

Harry Brooks, Activities & Employability Officer (AEO) (Chair)  
Alice Liu (TL), International Officer (IO)  
Matthew Widdop  
Syed Syed Khader Sadath

Staff members in attendance:  
Gemma Dunkley, Student Activities Coordinator  
Samantha Macbeth, Student Activities Manager

Quoracy for this meeting is: 3. Quoracy met.

**Trigger Warnings:**

Item No.	Item Title	Brief Summary of Agenda Item	Actions
<b>Start</b>			
1	<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>	HB welcomes everyone.	

<p>2</p>	<p><b>Constitutional Changes</b></p>	<p><b><u>Present</u></b> HB, TL, MW, SS GD, SM</p> <p><b><u>Women in Politics</u></b> TL questions the wording of the International Officer role. HB confirms with Liam on the wording. TL: - “Which member of a society would an international student go to as both roles overlap?” TL asks for any other International Officers rep wording. MW reads the CSS International Officer role. SS: - “It divides the students”. TL suggests alternative wording to remove the focus on safety and instead overall well-being and events”. MW: - “We don’t have to suggest wording if we ask for clarification from the group”.</p> <p><b><u>Further Information</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarify two roles and how they interact.</li> <li>- Question if international students have a welfare concern about who they go to.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Voting:</u></b></p>	
----------	--	--	--

		<p><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree for further information.</i></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further information request</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Korean Society</u></b></p> <p><b>Voting:</b></p> <p><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree to approve the constitutional change.</i></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constitutional Change Approved.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>North African Society</u></b></p> <p>HB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “In the past, we have rejected co-chair as it can lead to issues with the number of core committees. But we do have some societies with co-chairs”.</li> </ul> <p>HB suggests chair, deputy chair and vice president as the three possible roles.</p> <p>MW agrees with the change, as some societies do have co-chairs.</p> <p>GD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “On MSL, there can only be 3 core committee members, so we could not set up this role, and it would not be seen as equivalent”.</li> </ul> <p>SM:</p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10.2.3.2 amend typo.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GD and SM look into co-chair implications.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Student group policy says 3 core committee roles; MEDSOC is slightly different due to its transition.”</li> </ul> <p>HB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “We are looking at amending student groups policy, and I am looking at the possibility of having only core committee needing to complete Canvas training in order for audit criteria to be met. Having co-chairs could create complications in the administration oversight of this. All committee members would still need to complete their Canvas training in order to exercise their roles”.</li> </ul> <p>MW:</p> <p>Doesn’t want preferential treatment for groups based on age, as the groups with co-chairs, e.g. BUDS, have existed longer.</p> <p>SM:</p> <p>“We can seek further information on the implications of approving co-chairs?”.</p> <p><b>Voting:</b></p> <p><b><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree to approve constitutional change apart from the co-chair role, which is pending a further information (10.1.1).</i></b></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constitutional Change Approved</li> <li>- 10.1.1 Decision Deferred</li> <li>- Further action from GD and SM</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b><u>Debate</u></b></p> <p>MW questions the 'code of conduct' (10.7.3). GD explains.</p> <p><b><i>Voting:</i></b> <b><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree to approve constitutional change.</i></b></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b> - Constitutional Change Approved.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>3</p>	<p><b>New Group Proposals</b></p>	<p><b>Present</b> HB, TL, MW, SS GD, SM</p> <p><b><u>UOB Khaleeji – Cultural and International</u></b> GD: - “No responses from societies contacted regarding conflicts”. HB: - “I don’t think Arab Soc have been given enough notice”.</p> <p>GD suggests we can confirm when the coordinator sent the email and wait a week for the response.</p> <p><u>Further Information:</u> The committee has no current objections to the proposal, however would like a response from Arab Soc. Committee agree to go for further information and then delegate the decision to chairs action.</p> <p><b><i>Voting:</i></b> <b><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree to go for further information and then delegate decision to chairs action.</i></b></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b> - Chair’s action following adequate time for a response from Arab Society’s</p>	
----------	---------------------------------------	--	--

		<p>- <b>Further Information</b></p> <p><b><u>Ahmadiyya Muslim Student Association – AMSA – Religious and Belief</u></b></p> <p>MW questions the use of association in the society name.</p> <p>HB states other examples and agrees that it could create complications in by-laws.</p> <p>TL agrees.</p> <p>GD states that ISoc have concerns over the crossover over the aims.</p> <p>GD reads out ISOC’s response to AMSA’s aims.</p> <p>SM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Their Twitter link does not open their specific society interest, so does not show expression of interest”.</li> </ul> <p>*GD opens ISOC constitution*</p> <p>*HB reads ISOC aims*</p> <p>HB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Constitution does not mention volunteering even if they do it”.</li> </ul> <p>HB states examples of other religious societies where they have sub-groups and does not think it will affect ISOC membership.</p> <p>MW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “They do have different aims”.</li> </ul> <p>SS is concerned about conflicts between the societies.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>SM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “ISOC works closely with IMED, if approved we could suggest AMSA collaborate with ISOC so they do not compete”.</li> <li>- “Regarding category, religious groups do not need a certain number of members, but they do need original interest”.</li> </ul> <p>GD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “They have existed in history along ISOC”.</li> </ul> <p>HB asks about the response from the chaplaincy.</p> <p>GD says that there was no response from chaplaincy.</p> <p>SS says it could restrict other Muslims from joining.</p> <p>HB says that other people can attend regardless.</p> <p><u>Further information:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We need to see the expression of interest.</li> <li>- Remove ‘association’ from name.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Voting:</i></b> <b><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree on further information.</i></b></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further information</li> <li>- Decision deferred until next meeting.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><b><u>Friends of Palestine – Cultural and International</u></b></p> <p>HB asks whether the group have changed passwords.</p> <p>SM is unsure but states the Instagram account has restricted student group access to Instagram.</p> <p>MW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Their link tree still has old society name on it”.</li> </ul> <p>SM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “We can work with the group on the issues raised”.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Voting:</i></b> <b><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree to approve the group.</i></b></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New Group Approved</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Star Wars Society – Interest and Appreciation</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Voting:</i></b> <b><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree to approve the group.</i></b></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b></p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Look at policy regarding groups blocking student groups from social media.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New Group Approved</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Open Mic – Interest and Appreciation</u></b></p> <p>SM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Writers Bloc are in Activity”.</li> </ul> <p>SM questions wording of 2.1.2.</p> <p>SM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Naming specific societies could be problematic in the future if these societies no longer exist”.</li> </ul> <p>MW does not want specific societies there.</p> <p><b><i>Voting:</i></b> <b><i>HB, TL, MW, and SS agree to approve the group.</i></b></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New Group Approved</li> <li>- Amendments</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACTION:</b></p> <p><b><u>Amendment:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change typo on 2.1.2 to make it 2.1.3 and 2.1.4.</li> <li>- Change to group category to Activity.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

<p>4</p>	<p><b>Emergency Grants</b></p>	<p><b>Present</b> HB, TL, MW, SS GD, SM</p> <p><b><u>Mountaineering and Climbing</u></b> HB - “As the committee weren’t aware of the lost rack, it could be seen as unforeseen”. SM: - “It says that they applied for a Semester 2 grant but were unsuccessful”. HB asks what they applied for in this grant. MW confirms they applied for a new rack, but the application doesn’t confirm whether this is for the lost one. HB says that this could still be unforeseen. GD says that the 3<sup>rd</sup> round of grants will be out soon. In the Semester 2 rack, the missing rack is not explicitly mentioned. MW gives information on why it was rejected. GD says emergency grant criteria must be considered as the group has said it is not unforeseen. GD asks the committee to consider whether it is an emergency or not as the group has still been able to run their trips, and were aware the rack had been missing for a while. MW:</p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> - Contact group and notify them to apply for Semester 3 grant funding.</p>
----------	--------------------------------	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “As an old committee that lost the rack, it is unforeseen”.</li> </ul> <p>*SM reads out policy*</p> <p>SM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “UB Sport cut ties with them this year, and they may have previously been given funding from them”.</li> </ul> <p>SM discusses the split between UB Sport and the society.</p> <p>MW discusses grant criteria and that they could have applied for this in other grants.</p> <p>MW is happy that is unforeseen, but they could have applied for the normal grant, which they were rejected for.</p> <p><b><i>Voting:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>TL, MW, and SS agree that they cannot consider this request as it does not meet the criteria.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>HB votes against this.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>TL, HB, and SS would like to give money, however TL &amp; SS agree that the grant procedure does not allow for this.</i></b></p> <p><b>RESULT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emergency Grant Rejected.</li> <li>- It is not an unforeseen occasion or an emergency, as the issue has been known since the end of last academic year.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Semester 2 Grant has already been applied for, and they have been rejected.</li> <li>- An emergency Grant is not eligible as you cannot apply for something that you can apply for in a normal grant even if you were rejected.</li> </ul>	
5	<b>End of Meeting</b>	HB ends the meeting.	