

**Meeting of:** Board of Trustees

**Location:** SU Boardroom and via Zoom

**Date and Time:** Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> April 2022 4pm

**Members:** Josie Stephens, (Chair), Wil Barber, Edward Hall, Faiso Kadiye, Iye're Laditi, ShuYi Lee, Robyn McAlpine, Vaibhav Sharma.

**In attendance:** James Hann (CEO), Ricardo Visinho (RV), Nick Smith (Secretary).

	<b>Item</b>
1.	The chair <b>welcomed</b> members and the Board noted apologies
2.	There were no <b>declarations</b> of Conflicts of Interest
3.	There were no Chairs Actions taken since the last meeting to <b>note</b>
4.	The board <b>noted</b> that the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) bill had been extended into the next session of parliament
5.	<p>The board <b>noted</b> a presentation on the democratic structure proposals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The review had been undertaken to look at the issues within democracy within the SU including poor engagement, a perceived focus on undergraduates and the challenges of the PG sabbatical role.</li> <li>b) DemSoc had been engaged to lead this review and had worked with students to deliberate over the proposals using talks from experts, focus groups and an all student survey of the way students perceived the processes.</li> <li>c) The proposal would create the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Chamber of Officers with an Executive function</li> <li>• A Chamber of Deliberation with legislative functions</li> <li>• A Scrutiny Board to consider the work of the Officers</li> <li>• A Democracy Committee to support the operation of the democratic functions</li> </ul> </li> <li>d) Ordinary students would also be able to recommend policies and ask officers questions. There would also be annual student members meetings.</li> <li>e) Scrutiny Board members would be remunerated and consider work against the manifestos of the Union and the policies set by the Chamber of Deliberation, Referenda or Student Members meetings.</li> <li>f) The Chamber of Deliberation would have different thresholds for the votes – with minor changes requiring an referendum or general meeting to decide it. They would be chosen by sortition and would be around 30 people.</li> <li>g) Sortition criteria could be set by the Democracy committee and reviewed on an annual basis. The initial criteria should be protected characteristics and mode of study.</li> <li>h) Part time officers should be retained with additional committees to support them. Compensation should be offered to these part time officers. Risk and accountability for these committees should be carefully considered.</li> <li>i) Options would be proposed to students for both 4 and 5 sabbatical officers.</li> <li>j) The School had been approached to increase the number of staff in the representation team to help support these structures.</li> </ol>
6.	The board <b>approved</b> the Democracy Review next steps and Timelines
7.	<p>The board <b>noted</b> an update on lay Trustee recruitment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The process was underway and Peridot were finalising the process.</li> </ol>