



England and Wales Client Interviewing Competition

Minutes of 2021 AGM (24th May on Zoom)

In attendance: Graham Robson, Grant Stirling (Hull), Julie Price (Cardiff), Matthew Parry (Swansea), Tracey Horton (Staffordshire), Aruna Verma (University of Law), Elizabeth Fisher-Frank (Essex), Hannah Menard (South Wales), Tia Matt (Exeter), Jeanette Ashton (Sussex), Marc Howe (Oxford Brookes), Joe Thompson (Kent). **Apologies:** Patricia Leopold (Reading), Chris Rinik (Winchester), Kate Campbell-Pilling (Sheffield).

1. **Welcome and introductions.** GR welcomed everyone to the meeting
2. **Apologies.** Apologies for absence noted.
3. **Matters arising** from minutes of 2020 AGM (attached). No matters arising.
4. **Finance report 2020-21** (attached).

Finance report noted; income has increased with teams that had previously not paid now paying. Swansea in credit. Plymouth and Westminster outstanding 2020 fees but agreed to write off outstanding fees given the time involved in chasing. Competition balance is healthy with £13,040.62 in credit.

5. **Looking back at 2020-21:**
 - **National competition**

GR and JP reviewed the 2020 National Competition and explained the way that it had ended up being run with the regionals taking place as normal and then a semi final and final over zoom. First time joint winners, with both going on to represent at the International, with 1 team in the 2020 event and 1 team in the 2021 event. There were logistical issues that were overcome as we learned about hosting the events online but the consensus was that the events had gone well.

Thanks were offered to the regional hosts from 2020: South Wales, London Southbank, and Sunderland. General feeling was that the regionals had gone well.

The 2021 competition did not take place due to difficulties surrounding Covid.

- **International competitions at Swansea**

Comments were made generally approving the running of the event by Swansea; feeling of the meeting was that the online event had worked well. Agreement that the clients had been generally good but that there were some times when there were inconsistencies.

6. **Looking forward to 2021-22:**
 - **National competition**

Going forward, it was agreed that the current situation regarding Covid is unclear and that there are different situations for different Universities, with different students, particularly international

students. It was agreed that there was merit in striving to have part of the competition in person if possible. A decision on that can be made later in the academic year, not at registration.

Teams who wish to participate in person can qualify for an in-person national final- host TBC

It was suggested that it would be beneficial to have a final where the judges see all of the teams participate to ensure consistency. This was agreed as ideal but the issue has always been numbers- a final is arguably limited to a maximum of 6 teams which was suggested to be a very small national competition. Concerns raised about numbers qualifying from preliminary rounds to nationals. Suggestions of preliminary > semi-final > final to counter that.

It was agreed that much will depend on the number of entries. The Covid situation should become clearer, and unis may know what the form of teaching there will be. We agreed to have an online only competition as a starting point, asking for expressions of interest later if an in-person element becomes feasible.

Topic was discussed. International looks set to be contract, specifically entertainment and sports law and this was agreed as suitable.

• **International competition (Swansea again)**

Confirmed to be hosted in Swansea; possibility of an online and in-person element. Expressions of interest to judge welcomed.

7. **Election of committee.** We currently have the following officers: Co-Chairs (2), Treasurer, Regional Chairs (3), Rules Adjudicator, International Rep. Please see our Proposals paper.

GR and JP discussed the previous suggestions to change the framework of the competition i.e. it currently operates as an unincorporated association but it was agreed to think about this in the future. Emphasis was placed on the importance of training and volunteers were sought for a Training Sub-Committee with the volunteers also forming part of the wider newly called Academic Committee. TH, MH, LFF, TM, HM, and GS agreed to be on this sub-committee. Agreed they would meet as soon as practicable but before the summer break so that tasks can be allocated.

8. **Website and social media**

There was a discussion about the best use of social media. General feeling was that there are moments of significant traffic followed by lulls. Thoughts were sought on whether anyone wanted to take responsibility for social media and there was little enthusiasm. Proposal put that students, or recent students, may have better awareness of what works here and this led to a suggestion that former competitors should be invited to attend the AGM. Colleagues agreed to reach out to possible interested former students.

It was noted that Instagram is the currently 'popular' forum and discussions about setting a page up on that site. JT and GR agreed to look at this.

9. **Role writing for 2022**

Following agreement as to the topic for 2022, it was agreed that there should be a sub-committee to try to create the roles. JP emphasised the importance of including a legal note for the judges, possibly in collaboration with colleagues who specialise in those areas. MP, PL, JA, and JT volunteered to be on the sub-committee. Agreed they would meet as soon as practicable but before the summer break.

Discussion about the previously specified point about 'personality of clients' taking an enhanced role within the scenarios. For the 2020 competition this was a specific note that had been put on the site as it had previously been felt that teams participating in the International Competition were underprepared for this aspect of it.

The proposal was that this wording be amended on the website to allow greater flexibility in role writing. The feeling of the meeting was divided. Some felt that it was a practical reality of the real world, others felt that it distracted students from "the law". One representative stated that their team had asked whether they needed to research the psychological side of human behaviour.

A clear consensus was not reached but the overall feeling of the meeting was that personality should still be a part of the roles to test that aspect of the skill, but that the note on the website should be amended to allow flexibility in role writing and the recruitment of suitable clients.

10. AOB. No other business.

Client Interviewing Competition Accounts June 2020 - May 2021

INCOME £		EXPENDITURE £	
Opening balance	12,674.39	CIC website	166.66
Entry fees*	850.00	BM website	172.11
		ICCC entry fees	145.00
		Balance c/f	13,040.62
Total	13,524.39		13,524.39

Notes

*2 law schools have still not paid their 2020 entry fees: Plymouth and Westminster Swansea are in credit by £75.

Graham Robson, 7 May 2021