

SEMESTER 2, WEEK 8- Monday 26 October 8:00 am

Meeting opened at 8:05 am

Meeting Chair - Amer

Present: Miriam, Alex, Amer, Sarah Purvis, Donna, Daniel, Oscar, Barry, Rosie, Eden, Alison, Dani, Natalie, Max, Felicity

Late: Pat, Sinem, Ibrahim, Deaundre

Apologies: Sarah Tang, Mark

Absent: Abbey

Items

1. Welcome, Apologies
2. Capacity Check-In
3. Shoutouts
4. Portfolio Updates
5. What's On This Week:
 - a. **Mon:**
 - b. **Tues:** Yemaya Launch (12PM), SULS Presidential Debate (1PM) SULS x NSW Bar Association Legal Innovation and Technology Awards Night (5PM)
 - c. **Wed:** Interfac Nutrition Talk and Workout (9AM)
 - d. **Thurs:** Academic and Personal Resilience Workshop (10AM)
 - e. **Fri:**
 - f. **Sat:**
 - g. **Sun:**
6. Socials - Vote for FYD Faculty Table (RS/ADA)
 - a. Faculty Members Table
 - Penny Crossley
 - Jamie Glister
 - Natalie Silver (Keynote Speaker)
 - Simon Rice
 - David Rolph
 - Peter Gerangelos
 - Fady Aoun
 - Rita Shackel
 - b. President's Table
 - Simon Bronitt
7. Bylaws (AN)

Minutes

Shoutout

- (Miriam) shoutout to Nat for her conquering imposter syndrome workshop and shoutout to Sinem for the women's study group.
- (Amer) shoutout to Daniel and Barry for never failing to come to everyone's rescue with design and marketing and shout to Oscar for interfac

Updates

- (Alison) Opening up applications for first-year handbook at the end of this week so encourage people to apply if interested
- (Eden) Yemaya launch this week we will have some people to come along to read their pieces
- (Amer) Deaundre will be main moderator for the debate, we will either have another moderator from Honi or Pulp or someone else within the senior exec, and then we'll have people fact checking as well.
- (Alison) Bar association event is this week where we will announce winners
- (Oscar) We have a nutrition talk and circuit workout on Wednesday at 9am. There is also a tik-tok challenge this week on the facebook event. Amer asked if Oscar knew the person doing the talk but that hasn't been announced yet.

Final Year Dinners

- (Rosie) we can fit four per table so we have decided to have two faculty tables. There's going to be 2 tables for faculty. There will also be the President's table where myself, Alex, Amer and Simon Bronitt will sit.

Bylaws (Amer)

- We have previously discussed the Bylaws in parts, but it is important to discuss the document as a whole now in order to review and to keep consistency. Last week I took some time to review all sections we have previously voted on and I want to take the time today to revisit a few points. Please speak up if you disagree with any suggestions. In the interest of time, I propose we discuss these in parts as we go, and vote on any amendments as a whole, at the end of this discussion.
- During AGM we had voted to change notice board for sake of sustainability and we were aiming to try and conserve some paper. I thought it would be good to remove that in our bylaws to reflect our updated constitution.
 - Any issues with this proposed change? (*None*).
- In section 18 I thought it would just be okay to say executive because the executive encompasses the campus director. Any issues with this proposed change?
 - Any issues with this proposed change? (*None*).
- In section 27, I was going to query whether we should in fact not provide reasons? If there is a negative outcome in an equity application, then the member should be able to

contact the Equity Officer to provide a justification for a negative decision, and the Equity officer should be able to provide some sort of justification at a reasonable time.

- Any issues with this proposed change?
 - (Max) I don't see a huge problem either way. In terms of how it has gone in most instances this year there have been few refusals and most cases where there have been it has been because of some sort of procedural problem. I think that's because people are not applying unless they are eligible.
 - (Amer) So are you okay with this change?
 - (Max) Yes.
- (Amer) Clause 28- wanted to make a reference that within our bylaws for privacy policy (added later) there was a long list of personal information that may be stored by society. Might be worth adding a subsection here referring to that list.
 - Any issues with this proposed change? (*None*).
- (Amer) Scroll down to s 42- I thought out of completeness to add 'in Australian dollars' and then 45 I had a query just to the phrasing of that and how it currently looks. Just wanted to clarify - does that mean we have to grant an apportionment of a minimum of 25% if they satisfy clause 28?
 - (Max) basis is that people might not get full value of grant they applied for. Instances where someone might be eligible, but on circumstances wouldn't be fair to give them full amount. In practice, I can't think of an instance where anyone has had amount reduced except where they have applied for and received a lot of financial grants throughout the year.
 -
 - (Amer) My query is more surrounding the wording of this. Shouldn't the wording say 'if applicant satisfied eligibility criteria and successfully acquires a grant?'
 -
 - (Max) Yes that would be okay and clearer.
 - Any issues with these proposed changes? (*None*).
- (Amer) I don't think it's straightforward what the assessment panel is for. I was uncertain with the wording of ss 56 - 59 in conjunction with s 48. Doesn't the interpretation of both parts, in essence, get rid of the assessment panel if the equity officer has the discretion to make an assessment without the need to consult with the assessment panel?
 - (Max) No, because in another section of bylaws it says that an equity officer has to consult panel in certain issues.
 - (Amer) Where and what types of issues would those be?

- (Max) Things to allow an application on basis of something beside criteria, there was an instance of this last semester which was one of the few instances we used the panel when it fell outside the eligibility criteria.
- (Amer) To clarify: The language used, basically, the assessment panel is not so much the equity officer will overrule decisions of the panel, but the panel might decide there are other reasons other than those portrayed in bylaws?
- (Max) It depends on why they are being consulted, I think also there is something to do with the number of financial grants that someone can receive... just specific questions to come up.
- (Amer) Okay, I understand. So the idea is the Equity Officer has the judgement to make decisions, however if there are special circumstances that need consultation, the assessment panel will be deployed?
- (Max) Yes.
- Any issues with these proposed changes? (*None*).
- (Amer) I query here under s 53 why do we need to set a ceiling of 4 textbooks for the Textbook Loan Scheme. It makes sense for the maximum amount of law classes that are generally taken at any one semester, but since we have secured \$20,000 from the Walter Reid Memorial Fund and will be using that money only to expand the loan scheme in future years, then I'm not sure why we need to limit it to 4 textbooks. So I would query here why that can't be raised to 6 for example, given some classes have extra books too.
 - (Max) I don't think we should leave it without a ceiling because we need to provide notice to our applicants. I do also think that it might be better to leave this question to next years executive, just for the reason for that it's not going to take effect this year and I think this is a pretty significant question and it changes the operation of the program.
 - (Amer) I don't think it's at all problematic to make this change. We will unlikely be providing further textbook this semester and I'd rather set a clean operative bylaw given current assessment of information, rather than one that we predict will need to be changed.
 - (Felicity) out of curiosity has anyone applied for more than 4?
 - (Max) Yes.
 - (Felicity) what are the numbers?

- (Max) fewer than 3 but when it does happen I just tell them that we can't give them more than 4.
 - (Felicity) Probably wouldn't make a huge difference in that case right to change numbers.
 - (Amer) It does make a difference if a student is in need of an additional textbook. We received funding from faculty for a reason and that can only be used for the loans scheme. If there is no significant operational burden on SULLS, then I do not see a reason as to why this cannot be changed for the benefit of members now.
 - (Max) This is something that will come up in my handover, this is a big area for growth, so whoever is coming in as equity officer can propose this change next. I'll be looking at ways that they can expand with the new funding and that is a question for them to consider. I do want to keep it to four maximum textbooks now.
 - (Amer) Okay.
 - Any issues with keeping it as is? (*None*).
-
- (Amer) Under s 97 for Policy on Code of Conduct - I do not necessarily think the Bylaws which are meant to regulate procedure for SULLS should expand to regulate the standards of behaviour applying to all interactions between the Society's members, including those taking place beyond the context of Society's events.
 - (Barry) Has to be some limits- either SULLS or University related?
 - (Deaundre) Also situations where SULLS are working out outside context of SULLS event but are still doing things in SULLS.
 - (Barry) There should definitely be some limits.
 - (Deaundre) are we rewording to narrow it down to the areas that I brought up?
 - (Amer) If everyone is comfortable let's limit it to the framework Deaundre brought up?
 - (Max) However, if two members of society know each other and interact socially outside society and one member sexually assaults for example, then we should be able to sanction eg; by suspending membership

- (Amer) Okay this is a delicate issue to think about. As an organisation, is it for SULLS to be regulating interaction outside of SULLS, only because the subjects of interaction happen to be SULLS members?
- (Miriam) We have had students ask us before if certain people would show up in events because of their fear to encounter a certain said person.
- (Daniel) I think this is an important issue that needs to be flushed out. I also don't think it's for us to be dictating and necessarily acting on interactions outside the scope of SULLS.
- (Barry) Agreed.
- (Miriam) Guys, we've exceeded time for this meeting. I have got to go.
- (Amer) Yes. Let's revisit this question next week, along with the remaining points that are left for discussion. I encourage everyone to review these draft changes and bylaws before our next Executive meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:07 AM.