

ANU Debating Society Equity Policy

Contents

Article I. Introduction

Section 1.01 Terms of Reference

Section 1.02 Scope

- (a) Exceptions to Usual Scope Limitations to Equity
- (b) AIDA Tribunal Process
- (c) Liability of the Equity Team

Article II. Prohibited Behaviours

Section 2.01 Abuse of the Equity Process

Section 2.02 Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault

Section 2.03 Bullying, Harassment and Vilification

Section 2.04 Discrimination

- (a) Protected and Conditionally Protected Attributes

Section 2.05 Substance Abuse and Illicit Substances

- (a) Pressuring Others to Drink
- (b) Underage Drinking
- (c) Illicit Substances

Article III. Respectful Conduct

Section 3.01 In Debates

- (a) Distraction and Intimidation of Speakers
- (b) Ad Hominem Attacks

Section 3.02 General Conduct

- (a) Respecting Adjudicators' Decisions
- (b) Insulting Commentary
- (c) Language
 - (i) Generalisations
 - (ii) Graphic or Visceral Rhetoric
 - (iii) Reclaimed Language

(d) Gender Pronouns

Article IV. Equity Claims Procedure

Section 4.01 Background

Section 4.02 Informal Claim Process

Section 4.03 Informal Claim Resolution

Section 4.04 Formal Claim Process

Section 4.05 Formal Claim Resolution

(a) Mediated Resolutions

(b) Disciplinary Actions

Section 4.06 Claims Against an Equity Officer

Section 4.07 Exceptional Claims

Section 4.08 Conflicts

(a) Conflicts of Equity Officers

(b) Conflicts between individuals

Section 4.09 Appealing an Equity Claim

Article V. Prevention of Equity Violations

Section 5.01 Contingent Equity Officers at External Tournaments

Section 5.02 Role of Active Bystanders

Section 5.03 Responding to Equity Claims

Article VI. Affirmative Action

Section 6.01 Affirmative Action Policy

(a) AIDA Affirmative Action Policy

(b) ANU Debating Society Affirmative Action Policy

Article VII. Tournament Subsidies Policy

Section 7.01 Subsidies Committee

(a) Conflicts of the Subsidies Committee

Section 7.02 Selection criteria and priority

Section 7.03 Subsidies process

(a) Abuse of Subsidies process

Section 7.04 Confidentiality

- (a) Redacting personal details
- (b) General confidentiality of Applicants

Article VIII. Acknowledgements

Annex I: List of Recognised Protected Attributes

Annex II: Definitions with Examples

Annex III: Canberra Specific External Support Organisation Contact Details

Article I. Introduction

Section 1.01 Terms of Reference

For the purposes of this policy (unless otherwise specified), the terms:

- “*Committee*”, refers to voted representative members of the ANU Debating Society Committee.
- “*The Society*”, refers to the ANU Debating Society.
- “*Member of the society*”, refers to members of the ANU debating Society and those who attend events/tournaments hosted by the society.
- “*The Equity team*”, refers to the elected equity officers. Throughout the year this will consist of the elected Diversity VP and Equity Officer. During tournaments organised by the society, the conveners will choose tournament equity officers. Similarly, during external tournaments, the committee will choose contingent equity officers. Therefore, the “equity team” is contextual.

Section 1.02 Scope

This policy is superseded by ACT and Australian law and all individuals must be aware of their rights and obligations under the law. It is also superseded by the ANU Debating Society Constitution and the AIDA constitution.

This policy applies to all individuals in the Society as well as those participating in debating events hosted or organised by the Society. This includes but is not limited to:

- Debaters;
- Adjudicators;
- Coaches;
- Observers;
- Attendees of social events;
- Members of the Committee;
- Helpers; and
- Anyone who’s contact has been facilitated in some aspect by the society.

This policy applies for the entire duration of the year, which includes, but is not limited to:

- During internals (debating, training and socialising);
- During any formal event organized by the society;
- During any social event organized by the society;
- In accommodation organized as part of a tournament; and
- Over the duration of any external tournament or mini.

This policy applies to conduct in person and through electronic means, including social media. All agree, by being a member of the society, helping or attending any event hosted by the society, to be bound by the terms of this Equity Policy.

a) Exceptions to Usual Scope Limitations to Equity

A significant breach of this Equity Policy that is committed outside of debating (or any event hosted by the Society) by a planned or potential member of the society or society event participant is grounds for an actionable claim where:

- The equity violating behaviour was directed towards another planned or potential member of the society or society event participant; or
- There is strong reason to believe the accused perpetrator would put other (current or prospective) members of the society or event attendees at risk.

Claimants should be aware that it is much harder for the Equity Team to substantiate claims made about events that occurred before the current Equity Team was elected.

Additionally, the Equity Team may only act on claims insofar as they have had a claim submitted to them as the Equity Team. As a result, at the end of the Equity Team's term of office, any claim that has been resolved at a point in the year and has required ongoing punitive action (e.g. conflicting from internals indefinitely) will be considered void. This is because there has been no expression of consent by the claimant, that their claim be dealt with by anyone other than the Equity Team (and Development Officer if necessary). In order to prevent this from occurring, it is suggested that the Equity Team contacts all claimants that this affects in an effort to ascertain consent for the additional parties to be privy to the knowledge of their complaint.

b) AIDA Tribunal Process

The scope of the powers of this Equity Policy is limited to ANU and the Society. However there are avenues for further action through AIDA (Australasian Intersociety Debating Association). If a victim wishes for a resolution to their claim which goes beyond actions that the Equity Team can take (e.g. the banning of an individual from different or multiple non-ANU tournaments) they should direct claims to the AIDA Council. There is nothing which bars claims from being received by both organizations. The equity team will do their best to facilitate these wishes should the victim request it.

Under the AIDA Constitution section 17, any individuals who feels that their equity has been violated may request a meeting of the AIDA Disputes Tribunal. Under the AIDA Constitution section 18, the decisions of the Disputes Tribunal may be further reviewed by AIDA Council. To request a Disputes Tribunal, Individuals may either contact the Equity Team who will initiate the process on their behalf or directly contact AIDA at australasiandebating@gmail.com.

c) Liability of the Equity Team

The Equity Team will protect the Equity of individuals (as outlines in Section 1.2: Scope) and enforce this Equity Policy to the best of their ability. They have a range of qualifications and experiences which enable them to effectively tackle crises, handle complaints and otherwise act to ensure the safety and comfort of Individuals. However, ultimately, they are a team of volunteers who have sacrificed their time to facilitate the Society and individual Equity Officers are not liable for acts or omissions done or made during the fulfilment of their obligations as volunteers.

Article II. Prohibited Behaviours

The following section identifies behaviours that are expressly prohibited by the Society. In cases where the law is broken, individuals may prefer to file a police report rather than filing a

claim with the Equity Team. If this is the case, at the participant's request, the Equity Team will support the participant in the process and provide any other support they can.

Section 2.01 Abuse of the Equity Process

Any attempt to abuse the process of Equity, including the victimization of individuals who submit equity claims and attempts to use equity as a mechanism to bully or harass other members of the society are prohibited and considered serious violations of this policy. No individual (other than the submitting party) outside of the Equity Team will be allowed to retain a copy of any material or evidence relating to claims brought to the attention of the Equity Team to prevent abuse of the equity process.

Section 2.02 Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault

Positive and enthusiastic consent must be received for any conduct of a sexual or romantic nature, including but not limited to sexual intercourse, physical intimacy, flirting, making sexual jokes or suggestive bodily contact. If positive and enthusiastic consent is not received before initiation of a sexual or romantic interaction, it may be an equity violation.

Positive and enthusiastic consent requires a person to actively affirm that other parties in any sexual or romantic interaction are freely and voluntarily agreeing to what is occurring. All parties should enquire as to what other participants in a sexual act are feeling (e.g. "Is this ok?"; "Are we going too fast?"; "Do you like this?"). Sometimes consent can be given nonverbally through social cues.

However, if there is any lack of clarity about whether consent has been given, it is the duty of all parties to ask all other parties whether they are consenting to the interaction. Silence or passivity is not consent. If it cannot be determined whether positive consent has been given, the sexual or romantic interaction should be terminated immediately. It may be re-initiated once clear consent is given.

Consent to a sexual or romantic interaction is not given if:

- A party has been pressured or harassed into the interaction;
- A position of influence is used to encourage a party into the interaction;
- A party is intoxicated and incapable of giving consent at any point during the interaction; or
- A party has indicated through word or action any objection to the interaction whatsoever unless that objection is clearly rescinded and the party gives consent.

Consent can be withdrawn at any time, and the consent to one interaction (e.g. flirting) does not constitute consent to further interactions (e.g. kissing). If consent is withdrawn, advances by the individual after that point will be considered a serious breach of equity. Examples of withdrawal of consent include: verbal (e.g. "I don't want to do this"); implicit in an act (e.g. pushing another party away); or an indirect request through a friend or equity officer to stop the interaction.

Individuals should be aware that one of the following (or other) attributes may put them in a position of relative power over other individuals:

- Age;
- Debating experience or ability;

- Position of Authority (e.g. being on the Committee, Pro status); or
- Social Status

A position of relative power offers additional weight to an individual's words and conduct. This position must not be leveraged intentionally or unintentionally to encourage individuals into sexual relations as this constitutes pressuring an individual into sexual relations. Special care to receive free, enthusiastic consent must be taken if an individual is in a position of relative power.

Section 2.03 Bullying, Harassment and Vilification

All members of the society has the right to the enjoy debating and feel welcomed by the debating community. All forms of bullying, harassment and vilification as defined in Annex 2 are expressly prohibited.

Section 2.04 Discrimination

Any action that is found to cause or perpetuate systemic disadvantage, undermine human dignity or adversely affect an individual's ability to actualise their rights and freedoms in a serious manner constitutes discrimination. Both direct and indirect discrimination as defined in Annex 2 are expressly prohibited.

a) Protected and Conditionally Protected Attributes

This Equity Policy acknowledges that in society at large certain groups of people are particularly marginalized, stigmatized and/or oppressed. It recognizes that the harm that accrues to bullying, harassment or discrimination against these individuals is compounded by those social pressures and previous instances of bullying/harassment based on those attributes (henceforth labelled Protected Attributes).

Taking into account this additional harm, equity claims lodged regarding an attack on a protected attribute may be considered more severely. A list of characteristics acknowledged as protected attributes is included in Annex 1 but the Equity Team will consider attacks against protected attributes on a case-by-case basis and may choose to recognize an attribute not named in Annex 1.

Section 2.05 Substance Abuse and Illicit Substances

a) Pressuring Others to Drink

The following behaviours are prohibited:

- Aggressively encouraging others to drink alcohol or using a position of influence or power to encourage individuals to drink alcohol
- Giving alcohol to others to make them more suggestive and amenable to acts (sexual or otherwise)
- Using an individual's intoxication to make them agree to any act (sexual or otherwise) they might not otherwise consent to.
- Providing alcohol to seriously intoxicated individuals

Under Australian law, the consumption of alcohol is not a mitigating factor (excuse) for any violation of law. It is not a mitigating factor in the enforcement of this equity policy. If an individual has a tendency to act in a way which may violate another participant's equity when drunk, the impetus is upon them to manage their behaviour.

Strategies for behaviour management include:

- Not drinking
- Drinking slowly and in moderation whilst drinking plenty of water
- Asking a friend to assist in moderating drinking and controlling drunk behaviour

b) Underage Drinking

The society will not allow underage members to be supplied alcohol. The following are acts prohibited by this equity policy;

- The drinking of alcohol by a person under the age of 18 (minor)
- The provision or sale of alcohol to a minor

c) 2.5.3 Illicit Substances

The possession and selling of illicit substances (e.g. illegal drugs) is not condoned by the Equity Team. If individuals are found to be in possession of illicit substances, they may be asked to leave organised social events.

Article III. Respectful Conduct

Debating, like all competitive activities, requires certain standards of behaviour to be followed to ensure fair, equitable and respectful competition. All individuals are expected to follow the rules of debates.. Their violation may give rise to a breach of equity. In addition, the following section nominates behaviours that are expected of members of the society.

We urge individuals, where they are unsure as to how their actions will influence others, to follow these guidelines to limit the harms that may arise from their actions. While a failure to follow these guidelines is not inherently an equity violation, if an individual reasonably takes issue with an action in breach of these guidelines, they may make an actionable claim on that basis.

Section 3.01 In Debates

a) Distraction and Intimidation of Speakers

Teams should refrain from actions that have the potential to intimidate, disrupt or distract the opposing team, whether through words, sounds or conduct. For example, in most instances, individuals should refrain from table tapping, saying, "hear hear" or "shame!". Table tapping and saying "hear hear" is only considered acceptable when done in moderation by the team whose team mate is currently speaking whilst they are giving positive substantive.

For example, a team table tapping or saying "hear hear" when their teammate has said, "The opposing team was wrong when they..." is not considered acceptable. Teams should be aware that talking on the bench while a member of the opposing team is speaking can be distracting

to both the opposing team and adjudicators and should moderate their volume and tone appropriately.

Adjudicators, coaches, observers and any other members of the audience must similarly moderate their behaviour to avoid distracting debaters and adjudicators. They should not enter or leave the room during speeches and should keep communication to a minimum. Audience members may table tap quietly in response to positive substantive material.

b) Ad Hominem Attacks

An ad hominem attack is a formal fallacy whereby the speaker personally attacks or insults their opponent instead of addressing their arguments, e.g. “These idiots don’t understand how economics works...”. They include arguments that discredit the ability of another team to make persuasive arguments based on characteristics of their identity, e.g. “What would this team of men know about the struggles of women?” Ad hominem attacks are unpersuasive, disrespectful and intimidating for members of the opposing team. They should be avoided.

Section 3.02 General Conduct

a) Respecting Adjudicators’ Decisions

We believe that adjudicators are making their decisions in good faith and seek to make the correct decisions. There may be times during year where a member of the society does not agree with an adjudicator’s decision. Adjudication is difficult and often it is possible to see a debate in more than one way. In addition, debaters are not in a position to objectively assess their own performance. Ultimately, adjudicators’ decisions are final and cannot be changed. Where needed it is suggested to seek clarification for the reasons a debate fell to a particular team as it is a fantastic learning opportunity. However, actions that constitute harassment of adjudicators are prohibited.

b) Insulting Commentary

Members should refrain from insulting and non-constructive commentary on speeches, speakers or adjudicators both within and outside of debates. This includes on social media in “live feeds” about the debate or comment sections. A general rule to follow, is that if you wouldn’t say it to that person’s face, then it should not be posted online.

c) Language

The use of language is a complex transfer of meaning from person to person. Sometimes, the process of encoding and decoding meaning is imperfect, and words can be interpreted differently to how they are intended. Societal context, lived experience and personal history all change how words are understood. We therefore urge individuals to be considerate when choosing words both during and outside of debates. The following sections provide guidance for ways to moderate language to avoid offending or violating the equity of other individuals:

i. Generalisations

Generalisations about groups of people are often inaccurate, hurtful or restrictive to the people within that group. We encourage avoidance of language such as “ALL members of group X

are characteristic Y”. We encourage offering nuance and clarity to the statement, such as ‘Some members of group X...’ or ‘Members of X in Z circumstance...’. This helps to prevent statements from being unintentionally offensive. A good rule of thumb is to consider: if there was a member of that group X in the audience, would they be offended by your statement?

ii. Graphic or Visceral Rhetoric

Some experiences are deeply traumatic and to hear them described in detail can be traumatic and/or triggering, causing individuals to re-live the pain of those experiences. Such experiences include, but are in no way limited to, oppression, violence, sexual assault and war. We urge members to moderate language around sensitive topics so that if a listener has had such a traumatic experience, they will not be made to feel pained, uncomfortable or alienated during the tournament. In the context of debating, most people understand the nature of these sensitive topics and it is unnecessary and unpersuasive to give graphic descriptions of them. In a social context, it is also important to be aware that individuals may have had experiences with traumatic events and to moderate language accordingly.

iii. Reclaimed Language

Certain groups have found empowerment in reclaiming language that has historically been used as weapons against them. This policy recognises the right of members of marginalized or oppressed groups may use reclaimed language but its use by non-members can be seen as offensive and/or a continuation of the oppressions originally associated with that language. Non-members should exercise tact and their best judgement to determine whether the use of reclaimed language is appropriate in any given circumstance.

d) Gender Pronouns

The Society recognises that members have diverse gender identities that must be respected. Transgender, non-binary and genderqueer individuals often have an incorrect gender identity assigned to them, and this invalidation and erasure of their identity can be profoundly hurtful and oppressive. For this reason, pronoun introductions (described below) are conducted before each debate, to ensure that individuals are referred to using the correct pronouns. This process can be helpful in making these individuals feel welcome and respected. It is therefore important that this process be treated with the utmost respect and that individuals be careful to correctly use individuals’ gender pronouns.

During debates, chair adjudicators facilitates pronoun introductions. Beginning with themselves, the chair introduces their first name, and if they choose to, their pronouns. They then invite panellists, the Affirmative team and lastly, the Negative team to introduce their pronouns. If a speaker or adjudicator does not wish to identify a pronoun, they are not required to do so and it is the responsibility of individual speakers to use gender neutral language to refer to them within the debate.

Introductions should be of the form: “Hi, I’m Jane, first speaker of the affirmative, my pronoun is they”; “Hi I’m James, please refer to me as she or they”; most simply, “Rob, he or they” or an equivalent. Individuals should not describe pronouns as “preferred” or indicate that pronouns are not a fundamental part of individuals’ identities that should be respected.

In debates, when the chair adjudicator calls each debater to speak, the chair will also announce their pronouns. For example, the chair may say, “I now call on the first speaker for the Affirmative, X, who’s pronouns are she or they, to begin the debate”. If a speaker has chosen not to state a pronoun, the chair states that the speaker has not identified a pronoun. The process should be explicit and deliberate, and it is the responsibility of the chair, though others should call for it if the chair fails to initiate pronoun introductions.

Outside debates, the use of the correct pronouns of other individuals is equally important. We encourage individuals to avoid assuming one’s gender identity or pronouns, and, where possible at socials and in casual interactions, ask individuals what their pronouns are. It is expected that when an individual has given their pronouns, that those pronouns are respected and that the person is referred to with either those pronouns or gender-neutral language.

Article IV. Equity Claims Procedure

Section 4.01 Background

Anyone covered by the equity policy (see scope) has the right to make an Equity Claim. The preference of the Equity Team is that claimants directly action their own claims and, should they feel intimidated or otherwise require support, may include a trusted individual in the claims process. Sometimes though, individuals are not in a position to submit their own claims, for example because they are recovering from the traumatic incident which gave rise to the claim. Individuals may delegate the responsibility of actioning their claim to another individual. This nomination of an agent should be verified in writing and submitted by the agent to the Equity Team. Any misrepresentation of a right to action claims on behalf of another will be seen as a serious abuse of the equity process.

An Equity Claim is a complaint about any single incident, ongoing situation or culture which breaches the Equity Policy and has directly violated the claimant’s equity. Exhibiting a prohibited behaviour (in Section 1) or failing to act respectfully (Section 2) are breaches of the Equity Policy. Any information provided to an Equity Officer as part of a claim is presumed to be provided in confidence and will not be shared without the express permission of a victim. When the Equity Team deals with claims, they will not name additional victims referenced in claims without those victims’ express approval.

Victims have ownership of the claim resolution process. They can nominate how they think their claims should be managed and the Equity Team will not take their claim any further than they expressly consent to. A claim may be withdrawn at any point prior to the resolution of the claim.

There are two exceptions:

1. The Equity Team has good reason to believe that other individuals at the tournament are at risk from the content of the claim. In this instance, the Equity Team must act to protect individuals from further harm.
2. An offense under Australian Law has been committed. The Equity Team will not withhold important information or evidence from a police investigation and may report breaches of the law to the relevant authorities.

Where multiple claims are received regarding a single incident; ongoing situation or culture; or alleged perpetrator, the Equity Team, with the claimants' consent, withholds the right to action the claims together.

Claims may be either "informal" or "formal" and are outlined below.

Section 4.02 Informal Claim Process

An Informal Claim is one which raises concerns but does not require a formal response such as mediation or disciplinary action. Informal Claims can be made anonymously. They can be submitted through any of the following channels:

1. Directly contacting an Equity Officer (e.g. in person or by phone)
2. Nominating a third party (their agent) who can forward the claimant on their behalf (with their express written approval) to an Equity Officer
3. Submitting a claim through the Online Claim form at <https://goo.gl/forms/LbDGDH96YwMGihsv2>
4. An email submitted to anudebatingequity@gmail.com

A victim may wish to nominate a particular member(s) of the Equity Team to handle their claim. The online submission page is monitored by all members of the equity team. In the case where a victim wishes to nominate a particular Equity Officer(s) action their claim, they should contact them directly or have their nominated agent contact the Equity Officer(s) on their behalf.

If a victim wishes to submit a claim anonymously, they should use the online form or if they would like to nominate a particular equity officer(s) to hear their anonymous claim, they should nominate an agent to contact the Officer on their behalf.

Section 4.03 Informal Claim Resolution

Examples of resolutions that individuals may seek from an informal claim include:

1. Receiving support from an Equity Officer. Claimants can benefit from discussions with a neutral, supportive party and an Equity Officer can provide advice about further recourse that claimants have to the Equity Process.
2. A general announcement at the internals about the claim, such as an announcement reminding individuals that gender pronouns must be respected during debates. Additionally, if an informal claim is not anonymously made (the Equity Team knows the identity of the complainant) the Equity Team may take additional measures, including:
 3. An Equity Officer contacting a specific individual about an infringement to remind them of the Equity Policy.
 4. Equity Officers contacting the Development Officer to ensure individuals are not placed on the same team or adjudicating their debate(s) during internals (See Section 4.08b)

Section 4.04 Formal Claim Process

When making a Formal Claim, the claimant is unable to remain anonymous. Formal Claims are substantiated through accusations of punishable misconduct and the accused party has the right to hear the exact claim against them and respond to the accusation. This is necessary to protect the transparency and integrity of the equity process and provide due process to the

accused. However, the accused party does not have the right to retain a copy of any material relating to the claim and such material will not be provided them to prevent abuse of the Equity Process.

A Formal Claim must be made in writing. It can be submitted through the following channels:

1. Through the Online Claim Form: <https://goo.gl/forms/YFmOzt9TLYtcSQpK2>
2. An email submitted to anudebatingequity@gmail.com
3. A written communication to an Equity Officer

The victim has the right to nominate a particular Equity Officer/s to handle their claim and in that case should communicate this in writing directly to that/those Equity Officer/s. If the victim wishes to file an immediate Formal Claim to the Equity Team in person, the writing and formal submission of the complaint may be delayed due to time constraint between rounds and/or trauma faced by the individual. The Equity Team may begin investigations during this process. However, no resolution will be actioned until a written complaint has been formally submitted.

Section 4.05 Formal Claim Resolution

Examples of resolutions that individuals may seek from a Formal Claim may be divided into two categories; Mediated Resolutions and Punitive Actions. They are detailed below.

a) Mediated Resolutions

A victim may lodge a formal claim against a specific person/s and request the Equity Officer to talk to the accused party and/or facilitate a conversation resolution between the two parties. While the victim will not be able to remain anonymous, the Equity Officer facilitating the mediation will not break confidence with anything said to them by the claimant without their express permission.

Specific examples of actions which may be taken by the Equity Officer include:

- Explaining the claim to the offending party and discussing with them why their remark or action was inappropriate
- Bringing the claimant and the offending party together to conciliate the dispute.
- Requesting that the offending participant provide an apology

b) Disciplinary Actions

A victim may request a punitive action be taken against a specific person/s as a resolution to their claim. For a punitive action to take place, there must be a formal investigation by the equity team which may include but is not limited to:

- Talking to other individuals who may have relevant information, as required by the circumstances of the claim;
- Speaking to the accused party about what they have been accused of and by whom, and hearing their side of the story;
- Discussing other information that corroborates the claim with the accused party with the consent of corroborating parties.

In order to fully investigate the claim, the complaint will no longer be considered confidential and the name of the claimant will be released to named accused perpetrators. Complainants will be made aware that this is necessary before confidentiality is broken. If the Equity Officer believes that (i) the claim is sufficiently well-evidenced and (ii) that the breach of the equity policy is sufficiently serious, they may institute one of the following potential disciplinary actions (or others) in line with the seriousness of the offense:

- Issuing an Official Warning to the offending party
 - An Official Warning is a formal notification of wrongdoing. It will be issued in the case that the Equity Team does not believe that other disciplinary actions are necessary to protect other individuals at the tournament but want to signal to the offending party that their behaviour is/was unacceptable. Repeated breaches of the Equity Policy following an Official Warning, particularly if they are similar in nature to the original breach, will be taken extremely seriously as they indicate a pattern of wrongdoing. Such breaches will necessitate a stronger form of disciplinary action.
- Banning the individual from (a) social/s
- Removing or banning individuals from attending internals and ANU tournaments

When considering the appropriate punitive action, the Equity team may consider whether they think it likely the perpetrator will commit equity violations again, endangering individuals. In addition, repeated infractions or a failure to follow the direction of an Equity Officer will result in a compounding punitive action. For example, a failure to follow a direction to avoid coming into contact with a claimant during the tournament may lead to removal from the tournament.

Section 4.06 Claims against an Equity Officer

A claim directed at an Equity Officer is necessarily serious in nature. Equity Officers are held to the highest standard of conduct. If an Equity Officer is seen to be violating equity, it creates a culture in which violations appear to be tolerated and makes individuals feel locked out of the equity process.

Any claim against an equity officer functions similarly to other claims with three notable exceptions:

- All information pertinent to the claim will be withheld from the offending Equity Officer and they will not take part in the claim process in any way.
- An additional External Equity Officer will be nominated by the Committee to deal with this particular claim. It is suggested that this External Equity Officer be a senior member of the committee or a member of the ANUSA Exec or Clubs Council Exec, whom ever the committee believes will act fairly and impartially.
- Any serious breach of the Equity Policy by an Equity Officer may be grounds for dismissal and should be brought to the President of the Society in an appropriate amount of time.

Section 4.07 Exceptional Claims

In exceptional situations, the Equity Team retains the right to act with discretion to determine the most appropriate means of assessing and actioning claims where the usual procedure as defined in this policy is not suitable.

Section 4.08 Conflicts

a) Conflicts of Equity Officers

To protect the integrity of the claim management process, where possible, members of the Equity Team who feel that they are not in a position to impartially assess a claim should remove themselves entirely from the assessment of that claim. Individuals who are the subject of investigation as part of an Equity Claim have the right to request Equity Officers be removed from the assessment of their claim on the basis that they are incapable of being impartial in the investigation and assessment of the claim.

Reasons why an Equity Officer might be perceived as incapable of being impartial include:

- Any strong personal connection, either positive or negative with either the claimant/s or accused perpetrator/s;
- Extrinsic knowledge about circumstances surrounding the claim which might substantially bias an Equity Officer's view of the claim as it is presented; and
- Involvement in (an) historic or ongoing complaint/s that may in any way act to prevent the equity officer from being impartial.

If an individual who is the subject of an investigation wishes to request that an Equity Officer be removed from the assessment of a claim made against them on the basis that they are unable to investigate and assess a claim impartially, they should contact a different Equity Officer. In this contact, individuals should make the Equity Officer aware of the nature of the conflict. If this is not possible, it is possible for the claimants to digitally complete the equity complaints form and send it directly to the non-conflicted Equity Officer.

That Equity Officer will be able to keep the nature of the conflict confidential, however, if the nominated Equity Officer is removed from the investigation, they will necessarily be made aware of the existence of the conflict.

The Equity Team is not a large body and in cases where there is no individual in a position to action the claim without a conflict, claimants should immediately be notified and different provisions be put in place. These might include internal assessments of which Equity Officer/s are best placed to respond to the claims or, at the request of the claimant, redirection of the complaint to another member of the committee.

b) Conflicts between individuals

Equity Officers may work with the Development Officer to make sure certain individuals (if necessary) are not placed on the same team in internals or adjudicating certain individuals if there have been past equity complaints (formal or informal). For this action to be taken, the claimant must also fill out the internals conflict here:

<https://goo.gl/forms/LbDGDH96YwMGihsv2>.

The form will remain confidential to the Equity Team. The Development Officer will be told the conflicts in advance of internals and how long the conflict will last (eg. For a term, indefinitely). Express consent must be given from the claimant if this course of action is pursued. The Equity Team does not have the burden to inform the conflicted off individual.

At the end of their term, the outgoing Equity Team will check with all conflict claimants to ensure they have their consent for the list to be passed onto the new Equity Team-elect and Development Officer-elect. If the claimant does not give consent, then their conflict will be voided for the new year until they submit a new internals conflict form. If consent is given, then the outgoing Equity Team will pass on all necessary information to the Equity Team-elect and the conflict list to the Development Officer-elect.

Section 4.09 Appealing an Equity Claim

All individuals have the right to appeal any claim made against them on the basis of:

- The claim's substance;
- The process by which the outcome of the claim was determined; and/or
- The severity of any resolution that arose from the claim

Appeals are heard by the ANU Debating Society Executive (not including the VP Diversity). If a participant wishes to appeal a claim, they should contact an Equity Team member who will instigate the process on their behalf or can talk directly the current President of the Society

Article V. Prevention of Equity Violations

Section 5.01 Contingent Equity Officers at External Tournaments

It is strongly suggested that the Society nominates Contingent Equity Officers for all major tournaments throughout the debating year. These competitions include Easters, Australs, W*mens and Worlds. Contingent Equity Officers should not seek to handle claims without involving the (tournament) Equity Team. The personal relationships that exist within contingents make it difficult for the Contingent Equity Officer to intervene objectively and without influencing the decision-making of the claimant.

The Contingent Equity Officer should:

- Support individuals to make equity claims by:
 1. Providing immediate support and encouragement
 2. Helping them to access a Tournament Equity Officer
 3. Directing them to the tournament's Online Equity Claim Form
- Look out for the safety and comfort of members of their contingent throughout the Tournament.
- Understand the Tournament Equity Policy and answer questions that members of their contingent may have about it.
- Communicate messages from the Tournament Equity Team to members of their contingent.
- In the case of a dispute between contingents, the contingent equity officer may be called upon to be involved in mediation if both the claimant and accused agree to their presence.
- They should also uphold this equity policy in all necessary contexts, however acknowledge that their primary role is to facilitate claimant's communication(s) with the Tournament Equity Officers

At least one of the Contingent Equity Officers should be non-cis male identifying. Should this not be functionally possible, this requires a two-thirds majority vote by the ANU Debating Committee.

Section 5.02 Role of Active Bystanders

It is the duty of all individuals to ensure the safety and wellbeing of other individuals. If you witness a situation or conduct which might constitute an equity violation or a situation that could progress to a violation, it is important as a bystander to actively intervene to protect the equity of other individuals if you feel safe to do so. The first step is to assess the situation and consider the available options for intervention. There are many types of intervention and bystanders should never intervene in a way which makes them feel unsafe or threatens your own equity.

Methods of safe intervention can include:

- Telling another person (the best people to inform are the equity officers, or responsible adults);
- If in a social situation, telling designated sober reps of the incident;
- Checking in with someone to see if they are comfortable in a social interaction;
- If someone is intoxicated making sure they do not walk home alone; or
- In serious cases, calling the Police.

Bystanders should intervene in the way which they think will best resolve the situation. They should then report all serious incidents to the Equity Team and any minor incident if they believe the input of the Equity Team can assist in any way to resolve the situation. In the case where an individual's equity is violated, the bystander should support them in any way they can and make them aware of their recourse to the Equity Process. To re-emphasise, bystanders should never put themselves in unsafe situations and it is often better to call for and await help than to directly intervene alone.

Section 5.03 Responding to Equity Claims

Throughout your time in debating, you may be approached, either by debaters, adjudicators, or members of the equity team about an action, language use or behaviour you exhibited. It is important to remember that this is not a personal attack, but rather an opportunity to learn from the perspective of other people. Take the time to listen to what is being said, do your best to empathise and apologise if necessary.

Article VI. Affirmative Action Policies (AA)

Section 6.01 AIDA AA Policy

ANU Debating supports AIDA's Affirmative Action Policy and therefore attempts to adhere to it in every possible instance.

For the Australian Debating Championships (Easters), according to the AIDA constitution (Article 35):

- *“At least one third (rounded up) of the debating contingents must be non cis-male.*
- *At least one third (rounded up) of the debaters in first three teams of all debating contingents must be non cis-male.*
- *At least one third (rounded up) of the debaters across all teams must be non cis-male.”*

For the Australasian Debating Championships (Austral), according to the AIDA constitution (Article 23):

- *“At least one third of all debating contingents must be non cis-male individuals affiliated with the university they represent at the tournament.”*
- *“At least one third of the debaters in the first three teams of all debating contingents must be non cis-male.”*
- *“At least one third of the debaters across all teams must be non cis-male.”*

AIDA outlines no affirmative action policy for the Women’s Intersity Debating Championship (Wom*ns).

Section 6.02 ANU Debating Society’s AA Policy

According the ANU Debating Society Constitution (Part 5, Section 17, Subsection 2);

“Where a tournament does not have an Affirmative Action policy for non cis-males, or where the requirements are less stringent than the rules in subsection 3, the selectors will apply the requirements of subsection 3 in addition to the requirements of the tournament, unless a determination is made under subsection 3”

Subsection 3 reads;

“For every intersity tournament:

a) At least one third of the contingent, debaters, and top three teams must be non cis-males; and

b) At least one third of the contingent, debaters, and top three teams must be female-identifying. The provisions of subsection 3a must be met before applying subsection 3b. The application of 3b must not be done in a way that detracts any non cis-male debater or adjudicator.”

Priority is given to Part a) over Part b).

For the World University Debating Championships, since debates are conducted in the British Parliamentary (BP) Style, it is not possible to have “one-third” ratio of non-cis male in the top three teams. As a result, it is expected that one-third of the contingent is non-cis male identifying.

If these AA recommendations can not be met, then it requires a two-thirds vote of the Committee to ensure any overriding of any AA policy is never done in “bad faith”. The Society would like to acknowledge that in all cases AA should be attempted to be met in order to not ignore the systemic and/or historical disadvantage and oppression of certain groups of people. This is especially significant in cases where AA would contravene a meritocratic selection process. AA is broadly seen as a pathway to begin to correct historical and systemic disadvantage within the debating community.

Article VII. Tournament Subsidies Policy

Section 7.01 Introduction

The Society acknowledges that all members of the Society have differing levels of financial need. As well as this, attending debating tournaments (especially majors) can be a costly endeavour. In an attempt to make the opportunity to attend these tournaments as equitable as possible, the Society will endeavour to allocate a portion of its budget each year to subsidise individual members' registration and/or travel costs when they express a certain level of financial need to the Subsidy Panel.

Section 7.02 Subsidy Panel

The Subsidy Panel is chosen by the executive of the Committee. It must consist of (at a minimum):

- One non-cis male;
- The Equity Team (Diversity VP and Equity Officer) and Treasurer (unless any of these individuals have declared a conflict in accordance with Section 7.02a); and
- Three non-conflicted members to assess each application

(a) Conflicts of the Subsidy Panel

If a chosen member of the Subsidy Panel has a conflict with any applicant, they may not pass judgement on that applicant's proposal. Conflicts include (but is not limited to):

- Personal Relationships that would lead to negative or positive biases against the applicant
- If the applicant declares a conflict with an individual on the Subsidy Panel in their Subsidy Proposal
- If a member of Subsidy Panel declares a conflict with an applicant.

An applicant for a subsidy may not be a member of the Subsidy Panel or involved in any aspect of the subsidy selection process. This is because of the inherent bias of the situation.

Section 7.03 Selection criteria and priority

This is the recommended selection criteria for subsidy applicants in order of priority:

1. Level of financial need (e.g. financial independence, working status)
2. Whether the individual would attend the tournament without the subsidy
3. Gender
4. Membership of a structurally or historically disadvantaged group (e.g. Disability status, being a Person of Colour, LGBTQI+ identifying or identifying as being from a low SES background.
5. Adjudicators over Debaters

If a number of applicants need to be differentiated even after comparing them with the above criteria, then they should be differentiated by their debating/adjudicating skill level. Priority is given to the more skilled debaters. Note that this is a last resort and should never be taken into account over the above criteria and should preferentially never be considered.

Section 7.04 Subsidies process

Prior to accepting applications, the Equity Team will have a meeting with the Treasurer to finalise the monies available for subsidies for each Major Tournament. In this meeting, two things must be decided for each tournament:

1. What the maximum possible subsidy amount per each applicant is; and
2. What the total subsidy budget is.

The applications for subsidies will be submitted via an online form. The form will have information about the members of the Subsidy Panel. The form will contain questions intended to ascertain information fulfilling the selection criteria and priority as outlined in Section 7.03. This form should be circulated at the same time as ANU registration opens for each tournament.

An example of this is found here: <https://goo.gl/forms/HA7XsPIcTnzNdiYC2>

Once the application time has expired, the Subsidy Panel will schedule a meeting where they will allocate the available monies according to the Selection Criteria to successful applicants.

All applicants (successful or otherwise) will then be contacted by a member of the Equity Team (or Treasurer in the circumstance where all members of the Equity Team are conflicted off in the case of Section 7.02a). In this correspondence, applicants will be informed how much (if any) their registration fee will be subsidised, and their new subsidised registration fee. All applicants must be informed of the timeframe in which they are expected to pay their registration fee. According to wishes of the Treasurer, a method of staggered payments may be an acceptable avenue of repayment.

a) Abuse of Subsidies process

If the Subsidy Panel discovers an abuse of the subsidy process (e.g. lying or intimidating others to not fill out the subsidy application form to better their own chances of receiving a subsidy), this may be reasonable grounds to decrease the amount by which that individual's registration fee may be subsidised. In extreme cases, this may be not allocating any subsidy at all.

It is important to note, once a subsidy is granted, it cannot be rescinded. This punitive punishment can only be put into effect when considering future subsidy requests.

Section 7.05 Confidentiality

a) Redacting personal details

It is suggested that only the Equity Team (where possible) has access to the submitted Subsidies application forms. As a result, should an applicant wish for their name (and other personal details) be redacted from the application list provided to the Subsidy Panel. The Equity Team should do their best to adhere to these wishes.

b) General confidentiality of Applicants

The Subsidy Panel is required to keep all information about applicants submitted in their application (including the names of applicants) confidential. Any attempt to break applicants' confidentiality could be grounds for dismissing that individual from the Subsidy Committee and/or dismissing them from the Society Committee.

Article VIII. Acknowledgements

The Equity Team would like to acknowledge the following documents which informed the creation of this Equity Policy: the Wollongong Easters 2017 Equity Policy, the University of Queensland 2017 Equity Policy and the WUDC 2018 Equity Policy and most of all the Sydney Easters 2018 Equity Policy.

ANU Debating would also like to acknowledge the work done by Rebecca Kriesler (President 2017, Easters Equity Officer 2018) in the formation of this policy.

Annex 1. List of Recognised Protected Attributes

The following list of protected attributes is not exhaustive and, on a case-by-case basis, the equity team may choose to recognise additional Protected Attributes.

- Age or age group
- Debating or adjudicating ability
- Disability (including but not limited to past, present and future disabilities, a genetic predisposition to a disability and behaviour that is a manifestation of a disability)
- Disease (e.g. HIV status)
- Educational history (e.g. Private/public/selective schooling education)
- Institutional affiliation
- Intersex status
- Gender identity or gender expression (the gender-related identity, appearance or mannerisms or other gender related characteristics of a person, including but not limited to the ways in which people express or present their gender and recognising that a person's gender identity may be an identity other than male or female.)
- Language Status or Proficiency (e.g. ESL/EFL status, presence of an accent, speech impediments)
- Marital or relationship status
- Pregnancy
- Race; colour; descent; national or ethnic origin; or ethno-religious background
- Religious affiliation; belief; views or practice
- Region of origin (e.g. rural areas/different states)
- Sex
- Sexual orientation (including but not limited to LGBTQI+ status)
- Sexual practices or experience (e.g. previous partner(s) or lack thereof)
- Socio-economic status and background

Conditionally Protected Attributes

In the context of debate, a small range of attributes (Conditionally Protected Attributes) may be open to respectful questioning or challenge but outside of debates will be treated as Protected Attributes.

These include:

- Debating or adjudicating ability
- Political affiliations, beliefs or ideologies

In the case where these are questioned in the context of debate, the challenge must be directed at the ideas presented. For example, it might be appropriate to say, "While the opposition believes Democracy to be prima facie good, we think that a democracy is only legitimate if it provides utilitarian benefit its citizens". However, it is never acceptable to say, "Given this was your second debate you can be forgiven for not understanding...". Ad hominem attacks based on identity will always constitute breaches of equity. Caution should always be taken in referencing Conditional Attributes and individuals should be constantly aware of how their words may affect others.

Annex 2. Definitions with Examples

Content Warning: This section deals with specific details of Bullying, Direct and Indirect Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Victimisation and Vilification

Bullying

Bullying is the repeated, unreasonable behaviour by an individual or group, directed towards another individual or group, either physical or psychological in nature, that intimidates, offends, degrades, humiliates, undermines or threatens. This includes pressuring another person or group of people to do something that they are uncomfortable with.

Examples include: ridiculing of an individual or group on the basis of Protected Attributes; repeated demeaning remarks about an individual's debating performance, personality or looks; gossiping about or excluding an individual on the basis of a Protected Attribute.

Direct Discrimination

Direct discrimination is unreasonably treating an individual or group less favourably than another individual or group on the basis of a Protected Attribute in the same circumstances or circumstances not materially different.

Examples include: adjudicators penalising speakers on the basis of Protected Attributes, socially excluding individuals on the basis of Protected Attributes, questioning a speaker's ability or success on the basis of a Protected Attribute.

Harassment

Harassment is any unwelcome, offensive, abusive, belittling or threatening behaviour that humiliates, offends or intimidates an individual or group.

Examples include: sexist, racist, homophobic language or language otherwise offensive to individuals on the basis of Protected Attributes; physical threats; repeated unwanted and intrusive questions about Protected Attributes (e.g. their sexual history, sexual preferences, details of their religious beliefs).

Note that sexual harassment has a specific meaning as any unwelcome sexual advance, request for sexual favours or any other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature that humiliates, offends or intimidates a person and which a reasonable person, having regard to all the circumstances, would anticipate making the person feel humiliated, offended or intimidated.

Examples include: Inappropriate touching; verbal sexual advances or propositions; making derogatory comments or jokes of a sexual nature; displaying sexually suggestive content; sending intimate images of another person to others without their consent; sending intimate images of yourself to another person without their consent.

Indirect Discrimination

Indirect discrimination is unreasonably imposing, or proposing to impose, a requirement, condition or practice that has, or is likely to have the effect of disadvantaging an individual or group with a particular protected attribute, and which is not reasonable in the circumstances.

Examples Include:

Victimisation

Victimisation is to cause detriment to a person because that person has made an Equity Claim, taken part in claims proceedings or expressed dissatisfaction with a situation or the behaviour of an individual or group.

Examples include: breaking anonymity of claimants, ridiculing claimants, gossiping about claims procedures, discouraging or intimidating individuals from making claims.

Vilification

Vilification is the public incitement of hatred, contempt or severe ridicule of another individual or group.

Examples include: ridiculing an individual on the basis of a Protected Attribute (e.g. their preferred gender pronouns, sexuality, religious or cultural clothing) or asserting offensive stereotypes about a group or individual.

Annex III: Canberra Specific External Support Organisation Contact Details

Listed are a number of professional services designed to help in various circumstances of need.

- Lifeline - 13 11 14
 - Lifeline is a national charity providing all Australians experiencing a personal crisis with access to 24-hour crisis support and suicide prevention services.
 - Open 24/7
- Beyond Blue - 1300 22 4636
 - Beyondblue provides information and support to help everyone in Australia achieve their best possible mental health, whatever their age and wherever they live.
 - You can call, chat online, or email. There is also support for people whose first language is not English <https://www.beyondblue.org.au/get-sup.../get-immediate-support>
- ANU Counselling - 02 6125 2442
 - Free and confidential counselling is available on campus for all currently enrolled ANU students, including ANU College students.
 - Open 9am-5pm Monday-Friday.
- ANUSA Student Assistance - 02 6125 2444
 - The ANUSA Student Assistance Officers are able to support and assist students with various issues including financial, academic or advocacy issues. The service is confidential and free. They can be also be contacted via email: sa.assistance@anu.edu.au
 - Open 9am-5pm Monday-Friday
- 1800 RESPECT - 1800 737 732
 - 1800 RESPECT offers support options for people experiencing sexual, domestic and family violence. If you or someone you know is experiencing violence or abuse, you can contact 1800RESPECT on 1800 737 732 or through online chat at <https://chat.1800respect.org.au/.../c.../initialinformation.aspx>.
 - Open 24/7
- Q Life - 1800 184 527 (or contact online chat)
 - QLife is Australia's first nationally-oriented counselling and referral service for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) people. Online chat - <https://qlife.org.au/#contact>