# Muds executive meeting: 10/03/18

*Executive Members Present: Liam Holt, Tom Frankham, Udai Kamath, Beth Burns, Annya Reshty and Amelia Taylor*

*Executive Members Absent: Anneliese Cooper, Georgia Chahoud and Despina Bouletos*

**Red: Motion**

**Blue: Action Item**

*Meeting Opens: 9:12am*

**Agenda Item 1: Equity Policy**

AR: I want to propose this policy. Does anyone have any issues with it before we take it to a vote?

UK: In the definition, there are two different definitions for direct and indirect discrimination. Within the body within the policy, it is only said discrimination. We should be specific.

AR: That’s because it relates to both types. We can decide which one applies on a case by case basis.

TF: so lets add something at the topic being like “when we say discrimination, this includes direct and indirect”

AR: I’m happy to add that

*Georgia arrives late: 9:15am*

*Chair bans Udai from speaking cause he’s a dummy*

UK: Surely there are some cases where discrimination okay

AT: I think the reasonable person can understand the context of discrimination

BB: I think equity policy allows for some discrepancy

GC: why did you separate them?

AR: they both exist

UK: why do you need to define both separately?

LH: They are different and I think its important we recognise that

AT: I think this is pedantic

UK: I think its weird to define terms you never use. I also think the definition is too broad. It should be more specific, like “harass and vilify”

LH: we have a note that we says discrimination includes both, but can be broader then that

UK: I think we should make that amendment.

**GC: lets vote on that amendment**

*In favour: Udai*

*Against: Liam Holt, Tom Frankham, Georgia Chahoud, Beth Burns, Annya Reshty and Amelia Taylor*

Motion does not pass.

**Agenda Item 2: Bunnings BBQ**

BB: UNSW do these, they make heaps of money. It involves going to Bunnings for a day, we cook sausages and make money. My fear is we buy too many, don’t sell enough, don’t make money. We have one person with the card, they can buy more if we need to purchase more. Other things are logistics, we get as many people involved as possible (especially first years). Generally booked out quite far in advance, so we need to book it soon to do it this year.

UK: my concern is this seems far out of the purview to what a society does

AT: I think we get a lot out of it in terms of bonding, plus we get to make money to spend on debating

BB: good way to get people involved, to participate in the society; money does go back to them because subsidise debating

GC: my concern that it will burn people out; I worried that people will be mad if they lose most of the day cooking sausages. Effort verses reward, its not worth out time.

BB: yeah, would do shifts.

LH: seems like a big commitment; because people live far away from that. Could we do 2 venues? We could do something out west.

TF: There would be a manpower issue, more than one location is probably too many people

BB: we do the same thing of exec when we put out time in; what I noticed is that people have to do survive to points, its voluntary. Burnouts: its optional how long people do it, especially it you are local. It will take work

AT: the comparative is that we don’t make that money

*Annelise arrives late: 9:35am*

UK: I have experience doing these. They are difficult to do. Lots of planning. We have to bring things. Equipment. We are asking people to donate their time, to get a subsidy at a later point. A tournament contributes to debating.

LH: My parents would help me. We can ask other people to help out.

GC: im worried that people will have commitments and wont be able to make it. It’s a weird way of making funds. It seems bad and asking too much of their members. We need to think of other things.

BB: I can plan and bring. Im happy to do that work. I don’t think its that bad. People don’t have to do it. You don’t have to come.

AT: Its just hard work.

GC: we would need a lot of people. The risk is that people don’t want to be there. If it fucks up, they wont be happy. Similar to the o-week stall. A lot of people wouldn’t do that. Cant be the norm for the average member base. Maybe we should ask people and talk to them; see if people are keen? Lets have this discussion another time. Lets put vibes out.

**Action Item: ask people what their thoughts are. Check in on the facebook page (lets have this chat on Tuesday 2 weeks from now)**

**Agenda Item 3: Letter**

AC: we want them to like us; we had this two years ago, something to consider. We hold off, until we hit 50.

**Action Item: Amelia will look at it on Tuesday; If its not 50, wont sign.**

**Agenda Item 4: Portfolios**

GC: we are all on the exec for the same reason. We want a society that can hold itself up in 2 years. Portfolios are a team, they need to talk to each other and work with each other for that to happen. Not an opportunity for grand-standing; need to talk to people and act on the assumption that everyone is coming from a place of good faith. You have to back each other and the rest of the exec. People need to trust out exec. We need to be united and be a team. If you have issues, speak to me, not to other people. If you need help, ask for it. If you have plans, share them with everyone. Do you have any projects that you want to share.

**Action plan: Things to get done: prospectus; easters selectors; easters survival guide**

AC: the other thing is, transparency is really important, stops people from making stupid mistakes. We can allocate some of the schools work to sponsorship.

AT: schools is planning and meeting and we will bring the plans to the next meeting

UK: if we need help, we can ask.

GC: socials, need to have a meeting about plans. Post ideas on the meeting. Can do trivia, have a picnic.

**Agenda Item 5: Internals Room Allocation**

UK: people feel that they are being allocated to the same type of room. How do we a allocate people?

GC: this is a disappointing criticism. People were asking to be in those rooms. We had complaints about people not taking rooms seriously. This is an easy fix, we will encourage people to talk to us if they are unhappy.

TF: This isn’t a pressing issue at the moment cause we have so many first year.

GC: I can get people to keep an eye out for it. Come and tell me if its an issue.

UK: I think that we can make it clear to people if they are unahappy with their room allocation, we can change it for them. I spent time in bin rooms, but I didn’t ask for it.

AC: that’s fair, probably a result of womens. I was thinking we can allocate and type them up on a google doc. But we can check the patterns and have a record of it.

*Meeting closed: 9:59am*