**St. George’s Students’ Union**

Meeting of the Executive XI



MINUTES

23rd February 2016

*Boardrooms H2.5*

**\* \* \***

1. **Business**
   1. Apologies
2. **Constitutional Changes**
3. **Date of next meeting**

8th March 2016

**1 Business**

**1.1 Present**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Steven Gilbert | President | SG |
| Alice Walker-Earwicker | VP: F & SA | AWE |
| Ruth Varney | General Secretary | RV |
| Matthew Boon | Technical Officer | MB |
| Lucy O’Reilly | Webmaster | LOR |
| Jordan Colman | Webmaster | JCo |
| Bukola Ogunjinmi | International Officer | BO |
| Georgina Chamberlain | Heritage Officer | GC |
| Sebastian Locke | Heritage Officer | SL |
| Cameron Barclay | Events Officer | CBa |
| Theo Rennicks-Gordon | E & D Officer | TRG |
| Saad Muhammad | E & D Officer | SM |
| Hannah Jones | E & E Officer | HJ |
| Durva Patel | CPO | DP |
| Aniqah Rahman | CPO | AR |
| Moneet Gill | Sports Officer | MGi |
| Anya Brown | Societies Officer | AB |
| Joe Clark | Societies Officer | JCl |
| Alex Lisseter | Societies Officer | AL |
| Martin Gannon | Student Trustee | TA |
| Shashank Shivaji | Ordinary member | SS |

**1.2 Apologies**

Cerys Bladen

Khadija Stone

Bethany Agnew

Kate Jones

Avin Philip

Greta Jata

Francesca Harris

Lucy Chapman

Alia Nasir-Gonzales

Chantal Liu

Suchita Bahri

Seher Bashir

Francesca Humfrey

Vafie Sheriff

Mustafa Dashti

Michael Lee

Kat Telford

**2 Constitutional Changes**

Addition of:

* + 1. Student’s who do not feel that they can fulfil these duties due to social, religious or cultural reasons, but wish to be part of the Executive team, should refer to the SGSU Equality and Diversity HR Policy.

A draft of the SGSU Equality and Diversity HR Policy was provided.

* TRG: I think it is an important policy which is basically already performed and needs to be put into writing. However I don’t think the application section is clear enough.
* RV: It varies role to role.
* MGa: It has been left deliberately left vague to enable HR to take control.
* SL: It includes disability as well as religion.
* MGa: That comes as standard for this type of policy.
* AWE: The deadline set in this is in November, by which point most duties have been completed, so why would it be that late?
* SG: It is because it lines up with other deadlines in the University. However, if anyone has an objection I’m sure they would come forward before it would affect them, so before this deadline.
* MGa: We would need to write in that each application is considered as it is submitted rather than after this deadline as it currently states.
* JCo: Does this apply to committees of clubs and societies as well as the Executive?
* MGa: As a policy this should read a specific way and the wording in this is insufficient, in my opinion, to be passed today, for example: ‘our’, ‘their’, ‘us’.
* JCo: It says that the President is solely responsible for preventing discrimination. What is in place if they feel that they are being discriminated against by the President?
* SS: The form suggests that they can apply for specific exception or a blanket exception.
* RV: The policy can be changed, and will be changed in the future. The clause is about adding it into the constitution. If you think it acceptable now or will be in the near future and are comfortable putting it in, then you can accept the clause, or if you think it needs so much work it isn’t useable at the moment, then you should reject the clause.
* SS: What is the policy for changing the policy?
* SG: It can be changed by the VP Education and Welfare whenever necessary.

**MGa: I propose we reject the progression of 3.12.1 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: JCo

For (MGa): There are some wording issues, unclear areas, and needs to be made sure that they are in line with other SGUL and SGSU policies. In the past people have put poor policies into the constitution and it should be made watertight before being added in.

Against (TRG): I think the issues raised are very small issues and are not reason enough to reject it.

**Accept: 11 Reject: 1 Abstain: 1**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Addition of:

* 1. A society can be further defined as a religious society if the main aims of the society are to educate and worship a particular faith.
* RV: They are already self-defining and it makes things clearer if this is written into the constitution.
* SL: Could we reword to: A society can be further defined as a religious society if the main aims of the society are to educate and worship a particular faith or lack of faith.
* JCo: Surely that allows for an anti-Semite society for example?
* SG: That’s not ‘lack of faith’, that is hate.
* SM: This would be useful to have to clarify those who need to attend the interfaith forum and which events we should be attending the events of.

**RV: I propose we accept the progression of 2.7 as agreed above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: LOR

**Accept: 13 Reject: 0 Abstain: 0**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Addition of:

* + 1. A representative from each religious society is required to attend each Interfaith Forum committee meeting.
* LOR: If we are including lack of faith, is it fair to make them go to an interfaith forum?
* SL: I think it is, but I am not sure of the format of the forum.
* TRG: Each society talks about what events they are holding, what is coming up in their religious calendar, what things they are excited about, asking for assistance advertising events and how to distribute the multifaith room usage. It generally advocates sharing, understanding, appreciation and information about their faiths.
* LOR: It seems like a useful thing and if it is poorly attended this may help.
* SS: Is there a sanction in place if they don’t go?
* SG: No.
* TRG: Does it have to be a member of the society or from their committee?
* SG: Just a representative.
* TRG: Could we reword to: ‘A representative from each religious society committee is required to attend each Interfaith Forum committee meeting.’
* MGa: I don’t think it should be a committee member as this reduces the number of potential attendees and this is not the rule for Council.

**DP: I propose we accept the progression of 2.7.1 as agreed above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: AR

**Accept: 11 Reject: 0 Abstain: 3**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Alteration to add another Sports Officer:

* 1. Sports Officers (3)

1. **Sports Officer (maximum of three)**

* MGi: The job would be done much better with 3 people. Some people may say 3 is only needed if the 2 aren’t good but I don’t think this is the case. 2 people can still run as a team if they think they can do it.
* SM: If it was second years do you think they would still need 3?
* MGi: Yes. We are really organised and still struggle. The problem is at all other universities the sports officer is a paid member of staff so a lot the work needs to be done during office hours and this means there is a higher chance of one of the team being free to do this. Also there are 2 leagues and an assortment of other stuff so that would divide the work nicely too.

**MGi: I propose we accept the progression of 2.14 & 11 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: SL

**Accept: 16 Reject: 0 Abstain: 0**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Additions to and alterationa of the International Officer role:

1. **International Officers (Maximum of two)**
   1. To have an overall responsibility in representing and integration of the international students on the SU Executive across all the courses at SGUL.
   2. Shall be responsible for liaising with the students and staff involved in the INTO programmes.
   3. Shall work closely with the Vice President for Education and Welfare to ensure that the international students have the necessary welfare support.
   4. Shall work closely with the International Students’ Society (ISS).
      1. To keep in constant contact with the ISS committee, mainly regarding, but not limited to, the planning of events for international students.
      2. To assist where necessary in the planning and running of International Lunches and other ISS events.
   5. Shall sit on the International Committee.
   6. Shall sit on the International MBBS Operations Group (IMOG).
   7. Shall be a member of the core INTO meetings.
   8. Shall work closely with the International Support & Compliance Officer and/or Senior Compliance Officer.
   9. Shall organise and assist with all international student events, including but not limited to, the Multicultural Dinner, Welcome Weekend and INTO Introduction.
   10. To be a readily available point of contact for international students who may require welfare advice and ensure that such students are, where appropriate, guided to staff that may be able to assist.
       1. To keep in constant contact with the Joint Personal tutor Leads for International Students.
   11. To be a member of the representations zone

* CL: We have changed it to bring it up to date and in line with our actual jobs.
* DP: Can we reword 21.4.1 to ‘To keep in contact with the ISS committee, mainly regarding, but not limited to, the planning of events for international students.’
* SG: Why are we helping them plan and run the ISS events?
* CL: It is just to make it a 3 way communication link between the University, the ISS and the SU.
* MGa: Why are you not meeting with them anymore?
* BO: You don’t need to meet specifically, mostly it can be dealt with by email.
* MGa: It needs to be a tangible job.
* BO: Can we reword 21.8 to ‘Shall meet regularly and work closely with the International Support & Compliance Officer and/or Senior Compliance Officer’.
* SS: You have said you do all the things in 21.9, but do you have to?
* BO: Yes. Can we reword 21.9 to ‘Shall organise and assist with international student events, including but not limited to, the Multicultural Dinner, Welcome Weekend and INTO Introduction.’
* BO: Can we reword 21.10.1 to ‘To keep in constant with the Joint Personal Tutor Leads for International Students.

**BO: I propose we accept the progression of 21.1-21.11 as agreed above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: CL

**Accept: 16 Reject: 0 Abstain: 0**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Alteration to add the means of becoming a Community Project:

* 1. A society can be defined as a community project if it can be proven that the activities of the group primarily benefit the community either locally, nationally or internationally.
     1. A society can be further defined as a community project if they are part of an external organisation which may be a registered charity and upon successful completion of an application through the Student’s Union
* RV: What does the application form look like?
* DP: AWE ok’d it.
* RV: Technically it doesn’t specify it has to be a form, it could be verbal.
* MGa: Why has ‘further’ been removed?
* RV: Because we have added in descriptors for more types of society, to prevent repetition.
* MGa: Are there descriptors for all societies?
* RV: No, it is just a potential.
* MGa: Doesn’t the second clause repeat excessively.
* SS: Could we reword 3.1 to: ‘A society can be defined as a community project if it can be proven that the activities of the group primarily benefit the community either locally, nationally or internationally, upon success completion of the application form through the Student’s Union.’ and scrap 3.1.1.

**DP: I propose we accept the progression of 3.1 as agreed above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: LOR

**Accept: 15 Reject: 0 Abstain: 0**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Alteration to correct how Awards is run:

* 1. The Awards Committee shall be made up of:
     1. All Elected Officers of the Executive including Ex-President
  2. It is the responsibility of the Societies Officers to co-ordinate the opening of nominations for awards and that the Awards Committee meets to consider such nominations annually.
  3. The Societies Officers shall organise a Students’ Union Awards Evening annually for the purpose of presenting awards and honours.
  4. Should the Awards Committee feel that none of the nominations submitted for a particular award meet the defined criteria, the award shall not be given.
* MGa: Can we reword 5.2.1 to ‘All Officers of the Executive’.
* LOR: Can we reword 5.8 to ‘It is the responsibility of the Societies Officers to co-ordinate the opening of nominations for awards and ensure the Awards Committee meets to consider such nominations annually’.
* DP: It is in the community project officers job description to run Awards Committee too.
* LOR: The societies officers need support.
* MGa: It should be the responsibility of the Awards Committee.
* RV: No it should be specifics as otherwise it easy to pass the buck to other members of the committee.
* AWE: Also, the whole Awards Committee includes external trustees.
* DP: Can we reword 5.9 to ‘The Societies Officers, in conjunction with Community Projects Officers and Sports Officers, shall organise a Students’ Union Awards Evening annually for the purpose of presenting awards and honours.’
* GC: For something of the year it is good from a heritage point of view to track back.
* LOR: Use ‘may’ as then it can be opened but they don’t have to give it to someone undeserving.
* RV: Organising awards is complicated enough without the impracticalities of re-opening over and over again.
* MGa: Can we reword to: Should the Awards Committee feel that none of the nominations submitted for a particular award meet the defined criteria, the award shall not be given, and provision may be made for nominations for that award to be re-opened.

**RV: I propose we accept the progression of 5.2, 5.8, 5.8 & 5.13 as agreed above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: JCl

**Accept: 10 Reject: 1 Abstain: 4**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

*Amendments which are inconsequential such as capitalisations, grammar and headings do not need to be voted on or ratified under Clause 10.*

Alteration to correct grammar:

This regulation sets out the way in which the elections of The Union are held. This includes the rights of voters and candidates and the powers of those running the election.

*Clause 10 was implemented.*

Alteration to correct how the Assistant Returning Officer is selected:

* 1. The President shall serve as Assistant Returning Officer who is answerable to the returning officer for each election or by-election, and may not stand as a candidate for that election or by-election.
     1. If the President chooses to stand as a candidate for election, then a Senior Officer of the Student’s Union shall be nominated by the Executive to serve as Assistant Returning Officer.
* MB: What if all 4 want to run?
* SG: It’s never happened before and leaving it to any officer is too loose.
* GC: The nature of Senior Officer roles is that it is unlikely they will all re-run.

**AWE: I propose we accept the progression of 2.2 and 2.2.1 to SGSU council.**

Seconded: MB

**Accept: 16 Reject: 0 Abstain: 1**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Alteration to correct which Year Reps can be elected in the 1st academic term:

* 1. An election for first year representatives on each course, clinical transfer representatives, intercalating BSc representatives and any unfilled positions shall be held as soon as practical in the first academic term.

**GC: I propose we accept the progression of 3.2 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: AWE

**Accept: 16 Reject: 0 Abstain: 1**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Alteration to include the rules we already abide by:

* 1. Nominations shall be in the form of a Nomination Paper, issued by the Assistant Returning Officer, containing the following:
     1. the position for which the candidate(s) is nominated;
     2. the full name of the candidate(s);
     3. the candidate(s)'s full manifesto;
     4. a recent photograph of each candidate such that it fits on the nomination paper;
     5. consent to nomination signed by the candidate(s);
     6. the full name and signature of one proposer and two seconders;
  2. During an electronic voting process, in addition to the Nomination Paper outlined in 4.3, candidates will also be required to complete an additional electronic Nomination Declaration containing:
     1. the position for which the candidate(s) is nominated;
     2. the full name of the candidate(s);
     3. the candidate(s)’s full manifesto;
     4. the full name of one proposer and two seconders, whom must also appear on the paper nomination form.
  3. Nominees, proposers and seconders must all be Ordinary Members of the Union, and can only propose or second one candidate/team per position.
     1. Members of the Executive Committee may not propose nor second any candidate for election.
* LOR: I can see it would be fairer as Exec do carry influence, however I don’t think that is necessarily a bad thing as we do have the most experience in what the job involves and who could do it best.
* MB: I thought this was already the rule?
* SG: It is the rule but at the discretion of the president only.
* SS: A different point is about whether Exec can endorse, this is simply being able to propose or second. This means that running as a member of the student body you must be proposed by ordinary member.
* MB: People already think we are a closed group, this helps to reduce this.

**GC: I propose we accept the progression of 4.3.3, 4.4, 4.4.3, 4.4.4, 4.5 & 4.5.1 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: SL

**Accept: 16 Reject: 0 Abstain: 1**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Alteration to correct grammar:

5.2.1 briefing on the election regulations

*Clause 10 was implemented.*

Alteration to correct the constitution:

7.4 The Assistant Returning Officer shall determine the expenditure allowed for campaigning for candidates on an annual basis.

**RV: I propose we accept the progression of 7.4 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: MB

**Accept: 16 Reject: 0 Abstain: 1**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPETED**

Addition to the elections rules:

* + 1. A society may not endorse specific candidates.

* MB: Where is it written that you have to inform the other team when you are using club/society lists or making lecture shout outs?
* RV: That is only guidelines and etiquette, not constitution.
* SS: Surely a captain giving access to an email list is endorsement and therefore contradicts 7.6.
* LOR: Everyone is an individual and should be able to make their own decisions based on information presented to them, not through pressurisation and influencing.
* MGi: The president posting campaign stuff on a group is endorsing which is allowed in 7.6 so I agree this contradicts.
* RV: The president isn’t allowed to post, they are currently only allowed to let the candidate post.
* JCo: If the Executive cant endorse, surely other SGSU volunteers shouldn’t either which are society committees.
* MB: The benefit of society endorsement is that a society who will be served well by a specific team should be able to recommend them to their members. And to be honest, it will happen regardless.
* SS: The members of societies can still discuss who will be best for them, but this is about removing coercive messages from people in power within societies.
* LOR: This isn’t preventing people expressing opinions; it is just preventing them putting the weight of a whole society title behind it.
* MB: Members of a society don’t have to vote the way of the endorsement. Also, the committee has been voted in to represent that society, by its members, so it wouldn’t be undemocratic for them to use their position to influence these decisions.
* SS: Would a society saying these members of our society are running FYI be classed as endorsement?
* RV: I would say no, but it is a bit grey.
* SL: If we are banning it, it won’t stop but it will drive it underground. Instead of being on a public forum for discussion and everyone to see, it ends up on private emails.
* MB: 7.6 suggests support but 7.61 suggests no support. We should be more clear.
* SG: It is essentially being clear in our views against listing which candidates people should vote for.
* JCo: I can see that, but with reasoning and linked to manifestos it could be of benefit.
* MB: Maybe it should be you can endorse but only following a discussion with all candidates.
* SS: Perhaps include the need to allow other candidates the right to reply?
* SL: Another clause that it must be posted on an open forum rather than on closed groups?
* LOR: The specific example which sparked this was questioned mainly due to the lack of justification. However I think it should be allowed or not, but you can’t enforce rules about how.
* AR: I think people have a right to endorse, what I feel uncomfortable with is posting as an anonymous society rather than a person.
* MB: I think just stating a society is ideal as this is wrong, rather than preventing individuals endorsing which is fair enough.
* JCo: I still think it needs a clause which states societies can comment on candidate’s suitabilities based on manifestos and justifications.
* SS: If people cant anonymously propose, a society shouldn’t anonymously endorse. Perhaps the clause should include ‘anonymously’?
* GC: How would this be policed?
* SG: It is in the ARO’s job description to check this and seek out people breaking it. If it is not in the constitution then it can’t be followed up if a complaint is made.
* RV: Putting in ‘anonymous’ may confuse the issue as people may think it wouldn’t be anonymous if a society’s name is on it.

**MB: I propose we accept the progression of 7.6.1 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: DP

**Accept: 15 Reject: 2 Abstain: 0**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPTED**

Alteration to include the rules we already abide by:

7.7 Candidates shall not post campaign material in any union administered group, including specific cohort groups run by Year Representatives, on social media or the Student’s Union website.

* SL: This puts students who aren’t part of lots of other societies and pages at a disadvantage.
* SG: The union groups are there for academic matters, it should therefore be a neutral playground.
* SL: These are the best groups to access the wider student body as no one really watches hustings.
* SG: This is already the done thing. Also, 400 people viewed Top 4 hustings.
* SS: I think the distinction is between the year rep information platform and the frivolous group not run by year reps.
* SL: All groups are policed by year reps and not all cohorts have 2 groups.
* LOR: What is the difference between a club/society group and an academic group?
* SG: The year reps are directly SU which should be apolitical.
* MB: All students are informed of elections by emails. If you ban all facebook groups then they will be forced to the website.
* RV: We don’t let people post on the Cor Blimey groups run by the union, so why are these different? Also, if students are leaving groups because of election spam it makes the job of a year rep and by extension the SU much harder to communicate information.

**SL: I propose we reject the progression of 7.7 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: GC

**Accept: 6 Reject: 3 Abstain: 6**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPTED**

Alteration to correct statement:

7.8 Candidates may not actively campaign in any way in the library, computer rooms, the Student’s union office or in any of the Union’s commercial spaces, with the exception of the Bar and Eddie’s Café.

*Clause 10 was implemented.*

Alteration to include the rules we already abide by:

* + 1. Candidates may also not campaign in any part of the hospital, except from in lecture theatres/teaching rooms, as long as no teaching is disrupted and permission is granted from the preceding lecturer.
* GC: So where can you campaign?
* RV: Social Learning Space, Halls, University corridors and lobbies, the Bar, Eddie’s and with permission in teaching rooms.
* LOR: Can we reword to: ‘Candidates may also not campaign in any part of the hospital, except from in lecture theatres/teaching rooms, as long as no teaching is disrupted and permission is granted from the preceding lecturer.’ to make it more clear.

**LOR: I propose we accept the progression of 7.8.1 as agreed above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: AWE

**Accept: 13 Reject: 0 Abstain: 1**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPTED**

Alteration to include the rules we already abide by:

7.10 The Union’s Executive Officers, non-student staff and businesses will not endorse any candidate for any position; should an Executive Officer be running for an elected position, they may promote their own campaign.

* GC: Exec do have a better insight into the roles and what attributes someone needs to do them well, especially those running for your own role.
* RV: Exec may not endorse based on manifestos though, that is the risk.
* MGi: You would have to talk to all candidates and justify your endorsement.
* AB: It is better to remain neutral.
* LOR: It is a slippery slope and would be wrong to decide whether we get an opinion ourselves.
* AB: It means nervous people are at a disadvantage.
* GC: There is a flaw if candidates aren’t talking to predecessors.
* SL: I don’t think our endorsement is that important so why take away the small say we have.
* SS: Current exec already question new candidates at hustings which bring to light those who they believe is under-qualified.
* MGi: We are students not just Exec so we should have the same rights as other students.
* SS: Perhaps it should only be Senior Officer roles that aren’t allowed to endorse.

**GC: I propose we reject the progression of 7.10 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: LOR

**Accept: 9 Reject: 3 Abstain: 3**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPTED**

Alteration to allow a reasonable amount of time for candidates to present at Hustings:

* + 1. Representatives, up to 3 minutes;

**AB: I propose we accept the progression of 7.8.1 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: GC

Against (MB): Hustings is already very long.

**Accept: 11 Reject: 4 Abstain: 0**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPTED**

Alteration to correct statement:

8.4.2 Officers, other than Senior Officers, up to 3 minutes;

8.4.3 Senior Officers, up to 5 minutes.

*Clause 10 was implemented.*

Alterations and additions to allow for specific questions at hustings:

* 1. Questions may be submitted to candidates orally, in writing, or via social media, through the Chair of Hustings, and:
     1. Shall be put to all candidates for a particular position;
        1. A maximum of 3 specific questions may be directed at each candidate regarding their Manifesto or Hustings presentation.
        2. Shall be ruled out of order by the Assistant Returning Officer if of an offensive nature, and therefore dismissed through the Chair;
* MB: There needs to be more than 3 allowed.
* SG: There should be 3 so there are enough without going on forever.
* SS: It should be chair’s say on the night as perhaps Senior officers should get more questions?

**RV: I propose we accept the progression of 8.8, 8.8.1, 8.8.1.1 & 8.8.1.2 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: GC

**Accept: 11 Reject: 2 Abstain: 2**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPTED**

Alteration to correct statement:

9.10 When an election is carried out using an electronic voting process, The Assistant Returning Officer shall ensure that only Ordinary Members may access the electronic voting system.

9.11 The means by which Ordinary Members may access the electronic voting system shall normally be displayed on the Students’ Union website for 7 days prior to the election or by-election.

*Clause 10 was implemented.*

Alteration to quorum:

1. No business shall be transacted at any general meeting unless a quorum is present. A number equivalent to 1% of the student body, in persons entitled to vote upon the business to be transacted, each being a Member (but excluding Trustees), shall be a quorum.
   1. The quorum of the General Meeting shall be the number of Ordinary Members equivalent to that of 1% of the student body. In the case of the meeting not reaching quorum, the meeting shall be postponed to a time no more than 7 days later, and advertised to all Members.

* SS: What is 1% currently?
* RV: 56, which means currently we are reducing quorum by 4 however it realistically cant be higher and without constant exponential increasing it shouldn’t be a static number.
* JCo: Does that mean during a meeting you would have to reduce in percentages?
* RV: No it would be announced what quorum is at the start of the meeting.
* SG: Could you add a clause to only be able to reduce quorum by 10%?
* LOR: That would be very difficult, but it would be easier to put a minimum in.
* JCo: Could we remove the joint faculty numbers from quorum?
* SG: I would strongly disagree with that as we represent them.
* SS: Although they have the worst voting turn out, its not fair to exclude them as some of them use our union as their main one.
* RV: Could we make it 1% as minimum?
* SL: No, you would never get anything done.
* RV: If it drops below 56, Exec and Council get the deciding vote, which should persuade more people to go.
* SL: But they won’t due to the length of meetings, they will just criticise the Exec for making all the decisions behind closed doors.
* LOR: We should enable them having their voices.
* SS: You could make a clause that states it can’t be all exec present, there has to be a number of ordinary students in addition.
* JCo: If they are majority exec then it may as well be an exec meeting.
* SS: Until AGM is shorter, a minimum quorum couldn’t be put in place.

**RV: I propose we accept the progression of 25 & 2.7 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: SL

**Accept: 15 Reject: 0 Abstain: 0**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPTED**

Alteration to quorum:

* 1. a resolution passed by at least a two-third majority of the Members voting in a Referendum provided that at least 5% of Members cast a vote in the Referendum;
* SS: What is 5%?
* RV: 280. It is currently around 3% which is pathetic to change the view of the Union. We have seen we can achieve this because the referenda just passed reached about 7%.

**RV: I propose we accept the progression of 10.2 as written above to SGSU council.**

Seconded: MB

**Accept: 14 Reject: 0 Abstain: 1**

**PROPOSAL ACCEPTED**