**Executive Members in Attendance**

Tara Copeland (Chair)

Katharine Macy (Accessibility and Diversity Officer)

Alex Howarth (Membership Development Officer)

Finn Conway (Finance Officer)

James Bliss (Policy Officer)

Joshan Parmar (Events Officer)

Andrew Reynolds (Scotland Chair)

Jack Worrall (England Chair)

Sophie Thornton (Campaigns Officer)

Guy Benson (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Chloe Hutchinson (Wales Chair)

Pushkin Defyer (BAME Officer)

Chessie Flack (Youth and Student Development Officer)

**Non-Executive Members in Attendance**

Lucas North

Billy Thomas

Thom Campion

**Apologies**

Charlie Murphy (Vice Chair)

Catriona McDougall (International Officer)

Dan Schmissing (Communications)

**Meeting Minutes Taken By**

Guy Benson (Non-Portfolio Officer)

**Approval of previous Minutes and Action Point Review**

TC welcomed observers and went over housekeeping rules

TC raises that last month’s minutes should highlight Action Points

**AP:** **TC to email CM to highlight them**

*Questionnaire for leadership candidates:* Currently in progress, with TC, TC has about 10 questions and wants to draft an additional 15 and will then send to exec to pick best ones to send out to Ed and Layla.

*Training Opportunities:* AH has sent ST an email regarding training. At YL conference looking at training on standing for council, process for being selected, campaigning and what to do once elected and also HQ looking at providing connect training.

*Zoom for Accredited Societies:* AH is strongly in favour of offering this, doesn’t think there will be too many requests, 1 or 2 a week, but a good thing to offer to them so they don’t have to spend money for a zoom account. Should be First Come First Serve and Exec Members should get priority over accredited societies.

JW would be happy to help set up meetings alongside AH, unlikely to be used massively but thinks it’s a good thing to offer.

CH raises there should be a calendar that the whole exec can see.

CF has already set up a calendar but hasn’t shared yet as working on getting Young Liberals into Lib Dem domain, can’t share at the moment as unable to share without being fully accessible but working on this.

*Campaign on Istanbul Convention:* On ST list of things to do, this along with leave to remain on ST to-do list but has been focussed on freshers.

**Conference Update**

JP: We’ve opened sign up to conference, people are signing up. c.150 pre-registered – unsure of numbers right now. Dates are 19th July to 26th July.

The first Sunday will be more of a “rally” without motions – hoping to have Tessa speak and will also have EYL AGM. Then during the week will be motions and speakers. Final Saturday/Sunday will see around two-ish speakers and the more controversial policy motions, last day will be constitutional amendments. Socials also something to sort out but will probably be one of the last things to sort out.

JB is doing a lot of work on policy and looking at amendments and voting system.

JW: We will use Zoom for actual debates and then either Zoom Polls or “Ombea” for voting. JW has asked CF about GDPR compliance of voting system.

JP: For Conference speakers, have put together a spreadsheet of speakers to contact, going to have a preferential vote in Conference Committee.

TC: what time frame are we looking at for each day?

JP: When you sign up there’s going to be a type form sent out about availability on weekdays – will go with what makes the most sense.

TC: What is the difference with the voting systems?

JB: the two main options are “Ombea” - a custom built voting platform, alternative is inbuilt Zoom Polls – concern with Zoom Polls as you have to set up vote before hand, quite a lot of effort to set up votes in the first place – leaning more towards Ombea

Thom: Noted he is on conference committee, thinks Zoom Polls are the best way to go, if you make sure only people who should be voting are are in the conference it’s fine – other system costs £900 which is a big expense, would prefer Zoom Polls as it’s the better/easier option.

CF: Raises why we aren’t using Mi-vote that HQ pay for and won’t cost anything extra, so free and secure.

JW: Says we’re not using this system as not able to change things as we go.

CF: Says you can add people in and that you can make some changes live.

TC: Raised that voting system is an issue for conference committee to pick up, should be discussed by conference committee.

TC: Could we have an update on training?

AH: Will be young councillor training and connect training at YL Conference and then for autumn want to do training on setting up a young liberals branch and on fundraising for YL and running events for YL training. Focus of YL conference will be on campaigning, whereas autumn will be on training for branches and internal facing areas.

**Executive Outreach to Members**

TC: Lots of people don’t know how YL works, how executive works, initial idea was coffee morning, but this turned into more of a social than a chat about the executive. My idea was to put together a presentation that combines the constitution and exec regs to explain how YL operates to make it less confusing.

If it was word doc it could be included in welcome emails to new members

Would also make it easier for people to know who to contact

**AP: TC going to draft and send it to everyone to review and give input**

KM: Would like to do a “Meet the Exec” morning as part of conference

CH: Says a presentation would be really good, in SU had a presentation that said what SU is, what they do and who officers are – could do a webinar/presentation for all members about what YL do for members.

FC: There is a PDF that exists where there’s a diagram for how party is structured, would like to see a diagram for how YL is structured.

TC: CF and I had conversations with Mark Pack about the fact general membership doesn’t know what we do, so had discussions about putting out YL activities to all members. Would be good to send out to youth and student officers in LP. Would like to do a graph but would need someone else to put together with greater graphic design skills if personally did a rough draft/sketch.

JB: Was initially trying to do a guide for YL and already did an outline document, will send to TC.

**AP: JB to send draft of his guide to TC**

Thom: Has spoken to AH about doing training for non-YLers about how to work with YL, spoke to ALDC who said they were interested in doing this. ALDC unfortunately haven’t got back to us. Question would be whether you’d want to do it as ALDC or LDHQ training. ALDC training tends to be more on campaigning, practical skills, councillors whereas LDHQ would be more softer skills, how to be a more effective local party officer etc.

AH: Diagram of YL would be a good idea but raised it would be difficult to design. LDHQ/ALDC question –is it possible to have resource that exists with YL but which they can then approach to both LDHQ and ALDC with.

JP: Raises that if YL is this complicated should we be trying to make it simpler and easier to understand?

Thom: In reference to AH question, for ALDC training would need to be compliant to their training standards, key learning points, presentation script, Thom could work on this.

TC: With YL it’s not intuitive, issue is that simplifying would not be an easy process, would require constitutional amendments, too late for this conference but would be for the next exec to decide.

JB: Now not the right place to talk about reforming YL structures, it’s been brought up a lot the number of YL positions – lots of people raised how many positions there are but not one has raised what specifically they would want to cut

CF: HQ are putting together a diversity toolkit which does everything but talks about how to engage young people – could take this and expand, add in explanation of what YL is and add in presentation.

TC: To clarify, in presentation would be including what YL is and key things YL does as well as structure – things such as Conferences, Access Funds, Young and Winning, Freshers Pack.

FC: on subject of YL being complicated structurally, if people are raising the complaint that it is complicated, thinks the onus is on us to explain it or make it simpler.

TC: Agrees, but thinks the first step is to educate people on how it works at the moment – thinks giving people what the organisation does right now is the first step before thinking about reforming it.

FC: Agrees, says we couldn’t do a review for this conference anyway

JW: Almost agrees with Finn, it’s on us to make the structure simpler and easier to explain, thinks we need a holistic review into how YL works and how to make the process simpler and make it so we engage better with young people.

CH: Says can we put it on agenda for next meeting to discuss a review more fully [NB: Review was discussed later in this meeting, to confirm if we’d want to discuss again at next meeting]

JP: Will do session at start of conference on how YL works but could we do it once every three months.

TC: Says that is idea for presentation, will have it done for conference

Billy: for regional chairs, would be good to offer to them as well so we could do training at regional conferences

GB: Raises that we could make it a video recording – could we put it on YouTube and always be able to signpost people too.

TC: Happy to do a recording of the session. Aiming to have a draft finished and sent round for Saturday.

**AP: TC to send round draft of presentation by next weekend.**

**Executive Regulations**

TC: We have problems in executive regulations - when we changed accessibility and diversity, we just changed the title not the role, it says accessibility and diversity is responsible for handling complains and under 18s, need to fix this as legally we can’t be responsible for this. AH has also sent in his role for accreditation. Policy Committee is also the only committee in exec regs.

**AP: TC to write do amendments and send round later. KM to write briefly what accessibility and diversity should do.**

JB: In terms of accreditation scheme, it’s not mentioned in constitution or exec regs - are there plans to codify how we validate official branches into exec regs or constitution?

AH: Originally didn’t codify it because never said precisely how it should work, simplest way of doing it was emailing the whole exec, relevant state chair and if in England, the relevant regional chair – now system has been used for nearly a year it could do with being codified.

FC: Has original proposal document which said not constitutionalising it at beginning as wanted to see how it works – questions about whether it should go in constitution or executive regulations.

TC: The way constitution is written out is what roles we have, then Exec Regs talks about how the roles work and what responsibilities there are – would be worth putting branches and accredited societies in exec regs, or at least the process at which they are accredited.

AH: Accreditation scheme should be governed by a separate document that can be amended by an exec vote, wants to make it as flexible as possible as we haven’t had a full year of the system so need to be able to be flexible – AH amendment puts responsibility with Membership Development officer but doesn’t do anything above that.

FC: The way Executive Regulations works is that you can have separate regulations and schedules which can be amended by the executive.

JB: Thinks that constitution should say that accreditation scheme and official branches exist but then process of how they work is done via exec regs so exec can reform detail of this in the exec regs.

JW: This idea is a good one and this could be tagged along at the end of that constitutional amendment

AH: Supports JW’s amendment and agrees with JB idea that constitution qualifies existence but operation for how they work is in exec regs.

TC: In exec regulations it would be good to qualify committees roles – the layout is confusing with where committee responsibility and exec responsibilities are.

JP: If wanting to do more to engage membership could we change conference committee to an events committee. Then secondly, would DBS checks worth doing for some members of exec anyway even if don’t want to have responsibility for Under 18’s.

CF: Currently looking at getting DBS checks for the executive because it’s a lower standard for volunteer they might be free but difficulty is it has to be done via the organisation itself. Processes being are being put in place but taking a long time.

JW: For Events committee, in a usual year we’d have four conferences – two of our own and two federal Lib Dem conferences – usually events will come under other people’s portfolios including regions themselves, membership development or accessibility and diversity – so would be against changing conference committee to events committee. Changes like this could be explored as part of a holistic review of YL.

AH: Shall we call vote on my amendment?

TC: would be best to do it all at once with all amendments.

CH: Would be good to have a line about applicability of positions including state chairs

TC: Doesn’t think technically it applies to state chairs but clarifying this is something to sort out.

**AP: TC to do this this week and send out for vote for approval along with AH amendment**

**YL Reviews**

TC: Two documents to discuss, PD Alderdice-style review of YL and JW/EYL review looking at how it conducts campaigns.

PD: Chris Annous was thinking about Alderdice review for YL - would involve talking to members who are active, those that aren’t and exec members about what their role could do to improve diversity.

JW: Came up at EYL exec meeting, discussed what people thought about YL’s bodies and practices especially in campaigning but also in terms of other sections as well suggested a whole holistic review into the organisation.

Billy: The campaigns review idea predominantly comes from me summarising an existing review proposal I had, think it would be good to do a holistic look at how we do campaigns, EYL has resolved that they would like to do a review, if federal would like to do a review that would negate the need for EYL to need to do one. Would be good for a review to come from non-executives so exec can feed in as well as regions and external stakeholders. Should be solutions orientated.

CH: A good proposal and would agree that it would be solution focussed. Other organisations of a similar size often have strategies and plans that go over a few years. Wales is thinking of a strategy from now till 2022. Would welcome a broader YL strategy focused on a whole term of elections.

TC: Clarifies that we’re thinking of two separate reviews, campaigns and BAME diversity.

JB: Support both reviews that have been suggested, thinks one review should be done on campaigns and then additionally another on governance – a YL governance review. An overall governance review of entire organisation that could make suggestions including not just on YL but relationship between YL and external stakeholders – regional parties and YL regional chairs. Separate Campaigns Review and Governance Review.

KM: Raised that, with Alderdice review, it looks at all forms of diversity, supports both reviews.

AH: If reviewing YL need to bear in mind that way organisation is structured is decentralised – not in the power of federal YL to change states. Focus of Billy’s review idea should be campaigns and should also look at relationship between England and the federal exec. Fully in favour of an Alderdice style review too. They should both be conducted by HVPs.

TC: Agree it should be done by HVPs would obviously need agreement from HVPs, if they couldn’t or didn’t want to do it would need to find others willing to do it.

KM: With Alderdice, my understanding is that it looked on all areas, while focussing on BAME because that was where the main problems were as was getting better at women and LGBT but looked at all.

TC: if including all diversities need to be conscious that this widens the scope.

PD: Unsure how to do both BAME and wider diversity question at the same time, thinks they should be done separately

JP: If going to do a review I think we need to be specific on what it is – what does doing better on diversity mean – is it engaging BAME people more in YL events, standing for election, getting them to vote Lib Dem – need to be specific about goals.

CH: Agreed on it needs to be specific, good to know where we’re doing well, where we’re not. Should we consider looking beyond HVPs, looking for someone with relevant background.

Thom: For a more general diversity review would be useful to point out social class, faiths and beliefs, we are good at LGBT+ and good at women, but not great at working class, disability. Thinks it should look at everything.

PD: Useful to get someone from LDCRE to input into the review.

JW: Feels uneasy that original proposal has grown into a wholescale diversity review. Thinks we have tendency to look at all issues at once. The request was specifically about BAME representation.

KM: would like to do what Alderdice did but would be happy to do a BAME review and then a wider diversity review later.

TC: Clear that decisions that need to be made are that for the diversity review, do we focus on BAME or expand to multiple diversity; For Jack’s review – is it mainly campaigns or a wider governance report.

CH: For terms of reference, it should focus on campaigns but where necessary looks at the wider structure where it applies to campaigning.

TC: If focussing on campaigns it should focus on all aspects of campaigns, how we campaign in local elections and outside of GE will apply to all campaigns.

JW: It should involves local election campaigns, freshers, building up local branches etc. The decision should be who comes up with terms of references, whether it is us?

TC: If we’re doing a campaigns review, important to get action points before next year’s local elections which are a big date with plans and fixes in place for them. If looking at campaigning do we reach into state executives and expand to how states campaign.

GB: We shouldn’t tie the hands of the people doing the review, we should set what our goals are and then leave the terms of reference to the people doing the review.

TC: Goals should look at campaigning and if it reaches into other things that’s fine. Who would like to work on goals for a campaigns review?

**AP: JW, CH and JP will work together on creating goals for a campaigns review**

TC: Moving on to PD’s diversity review idea.

GB: Believes should focus on BAME issues then later could look at wider diversity.

AH: Raised that we’ve had BAME role for a year but haven’t made progress on issue.

JP: Raised what the purpose of the review would be, getting more BAME people voting lib dem or on engaging with YL?

PD: Purpose of review would be to look at if there are barriers to participation within YL? How effective existing solutions? Do YL do enough to engage with BAME community? – so focus is BAME engagement with YL.

TC: Everyone seems in favour of BAME focus so happy to be BAME focussed. PD to come up with goals of a BAME review, talk to Meraj, ideas for who best placed to conduct the review – planning done before the end of July so can progress in August.

**AP: PD to work with Meraj Khan to come up with goals for the review before the end of July so can be progressed in August after conference.**

**BAME Campaigns**

KM: Had meeting with PD, Dipa and Meraj around ideas about pushing BAME campaigns.

PD: Emailed black curriculum campaign idea and have replied with a suggestion of what we could share.

ST: Freshers designs, one is about race equality – keen for input from exec and BAME officers.

TC: Talk about decolonialising the curriculum – applies to a lot of things – white people usually seen as the base, not diverse.

CH: Could put together a template motion on what societies can submit to SU’s on decolonialising the curriculum – could get a couple of societies to do this, can help increase their visibility on topics other than freshers.

TC: Leave this topic with ST, KM, PD and Meraj

**AP: ST, KM, PD and Meraj to continue to progress BAME campaign ideas**

\*ST left the video meeting\*

**Engagement**

KM: Was raised by PD that we use Facebook a lot in comparison to other platforms, we have a discord but not necessarily inclusive if you’re not already on discord and cis male dominated – can we do anything to improve engagement on different platforms.

JB: To build on discord point, most people using discord also had experience of discord before, involved in other discord servers, discord is good but isn’t a solution to reliance on Facebook.

TC: What about exploring using PolicyLab platform to engage people?

PD: This point was mainly from personal perception but now working behind the scenes it doesn’t seem as such a big issue – one issue was that wasn’t originally on a mailing list so was lacking this engagement.

JB: We don’t have anything like the main party does for a membership area of the website – could there be scope for having an area that YL people could login?

JP: On point of emails, lots of emails go into spam, as we use nation builder it wouldn’t be difficult to add a membership area?

CF: three points – On being Facebook heavy – the federal party hasn’t found a solution to this, unlikely YL will be able to come up with a solution in isolation. PolicyLab – once out of testing phase we can get Charlotte to discuss this with us and use this as another engagement platform. Members area on website - could explore but it would be a significant undertaken – Greg would have to help and this would have to be after the leadership election as currently fully utilised – one website idea to explore is potentially having a newsfeed?

CH: On structure, for Welsh website we have a news tab so whenever something new is on the website, whenever we’re launching freshers could have a news tab. On members area, in 2014/2015 there was a policy and campaigns forum on welsh website but wasn’t used, we’re not going to get members on a new platform, we need to go to where they are. Two questions: How diverse is our twitter feed? How are we sourcing content, who de we follow? One idea would be whether we can segment audience and use mailing list better than we do.

GB: Wouldn’t be in favour of membership area of website as unsure what content we’d want to put behind that membership wall.

TC: DS will need to tell us about what is possible with website.

AH: Raised issue of Nation Builder vs Light House and what is going on with this?

FC: For website, have messaged Dan about way to discuss redoing large swaths of website - thinks we need discussion about website. Thinks there is a case for membership area of website for training and guides to branches.

CF: Biggest issue we have is not having DoB so don’t know who is YL. We do have a typeform that auto assigns you as a YL in Salesforce now if you provide DoB.

GB: Raised that training could go on federal website in membership area rather than YL.

JB: Could we have an area on existing HQ website that could be for opting into YL and giving your DoB

CH: Federal website could just have a redirect to YL but we can have it unlisted – don’t have much content at the moment and could be done via Google Drive with restricted access.

CF: At the moment the person doing it is furloughed, comes back on 1st August, but it would be easy to have a section for the members area of the federal website – could have a YL section.

JP: Thinks discussion is getting off topic – our website and online presence is only on Facebook, website looks like something from 2010 – doesn’t have interactivity , should be started again, made up to date – would be possible to engage whole groups of YL that we haven’t engaged so far if it was better.

TC: We should wait until we can get DS input and hear from HQ about getting a YL section of members area – two action points

**AP: DS to provide input on website [potentially add this as agenda point for next meeting]**

**AP: CF to speak to HQ regarding a YL section of the members area.**

**BAME Officer Consultation**

PD: Consultation finished a few days ago – tie of 11/11 on whether to be elected or co-opted, if elected would want an LDCRE rep to remain as a non-voting member – JB has drafted amendment so conference can decide whether elected or co-opted.

JB: To clarify, the consultation was 11 votes co-opted and 13 elected. There were three identity questions and three people didn’t put anything while one answer only put first name. Is uncomfortable with a nonbinding consultation discounting some people’s opinion. Constitutional amendment is going to end up with an explanatory note. The main amendment item changes the constitution without changing the role, then the amendment to the amendment will say a BAME officer elected than an LDCRE rep who is non-voting. Currently there is no distinction between who can vote for who and no practical way this could be changed but amendment written in a way that RO would make clear that it is intended for both BAME officer and the diversity committee positions to be voted on by members of those diversity criteria. There could be a way so that people select what positions they want to vote for, so at people’s discretion can untick certain positions. We wouldn’t be comfortable with a database of what people identify is, practically or principally would be incredibly difficult but ways that we can signpost so that we ask people to self-select the positions they should be voting for.

CF: Raised that at first year of Uni, Uni tried to make people tell them there diversity criteria so they could vote on certain positions, created a big problem, lots of complaints – we should be signposting.

KM: Agreed, lots of diversities aren’t visible, if get hacked would be terrible if leaked, not appropriate to hold this membership anywhere.

GB: Asked for clarification on what the amendment would be.

JB: Main amendment is changes to existing role then the amendment that will replace it will look at making BAME officer elected.

CH: Raised that if people abstain how does that affect 2/3rds majority?

Discussion held regarding this; noted that abstentions do not count towards the 2/3rds majority as that is the point for abstention

**Officer’s Reports**

CH: Would like a decision on what the freshers plan looks like, especially in terms of signups, how to use to recruit welsh members – sign up form, name, email, place of study, hometown – need to pick this up with DS and ST – wants to know what federal sign up form looks like, would be better to have a signle sign up form rather than duplicate.

Thom: Two questions – one for AH/CM – there are a fair number of details on approved societies that is out of date, one uni has details that is three years old; other question is for FC – what is thinking behind buying canva pro rather than affinity publisher?

FC: Just on their because DS was using to make graphics – exec officers shouldn’t have to pay for software themselves.

Thom: Says YL should look at an Affinity account as better

CH: Difficulty is Canva Pro lots of people can login and use it whereas Affinity is only one download.

FC: Will look at Affinity Publisher – will need to pick this up with DS as he is the one using the software.

AH: On the societies page question – DS is working on it, think he’s only half way through – difficulty is societies not telling me when chairs have updated – Planning on doing a mass email after Uni finishes to all societies asking how societies contacts have changed. In email will also ask when AGM and elections are so we know when elected in future

TC: A lot of progress currently going on with freshers, let ST know if any comments to raise about freshers.

**AOB**

**Budget Reallocation**

FC: Budget passed in January will not reflect this year due to Covid – plus already making extra purchases i.e. for Zoom – will be going to officers looking at what budgets were and changes considering current situation and changed plans for the term.

**AP: FC will get in touch with officers about revised budgets**

**Standing Orders for meetings**

FC: Similar thing that federal board and FPC do – standing orders for running of meetings – FC will draft something on these standing orders for meetings

TC: notes she is in favour

**AP: FC will draft standing orders for meetings and circulate**

**Phone banking New YL Members**

JW: Phone banking for YL members – received email yesterday – trying to work out who has the right permissions to set up phonebank.

CF: has most permissions accesses so happy to do that

**AP: CF to work out how to set up lists for YL members, to work with JW on this**

**Chairing Debates at Conference**

JB: Raised that if anyone is able and willing to chair debates please let JB know

**Lib Dem Speakers at Conference**

JP: If anyone has contact information for prominent people in the Lib Dems please let me know

TC: Would it be worth looking at Mark Pack and some of the MPs (not leadership candidates) that we did Q&A webinars with to bring into discussion?

JB: Had been planning on having Ed and Layla, Geoff in FCC is prerecording the speech people would make, then play speech and then do a Q and A afterwards. Thinks having Ed and Layla give separate keynote speeches wouldn’t be a bad thing even though we already have separate YL hustings down the line.

JW: A lot can go wrong with an online conference, would be good to get video from people who we might not want to invite for a Q&A – would be a good idea to have filler content ready.

KM: Would it be a good idea to use these spaces as a filler for what people do in their role within YL, get people more involved with how the organisation works.

JP: Can definitely look into doing something like that

**Charitable Giving**

AH: Has been working with KidsOut trying to improve appeal to students. One thing asked would be to stick them and a number of other charities on screen at the end of conference as a charitable donation appeal – doing something with charities would be a good thing to do, especially as a lot have had income suffer due to Covid.

CF: Last time charities discussed the main issue was on charity side in terms of not wanting to be associated with political party/organisation – would have to check with compliance but issue is normally on charity side – will double check for this specific query.

**AP: CF to check with compliance whether there would be any issues with doing a charity appeal if charity in agreement**

**Journalists**

GB: Raised the idea of approaching or inviting journalists to conference, CM previously brought this up – not necessarily in favour but wondered if this was still being investigated.

JB: Idea of inviting journalist to come to a specific slot would have been good but problem is so many factors in an online conference that make it uncertain.

CH: Would it be worth doing a press release – approaching press office to get HQ contacts, if we add blog/news section to website?

TC: Agrees that inviting journalist to this specific conf shouldn’t happen given this is the first ever online conference we are doing.

JB: In terms of publicity, mentioned he was doing a Lib Dem Voice article about conference agenda.

**Co-Option**

TC: New care leavers rep needed, believes co-option should take place after conference as very busy at present.

CH: Seeks clarification on who can apply.

KM: Would encourage broad range of applicants including estranged people, there’s no specific yes or no in constitution about who would be eligible to apply.

TC: Conference is scheduled for 19th to 26th July so can look to start the process the week after conference.

KM: Raised sharing co-option applications with diversity committee to get their input. Thinks useful to give anonymised applications – diversity committee can then give points that they thought about when reading through them to input into the exec’s decision.

CH: People that most understand the role will be people working in that position – would be good to get an overview of how the committee feels about the applications

TC: Preference is to send the anonymised final applications, and then if they want to feedback anything to the wider exec they can do so.

TC: Will leave with Chessie as RO for how this may best work

**Next Meeting Date**

JB: Next meeting falls on Saturday of conference – fourth Saturday – 25th July.

TC: We should move the next planned meeting to the 18th July, can also use this meeting to discuss conference and go over any final bits.

**Officer’s Reports – Committee Meeting Minutes**

TC: Some exec members have committees – would be good to include breakdown of any key points made within meetings between exec members and committees in the exec members officer reports

FC: Committees should be submitting minutes to the chair anyway

TC: Mainly looking at comms, conference, policy and campaigns committees, not state committees doesn’t need to see detailed minutes but at least an update on what is happening in meetings, any key action points and decisions that are taken by the committees.