

Minutes for Democratic Procedures Committee: Wednesday 12th June 2019

(A100 Law & Social Sciences Building – 17:30- 19:30)

In attendance:

DPC Panel Members:

Student Members:

Dimitrios Potsos (DP), Sabaat Nadeem (SN), Branden Cave (BC), James Li (JL).

Officer Members:

Jacob Collier (Community Officer), James Pheasey (LGBT+ Officer).

Apologies: Tom Leach (TL), Georgia-Mae Chung (G-MC),

Absent: Natasha Twebaze (NT), Nadia Sheikh (NS), Bryony Kirby (BK).

Proposers of motions: Cassie Ulrich (CU), Imogen Marley (IM), Zoe Mackenzie (ZM), Lee Taylor (LT), Jacob Collier (JC), Dimitrios Potsos (DP).

Chair: Dimitrios Potsos (DP).

Staff present: Joe O'Neill (Representation Coordinator), Lee Mundell (Administrative Assistant).

Other attendees: Ed Koffler (EK).

The meeting was quorate.

Agenda:

1. Student Trustee Appointments – BoT
2. Trustee Appointment Guidance Document – Presented by Cassie Ulrich
3. Introduction of a Vet Representative and Bioscience Representative on the Sutton Bonington Guild – Presented by Imogen Marley
4. New Constitution for the Environment and Social Justice Network, and corresponding Amendments to the Bye-Laws – Presented by Lee Taylor
5. Hall Changes: To remove the positions of Media & Communications Coordinator, Sports Coordinator, Campaigns Coordinator, Postgraduate Coordinator, and

International Coordinator from the Halls of Residence Student Committee Constitution – Presented by Jacob Collier

6. Hall Committees Elections Period - To amend the wording to the Halls of Residence Student Committee Constitution to enable a more flexible elections timetable in halls for the first term – Presented by Jacob Collier
7. Riverside Point Hall: To introduce Riverside Point Hall into the bye-laws as an Associated Residential Body – Presented by Jacob Collier
8. Living Out Committee: To remove the Living Out Committee as an Associated Residential Body – Presented by Jacob Collier.
9. Investigation Process: - To impose a time limit (of 15 Union Days) on the initial stage of the investigations process, in which evidence is gathered and interviews conducted, and to introduce the suspension of individuals being investigated, whilst under investigation – Presented by Emma Hodges and Zoe Mackenzie.
10. Equality and Diversity NUS Delegate Scrutiny: This motion clarifies that NUS Delegates representing one of the Equality and Diversity Networks is not accountable to the Officer Scrutiny Panel, rather to their Network. This may be either using the Network's own Scrutiny procedure, or directly to the constituency – Presented by James Pheasey.
11. Annual Bye-Law Review – Presented by Dimitrios Potsos.
12. AoB – Impact Magazine Constitution (*discussed prior to Motion 11 during the meeting*).

Minutes:

- 1.0 The Chair (DP) introduced the meeting and asked Cassie Ulrich to present the first item of business: Student Trustee Appointments (x2). For the sake of confidentiality, the Chair instructed that the two applicants should be referred to as Applicant 1 and Applicant 2, and they will be discussed in alphabetical order by forename. The Chair asked DPC if they understand which applicant is which and if they are happy to proceed.**
- 1.1** JP said the guidance document is motion 2. Would it be better to discuss that first?
- 1.2** The Chair said these applicants have been considered in line with the old process, so DPC will discuss them first.
- 1.3** DPC agreed and are happy to proceed.
- 1.4** The Chair said they will discuss the applicants in the same way they have in the past. They will read each applicant and DPC can raise any concerns they have. The Chair asked them to consider Applicant 1.

- 1.5 BC said he has no concerns with this applicant based on the document they have submitted.
- 1.6 The Chair asked if anyone else has any comments.
- 1.7 DPC had no more comments about this applicant.
- 1.8 The Chair asked Cassie Ulrich if she has any other information about the applicant she thinks DPC needs to consider.
- 1.9 CU said the applicant stood out in their interview as understanding the charitable aims of the Students' Union and its values.
- 1.10 JP said he has no issues with this applicant.
- 1.11 The Chair asked DPC if they are happy to vote on the appointment of Applicant 1.
- 1.12 DPC voted unanimously in favour of appointing Applicant 1.
- 1.13 The Chair asked DPC to consider Applicant 2.
- 1.14 DPC had no issues or questions to raise about Applicant 2.
- 1.15 CU said that one thing that stood out about Applicant 2 was that in a previous internship they were involved in the academic process and made very good presentations to the board of the company about how to make their processes more efficient, which should be a benefit.
- 1.16 The Chair asked DPC if they are happy to vote on Applicant 2.
- 1.17 DPC voted unanimously in favour of appointing Applicant 2.

Result: Applicants 1 & 2 appointed.

- 2.0 **The Chair (DP) asked Cassie Ulrich (Postgraduate Officer) to present the next item of business.**
- 2.1 **CU presented: Trustee Appointment Guidance Document.**

What is the motion asking? (*Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below*)

- The establishment of value-based guiding principles for the Democratic Procedures Committee (DPC) and the Trustee Board regarding the appointment of trustees

Why are you proposing this motion?

- To support and legitimise DPC in exercising democratic oversight and decision making of the appointment of trustees
- To ensure that the Union can appropriately manage the risk of term lapses and vacancies of trustees
- To clarify the responsibilities and expectations of both DPC and the Trustee Board in trustee recruitment and appointment.

- 2.2** CU gave an update on the points at the bottom. Regarding the first point, about the Chair of Trustees making themselves available: that would become normal practise for all appointments in the future.

The rolling update schedule of serving Trustees: that has been delegated to our People Committee, which is one of our subcommittees, as an action from the previous meeting. That will be ready in time for the start of the next academic year.

CU said they have also made the documents they have available, as they have for this one and the previous ones. In the Trustee Board schedule, there is a proposal to include a fixed recruitment time so that all potential appointments can be presented to DPC in a timely manner.

- 2.3** The Chair said CU has put a lot of work into this and has been consulting Joe O'Neill (Representation Coordinator) and himself. Previous concerns and questions have already been fed back to CU in drafting this motion.

- 2.4** The Chair asked DPC if they have any questions for CU.

- 2.5** BC said he has some concerns and fed them back to Joe. He doesn't see anything in this guidance document that would give him any more faith in the process. He said they talked about values, democratic transparency etc. The purpose of this should be more about setting the process. He doesn't see much here in terms of steps – these are just components. It is a great starting place but it needs more rubber hitting the road, in terms of how many meetings does DPC have and what information is given to them. The present document is too vague and value based to be applicable in terms of making sure both groups understand the process of what the Board of Trustees goes through in finding and recruiting applicants, and how DPC is involved.

- 2.6** CU said that as far as our recruitment process goes, herself, the board and HR are happy to make the steps they take available to DPC. She imagines that would fit in with the annual plan of the current trustees and the terms under which they are serving. DPC could then see what that process is and be able to evaluate it.

- 2.7** The Chair said he doesn't believe it would be easy to fit that into this document specifically because of how the trustees act within various things, and especially with HR being involved in that.

- 2.8** CU said they could put the process in, but in terms of supporting documents: they ask for a statement of intent and with that, they consider their applications, shortlist them and invite them to interviews. If they feel it is necessary, they invite them to a second interview before making a decision. With regard to documentation, the applicant letter is made available.

- 2.9** The Chair gave further context about what he understands DPCs role to be in the recruitment process.
- 2.10** BC said that his understanding that this is not set to be a codified mandate legislative process, it is to be the operational side of things. We have in the bye-laws in the Articles of Association that DPC will ratify the decisions of the Board of Trustees in appointing new trustees and stuff like that. He was seeing the guidance document as being far more operational, describing the steps that need to be taken. He said he thinks this is what CU is suggesting: a year out they launch the applications then do the interviews then it comes to DPC. Perhaps there should be something about what happens if DPC rejects a proposed trustee and how that process circles back. He said he understands the ambition of the guidance document, but he does not see it as being useful if it was given to someone new to the process of how we select trustees.
- 2.11** The Chair said he thinks it is important to know that this is not a common thing asked of guidance documents. They tend to be vague to allow flexibility in operation.
- 2.12** JP said this document does what it tries to do. It does illuminate that one line in the Articles of Association that DPC will ratify it. I do think knowing that process would be helpful, but I think this does illuminate that line.
- 2.13** BC said he does want there to be flexibility as he sees this process as being operational, he does not see it as something needing to be codified. His question for clarification is: Does this document have to come back to DPC every time they want to make a change to it, or is this something that they are supposed to hand to the person who is overseeing the application process so that they understand how to go about it?
- 2.14** The Chair said he thinks it is the former. It is the idea of how DPC plays into that role; Trustees are left to however they want to appoint. DPC are not here to judge it - it is just here to review it. The only thing he will say is that bit in the bye-laws about DPC will approve all new trustee appointments – we need it to reference this guidance document, because all our guidance documents will be listed in the bye-laws.
- 2.15** JP said that links into the bye-laws annual review in the last motion.
- 2.16** BC said if it is the former and this is a proper guidance document in the same stream as the other ones then the language has to be tightened up quite substantially. We should not be using the word “should,” it should be “may” or “shall.” If it’s “should” then it is as simple as a recommendation. It does not make this enforceable.
- 2.17** JP said he thinks that is fine. It is codified suggestion of what we should do if we did not do that – there would have to be a good reason for it.

- 2.18** JO raised a point of information: in this specific instance the word, “should” is used because none of our democratic committees could mandate our trustees to do anything.
- 2.19** JC suggested a way forward in the interests of time. He thinks it is important that a process is in place, and obviously, CU and DP have worked on this together, so he suggests the committee approve it, and perhaps those people who are interested can get together and look at how to change it. It is important as a process but clearly, there does need to be some amendment.
- 2.20** The Chair said having this guidance document instead of noting is preferable. The Chair asked if anyone else has any questions or comments.
- 2.21** BC said his issues with this is not necessarily the content, but more so its structure.
- 2.22** The Chair said that if next year DPC think the guidance document is ineffective then they could certainly look at it. Some of the people sitting on this committee will be on the new committee next year.
- 2.23** The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Motion ratified 6-0 without edits.

Note: Guidance document to be added to list in bye-laws (links into the final motion: annual review of the bye-laws).

3.0 The Chair (DP) asked Imogen Marley (Vice Guild Chair of Sutton Bonington Guild Committee) to present the next item of business.

3.1 IM presented: Introduction of a Vet Representative and Bioscience Representative on the Sutton Bonington Guild

What is the motion asking? (*Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below*)

The motion is asking to move the Hall Committee Reps from JCR elections to being part of the Guild itself

The motion is also asking to incorporate the vet and bioscience roles onto two current positions on the Guild, rather than creating two new roles. The roles will be assigned by the Guild Chair during the first Guild meeting.

Why are you proposing this motion?

- To allow the elections to run later in the first term than they currently do. Allowing students in halls to settle in and understand university life before committing to a role to help enhance student life on campus.
- To help improve student satisfaction, and hoping both Bioscience and Veterinary students can get their voices heard regarding social events on campus run by the Guild.

Do you have any evidence or supporting information you would like to add?

- Currently the nominations period opens immediately after Welcome week, so most students have been at university for about a week. It may be beneficial (and may get more nominees) to have people who understand university life be part of hall committee (president and also wellbeing coordinators)
- It's important the student's voices can be heard, especially with the vet school expansion. Having the incorporated roles, will hopefully help keep student satisfaction high.

3.2 IM said this motion is about two things. The first one is about moving the hall committee, which is currently run by JCR, onto the SB Guild. This is because, as the students targeted are first years in halls and the election happen at the end of September/start of October we've struggled to get people to nominate themselves. In order to get more people we need to elect them later. Therefore, she is proposing moving it to a Guild role to enable us to get more people.

The second change to the SB Guild Constitution is to add vet and bioscience representative onto two current positions. These are not going to be fixed to any particular positions. The Guild Chair will decide at the start of the year which two people these two positions will be assigned. We can't use Course Reps as they are purely educational and I think, especially with the dual intake it is important that we get people's views from those courses.

3.3 JC said IM has just made the argument for Motion 6. He is supportive of this if it is something the Guild believes is important. We should listen to them.

3.4 IM asked JC that if his motion went through (about making the Hall Committee election dates more flexible) could they move their nomination dates. Would there still be a long gap between nominations and voting? Would SB Guild have more flexibility if they did not have to adhere to JCR timeframes?

3.5 JC agreed it would. He asked if IM is asking to take that part out.

3.6 IM said whatever works best. SB Guild does not have much to do with JCRs. They tend to run quite separate.

3.7 The Chair said he has two questions. The first is about where it says: "Ensure two Guild members each year act as Veterinary Representative and Bioscience Representative in addition to their own roles . . ." He queried the "own roles" part.

- 3.8** IM said that if they added two extra roles to the Guild there would be too many people on the Guild and they felt that there wasn't enough to do in these roles if they were separate. Someone from Junior Ents said they would be happy to take on the Biosciences role in addition to their existing duties, and the Vice Chair said they would take on the Vet role, and we felt it would work better like that, if people were happy to take on that extra responsibility.
- 3.9** The Chair asked if IM was okay with the possibility that someone representing either of these roles might not be from the specific school.
- 3.10** IM said that would be fine. People tend to stick their own schools. It is a possibility, but she does not believe it would be an issue.
- 3.11** The Chair said he only other issue is where is says "Hall President," which suggests they are representing JCR rather than the Guild.
- 3.12** IM said she would be happy to change the wording.
- 3.13** DPC discussed what appropriate wording to use.
- 3.14** DPC decided to make "Be part of Guild not hall committee" to be first bullet point in the description of Hall President. They also decided to change the wording to: "Be part of Guild not Hall Committee (JCR)."
- 3.15** JP asked if this should have to go through some form of general meeting at Sutton Bonington.
- 3.16** IM said they have discussed it in two Guild meetings. Everyone has voted it in. Five of the Guild members from this year are also continuing next year.
- 3.17** The Chair asked DPC if they have any other questions or comments.
- 3.18** The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Motion ratified 6-0 with minor edit/s.

Summary of edits:

- **Chapter 3.3 Officer Job Descriptions.** For the Hall President role description, make "Be part of Guild not hall committee" the first bullet point, capatilise "Hall Committee" and add "(JCR)" on the end of this point, i.e. "Be part of Guild not Hall Committee (JCR)"
- 4.0** The Chair (DP) asked Lee Taylor (ESJ Officer elect) to present the next item of business.
- 4.1** LT presented: **New Constitution for the Environment and Social Justice Network, and corresponding Amendments to the Bye-Laws**

What is the motion asking? (Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below)

- New constitution for the ESJ Network
 - Revisions and clarifications to the aims and objectives
 - Revised committee structure
 - New structure for events, campaigns, and socials
 - Revision to structure of General Meetings
 - Revision of individual and student group membership
- Amendments to the Bye-Laws of the Union
 - Create the ESJ Network within the Bye-Laws, as all other networks are
 - Revise mentions of the network to a consistent naming structure (Network is defined as Environment and Social Justice Network, yet previously this name was used interchangeably with Environmental and Social Justice Network)

Why are you proposing this motion?

The current constitution of the ESJ Network is very weak, with poorly defined aims and objectives and a poor committee structure. The ESJ Network has effectively been non-existent for the past year, and the network is in dire need of reform. In its current state, the ESJ Network is not even capable of holding a committee meeting, let alone an AGM.

The Bye-Laws of the Union define all other networks, bar the ESJ Network. The amendment will allow the Constitution to act as more of a guidance document for the Network than the creating document which it currently acts as.

Do you have any evidence or supporting information you would like to add?

Message from the current Co-Chair: “nope we have never had a meeting and there was never even one that was meant to happen! literally nothing was planned and the elections were only open in march when everything should have been decided in September. ... That led to a lot of things either not happening or being severely delayed... Also v much focused on science / nature / waste when I think a big part of the ESJ network is connecting with people too and integrating into everyday life & looking from a social perspective - which was not very apparent! we do have a group chat but was only really for sustainability week and was never really used.”

4.2 The Chair said to LT that he has a few questions. He assumes that LT has considered keeping it separate from the equality and diversity networks, because he has written it separate here.

4.3 LT confirmed he had. He added that the ESJ Network, with the remit of social justice, almost needs to help coordinate and collaborate with the equality and diversity networks, but it isn't one of them in itself, especially as it doesn't have a defined

constituency. The ESJ Network is for everyone who is interested. It is for the entire student body.

- 4.4** The Chair referred to Page 44 of the bye-laws, under section “Part-Time Officer Roles” Point 16.ii [the proposed addition to the bye-laws] “This Network shall be outlined in the relevant Guidance Document.” This guidance document does not exist. He suggests changing “Guidance Document” into the “ESJ Constitution.” That way it is mentioned in the bye-laws and they don’t have to worry about it.
- 4.5** DPC agreed.
- 4.6** LT pointed out a spelling mistake.
- 4.7** Checked and corrected.
- 4.8** The Chair also wants to double-check that all the groups mentioned in Appendix A have agreed to be under the ESJ Network.
- 4.9** LT said some of them have, some have not. Appendix A as it is defined can be amended by the Network itself without going through this sort of process [DPC].
- 4.10** The Chair said it seems odd to have it as a separate document instead of having it at the end of the constitution. He recommends it being part of the constitution so that it is all in one document.
- 4.11** LT agreed.
- 4.12** JP said he would suggest that the appendix starts as blank.
- 4.13** LT said some of the groups have agreed to be listed.
- 4.14** JP said but they haven’t gone through the process outlined in the constitution, and the process is there for a reason.
- 4.15** LT said that the ones that agreed to be on it have gone through the same style of process. He added that unfortunately, until they populate that appendix with those members, it isn’t possible to hold it in a similar way. Through the summer he will be contacting societies that are interested and getting them to join, and then the network will be there.
- 4.16** BC said he doesn’t see any harm in having them listed and if they don’t join they can be taken out.
- 4.17** JP said he feels that this suggests they have joined. He said nothing aligns them officially with the ESJ Network, which is an issue.

4.18 LT said they could take out all the groups etc. that haven't agreed to be on the list. It is only a few that have agreed to be on so far.

4.19 DPC agreed.

4.20 Summary of Societies and Other Groups to remain listed in Appendix A (all other societies and groups to be removed):

Societies:

Sustainability Society

Pro Bono Society

Other Groups:

Enactus Nottingham

Foodprint

Ucycle

4.21 The Chair said he would also suggest, with regard to meeting requirements, you could enter a line about sending apologies to the Chair, which is common practice in many of these documents. The way it is now, if they do not attend they could be punished even if they have sent apologies.

4.22 JP asked if that at the bottom of Section 6 in the ESJ Constitution.

4.23 The Chair confirmed it is 6.4.i. Suggested addition wording at the end of this point is: "or submit reasonable apologies to the Chair."

4.24 DPC agreed.

4.25 The Chair referred to 8.4 and queried the use of the comma.

4.26 Short discussion.

4.27 No changes made.

4.28 The Chair referred to 10.1 where it says "The ESJ Officer." He said the ESJ Officer isn't mentioned elsewhere unless begin defined as the Chair. He doesn't think it is right to reference the ESJ Officer here when the Chair is the same person.

4.29 LT happy to make that change.

4.30 BC said it is a defined term, though.

4.31 The Chair agreed but added it is the only time the ESJ Officer is mentioned anywhere.

- 4.32** DPC agreed to the change.
- 4.33** The Chair said there is a duplication of the definition of Group Membership [2.4 and 5.1]. He asked LT if he would like to remove one.
- 4.34** BC proposed an amendment. For 5.1, replaced “student groups, such as projects, networks, and societies” with “Group Members as defined in 2.4”, and delete Point 5.1.i in its entirety.
- 4.35** DPC and LT agreed to the proposed change.
- 4.36** The Chair suggested adding a definition about “General Meeting”. It would be a new point, 2.11: “General Meeting shall refer to a General Meeting of the Network”.
- 4.37** DPC discussed and agreed the proposed new point.
- 4.38** The Chair asked DPC if they have any other questions or comments.
- 4.39** DPC had no more questions or comments.
- 4.40** The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Motion ratified 5 (for) – 1 (abstention) – 0 (against) with edits.

Summary of edits to ESJ Constitution:

- **New point to be added. 2.11 ‘General Meeting’ shall refer to a General Meeting of the Network.**
- **Point 5.1. Delete “student groups, such as projects, networks, and societies” from the end of the point and replace with “Group Members as defined in 2.4.**
- **Point 5.1.i. Delete in its entirety.**
- **Point 6.4.i. Insert “or submit reasonable apologies to the Chair” on the end of this point.**
- **Point 10.1. Replace “ESJ Officer” with “Chair”.**
- **The separate document “Appendix A” is to be added to the foot of the constitution. All listed societies are to be deleted with the exception of, Sustainability Society, and Pro Bono Society. All listed outer groups to be deleted with the exception of, Enactus Nottingham, Foodprint, and Ucycle.**

Summary of edits to the bye-laws:

- **Page 45, Point 16.ii. Replace “Guidance Document” with “Constitution”.**

- 5.0** The Chair (DP) asked Jacob Collier (Community Officer) to present the next item of business.

5.1 JC presented: Hall Changes: To remove the positions of Media & Communications Coordinator, Sports Coordinator, Campaigns Coordinator, Postgraduate Coordinator, and International Coordinator from the Halls of Residence Student Committee Constitution.

What is the motion asking? (*Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below*)

To remove the positions of Media and Communications Coordinator, Sports Coordinator, Campaigns Coordinator, Postgraduate Coordinator, International Coordinator from Hall Constitutions.

Why are you proposing this motion?

This motion would streamline hall committees to five roles President, Treasurer, Events (x2) and Wellbeing.

A survey was run with hall committee members this year (2018-19) in which 58 respondents took part out of 152. The roles of President, Treasurer, Events and Wellbeing were ranked as essential to the functioning of a committee. Those roles that had the most responses to 'not required' were Sports, Campaigns and Postgraduate. All other roles were deemed nice to have but not essential to the functioning of a committee; Campaigns fell between the 'useful' and 'not required' bracket.

In election periods the Students' Union has struggled to recruit full committees, often needing to go to co-option to fill places. It adds value to the committee and ensures the hall has the best representation if these spots are filled as quickly as possible.

For 2019, a new partnership with UoN Sport has been brokered to improve the IMS offer to halls. This will involve budget automatically allocated at the beginning of the year to pay for IMS fees and then all activity being coordinated by UoN Sport, rather than a variation across different halls. This new system means the Sports Coordinator would be effectively redundant.

Do you have any evidence or supporting information you would like to add?

The Students' Union will be reviewing the current JCR system under the Democracy Review. It would not be appropriate for us to make wide-scale changes at this moment in time, but we can consider changes which we hope will ensure the efficient running of the hall committees.

5.2 The Chair said he is happy with that and thinks JC has done a good job.

5.3 JP asked JC if he chased this up with Presidents' Committee (Prescom).

- 5.4 JC said they did send out an email but obviously, because it was exam time, they weren't able to get a Prescom meeting to approve this, but it has gone out to all Hall Committees giving every single President of every single Hall Committee a chance to have their input. Obviously, it is for DPC to decide. DPC has the authority to make these decisions if it believes a change will make governance more effective.
- 5.5 JC clarified which positions will remain in Hall Committees: President, Treasurer, two Events Coordinators and a Wellbeing Coordinator. From the insight gathered these are the positions that are still required and have a clear purpose.
- 5.6 JP asked for clarification that the Hall Committees share one constitution.
- 5.7 JC said that is correct. This proposed change would affect all Hall Committees.
- 5.8 The Chair said he likes this. He has lived in halls for two years and the committee in his hall has never been filled. This is a positive change. He asked if anyone else has any comments or questions.
- 5.9 Cassie O'boyle (Education Officer) asked JC if he has checked the bye-laws, because she thinks this might impact Sports Exec as well.
- 5.10 JC said they need to know if they are approving this first.
- 5.11 JON said the make-up of the Sports Executive Committee is defined on page 21 of the bye-laws, Point 3.
- 5.14 The Chair said they could add an amendment to this.
- 5.15 BC said the Chair could propose an amendment to the main motion to make all necessary changes in accordance with this.
- 5.16 The Chair said changes have to be specific.
- 5.17 The Chair asked DPC to vote on this motion first.
- Result: Motion ratified 4 (for) – 2 (abstentions) – 0 (against) without any edits.**
- 5.18 The Chair asked if DPC want the other changes to be added as a motion for later in this meeting.
- 5.19 JP asked if they could approve as a required cosmetic change to the bye-laws.
- 5.20 BC said it is a change in spirit with what they have already agreed.
- 5.21 The Chair agreed.

Action: To update the bye-laws – and specifically any impact on the make-up of Hall Committees – in line with the ratified motion above.

6.0 The Chair (DP) asked Jacob Collier (Community Officer) to present the next item of business.

6.1 JC presented: Hall Committees Elections Period - To amend the wording to the Halls of Residence Student Committee Constitution to enable a more flexible elections timetable in halls for the first term.

What is the motion asking? (Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below)

To amend the wording the Hall constitutions to enable a more flexible elections timetable in halls for the first term.

Why are you proposing this motion?

Feedback from students tells us that elections for Hall committees are too soon at the start of term. In 2018, they were held the first week after the start of term which did not give students enough time to adjust to their new environment before being thrown into the election.

By adjusting this wording we have more flexibility to hold the elections later but still within the first term which we hope will increase engagement – as students will know more people in their hall and communications will not be mixed up with Welcome.

This amendment will allow us to hold elections on our current proposal: which would be three weeks after the start of term, and link to our new SU activity as part of Chapter 1.

6.2 The Chair said he has an issue with Point 6.4 of the Halls of Residence Student Committee Constitution. He also asked what happens in the meantime, before any Hall Committees are elected.

6.3 JC said there is a new Chapter 1 Programme that is being introduced. It was the 2-8 Week Programme, which the University ran, albeit not very successfully, but the Students' Union is going to be doing activity throughout this week. We've got members of Hall Exec – people who were on Hall Committees this year – and they are going to be doing activities in their halls. They will be going out and speaking to students about their own experiences on Hall Committees, along with our Student Living team, and answering any questions students might have. There is going to be a lot more activity around this next year to ensure we get as many nominations as possible.

- 6.4 The Chair said his only concern is that although this is an event that is happening now, what if that changes in the future. He is concerned that if there is not an active committee and there is no longer an event, these students might be left behind.
- 6.5 JC asked the Chair what he meant by changes.
- 6.6 The Chair said what if they run an event but it is not enshrined in the bye-laws. The event might not happen in future years and there might be nothing else in its place. How do we ensure those students are looked after?
- 6.7 JC said this change does not majorly shift the election period from where it is at present. It will probably push it back about two weeks. It is not a major change; it is just giving that extra flexibility each year to set it when we think we will get the optimum amount of student engagement.
- 6.8 BC clarified that there are currently two election periods in the first term. He said he likes this, because it does give more flexibility to when the elections can be run.
- 6.9 The Chair referred to Point 6.4 (a) in Halls Constitution and said it needs to be reworded because Election Period 2 is in Term 1.
- 6.10 DPC discussed alternative wording.
- 6.11 DPC agreed to amend Point 6.4 (a) so that it now reads: “Any positions on the Hall Committee that have not been filled in the first term will automatically be re-opened in the next available Elections Period for a by-election.”
- 6.12 JC said he doesn’t know if this has to go to Elections Committee.
- 6.13 JP said it doesn’t. It will just be looked after by Elections Committee.
- 6.14 The Chair asked if there are any other questions or comments.
- 6.15 There were no more questions or comments.
- 6.16 The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Ratified 4 (for) – 2 (abstentions) with edits.

Summary of edits to the Hall of Residence Student Committee Constitution.

- **Point 6.4 (a). Delete “Election Period 1” and replace with “the first term”. After “re-opened in” add “the next available Elections Period” and delete “Election Period 2”. This point should now read: “Any positions on the Hall Committee that have not been filled in the first term will automatically be re-opened in the next available Elections Period for a by-election.”**

7.0 The Chair (DP) asked Jacob Collier (Community Officer) to present the next item of business.

7.1 JC presented: Riverside Point Hall - To introduce Riverside Point Hall into the bye-laws as an Associated Residential Body.

What is the motion asking? (*Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below*)

To introduce Riverside Point Hall into the bye-laws as an Associated Residential Body.

Why are you proposing this motion?

With the University taking on more bed spaces at Riverside Point (Unite) in September 2019, this hall will be home to over 200 students. We afford representation to other Halls of this size and this motion recognises the Hall as a residential body, granting it equal standing amongst other halls.

7.2 The Chair asked where Riverside Point Hall is.

7.3 JC said it is just off Jubilee Campus.

7.4 The Chair asked if there are any questions or comments.

7.5 There were no questions or comments.

7.6 The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Ratified 5 (for) – 1 (abstention) without any edits.

8.0 The Chair (DP) asked Jacob Collier (Community Officer) to present the next item of business.

8.1 JC presented: Living Out Committee: To remove the Living Out Committee as an Associated Residential Body.

Why are you proposing this motion?

The purpose of the Living Out Committee is to represent first year students who live off campus in private rented accommodation.

The Union has struggled to recruit committee members and the committee has been inactive for a number of years.

The Student Living Department and Community Officer do not feel that a committee structure is the best model to represent these students, who are spread across various areas.

Do you have any evidence or supporting information you would like to add?

There has been little interest in applying to the Committee and it has been inactive this year. From the name it is unclear what its purpose is – some have mistakenly thought it is for students who define as LGBT+.

- 8.2** The Chair said that as long as you feel that these students will still be supported and represented, he doesn't have an issue with this motion. He knows it is difficult if you take away their JCR as their role is to run events, but how do you run events for people who are everywhere. If JC and the Student Living Department believes this is the right decision, then he accepts their judgement.
- 8.3** BC said he can't think of any reason why the Community Officer can't take care of that, and also if it is looking for social activity, there are other societies on campus – that is where they are going to congregate anyway. He sees this as a good move.
- 8.4** JP agreed, although once again he thinks this should have gone to the Prescom first.
- 8.5** JC said he couldn't hold a meeting with the Living Out Committee because there aren't any active members on it.
- 8.6** JP said he means just the Presidents Committee.
- 8.7** JC said they do have a Student Living Outreach Coordinator and part of their role is to engage with students who live out, and the SU does partner the Off Campus Affair Team, who also do a lot of work around this. He said they recognise that in the future this is a piece of work they need to do to figure out what is the best way of engaging this type of student. He added that they did trial a café drop-in but that was poorly attended. They have to think of other ways to bring these students closer together.
- 8.8** The Chair said that in JCRs the same students tend to be living close to each other and eating together every single day. It is obviously a very different dynamic for students living off campus. His friends who live off campus tend to rely more on their Community Officer. He doesn't think the Living Out Committee has played much of a role in their activities.

8.9 The Chair asked if there are any more questions or comments.

8.10 There were no more questions or comments.

8.11 The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Ratified 4 (for) – 1 (abstention) – 1 (against) without any edits.

9.0 The Chair (DP) asked Zoe Mackenzie (Equal Opps and Welfare Officer) to present the next item of business.

9.1 EH and ZM presented: Investigations Process Edit.

What is the motion asking? (Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below)

- To impose a time limit (of 15 Union Days) on the initial stage of the investigations process, in which evidence is gathered and interviews conducted.
- To introduce the suspension of individuals being investigated, whilst under investigation.

Why are you proposing this motion?

- To streamline the process and ensure that outcomes are reached sooner after incidents are reported, for the benefit of the student that reports the incident and to avoid the process taking multiple months. For students under investigation and those that report incidents, the current lack of timeline allows too much time to pass between reporting and outcome. This results in undue stress for all involved and also makes gathering accurate evidence difficult given the time elapsed.
- To prevent students under investigation from representing the union or partaking in further activity whilst the process is carried out. This suspension intends to encourage student engagement in the process and in reaching timely outcomes to investigations and to prevent the avoidance of email correspondence and/or interviews/ evidence gathering.
- To discourage students from breaking the code of conduct in the first instance by making the process more visible and promoting a culture in which students understand and see the investigation process in action and therefore understand the potential impact of breaking the CoC.

Do you have any evidence or supporting information you would like to add?

- We have had multiple investigations this year, that have lasted over 6 months+ and some that remain outstanding. This time elapsed leaves students that report incidents wondering what action has been taken in response to their report; it also leaves students under investigation in a prolonged state of not knowing the

outcome. This time also nullifies the effects of many of the sanctions we can apply e.g. Removing someone from a committee position in April for an incident that occurred in November, when that individual's term is nearing its end anyway has little effect.

- Due to the nature of investigations and the data involved it is difficult to supply evidence or specific examples but I hope to be able to answer any questions you may have.

- 9.2** BC said he really likes the 15 days. It is a perfectly reasonable time line. However, he will make one suggestion. He referred to Point 6.i., under the changes.
- 9.3** The Chair said he knows where BC is going with this and he has an additional comment on it. He said he doesn't believe they should change "should" to "shall" as it would be too vague, as it would imply that there would be no more investigating after 15 days.
- 9.4** BC said "shall" is not vague. If they are imposing a time limit on a process then the correct word is "shall".
- 9.5** The Chair said that could mean that either they don't make a decision or they would investigate it for 15 days and then say they cannot go any further. What he would suggest is that a decision has to be made in no more than 15 days.
- 9.6** BC said it is not a matter of whether a decision is made within 15 days; it is a matter of the investigation being concluded within 15 days.
- 9.7** The Chair asked ZM what her intentions were at that point.
- 9.8** ZM said that the investigation should be completed within 15 days - and it is possible. She believes the wording is fine. It is all about the staff and letting them know that they need to complete the investigation.
- 9.9** The Chair said we can't mandate staff in the bye-laws.
- 9.10** BC said yes they can. What is the point in having bye-laws if they are not there to ensure that things happen?
- 9.11** The Chair asked JON for clarification.
- 9.12** JON said that you can't use democratic processes to mandate staff. You can create frameworks within which staff would operate.
- 9.13** The Chair said they can have "should" then.
- 9.14** ZM said that technically the investigation is through an officer.
- 9.15** JC said he knows it is a separate thing but they talked in their officer meeting about if something is a hate crime then it should not come through this process, it should be immediately escalated to the University Committee, because we should not be dealing with that kind of thing.

- 9.16** ZM said another reason she is bringing this to DPC now because this is where they have got to in negotiations with the University, with the ultimate aim being that any complaint that includes a crime possibly being committed goes through the University's procedures, because there is no point the SU investigating it and deciding if it should kick a student off a committee, if the student is ultimately going to get kicked out of the University. It isn't logical for it to be that way around.
- 9.17** BC said he has a question about that too, but do we want to conclude this amendment first?
- 9.18** The Chair agreed.
- 9.19** BC proposed that "should" be changed to "shall" because that is consistent language and it is not vague about whether it can or cannot. We are imposing a time limit on the investigation. That is the goal. Therefore, it should be "shall".
- 9.20** JP asked what would happen when the 15 days limit is hit. Do we have something along the line of that it should be done within 15 days but it must be done inside a month?
- 9.21** ZM said she doesn't think that is necessary because essentially if the investigation lasts longer than 15 days then the student can appeal. Therefore, if the investigation does carry on then the student can appeal it. We are making a lot of changes so staff know what they should and should not do in respect of investigations.
- 9.22** COB suggested adding a sentence similarly to the University Quality Manual, where it says, if an investigation takes longer than 15 days then the person being investigated will have that made clear to them in writing. That is what the University does in their governing document.
- 9.23** ZM said yes but you don't want to give staff the option of not completing the investigation within 15 days. ZM said it should be left as "should".
- 9.24** JP asked if this could lead to students being suspended indefinitely.
- 9.25** The Chair said that is a different issue.
- 9.26** JP said it ties in with "should" or "shall".
- 9.27** BC said once again this is just about the investigation. Under general circumstances, you would have the investigation completed within 15 Union Days and then a decision rendered upon that – on 10 Union Days or something.
- 9.28** ZM clarified that in Point 6 the investigation process and the investigation are different. The investigation process is the whole investigation of the issue, plus the panel, plus the possible appeal panel. Whereas the investigation specifically refers to the student being interviewed and all the information gathered. The 15 days refers only specifically to the information gathering stage.

- 9.29** BC asked if that is reflected in that language, because if you want the disciplinary procedure to be wrapped up within, for example, 20 days, then it should say that. The reading of this is that you have to complete your fact-finding within 15 days.
- 9.30** ZM gave more context. She said that at the moment the fact finding can take any length of time - there is no limit on it. Whereas the rest of the rest of the investigation process has specific time limits. We specified 15 days so that it was clear the first part has to be completed within 15 days. We spoke to Martine Sheridan (Director of Student Opportunities) and she said that most of the fact-finding is done within 7 days, so 15 days is quite generous.
- 9.31** JC said on Point 6 should we be defining what union activity actually is.
- 9.32** The Chair said that is defined in the bye-laws already.
- 9.33** The Chair asked if they are done with the discussion about 6.i.
- 9.34** BC said it should be “shall”. It is a recommendation, not a mandate.
- 9.35** JP agreed.
- 9.36** The Chair asked if we are able to do that.
- 9.37** JP said yes because it is technically mandating officers.
- 9.38** The Chair asked DPC to vote on changing “should” to “shall” in Point 6.i.
- 9.39** DPC agreed to the amendment.
- 9.40** The discussion moved onto students being suspended during the investigation process.
- 9.41** ZM said that so far this year there have been 16 complaints that have proceeded to investigations. Not all complaints go to investigation. Some of them are dealt with informally. Only 7 of them went to Code of Conduct. 1 of them went to an appeal. 3 are currently ongoing. 10% of investigations either don’t have enough evidence to proceed or is found not to have occurred. 90% of them are found to have occurred. But that doesn’t always mean sanctions.
- 9.42** ZM said that the reason for the suspension is because they have had some very nasty investigations this year, where the sanctions applied did not affect the student at all, despite the investigation finding them guilty. By the time the sanction was applied – because the process took six months – it didn’t apply and it didn’t affect the student. This student was allowed to attend celebratory events and represent this university while doing something that goes completely against the Code of Conduct in quite a serious way.
- 9.43** JC said to add that, if, for instance, there is a complaint against someone in a society with that individual, then in order to protect various scenarios that might happen it is important that we do suspend them from that activity to protect people who might be affected by their presence.

- 9.44** COB said you can't make a process based on the 10% of cases where no evidence was found or no further action taken, when there are 90% of cases that were proven and some form of action taken.
- 9.45** BC asked is there not something in the Code of Conduct about frivolous and factitious complaints.
- 9.46** The Chair said it is a good point.
- 9.47** ZM said that aspect is covered in that people can't just maliciously make up complaints to get other people suspended, because they themselves would be investigated.
- 9.48** BC said that covers his concern in that sense.
- 9.49** ZM said that this motion has been very much led by Emma Hodges (Sports Officer) and her experiences and concerns with sports clubs. People have been investigated while continuing to represent the University at a high level, playing sports and being on sports committees etc. and some of them have done things that are really, really serious. This isn't to punish people while they being investigated, it is to ensure that they are not around people who may have reported then.
- 9.50** BC said his concern would be the prospect of retribution in those committees. He isn't always enthusiastic about suspensions, but in some cases they are effective. With the 15 day time limit on investigations, he believes that is more than reasonable.
- 9.51** Discussion continued.
- 9.52** The Chair asked if there are any more questions or comments.
- 9.53** JP asked how it would specifically affect part-time officers in their representative roles as officers and not as Chair of their network.
- 9.54** ZM said this process doesn't apply to part-time officers.
- 9.55** The Chair said that all members of the SU should be covered by the Code of Conduct.
- 9.56** ZM said part-time officers don't sign the Code of Conduct.
- 9.57** JP said it only binds committee members.
- 9.58** The Chair said he's sure that there is something in the bye-laws to say that all full time members must abide by the Code of Conduct even though they haven't signed it.
- 9.59** ZM said the way the investigation process currently works is that it is only for people who have signed the Code of Conduct.
- 9.60** BC said he thinks this is just for people who become a member of a committee, but all students are going to be covered by the University's disciplinary codes.
- 9.61** ZM said you would sign the Code of Conduct as the Chair of the network; there are separate disciplinary processes that cover officers.
- 9.62** JP happy with explanation.

9.63 Discussion continued.

9.64 ZM asked if there is anything in the bye-laws about officers being suspended.

9.65 JON said the only way to remove an officer is through a vote of no confidence.

9.66 The Chair asked for any other questions or comments.

9.67 The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Ratified 4 (for) – 2 (abstentions) – 0 (against) with edits.

Summary of edit/s to bye-laws:

- **Page 28, Point 6.i. Change “should” to “shall”.**

10.0 The Chair (DP) asked James Pheasey (LGBT+ Officer) to present the next item of business.

10.1 JP presented: Equality and Diversity NUS Delegate Scrutiny.

What is the motion asking? (Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below)

This motion clarifies that NUS Delegates representing one of the Equality and Diversity Networks is not accountable to the Officer Scrutiny Panel, rather to their Network. This may be either using the Network’s own Scrutiny procedure, or directly to the constituency.

Why are you proposing this motion?

This brings this NUS Scrutiny Policy in line with the rest of Scrutiny Policy regarding Chairs of Equality and Diversity Networks.

As these delegates are answerable to their Networks, they ought to only be scrutinised by bodies made of constituents of these networks

Do you have any evidence or supporting information you would like to add?

This motion is supported by the collected PTOs.

10.2 The Chair asked if anyone has any questions or comments.

10.3 There were no questions from DPC.

10.4 The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Ratified 5 (for) – 1 (abstention) – 0 (against) without any edits.

11.0 JC asked if the Impact Constitution Motion will be presented.

- 11.1** The Chair said he had a discussion with JON about it. The proposed changes are not tracked in the document and their cover sheet indicated that they were just making two minor changes. However, this is apparently not the case. Impact have been operating under an unapproved constitution for a long time.
- 11.2** JON said that the changes they are making are to a constitution they approved in their general meeting a year or two ago, but which they never brought to DPC for a final look. They are making changes to a document that was never approved.
- 11.3** BC asked if this motion would be to approve the entire constitution then.
- 11.4** The Chair said yes. It is a lot to ask of DPC to read and approve it now without having a person from Impact present it. He doesn't believe the motion should have come to DPC as it is presently written. DPC need to approve the constitution, but they can't really do it without the proposer being here. He doesn't think it is realistic to go through the entire constitution now.
- 11.5** JON said the question is there anything in your reading of the constitution that has jumped out and needs to be addressed.
- 11.6** JP said he has only read the bits relating to the changes.
- 11.7** The Chair suggested they push it to the next DPC but approve it as a working version in the meantime with an expiry date set for the end of the next DPC [the first DPC of the new academic year].
- 11.8** JP asked if this version has been approved in their general meeting.
- 11.9** The Chair said yes.
- 11.10** The Chair asked DPC to vote.

Result: Working version unanimously ratified with an expiry date set for the end of the first DPC meeting of the new academic year. Impact to present constitution in this meeting.

12.0 The Chair (DP) presented: Annual Bye-Law Review.

What is the motion asking? (Please summarise any key points or major changes in bullet points below)

- Part I: Minor edits to the bye-laws to unify terminology and grammar across the document.
- Part II: Adjusting DPC Point 10 to increase its effectiveness
- Part III: Mandating a review of the current voting system by Elections Committee
- Part IV: Adjusting the definition of DPC to fall in line with other terminology.

Why are you proposing this motion?

- Completing the annual review of the bye-laws by DPC which is required in the bye-laws.

- Part III is being introduced to ensure our democratic voting process is up-to-date and the most applicable to our Union.

Do you have any evidence or supporting information you would like to add?

- Sought input from the rest of DPC. Had extensive assistance from James Pheasey.

- 12.1** The Chair said they will discuss Part I last, as that has the most amendments. He began with Part III, which is on page 9 of the bye-laws and explained that the added point asks Elections Committee to ensure the Union is following electoral best practice. They are to review this no less than every three years.
- 12.2** BC said he has no problem with that.
- 12.3** DPC voted unanimously to accept the proposed amendment.
- 12.4** The Chair referred to Part II. This is the change to Point 10 of page 5 of the bye-laws. He explained what the present point means. He explained his suggested amended and that at present an officer could theoretically change Point 10 and then change the other points they are currently prohibited from editing.
- 12.5** BC said he thinks all of these points are unnecessary because there is no conflict of interest [as defined in these points].
- 12.6** JP agreed.
- 12.7** JP added that while the Chair's proposed amendment ensures the point is doing what it is supposed to do, he does not believe it should be doing what it is supposed to do. It is up to DPC to decide what changes are approved. He said those points on this issue shouldn't be there at all.
- 12.8** BC said that would be a different discussion.
- 12.9** JP agreed.
- 12.10** BC agreed that they don't need 5, 6 and 10, but that is a different discussion. There is no conflict of interest. Officers are expected to operate in the best interests of the Students' Union. He added that electing Officers to be non-officer members of democratic committees is questionable.
- 12.11** The Chair asked where DPC stands on the proposed amendment to Point 10.
- 12.12** BC said he is happy for that amendment to be added if it clarifies the present system, although he does question the need for Points 5, 6 and 10.
- 12.13** JP said that he feels this change hinder progress of the Democracy Review.
- 12.14** BC said you just need DPC compliance.
- 12.15** JP said it does not say that DPC can chose motions, it says that Officers cannot propose them.
- 12.16** The Chair agreed, but the idea is that if the Officer proposes a change, they would speak to DPC first. They can make changes through a higher body of the Union: Union Council.
- 12.17** JON said it would have to go through a general meeting or referendum.

- 12.18** BC said that stuff from Union Council has to go to DPC.
- 12.19** JP said he feels this will just end up with Officers using other members of DPC proxy style.
- 12.20** JON asked for confirmation of any agreed changes.
- 12.21** JP said they should reject the proposed amendment to Point 10.
- 12.22** The Chair asked DPC if they want to accept the proposed amendment to Point 10.
- 12.23** DPC voted 1 (for) – 5 (against). The amendment to Point 10 on page 5 of the bye-laws was rejected.
- 12.24** The Chair moved onto Part IV of the motion, which is the DPC Guidance Document. There is one proposed amendment: changing DPC from no longer be a standing committee to being a body of Union Council, in line with the present democratic structures of the Students' Union.
- 12.25** JP said his understanding is that the bye-laws override this anyway.
- 12.26** The Chair said they are just bringing it in line so it is clear.
- 12.27** JC said that's fine.
- 12.28** DPC voted in unanimous agreement to accept the proposed amendment to the DPC Guidance Document.
- 12.29** The Chair moved on Part I. He proposed that DPC go through it section by section. They will vote every time the numbering in the document resets (each bye-law).
- 12.30** DPC agreed.
- 12.31** BC asked if there have been any other changes in addition to what has already been circulated to DPC.
- 12.32** The Chair said no.
- 12.33** They started with the first bye-law: Background.
- 12.34** The Chair detailed the proposed changes and gave context. He asked if there are any comments on this section.
- 12.35** BC said that including a list of every guidance document in the bye-laws is something they should consider not including, as it is an extremely tedious practice when you are trying to review and relay things back and forth. If you want a list, you can have a list somewhere else. He won't vote against now. But it's worth bearing in mind for the Democracy Review.
- 12.36** Section approved by DPC.
- 12.37** The Chair moved onto the next section: Democratic Procedures Committee. The Chair asked DPC if they have any comments or questions.
- 12.38** JON brought the committee's attention back to the first section of the bye-laws and the very first point. He said the SU is not an unincorporated association. The SU is a company limited by guarantee.
- 12.39** The Chair asked DPC if they would like to change Point 1 in line with that.
- 12.40** SN asked for more background.
- 12.41** JON explained that an unincorporated association is pretty much what every Students' Union was for a while, and NUS' guidance over the last few years has been for us to

move to a company limited by guarantee, as it is safer for your members in the event of the SU going bankrupt. That is also the reason why a lot of Students' Unions have gone from having a constitution to having Articles of Association, in compliance with this change.

- 12.42** SN happy with explanation.
- 12.43** Amendment to Point 1 of Section 1 agreed by DPC.
- 12.44** The Chair moved back to section: Democratic Procedures Committee.
- 12.45** BC said that Section 2.3: those should be capitalised as they are defined terms. (“Nine Full Members elected by Cross Campus Election”)
- 12.46** JP agreed and said this is inconsistent throughout the bye-laws.
- 12.47** The Chair asked if DPC want to make these changes throughout the bye-laws.
- 12.48** DPC agreed.
- 12.49** “Full Members” and “Cross Campus Election” to be capitalised throughout the bye-laws (in the correct context).
- 12.50** The Chair asked for any other comments or questions on this section.
- 12.51** BC said he has a general comment about the definition of conflict of interest to be noted for the Democracy Review. The definition of conflict of interest, which he has always operated under is: a set of circumstances where the private interests of an individual directly associated person or organisation may be reason to have perceived to bias a decision makers judgement in exercising an official power to do their function. It is something that has come up in relation to the Officers and their role on these committees when proposing changes – it is not a conflict of interest to perform your professional discretion. It is a conflict of interest if you are going to make money out of it etc. It is something to consider going forward. If you have a conflict of interest that is too strict, eventually you could find a reason for excluding everyone from participation.
- 12.52** JP agreed.
- 12.53** The Chair asked DPC if they are happy with the changes to this section.
- 12.54** DPC section approved by DPC.
- 12.55** The Chair moved onto the next section: Referenda.
- 12.56** BC referred to Point 9. He asked for clarification if it means that Elections Committee would have to approve the guidelines for each election period.
- 12.57** The Chair confirmed that is correct. They meet regularly to discuss how elections are run etc.
- 12.58** BC happy with explanation.
- 12.59** The Chair asked if there are any other comments or questions on this section.
- 12.60** No questions or comments from DPC.
- 12.61** Referenda section approved by DPC.
- 12.62** The Chair moved onto the next section: Elections.
- 12.63** No questions or comments from DPC.
- 12.64** Elections section approved by DPC.

- 12.65** The Chair moved onto the next section: National Union of Students (NUS).
- 12.66** The Chair asked if there are any questions or comments.
- 12.67** JC said it is worth mentioning that some of the conferences listed no longer exist, due to the NUS reforms.
- 12.68** The Chair said they can leave it as it is and when it changes make edits.
- 12.69** National Union of Students (NUS) section approved by DPC.
- 12.70** The Chair moved onto the next section: Societies.
- 12.71** No questions or comments from DPC.
- 12.72** Societies section approved by DPC.
- 12.73** The Chair moved onto the next section: Sports.
- 12.74** JC referred to Point 3.ii and said they have removed Sports Coordinators from Halls in his motion approved earlier in the meeting.
- 12.75** The Chair noted it as a cosmetic change to be carried out in line with JC's motion.
- 12.76** Delete "Hall Committee Officer" from Point 3.ii.
- 12.77** Sports section approved by DPC.
- 12.78** The Chair moved onto the next section: Student-Run Services.
- 12.79** No changes other than formatting.
- 12.80** The Chair moved onto the next section: Student Groups Code of Conduct.
- 12.81** JON said this one is perhaps a misunderstanding about what Campaigning Groups are. He provided explanation.
- 12.82** JP said he removed the Chair's proposed amendment. There are no other changes to this section.
- 12.83** The Chair is happy with that.
- 12.84** No changes to this section.
- 12.85** The Chair moved onto section: Trustee Board.
- 12.86** BC noted only proposed change is to Point 4.
- 12.87** The Chair explained the amendment.
- 12.88** BC said that's good.
- 12.89** JC asked whether you could change it to say "relevant Charity Law" rather than keep updating it.
- 12.90** BC said you would normally say it is defined by the charities act and any successive legislation or applicable legislation.
- 12.91** The Chair proposed they change Point 4 to read: "The Trustees are charity trustees as defined by relevant Charity Law."
- 12.92** DPC agreed.
- 12.93** The Chair asked to vote to authorise all the cosmetic changes to the bye-laws.
- 12.94** DPC agreed.
- 12.95** Motion ratified by DPC with the agreed changes.

Result: Edits ratified (?) 4-2-0

Summary of edits for Part I (bye-laws):

- Page 2, Point 1. Delete “an unincorporated association” and replace with “a Company Limited by Guarantee”.
- Capitalise “Full Members” and “Cross Campus Election” throughout the bye-laws (where appropriate).
- Page 89, Point 4. Delete “the Charities Act 2011” and replace with “relevant Charity Law”.
- Page 24, Point 3.ii. Delete “Hall Committee Officer”.

Summary of edits for Parts II & III (bye-laws):

- Page 5, Point 10: Do not add the proposed addition “nor this point”.

No other edits for Part IV (DPC Guidance Document).

13.0 The Chair asked if there is any other business.

13.1 No other business.

14.0 The Chair ended the meeting.