



Photo: Ajantha Abey Quidditch Photography



**QUIDDITCH  
AUSTRALIA**

# Quidditch Australia National Cabinet

Initial Planning Meeting – September 2020



## What is the National Cabinet?

The 'National Cabinet', styled after the Australian Federal and State Government combined meetings that have been occurring during the Covid-19 pandemic, is a space where Quidditch Australia and State Governing Body board/exec members have been convening to discuss and jointly manage the sports response to the pandemic.

This meeting is aimed at discussing how this concept may be expanded in the future, with state and national governing bodies being brought closer together.

## Meeting Attendees

Quidditch Australia – Luke Derrick (Chair), Nicola Gertler (Treasurer), Jamie Turbet (Secretary), Kelsey Collins (Gameplay), Ajantha Abey (Media & Communications).

Western Australia Quidditch Association – Lauren Espinoza (president), Vee Lowe (Sporting Director)

Queensland Association of Quidditch – Annie Partick (President)

Victorian Quidditch Association – Mark Kelly (President), Nicola Gertler (Vice President)

Quidditch New South Wales – N/A

South Australia Quidditch Association – N/A

## Meeting Minutes

Meeting Opened 9:19 PM, 15/9/20

LD – I want to open up discussion about bringing states and QA closer together. I feel like we don't communicate a lot and from the outside we are perceived as very separate entities and we should be more unified in our actions, and potentially merged on some functions.

AP - From what I understand it sounds like this is really a pooling of resources/standardisation of policies and procedures, among other things. I like the idea, as long as we can figure out logistics and make sure it's less work and not more, as has been mentioned already.



NG – what are the legal and financial implications? Would we be one single incorporated entity, would states retain their incorporation status and financial autonomy, how would this actually potentially work in a concrete way?

LE – Want to know what the difference to now would be. Open to discussion. Having state leaders meetings would be useful.

MK – open to discussion. I want to know what the benefits might be of consolidation. Social media presence and brand uniformity may have benefits. Communication between groups would be beneficial. Unsure of financial or legal considerations. Might create more administrative problems if states have to go through QA to do things rather than being able to do things themselves. I see how media could be confusing, no brand uniformity, not sure how this unifier would work, possibly more communication but its been good so far, joint money could be more beneficial if one state is struggling, unifying could create more work.

LD – I think this is where we should be looking forward to in the future. We currently have 5 different societies operating at once and we talk but in theory the VQA could just split off from QA.

NG – need a better more structured sense of how things would work. I don't disagree that it's a good idea but we need to get away from the broad hypothetical. Monthly meetings would be useful between states. National cabinet has been really useful. We say more communication but our communication is better than it's ever been before.

AA – In Australia we have a problem where all our top level volunteers are distributed between state boards and QA whereas other countries are much more consolidated and have more efficient use of volunteers. For example we could consolidate financially and volunteer energy wise on a unified website, social media, HR systems, complaints policy, etc. Debatable how to manage finances and incorporation but gradually consolidating operations infrastructure between organisations is a good direction to be heading in in terms of better use of volunteer resources, and more efficient communication across the country.

LE, AP – agree with all that, having single website fee and professional look is good.

LD – what don't the states want to give up in terms of individuality? A few years ago some states really wanted that separation.

LE – we don't want to always have to go through QA for money. We'd like autonomy on that front, but we wouldn't mind merging. We don't want the higher admin burden, and want to continue to manage all our events directly.

AP - I wouldn't want to give up state individuality, whatever that means. Some amount of control over things like state jerseys, finances, etc. I can't think of anything policy/gameplay-wise that we do differently or would be affected by



MK – longer game time, unique schedule is important to us. Want to be able to run our own finances. Centralising policy would be awesome. Handling little financial things is the opposite end of the spectrum though. QA doesn't want to hear about financial issues buying new locks and keys. States can handle the small day to day things themselves, but this needs financial autonomy.

LD – financial autonomy is really interesting for you guys because you guys have so much money and it would be unfair for QA to take that money and use it Australia wide given you have raised it yourself. This was one of the main things I wanted to get out of this meeting – what don't we want to mess with. We can work out whether to have separate bank accounts etc. We do seem to like the idea of a unified constitution, and unified way of communicating. Having everyone in the same slack channel would also make things easier.

JT – we can't have one unified constitution for different organisations.

LD – ok. What about branding? Assuming you can keep your own financial autonomy, would you want to keep your own individual names and branding or fall under the name of QA?

Jamie – other organisations work basically like we do at the moment, I don't necessarily see where the benefits are

LD – we can probably start with unifying policies then.

NG – we can make a focus on reformatting policies with same aims and definitions etc. Make all the schedules the same. Policies and constitutions can all reference QA's.

NG – something we've had in vic and maybe wa is we've had a big issue with getting people to run for positions on our committee, it's always the same few people or WA where there's a high turn over rate, and in VQA we end up having to pressure people into running for stuff. If we take away those kinds of structures do you think that we might end up with less people on state boards if we take away those requirements of certain numbers on boards for them to exist? Will people not run for positions on states if they're not mandatory to be filled?

AJ – could you just constitutionally mandate it anyway?

NG – we're registered with Victoria consumer affairs and under that you need to have a certain position filled to be incorporated and to meet requirements – not sure how this would work on a national level. We'd need to look into it further.

LE - I've got to run. But yeah I only joined the quidditch community last year when I started the UWA team. And this year I'm now President of WAQA because no one else wanted to do it and if there was no president there would be no more WAQA.



LD – didn't consider that it may actually be way harder to get people involved that way. Also unsure if for example SA would expect us to then run quidditch for them.

NG – it does put a lot more responsibility on the QA board and puts more pressure on QA.

LD – any other thoughts?

NG – I don't want to be treasurer anymore if we all just have one bank account.

LD – I think what we've all agreed to is that there are definitely some policies we need to unify. I will get constitutions from the states to see if we can streamline things.

AJ – I'm a big fan of having a single centralised slack.

LD – yes. Means we can communicate across groups a lot easier.

AP - Yeah, generalised QA slack is fine with me. Would potentially make it easier to keep in touch and keep info flowing when we're using the same platform/general channel

NG – I don't really need to know the nitty gritty details of states stuff though just the big stuff.

AJ – this is the beauty of slack though with channels and you just have to be in what you need to see.

LD – monthly ish meetings to check in would also be good as well.

JT – I would like to see reports from everyone, maybe monthly, and then a meeting every 6 months or so.

AP - Reports are good, I have literally no idea what goes on in other states haha

AJ – means we can get people on gsuite etc. using the single HR system as well.

Mark – vqa use facebook a lot, asking everyone to now use slack instead might be tricky, but we can do it.

JT – reports can also be sent out to members, helps with transparency. Each org is made accountable to each other and to members.

NG- can make a template for reports that asks some basic questions. With regards to timeframes, when is the next application for NSO?

JT – July 2021, and then every year I think.



NG – what timeframe are we looking at with this potential merging? This will change a lot of our operational structure. We wouldn't want to implement this mid season either, will need to have constitutional changes for states and QA, will need to fit within strategic plan etc.

LD – the longer term timeframe going through 2021 is more likely, ensure all our centralised policies are strong and not rushed, we don't want to call SGMs.

NG – it would be good to figure out when all our AGMs are and start to make a draft of when we want things done by. Rough timeline.

MK – different states have different admin structures – either board vs hierarchical. I don't see much benefit in constitutional streamlining if we're disrupting the structures of the different states.

LD – I agree. I don't think it will be beneficial to change boards to hierarchical structures and vice versa. I personally wasn't planning on changing this sort of thing.

MK – the constitution body could be made as similar as possible between states with minor changes as required.

LD – yes, and pooling resources between everyone will make everything better. If we all work together all the policies and documents will be better.

LD – ok I'm glad we had this meeting and we got these ideas across, thanks everyone.

Meeting closed 10:02 PM.