



# Student Council Minutes – 02.11.21

## 1 Welcome and apologies.

A welcome was given by JJ, acting as temporary chair. JJ also notes that Advance HE is listening in to Council, so they are better informed with the Governance Regeneration Project.

### Apologies:

- Braedie Atkins, Rahul Porwal, Fatima Soomro Magiesha Maheswaran, Eman Barreh -part attendance. Isabelle Atkins

### Present:

- Charlotte Earl (Welfare Committee Chair) CE
- Shingai Dzumbira (President) - SD acting as temporary chair
- Nathan Parsons (PG Officer) - NP
- Magiesha Maheswaran (Co-Ethnic Minorities Officer) MM
- Jack Sperry (Co-Environment & Ethics Officer) JS
- Naomi Carter (Co-Women's Officer) NC
- Eman Barreh (Co-Women's Officer) EB
- Peter Banfield (Sports Committee Chair) PB
- Steph Monti (Societies Committee Chair) SM
- Abi Baxter (Trans Students' Officer) AB
- David Bush (Education Committee Chair) DB
- Will Brewer (Sports Officer) WB
- James Hurt (Postgraduate Committee Chair) JH
- Jacob Jefferson (Democracy & Development Officer) JJ – acting as temporary chair
- Harry Jee (Democracy Committee Chair) HJ
- Chih Hsang-Lo (Societies Officer) CHL
- Noga Levy-Rapoport (Co-LGBTQUA+ Officer) NLR
- Kirsten Marner-Foley (Co-LGBTQUA+ Officer) KMF
- Thomas Garth (Environment Committee Chair) TG
- Jonathan Bateman (Development Committee Chair) JB
- Charlton Sayer (Welfare & Campaigns Officer) CS

## 2 Chair & Deputy Chair of Council (Super Council)

- JJ informs the Council we have received one nomination for Chair and two nominations for Deputy Chair. The council received speeches from all candidates and said voting took place today and will close on the 03.11.21 to then elect in our Chair and Deputy Chair for the remainder of the year.

## **RESULT: Charlotte Earl and Oscar Renton have been elected as Chair & Deputy Chair of Council**

### **3 Motions of no confidence (Super Council)**

- JJ notes none were received

### **4 Announcements & Co-Options**

- Co-options received below. A vote took place once the chair asked for speeches from all relevant co-options. This is a simple majority vote.
- Postgraduate Committee Members (3 to elect)
  - Rohil Vaidya (elected)
  - Neyha Mesiya (elected)
- Development Committee Member (1 to elect)
  - Lancelot Wilson (elected)
- Welfare Committee Member (1 to elect)
  - Alexander Mcleod (elected)
  - Adam Khan
- The democracy team raised a clarification point that as Adam Khan was elected on Ed Committee, they are unable to be co-opted due to them having multiple seats which would be in contravention of 57.3 on our Articles of Association.

### **5 Minutes from Last Meeting**

Vote to approve. Unanimously approved both sets of minutes, one which was the most recent Council meeting from last academic year and the other redacted minutes from the meeting in March.

### **6 Actions Arising at last meeting**

All updated in meeting papers.

### **7 Student Council Reports (FTO/PTO & Chairs of Committees)**

Questions or comments for FTO's:

- SD mentions that her report on online learning should be listed as term 3 not term 1 and 2.
- No further questions

### **8 Motions to Student Council/All Student Vote**

- JJ has stated that the motion order is in relation to bylaw changes being first as those are the ones Council can vote for. He reminds Council that any motions that aren't bylaw changes go straight to All student vote (ASV).
- JJ relinquishes duties as temporary chair to SD for the first four motions as they are proposers for three of those.

Motion 8.1 – Directly Elected Student Council Chair

Proposer: Jacob Jefferson

Secunder: Jack Sperry

JJ spoke in favor of the motion as he feels student council as a body doesn't have much awareness, students aren't engaging in our democratic systems but don't directly elect students on to Student Council. They have a quoracy and if it doesn't reach quoracy the election is done the same way.

DB, NP & NLR says the chair should be a neutral position and having them elected could bring in politics and there are some concerns over the neutrality of the Chair, as well as consistency.

JJ says he understands political points, but states the same can be applied to existing members of council

SD goes to summarizing speeches – JJ gives a speech in favor and NP gives a speech against.

8 in favour

11 Against

0 Abstentions

Motion – does not pass.

Motion 8.2.1 Amendment - Introduce a Men's Officer

Proposer: Liberation & Diversity Committee

NLR gives a speech in favor of the amendment to include and change the title to introduce a "Men's Mental Health Rep".

JH gives a speech against the amendment that says the focus on motion isn't just Men's Mental Health.

NC states that the role wouldn't work under liberation spaces as PTOs.

JH agrees and links to amendment 3 and doesn't have an issue with that amendment.

SD goes to summarizing speeches - NLR gives summarizing speech in favor of the amendment, and that the role be not about liberating men but need support structures for those men in wellbeing structures. JH gives a speech against the amendment saying there is issues with other amendments, listed 3 to come to it. Amendment 1 would negate the specific point about the motion.

6 in favour

11 Against

2 Abstentions

Amendment – does not pass.

Motion 8.2.2 Amendment – Introduce a Men's Officer

Proposer: Liberation & Diversity Committee

NP gives a speech in favor of the amendment.

JH queries whether this should be another motion entirely, NP states it is relevant as the title asks for equal representation for students.

NLR also agrees with the amendment that this amendment would help non-binary representation on campus

10 In favour  
5 Against  
2 Abstentions  
Amendment – passes

Motion 8.2.3 Amendment – Introduce a Men's Officer  
Proposer: Liberation & Diversity Committee

NLR gives speech in favor of the amendment stipulating that the role shouldn't be within Liberation spaces

JH asks a point of clarification on whether this means the non-binary officer is also excluded with the men's officer in liberation spaces as the amendment before has just passed.

NP says that the way the amendment was written would keep the non-binary officer within liberation spaces.

11 In favour  
3 Against  
5 Abstentions  
Amendment – passes

Motion 8.2 Equal Representation for Warwick Students – Introduce a Men's Officer  
Proposer: James Hart  
Seconder: Alex McOcean

JH gives a speech in favour of the motion talking about the importance of having a Men's Officer.  
NC states the importance of having trigger warnings before talking about sensitive subjects  
WB gives a speech against motion saying there isn't a need to have a men's officer. Part-Time roles focus on liberation and men's officer isn't needed.

JJ says there is not just liberation PTOs as there are other officers that are not liberation roles, like Environment & Ethics Officer, International Students' Officer etc

TG says the existence of a men's officer will be able to deal with some issues that are not used, or men are uncomfortable to use in our existing systems.

PB says fundamentally it's not an issue of being a man, but men don't feel there isn't anyone to talk to as there is a publicity issue not a need to create a new position.

DB mentions JJ's comment about other PTOs not in liberation is so that they consider those from underrepresented groups. Not a need to have a men's officer to be represented. The man issue is about men's mental health and that amendment was voted down so this motion should be voted down.

SD goes to summarize speeches and JH gives a speech in favour of the motion. WB gives a speech against motion and that the focus should be on men's mental health not about the creation of a men's officer.

There has been a procedural motion to postpone the decision of the vote until a later meeting (being the next Student Council)

SD asks for those to speak against and in favor of the motion. PB speaks against the procedural motion. CS speaks in favor of the procedural motion. WB speaks against the procedural motion, noting the split decision being made will be up to the chair and that will be different for the next Council. JH speaks in favor of the procedural motion and how heavily amended it has been.

SD notifies Council of the correct procedure which is that a vote has already been taken and the tie was the outcome which gives the Chair final decision on the matter.

9 In favor

9 Against

1 Abstentions

Motion – does not pass (Chair voted against the motion – split decision)

Motion 8.3.1 End Joint Tickets - amendment

Proposer: Nathan Parsons, Noga Levy-Rapoport, Sophie Kitching, Rahul Porwal,

NP gives a speech in favor of the amendment, stating joint tickets are incredibly important to help better represent communities. Having more voices in the room is better.

DB asks a question over what the rules currently are. JJ states that there is nothing within bylaws or regulations about joint tickets.

JJ speaks against the amendment and says two people against one for the role. Those that are joint tickets going up against one candidate seem unfair and will probably repeat this again in the actual motion, but PTOs should be included in the original motion.

NC speaks in favour of the amendment and points out that PTOs are not paid so having more people doing the work isn't a disadvantage. Having two people can help work with marginalized communities more and the mental health of officers is important to have two to split the workload. More people that do work is not a bad thing, especially a part time officer doing it.

NLR stipulates that the motion also implies that both officers act in a homogenous way as if we bring the exact same representation and ideas, perspectives. I would not of considered running if this role did not allow for joint tickets (LGBTQUA+ Officer role).

SK wanted to just echo the beliefs 1 under the amendment, that accessibility is important and not allowing joint ticketing would restrict this commitment. Indirectly allowing the inability to run, is an inaccessibility issue.

JJ argues that we don't do enough to assist PTOs. But the joint ticket and single ticket connections are limiting and that feels unfair on the student that is a single ticket to go up against two others for the same position.

SD asks for summarizing speeches, NC gives a speech in favour of the amendment.

10 In favor

8 Against

1 Abstentions

Amendment – passes

### Motion 8.3 End Joint Tickets

Proposer: Jacob Jefferson

Secunder: Charlotte Earl

SD asks for speakers in favour of the motion. JJ states as the motion have changed dramatically to what it was, they won't vote in favor of the motion.

0 In favor

12 Against

7 Abstentions

Motion – does not pass

### Motion 8.4 End Slate and club/soc endorsements (Tickets – 1:41:18)

Proposer: Jacob Jefferson

Secunder: Charlotte Earl

SD asks for a speaker in favor of the motion. JJ gives a speech in favor of the motion and how slates and endorsements are a barrier to student engagement with elections. This was only introduced last year and was not successful, we also require doing these for faculty rep and course rep elections and continue to be a barrier to our elections process.

NLR gives a speech against the motion and gives reasons why endorsements do engage elections and use wider support systems to see elections more widely. It's worth considering, candidates can pool resources together does support candidates and nothing wrong with candidates having access to a wider group of people to make changes with the Students' Union.

NP asks for a procedural motion to send to the relevant committee (democracy committee) to split the motion in to two. One being about slates and the other about endorsements. Noting they are separate issues and can come back to a later Council.

SD asks for a speech against the procedural motion, PB say meetings go long enough and JH says its better to get this done right first time.

6In favor

11 Against

3 Abstentions

Procedural Motion – does not pass

WB says no sports presidents are in favor of endorsements. Mention the feelings of clubs and how they are not considered overall if the exec are friends with candidates. Voting can be shown. DB echoes what WB states and says people can make decisions themselves without needing endorsements. Political parties aren't a good thing in an SU environment and slates breed that.

NC argues against the motion and says if the individual doesn't want to vote for a candidate they can, there is no compulsion on who the exec pick. It is an endorsement not what people do but an endorsement. A slate doesn't give candidates an advantage as last year not all those on slates won. Informal slates have always existed and it's better to be transparent instead of being opaque.

CE mentions how difficult it is in Autumn to get people in to slates and elections just a few weeks into the University life for freshers. Building up a network in a few weeks and the process of doing slates was difficult. Not just posting endorsements, it involved submitting evidence. Students don't want to deal with complicated procedures.

JH gives a speech in favor of the motion and how it will make life easier for everyone if slates and endorsements didn't exist. PB also notes the method of voting for endorsements of the exec doesn't consider the demographics of the exec and they were not elected for that reason, to be based on student politics.

NLR gives a speech against the motion and says these are not compulsory, it is so that they are given the option to do it. Endorsements are there for communities that feel engaged to do it. MM echoes the lack of compulsion with endorsements.

SD asks for summarizing speeches. JJ gives a speech in favor of the motion. NC gives a speech against the motion.

15 In favor  
4 Against  
1 Abstentions  
Motion – passes

Motion 8.5. – No more disruption to our education

Proposer: anonymous

Secunder: anonymous

Motion 8.5.1 – No more disruption to our education – amendment

Proposer: Education Committee

JJ takes the role of temporary chair over from SD

JJ asks for speeches in favor, DB gives a speech in favor of the amendment. The motion as is puts a one size fits all approach to strikes and isn't right.

JJ asks for speeches against the amendment. None.

10 In favor  
4 Against  
1 Abstentions  
Amendment– passes

JJ also introduces both amendments 8.5.2 & 8.5.3 which will be merged in as one amendment as they are asking for the same resolves.

DB gives a speech in favor of the amendment as they argue the motion should be clear in the title on what they are doing, and most people will see the title and determine whether to vote on it or not.



HJ gives a speech against the amendment as there is no issue on the name of the motion as it doesn't go against what the motion is arguing.

NLR argues that even if it does take the motion's motivation it isn't stipulating in the title what the motion is arguing for. Disruption to education could mean anything and is misleading. HJ says that considering the amendment that just passed (8.5.1) believes the title is appropriate.

10 In favor  
6 Against  
3 Abstentions  
Amendment– passes

Motion 8.5. – No more disruption to our education  
Proposer: anonymous  
Secunder: anonymous

JJ asks for speakers in favor of the motion, TG gives a speech in favor and states that the student body would be in favor of this motion too and that we should note the point about our tuition fees. Lecturers at lowest levels have an average pay double the national average, idea lecturer strikes should take precedent over teaching is questionable.

JJ asks for speakers against the motion. SD wants to highlight resolves 2 and that note wouldn't accurately portray how students feel. They are sympathetic to it and wouldn't be an accurate representation of students. University fee refunds won't happen, this will only upset the University.

JJ wants to minute that unless you wish to have positions minute here, we want to move on.

NP asks whether Council cannot send motions to ASV, JJ makes a point of clarification last year there was decisions made at Council that should have only been made at ASV in approving or not passing motions.

NP asks for a procedural motion to overturn the chairs ruling.

SD notes as she was on the Council last year there was a misunderstanding of how the Council functioned and recognized power and decision making shouldn't only be in one place.

NP clarifies that the procedural motion is not vote on things that should to ASV, rather whether Council has essentially the ability to not send something to ASV. The existence of petition route is good evidence that the Council can vote down motions that go to ASV.

6 In favor  
13 Against  
2 Abstentions  
Procedural Motion – does not pass

Motion 8.6. – Warwick SU to host 'One Hell of a Party' (goes to ASV)

Proposer: Oscar Renton

Secunder: David Bush

JJ asks for speeches for and against the motion, as the motion will inevitably go to ASV unless there's a specific need to make note of it here we can move on

Motion 8.7. – Warwick SU for a fair democracy (goes to ASV)

Proposer: David Bush

Secunder: Sebastian Maxted

JJ asks for speeches in favor of the motion. DB gives a speech in favor of the motion. NLR gives a speech against motion. Starting there are two separate motions in one.

Motion 8.8. – Warwick Supports In-Person Teaching and Universal Lecture Capture (goes to ASV)

Proposer: Oscar Renton

Secunder: David Bush

JJ asks for speeches in favor of the motion. DB gives a speech in favor of the motion. None against

Motion 8.9. – Warwick SU to take action against drink spiking (goes to ASV)

Proposer: Naomi Carter and Eman Barreh

Secunder: Becs Fox

Motion 8.9.1 - Warwick SU to take action against drink spiking (amendment)

Proposer: Jacob Jefferson (Democracy Committee)

19 In favor

0 Against

1 Abstentions

Amendment – passes

Motion 8.9.2 - Warwick SU to take action against drink spiking (amendment)

Proposer: Welfare Committee

JJ asks for any speakers in favor of the amendment. CE speaks in favor. Highlights the importance for all PTOs to be involved in the process of this motion. NC speaks against the amendment and says that the original motion included PTOs that were relevant to drink spiking, the additional ones are not.

SK notes that this is an issue for the disabled student's officer to be part of the motion because the group do and have been involved in incidents of drink spiking.

JJ notes that there was some worry on note 1 about the interpretation of it. That said for every single drink that everyone had, you would have to provide all those things. The commercial team wanted clarification on that.

NC clarifies that the motion wants to have visible drink covers for as many students as possible as we can get and afford. WB says that it addresses the concerns of the commercial team.

No speeches against the motion.

Motion 8.10 – Make Circling Great Again (gone to ASV)

Proposer: Charlotte Earl

Secunder: Jack Sperry

JJ asks for speeches in favor of the motion, CE speaks in favor of the motion. Noted that the motion was cut considerably to consider any financial issues that were raised previously, which is why the motion has been changed.

WB asks for the timescale for the motion as they are asked to deliver the second resolves. CE says not expected to be done straight away.

The Democracy team notifies the Council that 8.11 has been withdrawn from the papers as the proposer removed them.

Motion 8.12 – Bring Back 'Bus Stop' In the Terrace Bar (gone to ASV)

Proposer: Charlotte Earl

Secunder: Charlton Sayer

JJ asks for any speakers in favor of the motion. CE speaks in favor of the motion. Make sure that if the financial situation allows us to do this, we should do this. Passing this motion allows us to have it on the radar to look at.

Motion 8.13 – Introduce Milk Mondays (gone to ASV)

Proposer: Kieran Mardania

Secunder: Harry Jee

Motion 8.13.1 – Introduce Milk Mondays - Amendment

Proposer: Jacob Jefferson (Development Committee)

Motion 8.13.2 – Introduce Milk Mondays - Amendment

Proposer: Charlotte Earl (Welfare Committee)

JJ and HJ (as secunder) inform the Council the amendment has already been accepted. Both 8.13.1 and 8.13.2

HJ gives speech in favor of motion (read out statement from proposer).

DB asks for a question on the financial viability of the motion. JJ states the motion has been considered by directors and in the event a motion passes, the board of trustees will ratify and intercede if it has any implications financially, legally or reputationally we should note.

Motion 8.14 – Warwick SU for Civic Values (gone to ASV)

Proposer: Kieran Mardania

Secunder: Harry Jee

Motion 8.14.1 – Warwick SU for Civic Values - Amendment

Proposer: Nathan Parsons

Secunder: Noga Levy-Rapoport

NP gives a speech in favor of the amendment. The current title doesn't reflect what the motion is. TG gives a speech against the amendment. The proposed amended title is disingenuous to what the motion is. NLR agrees with the amendment and states how deeply offensive it is to claim the monarchy is representative of our civic values.

11 In favor

6 Against

1 Abstentions

Amendment – passes

TG gives a speech in favor of the motion talking about the benefits of the Queen and how she deserves respect. SD gives a speech against the motion and talks about how this motion is not a joke and is offensive to those from a colony. WB echoes this and says the university will see this and think of us as a joke. This is going to ASV and feels strongly against the motion. NC also notes her objection to the motion.

## 9 . Ratification of Student Trustees

JJ asks for speeches in favor of or against the ratification of Student Trustees that were elected in the summer. NP speaks against the ratification of the Trustees. Outlining that the quoracy adjusted and was wrong. Mandates don't make sense of their role. SD makes notes that these comments have already been raised before and that it is unfair to bring these up to the elected student trustees now. It was a decision from last year's education officer.

CE declares points of interest and will not partake in voting.

Trustees have been ratified by a simple majority.

## 10 Policy Review

JJ asks council to vote to ratify Power of Council ratifications from last year's Officers.

Policy Review has been ratified by a simple majority.

11 AOB

12 Date of next meeting: 30<sup>th</sup> November 2021.