



1 Welcome and Apologies

Welcome given by CE.

Apologies:

- Braedie Atkins
- Josh Lucas Mitte
- Emma Birch
- Anna Taylor

Present:

- (CE) Charlotte Earl (Chair of Council)
- (OR) Oscar Renton (Deputy Chair of Council)
- (CL) Caius Liu
- (CS) Charlton Sayer (Welfare Officer)
- (CHL) Chih-Hsiang Lo (Societies Officer)
- (DB) David Bush (Chair of Education Committee)
- (HJ) Harry Jee (Chair of Democracy Committee)
- (HH) Hugh Herring (Chair of Welfare Committee)
- (JJ) Jacob Jefferson (Democracy & Development Officer)
- (JH) James Hart (Chair of Postgraduate Committee)
- (JB) Johnathan Bateman (Chair of Development Committee)
- (MA) Martin Almeida
- (NP) Nathan Parsons (Postgraduate Officer)
- (NS) Nathan Stone (Democracy Committee Member)
- (RV) Rohil Vaidya
- (RP) Rahul Porwal (International Students' Officer, Non-EU)
- (SM) Steph Monti (Chair of Societies Committee)
- (TG) Tom Garth (Chair of Environment Committee)
- (WB) Will Brewer (Sports Officer)

Staff:

- (YY) Yaz Yeahia (Student Voice Manager)
- (JM) James Morrison (Student Voice Coordinator)
- (LM) Louise Marjoram (Projects and Campaigns Manager)
- (MGW) Martyn Groves-Williams (Interim CEO)
- (JDB) Jack Bird (Governance and Influence Assistant)

CONTENT WARNINGS

None

Motion	Status For/Against/Abstentions
Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting	Passed Unanimously Approved 16/0/1
7.1 - Inactive Societies	Passed Unanimously Approved 16/0/1
7.3.1.1 - Amendment A	Passed Majority Approved 10/6/2
7.3.1 - Restricting the Frequency of Bylaw Change	Failed Unanimously Rejected 0/15/3
7.3.2 - Removing Quoracy from Democracy Bylaws	Passed Majority Approved 15/1/2
7.3.3.1 - Amendment A	Passed Majority Approved 11/5/2
7.3.3.2 - Amendment B	Passed Majority Approved 9/4/5
7.3.3.3 - Amendment C	Passed Unanimously Approved 16/0/1
7.3.3 - Review of Full Time Officer Roles	Passed Majority Approved 9/1/7
7.3.4 - Associations	Passed Unanimously Approved 17/0/0
7.3.5 - Zones Feasibility	Failed Majority Rejected 5/10/1
Policy	Status For/Against/Abstentions
088 – On Campus Pharmacy Cruelty Free Cosmetics	Renew with Amendments Unanimously Approved 16/0/0
089 – The Use of Compostable Cups on Campus	Lapse Unanimously Approved 14/0/2
134 – Our Climate Emergency: Meaningful Action for Climate Leadership	Lapse Unanimously Approved 16/0/0

043 – Enhancing Module Choice	Renew with Amendments Unanimously Approved 16/0/0
094 – Protect Academic Freedom: Defend Statute 24	Lapse Unanimously Approved 16/0/0
102 – Focus on Fees: End the NSS Boycott	Lapse Unanimously Approved 16/0/0
136 – Warwick SU Supports Lecturer’s Intellectual Property Over Their Lectures	Renew with Amendments Unanimously Approved 12/0/4
010 – Supporting Temporarily Withdrawn Students	Lapse Majority Approved 9/6/1
017 – Bus Fares	Renew Majority Approved 14/1/1
090 – Wake Up! Let’s Tackle Sleep Deprivation	Renew Unanimously Approved 16/0/0
137 – Water Fountains at Lakeside, Please	Renew Unanimously Approved 16/0/0
055 – Building a Democratic University	Renew with Amendments Unanimously Approved 16/0/0
133 – Warwick SU Review Candidates Hall Touring	Lapse Unanimously Approved 14/0/2
096 – Warwick SU Against Casualisation	Renew Unanimously Approved 15/0/1

2 Announcements

CE informs meeting about Summer Elections taking place this week, electing all the committee roles and faculty reps – and encourages people to vote.

3 Chair and Deputy Chair Elections

CE informs meeting of two candidates for Chair – HJ and YM.

The meeting receives speeches from HJ, and CE notes that YM is not present, but their manifesto has been posted online.

CE then moves on to the candidates for Deputy Chair, JLM and EP. Noting that JLM is unable to attend the meeting per the above apologies, the meeting receives a speech from EP.

CE asks for any questions to the candidates that had made speeches, and none are received. CE informs meeting that voting should now be open on the SU website, open until tomorrow morning.

CE confirms the end of the Super Council but informs all those present that they are welcome to stay for the rest of the meeting.

3 Minutes from Last Meeting

CE displays the minutes from the previous meeting and asks for comments or amendments.

CE notes that the minutes as they were previously circulated did not redact the 'Any Other Business' section, but that this has now been addressed. HH's name is spelled incorrectly in the minutes, and CE underlines the name to be amended.

Voting is conducted to approve the minutes, and they are passed unanimously.

4 Actions arising

CE asks the Full-Time Officers for any updates on progression of motions from the previous meeting.

JJ gives the following updates:

- Trans Inclusion Motion – with People Department..
- Fair Parking – JJ says he has spoken with one of the Transport Managers from the University.
- Temporary Suspension – WB notes that it has now been ratified by the Board of Trustees and is now part of the Bylaws.
- Environmental Accountability and Sustainable Energy Education – JJ says these are still ongoing, and he is talking to University's Sustainability Advisor regarding these motions.
- Moving SU Committee Elections to Summer Term – JJ says this has taken place.
- Save the RLT – JJ says conversations are ongoing to hold staff accountable for the training and support students. Notes need to accept changes are going to happen, but ensure welfare of students is considered, and new system is as good as it can be. WB is chasing up on some issues related to this.
- No further comments or questions.

5 Student Council Reports (FTO/PTO & Chairs of Committees)

CE receives no comments regarding the Student Council Reports submitted.

Four of seven Full-Time Officers submitted their Reports for this Student Council.

6 Motions to Student Council/All Student Vote

CE explains that bylaw motions will be voted on during the meeting and will go into effect according to this vote, but that other motions will be voted on during ASV, later next week.

Motion 7.1 – Inactive Societies

Proposer: Chih-Hsiang Lo
Secunder: Jacob Jefferson

CHL gives speech in favour, stating that issues with submitting handover packs mean difficulties in contacting society executives. Additionally, finances are often locked up in inactive societies, and societies in this situation are unable to receive communications and support from the SU. Students may also spend money on memberships for societies that are not running. CHL states that the core problem here is that there is no formal deadline for handover packs – some societies handover late into term 1 after many events, and there needs to be a deadline.

As such, CHL states that the new deadline for handover packs will be the end of Term 3 and Term 1. Exceptions can be made for societies this would negatively impact, such as postgraduate focused societies like WMG Society who have elections in Term 1.

CE thanks CHL and asks for speeches against the motion – no responses.

JJ supports motion, stating that it is needed for admin and that we don't know how many societies are still active, financially we don't know what happens to the funds locked up in these societies, and argues that this should have been established years ago.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 1 ABSTENTION

Motion 7.2 – Warwick Wellbeing Strategy Review

Proposer: James Hart
Secunder: None

CE explains that this next motion will go directly to ASV but gives floor to JH to give a speech in favour.

JH gives a speech outlining his motion and the connected issues.

CE asks for any comments against the motion.

WB makes a comment against an element of the motion.

CE states that the meeting will now move on to motions regarding the Governance Regeneration Project.

Amendment A – 7.3.1.1 - Restricting the Frequency of Bylaw Change

Proposer: Jack Bateman
Secunder: Jack Sperry

CE states that before voting begins on the motion, there is an amendment to consider, proposed by JB.

JB gives a short speech in support of the amendment, stating that the goals of the motion in restricting bylaw changes to the last Student Council of the academic year seem unfair – the current Council - and give no warning to those who wish to change things. JB states that this amendment would change the motion to restrict changes to the first Student Council of the academic year, giving people time to change things.

CE asks for any comments against the motion.

WB argues that if the motion is to be passed, bylaw changes should be restricted to the last Student Council of the year, in line with the goals of the GRP to stabilise Governance, and the final Student Council tends to be a larger Super Council.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY APPROVED
10 IN FAVOUR / 6 AGAINST / 2 ABSTENTIONS

Motion 7.3.1 - Restricting the Frequency of Bylaw Change

Proposer: Full Time Officer Team
Secoder: Full Time Officer Team

CE asks the meeting if anyone has any comments in favour of the motion – no responses.

CE asks the meeting if anyone has any comments against the motion.

JJ gives a statement that it does raise an important issue and we could do with changing frequency, but that this motion is too restrictive, limiting when officers can implement changes, and stating his opposition to the motion.

CE asks for other comments – no responses.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY REJECTED
0 FOR / 15 AGAINST / 3 ABSTENTIONS

Motion 7.3.2 - Removing Quoracy for Democracy Bylaws

Proposer: Full-Time Officer Team
Secoder: Full-Time Officer Team

CE outlines the proposal, and notes that there isn't an amendment for this motion – thus voting will go directly to the motion.

CE asks if anyone would like to put forward a statement in support of the motion.

JJ gives a statement in support, arguing that the main thing affected by this motion is quoracy for full time officer elections, which causes undue stress during the week to reach it, when it's always been achieved, and the target should be higher than 10% anyway. It's very hard to rerun sabbatical officer elections if 10% is not reached, during the summer, notes that it affects sports clubs and societies.

WB comments that it doesn't, as the resolve only states Bylaw 6.

NP comments that the entire point of quoracy is to have democratic legitimacy, and that we should aim higher but never go below – it would hurt if the requirement was removed and didn't have to push people to vote.

WB comments that 10% quorum is always reached, and we're always pushing for more votes and won't stop without the requirement of quorum, and argues that most student unions don't have quorum, and we should be aligning ourselves with best practice across the sector – it reduces organisational risk and the risk of looking silly if we rerun elections.

JJ notes that he asked NUS how we could handle not reaching quoracy, and they asked why we still have it, as they don't do it anymore.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY APPROVED
15 FOR / 1 AGAINST / 2 ABSTENTIONS

CE: Explains how, given amendments to the following motion on Officer roles, it will be handled a little differently, and passes to YY or JJ to elaborate further.

YY explains the new structure of voting on the proposed amendments to Motion 7.3.3. on reviewing existing Full-Time Officer roles. JJ explains there will be 6 votes. Questions from DB answered by YY. WB inquires about Amendment C on Resolve 4, and questions are answered by YY.

Amendment A – 7.3.3.1 - Review of Full-Time Officer Roles

Proposer: Jack Bateman
Secunder: Jack Sperry

CE gives the floor to JB to outline the amendment.

JB explains the intention of the GRP to scrap the role of the DDO, and the interpretation that it believes encouraging student engagement or the SU's commercial elements are not issues requiring student representation. JB argues this is wrong – students recognise SU commercial outlets and want them to work best for them, and that there also isn't a clear plan for how to redistribute the responsibilities of the role, suggesting that it is not in the best interests of students for the role to be scrapped.

DB objects, arguing that the GRP wishes to compensate for the fact students are familiar with the commercial team anyway and that student democracy should be handled by impartial staff and not

partial elected representatives. DB argues most holders of the position have not been impartial in running elections – the DDO's main responsibility – to bring the DDO back makes no sense except to make things less democratic.

NLR agrees with DB's objection, believing it disingenuous to argue that keeping the role is about representation. They argue DDO is a role about democracy and overseeing operations with impartiality – and the aim of the GRP is to change the way we do operations – keeping the role is at odds with how Governance will work in the future, and the responsibilities of the proposed Vice President for Democracy and Development would be handled by zones and the new ways in which Vice Presidents would be able to interact with each other and committees. It would detract from other GRP policies.

DB proposes an immediate vote.

JJ states that he understands why DDO has been proposed to be abolished – with changes to trustees proposed by the GRP and codifying DDO responsibilities in bylaws, the ability of the DDO to do what they want is reduced. JJ further states that he has been unable to influence democratic results very much, and that there is no clear plan for how the new roles would take over the DDO's responsibilities such as estates and commercial in terms of representation. JJ argues he does not think we're ready for such a change.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY APPROVED

11 FOR / 5 AGAINST / 2 ABSTENTIONS

Amendment B – 7.3.3.2 - Review of Full-Time Officer Roles

Proposer: Jack Bateman

Seconder: Jack Sperry

CE gives the floor to JB, who provides a speech explaining and supporting the amendment.

JB states that this amendment is more in the interest of giving people a choice regarding the makeup of their officer team, and argues he believes representing international students is better suited to two part-time officers than one broader full-time officer.

WB argues that, given the high proportion of international students, and the high priority given by the University to representing international students, the role of Vice President for International Students should remain. WB admits there are issues, and issues regarding support and the role's exact responsibilities need to be addressed, but overall this would be welcome.

DB states his agreement with Will, citing that international students don't really get involved in the SU and need someone to help them with this. They argue Part-Time Officers are helpful but don't have the time to help with issues like visa applications, and a Vice President of International Students would be useful here.

RP states he would not support this amendment as it would reduce participation, merging two roles into one that deal with different issues, and proposes that there needs to be more collaborating

between FTOs and PTOs regarding what this role would look like in the future. RP also notes he has not been notified about the University seeking greater international representation.

JJ comments he believes it to be a great idea, but notes that the role's function hasn't been properly explained, and there is the issue of staffing for it, but agrees that the University has alled for better representation for international students.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY APPROVED
9 FOR / 4 AGAINST / 5 ABSTENTIONS

Amendment C – 7.3.3.3 - Review of Full-Time Officer Roles

Proposer: Jack Bateman
Secunder: Tom Garth

CE introduces the amendment and gives the floor to JB for a speech in support.

JB states that this is not a major issue and more a matter of wording – a question of whether the council wants to keep an FTO for Postgraduates and Education, or Postgraduate and Undergraduate Education, and whether all students should be able to stand as Postgraduate Officer.

CE asks for any comments against the amendment.

DB argues the Postgraduate officer should be a Postgraduate student, as it is what has happened in practice and what happens in the Postgraduate Committee – and that this should be formalised in the bylaws.

JH notes that the Postgraduate Committee does little related to Postgraduate education, which is handled by various departments, the Committee dealing mostly with welfare, arguing that creating a Postgraduate Education officer would be a step backwards and reduce the effectiveness of the position – keeping them as an officer for Postgraduate Students would make the most sense, letting the officer for Education handle education issues.

CE moves to vote.

WB asks whether the meeting can vote in specific parts, separating the name change from removing Resolves 4.

YY asks for the meeting to have a conversation about why to do this.

CE asks WB for a short statement.

WB argues that the two parts of the amendment are very different issues, and that whilst he agrees with the name change, he believes the Postgraduate officer position should deal with things other than education, and any person in a full-time position representing Postgraduates should be one themselves.

JB agrees to this change removing the change to Resolves 4 from the amendment, voting instead on the amendment, and is thanked by WB.

There is a brief discussion about what exactly is now being voted upon.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
15 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 2 ABSTENTIONS

Amendment D – 7.3.3.4 - Review of Full-Time Officer Roles

Proposer: Jack Bateman

Seconder: Tom Garth

CE announces the debate of the final amendment, but JB states he is willing to withdraw the amendment – noting that it was presented mainly in the interest of maintaining 7 Full-Time Officers, in case the other amendments got rid of two others or added two more.

Amended Motion – 7.3.3 - Review of Full-Time Officer Roles

CE informs meeting Amendment D to Motion 7.3.3 has been removed by JB and JJ, and that the meeting will be voting on the whole package of amendments.

YY explains that pizza will be arriving, so there will be a short 5 to 10-minute recess during which time the new motion with amendments will be assembled, which will be voted on against the original motion.

JJ says the only real change implemented with the amended motion is the 'Vice Presidents' name change, WB adding that the Postgraduate officer would also be required to be a Postgraduate student. TG suggests the meeting votes on the motion before the recess, and asks why another vote after is needed, which YY explains.

CE asks if JB wants to provide a statement summarising the changes, and JB says no.

CE then calls for voting on the amended motion.

YY summarises the amended motion to the meeting.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY APPROVED
9 IN FAVOUR / 1 AGAINST / 7 ABSTENTIONS

Motion 7.3.4 - Associations

Proposer: The Full-Time Officer Team

Seconder: The Full-Time Officer Team

CE gives the floor to CHL to explain the motion.

CHL explains Associations, outlining how they were created to have marginalised groups work more closely with PTOs, and arose from a consultation process during 2020-21. He states that there has been a lack of clarity in the last year regarding how they would work, in particular with the LGBTQUA+ Association. highlights logistical and financial issues as well as problems accessing the MSL system for elections which have caused their elections to be done offline. CHL argues that moving these Associations to operate under a society structure makes sense, as they do act in this manner, and this is how they have been treated.

JJ adds that currently, only one Association is currently operational, and questions how the motion will help them get set up.

WB suggests the Associations that were previously societies can just back up/

NLR explains that the only reason the LGBTQUA+ Association had any activity this year was because members were in the process of transitioning over from the Pride Society, and other Associations didn't have this existing structure. They posit that it makes sense to go back, as this would give PTOs the opportunity to liaise with and form Associations better if they were just Societies. The Anti-Racism and Anti-Sexism Societies already exist and closely work together with PTOs, and the Women's Association just didn't work out.

WB adds that this is still an Association, and still going to work in that way, whilst CHL explains there remain some differences with regards to finances.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
17 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

Amendment A - 7.3.5.1 - Zones Feasibility

Proposer: The Full-Time Officer Team
Secunder: The Full-Time Officer Team

CE moves the meeting on to discuss the next motion, exploring the feasibility of Zones to replace Student Council, and offers the floor to HJ to explain an amendment to this.

HJ explains the focus of the amendment is to give leadership of the project to the DDO, whereas before the project would be led by a wide range of people.

WB counters that the FTO team work together, and there are 7 of them to ensure representation and democracy within the SU's Governance structure and argues that this amendment would give more of the focus of doing the work for this project to one officer, whose opinions could lead the research, stating that he would prefer a group effort.

HJ responds that he believes having someone with clear responsibility to lead the project is important, that it would still be conducted in collaboration with FTOs and the Governance and

Influence team – and arguing that it would make little sense to have 7 people presenting it.

NLR questions the need for an amendment to push for one person to present the project and expresses their concern over having one person lead research into a significant overhaul of the current structure. They further suggest that, given the long-term impact of the project, the responsibility of researching for and leading it should be shared amongst everyone.

WB states that it's the President's job to make sure the team is working together on something it's required by policy to do – there will be someone monitoring the project in any case.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY APPROVED

9 FOR / 6 AGAINST / 2 ABSTENTIONS

Motion 7.3.5 - Zones Feasibility

Proposer: The Full-Time Officer Team

Secunder: The Full-Time Officer Team

CE calls the meeting to discuss the overall motion in its amended form and asks for any speeches regarding the motion.

WB states that whilst people may not know what's happening with Zones, the motion is purely to investigate how they could work. He also discusses problems with the efficiency of Committees, and how reform is needed to ensure they're working properly for the future, and argues that, given the amount of money spent on the GRP, it would at least be worth examining Zones further, stating potential benefits.

JB counters that there has been no consultation with any of the relevant Committees, and no detail has been given as to how an investigation into Zones would be conducted – and further argues the result of the change would be undesirable for students, outlining issues such as reduced accountability and the ability for people to directly influence issues.

JH notes how this issue has been discussed in the Postgraduate Committee, expressing that whilst the current system is flawed, Zones are a vague solution, poorly named and the focus should instead be on gradually reforming the current Committees system, using ideas from the GRP, rather than risk being trapped into looking into Zones.

HJ states that neither he nor the Committee he chairs was consulted on this, and that the Democracy Committee has functioned well in amending motions that would conflict with bylaws and good practice as well as holding FTOs to account. HJ suggests that Zones chaired by a relevant FTO would struggle to hold them to account and suggests reforms to the current system instead.

DB comments that the motion is about exploring feasibility, with consultation coming later, and that people should not vote as if this were the final solution. This motion, he argues, just admits that Committees need to be improved, and discussing how best to achieve that.

NLR argues that shooting this motion down prematurely will cause stagnancy in Governance structures and making Committees more effective, citing other Students' Unions who have implemented similar changes to good effect. They argue it would be inward facing to not even consider these changes, questioning the consistency of arguments made to fail this motion and the lack of effort to reshape Governance structures.

HJ comments that this would be a large project and take a lot of people and work which could be otherwise spent on researching alternative solutions, which could stagnate change and encourages the meeting to vote against the motion.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY REJECTED

5 FOR / 10 AGAINST / 1 ABSTENTION

CE calls for a quick recess, which lasts around ten minutes.

8 Governance Regeneration Project Next Steps

CE reconvenes the meeting, explaining that with motions now addressed, the meeting will now discuss the next steps for the Governance Regeneration Project.

JJ explains that there will be a Company Law Meeting to ratify the changes to the Articles of Association, namely the proposed changes to Trustees and the Student Council, noting that there have been delays in when it will take place due to needing to give days of notice. As such, the issue is currently with lawyers, and may be pushed back to next term.

9 Ratification of Trustees

CE explains that the meeting will now be ratifying one Lay Trustee, John Dubber, for which a profile has been circulated.

WB explains that the candidate was met as part of the usual process for Lay Trustees, and explains their expertise as CEO of UCL, and the value of their knowledge to the organisation.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY RATIFIED
16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

10 Review of Policies

088 – On Campus Pharmacy Cruelty Free Cosmetics RENEW WITH AMENDMENTS

CE gives the floor to TG, who recommends renewing this policy, with the amendment that products be ethically sourced as well and that the Vegetarian Society be renamed to VegSoc. JJ adds that wherever it says cruelty free, ethically sourced has been added in.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

089 – The Use of Compostable Cups on Campus
LAPSE

CE gives the floor to TG, who states they examined the policy in depth, speaking to David from the University, and voted to lapse the policy, citing there being only three centres in the country to handle the said cups, which is costly and logistically challenging – with the suggestion the policy will be reintroduced when there is better capacity.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
14 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 2 ABSTENTIONS

**134 – Our Climate Emergency: Meaningful Action for Climate Leadership
LAPSE**

CE gives the floor to TG, who recommends lapsing the policy as its goals had been completed and the motion taken forward.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

**043 – Enhancing module choice
RENEW WITH AMENDMENTS**

CE gives the floor to DB, who recommends renewing the policy with amendments, with Resolves 4 mandating the Education Officer rather than the Education Executive, removing Notes 5 and Resolves 6 which reference the SPIP which is no longer ongoing.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

**094 – Protect Academic Freedom: Defend Statute 24
LAPSE**

CE gives the floor to DB, who recommends lapsing this policy, as the change to Statute 24 has already gone into effect.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

**102 – Focus on Fees: End the NSS Boycott
LAPSE**

CE gives the floor to DB, who recommends lapsing the policy, as the NSS boycott has been ended.
Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

136 – Warwick SU Supports Lecturers’ Intellectual Property Over Their Lectures RENEW WITH AMENDMENTS

CE gives the floor to DB, who recommends renewing the policy with amendments, with Resolves 3 and 4 being removed, as they can be considered complete – noting that having an opt-out system for lecture capture makes sense for accessibility.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
12 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 4 ABSTENTIONS

010 – Supporting Temporarily Withdrawn Students LAPSE

CE gives the floor to HH, who recommends lapsing the policy, citing how CS has said Resolves 4 and 5 are already implemented and a member of the Committee spoke with experience that Resolves 5 is already in place.

NP counters that Resolves 7 hasn’t been completed, with the Finance Office not taking to students, demanding money from them whilst they were off ill, arguing that the policy still has purpose, and if Resolves 4 and 5 have been implemented, they should be removed.

HH disagrees, stating that the policy has been continually renewed since 2006 and has been renewed for the sake of it.

DB counters that only those Resolves that have been adopted should be removed, and if some haven’t been adopted, these should remain.

NP says it’s an important policy, which students should have a say on.

HH disagrees, stating there is no progression in only getting rid of Resolves 4 and 5, with members of the Committee saying some of these motions have no substance, running for years with only a few resolves, which they argue makes no logistical sense.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY APPROVED
9 FOR / 6 AGAINST / 1 ABSTENTION

017 – Bus Fares

RENEW

CE gives the floor to HH, who recommends renewing the policy. HH notes that the figures given when the policy was last amended in June 2019 are still mostly accurate, and there is little clarity to update these now.

Vote undertaken.

MAJORITY APPROVED

14 FOR / 1 AGAINST / 1 ABSTENTION

137 – Water Fountains at Lakeside, Please

RENEW

CE gives the floor to JB, who recommends renewing the policy.

There is a discussion about missing Policy 090 from the order, and it is agreed to vote on it after- and some confusion regarding the focus of the policy.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

090 – Wake Up! Let's Tackle Sleep Deprivation

RENEW

CE gives the floor to HH, who recommends renewing the policy, noting that there is no issue with dates and stating that CS has said it is still mandated to him in a meeting.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

055 – Building a Democratic University
RENEW WITH AMENDMENTS

CE gives the floor to HJ, and JJ interjects, stating that HJ was unable to attend the meeting and he chaired in absence, recommending renewing the policy but to remove Resolves 5, arguing that mandating NUS delegates seems pointless as they can do what they want, and to remove everything after 'Senate' on Resolves 1, as the Committee wasn't sure why they were electing people to be on University Committees.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
16 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

**133 – Warwick SU Review Candidates Hall-Touring
LAPSE**

CE gives the floor to HJ, and JJ interjects, stating that HJ was unable to attend the meeting and he chaired in absence, recommending lapsing the policy, as DDO has reviewed hall touring many times – the issue comes up every year, and it isn't necessary to have it in our books.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
14 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 0 ABSTENTIONS

**096 – Warwick SU Against Casualisation
RENEW**

CE offers this policy to be introduced by any Committees, and there is some discussion, and JH eventually agrees to present the policy after AOB, when there has been some time to read over the policy. After AOB, JH notes the Postgraduate Committee wishes to renew the policy, arguing that it remains relevant to ensure casualisation isn't a problem for Postgraduate teachers.

Vote undertaken.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
15 FOR / 0 AGAINST / 1 ABSTENTION

11 AOB

Chair used own discretion to use power of council to provisionally ratify student trustees through the officer team, that will be fully ratified through the next student council, due to timing and training requirements. JJ argues this is mostly important for trustee training.

12 Notification of Next Meeting

CE next meeting of council to take place next academic year, offers best wishes to next chair, and thanks the rest of the Student Council, adjourning the meeting.