

Selection Policy

Selectors are tasked with selecting the most competitive teams to represent the University of Auckland at major domestic and international tournaments.

For the avoidance of doubt, this policy is not binding on Thropy selectors, but should be applied unless there is a good reason not to.

When selecting, the selectors should consider factors in the following order:

1. Negative vetoes and minimum (both tournament and internal) Affirmative Action requirements;
2. Trial performance (Including CV performance under exceptional circumstances);
3. Negative preferences;
4. Affirmative Action beyond minimum requirements, Age/Development;
5. Other considerations.

Other considerations include:

- Past Performance;
- Positive Preferences.

Trial Performance

The selectors should use performance during trials as the primary consideration for selecting teams. This information should be used for both deciding what team a speaker should be in and deciding speaker combinations.

Affirmative Action (minimum tournament requirements)

Selectors should apply the appropriate affirmative action requirements for the tournament:

- The $\frac{1}{3}$ rule for debaters at New Zealand tournaments;
- The AIDA rules ($\frac{1}{3}$ of the top 3 teams, $\frac{1}{3}$ of speakers; $\frac{1}{3}$ of the squad);
- Not applicable for AWDC;
- The relevant WUDC depending on the number of teams the institution is sending.

The executive will instruct selectors as to the minimum number of teams they expect to send to the tournament for AA purposes.

Affirmative Action (minimum internal requirements)

Selectors should apply the following affirmative action requirements:

- The squad should consist of a minimum of proportion of people of colour (POC) speakers, equal to half the proportion of POC (This will be calculated as non-European students in university demographics) students at the University, rounded down as appropriate with respect to the number of teams attending.
- This quota does not apply when the number of teams sent to that tournament is two or fewer.
- Should the squad not meet this quota, the number of teams should be reduced until the quota is reached.

Negative Vetoes

The veto policy is designed to allow people to not debate with people who they would be unable to debate with. This policy is not designed to allow people to unfairly influence the selection of teams.

Trialists with a genuine reason are allowed to veto another squad member. This should only be done if the trialist honestly believes they could not debate on a team with that person. The trialist will be required to provide a reason as to why they are vetoing someone - this can be as brief as "personal reasons" if they are not comfortable with disclosing details.

The selectors must collect vetoes prior to the commencement of trials. This means if trialists sign up late, a second round of vetoes should be collected prior to round 1. Vetoes must be collected for any trialists by CV regardless of the stage it occurs at.

If vetoes are not collected prior to round 1, due either to selector error or an equity concern that arises after the initial veto collection, and a veto or equity concern about a team composition is received after trials:

- If teams have not been announced, vetoes are available and the veto policy applies as normal
- If teams have been announced, vetoes are unavailable and the person with the veto should be offered a judge or trainee slot instead

Which party (the person vetoed, or the person vetoing) is moved down should be decided by trial performance and other factors as outlined at the top of the document.

- Where the above results in someone being dropped from the squad, selectors should first consider rearranging teams without dropping someone, where workable.

Examples of a situation that may give rise to a veto include but are not limited to: any harassment, bullying, assault, sexual assault, or other significant incidents.

In exceptional circumstances where selectors are concerned that a speaker or group of speakers are attempting to manipulate team composition using vetoes they may ask the relevant speakers to clarify their veto to their choice of selector or member of the executive. The selector or executive member who hears the clarification may confirm the veto. If it is confirmed selectors may not refuse to apply it. Vetoes should be considered as true in all but exceptional circumstances (e.g. a speaker has vetoed substantial portions of trialists).

Selectors must also consult with someone using a negative veto if this would negatively affect their team placement. At this time, selectors should offer the person using a veto the opportunity to retract their veto.

In a situation where a veto considered legitimate by the selectors results in a speaker being excluded from the squad the speaker should be excluded from the squad.

Negative Preferences

Negative preferences may be used by speakers who would be uncomfortable speaking with another speaker, but not sufficiently so to warrant a negative veto.

Selectors should avoid placing speakers who have expressed negative preferences in the same team, unless it would significantly harm the competitiveness of teams.

Which party (the person negative-preferenced, or the person using the negative preference) is moved down should be decided by trial performance and other factors as outlined at the top of the document.

Positive Preferences

Trialists may indicate positive preferences towards other trialists. Selectors may use their discretion in taking these into account when considering team composition.

These should be considered below all other selection considerations.

Past Performance

To assist with selections, the selectors will be provided with the following measures of past performance:

- A list of past speaking performance submitted by individual speakers (optional);
- A list of tournaments they attended, team placement, speaker position and individual tab placement.

Past performance can be used in the following circumstances:

- When determining room allocations;
- When determining final team placement between speakers the selectors consider indistinguishable;
- When determining speaker position within a team.

Age/Development

The purpose of this consideration is to ensure the club's ability to be competitive in the future.

The following clause should apply for selections in:

- A3, where there are only 3 teams;
- A4 and below, where there are 4 or more teams.

When making decisions between speakers the selectors believe are of indistinguishable quality, the selectors should preference speakers which are younger (first and second year) rather than speakers who are older (third year and above).

Affirmative Action (beyond minimum requirements)

The purpose of this consideration is to ensure the increased representation of non-male speakers in the club.

When making decisions between speakers selectors believe are of similar quality, the selectors should preference speakers who are women, non-binary, and trans* speakers as well as POC speakers.

Policy on Absences

In exceptional circumstances (e.g. illness with medical certificate, close bereavement, compulsory tests, field trips) the selectors may at their discretion allow someone to trial by CV alone. The selectors may select them into whatever team they see fit (or may not select them for a team at all). Someone may not trial by CV where they cannot make trials for unexceptional reasons (e.g. work scheduling, pre-planned events, travel, assignments).

This is considered a replacement for trial performance when applied.

Policy on spots left vacant by trials or withdrawals

If a speaker withdraws from the squad, selectors should first re-allocate trialled squad members to fill positions in the squad.

If team places have not been sufficiently filled, trialists may trial by CV on the basis of CV alone to fill the missing position in the squad's bottom team.

If negative vetoes mean that the position cannot be filled by any of the CV triallists, the bottom team will be removed from the squad and offered trainee spots, or opportunities to take part in a cross-institutional team.

Policy on Partial Attendance

Trialists must be present and able to trial in at least two-thirds (rounded up) of debates. Trialists who are not present and able to trial in all debates may be negatively affected in selection at the discretion of selectors, unless the absence is due to exceptional circumstances. If the speaker meets the criteria on exceptional circumstances but can attend partially (e.g. has a funeral to attend in the morning, but trials in the afternoon), the trialists will be selected on the basis of both CV and trial performance.

Policy on re-trials

If the tournament is not able to go ahead on the same dates, the executive should Conduct re-trials, with:

- Consideration of original trial performance;
- A greater emphasis on positive preferences, especially where teams indicate they would like to stay in original team;
- Wider grounds on which individuals can trial by CV (e.g. difficulty in getting time off work, etc.);
- Where two speakers of similar levels are competing for a speaking spot, and one of them will be dropped from the squad, selectors should reward attendance at the original trial.

Speakers who are dropped from the squad, along with trainees from the original squad, should be prioritised for judge and trainee spots.

If a spot opens in the re-trialed squad due to a withdrawing speaker, people from the initial squad who have re-trialed should be prioritised for that spot.