



Student Council Meeting Minutes (2024/2025 Term 1)

Date: 19th November 2024

Attendance:

President: **Enaya Nihal (EN)**

VP Democracy and Development: **Sasha King-Smith (SKS)**

VP Sports: **Louis Gosling (LG)**

VP Postgraduate: **Alijah Taha (AT)**

VP Education: **Muneeba Amjad (MA)**

VP Societies: **Joe Stanley (JS)**

Co-Trans Students Officer: **Isra Rai (IR)**

Co-Trans Students Officer: **Dorian Valentine (DV)**

Ethnic Minorities Officer: **Songjia Cao (SC)**

LGBTQUA+ Officer: **Ariane Dayes (AD)**

Environment and Ethics Officer: **Raj Hacker (RH)**

Joint Disabled Students Officers: **Mads Wainman (MW) and Nye Steele (NS)**

Women's Officer: **Gursimar Kaur (GK)**

Academic Forum Rep: **James Kimmins (JK)**

Academic Forum Rep: **Erin Lewis (EL)**

Academic Forum Rep: **Otto Oldridge (OO)**

Sustainability Forum Rep: **Sophie Scholand (SOS)**

Sustainability Forum Rep: **Jemma Marlow (JMARL)**

Sustainability Forum Rep: **Matthew Scholand (MS)**

Steering Group Rep: **Gabriel Hyams (GH)**

Steering Group Rep: **James Varney (JV)**

Steering Group Rep: **Ollie Chapman (OC)**



Operations Forum Rep: **James Martin (JMART)**

Operations Forum Rep: **Matthew Price (MP)**

Operations Forum Rep: **Emily Payne (EP)**

Societies Forum Rep: **Katie Todd (KT)**

Societies Forum Rep: **Edward Swann (ES)**

Societies Forum Rep: **Sean Scholand (SES)**

Welfare Forum Rep: **Ollie Seal (OS)**

Guest: **Oscar Renton (OR)**

SU Staff Present:

Director of Membership: **Louise Marjoram (LM)**

Student Voice Manager: **Yaz Yeahia (YY)**

Student Voice Advisor: **Celine Al-Saleh (CAS)**

Student Voice Advisor: **Rozena Nadeem (RN)**

Student Voice Advisor: **Faheel Siddiqui (FS)**

Student Voice Advisor: **James Morrison (JMO)**

1. **Welcome & Apologies**

Council Members arrived in the room / joined the meeting online.

2. **Demonstration of New Voting System**

JMO led a demonstration of the new voting system to be used for this meeting of Student Council, with a successful test vote.

3. **Election of Chair of Council**

SKS invited applications for the Chair of Student Council, with only OC putting themselves forwards. OC made a short speech to convince Council members to vote in favour of their election as chair. This vote then commenced, with the following results.

Ollie Chapman: 27 votes
RON: 0 votes

OC is elected Chair of Student Council.

4. **Minutes From Last Meeting**



OC and JMART ask for clarification on what EUTOPIA is. YY provides this clarity, stating that it is a university body for relations with EU institutions that the SU had been asked to provide representation to.

OC accepts this clarification, and moves for Council to vote on this item.

For: 23 votes
Against: 1 vote
Abstain: 3 votes

The minutes of the previous meeting are APPROVED.

5. Ratification of Power of Council

OC introduces the concept of Power of Council, and the circumstances around its use for the previous Student Council, then asks if anyone would like to speak on the matter before moving to a vote.

JV asks for clarification on which set of Bye-laws was approved via Power of Council.

EN refers to the process of student input throughout the bye-law development process in the previous academic year. These changes were combined with changes from the Full-Time Officer team, and were intended to be voted on at the previous meeting of Student Council. However, this meeting was not quorate.

OC then moves to a vote, with the following results:

For: 11
Against: 12
Abstain: 2

Power of Council is NOT RATIFIED.

JV asks for clarification on next steps, as they are unsure whether Council now has any grounding without approved bye-laws.

LM leaves the meeting.

OC indicates that this will be discussed after the meeting with the Student Voice Team.

6. Announcements and Co-Options

OC introduces the item, stating that there are a number of Council positions, Forum positions, and one Part-Time Officer positions that requires co-option.

JV asks for clarification on exactly what these positions are.



OC then clarifies that this vote is simply as to whether Council approves co-opting individuals into these roles via email circulation, there has not yet been an application process.

JV argues that although uncertain on the powers of council due to the lack of ratification on the Power of Council item, co-options were removed from Bye-law 7 and therefore Council should not be co-opting.

OC asks for clarification on which set of bye-laws are currently being used.

YY outlines that as the Board of Trustees has already approved the bye-laws, these are the ones in operation. Also that bye-law 7 will need to be resubmitted.

LG discusses that several Forums have been moved outside of the Student Voice Team for this year, and as a result of this there have been delays in getting them arranged and meetings scheduled (particularly Sports Forum). They then outline that this has contributed to the lack of individuals interested in running for forum positions. They encourage Council to support co-options for this reason.

JV asks for clarification from the Student Voice Team on which specific roles are required for co-options.

YY clarifies that this is both for co-opting new forum members, and also co-opting new council representatives from the existing forum members.

DV asks for clarification on what the point in Council voting to approve the power of council decision was, if it was already approved by Board. They go on to argue that this would imply that Council simply exists to approve Board decisions.

OC requests a response to this comment from EN.

EN responds that the decisions made by Power of Council were intended to go to Council before Board, however there was no quorate council available. They also outline their opinion that the SU should have sought legal advice far sooner, in aid of greater transparency. They then remind Council that the organisation does need active governing documents, so it was a priority to Board to approve this in Council's absence.

JMART asks for clarification on whether the Bye-laws approved by Board are acting bye-laws or fully confirmed.

EN responds that they are fully confirmed, due to company law.

JMART then asks what the point of voting to approve them was if they are already in place.

EN clarifies that the motion was on Council approving the process of Power of Council, not specifically on the Bye-laws.

RH asks that if this is the case, why are Bye-laws being discussed at Council?



EN responds that bye-laws are not being discussed at Council, just the ratification of Power of Council.

YY reminds Council that several other items were covered by Power of Council, not just the new bye-laws.

MW raises that the reason that previous meetings of Council were not quorate was a protest by Council members against the Students' Union, They also outlined their demoralisation that this action was to protest a lack of consultation with Council, and has been responded to by an increase in lack of consultation with Council.

EN raises that they are aware of this demoralisation, and that it has partly led to the creation of the Fix the SU campaign. They raise that the SU has reached out to this group to meet and discuss concerns. They outline that they are aware of many of the issues with the SU, and would like to work with students constructively to fix things. However, they raised that after the failure of Council to meet, Board had no alternative but to approve the bye-laws.

OC brings the item to a close after a comment from JV.

JV outlines that a significant amount of work from themselves and other students had gone into a motion to Student Council that may have prevented this outcome, but it was blocked by Impact Assessment with no amendments provided, in contravention of the Impact Assessment document on the SU website.

JV asks to initiate Procedural Motion 6 (Vote in specified parts). One vote will be on the co-option of council reps, and the other will be for new forum members and the PTO role. The results of the vote to approve Procedural Motion 6 are as follows:

For: 23 votes
Against: 1 vote
Abstain: 5 votes

Procedural Motion 6 is APPROVED.

On the first vote, for Councillors to be co-opted by the individual forums the vote was as follows:

For: 22 votes
Against: 5 votes
Abstain: 0 votes

This motion is APPROVED.

JK asks for clarification on who will be co-opting the PTO role.

JMo responds that this will be members of Student Council.

GH asks who can apply to be co-opted into the International Students' Officer (EU) role.



JMo responds that any student who is registered as paying EU fees, and is a member of the Students' Union can apply.

Council then votes on the second part of the above motion (For vacant roles (International Students' Officer PTO and unfilled Forum roles) to be co-opted by Student Council), with the following results:

For: 9 votes

Against: 13 votes

Abstain: 1 vote

This motion is **REJECTED**.

OC proposes a chair's ruling, that Council will work to fill the self defined roles (PG Forum and Faculty Reps) and leave the empty forum positions unfilled. This will still include co-opting councillors from the existing forum members.

JK asks how many unfilled positions this will be across the forums.

JMo responds that it is approximately 14, mostly reserved roles.

LG emphasizes to Council that Postgraduate representation is extremely important, particularly to Sports Forum.

The Chair's ruling is unchallenged, and is therefore accepted by Student Council.

7. Ratification of Student Trustees

OC introduces the agenda item, and reminds council that further information can be found in the papers.

JK asks for clarification on the process, given the limited information provided.

OC clarifies that Council is not approving the Student Trustees themselves, but ratifying them following an application process held over previous months.

EN supports this clarification and provides further detail on the application and interview process.

JK responds that he was aware of this information, as he was one of the applicants.

JV raises that according to the Articles of Association, all Student Trustees must be approved by Student Council before they can sit. They then request a clarification from the chair of the board whether these Student Trustees have been sitting on Board meetings without this approval.



EN outlines that they have been sitting as trustees as their ratification had been approved via Power of Council.

JV, EN, and OC ask for clarification on why this was a separate agenda item to Power of Council, if the ratification of Student Trustees was part of Power of Council.

YY clarifies that this was originally included this way in the papers as the Student Voice Team had not had clarification from the Board of the exact contents of Power of Council, but once this was received it should have been removed as an agenda item. This power will still sit with the Board.

JK asks once again if there was a point in voting on this if Board's decision is the one that will stand.

JV argues that this approach is incompatible with the SU's Articles of Association, as there is uncertainty over whether these Student Trustees should have been able to sit on Board.

EN agrees with this point and offers to write up an explanation outside of the meeting.

JV makes the point that he finds it surprising that the Board has blocked motions based on a perceived legal, financial or reputational risk to the organisation, whilst it has simultaneously been operating with unapproved Trustees.

YY states that the concerns of Council members are valid, and that the SU will provide an update on this situation via email circulation.

RH echoes JK's earlier point that they do not see what the point in Council voting on this would be.

YY clarifies that Student Trustees do need to be approved by Student Council.

EN agrees with the approach to take this outside of the Council Meeting itself, and commits to providing a further update on this process and the status of the Student Trustees for Council.

JV expresses confusion over the voting on this agenda item.

EN clarifies that as this forms part of the ratification of Power of Council, Council has already voted to not ratify this item.

JV argues that himself and other Council members feel confused by this, and were unaware that their initial vote included voting to reject the approval of the Student Trustees.

OC asks YY for clarification.

YY outlines that EN's interpretation of situation is correct. Council has already voted to reject Power of Council, and so any further vote on whether to approve the Student Trustees separately would not have any weight.



OO raises the point that they feel a lot of these issues are caused by the quoracy requirement of Student Council, and recommends reducing the quoracy requirement by a small amount.

EN points out that it is expected that elected representatives will fulfil their duties by attending Student Council meetings, or communicate in advance if this is not possible. The reasoning for the 50% + 1 member quoracy requirement is to ensure a large number of voices in Student Council meetings.

MW argues that further discussion on this matter is unnecessary, as Council has voted to reject the ratification of Power of Council based on opposition to the principle of these decisions being taken outside of Council, not necessarily the content of the decisions themselves.

JK again pushes for clarity on whether any decisions taken by the Board whilst it has included the Student Trustees are valid.

YY states that SU staff will seek legal advice on this after the meeting.

OC rules that Council will proceed to the next agenda item.

8. Warwick SU to improve Postgraduate Representation in its democratic structures

OC introduces the motion, then gives way to OR as the motion proposer.

OR discusses the rationale for putting forwards their motion, emphasising the lack of postgraduate representation within the SU's democratic structures. They encourage Council to vote in favour of their motion.

JV asks for clarification on how this motion has reached Council, as the proposer was informed that it was blocked by Impact Assessment. The document stating that the motion was blocked is still publicly accessible on the SU website. They also asked why the PG motion had had this opportunity to progress, but none of the other motions that had been blocked had.

EN states that whilst they did not sit on Impact Assessment, they are aware that Impact Assessment spoke to the proposer and informed them that the goals of the PG motion could be fulfilled without it being a motion to Student Council, and it was for this reason it would go straight to Student Council as a motion.

OR raises their confusion, as their motion intended specifically to change areas of the SU's bye-laws and they believed this was the primary purpose of sending motions to be voted on at Student Council.

MW expresses their support of the motion.



AT further expresses their support of OR's motion, citing the powers given to their role as VP Postgraduate and the current lack of representation of postgraduate students. They also expressed the importance of representing a wide range of views of PG students.

JV asks for further clarification on the process behind this motion reaching Student Council, as the proposer had written it with the purpose of making change at this body. JV then quotes the Impact Assessment document's wording that the motion had been blocked from progressing further, and asks for clarification as to which point Impact Assessment changed their mind, why this was done, and why it was in contravention with both the IA document on the website and the initial judgement still live on the website as of Council.

EN states that they were not involved in any of the conversations mentioned.

OR states that he was informed by the Director of Membership that the motion would proceed, after they received the initial judgment that it would not.

OC asks for further clarification from those involved, but only SKS is present from the IA members and is unaware of any further context.

OC asks EN if there is a point of contact for JV or other concerned members to speak to with their concerns.

EN replies that they should contact the Director of Membership.

GH once again quotes from the Impact Assessment Outcomes document, which states that the motion was unable to progress due to conflict with the SU's democratic principles and the Education Act 1994. They also highlight the document stating that the motion would set a precedent of limiting elections to other groups of students. They then ask that if this position of Impact Assessment is still true, would Council still be permitted to vote on the motion?

EN states that the motion is not superseding or undermining anything, and that this is why it was being voted on by Council.

AT raises that he believes that the area of the motion that may have conflicted with the SU's democratic principles and the Education Act was amended in consultation with the proposers.

OR states that the motion has not been amended, has not been asked to amend it, and would disagree with the amendment if they were asked. The version presented to Council is unamended. They then argue that this is a further reason why impact assessment should not block motions without suggesting amendments, and highlights that this is what the Impact Assessment document says that it should do anyway. They are unsure as to why this has not taken place.

OC asks for further input from any present members of Impact Assessment.



LG, who states that they are not a member of Impact Assessment, states their belief that the motion was blocked so as not to create a precedent of limiting voting for certain roles to specific categories of students.

OR raises that the SU already has roles that are reserved for specific groups of students, and has done for many years.

OC asks Council members to specifically speak on their support or opposition to the motion itself.

AT reiterates their support for the motion.

No council member speaks against the motion, and the vote proceeds as follows:

For: 23 votes

Against: 2 votes

Abstain: 0 votes

The motion is **APPROVED**.

9. Demonstration of New Motion System

JMO and YY introduce and demonstrate the SU's new motion system, policy toolkit and ideas platform in their current forms to the members of Student Council.

MW, JV, and LG speak in support of the changes made.

10. Timeline of Regulations / Supporting Documents

JMART asks for clarification between the new structures and the judgements made by Impact Assessment on whether students can affect operational decisions made in the SU.

EN clarifies that an update will be provided to the next Council on which ideas are best suited for different avenues of work within the SU.

11. AOB

JMART asks several questions to EN about their Scrutiny Panel report and shares his findings with the rest of Student Council.



LG updates Council on his activities around data gathering on culture within sports at Warwick

12. Notification of Next Meeting (04.02.2025)