1) Set up written guidance and other guidance such as discussion for allocation of marks, 2) Examination of Style, Content, Strategy allocation and if it requires change, 3) Examination of current debating rules and if they concur with what community needs, 4) Revisit issue of striking and if/how it should occur and if it should be to CAP discretion. 5) Adjudicator Briefing, 6) Training for new judges, 7) Coaches invited or required to attend adjudication training, 8) Halfway house to assist people online to prepare—~~even possibility of online test?~~, 9) Whether there should be a single adjudicator.

Ann (Israel): Like gymnastics, because still scored by panels.

Claire: Drop top and bottom marks?

Ann (Israel): No, see similar frameworks.

Chris (New Zealand): 10) Look at how adjudicators are selected.

Andrej (Slovakia): 11) Whether CAP should have guidelines from year to year. 12) Who should provide feedback on judges, whether optional for coaches.

Irene (South Africa): Please look at consistency in marking after test.

Rumen (Bulgaria): 13) Time limit on delay of time for adjudication.

Asher (Israel): Sometimes having an adjudicator taking an extra 15 minutes more than others is a problem.

Chris (New Zealand): Thoroughly disagree with that. Most important thing is to give kids the right feedback. Kids would rather have right result in half an hour than have it rushed.

Irene (South Africa): Maybe adjudicators do not need to sit and wait a half hour with a silent room. That builds tension. Not a huge deal.

Roger: (Read out all 13 items)

Daragh (Mexico): Please remove the part about online testing.

Claire: Okay.

Beth (Wales): I have been looking at it and think that a test 2 weeks in advance would not to give accreditation, but to help with provisional rankings. If we place someone as shadow judge we can cite a reason. It means CAP need not spend a day after briefing to allocate results.

Claire: Might be a problem.

Beth: Test a week in advance gives CAP more time for analysis of DVD test. CAPs are limited to couple hours before adjudicator allocation in current system. Now we just look at marks.

Daragh (Mexico): Nothing wrong with giving quiz on the rules. Any judging of a debate online has been ruled out. A quiz on rules seems fine and could in part for CAP. Cannot be for accreditation.

Claire: 8) Assistance prior to tournament, but not accreditation.

Mexico & South Africa moved for a report from the adjudication working group in 6 months. All those in favor raised hands. 37 in favor. No dissent. Carried.

Draw working group has had nothing in two years.

Debbie (England): Power pairing should be discussed.

South Africa—A, B, C, & D all on same side of draw. If we keep prepared, we need to split the prepared and impromptu pairings for level.

Chris (New Zealand): When draw is announced that should be discussed.

Claire: We have registration closing dates, but we need to discuss how strict we should be on that. Payment, forms, and code of conducts all done by deadline and we could announce within a week of registration.

Effie (Greece): We should be firm. We knew this would be a problem in Greece but we released the draw a month prior because we were strict. We had 2 teams that almost did not make the competition. We should respect kids and coaches, but put in the rules announcement of draw a month in advance.

Daragh (Mexico): Report in 6 months because Irene might need to adjust schedule.

Irene (Scotland): We are setting a registration date close (pay) as three months in advance. We have 18 months until the competition. We should have a clear notion 3 months in advance.

Zheng Bo (China): Current system assumes new teams are weak. Maybe we should have more discussion about how to prepare.

Chris (New Zealand): Being discussed.

Effie (Greece): If they are strong, they can win all debates and be re-ranked the next year.

Daragh (Mexico): The notion that Quebec having a team would be an H team is unreasonable. We need to discuss power pairing. Some of our greatest successes are people that come from below. Hubris of the top of the bracket, more power from the insurgents.

Hayah (Israel & Sri Lanka): Sometimes the draw is not reflective of reality at all. Power pairing solves this.

Recommendation: 1) Power pairing, 2) Teams should meet A,B,C,D all prepared/impromptus? 3) Whether draw should be released at a set time.

Mexico and Sri Lanka seconded to go forward . 44 for, no dissent.

Claire: Hosting Working Group

Allison (Mongolia): Students should stay on as audience of elimination rounds. This should be listed as a welcome.

Claire: Host can indicate.

Claire: New Countries Report. Qatar sponsored Ross for working with new teams. Thanks to Qatar. Thanks to Ross. Did this work?

Jess (South Africa): Let new countries come a few days earlier to start on a level playing field.

Claire: We can encourage it.

Kelly (Qatar): We brought 7 of the 10 new countries—and 3 returning countries—here for a week of training in November. (Loud applause)

Daragh (Mexico): Mini-WSDC great. Use of certain motions should not be used by any tournament in advance. Odd that motions committee came up with motions used at the mini. Judges who were at the mini tournament also judged at WSDC. For appearances sake that should not happen in the future.

Claire: Motion?

Daragh (Mexico): No, I think Motions Committee should be aware that motions at subset events should not be used in WSDC. How could the prepared motions at this event already be used at the mini and have allowed for double judging on the same motion?

Mexico and Greece moving the motion that “hosts capable and willing to organize events that motions debated and taught at the event should not be set as motions at the subsequent WSDC event.”

-Unanimous agreement to put to motions committee.

Effie (Greece): Big brother system to help new teams? It was great.

Michael (Cyprus): Learning curve was steep. Being witty and quick graded well in other competitions. Unlikely same children will come back with this gap so knowledge will be lost. Newcomers having big brothers would help.

Mark (Sudan): What was the point of making WSDC so big? Bigger or include more countries and cultures? Cultural perspective seems the motions and adjudicator training swings a very western style to it. Distinctly different style in debate. How is that approached in the debate? Why not select a batch of motions from around the world? Huge step to consider.

Hayah (Israel & Sri Lanka): We try to pick motions that can apply anywhere in any background. More applicants for motions committee will get broader perspectives.

Zheng Bo (China): Important for us to bring debate back to our country. I wonder if the charity or council could offer help in terms of training and events. Loke & I worked very hard to bring a team. We are planning more schools and trips, but that demands a lot of resources. More support?

Claire: Charity has no money now. WSDC right now cannot achieve that.

Kenneth (Uganda): First time to attend. Quite enough support to new countries. I learned a lot on judging skills. I participated in shadow judging. The judges I worked with gave a lot of support on what to look for. Good opportunity. Another committee formed to give advice online? Could be individuals online to assist?

Someone I could ask for assistance? We all have obligations of fundraising in our own countries. Attach to mentors?

Claire: Perhaps name on website to access them.

Rumen (Bulgaria): New Countries committee could look for sponsorship of new countries? Could help with financial aspects.

Asher (Israel): We will take on board with charity.

Ann (Israel): UNESCO, IDEA, and USAid all have funds. Time-consuming for UNESCO, but they may give much money.

Claire: Exec committee has no money. Board of Directors is who to approach.

Mert (Turkey): A lot of EU funds too for European countries. EU & Middle East nations—we would like to meet after Octos for doing an event.

Claire: Funding is an issue for the Board. Close discussion, but contact Directors online. Recommendations for new countries and language?

Kelly (Qatar): Online training via Skype was free of charge that we offered. They could work out times between them and provided expertise without accommodations and transportation.

Ann (Israel): All new countries that feel motions are unfair should list at least 10 motions that are fair. Having a list of motions is helpful. Urge you to send in list of suitable motions.

Hayah (Israel, Sri Lanka and a pinch of Canadian) People interested should run for the Motions Committee. We should also look into the option of opening an online forum for new countries to discuss the tournament online.

Mert (Turkey): How did Qatar contact the countries for online support?

Kelly (Qatar): Part of bid to host was for Qatar to bring in 10 new countries. We went off of WSDC site to determine which countries were new.

Claire: New countries working group report in 6 months on online training, info online about contacts and assistance, and how soon can we open and online forum.

Mexico and Sri Lanka move. Carried unanimously.

Claire: Executive has worked hard. I want to thank Beth James for being a fabulous VP. (applause) Thanks to entire Exec.

Claire: Report on 2010 Committee?

Kelly (Qatar): We will report on Thursday.

Elections:

Claire: Turn over to Beth.

Kris (Canada): In previous years we received ballots for uncontested positions as well.

Aaron (Singapore): We received only one nomination for each of President, VP and Secretary.

Claire: This has been process since Washington. It is in the Council's hands.

Daragh (Mexico): This matter is not in the Council's hands. It is odd to claim democracy except in nomination of the three most powerful positions. Odd system to force in a nominated person in Motions if majority does not want that person in that committee. Sets dangerous precedent to assume that certain jobs are entitlements. If you run and nobody else runs, that's entitlement? Leadership at top of this organization is a small list of countries that dominate these positions. In previous years, issues discussed have not really addressed concerns of nations. The fact that we continue to return people on a pro forma basis presents a problem.

Beth (Wales): If this is a necessary move for council, best thing is to move the elections to Thursday. Encourage more people standing for the committee.

Daragh (Mexico): Nominations open?

Beth (Wales): Not necessarily.

Daragh (Mexico): Re-nominations selected by council. People who did not know of committees should put that forward.

Cameron (Scotland): Motions committee being uncontested seems problematic. At beginning of competition, each committee should be explained. We should reopen nominations this year.

Claire: We can tweak and improve it. In Council's hands. Put off to Thursday?

Kris (Canada): Despite efforts to make things clear, we still have people unclear about arcane elements. We should open nominations for all positions. Fundamental to have a ballot for every position—we have a right to express a view. Unreasonable to not make a voice.

Daragh (Mexico): People running for position should address council why they should have that position. Brief bio does not tell enough.

Effie (Greece): Difficult to go around and find people. Why not have 2-minute speeches? (applause)

Asher (Israel): Be sure you have a proposer and a seconder. Have a brief biography.

Beth (Wales): Nominations need to close tomorrow evening. Identifying people at dinner tomorrow would work.

Aaron (Singapore): Speeches at next council meeting?

Claire: Report of 2010, and items 4, 5, and 6 of agenda put off to next meeting?

Kelly (Qatar): Can anyone run?

Claire: Yes.

Hayah (Israel): Come talk to us to learn about what committees do.

Irene (Scotland): Requirement of status of people proposing and seconding?

Claire: Vague, so anyone can propose and second.

Daragh (Mexico): Only things new countries can't vote on are Directors and \_\_\_\_\_.

Krishna (Nepal): Make sure proper time is available.

Helen (Greece): Maybe someone for each committee could speak now?

Beth (Wales): Complaints Committee does not require work throughout the year, but usually complaints pertain to Code of Conduct in tournament itself. 2 complaint officers nominated by host—they are the first line of defense. Brought to them first and they see if it can be dealt with. Letters in writing may go straight to complaints committee. Outlined in code of conduct. At this tournament, we had several meetings and hearings were convened.

Claire: And you need to be at the tournament. Someone from motions committee?

Aaron (Singapore): You need significant time to dedicate to emails. If you do not designate significant time, don't do it. Half an hour a day, so leave the chain for a couple days and you are out. Nuances are important and you cannot train teams.

Chris (Wales): Big time commitment. Discussions keep going.

Dick (Ireland): Time constraints? Vote Exec now?

Claire: People want to have time to express opinion on that? We have a democratic right to express a view.

Jess (South Africa): Hour and 45 minutes of prep for Octos?

Aaron (Singapore): I am happy to take more nominations, but we need a time limit.

Ann (Israel): 7pm on Wednesday the 17<sup>th</sup>.

Mexico seconds. Carried unanimously.

Beth (Wales): Octofinals. QMDI has limited number of rooms at university. 1) Prepare in hotel rooms with judge present. 2) Prepare somewhere else in hotel. 3) Or prepare in university. Coaches elected the group prep room areas. Welsh delegation has reached agreement and they are the team facing Israel.

Hayah (Israel): Distinct disadvantage to countries that speak only English. Is the Israeli coach traveling in the van with the Israeli team??

Beth (Wales): I believe no. QMDI did try to find other venues. Independent person on each bus.

Bojana (Slovenia): Yoni not with his team and I will protect him.

Claire: Meeting closed.

### Meeting Part Two:

Korea moved and Pakistan seconded acceptance of Executive Report.

Kelley (Qatar): Many thank yous. Big thank you to Chris and Simon. Thanks to Will for running the second tab. Huge thanks to Claire for all your support over the last month. Thank you to Effie for all your roles. Thanks to the consultation committee for all you did. Thanks to the Complaints Committee for your delicate work. Thank you to Beth for coming out early. Thank you to the selected adjudicators. Of course, thank you to the Chief Adjudication Panel. There is more. Huge thank you to Professor Snider and Kate—it has meant a lot to develop our local community. Thanks to Ross for helping new teams. Thanks to Jessica for coaching Qatar. Thanks to Kelley (self) and yes I have to read this, for answering all the questions out there. Thanks to Fiona and the QMDI team. Hassan helped with finance and.... (GET THESE NOTES FROM KELLEY). Thanks to Al Jazeera for broadcasting, and their viewership spiked. Thanks to his Excellency...

Claire: Questions or comments for organizing committee.

Ann (Israel): Special thanks from Israel for all the effort.

Bojana (Slovenia): Possible to get list of which debates were broadcast?

Kelley (Qatar): Yes. Al Jazeera will be broadcasting the finals. I cannot give you dates, but we will have debates available to you at some point. I can get you the list of what was broadcast.

Sixto (Peru): Thanks for fantastic tournament (Applause)

Ramal (India): Thanks for this fantastic event. Can we get the debates to present back in our countries to show skills needed?

Kelley (Qatar): We cannot create 57 debate CDs for you to take home in 48 hours. They will be available to you, but not to take home.

Claire: Organizers have your contact information.

Japan: Kids feel like they have been in Disneyland for two days and appreciate very much.

Nepal: Thank you for making it possible for us to participate for the first time. We want to replicate this knowledge back home.

Irene (South Africa): Can we do a vote of thanks?

England seconds. (Much applause and carried by acclamation.)

Claire: My tradition to thank in my custom, which is a song. I saw an open star cluster when I was out in the desert. They remind us that WSDC is family. (Forgive the secretary for not being able to transcribe the song as it was not in a language I understand, but it was lovely.)

Claire: Now move to election of committee members. I will move to ask if Asher can take the char.

Asher (Israel): I would hate to but I will. I will remind everyone to speak in their mikes.

Aaron (Singapore): All nations present are eligible to vote.

Mark (Sudan): Mongolian coach asked if I could proxy vote.

Asher (Israel): Perfectly legal.

Sixto (Peru and Argentina): I am representing Argentina as well so I need two ballots.

Asher (Israel): This is election of chairs is in order. Speeches?

Daragh (Mexico): Call for both candidates to speak.

Claire (New Zealand): I am re-standing for the position of chair. I stand on my record and what I have done with you and for you. Chair is a powerful position? It is an administrative role. I am your servant and I act on your behalf. I will offer you a professional, effective and prompt servant, especially in code of conduct. You will get a respect for due process. I will not elevate any group above another. All nations have a place here. I encourage people to speak their minds. Working together as a collective is important. Inclusiveness I offer is to whole community. I hope I am open to and embrace all of them. I give prompt responses. I have received 5000 emails since DC and I answer all of them. I have supported every host. I support the CA, executive and host. My personal opinion is irrelevant.

Bojana (Slovenia): Thanks to Claire. I am good at administrative things. I am standing because I was approached it is not healthy to have one candidate. Claire did really big achievement but feel that a touch of coach and kids is missing. Exec is missing perspective of kids. Second thing I am better at is that this tournament needs a huge reorganization. I am servant of my community back home. I do not feel that the executive is moving to the direction of change. Training of judges and people doing that back home. I do not want to undermine CAP, but they could sleep more if a lot of us were organizing tournaments on a weekly basis. There are people in this room and community that are training people. Another thing that bothers me is that WSDC is a public event. I think that the Complaints Committee reaction was not a good way to go. We should not keep secret things from everybody. Kids speak. Kids need to have information of how things are solved. The committee did a good job but never acted publicly.

Beth (Wales): I will try and keep it brief. Vice chair had been a figurehead position. That's how this started, but as the year went on I saw opportunities to pick up a lot of work from the chair and executive. The vice chair should be there as the next in line. I have been many roles in this tournament and have been to several tournaments. I am standing for and have stood for the Complaints Committee.

Hayah (Israel): This is my 8<sup>th</sup> consecutive WSDC and want to take an active role. I have been on motions and exec.

Roger (Korea): I am withdrawing my nomination.

Asher (Israel): When we reconvene in a few minutes I will reveal results.

Claire: Eight people running for six positions.

Mehvesh (Pakistan): Don't ask me if I have been coming consecutively. I have been coming a long time. Parliamentary debate has been excellent. I am particularly interested in the adjudicators working group.

(Speaking on behalf of Sherria): She was working for exec committee last year in new countries and is part of Motions.

Effie(Greece): I started debating 14 years ago and I am hooked for life. I was a coach and judge for years. I was convener of the tournament last year. It was the fulfillment of the dream of my life.I hope to help the competition grow.

Angelika (Germany): I have not been a debater and will be brief. I have been coming since Cardiff in 1995. We founded a debating society in Germany. We go into the Worlds every year. We ran WSDC in Stuttgart. I want to share my experience from over the years.

Irene (Scotland): People ask if I have a day job. I care passionately about schools debating at every level. I have been fortunate to see six of my pupils make it to this competition. In 1991 I saw an afternoon of debates and was involved in London in 1999, Peru and 2003, and every tournament since.

Agula (Uganda): I bring a success story. I represent east Africa. I want to represent a success story of young people. We have a right and I have a right. I will bring diversity to this organization. I have helped with a homegrown organization. Promote debate in Africa. Tangible results from debates. So happy to meet teams from this country here. Distinct clarity of African or Latino or South Asian style is missing. With my input I would like to see us achieve global championship. I want in the rules these intrinsic differences.

"Max" Mustafa Mert Owen (Turkey): I do debate for a living. Team Turkey is new but I have been teaching high school debate since 2004. We started with just a couple schools and are now up to an 80-school league. I would like to bring in my experience of developing.

Joshua (Korea): I have been with WSDC since Stuttgart and debating has become a key word in my life. Since the 2004 tournament I have started the Korea Debate Association and have visited several schools. I have a day job as a law professor and consultant. Debate does help fulfill my life. I have been involved in working groups. I convened the 2007 WSDC, which was the most humbling experience of my life. We do run

four tournaments per year with the help of the Korea Forensics League. I would be the first executive committee member from northeast Asia.

Claire: Stand up or speak for Motions & Complaints? (Overwhelming agreement with standing up.)

(Acting secretary did not take notes on the voting.)

Claire: Anything to add on the 2011 WSDC?

Irene (Scotland): Nothing to add, just ratification of chief adjudicators.

Daragh (Mexico): One question worth discussing here might be advice Council has for Irene about the way the cap would be affected. I think it would be helpful. Because there are capacity issues for Irene it might be possible to have caps on delegation size.

Ann (Israel): Fairest way to maximize Dundee with 320 person cap has many issues to concern. Perhaps limit team sizes to four with one coach and one judge? Maximum of 6 instead of 8 would release many more possible places.

Cameron (Scotland): Perhaps a better way forward might be for Irene's committee to produce a paper with options that could be responded to by the community. For example, if you take Ann's idea, that would require a change of the rules. I suggest you remit to Scotland and that Scotland will produce a paper in the next couple months. Then feedback from community, then Scotland should make the final decision.

Beth (Wales): Hosting working group is an excellent forum for that discussion. Please start a list of countries intending to attend Dundee.

Claire: Options are to refer to working group or creating a working paper.

Beth (Wales): Irene can use the working group to help to put together a report.

Claire: We do not need a document from this council.

Irene (South Africa): Question of registration fees. The fees are very high. The cost of a visa is additional expense. Is it possible for the organizing committee to get more sponsorship?

Irene (Scotland): We are actively pursuing more sponsorship. There just isn't sponsorship out there. Cost is not that different from 2009 event in Greece. If we get more money, we would first put it to more dinners.

Allison (Mongolia): Accommodations allow access to a kitchen, so perhaps we could factor in costs of catering?

South Africa firsts and Botswana seconds that we move forward.

Cameron (Scotland): Should we be pushing this on the hosting committee?

Daragh (Mexico): My understanding is that the motion on the floor is that new money raised go to reducing the registration fee and not paying for dinners. It is not a binding vote.

Irene (South Africa): Agreed.

Claire: If council invites 2011 WSDC to examine whether it is possible to reduce the fee rather than funding more meals.

Claire: 21 for 12 against. Motion carries.

Irene (Scotland): Beth James and Andrew Marshall forwarded as chief adjudicators.

Seconded by Mexico. Carried unanimously.

Irene (Scotland): Cameron & Taimur nominated for complaints committee.

Claire: Problem is that there is to be one man and one woman.

Irene (Scotland): We replace Cameron with Janet Stevens.

Claire: 2012 bid from South Africa.

Ann (Israel): If born in South Africa you must have a South African passport to come to South Africa. Start proceedings now if this applies to you.

Bojana (Slovenia): All organizing committee members are white. I have a problem with that.

Effie (Greece): We cannot dictate who is on organizing committees and should not institute quotas.

Claire: I am worried we might enter into a discussion about this.

Daragh (Mexico): It is odd that you are afraid of a discussion.

Irene (South Africa): These are the people involved in South African debate at the moment that volunteered to help with the committee. I do not think it will impact on the running of the tournament.

Bojana: No disrespect but it is kind of strange.

(Name?\_\_\_\_) (Botswana): Leave South Africa to South Africa.

Mexico moves and Pakistan seconds to have 2012 WSDC in South Africa. Acclimation

Claire: Future?

Turkey would like to bid for 2013.

New Zealand considering 2013.

Thailand looking at 2013 or 2014.

Nigeria interested in 2015.

Claire: 2014?

Bangladesh.

Nigeria possible.

Claire: 2015?

Singapore.

Taimur (Pakistan): We have to take into account the capacity of the host site.

Claire: That may require a rule change.

Claire: 2010 Awards for nations?

Chris Erskine (Australia): ESL was interesting. Two teams broke 4<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup>. Their rankings were reversed after elimination rounds. Precedent is ranking of the 16<sup>th</sup> when they reach each advancing round. The consequence is that it reverses break ranking. ESL: Slovenia, Greece, Slovenia. EFL: Netherlands, Romania, Germany. New Countries: UAE, China, Malaysia (has not been in awhile). (Congratulations.)

Effie: Thanks for your good work.

Seconded by Wales. Much applause.

(Five minute break.)

Claire: Rule Changes. Go with A—Executive Committee, C—Chief Adjudicators, then D—Awards because these are the quickest.

Claire: Move to A, which is from the Executive. Vote by hand.

43 for, nobody against.

Claire: C on the following page. W1.

Daragh: The wording of two Chief Adjudicators does not preclude one of them being a deputy chief adjudicator.

Claire: Amendment?

Daragh: The way it is written does not preclude that.

Carried 40 to zero.

Claire: Now on to W2.

37 for the motion.

Mark (Sudan): New nations cannot vote?

Claire: Yes

Daragh: Actually it is just voting members.

Claire: Revote those countries.

34 to zero on Exec issue

33 for and none against on W1.

32 for and none against on W2.

Claire: Page 16. D—Awards. W3 to include amendments to include nations not around since 2008 but may have been around earlier.

Slovakia: Highest ranked team that has not participated in the three years prior to the tournament?

Daragh: Sympathetic, but three years not enough. Cook Islands was here once and if they came back we would call them a new team, but three years not enough.

Mark (Sudan): Still possible that students and coaches from three years ago still competing an unfair advantage.

Whether have W3 as written

Decade as new team?

Anyone first time since incorporation in 2008?

20.1.4.1. "within the previous ten years" added as amendment by Mexico and seconded by Wales.

Helen (Greece): Award new countries and we need no new rule.

Ann (Israel): New is new.

Kelly (Qatar): Ten years is a large gap.

Asher (Israel): Compromise on previous five years?

Ann (Israel): Israel not proposing that.

Beth (Wales): Organizational changes could happen over a long period. We are not in a position to investigate organizations inside a country.

Daragh (Mexico): Vote on my amendment?

Joshua (Korea): Vote on whether to have an amendment?

Claire: Any discussions on amendment?

Ann (Israel): Foreshadowed motion?

Claire: If lost amendment, next amendment.

Ann (Israel): Special status for returning teams after a long hiatus.

Claire: That is a different motion. Voting.

12 in favor and 21 against.

Claire: Any other amendments to rule 20? Vote on rule change of 20. Awards?

35 in favor and none against.

Asher: Results for complaints committee are Roger Hatridge (Korea), Beth James (Wales), Mustafa Mert Onen (Turkey), Sixto Ramos (Peru), Rama Sudev (India).

Aaron: Results for motions committee are Christopher Bishop (New Zealand), Eva Spoor (Netherlands), Mehvesh Mumtaz Ahmed (Pakistan), Simon Quinn (Australia), Thepparith (TJ) Senamngern (Thailand).

Executive are Sherria Ayuandini (Indonesia), Mustafa Mert Onen (Turkey), Joshua Park (Korea), Mehvesh Mumtaz Ahmed (Pakistan), Irene McGrath (Scotland), Effie Giannakouri (Greece).

Secretary: 49 to 5 Hayah Eichler (Israel)

Vice Chairperson: 52 to 3 Beth James (Wales)

Chairperson: Reopen Nominations 7, Bojana Skrt (Slovenia) 24 and Claire Ryan (New Zealand) 25.

Claire: Thank you for standing Bojana and I will take your points to hand.

Beth (Wales): Special thanks to returning officers

Claire: B is eligibility with background offered by Mexico on the matter. 75 minutes left. M1?

Daragh (Mexico): Under current rules I could go to Chicago and pick up a team of kids and have them represent my country. There is a situation in the rules where kids who are not from a country could represent it anyway only based on a passport. There are organizations without the financial resources to scout. This is not debate between identity claims, but between debate communities.

Debbie (England): I am in support and believe that no school system should send multiple teams. You would see more teams from England without passing this motion.

Allison (Mongolia): Oldest students from Mongolia would be ineligible to compete.

Bojana (Slovenia): I can get kids from international schools. Other problem is having kids that study abroad.

Joshua (Korea): A person's national identity should be up to the student and national organizations.

Daragh (Mexico): You can go to international school right now. (Daragh read rule 12.2.1.) No less representative to be at an international school. This school should not descend into identity politics. Competition exists to transcend identity politics and should not be a category of exclusion. Incredibly complicated issue. I take the point of Bojana about attending school overseas for six months, but that would still fit in this rule change.

Effie (Greece): 1) Better to have one criteria about this. 2) We need to find out about educational system, not people that left country for three generations. 3) Suspicious of identity criteria just because of passport. This has happened in the past and it is unfair.

Ann (Israel): Amend to "the academic year prior to the competition". (seconded by Singapore.)

Nigeria: should be preceding, not prior.

Ann (Israel): modified to "immediately preceding."

Joshua (Korea): "12 months preceding" may be better.

Daragh (Mexico): Academic year preceding championship would extend eligibility to anyone on gap year between high school and university.

Beth (Wales): Upper age limit confusion.

Daragh (Mexico): Point of order. Wrong amendment.

Maureen (UAE): How do you deal with exchange?

Claire: Vote on amendment to M1.

10 for and 21 against

Claire: M1:

18 for, 6 against.

Joshua (Korea): 18 is not majority of those eligible for voting, so the motion fails.

Claire: 23, so fails by a vote.

Revote: 25, so passes.

Claire: M2 is removal of age restriction.

Daragh (Mexico): Withdraw M2, but keep M2A.

Bojana (Slovenia): Clarify.

Daragh (Mexico): Cannot be 20, but can be in their 19<sup>th</sup> year of age.

Sixto (Peru): In other countries too?

Claire: Show of hands? (Many delegates held up their hands.)

Asher (Israel): Change to 19?

Mert (Turkey): Foreshadow to 21 in deference to Turkey?

Daragh (Mexico): 19<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> and start to end. Seconded amendment.

28 for and 2 against.

Claire: On M2A: 29 for and 2 against.

Claire: P1.

Taimur (Pakistan): This is to help nations bound by certain circumstance. This would be case by case.

Irene (South Africa): This would also address Mongolia's concern earlier.

Daragh (Mexico): This rule has to fall at council. Most rules are procedural rules but organization also has a Constitution. It is impossible to pass a procedural rule that allows constituent change. We can't waive an eligibility rule. This rule, as drafted, would allow students who do not attend secondary school to debate. P1 violates M1 and the Constitution of the event itself.

Claire: Philosophical dispute about whether nations can regulate for exceptions in their own nations. Good point of what Daragh raises.

Joshua (Korea): The rule should be amended and passed by 2/3 majority approval by Executive Committee. (Seconded by Pakistan.)

Kelley (Qatar): If you require council to pass with 2/3 majority, this may take issue with border disputes a year in advance. With Palestine it would have been easier to put teams together easier. If you have trust in council, they can make decisions on individual basis.

Daragh (Mexico): Council could vote on postal ballot. Amendment does not clear up any ambiguity in the rules. This gets into identity politics. While I accept jurist take different views, council cannot pass a procedural rule unless we change the Constitution.

Kelley (Qatar): Postal ballot not realistically practical or fast. Olympic standard for Palestine not followed by World Schools. Situations can change year by year.

Claire: This council has been effective in using postal ballots. We will have to before Dundee.

Matej (Slovakia): How will it work with postal ballot?

Joshua (Korea): I do not mind keeping it the way it is for the Executive Committee. Review process by Exec. Exec gets approval from council by 2/3 majority before final decision.

Claire: Withdrawing amendment and change 12.2.6 to Exec Committee may receive and consider. 12.2.8. EC shall refer to Council and make decision on 2/3 majority. Pakistan seconds. Vote on that amendment. 24 for and 3 against, so the motion is amended.

Lewis (UAE): Different criteria, so words important.

Daragh (Mexico): "Special cultural or ethnic affiliation" allow to bring that group? Such as Native American nations? Absurd that we as council would arbitrate which groups are to be recognized or not recognized. We should not be recognizing this. Criteria?

Allison (Mongolia): Theoretical explosions unlikely, but this rule allows for groups to be heard. Not allowing the motion is neocolonialism. (There were rude sighs.)

Taimur (Pakistan): We are not talking about every other case. We are talking about special cases. Palestine is a special case.

Anyone can, under this rule, apply separately. This examines right or legitimacy.

Chris (New Zealand): This would be a radical shift. There are examples of the Council dealing with Hong Kong and Palestine. We do not need a broad, open-ended radical change.

Daragh (Mexico): There are plenty of ways Palestinian issue can be resolved reasonably. My concern in the claim of colonialism is that we as a body have the authority to confirm or reject group identification. Agreeing to recognize all difference in a communitarian sense is progressive and helpful. There are no criteria in this rule. No case of how to accept or reject will produce offense. No way of explaining eligibility. Violates constitution of this organization. You cannot pass a constitutional change.

Asher (Israel): Comment from Israel. All people in Israel are welcome to get a place on the Israeli team. They are invited to our workshops. Palestine should encourage debating in their own country. They should be working on encouraging debates in their own country. Israeli child—irrespective of religion—is an Israeli. Dangerous to go along this proposal's route.

Ria (Indonesia): Can we make a specific provision for Palestine and scrap this proposal?

Claire: Not today.

Najwan (Palestine): Glad to be here and glad to represent Palestine. Palestinians are not allowed to be in the Israeli team. We did not emigrate to Israel. We do not accept offer to debate for a country that occupies us.

Taimur (Pakistan): We are making explicit what has happened implicitly. We allow Hong Kong, not entire UK, but separate nations.

Matej (Slovakia): Whether Palestine is a nation is a separate issue. 12.2.2 no longer exists.

Daragh (Mexico): Palestine reaches rules separately. Politics aside, Wales, Scotland and England would show that a student attending school in England cannot debate for Scotland. This is something that needs to be discussed at greater length. It is an incredibly complicated issue. We need a venue to speak freely, openly, and frankly.

Joshua (Korea): I do not see this as a radical shift. We are able to bring out exceptions. This simply expedites the process.

Claire: It is 12:40. 9 want to discuss and 2 want it to go to a vote.

Bojana (Slovenia): We accepted Montenegro like this. Kosovo in similar situation. Chechnya could be something similar.

Taimur (Pakistan): Children going to England and not being allowed to compete for Scotland is fine. But this particular case is whether Palestinians want to be called Israelis. We want to avoid problems.

Ann (Israel): Israel is a recognized state and not an occupying power in territories recognized by the United Nations.

Claire: Who wants to vote now? 5. Those that want to put off to a working group? (Clear super-majority)

New Zealand moves and Mexico seconds a working group.

Claire: How will this group be formed? Those for forming now? 8. Dealt with by executive appointment after canvassing net pals and all member nations? 18. 32 in favor and no against formation of the working group.

Joshua (Korea): Clarification of the amended motion.

Claire: On page 16, amendment proposed by Executive about coaching.

Irene (South Africa): Rule as it stands?

Claire: Allows an also. Can have a team coach and an assistant under the new rule.

Effie (Greece): Up to host nation about registration fees. Since someone is over 19, we do not need someone else. We don't need rules for things that are very clear and make sense.

Daragh (Mexico): Nothing in the rules in E2 that preclude another coach. This just clarifies that a deputy coach could be under 19. You can call a coach whatever you want. Host can determine how many to bring.

Irene (Scotland): The phrase "at the discretion of the host country" in the proposal may take care of these concerns.

Bojana (Slovenia): Encourage countries to bring one coach and one judge. Why do we need team managers? Encourage judges to come. We do have a problem with space. I am coach and team manager in one person.

Effie (Greece): Not up to us to decide what every country should do. Up to discretion of country to decide who to bring.

Eva (Netherlands): Our coach was not old enough. Bringing only one coach would have eliminated our actual coach.

Daragh (Mexico): Stipulate that Team Managers should be coaches or judges. The problem in Mexico is the issue of having assistant coaches for shepherding and development of the Mexican debate community. Grow talent from within.

Bojana (Slovenia): I agree with Effie about not interfering in the nation, but if countries bring no judges, we have no judges. We are limited on spaces. If nobody brings judges we have no judges.

Ann (Israel): The way things are works fine. We could provide guidelines. This organization is new with all these rules.

Claire: Rules around for a long time and have been amended over the years.

Daragh (Mexico): Happy to follow rule of no rule change. This does not mean that assistant coaches under 19 would not be allowed to attend. Big coach is the big cheese and assistant coach is the little cheese.

Claire: Vote. 20 for, but not enough for a 2/3 majority.

Daragh (Mexico): Vote that people do not believe that people under 19 be allowed to deputy coach.

Claire: Withdraw E2A for Daragh's motion? 15 for. None against. EE2A withdrawn.

Claire: Motion moved my Mexico and seconded by ....

35 for and none against.

Taimur (Pakistan): Thanks to everyone for abiding by rules of this culture here.