

Young Liberals Executive Meeting
27th April 2019
Liberal Democrats HQ

Present: **The Co-Chairs** (Callum James Littlemore, Dan Schmeising); **Communications Officer** (Harry Samuels); **Campaigns Officer** (Charlie Murphy); **Events Officer** (Catriona McDougall); **English Chair** (Jack Worrall); **Welfare and Accessibility Officer** (Katherine Macy); **Welsh Chair** (Thomas Hughes); **International Officer** (Ben Whitlock); **Finance Officer** (Finn Conway); **Policy Officer** (Tara Copeland)

Attending: Guy Benson, Chris Annous

Apologies: **Non-Portfolio Officer** (Erin Yarrow); **Membership Development Officer** (Alex Howarth); **Scottish Chair** (Becca Plenderleith)

Minutes and Matters Arising

There were none.

Declarations of Interests

Callum James Littlemore is working for the party as a consultant for Brecon and Radnorshire. If any decisions are made on that, he won't be making them or contributing.

Welfare Presentation

Jeanne is not able to make it today, but potential webinar in the pipeline.

Email Updates

Dan Schmeising says that we have had limited motion on emails. The discussion is happening next week to set the new emails up. They will be given access to see how much needs to be migrated over, and then finally we will have a cost to approve and be able to get it sorted.

Jack Worrall asks for an ETA.

Callum James Littlemore says that it is dependent on HQ time, but considering everything happening at the moment, it might not be immediately. If you're having problems with the emails, there can be short-term fixes potentially by jiggling around with the backend.

Finn Conway says that it works for him when people use @youngliberals.uk.

Callum James Littlemore says that it doesn't work for everyone. Everyone whose emails are sent or received after we lost the domain, it doesn't work. Mass emails also don't work. Legacy accounts are therefore fine; non-legacy accounts are not. Please make sure you post in the Facebook exec group if you've sent an email.

Dan Schmeising says to use Nomi's Lib Dem HQ account rather than her Young Liberals account.

Local Elections Update

Charlie Murphy says that we've had about 50 applicants for Young and Winning and that we have finished the planned support for them. We've given a hardship fund to one action day where it was requested. Nothing was claimed, however. Not sure how much we've got from fundraising for it, but we have been asking for donations. We did some posts about registration to vote which went down well, and we have about five more graphics which we can sponsor over the next few days. Looking good.

Finn Conway asks whether we can do ads as Young Liberals.

Callum James Littlemore says we can if they're verified but—

Finn Conway says that ads go on the national expenditure so they need approval by Nick Harvey or Darren Briddock.

Callum James Littlemore says that we can spend up to £50k but best if we don't because the national party are spending so much. On Euro elections, there are different sign-ups and registration dates.

Harry Samuels asks how much money we have leftover in the campaigns pot generally.

Finn Conway says that lots of people applied for grants, and then we emailed them, but they didn't give details. Of the people who replied and whose local parties replied to their emails, we've allocated £700 out of a total budget of £2000. In theory, we would have spent £1300 if everyone had applied. This is a rolling budget for all elections over the course of the exec.

Callum James Littlemore asked for an update on the Euro elections.

Charlie Murphy says he's focussing on the locals for now.

Tara Copeland says she knows it's the local parties' job to do campaigning, but is there a reason we haven't been advertising where local elections have been happening? Eg for people who haven't got locals this year.

Charlie Murphy says that he knows that London region has been giving a few places where people can go.

Tara Copeland asks why YL hasn't been doing that.

Charlie Murphy says that we could probably share where young candidates are. But in terms of others we could leave it to regional parties.

Tara Copeland says that she is asking why YL can't do that.

Harry Samuels asks whether there's a risk of picking a place over others and sending them there.

Tara Copeland says that it's more just about sending out a list of where young candidates are standing. Nobody is going to be saying "god, we have volunteers but it's awful".

Nomi Farhi says that in the past we have had target lists and campaigns lists.

Finn Conway said that we only know who the young candidates are who have signed up for Young and Winning.

Callum James Littlemore says we could definitely send out an email to all members saying "here is the best place to campaign" in each region.

Harry Samuels expresses his frustration that the newsletter was set up to send out information about campaigns events by region, with regions providing them to him in advance, but this hasn't happened – there were no notices whatsoever last month, and there is clearly something wrong if this is the case in the run-up to the biggest local elections the country has. Promoting events is really difficult when there are not those feedback loops from the regional chairs. Recognises it's difficult and people are busy, but would appreciate a redoubled effort.

Jack Worrall says that this might be because regional chairs haven't had information or lists of candidates' names. It's hard for them to get information and organise action days when they're not being given the candidates' names.

Charlie Murphy says he emailed every regional chair asking who wanted action days, and only two people replied.

Tara Copeland says that it's not just about YL – there are loads of action days today, for example, and we're just not there. Why can't we just have a list of young candidates in that area who got in contact.

Charlie Murphy says we can't just hand out data for people who don't want help or who didn't expressly request it.

Finn Conway says that as it's a matter of public record who's standing and where, can we not just say that X is standing in Y Borough Council, can regional chairs not just then get in touch with local parties themselves? In future, there was a BBC article about the different demographics of councillors, and only 10% are under-40. That's obviously dumb, but we might consider just expanding the range to include as much of that 10% as possible. For instance Tara's brother is standing in Kidlington, and we should be able to support them too.

Callum James Littlemore says it's a matter of priority – are we about just supporting young candidates, or are we supporting the whole party?

Harry Samuels; Tara Copeland – the latter.

Cat McDougall said that she had multiple people asking for London YL help over the age of YL asking for help and we offered the same support. We tried to reach out to people more as well, and we had about 25 candidates, and maybe about four or five got back to me. Even if regional chairs have the information, candidates don't respond.

Finn Conway says that on that, a point of best practice going forward is that candidates aren't necessarily their own campaign managers. If they're not in charge of their own money, they might not know what's going on with finance.

Harry Samuels says that we focus too much on "action days" as big events, when campaigning is often just campaigning. We shouldn't be focussing on Days Of Action, but on promoting general campaigning and where it's taking place in the run-up to polling day.

Cat McDougall says that it's very difficult to get candidate information just from names – last year we had no boroughs for some candidates, which makes it very difficult to do stuff.

Charlie Murphy says that the regional chairs are told the local authority and ward.

Kathy Macy says that next year we need to plan and there's no point freaking out about this time round. But we could maybe set things up with a buddy system for people who have anxiety. Not everyone has been campaigning since they were three like I did. If the local parties are happy to have a buddy system—my mother is appalled that I leaflet entire streets with nobody around me, and that we hop doors, and she understands my complete freak-out for it. It's also not accessible for under-18s. Young people don't always have the confidence, and we don't want to get bitten by dogs – we sing songs about it at conference. We should set this up in rolling for next elections. Some people really want to get involved but it's terrifying.

Callum James Littlemore says it's about setting up a living document.

Finn Conway says that we have Guy who has elections in his region, and that he is a regional chair.

Guy Benson asks whether we have considered doing a Young Liberals weekend of action. He is in a suburban rural region, and they don't want to travel.

Harry Samuels says that lots of action days on the same day across the country would be a good idea, which he has been advocating for years now.

Tara Copeland says that apart from a big hype-up for polling day, it's a bit too late for now, but we have Euros now, and we can test-run some of this for Euros. It's a bigger election and people are excited anyway, but we can at least maybe trial some of these systems.

Callum James Littlemore says that because it's all-up it might be different.

Dan Schmeising says that he wanted to agree with what Kathy said. When he was very new, he was helped out for the first one or two and that was it. Back on topic, we'd get more people involved if we had assistance in campaigning. Perhaps we should have YL campaigning mentors?

Kathy Macy says that she is creating an access document with lots of sections on campaigning and on making campaigning accessible for those with specific disabilities.

Jack Worrall says that although communications between the different regions and federal and different regions and London might not have been optimal in terms of promoting up and

outwards, it's been good at promoting it within regions, but they have been running action days regularly. West Midlands, South Central, East Midlands.

Cat McDougall says that Jack has been posting in the English group for bulletins.

Callum James Littlemore says that the regions need to buy in more to federal and signal boost things out.

Finn Conway says that the Gibraltar candidate on the SW list could be promoted by us because he's a student at Bristol. Secondly, as an observation on how we currently run grants, he's worried about how well-spent the money is. We did take into account winnability of wards, but the way we do things at the moment for grants to young candidates is potentially just a massive black hole that we send money into now and again. Finally just to draw people's attention to the national party website, they have an events page which has events across the entire country, which can be filtered by region and postcode. We might want to consider doing something like that for the Euros.

Callum James Littlemore says we did have one but it got spam attacked but the code broke.

Cat McDougall said that on Guy's point from earlier about doing a campaign weekend and campaigning wherever you are, you could have people sending tweets in.

Harry Samuels says that he has been advocating for this for three years. When he was Vice-Chair of English Young Liberals, he did precisely this, and we had over 100 campaigners on one day all showing what they were doing and it was great. We need to do more of this, and even though he sounds like a broken record, it's the best way to do campaigning. We need people sending in photos, we need people telling us where they're campaigning – I don't care if it's young candidates or not, if young people are going there, I want to see it. It's not too late to hype up these elections, we can have a constant stream of things coming in.

Cat McDougall asks if we should have a hashtag and a slogan to marshal people.

Kathy Macy says that we need to send more photos in than just York. If we all aim to have one photo this week, that's lots of people sending in campaigning photos.

Dan Schmeising says that he was going to make the hashtag point too. He has just quietly checked and "YLdoorstep" is not currently used by Labour, so we can pinch that.

Activate Update

Cat McDougall says that it will be in London officially now – a vote was held. We have a list of about 50 venues which she is slowly working her way through. It will be in the summer at some point when our illustrious Policy Officer is not on holiday in Malaysia. Other than that, there is not a huge amount to update on. Trying to see if we can get leadership hustings at Activate, and London region said that because they have to have two, they're happy for one of them to be a YL one.

Callum James Littlemore says that in terms of timing, we might want to consider the by-election in Brecon and Radnorshire if it happens. And the second point is that the leadership elections are happening – it will be concluded before the last PMQs of the session.

Jack Worrall said that the way that it was sold to him at English Council was that it was going to start on May bank holiday, with 28 days of formal campaigning.

Harry Samuels asks what those exact dates are.

Callum James Littlemore says that the leadership election will probably begin on 20th May, but this may well be reviewed due to proximity of the European elections.

Kathy Macy says that she has a list of accessibility things and asks how best to send them to Cat.

Cat McDougall says that email is fine.

Age Range Consultation *is deferred to the next meeting.*

LYMEC Update

Ben Whitlock says there's not too much to confirm. A hotel and venue have been confirmed, and we're now just waiting for LYMEC to have their budget meeting after the European Parliamentary elections in May.

Callum James Littlemore asked whether we've done a lot of work promoting the fundraiser on our website.

Ben Whitlock says that we're going to start pushing in the next few months, but we're waiting until after elections.

Cat McDougall asks about money and LYMEC and paying our fee. She is still incredibly grumpy about the situation in Brussels. She would like some sort of review into what happened because it was very embarrassing.

Finn Conway says the liability was not entirely on us. Because of our current financial situation which is that we have some weird signatory problem which is hopefully being resolved, we can't access online banking. As a result of this, LYMEC emailed our invoice and we had to tell them that there was a delay to the payment. They said this would be fine, and emailed another invoice, and he explained. Then twelve hours before our delegates arrived in Brussels, Finn was told at 9pm that if they didn't pay, our delegates would be barred from Conference. Finn had to make a personal transfer to pay the money, but that's not a good solution. LYMEC's conduct was unacceptable.

Cat McDougall said that she was shown messages from Nomi that the payment had gone through the Lib Dems and was on its way. LYMEC had not chased it up because they expected it to take three to five working days.

Nomi Farhi says that HQ told LYMEC that it would take two weeks. There was a clear error in the finance team here, though they had just lost half of their team, but they did inform LYMEC that it would take time.

Cat McDougall says that with the rules of LYMEC, we have to pay our membership fee before the Congress otherwise our membership is not valid for that Congress. It wasn't specifically just for us, it's just the rule.

Finn Conway says great, they should have told us, and that they didn't.

Ben Whitlock says that this is one of the first times it's happened. They had asked us for their bill for several months.

Finn Conway says he had been communicating with them on that for months, and they didn't tell us that they would disbar our delegates. LYMEC conducted themselves badly – end of story.

Callum James Littlemore says that they expected us to know the rules and it would have been nice that they had reminded us of the ramifications of not paying the LYMEC fee. So long as we make a note that this is the procedure LYMEC follows, hopefully we won't have this problem in future.

Finn Conway says that he and Nomi need to speak about YL's interaction with HQ finance at some point. As far as LYMEC is concerned, he has said his piece.

Cat McDougall says that she wanted to check that something was at least being looked into. We need to make sure that it doesn't happen again. Just wanted to check that something was happening.

Callum James Littlemore said that it was very confusing to find out that it wasn't sorted out when he and Finn thought it was sorted out.

Ben Whitlock says that in the event of a second EU referendum, JNC and other parties have expressed a desire to help us campaign. We would organise some kind of action day for them if that happened.

Cat McDougall said that the German Young Liberals wanted to do something in Oxford which they'd be organising.

YL Mentoring Scheme

Cat McDougall elaborates on the mentoring scheme, which is something for executive members. Having a list of people executive members can reach out to who are not former executive officers. For example, Events Officers can have people who work in events who they can reach out to. It means there is still a transfer of knowledge and experience, and it's not just someone picking up a job and not knowing what's going on.

Ben Whitlock says that he and Cat discussed this at LYMEC and he thinks this would be a fantastic idea. He knows that Nomi has some ideas on this.

Jack Worrall says that he completely agrees with the whole system, but after the last English Council Executive, he was talking to some of their members on institutional memory, and they came with a few proposals in terms of how the English Party deals with the

outgoing chair and the incoming chair, and basically they have a system where there is some sort of overlap where the outgoing and incoming chair sit on a committee, and so on.

Cat McDougall says the whole point of this is that it's not for the previous executive officer, and there's always a worry about stepping on people's toes.

Jack Worrall says that perhaps we could keep the outgoing chair on for a month or so to make sure there is overlap and handover.

Callum James Littlemore says that having ex-officers on the Committee has been floated before. But the overall idea from Cat about a mentoring scheme is a good thing overall and we should look at it.

Ben Whitlock says that we should be aiming to reach out to the various committees for the mentoring roles. But also we should require handover notes to be submitted electronically so that we have a database of past handover notes.

Kathy Macy says that at the Real Ale Society at York, there is a handbook for people to know what to do. On top of the mentoring scheme, we need to be aware of people who are a little bit more on the edge, and things can become quite triggering.

Nomi Farhi says that the mentoring scheme touches on a number of things. Some of it is just what she does (re institutional memory stuff), but organising the handover and so on was done by her and by Finn. Also, everyone will remember but on the handover day there were sit-down chats with every exec officer asking about training and resources. That is an ongoing offer. The only thing of concern about a mentoring scheme is that Nomi doesn't think it's safe or secure for a lot of reasons (welfare, press, publicity, and so on) to be encouraging mentoring relationships with anyone who isn't from the party, or based at HQ, or working for the party. They might encourage you to do something which is inadvisable.

Callum James Littlemore says we should focus on updated record keeping and keeping on top of keeping a note about things we do.

Nomi Farhi says that we might want to consider doing a constitutional amendment at Activate which formalises handover notes and mandates Exec officers to leave handover notes, otherwise people are happy to just do nothing.

Ben Whitlock says that he thought it could be good to set up shadowing with the relevant HQ officer, which Nomi said she'd set up. It could be something to explore in the future.

Tara Copeland says that this is an opportunity only available to a specific proportion of YL. She does not have time to take a holiday and sit in HQ to job shadow. And this is not going to be practical for anybody who has a job. Also a mentoring relationship can be one-sided and be difficult for vulnerable people, especially women. You don't want mentors to assume that it's a springboard for a different type of relationship.

Nomi Farhi says that that is her reticence as well. At the end of the day, the staff member job is here to be able to be a point of contact. Personally thinks a formalised mentoring scheme is particularly new and has some difficulties. But the goals identified are very important.

Handover, institutional memory, and making sure people don't get burnt out is very important.

Callum James Littlemore says that we could have a hybrid system of making sure that handover notes are formalised, having the point of contact at HQ, and having the option to come in and shadow people in HQ.

Hermione Peace wants to follow up on what Tara says and why it's a good reason to have a good formalisation of this. When Hermione was Comms last year, it was suggested to go down to HQ and talk to someone from the Comms team about general stuff. Because it was informal, it felt difficult. Felt very patronised and silly, and being a woman was down to it a little bit. It wasn't fun at all. Maybe if there was some kind of formalisation put in place, and even if the guy had been given a sheet of paper about what was being expected, instead of what actually happened, it might have been better.

Nomi Farhi says that if someone has treated you in a way that made you feel patronised, it should be raised. We should have a conversation about it.

Cat McDougall says that the idea of doing this was to bring in skills and experience that the exec aren't necessarily going to have. We don't have a lot of people who have organised events in the past. But if we had people in the party who we know is sound, that would be helpful. Especially since the staff member isn't permanent and may leave.

Nomi Farhi says that the staff member's job is to be that expert and if they're not, you can call them out on it – whoever they are.

Callum James Littlemore suggests we defer this to the working group and it comes back to the Exec when we have a full proposal.

BME Officer Proposal

Chris Annous joins the meeting, who is LDCRE's YL rep. He begins running through his officer proposal. Currently, despite having very pro-ethnic minority policies and immigration policies, the party is doing a terrible job with attracting BAME members and voters. Only 2% of BAME people voted Lib Dem at the 2017 general election, and we've only ever had one BAME MP. The party's membership is disproportionately white. Everyone agrees that something needs to be done, because YL is not currently as diverse as it should be. After discussions, there are two aspects in which he believes YL is currently failing: (1) not enough young BAME people are joining, and (2) those we do have are not properly being engaged. One-fifth of people our age are BAME because of demographic change. But none of the exec are BAME. Historically I understand it's never been close either. There has not yet been a strategic response to the Alderdice Review either. Soon the Federal Party will make it compulsory for all SAOs to have a policy on this. Alderdice says that there is a significant problem with the party's process and culture which is discouraging people from joining, voting, or progressing further in the party. Alderdice believes it is for two reasons: a lack of prioritisation (supporting diversity but not having the funds to do things), and a culture (a misunderstanding of what events are appropriate or how we can better reach out to other communities). The party is not actively anti-BAME or racist, but we just need to make an effort to make the party a better place for BAME young people. A further point made by Alderdice is that when we talk about diversity, we talk about all aspects of it. But the party is

doing much better with women and LGBT+ representatives than BAME and disabilities. By grouping it under one umbrella of diversity, we fail to see the discrepancies which emerge between different minority groups. It's a case of the image and the culture of the place feels like BAME backgrounds can fit in or enjoy themselves. It doesn't need to be mechanical changes, it's about how we present our work and encourage people from BAME backgrounds to stand. Spoken to Callum and Kathy, and thinks the best way to do this is to create a BAME officer on the YL Executive. It would be a non-voting member, because it would cause logistical difficulties, and they would sit on an accessibility sub-committee. This would mirror the way the Federal Board works; it wouldn't be re-inventing the wheel. To go into more detail, on this accessibility subcommittee, other liberation groups would be represented, such as women, non-binary, LGBT and disability group representatives, while the Accessibility Officer would co-ordinate their work. If we don't have any BAME people on the federal executive, it's hard for people to know how to make these changes, and for people to feed them up from the bottom – which is what we want, letting people put their own suggestions in. So, the first and most important role would be to work with the Exec and the Accessibility Officer to create a strategic response to the Alderdice Review. They would then be responsible for implementing that and adapting it. Additionally, they would attend YL Exec as a non-voting member, and would speak on matters concerning their role. Their role as a non-executive member should be formalised and written down so they can't be sidelined or tokenised. Another role for them would be to liaise with all the SAOs' internal organisations so that BAME people are involved and a culture is created across the party where young BAME people feel they can contribute. Sees the officer working across the Exec – having membership days with the Membership Officer; social events for people from religious backgrounds with the Events Officer. To give an example to crystallise the problem: Shaun Bailey did a video with a young black man where he made some stupid comments like how homelessness is “just hype”, but he spoke in a way which was extremely effective in communicating with someone from black heritage. For example, talking about his uncles (who in Afro-Caribbean cultures are wise figures in the family) – but the Lib Dems piled in on him for this video, even though this was effective communication for talking to someone from those communities. Finally, we currently have an Accessibility Officer, and it's unlikely that we're going to have someone who is a woman, LGBT, disabled and BAME filling that job. Therefore, we need to have specific officers and all these groups get representation. It seems pronounced the fact that we don't have anyone who is BAME on this committee. When objections come about funding this role, thinks BAME should be prioritised. Basically, the only objection has been the funding of the travel expenses for this role. Two responses: firstly, Lord Alderdice identifies this (BAME involvement) as being one of the key problems within the party. This should be considered an investment and not just a sunk cost. If we get this right we can increase engagement and participation. We'd have both financial and political benefits from this – it should be seen as investment, and not a sunk cost.

Finn Conway says that he has already chatted about expenses, so he won't reiterate the points, but has further questions. For the role of BAME Officer, would he prefer it that that role were elected or appointed, and if appointed, appointed by YL or LDCRE?

Chris Annous says he'd prefer electing it.

Finn Conway says that in that case, you'd need to think about the electorate for that position – who would elect them considering we don't collect self-identification data.

Chris Annous says that because it should be all of our priorities, everyone should get a vote on it.

Finn Conway says that brings us onto enshrining the BAME Officer – if it weren't elected, we could have got away with it being in the Exec Regulations, but if it's going to be elected and legitimised properly, it should go into the Constitution, which has to be an amendment passed at Conference. And finally, mention was made of co-ordinating with YL and local societies – this is difficult in that we already try to do that and it's like trying to herd cats. Everyone is willing to try to do it, but as a point to note before embarkation, it's going to be very difficult.

Dan Schmeising says that regarding elections, BAME people have much more lived experience of what is right for BAME people, and if the rest of the Young Liberals are able to vote for it as well, the only problem is that we don't have that lived experience, so we could end up getting a BAME Officer who isn't quite right for the job. Could white people vote the wrong way? What could we do about that?

Chris Annous says that he doesn't think there's a solution to that. So long as the person is of BAME heritage, it shouldn't be too much of a problem, though.

Callum James Littlemore says that we need to be very clear regarding where the BAME Officer would sit with regard the Accessibility and Diversity Officer. Also, it might be better to invite applications and co-opt, rather than going to the membership, which can often be a popularity contest. A similar process was followed in Wales for the Welsh Language Officer.

Hermione Peace says that she thinks it should be an elected role, but that we appoint the first officer so that we can establish the role, and then put it in the Constitution. It will make the role visible, and show the electorate what the role is about, so that the for the next time, the second officer who comes in will be elected. Also, we should encourage – in a situation where nobody runs – that we don't go to by-elections, but go straight to appointing. This is a role that needs to have a constant presence. If we give this role priority in terms of appointment immediately in case of vacancy, it will make it harder for it to be ignored, so that the job is never sidelined.

Callum James Littlemore says that we could create this right now through the Executive Regulations. For immediate appointment if nobody runs, we'd have to put a specific note on that in the Constitution, saying that it doesn't count towards the two-vacancies-trigger-a-by-election rule.

Hermione Peace also says that, about the “could white people vote for this or not”, as a woman, if we ever had a Women's Officer, she would be uncomfortable having non-women being able to run for the role or vote for the role. Also in the YL Women Group, we don't allow men.

Chris Annous says that he thinks it's a good idea about co-opting rather than electing, but since the YL Exec is white, it might be a good idea to work with LDCRE on the co-option.

Kathy Macy says she fully supports most of it. Do we have enough BAME people to sustain a role? Regarding the statement that the party is better re LGBT and women, the party is still bad with women. Regarding conferences, we mostly stayed on location and were together as

a group – people did bring drinks but the events weren't expressly alcoholic. Wants to set up a games night, it might involve drinking but at least it's not at a pub or something. Loves the idea of an access committee – propose BAME, women, LGBT – perhaps with a separate trans rep, disability and a carer or care leavers rep. Regarding ensuring there is a rep – York added such reps recently but this was difficult and can cause issues because there are no people there. When it comes to voting, we need to think about who can vote for what – you might need to trust that people will opt out of voting. Would say that ethnic minorities is where self-identifying becomes difficult – technically Polish people could identify as an ethnic minority; BAME is a huge category and it would need discussion. There are about three disabled people on this exec but we're all able bodied (so no wheelchair experience and so on). You have to just put a first step forward. Also, discomfort about BAME Officer coming to meetings, but other groups can't. What we should do is rework the Accessibility role and make that the spokesperson for all the subcommittee officers. We need a spokesperson and have to trust in the YL electorate to elect someone who is willing to speak on the subcommittee's behalf.

Finn Conway says that if we wanted to, we could fund it. But as it stands, there is no room. But we could amend.

Callum James Littlemore says that if it was put to a motion at Conference, we'd need to break the motion up into different parts.

Kathy Macy says that she would want her role to stay as it is, but also be the spokesperson for the access subcommittee.

Chris Annous says that if the BAME Officer were only allowed to phone in, the Officer would immediately be on the secondary level. We don't want there to be tokenism. BAME is a priority, and should be a priority for finance.

Jack Worrall thanks Chris for the paper. He is on board with the full proposal. Culturally we do fail with regard to BAME. We should offer help after the European elections to set up a scheme to help those from underrepresented groups (LGBT, women, BAME) to go through the approvals process for Parliamentary selection. Questions: how do we change our culture as a YL Exec, but also at Activate, to make that event and other campaigning events more accessible to BAME people.

Chris Annous says that there is no simple answer, but it has to be an active effort. It needs to be an understanding of what different communities want. Socials at Spoons – if you're from a non-drinking culture, you're not going to go there. Communications – different messages need to go to different people. Stormzy's latest song has gone viral amongst the black community, and Labour use that, and in different ways eg JME interviewing Jeremy Corbyn. Putting black members on advertising for Conference.

Tara Copeland says she's happy Chris is here. The one reservation she has is surrounding the election of the BAME Officer. If it's an elected role, it needs to be decided if it's voting or non-voting. And then needs to be decided what it does. If BAME has a voting role, do women get a voting role, do disabled people get a voting role? Personally wouldn't want to run an election campaign during YL election season for a non-voting role. Whereas like they do on FPC is they bring in appointed members who are appointed by the relevant groups. If you're worried about the Exec ignoring that officer, then that's on the Exec, not on the officer

or its role – that Exec should be held accountable. Also likes the idea of the access sub-committee.

Charlie Murphy says that he wants to come in on the point around the BAME Officer helping us with messaging. Should the BAME Officer sit on Comms Committee/Campaigns Committee? Also on the idea of whether they should vote or not. It might be better if they include them as a voting member. Otherwise the only person on the exec who is non-voting is the BAME Officer.

Chris Annous didn't want to push too far with the voting member of the Exec idea, but if people were in favour, he would be strongly in favour of that.

Cat McDougall says that she likes the idea of a sub-committee, but we have a problem with committees being non-functioning and underused.

Hermione Peace says that the issue with that sub-committee is that if you put a BAME Officer onto a committee and not on the Exec with everyone else, it automatically sidelines the issue. They need to be on the Exec to not be sidelined. What about other minority groups? It's not what we're talking about here.

Cat McDougall asked about what if we had expenses for the sub-committee – non-voting members of the Exec, but they could turn up to Exec meetings.

Chris Annous says that ideally this wouldn't cause an issue. All it takes is for someone to take a dislike to any Officer, and if they're not officially part of the Exec, there is a way of sidelining them.

Tara Copeland says she is not against them being a voting member, just that if they're elected by the organisation they should be a voting member. Secondly, regardless of if they become a voting or a non-voting member, the Exec needs to be held accountable.

Harry Samuels says that we're stuck doing things as we are, and we need to be a bit more imaginative. If they were co-opted, they could be mandated to come to Exec. If they were elected, we need to think about whether they could be co-officers. But ultimately there doesn't seem to be an objection about the existence of the job so to a degree we need to push on with the implementation.

Kathy Macy says that we would look bad if white people co-opt the BAME official, and there is more to discuss.

Charlie Murphy says that we can't be trying to include everything and having no priorities, because that means focussing on nothing. We have to make sure this is a priority that we're willing to focus on.

Dan Schmeising says that on white people voting for the BAME Officer, he remains perfectly happy with his opinion that if we can restrict the role to BAME people, then either way, there shouldn't be enough of a difference for it to matter.

Harry Samuels says that we should focus less on sidelining – we can implement this however we like, to ensure that they don't get sidelined. We need to focus on the detail of implementation as for co-option versus election.

Chris Annous says that this is not just about directly BAME issues, it's about BAME voices and contribution to each of the portfolios. The reason we don't get the changes that we need is that people feel that they can't speak up or that they're going to be ignored.

Jack Worrall doesn't want to talk about procedure but he will. We need to make sure they're not elected at different times to the federal exec. We don't want a situation where we have an executive in the future who can push it forward because it isn't a priority.

Cat McDougall asks whether we could put into the constitution that we have set dates for the elections.

Jack Worrall says that we had these for England, and nobody did anything with them.

Cat McDougall says that we could still write it in, and if they didn't happen, Conference couldn't hold them to account.

Dan Schmeising asks, after all this, what are we going to do? We need to make some sort of progress towards this today.

Kathy Macy is a little confused. As the Accessibility Officer, what she would like is to co-opt a BAME Officer who can work on the role in the interim, who the Accessibility Officer speaks for on the Exec, until we can get a proper role sorted out at Conference for the Constitution.

Callum James Littlemore says we need to make a key decision about whether we want the Officer to be on the Exec itself, or to be on a committee beneath the Accessibility Officer.

Hermione Peace remains in favour of having a fully sitting Exec Officer to represent BAME people. She recognises where Kathy is coming from, but the Alderdice Review says that this needs to be a priority. We all need to agree that there needs to be an independent BAME Officer.

Cat McDougall asks whether as a working solution we can co-opt someone to come to the rest of the exec meetings, until Conference can happen.

Harry Samuels proposes two discrete things to do right now: to amend the exec regulations to create a temporary co-opted role now, and then to commit ourselves to creating a motion to amend the Constitution.

Kathy Macy brings up a concern that we need more officers, and not just a BAME Officer. This includes a Disabilities Officer, a Care Leavers Officer, a Carers Officer, and so on.

Callum James Littlemore outlines a process including workshopping at the next Exec meeting to come up with a constitutional amendment.

Harry Samuels proposes an amendment to the Executive Regulations to create an interim officer which can be appointed by the Executive.

“1. BAME Officer:

- a. Work with the Accessibility Officer to create a YL Strategic Response to the Alderdice Review, and implement this across YL.
- b. Attend all YL meetings and speak on matters relating to their role such as the implementation of the Alderdice strategy, and the plans and actions of other members of the Executive when it concerns or could affect BAME individuals and communities.
- c. Liaise with relevant SAOs and AOs, especially LDCRE, to ensure YL is promoting an experience which is positive and inclusive for BAME members of Young Liberals.”

Passed with no objections.

Strategy Update

Harry Samuels and Finn Conway would rather get this done now.

Callum James Littlemore wants to quickly run through where each individual’s portfolio is at and update it – this is meant to be the checklist for what we want to do.

Harry Samuels suggests we combine this with officers’ reports to kill two birds with one stone.

Strategy Update and Executive Reports

Dan Schmeising says that the “mutual and beneficial relationship” with the party is going well because of a good relationship with Sal; “improving standing and image of YL with party membership” – we have a hit and miss view with people, some think we need to return to the 60s, some think we’re great. Also professional conduct has been good. “Lobbying and building connections to get YL policy adopted”, thinks this has been a success.

Kathy Macy says that some of the people involved in building those connections were quite rude to Tara.

Tara Copeland says that she felt that the conversations with the people arranged were not helpful. Most of the information was already known, and the conversation happened after the deadline for policy motions. A good working relationship with Nick da Costa, however, which is obviously very useful (he is on FCC).

Callum James Littlemore thinks that “supporting roles without encroaching” has been successful. The last element is about “greater transparency” by “more accessibility”. Minutes have been online quickly and very detailed, but we haven’t advertised the meetings enough.

Hermione Peace has sent emails with proposals to Lib Dem Women but they haven’t answered. Events at conferences – we had the Women in Politics fringe at York. It was successful in that we had good speakers and the people who attended got a lot out of it, but one of the big problems was that once again, men outnumbered women in the room.

Obviously didn't want to turn people away, but there was a point when it was very noticeable that there were more men in the room and Wera Hobhouse said quite loudly that "I thought this was meant to be a women's event". But it was a good discussion overall. But would say that if we're going to do more things like that in future, I did a poll about what events they'd go to. And they did want to see more panels. But the most popular was just casual meetups. So was thinking better to work with Aleisha but could do some meetups around the country specifically for women. The last thing we did was a new member's day for women, and it didn't go well, and it may have deflated people and drained them from doing things. Has been working on ideas for different types of training day and we could involve state and regional chairs in this. We should aim for two or three days in the summer (low expense), and if we can get people from the regions involved, they can talk to societies and get them onboard too.

Jack Worrall says that he was looking at training for his regional chairs and that it was in very preliminary stages and the feedback was that training on PagePlus, Nationbuilder and Connect should be delivered. Also another point on diversity training. In-person training is a lot better because you can have feedback. But in terms of accessibility, geography and so on, it's a good idea to have a mix of training days in person and webinars and so on.

Kathy Macy said that the women's event clashed with the Liberal Reform event about the sugar tax and eating, and eating disorders disproportionately affect women. Alex had planned to have one thing every month, but then it was Hibernata, then Conference, then his dissertation was due.

Finn Conway says that fundraising and donor base hasn't had much done so far because of elections. As for keeping spending level the same, people are sticking to their budget, so this is going well so far. So far we've spent around £2,815.11, and had an income of £12,400, so we're massively up, but that includes the grants where there is stuff to sort out, so our actual income is £4,728.54.

Harry Samuels has completed four of five manifesto pledges. The bulletin is up and running, social media has more engagements than ever, Comms Committee is being used to start up communications campaigns around our Core Messages, and the Comms Strategy was published, even if it appears nobody has actually read it, which is a shame. Go and read the Comms Strategy.

Charlie Murphy says we have been supporting local candidates in local elections, we have got a general election plan, as for refining how we communicate campaigns, and we've been working to make sure that campaigns are accessible with subsidies and hardship funds so they aren't claimed unnecessarily.

Cat McDougall has no problems with the strategy she was left by Huw, but she can't do them until Activate, because they are all about Activate.

Hermione Peace asks when we can expect a timeline for Activate.

Cat McDougall repeats the information given earlier about finding a venue in London.

Tara Copeland says that our policy was discussed at conference. Also, the feedback loop with FPC has been good, and feedback on our policy has been good with FCC. As for

offering good drafting advice to members, this has been one of the things which has driven up the wall. Nobody follows deadlines at all. People need to follow deadlines. We need to be really very firm about those deadlines.

Ben Whitlock says he's still working towards LYMEC. Communication of the event can be improved – will send things to Harry for the bulletin. And more international speakers is good.

Kathy Macy says that events accessibility is a joint role, and she has just sent an email to Cat for accessibility information. As for the quiet room, Glasgow was a problem, and spoke to Nomi about things at Conference in future. Training and new members events were helped out. Carers' consultation is coming up. It's in York, and people should stop complaining about it. Also working on the access document.

Callum James Littlemore asks if there is going to be any online attendance or streaming for the carers' consultation.

Kathy Macy will set up a Typeform consultation to draft something for people who can't make it so we get as strong a diversity of feedback as possible. Also a letter has been written to FCC asking for accessibility things.

Jack Worrall says that regional chairs have been pestered to set up their own executives; more regions are being self-sufficient, such as the East Midlands, London, and so on. In terms of getting more involved in the English Party, work is being done towards that. ECE has been attended. Big English Council on June 22nd.

Thomas Hughes says that they had a disappointing fringe at Welsh Conference, but are looking to start firing the membership into action. Nothing much to add on the main strategy document. As for B&R by-election, just waiting for the pointers on the best time for an action day in the constituency.

Any Other Business – Written Reports

Callum James Littlemore wants Exec members to submit a written report rather than just a verbal report.

Any Other Business – Constitutional Maintenance

Tara Copeland says that it's currently in nobody's portfolio and it's not in hers.

Callum James Littlemore suggests it goes to the Comms Officer.

Tara Copeland suggests that the Vice-Chair does it.

Hermione Peace says that it needs to be put in somebody's job description regardless of who decides to do it for this exec.

Nomi Farhi suggests it could be given to the Non-Portfolio Officer.

Callum James Littlemore suggests it be given to the Vice-Chair, but that it can be delegated to whomever.

Any Other Business – YL Storage Facility

Cat McDougall has heard of mysterious rumours of things that we have, such a storage unit in Cambridge with things in it. But we don't know what's in it. We should work out what we've got.

Kathy Macy says that she would like some space to put some quiet room things in. A clearout could even be a fun social thing.

Nomi Farhi asks what the problem is.

Cat McDougall says that it's about getting rid of former branding and things.

Nomi Farhi says that she cleared it out two months ago, and that we know what's in it already. If we need storage, we'll find it. If we don't, then what are we doing.

Kathy Macy asks if she buys cushions and stim toys for the quiet space if there will be a place to put them.

Date of Next Meeting

To be decided by Doodle poll.