



SYDNEY UNIVERSITY LAW SOCIETY INC.
ABN 49 844 560 526

Minutes of Executive Meeting held on **24/10/2022**

Chair: Ben Hines

Minute taker: Eden McSheffrey

Meeting opened: **9:12pm**

Present:

Ben Hines	President
Irene Ma	Vice President (Education)
Thrishank Chintamaneni	Vice President (Careers)
Naz Sharifi	Vice President (Social Justice)
Julia Tran	Treasurer
Eden McSheffrey	Secretary
Harriet Walker	Competitions Director
Maja Vasic	Competitions Director
Grace Wong	Socials Director
Vivienne Davies	Socials Director
Onor Nottle	Campus Director
Adam Schaffer	Sports Director
Ariana Haghighi	Publications Director
Michelle Chim	International Student Officer
Grace Wallman	Disabilities Officer
Edward Ford	Queer Officer
Julia Lim	Marketing Director

Absent: Kelly Ma, Justine Hu

Apologies: Yijun Cui, Elizabeth Nutting, Nishta Gupta

Late:

Early Departures: Grace Wong (9:58pm),
Vivienne Davies (10:07pm)



MINUTES

1 Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and delivered an Acknowledgement of Country.

Motion: That Yijun Cui, Elizabeth Nutting, and Nishta Gupta's apologies be accepted.

Moved: Thrishank Chintamaneni

Seconded: Adam Schaffer

The motion was carried unanimously with zero absences.

No conflicts of interest were declared at the outset of the meeting.

2 Procedural matters

Eden notified the Chair that three valid signed proxy forms (**Appendix A**) have been sent to him prior to the meeting pursuant to standing orders 50 and 51 within the Constitution:

- Elizabeth Nutting has nominated Adam Schaffer to vote on her behalf for all matters in this meeting.
- Nishta Gupta has nominated Naz Sharifi to vote on her behalf for all matters in this meeting.
- Yijun Cui has nominated Maja Vasic to vote on her behalf for: Valedictorian Nominations and Competitions Bylaw Amendments.

Motion: That both sets of minutes from 17 October be amended to include Maja's shoutout that Harriet looked 'hot at law ball'.

Moved: Maja Vasic

Seconded: Edward Ford

The motion was carried.

Motion: That the public minutes from the Executive Meeting held 17 October 2022 be approved as a correct and accurate record of the meeting.

Moved: Maja Vasic

Seconded: Ariana Haghighi

The motion was carried unanimously.

Motion: That the in camera minutes from the Executive Meeting held 17 October 2022 be approved as a correct and accurate record of the meeting, and that those minutes remain in camera.

Moved: Thrishank Chintamaneni

Seconded: Ariana Haghighi

The motion was carried unanimously.

3 Last week updates/shoutouts

- Maja shouted out Ariana for winning IV client interviewing and Irene for her great result in Negotiations. Maja also shouted out Eden for helping out with the Bylaws.



- Edward shouted out Naz for being a client for Rainbow CI and Ariana for writing every question and judging the semifinals.
- Ben shouted out Irene, Grace Wa., and Ariana for helping to draft a number of C&S nominations for the USU, Justine for her design work, Naz and Julia Lim for being the 2023 Executive, the members of the 2022 Executive for everything they have done this year, and Eden for his 'undying minuting'.
- Naz shouted out Nishta for running a fantastic ethnocultural panel earlier today.
- Grace Wa. shouted out Justine for her design work.

4 What's on this week

1. **Mon:** Just Defence Lawyers Criminal Law Moot Grand Final
2. **Tues:** Ashurst Client Interviewing Grand Final
3. **Wed:** Disability Inclusion Action Plan Consultative Session 3
4. **Thurs:** Gummow Equity Moot
5. **Fri:** Final Year Dinner
6. **Mon:**

5 Portfolio updates

Adam updated the Executive on the success of SULS Interfaculty sport this year. He noted there is one round left on 2 November but that we placed second behind Engineering.

Irene noted that Arasa Hardie and Chris Mueller have done a survey to get Students' ideas on how SULS and Faculty does, and how we can improve for the next year. Irene noted last year there was a competition with a free coffee incentive – she asked if the Executive were happy to do a similar thing this year. Ben said that sounds like a good idea. Julia T said that sounds fine.

Harriet noted Comps has set Tuesday 29 November as the date for the competitions dinner. She noted that it will be at Hotel CBD fourth floor and encouraged the Executive to attend.

6 USU C&S Awards

Ben noted that we nominated SULS for a number of awards at C&S. He said if the Executive is free Thursday night they should attend the awards ceremony.

7 Valedictorian Voting

Ben thanked Grace Wo. and Vivienne for organising this. Ben noted that he doesn't believe the Executive should be voting for Valedictorian but that we have to this year given precedent. He said his recommendation next year is to look into alternatives. Ben explained the procedure for the vote. Ben also noted that there are potentially a lot of conflicts so we have to trust each other and use the three criteria under the nominations: academics, life and spirit of the cohort, and co-curricular achievements.

Motion: To conduct the Valedictorian votes as a secret ballot.

Moved: Ben Hines

Seconded: Vivienne Davies

The motion was carried unanimously with zero abstentions.



Motion: That the SULLS executive waives the need to conflict off the vote given the unavoidable conflicts this vote presents as members of the law school.

Moved: Ben Hines

Seconded: Eden McSheffrey

The motion was carried unanimously with zero abstentions.

Aryan Mohseni was voted in as the LLB Valedictorian.

Irene Ma was voted in as the JD Valedictorian.

Ben congratulated them both for this result.

8 Comps bylaw amendments <3

Harriet and Maja distributed a proposed amendments document to the Executive (**Appendix B**) and discussed the amendments they are moving. They also thanked Eden for helping with drafting the motions.

They noted the first amendment's purpose is to combine a rule for simplicity and also to add a specification that the Competitions Directors can amend the Competitions Rules and that they are binding on competitors.

Old Clauses	New Clause
<p>4. Only students enrolled with the Sydney Law School are eligible to take part in a SULLS competition, internal or external. This extends to cohorts enrolled in degrees such as the Master of Laws or Legal Profession Admission Board's Diploma in Law.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>6. Only students enrolled with the Sydney Law School are eligible to be part of the Competitions Committee.</p>	<p>4A. The SULLS Competition Rules are binding on all participants in internal and intervarsity competitions, including competitors, coaches, judges, and third-party selectors.</p> <p>4B. The Competitions Directors have the power to amend the Competitions Rules for any purpose and at any time, provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The updated Competitions Rules are published on the SULLS Website and distributed in the SULLS Weekly as soon as is practicable. <p>4C. Only students enrolled with the Sydney Law School are eligible to take part in a SULLS competition, internal or external, or to be a part of the Competitions Committee. This extends to cohorts enrolled in degrees such as the Master of Laws or Legal Profession Admission Board's Diploma in Law.</p>



Harriet then discussed the proposed amendment to clause 5, designed to take out the 'enough numbers' requirements and adjust to encompass a broader scope of what competitions does.

Old Clause	New Clause
5. At their discretion, the Competitions Directors may establish a competition solely for a particular cohort or degree if sufficient numbers are found. The sufficient number shall be determined at the discretion of the Competitions Directors.	5. At their absolute discretion, the Competitions Directors may establish a competition solely for a particular cohort or degree, or for students belonging to a particular identity group.

Maja noted the next amendment is mostly paraphrasing. She also noted clashes don't impact a lot of people.

Old Clause	New Clause
7. Students may participate in more than one competition per semester. However, where there is a clash with respect to dates from Quarter Final stage onward (inclusive), Convenors may make alternative arrangements at their discretion. There is no obligation upon Convenors to do so and students must accept the binding nature of dates that are given to them.	7. Students may participate in more than one competition per semester. However, where there is a clash with respect to dates from the Quarter Final stage onwards (inclusive), the Competitions Directors are under no obligation to accommodate a student's participation in multiple competitions, and may make alternative arrangements at their absolute discretion.

Maja discussed the next amendment which is more substantive, about who can and cannot re-enter a competition. She noted some skills competitions run with senior and junior divisions and that this gets complex. She said further detail is included in the Competitions Rules and that they want to take this out of the bylaws because there are other eligibility requirements within the Competitions Rules and it is inflexible to impose these rules in relation to semi-finals. Harriet also noted under the Competitions Rules, the directors can waive eligibility requirements and that the content of clauses 8 and 9 are more suited to be in the competitions rules.

Old Clauses	New Clause
8. Subject to added restrictions in the Competitions Rules, any competitor who has progressed to the Semi-Final stage of an internal mooting competition is ineligible to re-enter that same competition in subsequent years.	8. Subject to added restrictions in the Competitions Rules, any competitor who has progressed to the Semi-Final stage of an internal mooting competition is ineligible to re-enter that same competition in subsequent years.
9. Any competitor who has participated in the Junior pool of a skills competition is eligible to re-enter the competition in its next season,	9. Any competitor who has participated in the Junior pool of a skills competition is eligible to



provided that they enter the Senior pool.	<p>re-enter the competition in its next season, provided that they enter the Senior pool.</p> <p>6A. A student's eligibility to participate in a particular competition shall be determined according to the SULLS Competition Rules. Any disputes arising as to eligibility under the SULLS Competition Rules shall be finally determined by the Competitions Directors.</p>
---	--

Maja noted that the next amendments outline and clarify the discretion of the Competitions Directors to appoint coaches and judges or third-party selectors. She noted the criteria and an outline for personal suitability. They noted that there are obviously some people who might be qualified to judge or coach a competition but there may be concerns about how they interact with competitors or younger students.

They wanted to introduce the personal suitability basis to ensure that if there are concerns about how people will coach or judge that the Directors can prevent them from doing so. They emphasised that a lot of knowledge is informally acquired in Competitions and second that judging/coaching is a privilege which we can grant but there is no entitlement to these things. Harriet also noted the power dynamics which exist between older students and younger students especially in a competitions context, and that it is important to recognise this dynamic and take things like personal suitability into account. She noted that formalising this discretion is a really important amendment they want to implement.

The Competitions Directors also discussed proposed clause 9B, which requires them to create a feedback form about judges. The purpose of formalising this is to ensure there are records of things occurring in competitions and to have a designated process around this. They explained this is a way to make complaints more accessible and ensures people feel supported within Competitions. Maja noted that In practice the vast majority of feedback they receive is related to someone's judging.

The Competitions Directors discussed the final amendment 9C, which recognises that the previous bylaws give the directors quite a broad discretion to exclude people so 9C is designed to accord procedural fairness while also retaining the fact that particulars do not have to be given to protect any people who come forward with personal complaints. They noted that they expect this to be a rare occurrence but that we need procedures to be in place.

Old Clause	New Clause
	8A. Current or former students of Sydney Law School, legal professionals, and any other suitably-qualified persons may be appointed as judges, coaches, and/or third-party selectors.



9A. The Competitions Directors retain the absolute discretion to appoint judges, coaches, and third-party selectors, having regard to criteria such as:

- a) The candidate's experience in the relevant competition;
- b) The candidate's experience judging, coaching, or selecting, whether in the relevant competition or otherwise; and
- c) The candidate's personal suitability as a judge, coach or third-party selector, especially having regard to the potential power dynamics that exist between these roles with respect to competitors.

Where there are no suitable candidates, the Competitions Directors may choose not to appoint a judge, coach or third-party selector.

9B. The Competitions Directors shall make a feedback form available to competitors, providing them with the opportunity to raise any concerns regarding judges and/or coaches.

- (a) Unless consent is obtained from competitors, feedback will be shared only among the Competitions Directors and the Equity Officer. However, the Competitions Directors may consider any feedback received when assessing a candidate's suitability as a coach, judge or third-party selector, under Clause 9A.

9C. If a person is rejected as a coach, judge or third-party selector under Clause 9A, they may request the reasons for this decision by emailing the Competitions Directors at competitions@suls.org.au. Any request for reasons under this clause must be made within seven (7) days from the time that the person was informed of their rejection. The Competitions Directors must respond to any request for reasons within fourteen (14) days. The Competitions Directors should indicate generally the reasons for



	the rejection, but are not required to provide particulars, especially where the provision of particulars would identify a person who made a complaint under Clause 9B.
--	---

Eden said that he thinks the clauses are great and agreed that it is definitely important to outline our procedures given the power dynamics that exist in competitions. Grace Wa. echoed this. Ben agreed these are fantastic.

Motion: That all of the Competitions Directors' proposed bylaw amendments (**Appendix B**) be approved en bloc.

Moved: Harriet Walker

Seconded: Maja Vasic

The motion was carried unanimously with zero abstentions

9 Comps rules discussion

Harriet asked the Executive for their input on changes they are thinking of making to the Competitions Rules. They discussed the circumstances under which someone might be prevented from participating in competitions, namely failing to fulfil judging obligations. Maja asked the Executive for their thoughts on how many rounds someone should be required to do and how long they ought to be barred for if they fail to meet these requirements.

Maja noted that the current threshold of judging two internal competitions is probably appropriate but could probably set that higher. She also noted that, especially next year when people will be flying overseas on SULLS budget, they should be required to judge more. Harriet emphasised that competitions runs on volunteers and people benefiting from this and that is why we give people that opportunity. She noted Grace Wa. has been a great example of this kind of volunteering support this year.

Maja also noted there is a provision for the comps directors to waive requirements especially when they do other comparable things like write problem questions / coach a team.

Grace Wa. suggested that a point system be used so that you can accrue points over time by judging or coaching competitions as is done in USYD Debating. She noted the judging deserves to be rewarded. Maja agreed educational programs need to be rewarded and there needs to be a distinction between IVs and other competitions. She said her only concern is that there are no real resources issues for IV judging as compared to internal competitions. Maja said she would be happy to look into a points system but noted that anything would happen to apply after you have done an IV but not before. Grace Wa. agreed.

Ariana agreed with Grace Wa. that the debating obligations and point system lowers obligations for younger students but ensures older students aren't constantly monopolising it. She asked if there is any clarification about when your two rounds expires. The Competitions Directors replied they think in the immediate semester after but noted the comps rules are vague on this.



Ben said a central public document would be helpful to hold people to account. He noted the points system may be a little confusing but that differential obligations are good.

Maja raised another issue relating to how the Competitions Portfolio deals with competitors who cheat. She noted that if you cheat in an internal you are kicked out of internals and that certain members who cheat in intervarsity competitions probably shouldn't be allowed to keep competing. Maja said that it is not great for SULS' reputation to have representatives who are found cheating. She noted that at the same time, sometimes disqualifications may be unfair or invalid and there are different degrees of impropriety here. She wanted to ask the Executive for their thoughts.

Ben said he thinks there should be a possibility for ramifications but agreed that some disqualifications are not valid e.g. where procedural fairness is not accorded. He agreed cheating in general is bad for SULS' reputation and it might be good to have a referral mechanism which automatically goes to the Competitions Directors and someone else to make a fresh assessment, who then make a discretionary decision based on the severity.

Grace Wa. agreed some form of disciplinary proceeding needs to be introduced and she agreed making it as independent from other bodies such as other universities or ALSA would be the best idea. She suggested for example linking up Equity and Competitions together to have an independent investigation.

Harriet said she will take this into account and draft up some changes and send them to the Executive for feedback. The Competitions Directors thanked the Executive for their input.

10 Hearsay

Ariana discussed the hearsay publication and asked Executives to submit their profiles. Ben said a 50 page document is not that helpful and that at this point in the year photos describing what happened could be a good alternative. Eden suggested that at a minimum each Executive should still submit a written piece on what they have completed that year for transparency and accountability's sake.

Motion: That the Hearsay publication for 2022 be titled 'Hearsay'.

Moved: Ariana Haghighi

Seconded: Adam Schaffer

The motion was carried unanimously with zero abstentions.

11 SGM 2022

Eden asked the Executive to register for the 2022 Special General Meeting to be held on 4 November 2022 at 6:00pm.

12 Absent Executive Member

Ben gave notice to the Executive that Kelly has been absent again and is therefore an Absent Executive Member. He said given this is the last meeting this is purely a formality as there will be no future vote.



13 Other Business

Ben thanked everyone for their work this year.

Meeting closed: **10:47pm**



APPENDIX A
Signed Proxy Forms

ASSIGNING OF EXECUTIVE VOTE BY PROXY

24 October 2022

I, **Elizabeth Nutting**, Womens Officer, appoint **Adam Schaffer**, Sports Director, as my proxy for the purposes of the Sydney University Law Society Inc. Executive Meeting to be held on 24 October 2022.

[Cross out the option which does not apply]

1. This form authorises the proxy to vote on my behalf on all matters.

OR

- ~~2. This form authorises the proxy to vote on my behalf for the following matters only:~~


Elizabeth Nutting
Womens Officer

Signed 24 October 2022


Adam Schaffer
Sports Director

Signed 24 October 2022

ASSIGNING OF EXECUTIVE VOTE BY PROXY

24 October 2022

I, **Nishta Gupta**, Ethnocultural Officer, appoint **Naz Sharifi**, VP (Social Justice), as my proxy for the purposes of the Sydney University Law Society Inc. Executive Meeting to be held on 24 October 2022.

[Cross out the option which does not apply]

1. This form authorises the proxy to vote on my behalf on all matters.


OR

~~2. This form authorises the proxy to vote on my behalf for the following matters only:~~



Nishta Gupta
Ethnocultural Officer

Signed 24 October 2022



Naz Sharifi
VP (Social Justice)

Signed 24 October 2022

ASSIGNING OF EXECUTIVE VOTE BY PROXY

24 October 2022


I, **Yijun Cui**, Equity Officer, appoint **Maja Vasic**, Competitions Director, as my proxy for the purposes of the Sydney University Law Society Inc. Executive Meeting to be held on 24 October 2022.

[Cross out the option which does not apply]


~~1. This form authorises the proxy to vote on my behalf on all matters.~~

OR

2. This form authorises the proxy to vote on my behalf for the following matters only:
- Valedictorian Nominations
 - Competitions Bylaw Amendments

YIJUN CUI 
Yijun Cui
Equity Officer

Signed 24 October 2022

MAJA VASIC 
Maja Vasic
Competitions Director

Signed 24 October 2022



APPENDIX B

Competitions Proposed Amendments to the Bylaws

Summary of Proposed Amendments 24/10

1. Combine Clauses 4 and 6, add new clause 4A, 4B, 4C

Rationale:

- Clarifying the binding nature of the SULLS Competition Rules on all participants
- Simplicity and clarity
- Maintain the flexibility of amendment of the Competitions Rules, but still ensuring competitors are properly notified of any changes to the rules

Old Clauses	New Clause
<p>4. Only students enrolled with the Sydney Law School are eligible to take part in a SULLS competition, internal or external. This extends to cohorts enrolled in degrees such as the Master of Laws or Legal Profession Admission Board's Diploma in Law.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>6. Only students enrolled with the Sydney Law School are eligible to be part of the Competitions Committee.</p>	<p>4A. The SULLS Competition Rules are binding on all participants in internal and intervarsity competitions, including competitors, coaches, judges, and third-party selectors.</p> <p>4B. The Competitions Directors have the power to amend the Competitions Rules for any purpose and at any time, provided:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) The updated Competitions Rules are published on the SULLS Website and distributed in the SULLS Weekly as soon as is practicable.</p> <p>4C. Only students enrolled with the Sydney Law School are eligible to take part in a SULLS competition, internal or external, or to be a part of the Competitions Committee. This extends to cohorts enrolled in degrees such as the Master of Laws or Legal Profession Admission Board's Diploma in Law.</p>

2. Amend Clause 5

Rationale:

- The 'sufficient number' requirement is redundant given it is at the discretion of the Competitions Directors
- Inclusion of 'students belonging to a particular identity group' allows competitions / programs such National Women's Moot, Women's Mooting Program, ESL Mooting Program, Rainbow Client Interviewing and Rainbow Moot

Old Clause	New Clause
------------	------------

5. At their discretion, the Competitions Directors may establish a competition solely for a particular cohort or degree if sufficient numbers are found. The sufficient number shall be determined at the discretion of the Competitions Directors.	5. At their absolute discretion, the Competitions Directors may establish a competition solely for a particular cohort or degree, or for students belonging to a particular identity group.
---	---

3. Amend Clause 7

- Clarity of expression
- The discretion is that of the Competitions Directors, rather than the Convenors

Old Clause	New Clause
7. Students may participate in more than one competition per semester. However, where there is a clash with respect to dates from Quarter Final stage onward (inclusive), Convenors may make alternative arrangements at their discretion. There is no obligation upon Convenors to do so and students must accept the binding nature of dates that are given to them.	7. Students may participate in more than one competition per semester. However, where there is a clash with respect to dates from the Quarter Final stage onwards (inclusive), the Competitions Directors are under no obligation to accommodate a student's participation in multiple competitions, and may make alternative arrangements at their absolute discretion.

4. Strike current Clauses 8-9, introduce amended Clause 6A

- Eligibility requirements are outlined in the Competitions Rules, and are more complex than currently stated in clauses 8 and 9. For example, Torts Moot and JD Torts Moot have different eligibility requirements than other moots. Further, Junior and Senior Divisions of skills are only run dependent on numbers, and this alters eligibility.

Old Clauses	New Clause
8. Subject to added restrictions in the Competitions Rules, any competitor who has progressed to the Semi-Final stage of an internal mooting competition is ineligible to re-enter that same competition in subsequent years.	8. Subject to added restrictions in the Competitions Rules, any competitor who has progressed to the Semi-Final stage of an internal mooting competition is ineligible to re-enter that same competition in subsequent years.
9. Any competitor who has participated in the Junior pool of a skills competition is eligible to re-enter the competition in its	9. Any competitor who has participated in the Junior pool of a skills competition is eligible to re-enter the competition in its

<p>next season, provided that they enter the Senior pool.</p>	<p>next season, provided that they enter the Senior pool.</p> <p>6A. A student's eligibility to participate in a particular competition shall be determined according to the SULLS Competition Rules. Any disputes arising as to eligibility under the SULLS Competition Rules shall be finally determined by the Competitions Directors.</p>
---	--

5. Introduce new Clauses 8-11

- 8A codifies current practice

Old Clause	New Clause
	<p>8A. Current or former students of Sydney Law School, legal professionals, and any other suitably-qualified persons may be appointed as judges, coaches, and/or third-party selectors.</p> <p>9A. The Competitions Directors retain the absolute discretion to appoint judges, coaches, and third-party selectors, having regard to criteria such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The candidate's experience in the relevant competition; b) The candidate's experience judging, coaching, or selecting, whether in the relevant competition or otherwise; and c) The candidate's personal suitability as a judge, coach or third-party selector, especially having regard to the potential power dynamics that exist between these roles with respect to competitors. <p>Where there are no suitable candidates, the Competitions Directors may choose not to appoint a judge, coach or third-party selector.</p>

9B. The Competitions Directors shall make a feedback form available to competitors, providing them with the opportunity to raise any concerns regarding judges and/or coaches.

(a) Unless consent is obtained from competitors, feedback will be shared only among the Competitions Directors and the Equity Officer. However, the Competitions Directors may consider any feedback received when assessing a candidate's suitability as a coach, judge or third-party selector, under Clause 9A.

9C. If a person is rejected as a coach, judge or third-party selector under Clause 9A, they may request the reasons for this decision by emailing the Competitions Directors at competitions@suls.org.au. Any request for reasons under this clause must be made within seven (7) days from the time that the person was informed of their rejection. The Competitions Directors must respond to any request for reasons within fourteen (14) days. The Competitions Directors should indicate generally the reasons for the rejection, but are not required to provide particulars, especially where the provision of particulars would identify a person who made a complaint under Clause 9B.