



SU Council Meeting - Agenda

14th December 2021 at 4pm via MS Teams

1. Welcomes and Apologies SF

a. To note: apologies received from:

- i. Alex Richardson (Vet Nursing Liaison Officer), Adam Robbins (IVSA Senior Rep), Gigi de Fort-Menares Lee (International Officer), Fuchsia Stocker

b. Attended:

- i. Gareth Jones, Victoria Lindsay, Jack Conway, Tamas Berczik, Caoimhe Abdul-Wahab, Elizabeth Brooks, Matthew Clarkson, Hasita Dodhia, Samuel Fenton, Willow Gibson, Eleanor Irvine, Anantha Kumarvel, Chloe Le Blond, Sebastian Miler, Ester Rodriguez, Dave Sherlock-Jones, Katherine Strathdee, Priya Toor, Chantelle Woodward-Iles

2. To note: statement from SF regarding Durham SU statement on 10th December **SF**

- a. SF apologises for getting caught up and publishing without consulting trustees/council. VL states to be wary of hearsay with the issue hitting the media. HD follows on in support but would have been nice as a heads up. DSJ sent detailed statement from NUS so research was conducted and not off the bat (not just reading the tabloids). VL just reiterating a need for a heads-up. EI to confirm the meaning of the statement and the support for Seun Twins and the Durham SU team instead of weighing in on the situation

3. To vote: confirm minutes from last meeting **SF**

a. VOTE: 14 Y – Confirmed.

4. Trustee positions *SF & Trustees*

a. **To vote:** method of recruitment for non-executive (student) trustee

i. SF gives background. Bring to council suggesting bringing in line with course rep election. Term 2 years or until no longer a member of the union. 2021/22 different – run election April/May – don't want role to be confused with role of officers. Role to run 2023 or graduated.

MC – if running 2 year office and already behind, would it make sense to start april may and run until Dec 2022 or just bar final years from running. Also is anything addressing a non-trustee officer running for this position. SF – non exec stating not SU officer team so officers couldn't apply. Don't see point of 7-month role instead of 1y 7m term.

GJ – want to keep in line with alumni officer appointment which recommends starts January. Takes pressure off. Q to SF – nominate to council not election. SF corrects in process. Trustee recommends to council as it is a governance decision, best coming from people with experience of trustee board. PT brings point that 6-month gap before someone new is elected if role go to final year.

MC – what role does council have if trustee recommends to council. Also what happens if gap – SF constitution states method of recruitment is done by council. Recommendation from Trustee board to council is written application. Trustee board to review applicants. SF – in terms of gap, we would just have to rerun the application process in the upcoming term and therefore alternating years

GJ – not sure if we formally vote in this meeting as lots of question and then ratify in Jan. Not sure final year would apply but as Trustee year of study could come into considering applicant.

EI – if start in Jan, only issue would be first term gap as most graduate in summer anyway. MC – registered as students until July 31st – SF suggests ending for continuing student ending 31st Dec. SF states that for this for reasoning that first years can apply instead of running election before they are enrolled. EB – if having final years apply and get it and make a deficit, can we just exclude them. SF – also applies to final year master's students but doesn't bring this issue. In penultimate year gap would still exist – no real difference. VL agrees. MC – to consider, as would have put something in writing, change student position to 1 year. Would have to put a lot of extra writing in? Any advantage?

GJ – when redesign of constitution, the reason we want 2 year while they're not elected officers they give continuity and in position for longer time so they span more than 1 exec group. Brings knowledge and memory that's not loaded onto Staff. Stop repeating of issues. If someone leaves can always coopt as a trustee. VL suggests also precedent. EL – do we not lose continuity at end of 2 year mark – SF alumni trustee should counter this issue. Should always be some continuity from non exec trustee. EI – addition to BSc specific – could choose to do Msci and postgrad as final year BSc you may be at university for a long time therefore not excluding final years. VL states vet students also go to PhD or other courses. MC – need to have a provision whos voted into alumni and then therefore rejoin as student. Would automatically go against byelaws of alumni trustee and cease to be in this role as they are a

student. MC clarifies who gets to vote of the position – Trustee gets to see applications, council shown trustee board decision to ratify into role.

ii. VOTE on how to recruit – application oct/nov and give trustee board to choose applicant, council to ratify after majority vote at trustee vote.

1. Yes (15)

b. To discuss/vote: recruitment of Jade Urquhart-Gilmore as Alumni trustee

i. Sent out advert for position and one response. Trustees have agreed to recommend to council to coopt this applicant onto trustee board. JUG email sent into chat. Term to start 1st January and last 2 years.

EI – on advertisement is there a way to get more people to see it. – SF – could improve visibility of the role and advertise the role when JUG is coopted – Could put on social media. VL – note: happy with choice but as filled with ex SU officers we are very clear about the scope of the role prior to starting and when advertising. SF – not an officer of the SU, only a position on governance of the union. GJ – when trustee voted, GJ and DSJ abstained as conflict of interest. DSJ to clarify on whether the role if they are a voting member. EI – would we run every year we needed alumni that we run the advertisement in the first term? SF – want it to start on 1st Jan – cross bridge when we come to it. GJ – clarifies on time period of role. MC – does this also apply to internships is still considered a student SF – yes. Clinical training program is still student. DSJ – also if someone becomes a member of staff of the college. SF to DSJ – is there any terms i.e., student ambassadors. – VSJ confirms with example. Grey zone would be members of staff that are also students but unlikely to occur. MC – check into writing of constitution now that we allow alumni to become SU members (VL nods in deny). SF – doesn't think its an issue

with becoming an alumni trustee as not a full member. MC to look into it with SF. Could also effect people who opt out of the SU but are still students. Technicalities need looking into. GJ – wording as some postgrads are classed as staff but still potentially classed as students and be entitled. VL mentions course rep as staff member.

ii. VOTE if council agrees with trustee board recommendation.

1. 13 Yes

5. Recommendations from C19 WG **MC**

Covid WG met 13/12/2021. RTP. MC has reached out to ask how to improve to captains and presidents and also reached out to Imelda (they don't have any updates)

a. **To vote:** Remove requirement for 'Activity Diary' from Return to Play

i. Found has been become redundant. On regards to events that have had covid cases, none have used activity diary. More works for clubs and not working how it is wanted to work. MC recommends remove section in RTP for activity diary to be upheld by covid marshals.

ii. **VOTE:** 14 Yes

b. **To vote:** Grant access to an SU Staff member for the RTP email

i. Main point of RTP is there is a register. Only person with access is MC. WG suggests would be worth someone else to have access. Recommend someone on staff have access. DSJ happy to have responsibility but should already have access. MC suggests GDPR issues with writing. GJ – suggests it be written as (SU Activities Nominee). SF states not a GDPR issue as its labelled as Students' Union. VL states that it is better as staff. DSJ – talking about emergency so wouldn't be able to nominate. Nominate SF to nominate. Needs clarification on wording. EI – query that

if MC is uncontactable would that also be extenuating circumstances.

Emergency or unable to do role within the SU.

- ii. **VOTE** on DSJ having access to email or MC nominating SF to nominate someone else having access

1. 14 Yes

Update on rest of RTP – MC – see how omicron goes on the next few months. Potentially in Jan modify policy if variant goes down.

- c. **To vote:** Request an SU representative be invited to the RVC Teaching, Learning and Assessment C19 WG
 - i. Only a request because nobody knows what's going on to allow access to the information. Not updated as regularly. VL – was requested last year after survey and college let it go. College may ignore or genuinely forgot about. Not first time has been asked.
 - ii. **VOTE:** 14 Y
- d. **To vote:** Request that course/year leaders provide regular (monthly) updates on plans for teaching and assessments during C19 pandemic
 - i. Major concerns that has been brought up, college is reluctant to give information on exams. Not sure if online or in person. Would appreciate decision being made. EI – went to QA, Charlotte Lawson stated that Bsc would be online. VL – two different issues. January would plan for online as not sure government is going to do. SF – policy states benefit of online exams and how they would change if they were online. VL – when read, vivas should be in person preferably but shows what colleges thoughts are. Should vs Need in writing (VL inferring). GJ - separate issues with COVID exam issues and digital assessment policy. SF – information inferred some courses may be last minute as trying to do in person.

Would be nice to have an official word. MC – moving forward from C19 perspective. Should be course separate as different schedules. Important to set deadline as opinion. Should use course reps/course leaders to update cohorts on situations. VL – government doesn't give warning so we can't. Students should have regular updates stating that plans may change. SF – updates on plans but also when planned discussions are taking place on when decisions are being made.

ii. VOTE: 13 Yes 1 Abstain

6. To discuss: RVC proposed Digital Assessments Policy **GJ SF EI**

- a. GJ – LTAC Brian Catchpoll presented paper for digital assessments. Plan to move to paperless exams. College keen for feedback. Access to infrastructure may be different per person. College wants to ratify march LTAC meeting. PT – general question – remote exams people used paper, mainly people with specific learning differences. Clarification? VL – can understand for non-written alternative for OSCEs but clarify for vivas for in person. Affects people with neurodivergent and specific learning differences. Some may prefer in person or remote. MC – student opinion, would Brian be receptive to having a legislative body being involved, some bodies may not allow online exams. Default to legislative body? GJ – always go with what bodies state. College push for digital assessment. If sector want it, bodies are usually receptive and might change for it. People to email feedback to GJ, SF and EI

7. To discuss: representation of non-BVetMed students on RVCSU council **PT**

- a. Camden meetings to discuss how to get more non-vet med courses involved in the SU, propose RSB or joint rep for societies. Suggest adding in new societies or removing. **JC** – would need organizations approval. **SF** - these are also student led organizations. GJ – not remove from council but represented. Other

unis don't have SU's, but VetSocs. Other side is can't keep adding more people. VL – non vet perspective agree council is bias towards vet. 30/35 societies represented. Learn/ed society rep? SF – is a potential solution could be creating a BVetMed officer role and getting rid of AVS/IVSA role, therefore one represented for all courses. GJ – historically BVetMed bias. Problem 1 – representation for learn/ed societies? Problem 2 – one position for one course but 5 vet societies can be sat by vet students. Suggests they can still come to council. SF – should we representing the learn/ed societies but also important to remember course reps are invited to attend as full members. Should potentially be pushing course reps attending. EI – AVS/IVSA have junior/senior – Junior/Senior for RSB? Junior elected and sit on council but senior not have voting power. VL – already structure of learned societies having reps at the university, might be a big role as one person. EB – junior rep is liaison with SU and senior rep. JC – suggests one voting member as with SAVMA and IVSA. PT – addressed in Camden group,

8. To discuss: engagement of SU Officers in the planning of meetings *HD*

- a. When polls are sent out, please make effort to reply. GJ suggests not putting down 20 times as unlikely to reply.

9. AOB

10. Date and time of next meeting tbc