

GC.6.15.11a

GUILD COUNCIL MEETING

DATE OF MEETING 4.6.15

Author Name: Joe Armer, Vice President (Education)

Author Email: j.armer@guild.bham.ac.uk

Add New Policy/Bye-Law

Summary: For the Guild to campaign and support the UK remaining in the EU

Section Two: Add New Policy/Bye-Law

2.1. Section to be added or added to (e.g. Bye-Law 4 Section 5)

New Belief and Commitment

2.2 Proposed Text (normally no more than 200 words in case of Belief and Commitment)

Add to the Beliefs and Commitments.

The European Union.

The Guild believes that the European Union brings considerable advantages to the Student Body including but not limited to the Erasmus exchange scheme, European Research funding and the freedom of movement for students and workers.

The Guild further believes that it is in the interest of the student for the UK to remain in the European Union.

The Guild will resolve in the case of any referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union to register students to vote and campaign to remain in the European Union.

Section Four: Written Statement in Support of Motion (shall normally be no more than 500

With the election of a majority Conservative government, a referendum on EU membership will happen by 2017, possibly by May 2016. The European Union provides considerable advantage to not only students through schemes such as the Erasmus exchange scheme which over 200,000 students have benefited from this nationally and the benefits that postgraduate researchers receive from access to European research council funding as well as the Marie Curie EU Research scheme. It also provides wider advantages to society such as stronger workers' rights and the provisions for a stronger export economy.

Much of the discussion centring around a 'Brexit' is based on xenophobic anti-immigrant rhetoric something which we should not stand for

The Guild of Students should believe in and campaign on staying in the European Union. No mandate was submitted to this text until it is more obvious when the referendum must occur.

GC.6.15.11b

GUILD COUNCIL MEETING

DATE OF MEETING 4.6.15

Author Name: Joe Armer, Vice President (Education)

Purpose: (Delete as appropriate)

Amend Existing Policy/Bye-Law

Summary: to make clear what our policy is on education funding and to add it additional information about beliefs on student loans and grants

Section One: Amend Existing Policy/Bye-Law

1.1 Section of Document (e.g. Bye-Law 4 Section 5)

Belief and commitments 9

1.2. Proposed Amended Text (normally no more than 200 words in case of Belief and Commitment)

Higher Education Funding

Remove

The guild supports the principle of a public education system set out in "a response to the government white paper" written by the campaign for the public university: [http://publicuniversity.org.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2011/07/Response to White Paper Final.pdf](http://publicuniversity.org.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2011/07/Response%20to%20White%20Paper%20Final.pdf). The Guild views the white paper as a double attack on this generation of students who will be faced by the twin burdens of record public and private debt.

The Guild believes it has the duty to back NUS supported demonstrations and protests, and believes it has the duty to play a significant part in the mobilisation for aforementioned demonstrations and protests.

Replace with

The Guild supports the following principles

- Universities should be part of a public education system
- The full cost of Higher Education should not be laid on the shoulders of students
- Universities exist as engines of social mobility and the creation and discovery of culture and knowledge rather than just merely existing as training providers or degree factories
- Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences make an equal and valid contribution to society as STEM subjects and therefore should not be deprioritized over investment in STEM fields.
- Higher Education and Universities should remain public entities and should not be opened up to privatization or to for profit entities. Public money should not be

- used to subsidize private institutions.
- The Student Loan book should remain in public hands and no further privatizations of the Student loan book should take place.
 - Competition and consumerism are not concepts applicable to the learning, creation and discovery of knowledge.
 - Student Maintenance Loans and grants should be sufficient for students to live on comfortably
 - Student Maintenance Loans and grants should be paid monthly.

Section Four: Written Statement in Support of Motion (shall normally be no more than 500 words)

This belief and commitment currently points to a dead link which is difficult to then find via google. The principles are outlined now in the text of the beliefs and commitments with the addition of further beliefs around student maintenance loans and grants in line with what many students already believe.

Higher Education funding is certain to come back onto the agenda in the next five years and therefore The Guild should be abundantly clear about where it stands on higher education funding and the long term vision for higher education.

We also have a clause in our beliefs and commitments (see Belief and commitment 22: The Student Movement) regarding NUS demonstrations, this merely tidies up our beliefs and commitments into a tidier document that reduces the possibility for any contradiction in the future. This is vital to ensuring that we are reactive and representative in any action that we take in the future in order to best represent the interests of our students.

GC.6.15.11c

GUILD COUNCIL MEETING

DATE OF MEETING 4.6.15

Author Name: Wadim Wesolek - VPAD

*Purpose: **Add Policy/Bye-Law***

Summary: To declare every day a Puppy Day

Section One: Amend Existing Policy/Bye-Law

1.2 Section of Document (e.g. Bye-Law 4 Section 5)

Beliefs & Commitments

1.2. Proposed Amended Text (normally no more than 200 words in case of Belief and Commitment)

65. The Guild of Students strongly believes that Puppies are beautiful and magical creatures as well as a great way of allowing members to relief stress. It is noted that in ideal world every member should have a puppy (on opt out basis) for cuddles, hugs and de-stress purposes. The Guild therefore should endeavour to hold at least one Ultimate Puppy Day during winter and summer exam period for students to attend. In addition, every day in the Guild of Students shall be an Honorary Puppy Day (no puppies needed) where love for puppies encouraged shall be shared among members.

Section Four: Written Statement in Support of Motion (shall normally be no more than 500 words)

The Goal for this motion is very simple – every day should be a Puppy Day. The research has shown that students find Puppy Days/Rooms beneficial to their mental health that particularly suffers during exam period. It allows students to enjoy themselves in the presence of beautiful cuddly creatures (Puppies) and as a result also de-stress. In addition every day should be Honorary Puppy Day because Puppies are awesome. To prove it, here's a picture of bunch of cute puppies:



GC.6.15.11d

GUILD COUNCIL MEETING

DATE OF MEETING 4.6.15

Author Name: Wadim Wesolek - VPAD

*Purpose: **Add Policy/Bye-Law***

Summary: To provide a procedure for removing Guild Councillors form post.

Section One: Amend Existing Policy/Bye-Law

1.3 Section of Document (e.g. Bye-Law 4 Section 5)

Guild Council Guidance Notes and Bye-Law 5 section 3

1.2. Proposed Amended Text (normally no more than 200 words in case of Belief and Commitment)

If constituents feel they are not being adequately consulted/represented by their councillor a petition, signed by at least 20 constituents or half of the constituents, whichever is less, calling for removal of councillor should be submitted to the Representation & Resources Officer

The Representation & Resources Officer will further investigate the issue and arrange a meeting between the councillor and constituents in order to resolve the issue via mediation.

If, after the mediation meeting, the constituents deem that there is no resolution, they can unanimously decide to petition for a vote on the councillor's removal. In such vote all constituents of the councillor in question shall be eligible to vote in.

Section Four: Written Statement in Support of Motion (shall normally be no more than 500 words)

It might come as a surprise to some but in fact Guild Councillors are representatives! (not delegates..). Bye-law 5.3 clearly indicates that they are to "vote in line with the views and interests of their electorate at Guild Council". Now, when I still was a student I found it horribly frustrating and irritating when people who deemed to be "representing" me voted completely against my (and many of their other constituents) interests views. What is even worse is that I couldn't do anything about it. Whatsoever. Therefore I suggest we introduce a small degree of accountability for Guild Councillors in cases where they fail and ignore their constituents (and break By-laws in the process) so that they can be removed if their electorate feels that it is a right thing to do. The procedure suggested is very much a problem-solving one which allows for mediation session to be held before actually petitioning for the proper VONC.

GC.6.15.11e

GUILD COUNCIL MEETING

DATE OF MEETING 4. 6.15

Author Name: Wadim Wesolek - VPAD

*Purpose: **Amend Policy/Bye-Law***

Summary: To make Student Groups Executive an independent body from Guild Council.

Section One: Amend Existing Policy/Bye-Law

1.4 Section of Document (e.g. Bye-Law 4 Section 5)

Bye-Law 6

1.2. Proposed Amended Text (normally no more than 200 words in case of Belief and Commitment)

Section 2:

2.1 All Committees (with exception of Student Groups Executive) shall be answerable to Guild Council.

Section 9.3

9.3.4 The power to decide on changes to society constitutions.

9.3.6 To provide report for information only to Guild Council

Section Four: Written Statement in Support of Motion (shall normally be no more than 500 words)

SGX is an essential committee to day to day running of student groups. It is an OPERATIONAL not political committee. No decisions made by this committee are political. We've seen some of the decisions made by the committee in the past that were tried to be reversed simply because of political reasons¹. The SGX shall be allowed to operate independently from political debates. Already the membership is not Guild Councillors but Student Groups Committee Members to ensure that the committee remains operational rather than political. There is already reporting relationship to the Finance Committee therefore there is a degree of oversight of the activities from the governance perspective. In addition there is usual appeals process from committee's decision that would be carried out by an independent apolitical body. Please allow SGX to do its great work.

GC minutes 31.01.13

There was a procedural motion to take the report in parts – discussing the de-recognition of People and Planet separately, there were no objections to this procedural motion.

¹ See attachment

Alice Swift (EEO) spoke against the de-recognition of People and Planet.

Ollie Cosentino (VPAD) in favour of the de-recognition of People and Planet.

The Acting Chair opened the discussion up to questions.

Kelly Rogers (Open Place) urged the Student Group Committee to show more sympathy and leniency in this situation.

In response, Ollie Consentino (VPAD) emphasised that the established process for de-recognition had been followed in this case.

Simon Furse (VPE) gave examples of groups that can't be de-recognised due to their importance.

In response, Ollie Consentino (VPAD) re-emphasised the need to follow proper process.

A Procedural Motion to move straight to the vote was approved there were no objections from the floor to a vote was taken.

For 47%, Against 53%. This part of the Report was not accepted.

GC minutes 21.02.13

There was a procedural motion to take the report in parts – discussing the de-recognition of People and Planet separately, there were no objections to this procedural motion.

Ollie Cosentino (VPAD) spoke in favour of the de-recognition of People and Planet.

Alice Swift (EEO) spoke against the de-recognition of People and Planet.

The Acting Chair opened the discussion up to questions.

Katherine East (VPW) asked a question to which both Alice Swift (EEO) and Ollie Cosentino (VPAD) responded.

Saara Pokki asked a question to Alice Swift (EEO). Alice Swift (EEO) responded.

Amanda Moorghen (No constituency) asked a question to which both Alice Swift (EEO) and Ollie Cosentino (VPAD) responded.

Hattie Craig (Women's Open Place), asked a question to Ollie Cosentino (VPAD). Ollie Cosentino (VPAD) responded.

James Kendrick (Campaigning Miniforum) asked a question to Alice Swift (EEO). Alice Swift (EEO) responded.

Procedural motion to move to a vote. There was opposition to this so there was a round of speeches.

Erin Lee (Student Parents and Carers Association) spoke for the procedural motion.

Kelly Rogers (Open Place) spoke against the procedural motion.

For 66% Against 34%

Procedural Motion Approved

Kelly Rogers (Open Place) asks a question about what the outcome of this result will mean.

Ollie Cosentino (VPAD) responded that this would mean that this part of the report would not be recognised by Guild Council.

A vote was taken to approve this section of the report:

For 50% Against 50%

Johnny Dolan (No constituency), requested a re-vote as there were some people in the room that did not vote.

A revote was taken to approve this part of the report:

For 46% Against 54%

This part of the report not approved

GC Minutes 21.3.13

Censure 1:

Kelly Rogers (Open Place) proposed a censure for Ollie Cosentino (VPAD) due to the way that the de-recognition of People and Planet has been handled. Amanda Morgan (No constituency) spoke in favour of the censure. She was concerned that the decision of Guild Council to re-recognise People and Planet keeps being overturned. Furthermore, Amanda feels that Ollie's behaviour is inappropriate given that steps are being taken to address the issues in what is a very active and important group.

Ollie Cosentino countered that Student Groups is within its rights to de-recognise People and Planet. Ollie felt that as Chair of the Student Groups Committee he has simply presented the Committee's report to Guild Council.

A question was received from Kelly Rogers (Open Place). She asked what feedback/guidance/pressure Ollie has given or exerted in the Student Groups Committee with regard to People and Planet. James Kendrick (Campaigning Miniforum) responded that he felt that Ollie had conducted himself both fairly and impartially. Ollie confirmed that he had voted in favour of de-recognition, although he did not have the casting vote in the matter. There was already a clear majority in favour of de-recognition in the committee before he voted.

Johnny Dolan (No constituency) questioned what precedent this censure may set. Ollie was simply presenting the report from his Committee to Guild Council. It was wrong to censure a Committee Chair simply because Guild Council doesn't like the content of the Committee's Report. Amanda Morgan (No constituency) responded that she felt Chairs should be accountable.

Ollie responded that he tries to make himself available to help all student groups. He felt that People and Planet hadn't tried to engage with him.

In response, Sean Farmelo (CAO) felt that the emails sent from Ollie to People and Planet haven't given the group enough notice to respond. One email had been sent around twelve hours before a meeting was due to take place. As such, People and Planet weren't given enough time to prepare a proper response. Ollie clarified that the emails were sent by Guild Staff (in Student Development) not by him.

George Derbyshire (IAA) asked where the problem lay: with the VPAD or with the rules.

Kelly Rogers (Open Place) responded by saying that whilst the rules may be 'faulty' the VPAD should use more discretion. In her words: "The buck stops with Ollie".

Ollie responded that People and Planet had been given at least a month to address the issues found during the audit conducted last year. People and Planet had already been given an extension to the deadline to address the concerns. Other groups in similar situations were able to address the audit issues within the timescales.

A vote on whether to censure Ollie Cosentino was held:

For: 38%. Against 62%. Ollie Cosentino was not censured.

GC.6.15.11f

GUILD COUNCIL MEETING

DATE OF MEETING 4.6.15

Author Name: Poppy Wilkinson

Purpose: (Delete as appropriate)

Amend Existing Policy/Bye-Law

Summary: To change the current quorum for all Referenda referring to Governance changes.

Section One: Amend Existing Policy/Bye-Law

1.1 Section of Document (e.g. Bye-Law 4 Section 5)

Bye-Law 3

2.3.5. Quorum for all Referenda referring to governance changes shall be either 10% of the Full Membership or two thousand Full Members, whichever is the greater. Quorum for Referenda referring to Guild Policy will be as stated in the Guidance documents on Referenda which shall be owned by Guild Council.

1.2. Proposed Amended Text

2.3.5. Quorum for all Referenda referring to governance changes shall be either 5% of the Full Membership or two thousand Full Members, whichever is the greater. Quorum for Referenda referring to Guild Policy will be as stated in the Guidance documents on Referenda which shall be owned by Guild Council.

Section Four: Written Statement in Support of Motion

During my first year as President the Guild of Students undertook a huge research project on the democratic structures within the Guild. Some of the conclusions from this research suggested that the current democratic processes are no longer fit for purpose due to the changing and growing demographic of the student population and the ways in which students want to 'engage' with their union and have their say on how decisions are made.

This research was the basis for two different proposals to change the democratic processes within the Guild. Both of these models went to referendum but neither received the necessary quorum (10% of the full membership) to enact a governance change. At the last referendum, 10% of the student population was nearly 3,500 students.

This motion seeks to change this percentage to 5% and keep "or two thousand Full Members, whichever is the greater" to give any future officer team the ability to put governance changes to referendum with a realistic chance of reaching quorum.

GC.6.15.11g

GUILD COUNCIL MEETING

DATE OF MEETING 21.2.13

Author Name: Edward Sainsbury

Purpose:

Mandate Officer(s) or Committees(s)

Summary: Mandating VPAD and ADO Elect to consider adding a Staff Recognition Award to Guild Awards

Section Three: Mandate A Guild Officer(s) or Committee

3.1. Person(s) Responsible For Delivering Mandate

VPAD and ADO Elect

3.2. Completion Date for Mandate

Report on progress to Guild Council before the end of 2015

3.3. Mandate Text (shall normally be no more than 200 words)

Guild Council mandates the ADO Elect to consider adding a Staff Recognition Award (or an award to that effect) to recognise the contribution of a staff member, or staff team that has gone above and beyond to support students.

Section Four: Written Statement in Support of Motion (shall normally be no more than 500 words)

Over the past few years it has become increasingly clear that as a union we are very bad at recognising the contribution that staff make in supporting the work of students. They often go above and beyond their job descriptions to support us... it seems only right that we should recognise their contribution to our union and the work they do. This motion is intended to start the conversation about adding an award to recognise the contribution of a staff member or staff team who have gone above and beyond to support a student/group of students in the guild. This mandate just asks that the VPAD and ADO elect to consider making this addition in time for Guild Awards 2016.