

## Minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Caledonian Student Voice Meeting of Session 2021/22

Meeting held on Monday, 21<sup>st</sup> February 2022, on Microsoft Teams, at 5.00pm.

### Sign In:

**Present:** Vincent Waters (Chair); Jonnie England (ViceChair); Adil Rahoo (Student President); Olivia Hall (VP SCEBE); Priscilla Otuagoma (VP GSBS); Tabitha Nyariki (VP SHLS); River Gowans (RG); Jessica Greig (JG); Christina Opoku Afriyie (CO); Karolina Syrek (KS); Natalia Timoshkina (NT); Helen Bolland (HB); Sohaib Saleem (SS); Jodie Murdoch (JM); Abdul Rafiq (AR); Abbie Houston (AH); Sadida Hasan (SH); Cols Young (CY); Bhavanishanker Sharma (BS); Hemantkumar Parmar (HP); Laiba Tareen (LT); Zeinab Farhat (ZF); Rachel Gibson (RG); Tun Nadia Aminuddin (TA); Oluwatosho Olowoye (OO); Raiyen Mehmood (RM); Afia Kazmi (AK); Hamza Saleem (HS); Vamsi Chaitanya Suriseti (VS)

**Absent:** Stefan Fisher (SF); Joshua Foster (JF); Ghulam Sidique (GS); Erin Rooney (ER); Natalie Lindsay (NL); Maryam Chishti (MC); Louise Dunn (LD); Noemi Buracchi (NB); Catherine Mackie (CM); Georgina Smith (GS); Liam Brown (LB); Sreejith Suresh (SS); Tarik Basbugoglu (TB); Zorena Shanks (ZS); Oliver Wright (OW); Rebecca Lawlor (RL); Rachael Hutchison (RH); David Grimm (DG); Syed Ali Hassan (SH); Reece Manson (RM); Nicola McMaster (NM); Michaela O'Hara (MO); Douglas Livingston (DL); Robert Gallacher (RG)

**Apologies:** Kenneth Heap (KH); Katie Moffat (KM); Charles Gribben (CG); Annamae Burrows (AB); Michaela Ditrichova (MD)

**In attendance:** David Carse (Chief Executive), Philip Morton (Clerk)

**Observers:** Kamalpreet Badi; Meg Lustman; Neena Mahal

Any member of Student Voice, excluding Full Time Officers, who miss two meetings of Student Voice without apologies in an academic year, will have automatically deemed to have resigned as a member, Officer, Department, PGT or PGR Rep.

### 1. Chair Announcements

The meeting started at 5.00pm. The Chair welcomed all members, two members of the universities court of governors, the new student voice clerk and the Chief Executive who was standing in for the student voice leader in their absence to the third digital meeting of Student Voice for 2021/22. It was recognised that this meeting was originally scheduled to be a hybrid event but due to operational issues, this had to be moved to fully online. Members were made aware that this meeting was being recorded for the purpose of minute taking and will be destroyed once the minutes have been collated. Members were asked to keep their cameras on and microphones off unless they wanted to discuss something or present a paper. The Chair asked members to raise their digital hand if they wanted to speak to help the Chair keep order. Members were reminded of what conduct was acceptable during the meeting.

A significant change to this meeting (that may not be used in further student voice meetings) was announced due to issues with the practicalities of using the previous system. For this meeting, a new voting system would be used following the format of the Trustee Board. The vote for 'abstentions' will be counted first, followed by those 'against', then the remaining number of voters will be counted as 'for' the motion. These votes were made by use of raising a digital hand. Observers were reminded not to place a vote throughout this meeting.

## **2. Constitutional Change – Accountability Schedule Policy Document**

The Chair explained that several items of discussion lead to the changes in the proposed schedule. The cover page of this document outlines the main areas of change. Point 2.7 of the proposal requires a separate vote and will be looked at separately before voting on the approval of the full policy document.

The Vice Chair raised a question on the rationale allowing the Full Time Officer to finish their contract of employment under the current accountability schedule, if the full time officers have been involved in making this document, why will they not fulfil the rest of their contract under this new schedule. The Chief Executive replied that this has not arisen from the Full Time Officers but from the previous consultation. This was not proposed through our democratic structures but was to be fair for those going into an election understanding the processes in which they would need to comply with.

The Chair explained point 2.7 of the document, that if a Full Time Officer is removed from their post for misconduct during their time in office that they cease to be a Full Time Officer at that point. The question that is open, should they be considered to stand again at a future time for election. This went to a vote with three options. Option one was that an officer cannot stand again if they are removed from their position; option two was that if they were or entered a programme of study, that they will be able to stand again; and option three was that the board of trustees would have the final say on whether the former officer would be able to stand again.

VP SHLS commented that they disagree with option three as the trustee board would be removing the power of Student Voice and strongly agrees with option one.

HB questioned that if the officer was removed, are allegations proven correct before removal? The Chief Executive clarified that the removal of an officer does require confirmation of misconduct through the correct processes. HB then questioned that if an allegation has been made but the officer was to remove themselves from post voluntarily prior to investigation, would this motion be triggered? The chair confirmed that this clause is only actioned if the officer is directly removed by Student Voice/Trustees. HB commented that there could be different levels of transgressions in relation to accountability, in which case is removal fair dependent on the level of misconduct. The Chief Executive commented that there is already a safeguard in place, where Student Voice votes to remove a Full Time Officer, that the Trustee Board could overturn the removal dependent on the nature of removal. It was clarified that option three of this clause was the universities proposal for the Trustee Board to interfere based on the seriousness of incident.

The Vice Chair raised that the removal from office is the last point in a misconduct process, that Full Time Officers could be held to account in a motion of censure meeting before being passed forward to the Trustee Board. The Vice Chair commented that similar to the American President impeachment rules, that an officer should not be able to stand again if they have been removed from post.

The Student President agreed with the comments of HB, that option two does not take into account complications within reason and rationale. Student President agreed with option three, although voices concern over clear wording within the proposed policy, and what would count as motion of no censure or a non-valid motion of no censure, subject to approval from the Trustee Board before the ability to re-run.

AR commented that options one and two in particular do not take into account the ability of human growth and character development over time.

CY had concerns in relation to allowing an officer to re-stand once removed due to misconduct. The Full Time Officers represent the student body and will have misused the power that they have. Having a second level of scrutiny dependent on the allegation is understood, however it is a concern that the

Board of Trustees could overturn a Student Voice vote. It was commented that if someone was removed from formal employment due to misconduct, that they would not be welcomed back; it should similarly be seen that if an officer misuses their power, they should not be able to re-stand.

The VP SCEBE echoed previous comments and agreed that if someone has been removed from post, that their return could have a negative effect on the wellbeing of the rest of the team. It was raised that you only get one year as a Full Time Officer (unless re-elected), if proven previously that they cannot deal with the level of work or misuse their position of power, that it is hard to believe that circumstances would change second time around, risking the integrity and workload of the position.

The Chair called for a vote. Options one was approved: **Vote: For: 17; Against: 11; Abstention: 1.**

The Chair called for a vote on the revised Accountability Schedule Policy Document. **Vote: For: 26; Against: 0; Abstention: 3.** The revised Accountability Schedule Policy Document was approved.

### **3. Constitutional Change – Elections Schedule Policy Document**

The Chair clarified that if this schedule is passed, that it does not apply to the current Full Time Officer elections that are underway. A committee met last summer to revise the current schedule which was then shared at a previous Student Voice Meeting.

The Vice Chair sought confirmation on the rationale behind the mention of a ten-week period allowing the ability to resign from the role after election. The Vice Chair then voiced concerns over the removal of the elections committee, a unique and important part of our constitution overseeing fair play and ensuring transparency across the board when it comes to elections. The Chief Executive confirmed that the ten-week period mentioned above relates to the democratic standing allowing for the next place candidate to take up post as opposed to holding a by-election in the summer, allowing time for induction and training in the summer. In response to the second comment, the Chief Executive confirmed that the elections committee amendment was sector practice and allowing an independent member of staff to oversee election decisions within an advisory role only.

The Vice Chair proposed an amendment to keep the elections committee, commenting the need for transparency and that there is no reason for an individual staff member to make all decisions.

The Chair called for a vote on the amendment to the revised Elections Schedule Policy to reinstate the elections committee role. **Vote: For: 29; Against: 0; Abstention: 0.** The amendment to reinstate the elections committee role was approved.

The Chair called for a vote on the revised Elections Schedule Policy as amended. **Vote: For: 29; Against: 0; Abstention: 0.** The revised Elections Schedule Policy Document as amended was approved.

### **4. Constitutional Change – Membership Schedule Policy Document**

The Chair highlighted the three main points to review. It was highlighted in the paper that Full Time Officers are defacto members of The Students' Association but this is not specified in the Schedules. The second amendment covered the ability to suspend a member of the Students' Association if the University has suspended them from campus. The third amendment proposed for the Trustee Board to have the ability of inducting Honorary Life Memberships for persons not affiliated with the University but who display an exemplary impact on the community aligned with the Students' Association's values.

The Vice Chair voiced concerns over the amendment relating to suspensions of Students' Association Members. It was highlighted that a student may be suspended for their own benefit and to ensure their safety on campus. Further concern was raised in relation to Honorary Life Memberships. Vice Chair mentioned that they have no issue with the Trustee Board issuing memberships but does not see the value in awarding an individual that has not done anything to benefit the University or Students' Association.

RG commented students and Full Time Officers can already nominate an honorary membership and that it is believed that external Trustees shouldn't have the right to choose this due to them not knowing what is happening within the Students' Association compared to those on campus.

HB questioned whether in the event of a suspended member, if they are still able to attend the Students' Association for advice and wellbeing reasons. The Student President replied that in the event of suspension, that any student still has access for advice, wellbeing and mental health appointments.

Student President went on to clarify that Full Time Officers met to ensure the award of honorary membership directly echoes the mission and values of the Students' Association. It was explained that this proposal of improvement was not to hand over power from Student Voice but to add additional powers to the Trustee Board. It was added that this proposal was in-line with how the University operates in other areas, for example, The Students' Association can nominate a candidate for an honorary degree, not necessarily as an associate of the University, rather incorporating those serving our same vision and values. It was raised that there should be a safeguard in place in the event of a nomination of a controversial figure. Adding power to the Trustee Board will further allow for ceremonial events for life members as well to have students more involved.

The Chief Executive clarified that a student suspended for their own safety would be classified as a 'withdrawal' or 'time-out' as opposed to a formal 'suspension'. University Governance is currently reviewing these terms and wordings and the matter is being closely monitored. It was noted that this should not prevent the schedule proceeding as planned.

Vice Chair proposed an amendment regarding the Trustee Board. Vice Chair does not feel that the trustees need this additional power when they already have the power to overrule Student Voice decisions. It was proposed to delete this from the revised document.

The Chair called for a vote on the amendment, deleting clause 3 that stated that the Trustee Board can nominate independent individuals for an honorary life membership. **Vote: For: 20; Against: 8; Abstentions: 0.** The amendment was approved.

The Chair called for a vote on the revised Membership Schedule Policy. **Vote: For: 28; Against: 0; Abstention: 0.** The revised Membership Schedule Policy Document was approved.

## **5. Trustee Board Membership Composition**

The Student President clarified the need for an additional external trustee member on the Board of Trustees. It was proposed that there would be a reduction of one student from the Trustee Board to keep the Trustee Board at sector level of twelve members. It was suggested that due to having four Full Time Officers and three students, that the board would still have a student majority but that they are currently in need of additional external expertise when it comes to fields such as finance and human resources for example.

VP SCEBE raised the concern that four Full Time Officers are employed and are no longer students when representing within the board and can't possibly represent a student view when they are not

attending the university as a student themselves. It could be argued that this amendment would no longer make the Board of Trustees student led.

The Vice Chair further voiced the concern that Full Time Officers are not students and that the reduction of a student position would not make the board student focused. It was outlined that if the rationale for decreasing the number of student trustees due to the appointments committee being unable to fill the position, that this is a real issue as to why with the population size of the university that this role cannot be filled. As a possible amendment, it was stated that if there is a struggle to fill the student trustee position that we must look to tie this into another role such as Societies Council or Sports Council leader.

VP SHLS added to the concerns of VP SCEBE that an additional external trustee should not be appointed at the detriment of the students. It was raised that there would be more value in adding a thirteenth member to the board as opposed to taking away a student member. RG agreed that as a student trustee that they do not see a benefit or removing a student trustee, rather if further expertise is needed that adding a thirteenth member would be more beneficial.

Student President commented that although Full Time Officers are employed, that when involved in trustee meetings that they are acting as student representatives. It was further added that they were happy for take on further amendments as to not compromise numbers.

The Chair asked for a decision on the amendment proposed. The Vice Chair proposed an amendment to keep the Trustee Board as twelve members in the roles that they are currently in, but for the Trustee Board to consider the desirability of tying student trustees to other elected Student Voice or subcommittee roles. The Chief Executive clarified the importance of law in which external trustees are not allowed to represent any individual group and must act in the best interest of the charity.

VP SHLS asked whether student trustee positions are closed to only those who are already volunteers, disallowing non-volunteering students from applying for the role. Chief Executive clarified that this is not an issue with the number of people applying for the role of student trustee and that there have always been more applicants than positions available.

The Chair first called for a vote on the amendment that the Trustee Board stays as the current twelve roles. **Vote: For: 28; Against: 0; Abstentions: 0.** The amendment was approved.

The Chair then called for a vote to approve the amended proposal. **Vote: For: 28; Against: 0; Abstentions: 0.** The amended proposal was approved. **Action: Student President.**

## 6. Ideas

### a. GCU Should Begin Using Digital Student ID's / Introducing NFC Digital Student Cards

RM and AK have proposed similar ideas that were agreed to be presented as a single idea. The proposal is to replace the current physical student ID system with a digital student ID application. RM communicated that learnings from the COVID-19 pandemic indicate that methods of contactless engagement ensures that staff and students are safeguarded as well as reducing the need of handling unnecessary physical items, increased efficiency for the card holder and helping to future-proof the university. Furthermore, it can help the university lower costs in the manufacturing of each student card as well as reducing the use of plastic, aiding towards greater climate goals.

VP SHLS commented that although they are in agreement that the idea is good, that some students would not be able to utilise a new system due to not having appropriate technology

to run the application. It was proposed that an improvement could be that a student can decide on having either a digital or physical card.

Vice Chair commented asking for confirmation that this system would work in the same way as using a phone instead of your debit card etc. AK followed up by commenting that yes, they could see this working in a similar fashion to how we use Apple Pay etc. at the moment and that there should still be an option of physical cards for those that cannot use the technology.

The Chair confirmed that the proposed improvement would clarify that students have an option to have either a physical or digital ID card. RM agreed with this improvement to the proposal.

AR commented that although a great idea, that from experience using similar applications, students would likely not download a designated application. Although the reduction of plastic usage is a positive factor, it is a concern that using a mobile application is no safer than a physical card and that students may well deter from using the application for security reasons.

HB commented that as a wheelchair user, that having just one device (i.e. a phone) is much easier from an accessibility standpoint. It was noted however that security is a concern and asked if the university have the infrastructure to protect mobile phone data. Furthermore, the concern of hacking and cost efficiency was raised. VP GSBS agreed with the concern of security and added that if there was an issue with a students' phone, technology or the application itself, that they would also need to have a card as backup. The Student President agreed on the concerns of cyber security and how data could be misused in the event of a hack. VP SCEBE added a concern that due to student cards using a chip or similar, would there need to be new technology instated within the university to allow for phone applications. The Chair confirmed that the university would need to invest in modern sensors to support the use of digital applications. KS added that they have used similar technology in other institutions, and although it did work great, saves time and eliminates the issue of lost student cards, that there must always be a backup in the event of technology going wrong, lost/broken phones etc. They also further raised concerns with the costs implemented with this investment upon the university. Several members echoed the sentiment that although a strong idea, that the practicality and accessibility to technology for all students to use a digital ID card may not be feasible.

AK added that as a Masters student currently studying electronic and electrical engineering that both herself, and classmates are in agreement that digital ID cards are the way forward. It was said that many students forget or lose their cards but are so used to carrying around technology at all times. They understand that some may feel uncomfortable having all data stored on your phone but echoed that hacks can happen anywhere, and that this shouldn't be the main concern moving forward.

The Chair called for a vote on the changed improvement for students to have the option to choose between a physical or digital card. **Vote: For: 24; Against: 4; Abstentions: 0.** The revised amendment was approved.

The Chair called for a vote on the full idea proposed with the either/or improvement in place to be presented to the university. **Vote: For: 24; Against: 2; Abstentions: 2.** The Idea with improvement was approved. The VP GSBS agreed to take forward this idea. **Action: VP GSBS.**

## **7. Clubs and Societies Proposed for Affiliation**

The Chair presented the list of new clubs and societies seeking affiliation to the Students' Association. This list included:

- PENZA Glasgow
- DESI Society

The Chair stated that the proposed societies would be considered separately beginning with the DESI Society.

Vice Chair had an operational question regarding a previous Student Voice meeting in which it was agreed to include the society packs within these application documents. The Chair acknowledged that this had been agreed although due to availability changes, that the DESI society pack was not released at the same point as the others.

The Chair called for a vote to approve DESI Society. **Vote: For: 26; Against: 0; Abstention: 0.** The DESI Society was approved.

The Chair announced that the second society application proposed was PENZA Glasgow, having previously been proposed and rejected at Student Voice 1 and 2. It was stated that the Board of Trustees are concerned with the reasoning behind this rejection although it was acknowledged that it was unknown why individual members of Student Voice voted the way they did as they do not need to give an explanation on their voting stance. The Chair opened the floor for questions.

Vice Chair was concerned by the wording within the paper in which it was originally stated that the PENZA Society will be autonomous from PENZA UK, although later states that the society will be affiliated with PENZA UK. The Chief Executive confirmed that a society can affiliate with a national body whilst retaining the ability to manage their own rules on a local level.

KS noted that Student Voice in the past have approved a Catholic Society although there does not seem to be one now and hasn't been in the last 3 to 4 years. Since this time, our approach to different denominations within Christianity it to take a unifying approach with Christian Union acting as an umbrella group for the different Christian faiths. The Chair confirmed that there is no longer a current Catholic Society within the Students' Association.

TA voiced an opinion that if a proposal has already been voted against twice, that it should wait until the next academic year before being re-proposed. The Vice Chair followed to reiterate that Student Voice members have never been asked to explain their reasoning for decisions and that doing so undermines the integrity of Student Voice. They went on to comment that this paper does not address the main issues concerning the society and that the second rejected vote on this was an increased majority on the first.

RG noted that this went to Trustee Board and that they are a member of Trustee Board and they were asked not to talk on this as a conflict of interest but that their contributions might contribute in part to the long explanation on why Trustee Board overturned the previous decisions made by Student Voice.

KS voiced that whilst working with many Christian Unions, Christian denominations like PENZA has never before had an issue with joining an already established Christian Union. Christian Unions are place where the different denominations can come together under a shared belief. For KS, it raises questions on why PENZA does not join the umbrella organisation. KS noted that an attempt to open dialogue with those named on the PENZA application on how the Christian Union and PENZA could work together to create a comfortable environment for both parties to work together but there has been no communication from PENZA. This has raised questions/red flags on why they are unwilling to engage.,

CO commented that PENSA Glasgow has always had a society at GCU and never been rejected [clerk's note: PENSA has only been applied for affiliation this year] in this way and feels many concerns surround LGBT+ issues and the similarities between the Christian Union. Being part of PENSA before and the current Ethnic Diversity Network Officer, there is a massive concern over Student Voice's intentions to eliminate a black Christian minority society and take away a space for the community. The Christian Union is mainly Caucasian so black Christians may feel more at home at PENSA with other people who look like them. As EDN Officer, CO was concerned about taking away a space for Black people. It was added that if Student Voice say that they stand for minorities and inclusion, then worry about those values and extent of this inclusion.

ZF agreed with the sentiments of CO, that previous issues were addressed in the current PENSA paper and voiced that religious belief does not have the right to discriminate, further to this, the welcome pack has made it clear that nobody was to be excluded and during a Student's Association meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2021, it was confirmed that nobody would be excluded from the society. It was stated that the Christian Union has not reached out to PENSA to work alongside each other. It was commented that PENSA Glasgow was being denied on the basis of misconceptions.

KS clarified that the Christian Union does not discriminate against anyone and the majority of those in the Christian Union at GCU are minorities from all around the world. Secondly PENSA should be the body to open communications with the Christian Union due to them being an already established society.

The Chair called for a vote on PENSA Glasgow Society. **Vote: For: 7; Against: 6; Abstention: 13.** The PENSA Glasgow Society was approved.

#### **8. Extension of the Meeting**

The Chair explained that due to time constraints for the meeting, there are still items to be discussed by Student Voice and requested members if the meeting could be extended by 30 minutes.

The Chair called for a vote to suspend the current guillotine of time and to extend the meeting to 19:30. **Vote: For: 26; Against: 0; Abstention: 0.** The meeting time extension was approved.

#### **9. Full Time Officer Reports**

The Chair invited the Student Voice members to ask the Full Time Officers questions about their written reports.

There were no questions or comments raised to the Student President, VP SCEBE, VP SCEBE, VP SHLS or VP GSBS regarding their reports submitted.

#### **10. Student Voice Officer Reports**

The Chair invited the Representation Officers and two Media Groups to update Student Voice Members on their current projects.

The LGBT+ Officer clarified that they are currently working on social media campaigns to highlight and celebrate LGBT+ history month this month. They commented that it has been difficult to figure out times and availability at this moment. They are currently looking into ways of collaborating with the Disabled Students' Officer.

The Women's Officer commented that they have been planning to conduct a campaign to enhance the safety of women. This is still in progress and needs to be worked upon before actioned.



The Ethnic Diversity Network Officer was no longer present although VP SHLS confirmed that there was a careers event booked for 02<sup>nd</sup> March for EDN students as well as the campaign launch for Student Voice and all Student Groups to pledge to tackle racism and discrimination within our communities and societies.

The Manager of Radio Caley stated that they are excited that the studio was now open again and broadcasting again.

The Editor in Chief of The Edit confirmed that they have had two issues released so far this year, an election special to be released very soon, promoting all candidates running for the Full Time Officer positions as well as a Spring edition to be released shortly after this.

The Disabled Officer, International Students Officer and Care Experience Officers were not present to give an update on their current projects.

There were no further questions asked in relation to the Student Voice Officers reports and updates.

The Chair reverted to the formal votes for both, Full Time Officer Reports and Student Voice Officer Reports until after the Minutes of Student Voice Committees. The Chair invited members to take a vote on all of the reports discussed. **Vote: For: 21; Against: 0; Abstention: 1.** The Full Time Officers and Student Voice Officers Reports were approved.

#### **11. Minutes of Student Voice Meeting on 06<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

The Chair invited members to consider the minutes of the previous Student Voice meeting held on 06<sup>th</sup> December 2021.

Vice Chair commented on several points for amendment. It was pointed out that in section 3 of the minutes in regards to the Revised Radio Caley policy, that the role discussed within this section has been in need of getting rid of for a while. In section 4, in which an amendment was approved, Vice Chair clarified that there were not 0 votes against the amendment as stated within the minutes as they had voted against it themselves. In Section 7.1 in which the idea to raise awareness of the needs of disabled students was brought forward, Vice Chair commented that his phrasing was that this was previously covered by the Student President and was not needed to be an idea. In terms of library hours, this is up for discussion every year and has been voted on at least once before. In section 7.6, Vice Chair commented that council would not allow certification of nursing courses if added. Within section 12, the main concern was not due to the closeness to the Christian Union but to later points raised. It was pointed out that historically, societies have refused partnerships with the likes of SNP and Labour parties who are external affiliates.

ZF stated that in section 12, there is clarification on affiliations and what is permissible within the Student's Association. It was commented that this was an inaccurate.

The Chair asked if members were happy to take all of comments as one revision to be voted on as opposed to being split into individual votes. It was agreed to vote on all additions as one.

The Chair asked that those present at the previous meeting could vote to approve the amended minutes of the meeting at Student Voice held on 06<sup>th</sup> December 2021. **Vote: For: 24; Against: 0; Abstention: 1.** The amended Student Voice minutes from 06<sup>th</sup> December 2021 were approved.

#### **12. Matters Arising from meeting on 06<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

The Chair asked the members if there were any questions about the matters arising.

Vice Chair asked VP SCEBE and VP SHLS on why there are no current updates on their actions. VP SCEBE stated that both themselves and VP SHLS had sent on their updates but did not seem to be included in the document. It was confirmed that these could be sent to members separately for any additional questions.

### **13. Student Voice Committees**

The Chair asked the members if there were any questions relating to the Committees of Student Voice Minutes. There were no questions.

The Chair called for a vote on the previous minutes of all Student Voice Sub Committees.

**Vote: For: 22; Against: 0; Abstention: 3.** The previous minutes of all Student Voice Sub Committees were approved.

### **14. Honourable Life Membership Nominations Deadline 18<sup>th</sup> March 2022**

The Chair clarified that any student can nominate a person that is either a student or that has a close connection to the Students' Association.

Vice Chair commented that the link given in the agenda had a typo and clarified that the deadlines for nominations is 2022 and not 2021. This has since been updated on the website.

It was clarified to those that may not know, that the Executive Committee receive all nomination to create a shortlist of six candidates that can be introduced as an honorary life member that are then presented at Student Voice 4. It was further noted that additionally, that Full Time Officers automatically receive this award.

### **15. A.O.C.B**

There was no further business to be discussed.

### **16. Student Voice Meeting 04.04.22**

The next Student Voice meeting will be taking place on Monday 04<sup>th</sup> April 2022. Details on the format of this meeting will be confirmed by the Clerk as soon as possible.

The Chair thanked all members of Student Voice for their attendance and engagement at the third Student Voice meeting 2021/22.

**The meeting was concluded at 7.20pm.**