

Colleagues:

As I reported in an earlier message, the members of the Faculty Council, elected by the faculty business meeting at the Model, have been working over the summer to update some of the procedures at the Washington MOAS. We had imposed a deadline of September 1 for our work, and we came close. Here is my report to you, on behalf of the Faculty Council.

To remind you, we met in Washington in late July and addressed an agenda of well over a dozen topics, including reorganizing the parent organization which sponsors the Model; working to increase student involvement in the management of the Model - the initial impetus for this being the Resolution passed by the General Committee at the closing of last April's model; working with the Fairmont Hotel to see what our arrangements would be and for how long we would be able to meet there; meeting with Irene Klinger and Nelly Robinson of the OAS; and dealing with the elephant in the room, which is the fact that many students were not able to present their work at the Model, which is where I will begin.

The major problem facing the Model OAS in the past couple of years has been our inability to make sure that each student was able to present his or her work during the Model. As some of you with more experience know, when the Model had few universities participating, steps were taken to increase the time available for students to present, and the length of the model was reduced by one day. But with our full roster the past couple of years, the same structures have produced a glut of work to be presented, and too little time in which to have it all introduced formally. That is of course unfair to students who have prepared hard for the Model. In addition to hearing from several of you during the Model last April, we also had feedback from the OAS about the concern this situation caused in some delegations.

Solving this conundrum was at the heart of all our efforts this summer, and we have made several changes that we think will ensure progress. We began with Stuart Voss's proposal to revise Article 43 of the Rules, as a way of ensuring that each delegation would get at least one item presented to the Model - you will recall that he introduced this at our faculty meeting last April. But we quickly realized that we wanted to take even more dramatic steps to increase the probability that ALL items would be presented to the Model, so we went in a different direction than Stuart's original proposal suggested.

Let me summarize some changes for you, all of which are described in more detail in the 2010 edition of the Rules of Procedure, now (or very soon to be) visible on the WMOAS home page on the Internet. I urge you to print a copy of the Rules so you can see the different dimensions I will describe only briefly here. There are many changes to the Rules, and there may be some initial confusion because of the number of changes we've made. You will need to take some time to become familiar with some new concepts and procedures.

First, there are now two acceptable Items that students may present to the Model: Proposed Draft Resolutions and White Papers. Since we all know about PDRs, I will describe White Papers as research documents that a) focus on the agenda topic as a general question, and b) present the position of the delegation regarding that agenda topic. A White Paper is a delegation's attempt to help the other delegations deliberate, by providing sound research information. A White Paper requires no action by the Committee: it is presented, there is a statement by the delegate (like the Proponent Statement for a PDR), and there is a Question Period (as with PDRs). There is neither debate or amendments, nor voting. White Papers, because they seek to provide a solid basis for subsequent deliberation, will be presented first in the schedule, i.e. prior to the consideration of any PDRs. For the 2010 model, White Papers are limited only to the General Committee, as a pilot year.

The Order of Precedence in the past has been used to organize seating and the order of voting, and for replacing missing Vice-Chairs of committees. Beginning in 2010, the Order of Precedence will also be the basis for the order of presentation of Items in Committee. All White Papers will be presented on the first agenda topic (again, only for the General Committee in 2010), then all on the second topic, and so on, until all White Papers have been presented. Each subset (by topic) will be presented according to the Order of Precedence. Once the committee moves into the PDRs, those too will be presented according to the Order of Precedence, which means the agenda topics will fluctuate. If a delegation has two items to introduce in a committee, as most do, the delegation will choose which of the two items will be introduced in the first round of the Order of Precedence. There is a new procedure set up to record those choices as early as possible, so all delegates will be able to know well ahead of time the calendar of business. Finally on this topic, the Packets of Items will be organized NOT in the order of presentation of Items, but probably alphabetically by member state.

The three packets of Items are now called the Electronic Packet, the Working Group Packet, and the Washington Packet, roughly corresponding to what we used to call the First, Second, and Third Packets. The schedule of the Model (the Program), will label an early committee session as a Working Group session, so that those PDRs will be ensured of an earlier presentation slot. That Working Group session will therefore interrupt the normal flow of the Order of Precedence, and it too will have its business (Working Group PDRs) presented according to the status in the Order of Precedence of the first sponsor delegation. A delegation assigned to a Working Group is now assured of having a chance to present the resulting PDR earlier in the Model.

The Question Period on all Items (White Papers and PDRs) is now strictly limited to three questions. It is the sense of the Faculty Council that questions, to the extent possible, should be addressed in Caucus sessions. We hope this change will dramatically increase the odds that all Items will be presented at the Model. We will urge Chairs of Committees, and we will remind all delegates, that if there are more serious questions of concern about a PDR, that there is a procedure for tabling a

PDR so that it can be addressed in a Caucus session. There is also a clear process for recovering an item from the table and reintroducing it to the calendar. These procedures, including updating the calendar of Items as well as managing any tabled PDRs, will allow Chairs to exercise clear leadership.

On every PDR introduced, at the end of the Question Period, the Chair will ask the committee if there is any objection to unanimous consensus on the PDR on the floor. If there is any objection to an automatic unanimous vote in favor of the PDR, then the Chair will immediately continue with the normal process of creating a Speakers List, etc. (The delegation objecting need not and indeed cannot provide an explanation.) If there is NO objection to unanimous consent – which could indicate excellent work by delegates in an organization based on consensus – then the PDR will be considered as adopted by consensus, and there will be no need for a Speakers List, debate, or voting.

These and a couple of other relatively minor steps are being taken with two goals in mind: making sure that all students get to present their material and retaining the educational quality of the experience. Hence, we decided early on NOT to reduce the number of PDRs, but rather to change the structures somewhat to ensure, hopefully, that we can save enough time on procedures in order to get everyone's efforts presented to the Model. We will have a member of the Faculty Council in each committee throughout the Model, to monitor how these changes work, and we'll have, I'm sure, a spirited discussion of these changes at the faculty business meeting during next April's Model.

In addition to those changes in the Model itself, we have re-instituted Awards! Awards will be based solely on the written content of Proposed Draft Resolutions, not on the presentation or disposition of the PDR. Nor will awards be based on student performance during the Model generally, because of the difficulties of monitoring this process. There will be one Best PDR Award for each of the five committees, and these will be recognized during the closing ceremonies. The procedure for nominating and choosing these Awards is described in the revised Rules of Procedure – toward the very end of that document.

We are instituting an academic Journal, which in its first issue will likely be the Proceedings of the upcoming Model. PDRs that earn the awards mentioned above will automatically be published in the Journal, and we hope that White Papers will also be published in the Journal on a regular basis. The Faculty Council made this decision in order to emphasize the educational nature of the WMOAS, and is committed to doing the extra work that this new venture entails. We are hoping for a physical Journal, not solely an electronic Journal, and we hope for blind reviewing of White Papers as soon as that can be implemented. We hope students will see the opportunity here for enhancing their CV as they consider graduate school options. We hope that potential publication of a White Paper will induce students to submit these as Items for the Model, which will help reduce the time spent on debate, which in turn will help ensure that all PDRs get considered.

On the question of overall student involvement in the management of the Model, the Coordinators will issue a separate document, but the Rules will show that the major officers of the model are now to be consulted on planning, on maintaining decorum and appropriate behavior in Washington, and on the details of the “Crisis” scenario that will be presented to the Model at some point during the proceedings. In other words, we want the student leaders to help us plan future Models as well as to help the Coordinators implement a successful Model while it is in session.

The parent faculty organization that sponsors the Model has been the Inter-American Institute for Diplomacy. For a variety of reasons, the Faculty Council has opted to create a new organization from scratch, to be called the Institute for Diplomatic Dialogue in the Americas, IDDA. We are now in the process of incorporating that entity, which once organized, will apply for tax-free status with the U.S. government and will apply for Civil Society status with the OAS. We will be sharing the bylaws of this organization, once they are completed – we opted to work more intensively on the Model itself this summer, so we exempted our work on the new IDDA from the September 1 deadline. Rest assured that you will be kept apprised of these efforts.

Finally, the Fairmont Hotel, in spite of some noise issues during the first night of last year’s Model, welcomes us back with open arms, and has indicated that we are likely to be invited for future years as well. This of course is based on the presumption of a total absence of noise issues this coming year. You will hear more about this in future communications, but I want to stress how important it is that you and your students maintain proper diplomatic decorum at the Hotel. We will be asking the student officers of the Model to join us in enforcing these provisions.

I’m sorry for the length of this message, but the volume of changes and the urgency of our concern that all students get to present their work necessitates considerable detail in our report to you of our efforts. I urge you to read the new Rules of Procedure, which hopefully will answer questions that may arise concerning these changes. But if after reading the Rules of Procedure, 2010 edition, you have other questions, please do not hesitate to address them to myself, the Coordinators, or the other members of the Faculty Council.

Bob Trudeau

Faculty Council Chair