

Student Council

**21/2/19**

Present:

Nathan Bland – NB

Rachael Chapman – RC

Emma Stevenson – ES

Sophie Sinclair – SS

Lewis Benn – LB

Chelsey Grooby – CG

Charles Isherwood – CI

Jake Bainbridge – JB

Chloe Tear – CT

Zoha Shah – ZS

Emma Riley – ER

Daisy Speight – DS

Staff Present:

Finn Northrop - FN

Absent with Formal Apologies:

Maria Beckwith – MB

Absent without Formal Apologies:

Emma Drinkwater – ED

### Item 1 – Welcome from Chair

NB welcomed council to the meeting

### Item 2 – Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting

NB introduced the minutes of the previous meeting

NB moved to a vote

Council approved the minutes (unanimous)

### Item 3 – Resignations from Council

NB informed council that, in line with what had been laid out in advance in the agenda, Council would be dealing with the triggering of Byelaw 1.32 by three councillors. NB explained that automatically the councillors were deemed to have resigned, but that council could choose to exonerate them by taking their absences as legitimate.

NB moved to discuss Emma Drinkwater's triggering of Byelaw 1.32 first. NB noted that ED was not in attendance

CI explained that he had engaged briefly with ED, especially toward the start of the year, but she had given him no reason for her absences.

NB asked if anyone wished to speak in ED's defence.

NB moved to a vote. The wording of the question was such that a "For" vote meant that Council deemed the councillor to have resigned, and an "Against" vote meant that Council exonerated the councillor

*For: RC, JB, CI, CT, DS, CG, SS, LB, ES*

*Against: ZS, ER*

*Abstain:*

### **ED was deemed to have resigned from council in line with Byelaw 1.32**

NB moved next to discuss Zoha Shah's triggering of Byelaw 1.32

ZS explained that she had been in lectures at the time of meetings

CI queried why she had arrived with a Badminton racquet with 10 mins left of the December meeting

ZS claimed that her behaviour would improve

NB stated that council would be able to vote on whether they wished to hold the Byelaw 1.32 votes in private

CI claimed this meant that the individual who was subject to the vote would leave the room

ER expressed disdain at the whole process

NB moved to a vote

*For: RC, LB, CT, DS, SS*

*Against:*

*Abstain: JB, ES, CI, ER, CG, ZS*

Council therefore chose to hear closing arguments and hold the vote without ZS present

*\*ZS left the room\**

CI explained that lack of BME representation damaged council, but concluded that he liked ZS and wanted her to stay

NB moved to a vote

NB moved to a vote. The wording of the question was such that a "For" vote meant that Council deemed the councillor to have resigned, and an "Against" vote meant that Council exonerated the councillor

For:

Against: All Councillors

Abstain:

**ZS was not deemed to have resigned under byelaw 1.32**

*\*ZS re-entered the room\**

NB moved next to discuss Emma Riley's triggering of Byelaw 1.32

ER argued that the Byelaw was wrong and she had never seen anything like it in government or in Students' Unions. Explained that she didn't believe she should have to attend a meeting if she didn't want to, citing a personal reason for missing the first meeting of the year. Claimed she had not been informed of the byelaw and that she should not be expected to know the byelaw. Argued that as a volunteer she had no obligation to attend any meetings.

ES stated that she did not believe it to be too taxing to send apologies to the chair where there was a personal reason for not attending

RC explained that the rules and key byelaws had been made clear at the start of the year

ZS defended ER, then pivoted and pointed out that the officer role was akin to a job

CT explained that her role, similar to ER's was occasionally pastoral, but that that was not an adequate excuse for ignoring other responsibilities

CI complimented ER and expressed admiration, but said that rules had been made clear

JB echoed this, and explained that ER's presence was important

LB stated that he loved ER but expressed that he felt ER should be at meetings

NB stated for purposes of clarity, that contrary to ER's assertion, no-one was actively trying to remove her from council, she herself had automatically triggered Byelaw 1.32

ER complained that the SU was incompetent, had organised elections that clashed with International Women's Day

ER then claimed that council was pointless and that most SU's didn't have anything like this and that it was just the President and other Sabbs

CI claimed that she was absolutely right, that having a council was rare and that most SU's were getting rid of their council's

ER claimed she hated meetings and had instead done other things in her role, such as engaging with SU on Tour

\*ER left the room\*

ES noted that she was uncomfortable with many of the defences ER had made early on, but that she seemed more amiable toward the end of the discussion

Council all agreed that they felt ER had a lot to contribute

JB explained that ultimately being an officer was a responsibility and that by not fulfilling the responsibilities of the role ER was depriving council of hearing from a women's officer. He expanded by saying that it was vital liberation officers attend in order for council to be a truly representative body.

NB moved to a vote. The wording of the question was such that a "For" vote meant that Council deemed the councillor to have resigned, and an "Against" vote meant that Council exonerated the councillor

For:

Against: All Councillors

Abstain:

**ER was not deemed to have resigned under byelaw 1.32**

\*ER re-entered the room\*

#### Item 4 – Matters Arising

NB moved on to discussion of the LTU Race Equality Plan, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, this was an opportunity for council to give feedback on behalf of students and feed in to the university's equality work

It became apparent that no-one had read the document in advance, no-one had brought a printed copy and very few councillors had laptops with them, thus FN left the room to print off copies for everyone to read through and thus the meeting was paused

Meeting resumed with Council now all having printed copies of the Race Equality Plan

NB suggested deferring discussion to the next meeting

CI said it was fine and that he would just summarise the document for council

CI glossed all the sections of the Race Equality Plan that he deemed relevant to council, listing the key points and giving them brief commentary

CI was positive about the plan

CI suggested that if councillors had further opinions they could email him or FN with them

ES queried where the 'consultation' had come from

CI explained that he had been involved in expanding the number of students interviewed as part of the consultation, which involved walking round campus chatting to students

NB made clear councillors should email CI or FN with comments by the 12noon on Friday

NB moved on to the Action Tracker

CI ran through the Action Tracker, especially Cut the Costs. Explained that he was disappointed with how the campaign had gone

ES queried progress on Free Periods and why there had been no meetings with the University

CI explained that he would set a date for meetings to take place

CT explained that she had continued to have meetings with relevant staff about Assistive Technology and that progress was positive

NB queried where the promotion had been, as was detailed in the policy

CT explained she had not had the pre-requisite information for this to be possible

JB chatted about the progress on the LGBT\* campaign, including the addition of an SU Values award to Sports/Society Awards Evening

LB explained that he was pleased with the rainbow laces campaign

ER used the subject of rainbow laces to discuss that the women's rugby team had objected to an opposition team which featured a Trans Woman. ER explained that it was not fair, they had complained because the woman on the opposition team had not had a "sex change" and therefore should not be allowed to play. ER continued that she felt, wearing rainbow laces showed the team still supported the woman in the abstract even though they objected to her playing on a women's team.

CG echoed these sentiments expressing that it was not fair

ER and CG both explained that the woman and the opposition team had still been a man, with both referring to the woman using "he/him" pronouns

CI echoed their sentiments

ES and CG queried why microwaves had been delayed

CI explained that there had been various hold-ups with University and that it would probably not come to fruition because of issues over who would be responsible for the microwaves. CI explained that instead students could use the microwave in the staff corridor, if they cleaned it properly

CI moved on to lockers and said the library had tweeted about them and were considering adding more

CI then moved on to the issue of Blood Donation and said that he had spoken to Nurses when he last gave blood who explained that they were not going to University campuses anymore because Student's fainted too much

CI claimed that instead planned to make LTU a donation point

**A/P - SS and CI to act on the GP policy**

**A/P – NB to act on Student Council Faces policy**

#### Item 5 – Sabbatical Officer Reports

CI Goals were taken as read, with CI choosing to only expand on the success of QSU

JB Goal were also taken as read

#### Item 6 – Motions Debate

CT introduced her reading week's motion

CT explained that giving students time either to catch-up on work or too relax either at uni or back in the familial home was incredibly important and that it was a vital part of student welfare

ER expressed that she was prohibited from returning home during reading weeks

CI stated that this would face resistance from the University but that he was incredibly supportive of the policy and felt it was important for student welfare

NB moved to a vote

Vote was unanimously in favour

NB moved to RC's motion on Vegetarian and Vegan food

RC introduced the motion and explained that the idea was the result of consultation with some of peers who expressed that the options for Veggies and Vegans was incredibly limited and that this could deter students from staying on campus during the day

NB moved to a vote

Vote was unanimously in favour

#### Item 7 – AOB

NB asked if anyone had anything to raise in AOB, no-one had anything to raise

NB thanked council and closed the meeting

