**MEETING OF SGSU EXECUTIVE – MINUTES**

**Tuesday 18th April 2017**

**5.30pm – H2.6/7**

1. **Business**
   1. Apologies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VP** | Vikram Patel | Charities Officer |
| **NMer** | Na’im Merchant | Student Trustee |
| **SJ** | Shalu James | Events Officer |
| **ET** | Eesha Tripathi | Charities Officer |
| **KS** | Khadija Stone | E+D Officer |
| **LoC** | Lorna Chapman | Societies Officer |
| **AC** | Anshaal Chawdhery | Charities Officer |
| **CBa** | Cameron Barclay | E+E Officer |
| **RT** | Ruben Thumbadoo | Student Trustee |
| **CA** | Chandru Amaranathan | Events Officer |
| **CL** | Chantal Liu | International Officer |
| **MD** | Mustafa Dashti | Community Projects Officer |
| **AD** | Alex Denley | Technical Officer |
| **BO** | Bukola Ogunjinmi | International Officer |
| **JC** | Joe Clarke | Communications Officer |
| **LuC** | Lucy Chapman | Campaigns Officer |
| **YK** | Yuna Kishimoto | Events Officer |
| **SA** | Saeed Azizi | Student Trustee |
| **NMel** | Naomi Melamed | Societies Officer |
| **KT** | Kat Telford | Chair |
| **OR** | Ollie Ryan | Sports Officer |

* 1. Present

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FH** | Francesca Harris | General Secretary |
| **TA** | Tanisha Amin | VP Education + Welfare |
| **CBr** | Corey Briffa | President |
| **IB** | Ishaan Bhide | VP Finance and Student Activities |
| **EO** | Ethan Osborn | Technical Officer |
| **WM** | Will Morrell | Sports Officer |
| **NA** | Naireen Asim | Charities Officer |
| **GB** | Gabriela Barzyk | Representation Officer |
| **JT** | Jeremy Teo | Events Officer |
| **SS** | Sunil Singh | Representation Officer |
| **SL** | Sarah Lasoye | NUS Delegate |
| **CBl** | Cerys Bladen | Heritage Officer |
| **AB** | Anya Brown | Heritage Officer |
| **RV** | Ruth Varney | Communications Officer |
| **JM** | Jess McNaughton | Societies Officer |
| **AS** | Ash Sithirapathy | Societies Officer |
| **BA** | Bethany Agnew | Campaigns Officer |

* 1. Minutes from the previous meeting were **PASSED**
  2. Action Points

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comms | 07/03 | Find out how to change the in office link | **ONGOING** |
| Socs | 07/03 | Set a date for council society dissolution before | **COMPLETE** |
| International | 07/03 | Liaise with MSci Y3 on outcome of communication with the ERASMUS student | **ONGOING** |
| E+E | 21/03 | Talk to Comms about green impact | **ONGOING** |
| E+E | 21/03 | Get in contact with Kingston E+E rep | **ONGOING** |
| Heritage | 04/04 | Sent comms photo for app | **ONGOING** |
| Heritage | 04/04 | Pursue SGUL Change application | **COMPLETE** |
| Rep Officers | 04/04 | Speak to senate about how to improve personal tutor system | **ONGOING** |
| Tanisha | 04/04 | Invite head of personal tutors to next Senate meeting | **COMPLETE** |
| Campaigns | 04/04 | Meet with Corey and Tanisha | **ONGOING** |
| Sarah Lasoye | 04/04 | Send new role constitutions to Fran for next meeting | **COMPLETE** |
| Socs | 04/04 | File constitution and handover for Finance Soc | **ONGOING** |
| Fran | 04/04 | Make email account for Finance Soc | **COMPLETE** |
| Comms | 04/04 | Make webpage for Finance Soc | **COMPLETE** |
| Ishaan | 04/04 | Make budget code for Finance Soc | **COMPLETE** |

1. **Reports**
2. **Students’ Union Issues**
   1. Awards amendment (LoC/JM/AS/NMel)
   2. Rewards Committee reflection
   3. Progress Award
   4. AGM reports (FH)
   5. Technical Officers constitutional changes (EO/AD/MG)
   6. Liberation Officer (SL)
   7. Democracy Officer (CBr)
3. **AOB**
4. **Date of next meeting**

2nd May 2017

**REPORTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| President | CBr gave a verbal summary of the written report.  EO: where do things stand with the renovations?  CBr: our next meeting is 24th April where we will finally have the design we want. | PASSED |
| VP F+SA | IB gave a verbal summary of the written report.  EO: do societies with financial queries come and arrange a meeting with you?  IB: yes. | PASSED |
| VP E+W | TA gave a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| General Secretary | FH gave a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| Events Officers | JT gave a verbal summary of the written report.  TA: why can’t showcase be in the Monckton?  JT: just for atmosphere, feels like there’s more people there if we do it in the bar. | PASSED |
| Sports Officers | WM gave a verbal report. | PASSED |
| Communications Officers | RV gave a verbal summary of the written report.  TA: when will the news letter be back?  RV: 4th May, after April as it wasn’t worth it as everyone was on holiday or doing exams this month. | PASSED |
| Heritage Officers | AB and CBl gave a verbal report. | PASSED |
| Charities Officers | NA gave a verbal summary of the report. | PASSED |
| Societies Officers | AS gave a verbal summary of the written report.  GB: how many societies do you think will be dissolved?  AS: there’s quite a lot but there are some who are only missing hand overs which we are being less strict on. Probably around 20-30. | PASSED |
| CPOs | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| Technical Officers | EO gave a verbal summary of the written report.  TA: Who’s DJing?  EO: Ash, Victor and Razz and will be swapping throughout the night. Potentially Boon will do a slot depending on timings. Will also have a alternative room with Radio Society doing some there. | PASSED |
| E+D Officers | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| E+E Officer | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report.  IB: the green impact has been in the process for a while now, when will this be done? Has this action point been achieved?  TA: deadline is 5th May | PASSED |
| International Officers | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| Representation Officers | SS gave a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| Campaigns Officers | BA gave a verbal report. | PASSED |

**Students’ Union Issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Awards amendment (LoC/JM/AS/NMel) | *POSTPONED FOR NEXT MEETING* |
| Rewards Committee reflection | *POSTPONED FOR NEXT MEETING* |
| Progress Award | *POSTPONED FOR NEXT MEETING* |
| AGM Reports (FH) | Reports are due by 30th April. They must be written in prose and an absolute minimum of 1 page. There is no official maximum. Your attendance and report submission records will also be posted with them, as was done with six month reports.  It was passed at last council that each officer/team must put your manifesto points at the beginning of your report, so this must be done also.  **AP** Fran to send proforma for report this evening. |
| Technical Officers constitutional changes (EO/AD/MG) | EO: There have been times where people have expected a full show on just over 2 weeks notice, I have changed it so that it clarifies how much can be expected within 2 weeks and that more time is needed for higher level of service. I have removed the section that says that the societies officers can sign out technical equipment because it doesn’t make any sense. Finally, I have added in the new hire contract rules. Have also made a slight change to the inventory and that it must be handed over.  TA: I think you should stimulate how much further in advance it should be.  EO: I am happy to change that to a month in advance.  CBr: is the music room societies officers part still there?  EO: yes, they are still jointly responsible.  EO explained the equipment hire contract.  TA: Societies Officers, how do you feel about these changes?  AS: we don’t really have music room access at the moment anyway so if Ethan thinks this would work then that should be fine.  13.2: changed to at least one month in advance. 15 for, 0 against, 0 abstain  10.5: 15 pass, 0 reject, 0 abstain  10.5.1 and 10.5.2 deletion: 15 pass, 0 reject, 0 abstain  13.4: 15 pass, 0 reject, 0 abstain  13.4.2: 15 pass, 0 reject, 0 abstain  13.4.3: 15 pass, 0 reject, 0 abstain  13.5: 15 pass, 0 reject, 0 abstain  13.2: 15 pass, 0 reject, 0 abstain  13.5.1: 15 pass, 0 reject, 0 abstain  **All changes passed.** |
| Liberation Officer (SL) | RV: we suggested this a while ago and this is where the representation officers came from. We decided our university wasn’t big enough to warrant 4 officers and so we used a team of two instead. We also have the societies who work more closely with individual, such as LGBTQ+. I’m not sure that it’s wholly necessary in our university even though I understand that it’s bringing us in line with others but as a specialist university it may not be the right step for us to take. Anonymity could also be an issue for people who may want to run for these roles.  SL: I think they are necessary and to say they aren’t is a reflection of how people are poorly engaging with the university yin order to express how they are feeling on campus. I know of a number of women who don’t feel that the issues they face are encompassed within the university. I don’t feel the representation officers fill the roles that these would serve. Their role is a lot more bureaucratic. The steering groups have had positive effects and if anything that is more of a reason to bring these roles in as they would have somewhere to channel through. In terms of anonymity I think there are enough people that would still want to go for the roles.  GB: this was discussed at the last council steering group and people thought a nice way of doing it might be to have these roles within societies who come and bring issues t representation or E+D. In terms of being under our roles we aren’t always able to reach out to these groups so might be good to have an office that does, even if not all of them  RT: Would these people be extra officers on exec?  SL: yes  RT: Would any current officers be removed from exec?  SL: No  RT: From the descriptions sent it appears that a lot of their remit is E+D, campaigns and to an extent VP Education and Welfare. What makes the role different and not jut a once a year campaign role?  SL: These autonomous campaigns would be run by these students, black students running black history month for example. Not to say these can’t be incorporated within campaigns also but to have someone liaising with student sin those open meetings and bringing in what they want in those campaigns would be a good force and would get people more involved within the SU and to feel that their voices are being heard on a larger scale across the university. Think it would tie really nicely all these groups together rebut don’t feel that those roles mentioned are effectively tackling all of these groups needs.  EO: looking at the LGBT+ officer, there are student sin the university who are outstanding members of the LGBT+ society but are not open about their sexuality. Pride offers anonymity. I do feel that branding the officer as LGBT and defining it as someone who is openly LGBT+ would limit the people who would run for it as it is effectively branding them. Also, what this officer would be responsible decimates what Pride society does – every single thing is done by Pride. I know that the pride constitution is being rewritten at the moment to include a campaigns and events role in the society also, and these are all aims of pride. I worry that in creating a role like this would be really taking away from an existing society as it has so much overlap that it would essentially remove what the society does and I feel that is actually worse than not having the officer at all.  AB: I understand why these officers work in other universities, but I feel that within our SU as niche roles they would firstly take away from current roles whilst adding extra people to exec which has pros and cons, it gives more opinions but makes meetings harder to run and less efficient. I feel that a better step might be for those societies should constitutionally be required to work closely with representation officers and also campaigns officers and this was a constitutional requirement then this would be a good mid-way point. I think it is a bit too niche to be a full exec role but this would be a good stepping stone, not taking anything away from the individual societies but they get more input o what we do as an executive.  RV: I do think these roles are important but it was the student body at AGM who decided that it wasn’t suitable for our university. Members of these societies said that they didn’t want a single person to represent them but they liked that they were community groups that do this, and that they wouldn’t want the communities they’ve built to be taking away. The other issue would be if we had a woman who came with an issue that would stop the work of VP E+W for example. What was suggested was that the links need to be better and the societies who already do these fantastic jobs should have better links with the SU and the university which is where representation officers and steering groups came form. This isn’t to say that we are there yet and we still have much further to go and we should do more, maybe we should poll the students and see how they feel about this but each time we suggested it last time people told us that we were stepping on their toes a bit and they didn’t want it and part of our role as exec is to respect these students but assist however we best can.  IB: Firstly, about the women’s officer, I know that when I applied SGUL is a majority women’s university at 71%. I am wondering how appropriate it would be to have an officer solely representing the majority. I understand that you don’t feel these needs are being met but I don’t know if its appropriate to have a majority representing when our minority is men. Also I have a problem with asking only certain people to run for these roles which I feel that in itself is discriminating against people who are supporters but may want to represent these people.  CBr: we talked about how we have people who we feel already do the roles but maybe our engrained issue as an exec is that we are trying to do too much are were not focusing on a role and what they individually should focus on, instead we are giving loads to a group of people.  SL: we’ve had questions as an SU since last year on whether we are representing the student body well enough and I don’t think we are focusing enough on the specific areas that people are concerned about and to say they are being covered well enough in the positions that are already there is false as the problems are still there and they still stand. In terms of anonymity I don’t think we should decide for ourselves, it should be that we talk to the rest of the students. I don’t feel that we would be stepping on the toes of LGBT as it is currently running. I think there is a place for having these voices on exec and there are a lot of students doing work to try and change the exec and university structure and to tackle issues that haven’t been tackled in a very long time but don’t have the means and spaces to do this and end up frustrated. To say that one student may not be representative of all these people, this could be true, but there will be mandatory meetings where these officers are held accountable. Women students are a majority here which is true but to say there is no issues or problems because of this then that is untrue. This role would allow people to come forward with their issues more. In terms of safeguarding I don’t think that needs to be an issue, the problems would be brought to them who could signpost but they are mainly there doing campaigns, representation etc. I don’t think they’d need to be trained in safeguarding etc that isn’t their role they are just there as a voice. We are here to be a representative body for the students at George’s and we mustn’t forget that just saying that we have representation and E+D officers. We need to look and see how we can tackle the problems that we currently aren’t covering.  TA: firstly, I don’t think women being a majority is relevant as the issues still stand. About campaigns we need to consider that campaigns was a brand new role this year and we chose campaigns because we weren’t comfortable putting it to the students yet as not enough people knew about the role yet and we wanted to established reputation first and then build on it, similarly can be done with E+D. we can very easily for example do any number of these campaigns next year its always about support and getting student sot buy in and engage. We also have very low engagement with campaign weeks and events and elections. It is really disheartening to have such poor engagement as an officer. I wouldn’t want to saturate it even more but would rather try and tackle the issues are they are at the moment and then If that doesn’t work reconsider. I agree about self-defining, I think you are most likely to understand the issues if you are experiencing them yourself and I also wanted to comment that I don’t think Pride, even if it has taken more of a social responsibility this year I don’t think it always has to will be for example the gender neutral toilets. We also have dignity advisors who are not well used at all but are there to address all these issues. These are more strongly supported by the university. I think if we can come at it from both sides then that would be good, and if still net year these things weren’t all being covered then maybe that’s the point at which we should reconsider. I don’t think saying campaigns aren’t well covered enough isn’t fair as its their first year.  SL: I didn’t know that it was the first year of campaigns. I think that it would be good to have campaigns all students want celebrating but also smaller more niche ones which aren’t currently recognized by the wider student body. I think these new roles would allow for these campaigns to be explored more.  BA: Lucy and I went to the NUS conference at the beginning of the year as campaigns officers and we sat in a number of sessions which covered these protected groups and there were these separate officers there and we did wonder why we didn’t have those officers here. The number of people affected by these things is the same in proportion at other universities but as we are so much smaller in my opinion we don’t warrant having a whole role dedicated to tis – but that’s not to say their opinions etc are any less important. We have emailed out asking for anyone who wanted to be involve to get involved and they did. Looking back on the year a lot of what we’ve done is finding our feet and then it can be grown on. If you compare our tow campaigns the second one went so much better than the first as we had learnt how to do it. Next year for campaigns it is something we would really put in our handover to contact these societies and to get them really involve din campaigns. We did send an email at the beginning of the year saying that if anyone wanted our help on their own campaigns but haven’t had that much interest but this may just be as campaigns is a new role but next year hopefully with the right contact etc then this can be improved upon. I also agree with Tanisha that we are saturated with campaigns and this decreases engagement. If we were to have less but more then that is more powerful than having loads of poorly run campaigns.  GB: as Ruth said we asked two years ago and we asked against the steering group and people still have the same ideas and they don’t feel that being so small we wont have enough impact to make these roles worthwhile. We also have steering groups that are a place for this and we are equally happy to meet people outside of these meetings. We have E+D, representation, campaigns etc but there is a limit of how much we can offer and getting people to come forward. I think that as we’ve said if we have someone in a society as we do now they have been coming forward to us now and we have been tackling these issues and I think this is more beneficial than having one person dedicated to it.  EO: to Ruth and Ishaan I agree with what you said about the aspect of representation. Whether you need someone with similar characteristics to you to represent you I think is a personal choice, not something this is necessarily technically needed. We have had many contact for representation in the university which have been very successful despite them not being actively part of that cause. Although not all are anonymous some are and I think that’s important to respect, just to clarify my previous point. This also massively narrows that scope of the officer aside form not respecting anonymity. Georges is ranked very highly in terms of student support – if there are issues where people don’t feel supported I feel that just needs to be identified and worked into what already exists.  AB: as we are such a small university we can’t function exactly as other universities function. This is why I feel that the committee society position I mentioned would be a good option. The problem lies with our student engagement and I think that across the board that is something that we as an exec need to improve on and the more that improves the more these individuals will feel they can come forward to us and that middle ground will do this.  RV: E+D officers have noticed this year that BHM isn’t done as well as it should be. They have put in work this year so that it isn’t the same case next year. ACS also do great work for this which is something we can build rather than change. Exec is an open meeting. If people want something changing then they are more than welcome to come every time and say their views, and although people may not know that then again that is something we can work on. Maybe having days once a month for example Women’s days with VP E+W where she has open welfare days for that specific minority so they feel that’s their time and if they want to book out slots then maybe that’s something that we can think of. But I feel that having someone on exec who is only there to represent one thing, as exec we are here to represent everything we are a part of. So many people do such hard work on the executive for free, having someone who is just to represent and does very little active work would be unfair to give them equal reward. If they are going to be a representative, they also need to do something actively.  IB: when I spoke last time I wasn’t saying at all the women’s issues weren’t relevant but rather that if the needs were being met then we wouldn’t have this document in front of us. I am just asking that specifically at George’s how appropriate it is having an officer to represent the majority – in no way am I condoning women’s issues or putting a block on this. The other thing is that VP E+W has a large array of resources available to her now to represent all these people. As someone going into final year having 3 non sabbatical officers who aren’t accountable to anything other than the executive would be dangerous as these issues will crop up. No matter how much we say that these people have to be confidential etc we can’t hold them to this and there would be issues with this.  SL: I completely agree that the work campaigns have done this year has shown they are necessary to reach the student body. I think the problem is created by people who aren’t in those groups coordinating and leading these campaigns but having to ask them to be involved creates a problem. Having someone who is in this groups comes forward to lead a campaign they are the best people to lead these campaigns. They can work wit the campaigns officers but this would be the first step. That would be more of a success than it can be a failure. There is an issue in translation, people don’t ant to approach people who they fear will not accept the issue they are bringing forward as valid. Although they are there, will they understand the issue being brought forward? Having people sit in the place and ensure that they are only accountable to that group of people then this would encourage this more. Think the issue raised bout us being a small university and this translating to what we want to achieve and if these issues are valid or important enough, saying we are small and that’s a reason to not have these roles doesn’t sit well with me I just don’t think its up to us to decide. I think we should take it to council or something again and ask again, because I do have people telling me they want these things. I think there are successful allies there but I don’t think they should be the voice of a specific campaign. The support services in place are good but not advertised enough, for example dignity advisors need to be pushed more. I don’t think these liberation officers support wont be the same as its being discussed. Its not going to be therapy or any official realm of support its just a safe space. This is someth9in that needs to make people feel their voices are worth more than they currently feel. I think to say that we would bloat the SU with these roles comes back to what we want to SU to be. If it isn’t representative of the students then we need to change this, specific issue as are being swept under the carpet. A reform is needed on the way we think about the issues being brought forward and the way we receive them. I think this needs to be taken to council again and re ask. I think a women’s day monthly with VP E+W is only a step and as people come to her once a month and if she becomes overwhelmed and then realizes that this is a role in itself as this will happen because its much more deep seated than we realize. To have these roles dedicated to these people as a force to move it forward ad not leave it all to one officer and making sure its actually happening would work much better in the SU. Their role wouldn’t be just sitting there to represent, it would be inward and outward facing, giving more engagement to students who currently have no engagement will be an officer approachable to by student every day of the year. I think to personalize it I have had so many people come to me this year asking who to go to, and how they should weave this into the institution and it is exhausting to explain to people that you are not the best person to deal with it and show them the other routes which they go through and they are still failed. The only way I have seen these things successfully done, though at much larger institutions, is through having dedicated campaigns etc. I don’t think that having these roles will stop the discussions already had or exclude men from any of thee issues. In its most painfully, victimizing sense we will always fall hardest on women and this is why the women’s officer is the face of these issues in other institutions. In this day and age we have to acknowledge that it is women facing brunt of these things. Think VPE+W can be fed into this in the best way possible in terms of helping them to lead the campaigns and all the things they want to achieve in that year. I think they should have formal training but not necessarily in safeguarding or support. Rather they should be training in the same way other liberation officers are in other institutions, so they know what to do in situation that come up time and time again. Their roles is not being the person to go to but to be a face and to prove the supportive space to ensure these issues are listened to etc. these officers can do so much good in pushing other individuals such as dignity advisors and counsellors to look at these issues and how they are streamlining their expertise to these groups of students.  IB: I think to get the respect it deserves this should be taken to AGM, not even council is enough.  RV: I would like to suggest having a poll.  EO: I completely disagree with what you said about an ally being unable to provide this service. In my own experience the previous VP of Pride who I think would have been the best person at the time to represent these issues  AB: when this is put forward to the student is needs to be made clear that this isn’t black or white there are other options in the middle which aren’t stepping on toes etc.  AS: I think the core issue with this is that there are students who don’t feel represented but adding another gateway to what they perceive as a flawed system isn’t going to help them et their opinions across. This is a door to something they don’t feel will help any way, they sue other routes tog et their help and they don’t need to necessarily use exec for this. Perhaps educating everyone more and making it more visible to support services rather than adding another round-about route through exec would make it more complicated.  TA: I totally see both sides of the coin on this. I agree we need to fix the existing things at the same times as introducing new roles. I personally think campaigns should be bigger with more people. Our biggest most successful campaign was mental wellness week because we had everyone on exec engaging and having been on exec for a few years I don’t think that adding another role to cover something fixes issues. Its having everyone involved that fixes these issues. If in the short term we don’t get these officers, I think there are still things we need to be doing. Maybe we should be asking at AGM what needs to be covered in campaigns for the following year rather than at the beginning. I haven’t had as many people come to be with the issues you’ve mentioned which does also show a flaw in the system. I feel E+D could cover women’s issues more strongly, not completely cover it but better than we currently do. I would be interested to see what students think about LGBT but with BME the university is involved with this but I also myself ran for exec as I would like to represent these individuals and we really do need to work on this, but this may not be through new roles. |
| Democracy Officer (CBr) | Discussion to catch up on what was previously said in other meetings regarding the role. |

**EO proposed to adjourn remaining agenda points (FH seconded)**

**Accept: 9 Reject: 1 Abstain: 0**