

BRITISH INSTITUTE OF VERBATIM REPORTERS

138th ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

virtually via Zoom

on

Saturday 19 September 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEORGINA FORD (PRESIDENT)
NICOLE HARRISON (VICE PRESIDENT)
ALAN BELL
ORLA PEARSON
IAN ROBERTS
LEAH WILLERSDORF
MARY SORENE (SECRETARY/TREASURER)

MELANIE BALL
NATALIE BRACKEN
HEATHER CASILI
VICTORIA DAVIES
NICOLA DUTTON
MIRELLA FOX
SHARON GOULDER
SUSAN HUMPHRIES
MARY KRELLE
RACHEL LLOYD
HILARY MACLEAN
DEIRDRE O'MALLEY
WENDY OSMOND
LOUISE PEPPER
KATY RYDER
MIRIAM WEISINGER
SUMANTH NAYAK

Welcome and introductions

THE PRESIDENT: It is 9.30 and I propose we start. Welcome, everybody. Just before we get going properly, I would like to remind you that Mary Krelle is taking the note. When the time comes for any questions, state your name, speak clearly and one person at a time, which, let's admit it, we are the worst when it comes to that. Please observe the Zoom etiquette as previously provided. If anybody is having trouble getting in, obviously, they will not be hearing me say this, but keep trying. Leah is monitoring the situation for us. Thank you, Leah. The Secretary will now read the Notice to open the meeting.

(SECRETARY DULY READ THE NOTICE)

Apologies for Absence

THE PRESIDENT: Mary Krelle, I think you resume taking the note from this point. Can people hear me okay? I would like to welcome Melanie Ball to the Council. I do not see her on the Zoom call, but she knows she has joined anyway.

Could we have the apologies for absence, please?

THE SECRETARY: The apologies for absence I have received are: Amanda Bavin, Sandra Glenny, Joanne Peter, Rita Fox, Barbara Bennett, Pauline Miller, Maria O'Brien, Andrew Howell, Kath Sykes, Susan McIntyre.

THE PRESIDENT: Do any of the Members have anything to add? Either unmute yourselves or perhaps type it in the chat box for ease of reference.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: May I please just say Miriam is struggling to get on, so could we put her apologies there just in case, please?

THE PRESIDENT: We will note that she is trying to get on.

Record of the Last Meeting

THE PRESIDENT: Now we come to the record of the last meeting, which was circulated to members via the website. Are they agreed and does anybody have anything to raise? Going, going, gone. Is everybody agreed, in that case? I see Victoria nodding. I see Louise in the caption box saying yes. I think I have everybody.

NICOLE HARRISON: If you just go on the reactions and put a thumbs up.

THE PRESIDENT: Put a thumbs up in the box if you agree the previous record. Thanks, Natalie. Is that everybody? What about Sumanth?

THE SECRETARY: It may be as a student he thinks he cannot vote because they cannot vote usually.

THE PRESIDENT: In which case, I will sign the Minutes.

(THE MINUTES WERE AGREED AND SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT)

THE PRESIDENT: Now to my very presidential Presidential address, for which I have been told Leah has tissues. Thank you very much, Leah, even though they will have to be virtual tissues. I have not prepared anything much because, much in the way of the year so far, it has all been a bit odd, hasn't it? I think I have done about six months as President. We took the decision very early on to do the AGM by Zoom, and it all feels extremely strange and weird not having you all here, trying to pick somebody on the screen to look at. What I would like to say is it has been very tough for everybody, and I really hope people are starting to feel better. Of course, this morning we woke up to the news that there may be another lockdown because Boris, in his wisdom, has decided that we might need to do that. I know some of you are living in the parts of the country that are affected by local lockdowns already. I hope you are getting through it and finding ways to work. It has been horrific. I do not really know what else I can say to make people feel better, but we have been pulling through. I think the afternoon teas have been a very good source of contact for us. Mary has been wonderful. She has been at every single tea, with her crumpets, keeping us in line.

So, what is there for the future? The things that we have planned include examinations tomorrow. We will be doing our new style of membership exams. Please bear with us those of you who are talking them because we are doing these virtually as well and we are finding our way through. It is not going to be easy, so please bear with us. Moving forward, we want to be able to go back to doing the exams in person because I think it will be easier. I would encourage everybody to think about scaling up and moving into doing real time. The captioners among us have had a really good run at getting used to using Zoom for our clients. There has been a lot of work coming in for the captioning side of things. For those of you who have not yet moved into real time, please reach out, and any of us will help you to improve your notes to get you doing real time. You may not feel you want to move into captioning, but if you become a real-time writer you are giving yourselves a good advantage in the workplace for court reporting as well because a lot of the hearings are being done online. They also want the real time because it helps them to follow along if they lose the connection for some reason. I propose that we do some workshops to improve people's output, so please get in touch with Mary in the first instance, or myself, if you have any other questions, and we will see about arranging some online workshops to that end.

With regards to moving forward with what Council is doing, we really could do with more people joining Council. It is a big commitment, but now we are doing things online it is so much easier for us to connect. We do not have to travel around the country to each other's houses like we used to. We are a very small Council and we really need more people to help. Mel, I know you are not here at the moment, but

thank you so much for joining us. We really need more people because otherwise as Council we become stale and we need fresh input and fresh ideas. We get very complacent and one track. Sometimes it just needs a new idea to come in to revitalise us, especially when we have all been having issues with our own confidence around this Covid time. That is something that Lucy will be talking about later; how to steer us through this time and how to move on.

I do not think I have anything else I want to say with regards to my address. As I say, it has been a really strange time, but we are here to help you, so if anybody has anything that they want to raise personally or as a group that we want to discuss around mental health issues, if someone is feeling very depressed, you do not have to go through it alone: please contact us and let us help you.

The Betty Willett Award

With that in mind, I am going to shut up now so we can move on to the very next item on the agenda, which is indeed the Betty Willett Award. I am going to read out the nomination missing out the name of the person who has been nominated - and I will announce that at the end - because I think that is going to be quite fun. This is from the nominator, who I will not name either.

"I would like to nominate [] for this award." I am going to change the pronoun as well. "They are truly the most genuine and friendly stenographer in the UK; they are so welcoming and helpful especially to any new STT reporters. They have a breadth (and years!) of knowledge that is unsurpassed. They are extremely supportive by their very nature. They were extremely supportive in a team environment at the BBC and remain so in the (competitive) freelance world."

I think you may have quite a good idea who that is now so I shall name the person. The person who has won the Betty Willett award is none other than our very own Andrew Howell.

The rest of the nomination goes: "Specifically, Andrew has helped new reporters by taking the time and patience to explain how different software interacts. He has an encouraging way about him, with only positive things to say about everyone, and the industry itself. He is always keen to discuss stenography with management (pre-2000 at the BBC) and with clients in the freelance world and stresses our "worth" and expertise. He will "speak up" for reporters when it is required. I can't give any more specifics on this one instance as it would break client confidentiality, but he will act on behalf of all stenographers and in all their best interests.

"In April 2019, he gave a student a stenography machine. A selfless gesture. In August 2020, Andrew was the first person there to congratulate Leah when she passed her RPR exam. He likes to keep the profile of others high. Andrew has a working knowledge of most types of software and set up the Facebook Text on Top users' page, which is used by lots of people across the industry (including in the US and other countries, by the way). He is the expert when it comes to all things Stenograph/CaseCatalyst. In 2018-2019, Andrew took

the time to explain on Facebook that CC needs wrap margins ticked so it becomes a continuous line of text for the purposes of Streamtext. This directly helped a new reporter with her work. He takes it upon himself to become a super-user and has many tips and tricks. Andrew doesn't get involved in the politics of the freelance world and remains neutral - which I know from personal experience can be extremely difficult. Over the years, he has taught and passed on his knowledge of: KLive," (I have no idea what that is) "OpenWrite, Text on Top, CaseCatalyst and appeared at BIVR events. He captioned the BAW in 2018, always with smiles, hugs and coffee!"

LEAH WILLERSDORF: And biscuits!

THE SECRETARY: The award has been received by our member and we were hoping to get a photograph of him holding it but so far it has not come in. His email response when I wrote to tell him that he had not only been nominated but was the successful recipient was: "OMG, that's FANTASTIC! Thank you! That's really quite an honour." And when it was received: "It's FANTASTIC. It's a beautiful award. I'm really honoured. It's wonderful. And a lovely thing for Amanda Bavin to write all that. Just super."

THE PRESIDENT: With that, does anybody have any questions or comments? When we eventually get a picture of Andrew with his award, we will pass it round to everybody so you can see it. We will put it on the Facebook page and email it out to members. Does anybody have any questions or comments?

VICTORIA DAVIES: That was a really good nomination by Amanda and it is really well-deserved. I think everyone would agree he is one of the nicest people in the profession.

THE PRESIDENT: I totally agree. He really does deserve it. He has been amazing. Personal interactions with him are just --- he is just a lovely person to be around full stop, quite frankly. I am really sad he is not joining us today, but, as Amanda said, he does not tend to get involved in the politics side of things.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: I reckon he probably cried when he got it. I did speak to him yesterday but I did not ask him. He was quite close to Betty as well, I think.

THE PRESIDENT: That makes it extra special, I think.

THE SECRETARY: Could I just add that he was sworn to secrecy until after today. I said he could boast about it to his heart's content after the AGM but he had to keep it quiet.

THE PRESIDENT: He has done very well keeping it quiet.

THE SECRETARY: Even from Leah.

THE PRESIDENT: Could I ask for the Treasurer's Report, please?

The Treasurer's Report

THE SECRETARY: The Treasurer's Report was sent to you by post. I will put it on the screen. Can people see it? As I say, this is just the boring figures. I will go slowly through them. I am trying to get it to fit the screen because it is so long. The bottom line is we get money in, we pay money out. Fortunately, we have a little bit in reserve. I do not know if anybody wants to ask about the accounts, but you can see the figures there. I put everything into a separate line with different colours so that you know exactly what is spent and what has come in. Some things we get in advance for the year. The ID cards were already paid for. Do not forget these are for 2019 because we are always a year behind with accounts. Does anybody have any questions and are they approved? May I stop sharing the screen? I do not have to put the resolutions up if people have read them in their Notice.

THE PRESIDENT: Have people read the resolutions or would you like me to read them out to you? Would that be easier than Mary sharing the screen?

THE SECRETARY: I can read them out but it is much easier to see them.

THE PRESIDENT: I can, no problem, it is just it can take a few moments to get them up. I need people to say that they approve the accounts because I have to file them at Companies House and I cannot do that until they are approved at the AGM.

NICOLE HARRISON: Can we all put a thumbs up and we take a picture of it?

(REPORT AND ACCOUNTS WERE DULY APPROVED)

Special Resolutions

THE PRESIDENT: That is all approved. We now come to the Special Resolutions. Mary, can you try and put them up on the screen?

THE SECRETARY: I can. I have got 1 ready.

THE PRESIDENT: Moving on to the Special Resolutions now, can people see Mary's screen share?

THE SECRETARY: Moving on then to Special Resolution 1 which is: "To consider, and if thought fit, to pass a Special Resolution regarding changing the Memorandum & Articles of Association, Article 20, to change the term of office of President from one year to two years, with a minimum of one year as follows:" Then it gives the current wording of Article 20 and, if I just scroll down a little further, because this seems to be very large, in red is the change. "for a minimum term of one year" and "shall not be eligible for re-election for a period of two years after the termination of their term of office".

LOUISE PEPPER: Can I ask a question? I am just wondering what was the thought process behind this change. Why do we want to change it from one year to two years?

THE PRESIDENT: Simply because we are really low on numbers. The way we were rotating people in and out, it was just getting ridiculous. We do not have enough people on Council to follow those terms. Also, when we hold the BAW, because that is every two years and because we start planning the year before, it is easier if the person who started planning then carries it through to the BAW. It is a combination of the two things. It seemed sensible to change the term.

LOUISE PEPPER: Thank you.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: May I add to that? Also, it is an optional two years, so at the end of the first year, if that person feels like they do not want to carry on for the presidency into the second year, for whatever reason, they do not have to and we just hold another election. It not compulsory for that President doing two years; it is purely at their discretion.

THE PRESIDENT: Exactly. If we end up with more members on Council, people can say, "I only need to do it for one year," or if someone feels they cannot carry on for two years we will hold elections in the normal way.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: It also saves doing another Special Resolution every year to get a President to stand again.

THE PRESIDENT: Natalie next, please.

NATALIE BRACKEN: You are saying that you have got problems with numbers and things, I do not know, am I reading this the wrong way round, maths was never my strong point, but could it not be for a period of one year? Sorry, I cannot see the old wording. Was it three years before?

THE SECRETARY: No, it was one.

NATALIE BRACKEN: I am talking about the second part, "for a period of three years after the termination of their office", can it not be for a period of one year after their office? Say they did not do it for a year they could come back the following year. Doesn't that help a bit more? You can leave it as two obviously, but do you understand what I mean?

THE PRESIDENT: We follow what you are saying. Go ahead, Nicole.

NICOLE HARRISON: I am done.

THE PRESIDENT: We reduced that term down to two years.

NATALIE BRACKEN: Would you not consider reducing it down to one?

NICOLE HARRISON: I think what you are trying to say, Natalie, is a past President being able to come back after one year as opposed to three years, instead of having a President for two years. Correct?

NATALIE BRACKEN: Yes, correct.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: I was just thinking, because we are also changing - I do not know if we have done it yet, I was not particularly concentrating, but we are also doing another Special Resolution where --- now I have lost my train of thought. Say, for example, I did three years and then if I was to do another year, a year off, with what you are saying, Natalie, that would allow me to come back on the year after and, quite frankly, I would not have done that. That is me. I am not explaining it very well. I think there needs to be more than a one-year break after a presidency for that President. That is my opinion.

NICOLE HARRISON: Also, we need some new people on and new blood and what have you. If we go by the suggestion you have made, Natalie, it is going to be a year off, year on, year off, year on.

NATALIE BRACKEN: But it would not necessarily mean that they would be voted back on it, would it? It would just mean they were eligible. Say there was work they were doing in their year that they had not quite finished that then somebody else took over for a year, I do not know. It was just to help you guys. It is just a suggestion, but that is fine to stick with the two.

ORLA PEARSON: I think it is a good idea because it is up to the President if they want to come back. It is not like they are forced to come back after a year. It would just be if they chose to come back after a year and wanted to finish off or other people felt they would be good to go again. It is all in the person's choice. We would not have made you come back and do another two years. It would be just like, "No, I am not up for it. I need another year off." But someone else might think, "I'm not done yet." I think it is a really good idea and I think putting it in is not going to create problems. You just say, "No, I don't want to come back," but it gives more flexibility than we have now.

THE PRESIDENT: May I ask Mary going back into pre-history why was it set up like this in the first place? Just out of interest. We have all walked into this and the way it has been done, and I am just wondering what the rationale was for it.

THE SECRETARY: No, but it seems to be fairly common in Memorandums and Articles of Association in the past and, of course, the new Memorandums and Articles of Association are quite different and you only have to have one Director now and you do not have to have a Secretary. These are the rules over and above that. It is really a question of choice. Shall we just hold that for the moment and look at the next resolution, because it is all part and parcel of the same thing? I do not want it to be misunderstood.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: I think it also goes back to a time when there were 15 people on Council.

NICOLE HARRISON: I think a lot of this is due to we used to have a much bigger Council and now we have shrunk and that is why. The plea we have from the President is we would love more people to be on Council.

THE SECRETARY: I am sorry, I cannot get that second one up. I am going to have to change sticks because that one says the document is corrupt.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you want me to read it out? The second one is the one electing the President for two years. They are slightly in reverse order because of the way the numbers run in the Memorandum & Articles. What Resolution 1 is about is when a person is eligible for presidency again after they have had their two-year term, and that is coming next in Resolution 2, that we are asking to change that. I do not mind reading it out.

Resolution number 2 is to change the current wording that, "At the Annual General Meeting of the Institute, it shall elect its Council and the President for the ensuing year", and we are saying "elect its Council Members for the following year and the President for the ensuing two years", and, "If at the end of the first year, the President opts not to continue in post, a new President shall be elected at that AGM. Such election shall be by a simple majority of the votes cast at the meeting." Those two go hand-in-hand. Madam President, how do you want to go?

THE PRESIDENT: If everybody is agreeing that we should just have the one-year term and everybody is eligible, do we still want to have the President for two years or do we just have everybody eligible on Council every single year, because then we can just do away with all of those and have an election every single year?

VICTORIA DAVIES: Could I agree with that, Georgina. I think a two-year term is better than a one-year term and everyone should be eligible who is on Council.

NICOLE HARRISON: I think the reason why things changed, from my memory, is electing someone on two years is, "Woah, we don't want two years because it is a lot of our time and effort." That is why when we did the Special Resolutions for Leah, with all the changes and stuff being made, it was good to have that one person with consistency throughout. Some people just think, "I don't want to dedicate the two years," albeit you are still on Council, still doing things, but it is that thought process, whereas we did not do Special Resolutions or anything like that. I did the BAW and that was one of the things I said because if you have got a year you are not doing it but you are planning it to then to move forward it is better for two years, but some people think, "I don't want to do the two years," because it is too much of a commitment for them with all their other work. Do not forget, we do not get paid for this. It is all our own time. It is a good thing to do and it is great to have it on your CV. I think having the two years is the best way forward for this.

VICTORIA DAVIES: Why do we not say it is a minimum of one year and a maximum of two?

ALAN BELL: I think that is what we have said.

VICTORIA DAVIES: I thought that is what Nicole was saying it should not be.

THE SECRETARY: You did seem to say that, that people might think, "I don't want to do two years."

ALAN BELL: You can do one.

NICOLE HARRISON: You have the option of doing one.

VICTORIA DAVIES: It is a minimum of one and a maximum of two.

NICOLE HARRISON: You have that choice to go forward, to stay on if you want to. That is all we are saying.

ALAN BELL: That is what the resolution says.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: That is the second resolution. There are two resolutions. There is one to have the time period between when your presidency stops to the time period when you are eligible to stand again. That is one. The second one - this is how I understand it - is to change it from the minimum of one to a maximum of two. There are two different resolutions.

NICOLE HARRISON: Thank you, Leah. You are much more eloquent than I am.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: It gets confusing because the Articles are quite wordy in the way they have been written.

THE PRESIDENT: They are ridiculously wordy.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: We have had quite a few laughs over the way they have been worded. We have tried to make it a bit simpler.

THE PRESIDENT: Natalie has suggested we use the love heart icon when we want to speak. That might be quite helpful. Thank you, Natalie.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: And also say our names before we speak.

THE PRESIDENT: I suggest that we scrap Resolution 1 if we are going to have everybody eligible every year.

THE SECRETARY: Effectively, you have to delete that Article if that is the view.

THE PRESIDENT: So the new suggestion ---

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Can I throw a spanner in the works? Doesn't it have to be voted by the whole of the membership to change it, not just those who are here?

THE SECRETARY: The Special Resolution goes to the whole of the membership.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: We are about to try to amend it without the whole membership.

THE SECRETARY: I think, strictly speaking, that resolution falls if it is not agreed. We do of course have some ballots that have come in via email or post and they will be added to the votes.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: What I am saying though is even though we have those, it is still not a new resolution that is going to the whole membership. What you have just said is it has to fall if it is not agreed.

THE PRESIDENT: We will have to send around a new one. If people agree that this resolution falls, we will have to formulate a new one in its place which we can then send round to everybody.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: We can probably have a quick EGM to say yea or nay, like we did last Saturday.

THE SECRETARY: I think that is possibly the simplest way.

THE PRESIDENT: Could we have a show of hands?

THE SECRETARY: It was going to be in the chat box. You were supposed to send your votes through to me only. Somehow you can do that.

THE PRESIDENT: Could people message Mary privately, What we are doing is voting on whether or not the first resolution falls and then we as Council make a new one and send it round for you to consider. If you agree that resolution 1 falls, could you please message Mary privately in the chat box with yes or no?

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Can I double check, that resolution is the one that changes the length of time between a presidency stopping and being eligible to stand again?

VICTORIA DAVIES: Why is this falling? Has somebody spoken against it?

IAN ROBERTS: I thought that was you, Victoria.

THE PRESIDENT: You were saying that people should be eligible every single year.

VICTORIA DAVIES: I do not remember that.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: That is what I mean. I think the two got convoluted in together at some point there.

VICTORIA DAVIES: What are we voting for, they should be eligible after how long? One year.

THE PRESIDENT: If you are on Council, you are eligible every single year.

WENDY OSMOND: Can I make a suggestion? Rather than voting that it falls, should we not just vote for or against the resolution? It is a bit confusing.

THE SECRETARY: If you go back to this first resolution, it is that, "The President shall hold the office for a minimum term of one year and shall not be eligible for re-election for a period of two years after the termination of their term of office." That is effectively what you are voting for or against.

THE PRESIDENT: If we want to change it so that it is every single year you are eligible ---

THE SECRETARY: It is confusing to start changing the wording. The vote should be on the resolution as it has been ---

THE PRESIDENT: I had not finished. That means that you disagree with that resolution if you think people should be eligible every single year. That means you are against that resolution.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: That is taking on what Wendy Osmond just said, so either vote yes or no and then it just goes. Gotcha. We get there in the end.

THE SECRETARY: If you are voting for it, you say yes. If you are voting against it, you say no, and, effectively, that falls. Send me your votes please. If you have already voted via email then, strictly speaking, you should not be voting again.

MELANIE BALL: Can I just ask, I voted one way but obviously we had not had this debate about changing it to the one year from the two years.

THE SECRETARY: I was just thinking if people wished to change their mind, perhaps put a note in to say change of mind. It is a private vote. It is just going to come through to me only.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Does that not include the whole of the membership who have not been included?

THE SECRETARY: Leah, we are voting for or against the Special Resolution that is on the table. Nothing else.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Melanie has just said she has voted via email and now we have had a discussion, she might want to change.

THE SECRETARY: You mean she wishes to change her mind from the way she voted?

LEAH WILLERSDORF: And so might other people. Sorry, I am just playing devil's advocate.

THE SECRETARY: We can only take the votes of the people who are present.

NATALIE BRACKEN: The thing is the people who voted beforehand have not heard this discussion today and so they are voting on a different premise to what we are going to be voting on. My view is that we vote on it, ignoring anything that we have all said. I would be happy to vote in favour but then to have a Special Resolution to change it down the line or something to do it for every year. Basically we are arguing - I mean discussing - about a year. I just think otherwise it is not going to be a valid vote for people who voted before today. That is just my view.

NICOLE HARRISON: I think what is being said is we are not changing it.

THE PRESIDENT: Correct me if I am wrong, Mary, but the voting on anything we raise here and vote on is a vote of the people who are present here?

THE SECRETARY: Yes, but it does include the votes we have had previously by ballot and, while they have not heard the discussion, they have read the resolution and it is just that resolution we are voting on. It either stays the same as it is now, which is you cannot stand again for three years, or we vote that it changes to two years.

THE PRESIDENT: So we are not voting on what we are changing it to? We are just voting on what is on the paper here now. After that, depending on which way it goes, we send out new wording to everybody to vote on. The votes that people have already had will still stand because they are voting on the paper here.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Got you. Sorry to confuse matters.

IAN ROBERTS: It does not really matter what the result of this vote is. We are having an EGM in a couple of weeks anyway for the new one we are going to write.

THE SECRETARY: We have to give 21 days' notice. It is either we abandon this Special Resolution ---

IAN ROBERTS: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: We vote on it or we abandon it.

THE PRESIDENT: If people feel very strongly that we need to re-word it as it is from here and send out the new re-wording for people to vote on, perhaps the easiest thing would be to abandon voting on this resolution right now.

NATALIE BRACKEN: May I make a suggestion? Does Council want to have a bit of discussion first for five minutes? You could all go on mute and have a think about it. Because it affects you guys more than it affects us really.

THE SECRETARY: We have just discussed it here. It is either the resolution which is on the table, you vote for or against, or if there is such consternation or thought that things are not fair we effectively abandon that resolution and take it off the table.

NICOLE HARRISON: That is why you are voting against. We need to vote against to drop the resolution and then as Council we can do it after this AGM and come back with an EGM. That is what Leah said. If you do not want this, you have to vote against.

THE PRESIDENT: I think that is quite plain.

NICOLE HARRISON: The vote has to be for or against, period. If we voted against it, it could be something else, the wording is not right, we as Council, who are still on Council once we have our votes for who is President, can then come back with an EGM to change the wording. We have to vote for or against what the papers are here because we have postal votes for the people who were not able to attend.

NATALIE BRACKEN: Can I check that the second resolution will not be affected? Are they linked? I do not have the wording up in front of me. If one goes, will it conflict with the other? If we all vote in favour of the second one but against the first one, will that cause problems for BIVR?

THE PRESIDENT: I know what you mean. Thank you for raising it.

THE SECRETARY: I do not think it does, actually.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: From my memory I think they are separate, but I stand to be corrected, as they say.

THE SECRETARY: I only read the second one as I thought it might have an impact on the first one and that you were misunderstanding what we were proposing because I thought you had read two in conjunction. 2 is not reliant on 1.

THE PRESIDENT: Resolution 2 is separate. It is to elect the President for the next two years from next year, so that is separate to resolution 1, so you can vote differently for each one and that should not make a difference at all. Have we voted on 1 yet?

HEATHER CASILI: Is anyone keeping an eye on the chat because there are a few people who are confused about this situation, as am I? I have sent Mary a vote, but now I do not really know what I have voted for. I have messaged Georgina and I said I thought the document needs to be re-worded and clarified. There are a couple of other people on there who have mentioned how confused they are about the situation. I am quite new to a lot of what goes on behind the scenes in BIVR.

THE PRESIDENT: Welcome.

HEATHER CASILI: Is anyone keeping an eye on the chat? There are quite a few people coming up saying they are a bit confused.

THE PRESIDENT: It is very confusing because the resolutions are worded very confusingly, I admit. I personally find them very difficult to follow.

HEATHER CASILI: That makes me feel a lot better, thank you, Georgina. I am not like, "Should I be here?"

THE PRESIDENT: It is all written in very old-fashioned language, to be honest. These resolutions have been around for years and years. They have been tweaked here and there but they are still very formal. What I will do is read the Special Resolution out again slowly.

HEATHER CASILI: May I make a suggestion? The Special Resolution you are reading out we have had a discussion about changing that Special Resolution and the term of how long people want to stay on board with one thing or another.

VICTORIA DAVIES: May I make a suggestion that we take five minutes and everybody gets the email and reads the resolutions, because I think if you read them they are quite clear in the end?

THE SECRETARY: They were sent out with the Notice on 24 August.

THE PRESIDENT: Shall we take a break for people to read those? We will mute everybody and come back in ten minutes. Is that enough time for people to get the resolutions and read them or would you like a bit longer?

HEATHER CASILI: That sounds good. What was the date the resolutions were sent, 24 August?

LOUISE PEPPER: Sorry to interrupt.

THE PRESIDENT: 28 August.

LOUISE PEPPER: The 28th did you say? I thought it was the 24th.

VICTORIA DAVIES: I have got one from the 28th.

LOUISE PEPPER: Would it not be easier ---

VICTORIA DAVIES: I think people need to read it because it has been read out and people are still confused. If people read their own emails and read through, it is really quite clear.

LOUISE PEPPER: We have had discussions about changing it all, so I am still not clear.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: It is very wordy so I think people do need to read it.

HEATHER CASALI: May I clarify this, and thank you, Georgina: we are going to read the resolutions and vote yes or no on that resolution? If the majority says no then you will go away and figure out how to change the wording to accommodate the new thinking that we have just been discussing going forward?

THE PRESIDENT: Exactly, Heather, that is exactly right.

VICTORIA DAVIES: Is this new thinking from what I said about you should be eligible every year?

IAN ROBERTS: Yes.

VICTORIA DAVIES: Sorry, I actually agree with the resolution.

LOUISE PEPPER: Can someone tell me what the subject was in the email because I am having trouble finding it?

VICTORIA DAVIES: "BIVR 2020 AGM Notice plus virtual AGM programmes".

LEAH WILLERSDORF: The very first one that went out about the AGM and workshops, I suspect.

VICTORIA DAVIES: 28 August.

LOUISE PEPPER: I have got it, thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: We will have seven minutes and come back at 10.30 which is seven minutes on my clock. Is that okay for people?

(Short break)

THE PRESIDENT: Has everybody finished reading it? I will try to explain it again. Resolution 1 is to change the time of eligibility for office. The first resolution is to change the eligibility criteria, so how many years you have to be off of being President before you can be back in the running to be President. That is Resolution 1. Mary, have I got that correct?

THE SECRETARY: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: The second resolution is to change the length of time you spend as President. Mary, am I correct on that?

THE SECRETARY: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: That is what we are voting on. Resolution 1 is the eligibility criteria. People have said during this discussion that they think people should be eligible every single year. This issue was raised by Victoria and lots of people agreed. If you want us to change the wording of this resolution, what you need to do is vote against resolution 1. Council will then come up with new wording to allow for people to be eligible every single year. We will do that by an EGM. If you want to change it to every single year that everybody on Council is eligible, you have to vote against Resolution 1. Is that clear? Victoria?

VICTORIA DAVIES: I retract what I said before. I do not agree with it.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: You should come on to Council for that, Victoria.

LOUISE PEPPER: Georgina, I am sorry if I am just being completely thick, but what you just said was clear, that Resolution 1 is to change the wording to allow a person to be able to stand every year, but as I am looking at the resolution here on the email and reading it, that does not sound like that is what it is about to me. It says it is changing the term of office from one year to two years. That is a different thing, is it not? It says Special Resolution 1.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Resolution 1 is amending Article 20.

LOUISE PEPPER: Right. I do not know what that means. Article 20.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: The wording is changing the gap between being President and when you can be eligible again. That is all we are changing.

NATALIE BRACKEN: Can I just say, Georgina, you just said everybody is eligible every year.

THE PRESIDENT: No, I was trying to explain what Victoria had asked for previously. Her suggestion was that everybody is eligible every single year, which is not what this resolution says. If people like the idea of everybody on Council being eligible every single year, that is not in the wording and we have to rewrite that, which means you have to vote against this resolution because it does not say that. If you vote against this resolution, then we can rewrite it to every single year, which is the suggestion Victoria has now rejected.

NATALIE BRACKEN: Victoria, was that for the first resolution you were talking about, or the second?

VICTORIA DAVIES: That was for the first and I actually agree with the resolution, so please ignore me.

NATALIE BRACKEN: What I said was, and remember at the beginning of this discussion I said about having one year rather than two years, but meaning you

have a year off and then the next year --- I was not meaning every year that you can be on Council.

THE PRESIDENT: If that is your idea or your suggestion, that is not what it says in the resolution so you are against the resolution.

NATALIE BRACKEN: But I do not mind the two years though.

THE PRESIDENT: You have to make up your mind. You are either for it or against it. If you have another idea as to what you think it should be, which you have suggested, that means you are against this resolution. We really do need to get on and vote. If you are against it, we can re-write it and send it round for people to discuss and we can have another discussion about it, but we do need to get a vote on this because we have the other ones to get to as well. Are people clear on what they are voting for now? (Assent)

LOUISE PEPPER: Georgina has frightened me now. She has put on her teacher voice and is getting cross with us, so we are just going to do what we are told!

NICOLE HARRISON: Can you make sure you are voting on the chat privately to Mary?

LEAH WILLERSDORF: From now because some might have voted before and said the opposite to what they want to say now. Victoria!

(Pause for voting)

HEATHER CASALI: So we need to vote again if we have already voted?

THE SECRETARY: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Hopefully, it is clearer for everybody now. We want people voting when they are clear. I also suggest - this is openly to everybody - we think about making the wording of these Articles into modern and plainer English so that they are easier to understand.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: In 2020 English.

THE PRESIDENT: Note to Council! Mary is just tallying up the votes.

(Pause to count votes)

THE PRESIDENT: The resolution passed. People voted for Resolution 1. Resolution 1 will now be amended as per the new wording shown in your document.

We will now move to Resolution 2. Currently, the wording of Article 25 reads, "At the Annual General Meeting of the Institute it shall elect its Council Members and the

President for the ensuing year shall be elected. Such election shall be by simple majority of the votes cast at the meeting.”

The new wording is: “At the Annual General Meeting of the Institute it shall elect its Council Members for the following year and the President for the ensuing two years. If at the end of the first year, the President opts not to continue in post, a new President shall be elected at that AGM. Such election shall be by simple majority of the votes cast at the meeting.”

Are people clear as to what that resolution means? (Assent) Are people clear what they are voting for on this one? (Assent)

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Miriam is here.

THE PRESIDENT: Could everyone please send their vote either for or against privately to Mary, please.

(Pause for voting)

THE PRESIDENT: Special Resolution 2 has been unanimously carried. That resolution is passed.

We now move on to number 3. This is just changing the wording of Article 18 to add some words. It says currently, “Being on Council involves a willingness to stand for President (while noting that the position of Chief Examiner is exempt as they do not need to be a Council member).”

We are adding some words, so it shall now read, “The Institute shall be governed by a Council of up to twelve Fellows and Members, in any combination. Being on Council involves a willingness to stand for President (while noting that the position of Chief Examiner is exempt as they do not need to be a Council member).” Is that right, Mary?

THE SECRETARY: That is the wording I was asked to put in, yes.

THE PRESIDENT: We want to ensure everybody who stands for Council understands that it means they have to be willing to stand for President. There is no joining Council and every year saying, “I don’t want to be it.” Is that clear to everybody?

MELANIE BALL: I am joining Council this year and when I spoke to Ian at that stage this had not been passed and you were not forced to stand as President. I do not think I would have come on to the Council if I was going to be forced to be President. It is like being at school, some people like public speaking, some people do not, some people like being in the limelight, some people do not, and I do not think people should be forced against their will to have to stand.

THE PRESIDENT: It does not mean you have to be voted for. It just means you need to be willing to be in the pool.

MELANIE BALL: If you are in the pool and you are voted for, if you have to stand, you have no way of saying, "I don't want to stand because I don't feel confident enough to stand," or, "I don't have enough time to take on the role of President."

THE PRESIDENT: You have to be on Council for a certain length of time, I think it is a full year, before you can be eligible. That way you are getting used to the wheels and how the mechanisms of Council work. It really does need to be in there, I think, because presidency and vice presidency go hand in hand with being on the Council of a leading body. That is just my view.

NICOLE HARRISON: When I was voted President last year, I was quite shocked. I am not a forward public speaking person. I hate public speaking and anyone who knows me knows that. You find what your strengths are and sometimes you have to be put out of your comfort zone. Being President I was extremely out of my comfort zone, but I learned so much and got so much from it. It is an absolutely amazing feeling. I do not know how Leah feels because she did it for three years. I think if you just step out, especially with this year being stuck on remote and doing all new things, we are all out of our comfort zone and that is what your Council is there for; to help get the President through because you are not alone doing it. I just think you should be willing to do it.

THE PRESIDENT: Obviously, Mel, if you do not agree with this, you can vote against and you can withdraw your co-option on to Council if you feel you really, really do not want to be in that pool. We would be sorry to see you go because you only just joined you about an hour ago, but it is entirely up to you. We do not want to force you if you feel you really cannot do it.

MELANIE BALL: I am just going to refer to Louise's note. Louise was saying she would have stood for Council but now that has put her off. It would have put me off.

LOUISE PEPPER: That is true, yes.

MELANIE BALL: It would have put me off. I was going to say I would like Louise to be in Council but now she does not want to be in Council either because you are forcing us to be President when we do not want to. There is another person - Rachel - who has just said the same

NATALIE BRACKEN: Mel, if this helps you, was it last year where everybody had to give a speech or was it the year before, when we were in a hotel in London, and perhaps it should be a stipulation that everybody has to give a presidential "vote for me" speech and, Mel, you would just say, "Please don't vote for me" as your speech. Would that help you? I do not know. It is a reason I would not want to go on Council. People's work commitments change.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: We are all busy. Sorry, Natalie, to interrupt, but everybody is busy. Every single person on Council is busy. We all put our time and effort into it

and being President is part of that. I am sorry, that is just my opinion. It is making me angry.

MELANIE BALL: I disagree, Leah, and I do not know why you are getting angry because I think there should be people in the back row of Council who are quite willing to do lots of hard work but they don't have to be the spokesperson. I don't see why you have to be forced.

THE PRESIDENT: You have got an experienced Council behind you who will help you every step of the way.

MELANIE BALL: You can see quite a lot of people agree with me that they don't want to be forced and you are putting off people coming on to the Council when you really want to encourage more people coming on to the Council.

THE PRESIDENT: This is the point of having the discussion. We are finding out how people feel about it. If you do not agree, vote against it. This is why we are bringing it to you. These are suggestions that we have that you have the choice to vote on.

MELANIE BALL: Leah has just said she has got angry about. What is there to get angry about?

LEAH WILLERSDORF: I just don't get why or how you could not want to --- you are coming on to Council because you love the profession and you want to help promote the profession and protect members' interests. That goes along with being President and that is leading your membership that you are on the Council leading anyway.

THE PRESIDENT: Louise, you wanted to say something.

LOUISE PEPPER: I am a little bit confused again. You will have to excuse me. I have had such a lot of medication this morning, I am feeling a bit dopey. I thought what we were voting on was not whether somebody should be forced to stand for presidency if they are on Council, but just to change the wording of the resolution rather than that, or is it one and the same thing? I think a person should be able to want to be on Council and at the same time not want to be President - although a person could change their mind after they have been on Council and they may be willing to stand once they are more familiar with the role and, like Leah said, have got used to the mechanisms of it. I thought what we were voting on was not whether a person should be forced to stand for presidency. I thought it was just the wording, or is it the same thing?

MELANIE BALL: Once the wording is changed, it is a resolution and it becomes law, more or less, which means you can be forced to be President. You will all be up for President.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: The other thing I will add is that if you come on to Council and you are not willing to stand as President, we get into the situation we are in this year of having two Council members standing and then we had to add Georgina. That is another reason why because Council is so small you have to have people willing to do it.

VICTORIA DAVIES: Doesn't this raise a secondary issue of why people are not coming forward and why people don't want to stand for Council and presidency as well? Should we not start some sort of mentorship scheme perhaps or something like that?

MIRIAM WEISINGER: May I speak, please? I messaged and said I really do not think people need to worry about being forced to be President. You cannot be forced to be President. You can be in the pool, but I do not think it is a problem. We desperately need young people on the Council who are going to take the profession forward. I am reaching the end of my working life, please God, and I do not want to carry on doing the job I am doing. We need new people with enthusiasm who will keep this as a profession. Do not worry about being President. Cross that bridge when you get to it. Resign from Council in two years' time. Do not worry about it. I think we are trying to run before we can walk. I really do.

VICTORIA DAVIES: Does that mean nobody is going to kidnap Melanie's cat and make her stand for Council then?

MELANIE BALL: I have 16. You can have all 16 on the Council if you want.

NATALIE BRACKEN: Can I check what the rule is? Sorry, I have forgotten. I do not know if it is in that wording that you just read out. Don't you have to have been on Council for a few years before you are eligible for President? I cannot remember.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: I think it is one full year. I do not know what Article it is.

NATALIE BRACKEN: Thank you, Leah.

THE SECRETARY: I believe it is one year. Could I just reiterate the wording that was proposed? It involves a "willingness to stand for President". It does not say you have to. Things change. People's circumstances change, as we know, and that is why we stopped having the President Elect because two years running, for valid reasons, the person elected for President could not then stand. That is a good ten-plus years ago. Unfortunately, I go back 20-odd years as Secretary. I do not know everything and I forget a lot of stuff, but it is just a willingness and, as Georgina said with the previous votes, if you do not agree with it, you vote against it. Do not abstain because that will not help at all. Vote either for or against.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we should draw this discussion to an end and have a vote now. People have their strong views, but it is absolutely over to you. We need to vote on it. It may be we have to revisit the issue at the next AGM, but for now we

need you to vote on how you are feeling about it, and we will see where we go after the vote and take it from there. Vote now privately to Mary, please.

(Pause for voting)

THE PRESIDENT: The result is 14 for and 8 against so the motion carries. A reminder that it is just to change the wording "willingness". We will not force you if you are voted in. We can automatically add this as an ongoing resolution to the following AGM if people still very strongly about it, that is no problem, but please bear in mind we will not be forcing anybody. It is simply to change the wording so that people know what they are getting into when they join Council. I am sorry if you feel that is going to put you off joining Council and, Mel, if you would like to withdraw on that basis, that is fine, or you could do a year and resign at that point; at the point you become eligible to become President. That is always an option.

MELANIE BALL: Seeing as I have just come on, I will stay on at least for the year. Thank you anyway.

THE PRESIDENT: Nicole has just said on that basis does anybody want to join Council, if anybody else is willing? I see we have a new Council member there, Victoria. I think Arlo would like to join!

Election of President

THE PRESIDENT: The next point of business is the election of President for the next year. Those eligible are myself after the EGM putting me in the pool (because we only had two other people who were eligible, being Ian and Alan). Orla and Miriam were both eligible but indicated they did not wish to stand. Mary has already had postal and email ballots. Anybody who hasn't voted, I would ask you to vote now indicating the person you wish to be President for the next year. Could you do that by private message to Mary. Thank you. Just to point out I have been helping Mary count the votes, but because I am in the pool, I am going to ask Nicole to help count the votes on this one, just for reassurance.

(Pause for voting)

THE SECRETARY: I can tell you the vote, unfortunately, no votes for Ian, two votes for Alan and everybody else has voted for Georgina. There are so many I have not actually counted them. Your President is Georgina.

THE PRESIDENT: Thanks, guys. In that case, the previous President is usually the Vice-President. Nicole has indicated that she is happy to stay on as Vice-President. Can I have a show of hands that everybody is happy with that? (Show of hands) Nicole stays on as Vice President. Thank you very much indeed. That was interesting voting this way.

NICOLE HARRISON: A whole new experience.

Date of Next Meeting

THE PRESIDENT: The next matter is to decide the date of the next Annual General Meeting. We have said September 2021. We usually have it in September, but does anyone have any reason why they might want it to be some other time? Does anybody have any issues with the timing?

THE SECRETARY: Quit while you are ahead.

THE PRESIDENT: With any luck, we will not be in lockdown this time next year, but we have run it virtually this time and we could run it virtually again if we have to. I really hope we do not have to because this has been quite stressful for Mary. If we have to do it this way again, we will obviously have a bit more experience in running them. I think it has been okay so far. Touch wood. All we have to say now -- Leah is raising some points. I was just going to say AOB. Leah, I will let you fire away with your AOB.

Any Other Business

LEAH WILLERSDORF: There are two that I think are for you I have put in your chat box. The other one is to do with the website. What we are going to do with the Find a Reporter is we are still finding we have to fine tune it. This was the big thing last year and we are still finding we have to fine tune it. At the moment where it says Find a Reporter, we are going to call that Find a Professional and then we are going to have a drop-down box for Verbatim Reporting, Verbatim STT, for each of the categories basically, and we will probably even have one for the pen writers because they get asked specifically for work when it comes to doing things that do not use electronics. Each of those will have their own Find a Professional search, so your category of verbatim reporting will be on that particular page and audio transcribing on their page. It will all be separated out. Each of them will also have a home page, like an introductory page. For example, on the STT one, we get quite a lot of questions on the difference between a legal official transcript and an STT transcript. We have got wording for that so we are going to put that on there. Other things like the difference between the QRR and STT, for example, because the QRR skews certain things because that is a BIVR accreditation and then there is real time which is done in captioning and verbatim reporting. They all overlap but they are all separate and distinct as well, if that makes sense. That is in process. We were hoping for it to be done for today to announce it, but it did not happen. That is one of the things we are going to be doing.

THE PRESIDENT: I have a couple of AOBs, but I would like anybody else to do theirs before I do mine. Does anybody have any AOB?

VICTORIA DAVIES: No, but can I follow on to Leah's point? I do not agree with the word "transcripts" in relation to STT notes.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: What do you want us to call it?

VICTORIA DAVIES: "Notes". I can see Louise laughing there. We had this discussion. I think the water is getting muddied when you are doing a legal STT job and suddenly they are presented with this supposed transcript.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: So you are saying if you are doing it under the MoJ contract, for example, and have gone into a crown court, you are providing STT draft notes, not a draft transcript?

VICTORIA DAVIES: Everything on STT is not a transcript.

LOUISE PEPPER: Victoria and I had an horrific argument about this yesterday, didn't we, Vic?

VICTORIA DAVIES: One of many, Louise.

LOUISE PEPPER: May I just say I think the word "notes" could be a bit misleading as well. I am not disagreeing necessarily with what you are saying, Victoria, about the word "transcript". I understand your point. I do not think I agree, but I see what you are saying. Also, the word "notes" could be indicative of something that is not verbatim. It could also be like a precis or a summary, if you are saying the word "notes". I do not know what would be a good choice. Perhaps that is a discussion for another time.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: No, it is a discussion for today because it will need to go on the website. Rather than us put it on the website and us have members going, "No, no, no", it would probably be better if we can hash that out today. What is the time?

VICTORIA DAVIES: "Document" or "text file".

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Say that one more time, sorry.

VICTORIA DAVIES: In the chat Katy and Natalie have said "document" or "text file".

WENDY OSMOND: As long as it has "draft" with it, it is not such an issue what the actual word is.

VICTORIA DAVIES: It is because in court you also have draft transcripts.

IAN ROBERTS: What about "draft text"?

VICTORIA DAVIES: Or maybe "rough".

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Do they understand the word "rough"?

THE PRESIDENT: I think "draft" is easier to understand.

LOUISE PEPPER: You could always put the word "draft" on but I don't understand what the issue is with the word "transcript". You think it could be mixed up with an official court transcript?

LEAH WILLERSDORF: A legal official one. I see what Victoria is saying. Say you have attended as a captioner but I have attended to do the legal official one, we are both there in two different respects, and our output will most likely be the same but our final document might not be.

LOUISE PEPPER: Technically, it is still a transcript so perhaps one could be called the "draft captioning transcript". I still think that the words "notes" or "document" could also be a bit misleading. It does not sound like it is necessarily a verbatim record.

VICTORIA DAVIES: Is it not the captions then?

LOUISE PEPPER: "We will send you a copy of the draft captions"? I do not feel that strongly. I am going to shut up.

MELANIE BALL: What about "draft captions to text"?

VICTORIA DAVIES: Or the "text from the meeting" or whatever?

THE PRESIDENT: Sharon has made a good point. It is not a full transcript as in you would not take a note of the deaf person.

LOUISE PEPPER: Sometimes you do. It is still a transcript whether you take them down or not. The issue is the word "draft". As long as it says "draft" or "rough".

VICTORIA DAVIES: It is transcript for me for and other people. I have had somebody trying to use a transcript in court from STT notes.

LOUISE PEPPER: Yes, but we should make it clear with a disclaimer and headers and stuff like that anyway that that is not to be done. "STT transcript", Miriam says. That is a possibility. I do not mind not using the word "transcript", but I would prefer something that makes it very clear that it is still a verbatim note. We could call it "verbatim note".

LEAH WILLERSDORF: What about the "captioning record".

VICTORIA DAVIES: That is a good one.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: So "official legal transcript" versus the "captioning record" just so we can get that out? Basically, the idea of these dedicated separate parts of the website is so that someone coming to find a professional can see exactly what they want, and that is why at the moment we have the little blue box that says "What service do I need?" They have to answer a whole load of questions and then they get their answer at the end. If we have the two different types of transcripts --

- it is like that one in India I posted in the group the other day. I do not know that he is sure what he wants, if he wants a verbatim reporter or a captioner, so I have asked him to go and look at that because that would tell you. If we have there as well the difference between a transcript and captioning record.

VICTORIA DAVIES: I like captioning record.

LOUISE PEPPER: I do not like the word "record". Is this just for the BIVR website we are talking here? It is not for people's individual preference. Maybe you could have "official court transcript" versus "draft captioning notes". I think that would be better. I do not really like the word record because it is not the official record.

WENDY OSMOND: Maybe "captioned" past tense to show they were the captions that went out at the time.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: What word to put with that then, Wendy? "Captioned transcript" or "captioned record"?

MELANIE BALL: I think "text" is better.

WENDY OSMOND: I think captioned text is fine.

LOUISE PEPPER: I prefer that to the word record.

WENDY OSMOND: I do not know how long it can be.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: The shorter the better.

WENDY OSMOND: There is some wording somewhere "for the purposes of communication support". A lot of the time you edit things anyway because you have to.

LOUISE PEPPER: Is it not a good idea to put the word "official" next to the court reporting transcript. That would also be a clarification, would it not?

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Basically we will be saying things like the difference, we have got it all written. One of them is a legal court reporting one, an official one can be used for example in the Court of Appeal to be quoted from whereas a captioned text file could not, for example. If you see what I mean.

LOUISE PEPPER: I think captioning is better because if you say captioned text file it sounds like the file itself has been captioned, like you have got a header.

THE PRESIDENT: I think you are going too deeply, Louise, to be honest.

LOUISE PEPPER: I am just going to say I would prefer the words "captioning text file" rather than "captioned" because I think the word captioned could be a little bit misleading.

THE PRESIDENT: We will go through the chat and we will see what people have said and which is the preferred one for now. It is just to go on the website. It needs to look nice and snappy and easy to navigate. That is what we will do for now. Obviously, you will see the results, but your objection to that word has been noted, Louise.

We really need to move on now because we are starting the next topic at 11.40 for the first seminar. Does anybody else have anything they want to raise before I do my two points?

SUSAN HUMPHRIES: Just in the afternoon two sessions, which I found really useful, and I think everybody else who did them did, it was mentioned about doing depositions and that we could qualify as a notary. Has that gone out anywhere? Is it on the website, because I could not get on the website yesterday?

THE PRESIDENT: We did some searching and, basically, there is no way for us to become notaries at all.

SUSAN HUMPHRIES: You and Ian went on the website and it said as long as you have a degree you can comply effectively.

THE PRESIDENT: It is pretty complicated.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: And very expensive.

IAN ROBERTS: You have to apply to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

MELANIE BALL: Could we not as a body make representations that stenographers in the UK really need this to be able to compete worldwide against US reporters and stuff?

SUSAN HUMPHRIES: I think it is something that you could take further because a lot of people have got degrees and I know a few of them have already got law degrees, so they are halfway there or 80% there. I think it is something that could be pursued further if you as a Council could take it and do a bit more research.

THE PRESIDENT: We will add it to the list certainly. No problem. Anybody else? I have a couple of things to raise. We do actually have a position within BIVR for Fellows and we have not awarded any fellowships recently. The criteria for Fellows are, Mary, can you remind me? You have to show proficiency in two separate areas.

THE SECRETARY: I do not have it here.

THE PRESIDENT: This is the surprise. You have to show competence in two separate areas of the court reporting or the stenography/verbatim reporting field. In the olden days it would have been if you worked doing Hansard and doing normal court work, because Hansard is different from ---

THE SECRETARY: Crown court and civil court were two separate fields, and Hansard a third separate field.

THE PRESIDENT: Also there was another one of conference reporting as well. We are going to revive this practice of awarding fellowships, so if you show competence in two separate areas of the verbatim reporting field, you will qualify as a fellow. Because we now have real time what that means is anyone who has a real-time qualification and has a court reporting qualification will qualify as a fellow, so we are going to go through all your details and, if you are eligible, you will become a fellow of BIVR. That is if you have a speech-to-text qualification, if you are NRCPD-registered and you joined BIVR on the court reporting side that makes you a Fellow. Leah, was that clear?

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Yes.

MELANIE BALL: May I ask, those of us who used to work for Smith Bernal all those years back, we got a certificate from them saying we were LiveNote accredited or whatever it says on it; does that count?

THE PRESIDENT: Unfortunately not. When I raised that when I first joined Council I was told no because it was an in-house qualification. I think that is because, well, it was just the way it was then. I think people did not particularly like that particular firm.

THE SECRETARY: It was not just that. There were other methods of training, it was actually the Palantype training - I go back so long - that people were given the cassette to practise over and over again until they got that speed and then they got the next tape up, the next 10 words a minute.

THE PRESIDENT: That was not about how the Smith Bernal LiveNote training was done.

THE SECRETARY: I am not talking about Smith Bernal. That was how that training was done and so it was decreed that was effectively in-house, it was not a separate unseen unheard test. That is why in-house testing was not acceptable.

THE PRESIDENT: We might have to re-look at this because that is not what I understood. We will look at that again. What is an RQP, Natalie?

THE SECRETARY: That is the IPS qualified real time reporter.

THE PRESIDENT: Any real-time reporting exam you have. Any one will count that shows that you have proficiency in real time: a QRR, an RQP, NRCPD registration, CRR from the US. Any of those is acceptable. Is that clear?

MELANIE BALL: In that case I think the Smith Bernal one should count because it was an unseen test. They gave you a test. Basically, this is what happened. I was

doing a two-year job in Bermuda. Graham told them they should be getting 100% accuracy in the rough real time, when they were quoting Swiss law all day and all this nonsense. One of the solicitors complained that everything was not coming out translated. Graham said to me, "You mustn't be good enough; we are going to do a test." Because of that he instituted this real-time thing, which was a proper real-time test to make sure I got whatever it was, 90 whatever it was. I got a certificate and other people after that had to do the test. It was still a proper real-time test because otherwise he would not have let me go back into court to do real time.

THE PRESIDENT: I totally agree with you, Melanie, because I am in the same position, but when I came on Council I was told by, I think it was Betty that it would not count.

MELANIE BALL: Can that not be overturned? Can you not put a resolution?

LEAH WILLERSDORF: That certificate that Melanie is talking about, the certified LiveNote reporter.

MELANIE BALL: I cannot remember, Leah.

THE PRESIDENT: It is, but it is not the same as they have in the US.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: That is what I was going to say.

THE PRESIDENT: It is completely different. It was quite an involved examination. To get it now you have to do three tests and then have it ---

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Bless Betty, but surely that can count? Because if you think about it, it is a little more strict than the QRR and if the QRR counts ---

THE PRESIDENT: What we will do, Mel, is we will take that back to Council and we will kick that one around. We have 11 minutes left before the next session, so we really need to break.

LEAH WILLERSDORF: Can I say one more thing to do with the website? We have added two filters into the search. One is for those who are NRCPD registered. There is a special filter on there, so if someone goes there looking for someone who is on the register they just click on that and up comes all those who are registered.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless anybody has anything else, I propose we call a close to the AGM. That gives everybody about ten or 11 minutes before we hear from Lucy. Those of you who have not paid to be on the seminars, I will say thank you very much for attending but we will be booting you off. We will let you stay on for five or ten minutes to have a chat, but when it comes to 11.40 you will have to leave if you have not paid to join the seminars. Once again, thank you all very much. I look forward to next year, hopefully not in lockdown, and that we will all be able to meet in person soon.
