

# Agenda

## General Meeting

### 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2023

There will be a meeting of the **Students' Union General Meeting** on **Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> of February 2023** from 5pm via **Microsoft Teams**.

In order to ensure the meeting is kept to time please ensure all attached papers are read in advance.

#### IN ATTENDANCE

- |     |                              |     |  |
|-----|------------------------------|-----|--|
| 1.1 | Members Present              |     |  |
|     | Tash Miller                  | TM  | Union President                          |
|     | Murray Bushell               | MB  | Sports President                         |
|     | Jess Reid                    | JR  | Vice President Communities               |
|     | Dante Lopez                  | DL  | Housing Officer                          |
|     | Lucy Wilson                  | LW  | Engagement Officer                       |
|     | Ciaran Sweeney               | CS  | Media Officer                            |
|     | Zoe Crosher                  | ZC  | Health & Wellbeing Officer               |
|     | Petra Jarosova               | PJ  | Equalities Officer (Women)               |
|     | Siobhan Campbell             | SC  | Sports Communication Officer             |
|     | Adhiraj Singh                | AS  | International Officer                    |
| 1.2 | In Attendance                |     |  |
|     | Megsavanh Warren             | MW  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Fiona Kerr                   | FK  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Raeven Izard                 | RI  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Barbora Svobodova            | BS  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Liam Wray                    | LW  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Mairi Calderwood             | MC  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Gellert Turkevi-Nagy         | GTN | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Pranav Ram Hariharan         | PRH | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Niamh Hickey                 | NH  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Ali Muqtadir                 | AM  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Mathieu Monclar              | MM  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Thelma Adaeze Munonye        | TAM | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | Gaja Zivec                   | GZ  | Faculty Officer                          |
|     | 106 Ordinary Student Members | OM  |  |
| 1.3 | Observers & Staff Support    |     |  |
|     | Natalie Hay                  | NH  | Democracy and Representation Coordinator |
|     | Nick Manton                  | NM  | Communications and Activities Manager    |
|     | Al Lawley-Powell             | ALP | Chief Executive                          |
|     | Jordyn Austin                | JA  | Activities & Volunteer Coordinator       |
| 1.4 | Apologies                    |     |  |
| 1.5 | Absent without Apologies     |     |  |

#### MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

- 2.1 Minutes ratified by TM. No objections.

#### CHALLENGES TO ORDER PAPER

- 3.1 No challenges to order.

#### DATES TO NOTE

- 4.1 Sports Zone – 7<sup>th</sup> February
- 4.2 Communities Zone – 8<sup>th</sup> February
- 4.3 Equalities Zone – 13<sup>th</sup> February
- 4.4 [RATE – Nominations Open Now!](#)

## ELECTIONS & RESIGNATIONS

- 5.1 [Spring Elections](#)
  - 5.1.1 Stand Period – Nominations Close 14<sup>th</sup> February, 12pm
  - 5.1.2 Candidates Announced – 16<sup>th</sup> February, 5pm
  - 5.1.3 Voting Period – 28<sup>th</sup> February, 10am to 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 5pm
- 5.2 Elections Committee Election (x1)
  - 5.2.1 Nicholas LaRue and Maria Morari stood for election. Nicklas LaRue was ineligible, and Maria Morari was elected.

## REPORTS

- 6.1 Union President
  - TM I will keep it nice and quick for you. I'm doing quite a bit of work at the moment to do with our Personal Tutors. So you've heard me mention it at the last General Meeting, Education Zone and Equality Zones as well, but it is quite a large project and we've done quite a large survey, which many of you all filled out. So very grateful for you taking the time to help me out there. We've also surveyed quite a lot of staff members who also work as Personal Tutors to hear what they think of the program and to hear about the additional workload that it has or that it imposes on them. We also used Education Zone earlier this week as an informal Focus Group where we discussed a couple of different options that other Universities have. We got some really great thematic analysis from that. So that was really great and we're looking forward to the next part of the process. I'm sure in the next few weeks or in the next month or so, I'll have a bigger report to give you to see what we're recommending to the University.

On another note, last week I had the opportunity to speak at the Advanced Higher Education Top Management Program to about 25 Vice Chancellors and 35 to 40 senior management members from across the UK as well as the globe. We chatted about Trade Unions and Students' Unions on our involvement with institutions, how institutions use students and how they integrate students into their decision-making. We had some really productive conversations and I was able to really able to speak to them about the importance of students when it comes to making decisions.

I'm working with some University colleagues on the Learning Spaces Upgrade Project, which if you haven't heard of it, it's a £6 million project that over the next few months will be upgrading about 60 to 70 classrooms across Cottrell and Pathfoot. The first stage of that will be rolled out in the next few weeks and over the summer. So hopefully when you come back for the 2023 autumn, you guys will have some fantastic new classrooms and there's some really good high tech heading into those classrooms, which will make it a lot easier for our lecturers to use but also for our Clubs and Societies to use in their bookings. We really worked hard to make sure that Clubs, Societies and Sports Teams would be able to go in and use those facilities. If it's not a teaching room, it's certainly there for you guys to use socially.

I've also been working with some colleagues and McGill's, the new boss provider. Just to ensure that prices are staying where they're at for now and we're hoping to keep those fares at the current rate, for as long as possible, and if not, then we'll be really pushing to lower them as well. We're also looking at a campaign making it easier for students to get on the bus and reducing the costs as much as possible.

I was with VP Communities yesterday at the Fight for Students NUS rally, and as VP Communities mentioned that she spoke, but she didn't say that she spoke absolutely brilliantly and she was an absolute asset to students yesterday. We had a fantastic afternoon with Sabbs from across the country, with NUS and those of you who are there. So very grateful for you guys for joining us.

## 6.2 Sports President

MB Towards the end of last semester, we had a Mental Health First Aid course run by the Union and thankfully a few of my Welfare Officers were able to attend that. Hoping to run a second one this semester. If there's any spaces left, then hopefully we'll get some more Welfare Officers on there. Obviously, maybe open up to the students as well if we can fill the spaces up.

With Re-Freshers, we put more focus on our, 'Give It A Go' period this year. What we found was Clubs putting more of an emphasis on their social media presence and reaching students instead of students coming to them at Sports Bazaar, so it was good to see. We also ran activities such as wheelchair basketball, dodgeball and pickleball. So thank you for everyone for coming to them. We put a big emphasis on our big BUCS Wednesday and fixtures, you know, about 10 fixtures on that day. I like to think we're undefeated, but I'm not quite sure that was true. But I'm going to claim undefeated.

In terms of catch-ups for the start of the year, I've been catching up with all my Clubs or trying to catch up with them, just promoting elections with presidents to see if anyone got any interest in part-time roles or the sports president role. AGMs, they're coming up for our Clubs in March time. So it's trying to get everyone ready for next semester. Just making sure that handovers take place in our Clubs and this making sure everyone knows what's happening. Club Development and putting in a big push on that, making sure the Clubs are OK seeing how their first semester, if there was any problems and just seeing how we can help in second semester and any big targets they have.

Coming up, we have Sport for All. That will be a chance for all disabled students to get involved in sport. Just try and showcase how inclusive the Sports Union is in that week but hopefully have boccia, wheelchair tennis and basketball and I'm hoping to get blind football but that's still a work in progress. We're also putting an emphasis on education and making sure all our Clubs are welcoming and inclusive as they can be.

Conference Cups coming up as well on the 8th of March so we have about 12 teams in the Quarterfinals, 2 in the semi's. So I think we're hoping for a big turn out from Stirling, a big day out for all the teams in Saint Andrews. That'd be great. Speaking of Saint Andrews, we've also got Varsity coming up on the 22nd of March. So us and Saint Andrews, it will be about 22 Clubs taking part. Plenty of games, likely to be about 500 or 600 students taking part in that. I'll be great to see. It will be a big day out in Stirling and in Saint Andrews and hopefully this year we can take the prize of winning.

Also coming up is club photos on the 5th of April and then if you come to Sports Zone on Tuesday, you'll find that when Sports Ball will be. I can't announce where and when it will be yet. But stay tuned for that.

Also just throughout the semester, I've been catching up the Sports Centre, meetings about our outdoor facilities and how we can upgrade them, but also meetings with Cathy Gallagher, Executive Director, just to see the direction of sport and how we can improve performance and also participation.

## 6.3 VP Communities

JR Just to give a quick overview of what I've been up to, it's been a busy couple of months. With housing, developing a housing guide that's going to be live

hopefully by the end of this month, if not next, which gives students very clear information on what support they can get around private renting, what they can expect really trying to empower students through knowledge. We will be beginning rent negotiations, which is obviously quite a pivotal point in the year and something that we are wanting to ensure we add heat for students. Finally we've got our housing fair 15th and 16th of February, which is an opportunity again for you to find out more about housing and Stirling, find out more about private rent. We have Shelter Scotland coming in to deliver a couple of sessions on your tenant rights. Obviously, we want students to know what their tenant rights are in terms of living in private rent where you can get support, and how you can deal with a less than friendly or helpful landlord.

With our international students, we have International Day of Culture happening on the 7th of February. It's lots of fun. We have a language cafe, a cultural market and we have a ton of Societies getting involved in that which is fantastic to see.

I'm also doing a lot of work right now, arranging pride week with the support of the LGBTQ society, and we've got a lot in the works with that right now, including having Waverley Care, which are our sexual Health Organization, who are going to be doing HIV and syphilis testing during LGBTQ Pride Week. We've also got the Drag Queens coming in, which is excellent. It's going to be great fun doing Drag Bingo. We're also hopefully going to get some Zign making workshops happening during that week as well.

I've also been sitting on the NUS Future of Scotland Steering Group. If some of you remember from my last update, I got elected to that group for NUS, which is excellent. So, it's really looking at how NUS functions, how it supports students and how can we make it better. So it would be great if any students have any opinions on that, to come forward and have a chat about that.

I was also at the rally yesterday to support students and the cost of living crisis and to encourage the government to support students better as we know that the budget that's been proposed is not helpful or supportive to students. That was fantastic because I got to speak at that and really emphasise that Stirling students, amongst other students in Scotland, need a lot of help, a lot of support, better bursaries, rent controls, all these things.

Finally some Clubs and Socs stuff. We had a fantastic Clubs Academy and a great Freshers week. Our first Clubs and Socs Fayre in the Atrium since 2019, which is a big success. A couple of Societies that have had successes this year include Drama with their British Regency Ball, which is exciting; Photo and Videography with their exhibition; Vegan Society and Debating Society doing a debate on the vegan motion. Those are just a few, there are tons of other Societies succeeding, but just want you to really highlight them because I'm quite proud of those things for those Societies. Thank you.

## UPDATES, DISCUSSION AND DECISION TOPICS

- 7.1 Amendment to Buffer Zone Motion for NUS Conference
- JR We received a lot of support at the last General Meeting for the Buffer Zone Motion. The reason I'm putting this forward is that the Buffer Zone Motion, rather than going to NUS Scotland Conference, should go to NUS Liberation Conference. Simply to make things more appropriate for where the motion goes and whom it affects. It affects no details of the motion, simply which Conference it goes to.
- OM What makes the Liberation Conference more suitable than the Scotland Conference?
- JR NUS Liberation is for all the equalities-based groups to come together to discuss issues that are prevalent within NUS and the student movement. So obviously, buffer zones is regarding the abortion services bill and supporting the abortion

services bill. In that case, abortion services is very much a liberation-spaced issue.

It's also something that's affecting all the devolved nations right now, and I think it would be really a great opportunity to talk about an issue that affects all the devolved nations equally, at a higher level.

JR It's going to a more appropriate conference, but also by having this motion go through it and amend it to go to a different conference, it allows us to take forward another motion to NUS Scotland which directly impacts Scotland and is quite time sensitive and critical which is obviously the next motion we'll be discussing.

*No speeches against the motion.*

*No summation was provided.*

## 7.2 Support for Student Sex Workers Motion

JR There is a massive gap in NUS Policy around support for student sex workers. So what this would do is, it would show our Union support for student sex workers and believes sex work is work and that we would actively campaign in support of sex workers housing rights because if people aren't aware right now the eviction ban does not apply to student sex workers. If there is anyone who is doing sex work in their flat, they can be evicted because it's counted as a crime and due to the legal definition of brothel, anyone living in their flat could also be evicted.

OM Student sex workers who do sex work in their accommodation can be evicted? What is the exact classifications of what is considered for eviction?

JR Yes, due to the legal definition of brothels and the fact that sex work is not fully decriminalized, yes students can be evicted if they're found out for doing sex work, which is why I think it's so pivotal that we campaign in support of sex workers, student sex workers. But all sex workers.

OM If a student has Only Fans, can they get evicted?

JR Yeah, unfortunately, that is the case. If they're found out by the police or by any Body they could technically be evicted, so yeah, it's quite shocking and I think there's not enough being done to support students in that.

OM Has there been a case of sex workers' flatmates being affected as mentioned?

JR Thankfully, I currently know of no case where students' flatmates have been affected by as mentioned in the motion. The reason I mentioned it in the motion is because I know in Northern Ireland where the law is similar in some cases to Scotland, sex workers partner were affected and that they were arrested for the accusation of being a pimp because if you're seen as assisting a sex worker due to the law. That's what happened. But no, as far as I'm aware of, no student has been affected, but could be.

OM From a Nursing Background, Only Fans is already deemed as like we can't. It's not allowed on our course. So any aspect of sex work, they can get evicted?

JR Yes, because sex work is not fully decriminalised in Scotland. With Only Fans, it's a lot more difficult to be found out than if you were doing street sex work, but if you're found it, then yes.

OM I would like to speak in favour of this motion. I think something that is often missed is that the people who engage in sex work are usually the most vulnerable people in society. I think the fact that they are subject to eviction in this way, it puts takes them from a precarious position to like a really dangerous position. So doing what we can to support sex workers, student sex workers so that they can be safe and secure, is really vital.

*No speeches against the motion.*

JR I think everyone has the details on this motion and why it's so pivotal that we need to support student sex workers. Thank you to those of you who asked questions and thank you for your vouching of support. I totally agree with you, people who tend to be sex workers tend to be more likely to be in need of support. So yeah, I hope you all vote in favour of this motion.



- 7.3 Clubs and Societies Coronavirus Recovery Motion
- OM I'm hoping to support smaller Clubs and Societies of this Union. We really are the backbone, to be honest. Both reducing the membership requirements in order to allow small Clubs to access the funds to allow them to grow year upon year and removing the requirements for Union branding on club publicity is also just reflecting the current practice. I must admit, the stuff in the original motion around non-student members is now made redundant by the amendment by the Sabbatical team, which brings my motion even further by bringing the requirements down to three. All in all, should bring a recovery around for Clubs and society. That's allowing them to grow year upon year by preventing us from making Clubs defunct and stopping access of funds unnecessarily where there is still a prospect for growth.
- OM Is the motion essentially about reducing the £5 minimum requirement for joining a society? Is that what it fundamentally boils down to?
- OM That is reflecting the current practice of CZEC in which we haven't set a minimum requirement this year, it's more reflecting that it is the position of the Students' Union that we haven't been setting requirements to allow Clubs and Societies to insight growth by reducing their price which some students may not be put off joining Clubs and Societies by.

7.3.1 Amendment 1

JR I'd firstly like to emphasise that I wholeheartedly support this motion because it is making it easier and more accessible for Societies to both get started and continue. What the amendment does is basically, consolidates the view that Societies just need a committee to continue. No society should be disaffiliated because they don't have enough members. The reality is for us, if you have a committee, if you're passionate about being a society, you deserve to be part of our Union. It's the same view regarding the membership fees as well. So this motion would allow you to both choose to have a membership fee if you wanted to or choose to get rid of your membership fee. It gives Societies full control to do whatever they want, whether they want put it up if necessary, or put it down. It's allowing Societies to be fully part of our Union more easily and more accessibly. And obviously, the amendment also does take away amendment to non-members, because you would only need a full core committee. So President, Secretary and Treasurer to be a society.

*No speeches against the motion.*

*No summation was provided.*

**AMENDMENT MOTION PASSED (96.4% IN FAVOUR)**

- OM So my concern regarding this is the overloading of the Union that's going to be caused by the lack of opportunity costs, because even though the £5 isn't that much, people really have to consider whether or not they want to partake in that society. So the £5 is really about the fact that people have to consider whether or not they want to partake in in a society rather than the actual cost. Furthermore, not to mention the funds it will provide the Union. Without taking away the £5 as well as removing any need to actually consider this seems t create Societies that won't actually provide any value, because if not, people would already be joining them.
- OM The reduction in the membership fee is a reflection of current practice. The union hasn't set a membership fee this year and we also we similarly haven't particularly enforced the membership requirements as strictly as the Union schedules actually do. This is more a move to reflect current practice and to put it on paper as it is really done. CZEC, as when looking over the Community Zone, still does cost benefit analysis when looking at new Societies coming into the Union and Societies wouldn't necessarily be approved just because of their existence.

- JR Just some clarifications. It doesn't get rid of the £5 membership. It gives Societies choice, so most Societies will likely keep it. It also doesn't take away the process Societies have to go through to become a society. They still have to get approved. So there is still the membership fee. If a society chooses to keep it, it's more just puts it in your hands. But just a clarification.
- OM I might as well summarize the motion as amended. So in moving the membership requirements down to simply the committee, it will ensure that continues to Societies that have took a hit over the Coronavirus Period. Also by amending it so that the moves are permanent, I do support the Sabbaticals in this move. I'd also like to just quickly clarify that getting rid of the £5 membership, they will still be a Students' Union club to Societies membership for all students. They have to pay £5 to the Union for the club admin and Societies, they do have to join regardless of the membership fee.  
And simply the only other amendment left after the amendment that's been passed in the motion is that the movement on publicity, as once again a reflection of current practice.

**MOTION PASSED (88% IN FAVOUR)**

- 7.4 Llama's (and other live animal displays) Removal Motion
- OM First of all, I would like to humbly admit the mistake I've made in this motion, as the Brig did point out a few days ago, that indeed we have had Alpacas. None of the people at the last meeting, especially those involved, mention it at the prior Union Meeting. But regardless, I bring this motion back before the Students' Union to be re-balloted simply because I believe it is after the last meeting that the Union may have the ability to be considered it. Now, with the Sports Union being excluded.  
I know it's a lot of concern around the Equestrian and other teams and the Sports Union that necessarily use animals for their Sport. I make the same arguments as at the last time when I bring this motion, the Students' Union to bring these animals into a large group at Sustainability Fayre when it is necessarily unsustainable to bring these animals in and also to have them outside the habitats that they are naturally in to be transported to transport to you. I stand by that with the concession that the Sports Union be excluded for a point of practicality. Thank you.
- OM Would this also concern, for example, the Union's work with Paws against Stress? So in this case, dogs or potential future other collaborations with service animals.
- OM This motion specifies entertainment. There will always be arguments as to what classifies an entertainment. The Union will have to decide on that. If there is a basis to believe that those animals provide more than entertainment and they do provide a legitimate use and especially service dogs, they specifically are not at all within the scope of this motion. But if the dogs do provide the legitimate use that is provable, then yes, this motion doesn't include them necessarily. It will be for the Union and its implementation to decide where the line of entertainment is drawn. However, I've not specifically defined it in this instance.
- OM My question is in regards to the motion. Is the motion directed at curtailing the Llamas that come to campus at the beginning of the school year entirely or are there other instances of examples that the proposal would like to highlight?
- OM The motion is a sort of a general ban. The alpacas are brought in at the start of the year are an easy point to example where animals having brought in used by the Union in a commercial way in front of hundreds of students. This that is a particularly strong example that resonates with this Union but this motion would concern other animals used for entertainment by the Union.
- OM Is the proposals objection to the animals that are on campus in regards to their safety or their treatment?
- OM I would say from a personal point, a philosophical view on it, but it is from the practicalities of the animals welfare and of their safety and necessarily just of the experience of being around hundreds of students in a commercial setting where they're expected to perform. That isn't necessarily detrimental to the welfare of

- the animal, at least acutely. And by supporting it, this Union is necessarily agreeing with it.
- OM We stress the importance of consent for humans because humans can tell us when they consent. We do not afford animals the same. Animals are transported to the uni, touched by dozens of people who show up to these events all without their consent. They cannot tell us if they want to come. They cannot tell us if they want to be touched or not. They can show us by pulling away but some people ignore that and go after them anyways. I don't think that it is that it is right to hold these events. Without the consent of animals, I personally would not want dozens of people touching me, and I can imagine many animals would prefer not to as well. We should cancel these live animal events since they cannot give their consent to it.
- OM I understand the motion and I love a lot of animals. I have only one question. These animals are already captive animals. If anyone don't do something with them. Sounds horrible I know, but how the shelters and the people who take care of them? They found money to take care of these animals because yes, it's nice, but there's no student in accounting and finance. I need to look at the worst part. How they going to survive? How they going to fund themselves? I mean when they found the money to feed this animal, to take care of, to bring vets etc. They are less worse than to be in circus or whatever.
- OM It's a sort of way of thinking. We are by using these commercial companies that are not shelters. They are companies that are using these animals for the sake of profit. I think by doing that, we are necessarily agreeing with the morals of holding them captive in these circumstances. But over all that is the moral argument we are agreeing necessarily with the models of the companies that are exploiting these animals commercially by using them. And I think it would be better for the Union to not participate in such a moral practices and to accept this motion.

### **MOTION FELL (43.8% IN FAVOUR)**

#### 7.5 Amendments to Standing Orders Motion

- TM Please note that currently ownership of no confidence votes in Sabbatical Officers are the property of our Constitution. That's not to say that we are unable to discuss and pass this motion today, but as it would require changes to the Constitution, it would need to be ratified by Referendum and also agreed by University Court. So if you could keep that in mind.
- OM I believe this motion doesn't necessarily amend with standing orders with regards to no confidence. This is a necessarily technical motion. I will take a few minutes to describe what actually does in a few of these amendments; simply 6.6 is an adoption of a standard rules of order version of what we already have here and practice which is unanimous consent. This is what is already used by the Union regularly and simply adopting standing orders, we can lessen the procedural questions around some of the procedural motions we use. To amend the schedule relating to minutes simply because no longer the use of paper votes and no longer the declaration of voting within the general meeting and giving the results at the time, the amendment to give intermediate voting information is simply to try and increase the transparency of voting made in the Union. The amendments to the points of order are simply adding some points which, just from standard rules, of order, to allow the Union to proceed a bit more effectively and some of the debates which might get long and unwieldy, such as allowing the settings side of motions which may or to be inconsistent with the Union or time limits and remains of the agenda and the privacy part. The amendment to the standing order with relation to the suspension of standing orders to reduce removes the two-third requirement that simple majority because it's a decision that only affects the one meeting and I don't see the need for a super majority when it doesn't affect further proceedings of the Union. The amendment to the vote of no confidence part. That is simply a clarification of how I believe I interpreted to currently stand. That's simply why I contest it, it's not necessarily changing it. The general meeting already has some ownership of a vote of no confidence. The schedules are necessarily broken, and this is an



attempt to reform it in some way to make it easier to read, not necessarily something that will be used. It's just there in order to make it easier to read. And also it increases the majority required for a Union Officer to be banned from standing in an election after being low confidence to just super majority rather than simple majority because I feel like the decision is too large to make, considering a supermajority is already required for the vote of no confidence.

- JR So just to clarify for absolute, no doubt, this motion changes it from a referenda to get rid of a sabbatical officer to a general meeting?  
Correct? So there would be no referenda. Students outside of a meeting like this couldn't vote on getting ready for sabbatical officer.
- OM I am aware of the concern that necessarily comes from the Sabbatical Officer team over this. This is a reflection as a rewording of the current standing orders. This is not a new or novel innovation. This might be a broken part of the Constitution. I'm not trying to change it. I'm trying to make it easier to read. I'm reflecting how I interpret it already and if we look at the current version of Schedule 5, you will see the same section there worded worse. I don't necessarily agree that it should be there. That would have to be in a wider sort of reform of the way this Union works. I'm not trying to decrease the requirements for a vote of no confidence. I'm simply trying to reword the way that Schedule 5 is currently worded.
- OM Correct me if I'm wrong, but if this is passed, does that mean if no one speaks up against a motion, it unanimously passes without votes? Because I the person writing the comment and I'm sure others also, do not feel comfortable in speaking up, but still want the opportunity to vote for or against motions without having to debate my reasoning.
- OM No, the changes to unanimous consent only exists on votes of procedure, so that would be on challenges to the order of the chair on points of order and other such procedural votes. It doesn't apply to substantive policy motions.
- MB My understanding of it might be wrong, but my understanding is that if a majority of people vote for a no confidence and I could be removed from my possession in this current meeting, we have 108 people. In the Sports Union I have or we have 2156 members. I don't know how many people this call are part of the sports union, but is it right that 55 people could vote to have no confidence in me but the 2001 for the people have chosen to represent them haven't had to say?
- OM OK, I do understand that the sticking point here once again I'm reflecting how the current schedule is written. I don't necessarily have the rewarding folks don't see as necessary. I understand that it is how it currently stands, but if we want to leave it how it is, which is slightly unclear, that is absolutely fair. I don't necessarily want to remove to lower the requirements for it. That's how I see it's currently standing. I mean, I don't have a current copy schedule in front of me. I can get it up, but the current one that allows the exact same to occur, but it simply states it in a slightly different way. I am actually making it slightly difficult to ban further elections standing here and rewarding how it's currently put. But the threat actually currently stands and if we want to repeal that part schedule five, we should. That's how people see it. But this threat currently exists that we're discussing.
- OM At the end of the day about greater students union democracy, if we as the student union, are unhappy with how our officers are doing their jobs, that we should easily have the power to both make confidence and other student unions do have this power as it's my understanding of that. If the officers are worried about vote of no confidence, you should push the greater student union attendance.
- JR I'd like to speak against this motion, both as a Sabbatical Officer and as a socialist, because in the end, what this motion is doing is taking away democracy from our students rather than encouraging participatory democracy. It's not just a case that students simply vote in this meeting and we should get rid of sabbatical officers. Students should have an opportunity at every point. And what our current regulations allow is for students to actually engage with the process of democracy, engage in referenda and what this does is reduce that to 100 people. Where I as a Communities Zone sabbatical officer would have my 1300

Members not been able to vote. And yeah, of course, we encourage students from our Zones to attend. But in the end, there might be exceptional circumstances that prevent students from attending this meeting.

What our current regulations ensure is that everyone gets a chance to vote over a period of time rather than one hour in their day where they could be in a lecture, could be working or just simply have an emergency. I will always vote for more democracy and I hope everyone in this meeting does the same.

OM So, since the point of vote of no confidence has become the sticking point I posted the current Schedule 5 in the chat. If we have a look at that, we can see that there is as a very clear ability to do exactly the great threat we're describing right now.

Within the schedules already, I am clarifying what is not necessarily right and clearly here, but you can see that already there is the ability to vote of no confidence a sabbatical officer or any officer of the students union via a non referendum means. I'm not saying that's right, I'm rewarding a section to clarify what it means. You can see right there what it already is. If we want to vote on getting rid of that, that may be something for another meeting. But this is all just rewarding the way the already messed up standing orders are.

### **MOTION FELL (35.7% IN FAVOUR)**

#### **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 9.1 General Meeting 13<sup>th</sup> April, 5pm via MS Teams.
- 9.2 Motions for the next General Meeting can be submitted to until 5pm, 5<sup>th</sup> April.

#### **RESERVED BUSINESS**

- 10.1 No Reserved Business.