

Australian National University
Law Students' Society



Minutes for Committee Meeting

Date: 13/8/17

Time: 6.35pm

Location: LSS Common Room

Present: Bryce, Eddie, Mickey, Ella, Eden, Tony, Nina, Belinda, Ashish, Joe, Max, Rocky, Lucy, Shiban, Felicity, Bede, Aley, Katharine, Lakshini, Brigid (left early), Kathy, Julia, Hugo, Sarah, Suchara, Angela, Campbell, Shani, Matt, Lily, Maddison

Absent with Apologies: Anna, Sheng, Carina, Jess, Tiffany

Absent without Apologies:

- **President Report:**

- Thank you to the Committee for the start of semester
- Law Ball was fantastic
- Coming up: Market Day on the Law Lawns
- SJ Careers and Comps Sign-ups – good!
- Reminder about Office and Common Room security and to lock up whenever unattended – please tell Bryce about mess
- Reminder about attendance at meetings as well as timeliness
- Put yourself on rosters and don't pull out close to event/meeting
- ISD:
 - First blog out and shared
 - Good sign-ups for mentor program
 - Launch for program on Tuesday 12-2pm – please respond to Facebook event, because the event is for everyone
- FYOs have switched portfolios

- **Administration Report (presented by Bryce in Anna's absence):**
 - o Peppercorn currently working on next edition
 - o Constitution/regulation reform will be discussed later
 - o Julia – leading the publicity survey discussion:
 - Uploaded draft report to LSS Committee Page
 - Summary at start of common publicity questions – good checklist for asking the Publicity Director anything
 - Highlights:
 - Reinforce communication – must talk to Julia regularly when trying to organise anything
 - Message Julia on Slack – NOT Facebook
 - Slack messages are good for changing things last minute – Julia can adjust things quickly and easily
 - Any cool ideas for marketing, talk to Julia (Snapchat filters etc.)
 - Only contentious point: concerns raised about asking people to post in residential college groups too often – thoughts?
 - Eden: came up in ResCom meeting, potential for asking for posts to be deleted – hasn't come to fruition yet, it has become a meme in Burgmann for LSS to try to get Burgmann residents to come
 - Brigid: general trend is for people to post events they are personally running, people don't want to plug events which they aren't running
 - Angela: Fenner Law page is easy to post on
 - Brigid: Ursies Law page was banned
 - Campbell: potentially better to just advertise liking LSS page/Notice Board/Law Students @ ANU so they're only seeing it in 2/3 places
 - Laksshini: change in entry requirements means there are less students doing law, so all posts about law are becoming less relevant
 - Bryce: so only appropriate in college law pages?
 - Max: I disagree – college law pages would be more spammed (due to less posts overall)
 - Rocky: Fenner wouldn't have that problem – much more posting
 - Shani: suggestion to move to Academic Pages?
 - Sarah: true that people switch off after spamming of LSS events
 - Brigid: made worse when we have multiple events at the same time
 - Suchara: suggestion just to invite friends
 - Rocky: isn't that the same thing?
 - Angela: better perhaps to switch between the two options?
 - Brigid: advertise a big calendar in our e-newsletter?
 - Julia: good idea – people said in the survey that events should be finalised sooner so that advertising can come out earlier – Julia would love to do that but doesn't know if it's viable
 - Hugo: newsletter doesn't go to that many law students, only about 500 – but CoL won't give us email addresses – hopefully can get CoL to send it for us?
 - Bryce: good idea to sent to all law students, only if there is an unsubscribe button
 - Ella: great idea, can reach a much more diverse audience with all law students

- Bede: get a lift of events on Facebook
- Bryce: used to invite friends instead of posting in college pages – Julia to write-up a document outlining her opinion of where the Committee sits on this issue
- Julia: please read the report, will finalise it tonight
- Bryce: if no one has any issues with the report, then all good

- **Finance Report:**

- No report in Sheng's absence

- **Careers Report:**

- Exploring Legal Pathways – 6pm Wednesday 16th
- September 26th – “No Clerkship, No Worries” event

- **Competitions Report:**

- Lots of sign-ups, but also lots of drop-outs
- Matt – Client Interview roster – will organise by Thursday
- Laksshini – Witex organiser
 - 26 teams registered
 - 21 dropped out
 - Sarah: very annoying for teams which don't drop out
- Laksshini: registration at BBQ poorer option than online sign-ups because of logistics – suggestion to make it online only?
 - Issue of accessibility – have a bond to prevent drop-outs?
 - Bryce: sign-ups online, but launch at BBQ too?
 - Sarah: info session before sign-ups?
 - Brigid: suggestion for longer application process so people can consider further
 - Rocky: more appreciation for posts made by Julia and Tony
 - Tony: perhaps have a stricter sign-up process at BBQs?
 - Laksshini: not feasible for the Comps team to be constantly chasing people about sign-ups
 - Bryce: sign-ups will be online only if no one has any objections? (none raised). Now – both BBQ and info session?
 - General consensus that both are okay
- Laksshini: reiterated that Comps teams can't do sign-ups, info session, and run a BBQ all on the same occasion
 - Potential \$15 bond for entering comp – get it back if you end up competing, otherwise kept by Comps team/LSS?
 - Matt: if there is a genuine reason i.e. illness in hospital etc. then bonds can be returned
 - Lucy: bond may deter people from entering
 - Laksshini: bond would probably only deter people from dropping out, no real issue with entries
- Tony: potential banning period – can pull out up to 3 days before (suggested by Bryce)
 - Bryce: bond can be put on hold for now – look at harsher penalties and ban period – as long as we have a clear rule

- Tony will sort this out after this meeting
 - Competed in Criminal Law Moot – one of our competitors got Best Oralist
- **Education Report:**
 - Speaker Series – date/topic will be finished by next week, starting to form survey questions
 - Booking PETs this week
 - Next Committee Meeting – we'll be discussing how we want to move forward with the removal of the Exam Database
- **Events Report:**
 - Massive thank you for Law Ball
 - Bryce congratulating Events team
- **Social Justice Report:**
 - WIL Breakfast – Thursday 17th 9-11am
 - Reminder to buy tickets
 - No speaker currently from Clayton Utz
 - If anyone knows potential female speaker, please let Suchara know tonight
 - Bryce: advice for next year – keep in mind availability of firms during clerkship applications
- **Constitutional reform**
 - More constitutional changes coming up in Week 8
 - So AGM takes much less time, we need to get things sorted now
 - Little things to do with elections, only 3 items up for debate right now
 - Running for elections is an exclusive right of paid members - if you are a law student and not a paid member, you cannot run. If you are a non-law student, you can't sit on the committee/executive.
 - 1st: who thinks it should be only law students to be able to hold office?
 - General consensus: everyone thinks so
 - Joe: potentially some positions that we might not need a law student for?
 - Bede: perhaps if there are no law students willing, we can open it to non-law students
 - Bryce: first suggestion messy, but should it be law students, non-law, or only non-law by default?
 - No votes for first two suggestion, only for last option (definite majority)
 - Should law students have to pay for membership?
 - First point: income (helps but we will be fine if no income here),
 - Second point: filter for joke runners
 - Suchara: we should be representing all law students, not just those who want to pay
 - Eden: payment shows a commitment to the society
 - Bede: weird to be running if you aren't technically a part of the society
 - Matt: we already have CoL reps, which any law student can run for
 - Bryce: keep it as paid member, change it, or on the fence?

- Only votes for keep it as paid member only
- Only international students/JD students can run for these positions respectively, but anyone can vote.
 - Firstly: should JDO only be JDO students voting?
 - General consensus: yes
 - Only JDCs vote for JDC positions?
 - Bede: good thing that JDs are represented in society, but JDs should be rewarded for engaging with LLBs, so I think it should be everyone to vote
 - Bryce: any objections? (no objections)
 - International students director, IS only to vote or domestic students as well?
 - Aley: I think it should be everyone to vote; it will encourage potential ISDs to engage with domestic students as well as IS
 - Eden: potential for an ISD who doesn't actively engage with IS, if they have lots of domestic friends
 - Ella: in ANUSA, you have to be a part of a collective to vote for a position within it
 - Campbell: how does that work logistically?
 - Bryce: yes will be yuck. But CoL can most likely do that
 - Laksshini: practically, how many international law students are there? It might be a bit too pedantic, it really restricts the amount of people voting
 - Lucy: I agree
 - Joe: Don't feel strongly either way, but shouldn't separate JDC voting from International Students voting
 - Bryce: does anyone feel strongly for making it only International Students voting?
 - Maddison: what does Tiffany think?
 - Bryce: good point, if she thinks we should, then I will put forward an amendment
- At the moment, you can vote if you are a law student, or anyone with a paid membership
 - We have broken that consistently because we don't know how to allow students from other colleges to vote
 - This is logistically difficult, but possible
 - As membership runs out at the end of the year, non-law students aren't shareholders in the voting process
 - Lucy: there are a lot of LSS members that aren't doing law because of events
 - Matt: easy to get rid of the duplicates (side-note)
 - Bryce: any other thoughts? anyone has to leave? (no one has to leave) – extend meeting for 10-15 minutes
 - Joe: what about final year law students?
 - Bryce: no conclusion, sort of on the fence. Anyone have a strong thought either way? We will put up vote for amendment.
 - Eden: Do we have time for other points? happy to delay my point if we don't have time.
- Bede: JD first year position would allow people to have someone to touch base with in their first year. There has been no desire for JDs to run in LSS, current directors

were asked by previous directors. I think that there is a strong argument for an additional first year officer because they are very useful, but I understand the size of the committee must stop at some point.

- Bryce: ignoring whether it is an additional position or in place of a current first year officer, should it exist?
 - Definite majority in favour
- Bryce: LSS is very large, so that is an issue. But do FYOs think that their workload would become too diluted if there is an additional FYO?
 - General consensus: no
- Suchara: would the JD first year officer be cycling through other portfolios or underneath JD directors?
- Bryce: personally, I'm for replacing a FYO with a JD FYO because splitting up portfolios gets messy with five officers. If everyone is on board, we can do an amendment and workshop what that looks like.

Meeting close: 7:40pm