



ALANTHA O
ABEY QUIDDITCH
PHOTOGRAPHY

Photo: Alantha Abey Quidditch Photography



**QUIDDITCH
AUSTRALIA**

Quidditch Australia June Dropbears Meeting



Emergency May Meeting

Date: 13. 06. 2020

Location: Google Hangouts

Present: Ajantha Abey, Kelsey Collins, Alistair Yap, Jamie Turbet, Nicola Gertler, Scott Palmer

Apologies: Luke Derrick

Nominated Chair: Ajantha Abey

Meeting Opened: 6:07pm

Note: NG has a conflict of interest in the matter, and therefore is not eligible to vote or voice their opinion on anything discussed in this meeting. She has been invited to watch and ask questions to the rest of the board to ensure we have considered all possibilities.

The Team

AJ: First point is what we want to do with the team. Our final options are either keeping the structure or dissolving the structure and keeping the players. Thoughts?

KC: More in favour of dissolving the current structure. This is fairest - using 30-35 as part of the campaign would be good. Give them six months or however long to train together - then selectors choose. Not really a full reselection process - over the next 6 months people can monitor the performance, commitment etc.

NG: Can I ask questions?

AJ: Yes

NG: How do you feel the current outcome leads to the best option for all potential applicants and current treated fairly? Are we preserving the status quo here? How do you justify keeping the current selectors when they are applicants and the team - will this lead to them choosing team selectors?



AJ: We will discuss selectors later - but good point. We need to balance fairness of people coming onto the team and giving them a fair shot - as well as to those who are already on the team. On balance, since the current people have already invested so much we should prioritise them due to what they have already put into the process. How do we prioritise this whilst also allowing others to join in?

NG: Not sure I understand - why consider the people who have already have the opportunity - others joining later down the line have a variety of reasons why they did not put their name down last down. Would people have to justify why they didn't try last time?

AJ: It will be open to anyone, for whatever reason, can apply

KC: Opening up written applications to anyone and would be able to come along to any of the training camps - coaches/selectors choose who get's to continue with the training. Need to cap on a manageable number.

AJ: Whoever gets to be added is a coaches question

SP: Agreed.

NG: The board needs to represent the best interests of everyone involved. We are not here to select people - we are here to determine the structure of how we will move forward.

KC: We want to open up applications to be fair to the whole community. We need to have a set criteria for this - but needs to go to coaching staff

NG: I think it goes on a different path to what Scott was saying. You are saying we are hear to set up a framework - I agree with this. Preserve the integrity of people who have already received a position as well as this being an opportunity to apply for. Some kind of criteria for the application process. The intention of the framework is being able to pick people who are at the standard required to play. Not relevant to set a limit on participation, or number cap - everyone who meets criteria should have the opportunity to prove themselves.

AJ: Just to reel us in - this will happen with either option we choose. Do we keep the current structure or dissolve into the 30?

NG: Maybe you should go around the table?

KC: If we're talking about this, should Nicola leave? Unsure where we are drawing the line.

JT: Personally I feel it is fine. If others feel otherwise they can send a private message to AJ?

AJ: Sound good



AY: I'm more on the side of dissolving to the 30 as it engages the community more. Gives people the chance to earn their way in.

AJ: Jamie, has your position changed from earlier conversations?

JT: No, want to dissolve to the 30

SP: Dissolving to the 30 - best for fairness, and can increase our chances of winning which is what we are trying to do

AJ: Keeping the structure seems very rational to me, but I'm conflicted. Like Jamie's point that it is like having a standing squad which is a model I would like to move towards anyway. This could be a good opportunity to try something new. Seems like we are moving towards dissolving to a group of 30. Everyone happy?

All (except NG): Yes

The Selectors

AJ: Need to work out selectors and a rough timeline of when the team gets picked. Selector issue - COI for those on the squad and also a selector. We want at least one new selector for this process.

SP: Reading from what Paul was saying adding new selectors into the mix would be problematic as they need to be brought up to speed - adding a new selector could give us a fresh set of eyes on the situation. I'm on the fence

KC: I don't think it's fair to have players be selectors - inconsistent of what we are trying to do. Need more people to balance that out.

AJ: Have we asked selectors if they can stick around?

JT: no

NG: Scott, when you say there is not enough time, how much time do you think they need?

SP: Purely because if we are wanting the team to have good synergy we need to have a new selector ASAP - if we want to have the best team within the next month have the selector picked which I don't think is enough time if we are sourcing opinions from other people.

NG: Why do you think we will choose the team in the next month?

SP: Unsure

NG: What are they being brought up to speed on?



KC: From memory Paul gave us feedback on the options that was a concern of his. He said there was complexity in the decision making.

NG: Does anyone have anything to say on this?

KC: I think there is enough time for selectors to be brought up to speed. Happy for new selectors.

JT: I don't think it will be an issue - they have 6 months

KC: Biggest barrier would be having more people interested in the role

AJ: Is everyone agreed on adding at least one more selector?

All (except NG): Yes

NG: Can I just confirm people agree there needs to be a change to the selector panel in some capacity?

AJ: Just saying that at the very least there should be a new voice who is not an applicant

SP: Need to be careful about the wording of that

NG: On that point, if current selectors want to be in their role should they be allowed to continue in that roll? Why is it not fair for other potential applicants to be on the selector panel when there are already players?

AJ: I see it as we are trying to make the situation better not worse, therefore we need someone without conflict of interest. Trying to balance the fact we already have a number of players on the panel. If we get more applications than we thought we could add them - create a new panel or something

JT: I think we can remove all selectors and perhaps start from scratch. Looking at what other sports have done, they only have about 4 selectors. Since the selection process is less intensive this time round as it is a smaller pool of people, I think a smaller number of selectors as well as the coaches will work.

AJ: We need those different states of expertise, gender diversity, position diversity

JT: Not necessarily, as they will have 6 months to watch candidates. It won't be like they have little time to learn about a whole bunch of new players

AJ: They will for applicants coming in



NG: Seems like the current group of selectors can maintain their COI as they were allowed to choose before confirmation - changed now. If we will negate this by removing them from discussion where necessary - not changing with new people. Not a fair applicant process. Next point: moving forward to 2024, having a standing squad could allow us to bring in more coaches and expertise in certain areas - but not expected to go to the US. Bring people in those sort of capacity and get them assist in selection. The coach should be the final determiner. The reason we have players that are also selectors is because.

AJ: Like scouts

JT: Are you suggesting this could be used instead of selectors?

NG: I'm not suggesting anything, just suggesting something that hasn't been discussed. Looking for staff members we haven't really explored smaller roles. If you want to expand the coaching group who can also select could be beneficial and we haven't explored it yet. Could be a way of removing your concern for personal level.

AJ: I'm interested in this idea. In terms of how we are thinking of this - we agree that we need at least one more. First question, are we accepting at all from people who are applying for the team?

NG: Are the current selectors required to do anything?

AJ: Good point.

KC: two options: anyone who is playing has too much COI, go through the process again but keep the current selectors on hold. Or we fire all of them and get everyone to go again.

AJ: Suspending everyone until we have more information?

SP: I like the first option. To avoid COI we do need to put the current selection squad on hold

AY: yes

JT: Yep

AJ: Who can apply?

KC: If we are keeping current selectors we should allow all

All (except NG): yes

AJ: How do we open applications? Can do all three options; open applications, nominations by teams, board approaches individuals



SP: Agreed

JT: How would a nomination system work?

AJ: Could get teams to endorse applicants?

NG: Sponsor? Is it two clubs? No big barrier to getting two clubs. Own club

JT: I would like to limit team nominations to their own clubs, and make it a female, non-female type system, like SS MVP

AJ: People aren't exposed to people just from their teams

SP: Teams need the approval of applicants

KC: Need to be clear about playing/non-playing applicants

NG: For the sake of receiving the same information. Do you think current selectors should fill out an application or be nominated?

JT: Yes, but then should scrap the whole selection squad.

AJ: We already know why we selected them.

JT: Having at least nominations would be beneficial - especially if we want the community to be involved in the process.

NG: They also filled out applications 9 months ago. They might want to add to their application

AJ: What we have come to is we are putting the current selectors on hold, opening up applications, nominations from teams, sponsors. Once applications are closed we decide what we want to do.

JT: I'd like to explore Nicolas coaching idea and using them as selectors

NG: Could ask for that in the application process.

AJ: Could you put that way of selecting in writing?

JT: Are we opening individual applications to community scrutiny. I'm not for it, but we haven't discussed

AJ: Conflicted, but I think the application process is enough

SP: We are getting community justification already - don't need to do it again

NG: Nothing wrong with doing research about people as well.



SP: Another way of getting the community being heard.

JT: Are nominations from clubs or teams? Should they be limited?

AJ: Clubs, no restrictions

SP: Yes

KC: I would prefer to restrict

NG: Does putting in a minimum devalue the process?

AJ: Since candidates need to be nominated i think its fine

JT: Is it mandatory for applicants to be endorsed?

AJ: Yes

General Business

NG: Are we supporting moving the event?

JT: Teams haven't responded by Dropbears want to move

AJ: I'll represent that

SP: When are IQA meeting?

AJ: No idea

JT: In terms of telling everyone what we decided, can we agree on telling management, then team, then community

AJ: Yes

Meeting Closed: 7:43pm