

SYDNEY UNIVERSITY LAW SOCIETY INC. ABN 49 844 560 526

Minutes of Executive Meeting held on: 18/02/2024

Chair: **Danielle Tweedale**Minute taker: **John Mentzines**

Meeting opened: 8:06 pm

Present:

Danielle Tweedale President

Priya Mehra Vice President (Careers)

Jessica Xu Vice President (Social Justice)

John Mentzines Secretary
Amante Abela Treasurer

Antonia Odegbaro Sponsorship Director

Mounica Akula Social Director Zara Paleologos Social Director

Kiana Asgari Competitions Director
Daniel Kim Competitions Director

Ben Cullen Campus Director

Kate Sinchilo Publications Director

Phan Vu International Student Officer

Jessica Pens Women's Officer

Juan Facundo Majul Fajardo Queer Officer

Yoyo Chien Design Director

Yuan Tran Marketing Director

Sara Wardak Ethnocultural Officer

Apologies: Ellie Mangharam, Charlie Hua, Kira Trahana, Stef Howes, Sarah Huffman

Absent:

Late Arrivals: Kate Sinchilo (8:13 pm)

Early Departures:



MINUTES

1 Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and delivered an Acknowledgement of Country. Apologies were received from Ellie Mangharam, Charlie Hua, Kira Trahana, Stef Howes and Sarah Huffman.

Motion: To accept the apologies received from Ellie Mangharam, Charlie Hua, Kira Trahana, Stef Howes and Sarah Huffman, for the Executive Meeting taking place on 18 February 2024.

Moved: Danielle Tweedale Seconded: Mounica Akula

The motion carried unanimously with zero abstentions.

2 Procedural Matters

Motion: That the public minutes from the Executive Meeting held 14 January 2024 be approved as a correct and accurate record of the meeting.

Moved: Danielle Tweedale Seconded: Daniel Kim

The motion carried unanimously with zero abstentions.

The following circular motion was approved via email on 15 January 2024.

Motion: To appoint Stef Howes as 2024 First Nations Officer for the Sydney University Law Society.

The motion was carried with 14 votes in favour and 5 abstentions.

The following circular motion was approved via email on 21 January 2024.

Motion: To appoint Juan Facundo Majul Fajardo as 2024 Queer Officer for the Sydney University Law Society.

The motion was carried with 8 votes in favour and 11 abstentions.

The following circular motion was approved via email on 24 January 2024.

Motion: To approve the 2024 President and Treasurer creating a new bank account linked to a society debit card in compliance with the SULS Constitution.

The motion was carried with 21 votes in favour.

The following circular motion was approved via email on 13 February 2024.

Motion: To authorise Eden McSheffrey as a delegate of the 2024 SULS Executive to assist with the USU Constitutional Dispute. In this role, Eden will be present at and able to contribute to



discussions/negotiations with the USU, and provide advice to the SULS Executive on the matter. He will not be able to enter into agreements on behalf of the 2024 SULS Executive without prior approval given through a resolution at a meeting.

The motion was carried with 17 votes in favour and 3 abstentions.

3 Capacity Check In & Chair of Next Week's Executive Meeting

Dani explained that in the past a google sheet has been used to keep track of how the members of the Executive are managing their workloads every week. Dani further explained that this practice would continue this year, so that the President and Secretary could observe how everyone was going and if anyone was reporting significant stress with their workload then another member of the Executive would check in with them..

Dani also noted that this year the chair of the Executive Meeting would rotate every week. Zara was ultimately chosen to be the chair of next week's Executive Meeting.

Motion: To appoint Zara Paleologos as the chair of the week 2 Executive Meeting.

Moved: Danielle Tweedale Seconded: Kiana Asgari

The motion carried unanimously with zero abstentions.

4 Shoutouts

Dani shouted out Antonia for the extensive work she has been doing behind the scenes with sponsors while simultaneously doing a corporations law intensive.

Antonia thanked Dani and shouted out Amante for the work he has done on completing invoices for sponsors.

Dani also shouted out Kat and Yoyo for their incredible work on publications.

Daniel shouted out Kiana for being a great fellow competitions director and for judging a significant number of rounds for summer competitions. Kiana thanked Daniel and shared the same sentiment that he was a great partner.

Zara shouted out Ben for his work during Welcome Week.

Priya shouted out Zara and Mounica for the social events they have been organising.

Antonia shouted out Dani for all her work as President.

5 What's on this Week

Dani outlined all the events that are occurring this week.



Ben encouraged members of the Executive who are in the LLBIII cohort to attend the cohort picnic on Monday if they are free.

Mounica asked wellbeing officers to upload their qualification certificates and to complete the mandatory responding to sexual harassment module.

6 Administrative Tasks

John explained that the current meeting time of 8 pm on Sunday was only a preliminary time for weeks 1 and 2, and that the Executive needed to decide on a time to meet throughout the rest of Semester 1. Ben noted that a time during the work week would be nice. Dani also noted that it would be nice for the meeting to be in person, but if necessary people could join the meeting via Zoom. Facundo also emphasised that he would rather the meeting occur during the work week. It was ultimately decided that either Tuesday or Thursday at 7 pm appeared to be the best times, and that the Executive would make a final decision on which time in the next few days.

John explained that it was necessary for everyone to allocate themselves to two time slots for office hours, as soon as possible.

Dani noted that it was the responsibility of anyone who eats anything or uses anything in the SULS Office to clean up after themselves. Dani explained that last year there was also a cleaning roster for the SULS Office. Everyone agreed that it would be a good idea to implement a similar roster this year.

John reminded everyone to input everything they want in the SULS weekly into the relevant document by 10 am on Sunday.

John noted that the internal calendar needed to be finalised in the next few days so that he could create the external calendar. Dani emphasised that it was important to not concentrate too many events on particular days.

7 Intro to SULS Committees Information Session

John reminded everyone that the Intro to SULS Committees Information Session would be held via Zoom at 6 pm on Tuesday. John encouraged all members of the Executive to attend if they could, but otherwise they could send pre-prepared remarks to Dani and himself. Dani requested that pre-prepared remarks be limited to 2 minutes.

8 Executive Retreat Summary

Dani explained that a summary of what was discussed on the executive retreat could be found in the retreat document.

Dani noted that everyone should have now filled in the internal calendar. Dani also reminded everyone that they need to complete and submit to the USU a risk assessment form 2 weeks prior to the commencement of an applicable event, and she encouraged every member of the



Executive to obtain as many qualifications as possible.

Dani noted that, as was discussed on retreat, all administrative tasks, announcements and forms would be communicated through Slack. Dani explained that messenger would still be used to message people individually.

Dani informed everyone that there is now a new support tab on the SULS website and that the process of simplifying the tabs on the website was underway.

8 SULS & USU

John explained that there are a variety of views held by members of SULS and the Executive in regard to the issue of whether current SULS Executives should be permitted to also be USU board members. John further explained that some people view being a USU board member while also being a SULS Executive as a serious conflict directly impacting SULS because the USU has oversight of SULS and SULS is required to comply with the USU's rules and regulations. John also explained that it may be viewed as unfair to prevent members of the 2024 SULS Executive from running for the USU board, given they would not have been aware of this restriction when they chose to run for the SULS Executive. John asked the members of the Executive if they wanted to offer their thoughts on the issue.

Kiana explained that people are concerned about the conflict involved in holding both positions simultaneously and the significant workload involved in performing both roles. Kiana further explained that for certain executive positions, particularly the President, Secretary and Treasurer, the conflict is particularly problematic and that this could be a consideration in determining what restrictions may be appropriate.

Zara stated that she understood that some executive positions have greater conflicts than others but that it was hard to draw an appropriate distinction between positions and that there was a conflict regardless of the executive position that the person held.

Daniel said that there was merit in discussing potential restrictions given this issue had been discussed by the Groove for SULS ticket. Dani and Zara pointed out that there was no official campaign policy from Groove in regard to this issue..

Ben commented that after this discussion, the issue should be tabled for future discussion so that the meeting's minutes could be published for members' consideration and the Executive could thoughtfully consider all the points made. Ben stated that regardless of the outcome, he was unclear on why a distinction should be drawn on the basis of whether an executive was elected or appointed. He also noted that the USU regulates how SULS operates in a significant number of ways. Ben then pointed out that the USU Constitution prevents candidates running for the USU board from using their position in a club as part of their campaign, and asked the Executive whether they thought it would be hard to separate someone's profile as a SULS Executive from their campaign when running for USU board.



Kiana said that preventing executives from running for USU board would create the impression that the members of the Executive are taking their roles very seriously. Kiana explained that if you are on the USU board and are a SULS Executive at the same time then this image may be tarnished given the significant workload required for both positions, even if you do genuinely dedicate yourself to both roles.

Zara emphasised that if any restrictions were to be implemented then it should be before the next USU election, because it would be wrong to restrict future Executives and not the current Executive.

Facundo stated that he thought it would be beneficial to hear about the experiences of people who have been both SULS Executives and USU board members at the same time. Facundo explained that anyone who intends to be on the USU board wants to benefit societies and students, meaning the goals of both SULS and the USU were aligned. Facundo agreed that any decision on this issue should be made before the next USU election. Facundo also noted that anyone who has ever run for the USU board has had a platform with a club or society, and he also agreed that there is a distinction between different roles in the society, for example the President and autonomous positions.

Amante said that the Executive should not dictate what people's workload should or should not be. He also noted that the only gateway onto the USU board is your profile from having experience in clubs and societies, and that this is not a misuse of that position. Amante also stated that it is not fair to bind people in the current Executive because they were not aware of any possible restrictions when they joined the Executive. However, Amante said that it was not a problem to bind future Executives because they will know about the restrictions before they decide to run for the SULS Executive.

Kiana noted that given the length of a law degree it was possible to be both a SULS Executive and USU board member without your time in those roles overlapping, and that the conflict in holding both those positions simultaneously was significant. Kiana said that she did not believe that the workload was the biggest concern.

Zara said that the biggest issue was the conflict, and that there currently were insufficient mechanisms to deal with it. Dani explained that the conflict can be dealt with and that it could be worth considering specific provisions to manage the conflict if this scenario arises in the future.

Zara also stated that it was not ethical to hold both positions at the same time because as a USU board member you are paid to oversee clubs including SULS. Dani asked why that was different to any other job and Facundo said that he did not understand what the issue was with USU board members being paid. Zara said that being paid meant your interests aligned more with the USU in comparison to SULS. Facundo replied that USU board members are elected for a fixed term, so their pay is secure regardless of how they act in the role. In response to some general misunderstanding, Kiana explained that Zara's concern was the fact that as a USU board member you are paid to oversee SULS, which creates a significant conflict if you are also a SULS Executive.



Mounica asked how the conflict could manifest itself. Dani explained that disputes over constitutional amendments are escalated to the USU board under certain circumstances.

Amante said that USU board members being paid does not strengthen the conflict because they are not paid to perform the role in a specific way. Amante also noted that both positions are democratically elected and to restrict SULS Executives from running for the USU board would be taking away the will of the people.

Facundo said that for JD students there is not a lot of time to run for both the USU board and the SULS Executive, making it very difficult to prevent the terms for both positions from overlapping.

Kiana brought the discussion back to the beginning and emphasised that the conflict is most significant for roles that are responsible for the administration of SULS. Kiana noted that it is very difficult for the functioning of SULS to have the roles of President and Secretary conflicted off, because these roles are essential to the administration of SULS.

Ben emphasised that the workload concern is not determinative, and that the current dispute between SULS and the USU is very relevant to the extent of the conflict.

Dani thanked everyone for sharing their thoughts in a respectful and positive manner, and noted that this issue would be tabled for next week.

Facundo asked how a possible decision to prevent SULS Executives from running for USU board would be approached, for example would such a decision go to an AGM.

Dani said that there are a number of different options and that an AGM was one of them.

9 Costco Membership

Zara explained that the most cost effective way to provide breakfast for LLBI camp would be to buy food wholesale from Costco, which requires a membership. Zara noted that socials were happy to absorb the cost of the membership in their budget. Amante asked for the cost of the membership to instead be put in the office budget and emphasised that the membership would be available to every portfolio. Amante further emphasised that it would be important to implement procedures to prevent anyone from using the card for their own benefit.

10 Socials Portfolio

Zara asked everyone to let Mounica and herself know if they could attend the LLBI camp because they needed to confirm the number of people who would be attending since executive tickets are going to be fully subsidised this year. Zara explained that this was because members of the Executive would be attending in an entirely supervisory capacity, with no drinking of alcohol. Amante asked if the number of executives attending would be limited to ten. Zara replied that the limit would depend on the number of tickets that are sold, as there is a maximum number of people who can attend the event.



Zara said that she needed as many JDs on the Executive to market the JD drinks event as possible, and that it would be very helpful if JD members of the Executive also attended the event. Mounica let wellbeing officers for the event know that they can upload their qualification certificates onto the USU website.

Zara suggested that the socials portfolio would organise monthly meet ups for the entire Executive. Dani said that she was keen.

11 Booking Flights for International Competitions

Kiana explained that the proposed procedure for booking flights for international competitions was to allow competitors a five day window on either side of their competition within which they can pick a time for their flights from wherever to wherever they want, as long as the price is comparable to flying to or from Sydney. Kiana explained further that SULS would not pay for competitor's accommodation during the five days either side of the competition, only the period from the day before the competition to the day the competition ends. Kiana emphasised that there was a strong preference for SULS to book the flights, but an alternative would be to have competitors purchase their own flights and SULS would set a cap on the amount that would be reimbursed, but this is not very flexible to changing flight prices. Kiana asked for the thoughts of the rest of the Executive on the proposed procedure.

Daniel emphasised that the five days either side of the competition are not designed to enable competitors to have a holiday, they are primarily there to provide competitors with flexibility. Amante, Ben and John agreed that the five days either side of the competition were perfectly adequate.

Ben asked what happens if a competitor wants to fly outside those five days. Kiana explained that in that scenario the competitor would have to pay for the flight themselves.

Facundo asked why it mattered when a competitor flies to and from the competition if the price of the flights are the same. Kiana explained that SULS only spends money on international competitions for the purpose of enabling students to compete, and booking flights around when competitors want to holiday would increase the risk of fluctuating flight prices. Kiana noted that exceptions would, if necessary, be made for compassionate reasons.

Jessica Xu asked if competitors could position the ten day window how they wanted, instead of it being five days either side of the competition. Daniel explained that he understands the desire of competitors to travel, but they are being sent to these competitions by SULS to represent the University of Sydney, not to travel. Daniel noted that these competitions are very expensive to organise and are wonderful opportunities for the competitors. Daniel and Zara also noted that most university law societies do not fully fund these types of opportunities.

Amante explained that the longer flights are left unbooked the greater the financial risk and that flights are a significant cost in the competitions portfolio's budget. Amante also noted that other clubs at the university fly competitors in and out for international competitions without any flexibility.



Kiana explained that it would be a good idea to pass a motion implementing this procedure for booking international flights, and that eventually it should be in the Bylaws.

Motion: To approve the policy that flights for international competitions will only be paid for or reimbursed up to a set cap if they are booked five days either side of the competition.

Mover: Daniel Kim

Seconder: Zara Paleologos

The motion carried unanimously with zero abstentions.

12 Other Business

Dani emphasised that even though what is discussed in Executive Meetings is made public in the minutes, members of the Executive should not communicate to other people what has been discussed. Dani explained that this was because the minutes have to be approved by the Executive at the next Executive Meeting, and that members of the Executive should simply refer other people to the approved minutes.

Meeting closed: 10:04 pm