

# MINUTES IDEA GA

*AUGUST 27, 2014*

## PRESENT

Virginija Paksiene (Board, EDC Lithuania), Alena Stefanovich (Belarus), Olena Zyma (New Vision, Ukraine), Maryna Teplova (New Vision, Ukraine), Stefan Ristovski (Macedonia), Harry Mystakelis (DSG, Greece), Marija Maksimova (OK, Serbia), Michal Adam (SDA, Slovakia), Yvonne Heselmans (ED IDEA NL), Vojtech Cerny (ADK, Czech Republic), Andrej Schulcz (Board, Slovakia), Anne Valkering (IDEA NL).

## VOTES/ABSENCE/MEMBERS

- DC gives proxy to ADK
- ARDOR gives proxy to SDA
- EDS gives proxy to SDA
- EDC gives proxy to New Vision
- FOKAL has given proxy to OK
- VDCH not present at roll call
- Debate Association Turkey not present
- CKD not present
- ACCD not present
- Debate in Civil Society Public Union National Debate Center Azerbaijan not present but tries via Skype

Debate Association Turkey has not been present for two years in a row. They were unable to attend due to visa issues.

**Action:** Yvonne Heselmans should alert the Debate Association Turkey that they have not attended and that they need to be present at the GA in 2015 in order to avoid losing their membership.

VDCH has been accepted as member for IDEA in spring. The president has had to miss out on the meeting, but they are sending a proxy from Vienna

**Action:** Andrej Schulcz will send VDCH the membership questionnaire

Yvonne mentions that potential new members from Slovenia, Poland and Finland have been identified and we are working with them on a new project.

## MINUTES 2013

Adopted

## IDEA NL REPORT

This is discussed in the annual narrative report and budget 2013, progress on narrative and budget 2014, plus the annual plan narrative and budget 2015.

**Action:** Yvonne Heselmans confirms that she will gather information from members about their fundraising results, and share fundraising leads with members (action from 2013)

### **Discussion:** Fundraising

A lot of fundraising is focused on EU, a lot of IDEA NL activities are focused on the Netherlands: a lot of money spent on a country or countries that are not the most in need. We should focus a lot more on funding that non-EU countries can participate in as they are some of the most needy. IDEA NL should facilitate the fundraising for these organisations, not only with Dutch embassy, but also with USAID, NED, UN bodies, etc.

On the other hand, IDEA NL's survival depends on having Dutch activities. And they are not just Dutch activities, but Western-Europe focused. IDEA NL does attempt to include non-EU partners but we are lacking in that department and would like to develop further. Equally, IDEA SEE do local activities and own projects that focus on their own sustainability, they should probably use local trainers from our members more, like IDEA NL should.

Eastern European Associations are often more developed than Western European ones (if they exist at all). IDEA NL should probably also try to help these organisations (and entice them into) going for further association development.

Members should notify IDEA when they need international partners, so we can facilitate and help. UK democracy might be another option. Members can also do their own international applications, like EDS and SDA do with IDEA. In international projects, does IDEA have a responsibility to include everyone in the project (even if the circumstances are more difficult in some cases)? Does IDEA have an obligation to do the work for members, or should the members be the ones pitching ideas to IDEA?

It is definitely somewhere in between. IDEA should seek more international donors than the EU, should seek opportunities for all international members, not just the EU. But IDEA should aim to organise at least one international event which all members can attend per year.

In addition, we should use European projects that got accepted to then just aid Macedonia, or Ukraine to participate in the same project with financial aid. For example the ready-made application can be sent out to partners outside of the EU so that they can apply for other funds so they can participate in the projects if they want to.

[Break]

**The annual report for 2013 is approved** (three votes are absent, other than that, all in favour).

### **Discussion:** Sharing information on fundraising

We decided to share fundraising information, unfortunately has not happened. IDEA Central has proposed the same for the IDEA entities.

Proposal 1: the database of potential donor options is shared between IDEA members and entities: all can update and share information on donors, and get information from it. This proposal seems acceptable in to all.

Proposal 2: the members share accepted proposal with all other members.

Discussion: do we want to share with all members, even if they do not find the IDEA membership all that important. Or do we share the information after asking who is interested to participate and needs to do more fundraising and then share the full grant application. The latter is status quo. Share some information, a draft of the application (make some kind of form). Too sensitive to share the whole application. In that case we should stick to the IDEA Central thing,

Should we do this when we start writing or when we have handed in the application. Or when we have a full concept in mind. Should you have obligation before? Probably yes. But then people can delay until after.

The IDEA member questionnaire could be a useful medium. But they don't do the next year. First: old projects in the member questionnaire, then ask for what project proposal.

IDEA NL should definitely send out their concept notes to all members even if they are not eligible. But clearly indicate who is eligible.

**Resolution:** IDEA entities and IDEA members should share information on international fundraising not only on activities that they have pursued but also on current international fundraising when they consider the time to be right.

Adopted unanimously

## IDEA CENTRAL

Based on presentation

The future of the network of IDEA entities is not entirely clear. OSF seems to be moving out slowly, even though they have committed to further institutional funding to IDEA entities at the moment. There is a possibility of not having any OSF funding for IDEA NL after 2015.

**Action:** IDEA NL Board will paint a few scenarios and will start to explore the options.

## MEMBERS AND PARTNERS POLICY

See proposal document

Notes: non-debate organisations should not become observers, only partners. Observers are, to an extent, potential partners.

### **Discussion:**

What kind of organisation is allowed in, local ones in one city (in say Istanbul) or not? One debate club is not usually allowed in, unless they have a network of smaller clubs, so maybe one umbrella for all of Istanbul could become a member, but not one university club.

The amount of 10000 is too high: it is something OK for example barely achieves. We can change it. There is, however, also an apply-and-explain policy: if an organisation does not achieve the requirements, they can explain on the basis of the application.

This applies to existing members as well as new members.

Benefits for voting members, are they enough? Add: access to IDEA leads on fundraising, concept notes and project proposals. License to work with, adapt and translate IDEA manuals and resources of those of other members. Also add: help from IDEA with grant-writing and expertise deposition. Not just preferred partners, but also help for fundraising. We should add these in test/shadow mode for one year and then add them next year.

Requirements these are Board suggestions: we would want to receive the statutes of all members, adhere to a code of communications (discussed of GA), refraining from funding political parties. Are we ok with the Board setting them? Yes. They seem reasonable.

**Note:** we should come up with policies on when to use the IDEA logo at events (that are not already projects of IDEA). Members should also not misinterpret what IDEA membership is (and is not). Problem: we don't own the brand.

**Motion:** IDEA GA takes note of the "*Members and partner of IDEA NL discussion paper*" and asks the Board to further report on the development of the internal procedures that result from it.

**Addition:** the network does not currently require members to sign a document on their membership. This should be created as it is useful for EU applications and audits. It would be an open, principled document. The new requirements will also be part of the new member applications.

The GA thinks the addition is a good idea.

The GA also agrees unanimously with the motion.

## CHANGES IN STATUTES

The document was sent out to the members and is now up for discussion

**Motion:** The notary should be able to adjust the document and the changes to be more in line with legal/Dutch standards keeping the spirit of the document in mind.

**Motion:** Yvonne Heselmans and Ton Sonneveldt have the authority to approve the document.

**Motion:** Yvonne Heselmans and Ton Sonneveldt should be able to sign the document.

**Motion:** the GA has to accept this proposal. If there are any deviations between this and the final one. The ED and Board have to come back to the members to justify the changes.

We vote on these points when we approve the general document.

The GA votes to approve the changes in the statutes as presented by Yvonne and Andrej (and annexed in the documents for the GA). This was approved unanimously.

## DEVELOPMENT GLOBAL YOUTH FORUM

Anne has done a survey of IDEA organisers and trainers of Youth Forums past, and presented their ideas to the IDEA Central Board. She looked into the feasibility of holding a Global Youth Forum and what potential changes should be considered. The proposal has been sent to the Board of IDEA Central and awaits approval. At the moment, it was too late to try organise a GYF2015, but a European Youth Forum would be possible for 2015 and is something we are trying to achieve.

If any members are interested in hosting a European Youth Forum, they are very welcome to contact Anne.

## EUROPEAN YOUTH FORUM

The European Youth Forum is a European Youth Council of National Youth Councils and other umbrella organisations. It is an important avenue for the EU to contact youth, it has some influence over European organisations. It is known to be slightly bureaucratic, and one needs to be active to be a part of that influencing of the EU. The organisation also offers training opportunities. IDEA would become an observer. We have applied for that status. If they are positive, they want to have interviews with members or potentially also GA members.

Question: do you agree with this process or have concerns?

Why only observer: we do not qualify for all rules and may not qualify for all requirements.

The GA generally agrees.

## PLAN FOR 2015

Questions: What were your own expectations before the meeting? How shall we share information? Is IDEA focusing on the right things, should IDEA focus more on the network?

Talking points:

### DIVISION OF ROLES FOR 2015 (ON SHARING INFORMATION)

Every member appoints people to collect info about topics, IDEA monitors, but a coordinator can be from member as well, we collect the data in one spot and share it with all members via some online tool.

### *WHAT SHOULD WE SHARE?*

Programs:

- university
- high school
- teachers
- debate trainers and judges
- non-school debate (DIN)

- public debates

PR/marketing:

- Promote past event, with some form, request on a monthly basis, so that it can be promoted on the website.
- Gather information about future events
- Which other IDEA members participate in the event

Fundraising:

- Share summary or draft of proposals

Evaluations:

- Results from evaluations
- Tools of evaluations

Evaluations can also be shared for each of the program topics.

What should be shared:

- News
- Materials
- Structure of program
- Training modules
- Knowhow for workshops
- Event knowhow
- Evaluation forms
- Quality criteria
- Risk management procedures
- PR/media things to show off your successes

Which tool should we use – technically

**Action:** Yvonne or Andrej will ask IDEA Central to expand Basecamp – we have an account there

We can also use it for joint projects.

**Action:** Yvonne will also share a list of all products that IDEA has made and will ask members to show which of these products they use, so as to show off how strong the members are. Andrej will use this list in IDEA Central discussions.

Who should lead some of these things

Marija: university and trainers (so 2 different ones)

Virginija: teachers

Anne: pr/marketing

Harry: high school

Yvonne: DIN

Stefan: fundraising

Those that get these tasks should make some sort of schedule for what they are going to collect

### *EVALUATION PROJECT*

A number of projects have been started, and the results and methodology should be shared. In addition, we have the proposal for Erasmus+ that we are hopeful to get and October 1 is the next deadline. IDEA NL, Anne will assemble a track record in November and December. This will be on the basis of evaluations shared, and also numbers and information over the last 15 years. But the last 5 years are the most essential. On top of that make clear structural changes on the basis of your projects. The best would be to provide external evaluations, but this is probably not possible.

**Action:** IDEA NL will share a questionnaire the first week of October. Members respond in 6 weeks

### *QUARTERLY MEMOS*

Various IDEA entities already share information about their activities on a monthly basis. We can use a similar template for these quarterly updates.

It would be a good idea to share this between members in addition to the annual survey and to share it between all members initially, if someone is unresponsive, we cut them (and inform them of that).

We could ask the IDEA entities to share their memos on a quarterly basis with the members, in exchange for receiving this from the members.

Both ideas are agreed upon unanimously.

Content proposal: IDEA will send a format, members can add chapters. It is always: past programs, future projects, fundraising successes.

**Motion:** Yvonne sends members a quarterly form that they reply to. These will be shared among the members (until some turn out to be unresponsive) and IDEA entities, the second will only receive when they share their own memos in return.

## ANNUAL PLAN

**Addition:** try to set up a (small) fundraising training or expertise sharing by an expert should be sought. Preferably an external expert

**Addition:** we set up a shared quarterly memo

**Addition:** we set up a sharing system

**Addition:** IDEA starts gathering a track record

The annual plan is unanimously accepted with the additions

## BOARD ELECTIONS

Elect two new members, unless a third person gets a majority of the votes. GA agreed.

Candidates are: Ioan Nascu, Jens Fischer, Lazar Pop Ivanov, Michael-Sam Vidza, Nadina Balagic.

Votes first round:

Ioan Nascu 7 votes

Jens Fischer 10 votes

Lazar Pop Ivanov 11 votes

Michael-Sam Vidza 0 votes

Nadina Balagic 2 votes

Three Board members elected, Lazar Pop Ivanov, Jens Fischer and Ioan Nascu.

## STRATEGIC GOALS FOR IDEA (TO PASS ON TO BOARD)

Topics to be discussed

- Debate in curriculum
- Capacity development
- Fundraising and diversifying dependency

## CURRICULUM

A lot of members seem to aim to include debate in curriculum. We should as a network spend some time to think about how to get into institutions. One step could be an evaluation of the effects on our students. There are different situations in different countries, and different barriers. Estonia does have it in the curriculum. IDEA NL should most of all be a repository of knowledge, help with preparations, and to support the program.

Evaluation has the highest priority in that case.

Alena can assist with this process as she helped with an education project that was introduced in Ukraine.

We should also promote this goal of getting debate in the curriculum with IDEA Central and all the other IDEA entities. It is almost more essential than DIN, because in many countries the education system and curriculum is not suited for debate and the skills taught in debate are very important for the future of young people.

Hard to come from outside of the system, but first need more teachers on board before you can get this to happen. Teachers need to be convinced, not necessarily debate teachers.

We need to explain debate to outsiders, who often seem to be put off by debate. What can we do to make debate more attractive to outsiders. Show how it is done, or how to add things to what we do? Suggestions: doing public debate well (add a judging to it). Trainings: maybe not just train argumentation but teach a bit about politics, public discussion, teaching how to evaluate it, spotting demagoguery, analyse news articles. Discuss what is enough? Teach how to be understanding and informed citizens, or make people active citizens. And what steps are necessary.

We should probably also look at the background of the situation: what kind of barriers do we experience, why do we not get debate in to the curriculum? Find out from different partners. Also ask for successes: who can help, in what way?

**Action:** Yvonne should take the inclusion of promotion of debate into curriculum in the programmatic strategy of all of the IDEAs, and should use the members' input.

**Action:** Yvonne will seek out teacher associations in history and geography and reach out to them. And also to the (v)mbo council which is working on introducing debate in their curriculums.

**Action:** set up a questionnaire or sharing of experience on how to achieve this debate in the curriculum