

Please refer to the following trigger warnings and/or content warnings: external memberships, dietary requirements, climate change/divestment, Prevent, islamophobia, trade unions, UCU strike action, democracy review

Acronyms: ASM = All Student Meeting

Please note: The meeting minutes have, following feedback, been revised and republished with amendments on page 27 regarding discussions on external memberships. Those amendments are:

Amendments to the All Student Meeting Minutes (May 2023): The following points were not made clear in the original set of minutes and changes are now reflected below:

- **Current Number of External Members:** A conversation was had on the current number of External Members. The current count of external members is 83 as of 22nd May 2023.
- **Clarity of Trustee Board Remit over the All Student Meeting:** Clarity was requested around the Trustee Board remit with regards to overturning decisions at All Student Meeting and All Student Vote. Information regarding this can be found in the Guild of Students By-Laws, under 2.4 “Members’ Democratic Process’ Page 15.

“2.4.4 In accordance with Article 96, decisions made through “The Process” can be overturned by the Trustee Board for financial, legal or Guild reputation issues”.

Present:

Officers – Acacia Matthews (AM, Guild President), Izzy Lawson (IL, Activities & Employability Officer), Alice Lui (AL, International Officer), Florie Craddock (FC, Sports Officer), Hannah Wilson (HW, Disabled Students Officer), Chinaza Nwankwo (CN, Ethnic Minority Students Officer), Robin Hayward (RH, Trans & Non-Binary Students Officer), Ness Chigariro (NC, Education Officer).

Scrutiny Panel Members – Becky Hudson (BH)

Idea Submitters – Jacob Wilson (JW), Ismael Rodriguez-Foronda (IRF)

Guild Core Staff – Rozena Nadeem (RN, Democracy Coordinator, Minute Taker), Jane Baston (JB, Senior Voice Coordinator), James Lindsay (JL, Director of Support & Representation), Adam Dorey (AD, Policy & Campaigns Coordinator), Dayna Hopkins (DH, International & Postgraduate Coordinator), Eloise Watkin (EW, Representation Coordinator), Solomon Gibson (SG, Representation Coordinator)

Apologies:

Officers – Reeve Isaacs-Smith (RIS, Welfare & Community Officer), Ben Lockley (BL, Postgraduate Officer).

Scrutiny Panel Members – Jamie Cox (JC), Shreya Dinesh (SD), Ellie Rose (ER), Sarah Aray (SA)

Guild Core Staff – Scott Dawson (SD, Student Voice & Representation Manager)

Absent Without Apologies:

Officers - Chirag Sejpal (CS, LGBTQ+ Students Officer), Madupavitra (MM, Womens' Officer), Maiar Elhariry (ME, Ethical & Environmental Officer), Aminah Saleem (AS, Campaigns Officer)

15 students excluding Officers and one Scrutiny Panel member were in the meeting at the start of the meeting.

Item No.	Time	Item	Purpose
1	12:08pm - 12:16pm	Welcome & Introduction from the Chair of ASM	<p>AM: AM introduced themselves and why they were chairing this meeting (the Chair of All Student Meeting was not able to attend). AM also provided a brief overview of the Guild of Students, and how decision-making in the Guild and ASM works. AM noted that as the ASM was not quorate, discussions and voting for items took place, but the votes cast were not valid.</p> <p>Students raised concerns about subtitles not being available in the meeting. Guild staff and Officers looked to resolve this. The meeting was restarted so that subtitles would be available, and students could fully participate in the meeting.</p> <p>AM: AM introduced themselves again and why they were chairing this meeting. AM also provided a brief overview of the Guild of Students, and how decision-making in the Guild and ASM works, again.</p> <p>16 students were now in the meeting.</p> <p>AM: AM confirmed that the meeting was not quorate, so discussions and voting on ideas, policies and Beliefs and Commitments could still take place, but votes cast in polls for these items in the meeting would not be valid. The items would all be allocated to the All Student Vote.</p>

2	12:15pm	<p style="text-align: center;">Officer Introduction & Updates</p>	<p>The members of the Officer Team who were present introduced themselves and provided brief updates on projects, campaigns and Decision-Making Committees.</p> <p>Officer Updates:</p> <p>NC: NC noted that they are a member of Education Committee and Activities Committee, and that they have been working on timetabling.</p> <p>FC: FC noted that they have been working on lots of Ethical and Environmental Committee work for Go Green Week, and lots of other sustainability work. FC noted that they have also been working on monthly memberships for UoB Sport and the Cost of Living priority campaign.</p> <p>AL: AL noted that they are on Education Committee and have been working on safety for international students, a Language Café event and work on international student visa requirements with the University.</p> <p>RH: RH noted that they sit on Welfare and Liberation Committee. RH also commented that they have been working on a Trans and Non-Binary meet and other events.</p> <p>IL: IL noted that they sit on Activities Committee. IL commented that they have been working on Guild Awards which is next Monday, and have also been working on the Cost of Living Campaign - specifically the £3 Meal Deal in Joe's Bar.</p> <p>AM: AM shared that they have been working on a consent course, which will be ready for September, and work for the Cost of Living campaign. AM noted that they had an amazing Officer Elections, and that there were some Officer elects in the meeting today. AM noted that they chair Campaigns Committee, which unfortunately has not been quorate this year.</p> <p>HW: HW noted that they are the Disabled Students Officer, they support DAMSA, they work with the University to improve</p>
---	---------	--	--

			access, and most recently they have been working with the University's Accessibility Oversight Group.
--	--	--	---

3	12:47pm	<p style="text-align: center;">Scrutiny Panel Report</p>	<p>A member of the Scrutiny Panel, BH, presented a short report on the Officer Team’s progress.</p> <p>BH: BH noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers have generally been doing a great job all year • There has been lots of emphasis on welfare and safety across all roles • There are also trends in increased transparency, inclusion and accessibility • Some initiatives noticed by the Panel in particular were the decrease of single-use plastic in Guild club nights, work lobbying the Guild to pay the Living Wage to student-staff, work on the Community Pantry, and safety equipment in the Guild. • The Panel’s main constructive feedback is for Officers to start thinking about their handovers for the next Officer Team. <p>AM: AM noted that the Scrutiny Panel challenge the Officer Team very constructively, which is helpful to the Officers, and it is always great to meet with them. AM asked attendees if they had any questions for the Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>Student: Question: Do the Scrutiny Panel have any thoughts on how external memberships were handled by the Guild?</p> <p>BH: BH noted that from the feedback that the Panel had collated from the last meeting, no particular thoughts on this were raised.</p> <p>AM: AM clarified that the Trustee Board’s statement on external memberships was released after the last Scrutiny Panel meeting, so the Panel would not have been made aware of it.</p> <p>The following question was posted in the meeting chat: “Is the Panel going to consider re-introducing the external memberships, as it is a major topic now?”.</p> <p>AM: AM asked attendees if they would like her to explain how the Scrutiny Panel works.</p>
---	---------	---	--

			<p>Attendees agreed.</p> <p>AM: AM explained how the Panel works, and that the Panel do not really have control over the decision on external memberships.</p> <p>IL posted the following link to the Scrutiny Panel page on the Guild of Students website in the Zoom chat: https://www.guildofstudents.com/representation/scrutinypanel/</p> <p>AM: AM reminded attendees that the decision on external memberships was a Trustee Board decision, and not just a decision of the Officer Team. AM also reminded attendees that an item on external memberships would be discussed later in the meeting, so attendees could ask questions about this topic when this item is discussed.</p>
--	--	--	--

4	12:25pm	<p style="text-align: center;">Belief & Commitment Renewal – Trade Unions</p>	<p>AM: AM noted a trigger warning/content warning of trade unions before this item was discussed. AM also noted that this item was a Belief & Commitment about trade unions that required review. AM noted that if this topic was triggering for them, they were free to not listen to the discussion.</p> <p>The full Belief & Commitment can be found on the Guild of Students website here (this link was posted in the Zoom chat at this point in the meeting): https://www.guildofstudents.com/pageassets/representation/allstudentmeeting/Belief-Commitment-Trade-Unions-FINAL.pdf</p> <p>AM: AM asked students if they had any questions.</p> <p>A student posted the following question in the Zoom chat: “Good lecturer working conditions benefit students. Lecturers that are sufficiently paid and well-rested will provide better education, and better people are likely to want to be lecturers if their demands are met. And as a Union we should support other Unions. So, I fully agree with this Belief and Commitment.</p> <p>Another student posted the following comment in the chat: “This looks good as is to me.”</p> <p>NC left the meeting to attend an urgent University meeting.</p> <p>A poll was conducted to allow students to vote on this item.</p> <p>The outcomes of the poll were as follows:</p> <p>For: 18/21 (86%)</p> <p>Against: 0/21 (0%)</p> <p>Abstain: 3/21 (14%)</p> <p>AM: AM thanked students for sharing their thoughts on this item, and voting in the poll.</p> <p>AM closed this item.</p>
---	---------	--	---

5	13:11pm	<p style="text-align: center;">Idea Submission – Plant- Based Catering</p>	<p>AM: AM provided a trigger warning and content warning for this idea, and noted that the item was about plant-based catering, climate change and divestment. AM informed attendees that if they felt that the topic was triggered for them, that they were free to not listen to the discussion. AM asked if the idea submitter wanted to present this idea.</p> <p>IRF: IRF noted that they were happy to present. IRF provided background context for the idea and talked through their submission.</p> <p>The full idea submission can be found here: https://www.guildofstudents.com/pageassets/representation/allstudentmeeting/Idea-Submission-Plant-Based-Catering-FINAL.pdf</p> <p>Students posted the following comments and questions in the Zoom chat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Plant based options are really valuable, but for those with allergies, sensory issues, or specific nutritional needs, having meat-based options can be completely necessary. Many students, such as those on meal plan, eat the vast majority of their meals on campus, and meat options available to them, I agree with increasing the number of plant-based options, but I think removing meat entirely is not a good decision.” • “When you say 100% plant based, are you saying absolutely no food products that come from animals? If so, how do you plan to account for certain folks, such as neurodivergent folks who struggle to find foods that they can eat? I think reduction to complete zero is insensitive to certain groups of students.” <p>IRF: IRF commented on the first question by explaining that by introducing solely plant-based options, they would be getting rid of 5 of the 14 main allergens. They want to aim to be as inclusive as possible. For the second question, IRF commented that they are not wanting to ban food on campus, and that there are also people with sensory issues and/or who are neurodivergent who are backing their campaign. IRF</p>
---	---------	---	--

		<p>further commented that they do want to support people, but Plant-Based UoB do also want to prioritize the climate crisis, and that they want to maximise the time that food is available for people with allergies.”</p> <p>IL posted the following question in the Zoom chat: “Is it worth mentioning that vegetarian food isn't intrinsically Kosher if it's made by non-Jewish, or with non-Kosher equipment.”</p> <p>A student posted the following comment in the chat: “I am Jewish and coeliac, and am really happy to be a point of contact for anyone with questions about kosher and gluten-free concerns.”</p> <p>A number of other questions and comments were posted in the Zoom chat, for which AM noted that similar themes appeared.</p> <p>These themes were (1) Consideration of Kosher options, and (2) Accessibility</p> <p>AM asked for these two themes to be addressed one at a time.</p> <p>A student provided further comments about Kosher options: “There are lots of very observant students on campus. Vegan options will open up food options for Jewish students. Some Jewish students won't eat vegan options, they will only eat Kosher options.”</p> <p>IRF: IRF noted that Plant-Based UoB would like to be as inclusive as possible. IRF also asked AM what work the University is doing right now about catering options.</p> <p>AM: AM noted that the Officer Team are pushing for more plant-based options, but are also offering meat options too as this is what students also want.</p> <p>IRF: IRF noted that Plant-Based UoB do not want to remove meat options.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>The following comment was posted by a student in the Zoom chat: “But it sounds like you want to remove all other options that are not plant-based? So, is that not just undoing whatever the University does right now?”</p> <p>Comments and questions around accessibility from students included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “You may not be banning food from campus, but what about students with mobility issues? They will have to go out of their way, which may already be hard enough as it is, to get food elsewhere.” • “I think it’s worth pointing out disabled people cannot necessarily go to alternative venues for food such as off campus and may not be able to bring their own food. Selly Oak can be a nightmare for wheelchair users.” • “I 100% think investing in more plant-based food is imperative, but complete reduction isn't safe.” • “I often have to buy food on campus without being able to prepare any at home, due to time constraints. how would you suggest that people who are unable to eat purely plant-based meals get their food? I was speaking to a disabled student earlier who said they were specifically told not to eat plant based for health reasons, after they went veggie and they health deteriorated significantly. So, I am not satisfied with that response.” • “Might it be better to incentive plant based instead of banning certain foods? Reducing plant-based food costs or doing reward schemes?” • “As someone who has significant disabilities and struggles enough trying to find food I can eat on
--	--	--	--

			<p>campus, having certain things completely banned I think would make my life even harder - I completely think having MORE plant-based options is great though.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Campus is a place for everyone. This kind of stuff is better suited for private businesses. Where people actually may have more of a choice. This will only lead to make campus less accessible. Climate change is important, but out of all of the things we can do to negate our impact, removing certain food options on campus is the wrong move. There's a lot of better places to divest energy and time in, that will not make campus rough. Increase plant-based options, don't remove all animal based.” • “I also would like to raise that giving people time to adjust to new foods is not a solution to the question of sensory issues as they do not just go away over time.” • “See (not angrily here) but what you just said is that "you would be comfortable" to eat completely Vegan food - however I can think and know of many people who would not be.” • “Whether you like it or not, removing all animal-based products will have an accessibility effect, as someone who is struggling. If you force people to buy their food off campus, they'll still buy it. They'll still be having a carbon footprint from it, perhaps an even worse one as the university can't control where external stores source their food.” • “Disabled and neurodiverse people join the university every year. The accessibility issues will remain. Disabled Students Allowance (DSA) doesn't cover
--	--	--	---

			<p>things like getting carers in to prep food at home. Selly Oak, The Vale and campus will remain inaccessible to disabled people especially with mobility issues. I think there is a middle ground but we need to safeguard access for disabled people to obtain food on campus.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Rather than continuing to push for 100% plant-based catering, considering that there has already been an admission of the fact that this needs to be a gradual change, is it not fair to compromise for the meantime, and revisit a theoretical full change to vegan catering only in the future? It doesn't lock people into a position that may end up excluding those most vulnerable from campus or making their lives more difficult, when campus is already so inaccessible to people, while allowing for further campaigning down the line if there do end up being solutions to the issues of 100% plant-based catering in the future”. <p>Other comments and questions about the idea submission included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Expensive street foods are in Selly Oak, not including Harborne and the Vale” • “The food on campus should be able to feed all students, particularly as many don't have any other food options. Also, there are many other ways to fight the climate crisis that aren't stopping a handful of people from eating meat.” • “I'm pro more plant-based options but I'm against completely enforcing only plant-based options provided by campus establishments. When we take socials to Joe's we want to make sure all our members can find something they want to eat.”
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “They're serving all types of meals on campus, so people don't have to look for food off campus.” • “Increasing new plant-based options instead of reducing the current options could be a way forward.” <p>The following comments and questions related to the All Student Vote were posted in the Zoom chat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Considering consensus decision-making, choice is an important part of catering options. A way forward could be to comprise for the motion ahead of the All Student Vote?” • “My main concern is that I think, in the All Student Vote, 100% would be voted down, however, 50% might be passed.” <p>FC: FC suggested that increased increments of plant-based options could be proposed instead of 100% plant-based options.</p> <p>IRF: IRF noted that Queen Mary University worked on increments for plant-based options which worked and they are earning more money from it.</p> <p>A student provided the following comment in the Zoom chat: “I 100% support the idea but you did not acknowledge accessibility issues which I was upset about, you said students should do due diligence. I cannot change my sensory issues for plant-based meat.”.</p> <p>IRF: I apologise. I’m doing research everyday on top of studying and my full-time job. We are trying to make our work inclusive. I have been reading feedback and comments from students too. It is a hard issue to solve. We can talk with the Guild and the University to discuss this. At St. Andrews, meals were plant-based by default, but students can have a meat option added.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Students asked IRF to speak to students who would be affected by this (e.g. specialists on sensory issues), rather than just plant-based professionals and other groups.</p> <p>IRF: IRF acknowledged this.</p> <p>A student asked if Plant-Based UoB would you be happy to amend the idea to the following: "For Guild-owned catering, procurement, and partnerships to go 50% plant-based by next academic year and 90% plant-based in the next 3 years."?</p> <p>AM: AM noted that the idea submitter can amend their idea. AM also noted that the idea would need to go to the Guild's Trustee Board and Finance Committee as it will have financial implications for the Guild.</p> <p>A student posted the following comment in the Zoom chat: "Hi everyone, I also run this campaign alongside IRF and I just wanted to say thank you so much for all your feedback. We really appreciate hearing from you what you think will and won't work. We really do want to see this change being as inclusive as possible so if anyone with sensory issues or allergy concerns could stay in contact with us so we could learn from you, we would very much appreciate it."</p> <p>A poll was conducted for this idea.</p> <p>The results of the poll were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For (9/25) – 36% • Against (14/25) – 56% • Abstain (2/25) – 8% <p>AM closed this item.</p>
--	--	--	--

6	1:28pm	(Access) BREAK	<p>Attendees took a short break.</p> <p>The following links and contact details were provided on the meeting slides and in the Zoom chat for services within the Guild or University, if attendees at the meeting felt that they wanted to talk to somebody about their wellbeing and/or welfare:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guild Advice - guildadvice@guild.bham.ac.uk • UB Heard - https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/student/your-wellbeing/mental-health/ubheard.aspx • UoB Multi-Faith Chaplaincy - https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/student/multi-faith-chaplaincy/index.aspx
---	--------	---------------------------	---

7	1:33pm	<p>Policy Submission - Prevent</p>	<p>IL chaired this item.</p> <p>IL: IL provided a trigger warning and content warning for this item. IL noted that if attendees felt that this topic was triggering for them, they were free to not listen to the idea.</p> <p>AM: AM noted that a Belief & Commitment about the Prevent Strategy was reviewed last academic year (2021/22), but lapsed in the final All Student Vote – hence the re-submission of the policy.</p> <p>The full policy submission can found be here: https://www.guildofstudents.com/pageassets/representation/allstudentmeeting/Lapsed-Belief-Commitment-Prevent-FINAL.pdf</p> <p>IL: IL asked attendees if they had any questions.</p> <p>Student: I support the idea, but how will you promote the vote and get students to vote? Have you reached out to the ISoc?</p> <p>AM: We did reach out to ISoc last year. If you can tell your friends to vote that would be good!</p> <p>A poll was conducted for this item.</p> <p>The results of the poll were as follows: For (21/25) – 84% Against (0/25) – 0% Abstain (4/25) – 16%</p> <p>IL closed this item.</p>
---	--------	---	--

8	1:15pm	<p style="text-align: center;">Idea Submission – External Memberships</p>	<p>FC chaired this item, so that AM and IL could engage in discussion on this item</p> <p>FC: FC asked if the idea submitter was present in the meeting and wanted to present their item.</p> <p>JW: JW noted that they were the idea submitter and that they were happy to present the idea.</p> <p>JW: JW provided background context for their idea.</p> <p>The full idea submission can be found here: https://www.guildofstudents.com/representation/allstudentmeeting/</p> <p>IL posted the Officers’ statement about the Trustee Board’s decision to discontinue External Memberships, in the Zoom chat:</p> <p>“The Guild’s Trustee Board has approved a closure of further applications for External Membership, for the remainder of the current academic year. This is pending a planned change to the Guild’s Byelaws in May 2023 to remove provisions for External Membership as a category of membership. Existing External Members will be permitted to serve out the current academic year, at the end of which their membership will lapse (July 2023).</p> <p>This action has been taken for 2 reasons; firstly, a result of a rise in complaints regarding extremely serious misconduct allegedly committed by some External Members. As External members are non-students, the Guild is unable to escalate any concerns to University misconduct when allegations are made. Therefore, removing External Memberships is the most effective course of action to ensure student safety. Secondly, and following a review of other Students’ Unions processes, it would appear that many Unions no longer offer this provision. Given the rise in External Membership applications which is also administratively demanding, the Guild has concluded that the processing of External Memberships is no longer a useful use of Guild resources.</p> <p>There are ongoing conversations as to how we can support recent alumni, including how we enable them to support</p>
---	--------	--	--

		<p>existing student groups and build a strong local community in the future. We are also aware that some Student Groups will be impacted by this decision more than others. We therefore encourage any concerned committee members to arrange a meeting with their group’s Coordinator to discuss any potential issues that may arise.”</p> <p>Given the rise in External Membership applications which is also administratively demanding, the Guild has concluded that the processing of External Memberships is no longer a useful use of Guild resources. There are ongoing conversations as to how we can support recent alumni, including how we enable them to support existing student groups and build a strong local community in the future. We are also aware that some Student Groups will be impacted by this decision more than others. We therefore encourage any concerned committee members to arrange a meeting with their group’s Coordinator to discuss any potential issues that may arise.”</p> <p>FC: Do any attendees have any questions?</p> <p>The following comments and questions were posted in the Zoom chat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Thanks for bringing this up. I took a leave of absence and a year out, on health grounds and could not get external membership as it stands. I was not on the UoB registration database as used by the Guild for membership.”. • “AM is busy and doesn’t need to sign loads off loads of external memberships. In serious incidents, that’s what the policies are there for.” • “Last year, the All Student Vote showed CLEAR support for external memberships. Why was it deemed democratically viable to overrule that vote? How do we know the Guild won’t overrule any of our other decisions, including the result of this meeting/vote?” <p>AM: AM explained that after the All Student Vote last year, when external memberships became free, the Guild was</p>
--	--	---

			<p>spending money on students who are not UoB students. AM also explained that this was illegal and not in line with the Guild’s charitable objectives. There were also some serious incidents from external members, which is not fair on student safety. The decision to remove external memberships was not taken lightly. The decisions made on the Trustee Board however are all made with students in mind.</p> <p>The following comment was posted in the Zoom chat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “It is worth noting that external memberships can still be revoked, so while they cannot be punished in the same way as students, they can still have their membership revoked”. <p>IL: IL noted that the Guild cannot go to the police and they cannot be held accountable through this avenue if they do not have sufficient evidence. Also, those reporting may not want to go to the police (i.e. wish to remain anonymous).</p> <p>Further comments were posted in the Zoom chat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Students know what serious misconduct is. Trustee Board is not democratic. Students are aware of serious misconduct.” • “I believe the Ball Room & Latin American Society had quite a few members, as one partner was still a student.” • “I know multiple people who have had to go on a Leave of Absence (LoA) for various reasons, and I don't think it's fair to further exclude those from further events because they aren't technically part of the university for the rest of that year.”
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Personally I think I feel a bit safer knowing that all the people in societies have accountability to the university?” • “The issue is that this proposal by the Guild will not stop external members from coming to society events anyway - it just means their presence is then unregulated.” • “For me, I don't feel safe with people being accountable to the university - just because, I don't think the university can do anything other than just say 'we are taking away your membership’” <p>IL: IL explained that the Guild are are still looking into mitigations and exceptions for students on a Leave of Absence, and that it may be a little strong to say that it is the plan to have a definitive exception for these members. IL explained that it is the intention to have a plan, but that the Guild are still working out the parameters of such exceptions.</p> <p>The following questions were posted in the Zoom chat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “What would a reasonable fee for external membership be?” • “Are there any values for how much it actually costs to handle external memberships?” • “We could have another vote over charging a minimal fee.” <p>IL: IL noted that the Guild cannot charge a fee for external memberships, due to the All Student Vote last year.</p> <p>Student: Comment: That feels like we were insufficiently informed at the point of the vote last year.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>A student posted the following comment in the Zoom chat:</p> <p>“One of the largest problems I have with this is that it feels like the Guild just moving the problem elsewhere. The Guild could try to create a space where students and alumni could interact, pass on information, make networking connections, and create larger social circles (while maintain their current ones).</p> <p>Students may still be subject to the same risks just external from the Guild without that support network to help them.”</p> <p>IL: IL noted that charging a fee to cover costs of staff time, admin and background checks has been looked at, but due to the outcome of the vote last year, the Guild cannot do that and they are stuck.</p> <p>JW: Question: This could be overruled though right?</p> <p>Student: Question: Or we could have another vote, now that more information has come to light?</p> <p>Student: If we had known at the point of the decision last year that the fee being removed would have lead to the complete removal of external memberships we almost certainly would have voted differently.</p> <p>AM: AM noted that charities have a legal obligation to ensure that their charitable objectives are met. AM mentioned that it was also worth noting that are students on the Trustee Board too, who come from a diverse range of backgrounds. AM further noted that the current Officer Team were not Officers when the vote happened last year, and that she agrees that not all the information was given, but it was not something that anyone in this meeting right now can shed any light on unfortunately. Moreover, AM explained that additionally, there was an increase in allegations in this academic year, the same extent of this may not have been known to the Officer Team last year, but she could not speak for certain either way on this. AM apologized for this.</p> <p>Students posted the following comments in the Zoom chat:</p>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I didn't realise that by removing external memberships that this would therefore stop people committing misconduct against students.” • “I'm curious - as far as I'm aware, you provide large numbers of resources to prospective students and offer holders. How are leave of absence students different to offer holders?” <p>FC: FC read aloud HW's comment from the Zoom chat:</p> <p>For disabled students there are three main areas of concerns I've been hearing over and over again:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. External memberships are used by carers. 2. Affects disabled people on LOA for health or other reasons 3. After graduation, disabled students are cut off from their support networks and activities without official membership routes. <p>There haven't been any viable solutions raised for these as of yet. Do you have solutions to these scenarios?”</p> <p>FC: FC acknowledged that the Officer Team and Trustee Board had not yet devised any viable solutions.</p> <p>Students posted the following questions in the Zoom chat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Prospective students and offer holders frequently end up in e.g. society discord servers. As far as I'm aware, this is fine by Guild rules, whereas student groups are encouraged to kick out alumni. Why shouldn't the same be the case for leave of absence students?” • “If there are staff for external speakers for background checks, why can't those same stuff handle external members?” <p>AM: AM noted that unfortunately, everyone has to leave the university at some point, it is difficult.</p> <p>HW: HW asked if the Trustees had reached out to other Student Unions that do offer external memberships, to find out how they are able to run external memberships legally?</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>AM: AM noted that offering free external memberships and allowing anyone to join the Guild puts the organisation in a difficult legal position. AM also noted that the only solution to ban them from the Guild which is reactive, and lots of students would not feel comfortable going to the police.</p> <p>Student: I've been to societies at other universities where there a lots of external members and no one says anything.</p> <p>IL: IL mentioned that this has happened and will happen, and the Guild are trying to do something about it. IL also noted that students might not want to go to the police, and that misconduct is a pattern of behaviour from external members.</p> <p>FC: FC that the meeting had gone over time, so the Officers were going to take 5 more minutes to take questions. FC noted a comment about Student Groups and their response times to committees not being great, in the Zoom chat. FC asked IL if IL wanted to comment on this question.</p> <p>IL: IL noted that the Officer Team were asking groups to meet with their Coordinator in the Student Activities Team, to discuss any concerns. IL mentioned that there was a misunderstanding here, and that concerns around external memberships would not be solved just by groups meeting with their Coordinator. IL further noted that the Coordinators are not supposed to have the answers to all of the problems, and the meetings were intended to scope out the problems that groups forsee, so that the Guild can mitigate these as best as possible.</p> <p>Student: Question: The discussions around external memberships started in October, which was 5 months ago, and students have been asking about it since then.</p> <p>AM: AM noted that the Trustee Board have to keep information like this confidential.</p> <p>Student: Question: I don't have a fully informed decision yet.</p> <p>AM: AM noted that there will be financial support for students losing out. AM informed that groups can talk to their Coordinator about accessibility, and if they have regular external speakers (e.g. Yoga Society have an external speaker for which they have to complete and External Speaker Form for). The Coordinators also have to be aware of specific issues that affect your Society so that support provided can be</p>
--	--	---

			<p>tailored. There are a lot of Student Unions (e.g. Leeds, BCU) that are making the same decision.</p> <p>FC: FC mentioned that they have had a lot of really interesting questions and comments, some of which had been answered already.</p> <p>JW: Question: It is clear that students will agree with the idea in the All Student Vote. In this case, what will the Officers do?</p> <p>AM: AM noted that if this is the case, the idea will be reviewed in the next Trustee Board meeting, which is in a months' time.</p> <p>A poll was conducted for this idea.</p> <p>As a reminder, the idea suggests the Guild should maintain a similar system for external memberships</p> <p>The results of the poll were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For (18/25) – 72% • Against (4/25) – 16% • Abstain (3/25) – 12% <p>Students continued to post comments in the Zoom chat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Other universities, for instance Sheffield, allow for alumni memberships which allow alumni to attend societies still after graduation, so there is precedent and ability for other student unions to allow for this. The Guild could consider it as other Guilds have done so.” • “Is it not possible to do the same background checks that are done on external speakers on external membership requests?” • “To challenge of the external speaker process will naturally be the 3 week in advance notice process. Many societies don't plan their events a month in
--	--	--	--

			<p>advance. Can we establish an efficient process for external attendees to societies? (... irrespective of costs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “So what happens if an external speaker came in and did something bad? Are we going to remove external speakers entirely just in case something happens?” • “Have you spoke to other student unions that run these schemes? Just a quick yes or no will suffice. I'm just curious how much research beyond internal discussions have occurred.” • “How many times have external members misbehaved?” • “I know large numbers of cases where students have done horrible things and no accountability has been possible through the Guild structures.” • “What about the Guild of Graduates members?” • “Why was this not done before the decision was taken?” • “We can't discover issues that we'll have if there is no serious plan to replace external memberships. The external speaker form is hypothetical at best.” • “If there is no viable plan to replace external memberships, we cannot anticipate problems that we would encounter.” • “Mitigation is useless if we do not know what the problems that need mitigating are.”
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Forgive me if this sounds very naive but I think it would be important to understand from the victims of cases of misconduct and worse what they would feel would make them/others feel safer/ what could have prevented incidents, as ultimately to debate and speculate over what would make them feel safer feels like we are in danger speaking over them rather than us elevating their thoughts?” • “What information is there about external members vs external people causing problems?” • “If you ask all external members to join a society there will be a benefit to a Guild, in line with Charity Law.” <p>FC: FC acknowledged that not all questions may have been answered, however had to close this item due to time.</p> <p>Amendments to the All Student Meeting Minutes (May 2023): The following points were not made clear in the original set of minutes and changes are now reflected below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Number of External Members: A conversation was had on the current number of External Members. The current count of external members is 83 as of 22nd May 2023. • Clarity of Trustee Board Remit over the All Student Meeting: Clarity was requested around the Trustee Board remit with regards to overturning decisions at All Student Meeting and All Student Vote. Information regarding this can be found in the Guild of Students By-Laws, under 2.4 “Members’ Democratic Process’ Page 15. <p><i>“2.4.4 In accordance with Article 96, decisions made</i></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><i>through “The Process” can be overturned by the Trustee Board for financial, legal or Guild reputation issues”.</i></p>
9	1:40pm	<p>Democracy Review Update</p>	<p>AM: AM provided a trigger warning for this item. AM noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers and the Student Voice Team have had meetings with students from a variety of backgrounds and with stakeholders. • Timelines for next steps for the review are still being collated. The new structure will be ready for the academic year after next academic year, but some changes will still be made for next academic year. • Acacia, Ben and Florie have been working on the review. Acacia and Ben had politics and Guild background, Florie did not have this background, so there were a mix of perspectives from the Officer Team being contributed for the review. • The new system will hopefully be less bureaucratic than the current system. <p>AM asked attendees if they had any questions.</p> <p>No attendees had any questions.</p> <p>AM closed this item.</p>

10	2:19pm	Questions/ AOB	<p>A question was asked about lack of minutes for decision-making committees on the Guild website.</p> <p>RN: RN noted in the Zoom chat that the minutes for committees have been uploaded to the All Student Meeting web page and event pages, but have not been uploaded to the committee pages, due to a delayed review of the Student Voice web pages on the Guild website.</p> <p>No other questions were asked.</p> <p>AM thanked all attendees and the meeting closed at 2:30pm.</p>
----	---------------	---------------------------	--