



SU Committee Meeting – 05.02.2022

Attendance: LH (Publicity & Relations Officer), AW (President), KM (VP), CH (LGBTQ+ Rep), JV (SU Rep), AD (SU Rep), DM (WCS Rep)

Absent: PA (EM Rep), DB (SwD Rep), JN (Local Students' Rep), WS (SU Rep)

Location: Conference Room

AW reminisces for the days of SU Comm 19/20 where it started with a dance so LH starts the meeting with a wave round the group

LH has not read the papers.

Ending the use of Non-Disclosure Agreements in cases of sexual assault, bullying, and other forms of harassment

LH: I am torn about this, they want to pressure the University to remove NDAs which I was initially against as they are there to protect the victim to some extent

AW: It is complex, on one hand there is a big problem with the misuse of them to silence people. NDAs do have some perks in that there are cases when someone willingly enters into an NDA to avoid the need to publicly talk about it. However there are people who would willingly talk about it but are gagged by the NDA. My issue is that this motion does not take into account any of this nuance and there needs to be more than the 20 minute discussion in SU Assembly than this will get

KM: For an issue so large this motion is way too short, there is no detail. It is not clear on whether they will encourage the University to use them in the case where the victim would like an NDA

JV; In Assembly Notes it just says “they are being used”

AW: I would rather this is not brought to Assembly in this current form. I don't think an amendment is appropriate or enough, it would just be a re-write

LH: There was no discussion of this in the SU Comm meeting and I think it was ST (SU President) wanted us to submit it as a committee, it was odd

AW: So should we say in the meeting that in principle we are in favour but we are against it as there should be higher standards for the quality of motions?

LH to vote against and express the view that we are against the lack of nuance this conveys - it is not effective policy



Democracy Review – Assembly Membership Proposal

LH: Why have they decided the academic ones like that - surely some are representing more students than others?

AW: That is the same as saying there are more mature students than students of colour, they each get one rep. SU governance is so fucked, if someone proposed this motion to the JCR meeting we would turn it away at GovComm. It is not a motion, it doesn't tell you anything about how these positions are elected; who they represent; who can run. The standard for motions going to the SU is shockingly low when it should be higher than anyone else

LH: Nothing the SU does is working. They are changing the SU Rep from common room to colleges

AW: I spoke to JB (Opportunities Officer) and he said they will be elected by students of that college and there will be no more SU Comms, they won't work with the exec, no access to common room social media - all the methods SU Reps have to be able to represent students will be taken off of them

LH: This just makes the SU one big clique

AW: I am going to submit an amendment on this point. Frankly I don't agree with the rest of it but the wider student experience structure section makes no sense. Who are the university Enrichment Department Reps? Who are the three when there are about 6/7 departments - where do they come from, how are they chosen? For some of those you pay subs so how does voting work - are they elected in campus wide ballot too?

AD: It does say the bit about committees of constituents

AW: But like 3 reps for 6 DSO's???

LH: I feel conflicted about the associations bit as sometimes they don't get Presidents elected so there could be no representation

AW: I hate the way this is structured as it presumes you need a person from a certain area or domain somewhere in the uni to have a conversation about that area. Why do we need a Rep from every college when there will be so many other reps who will also represent so many other areas including colleges?

AD: I think it is just to guarantee that and the chances that it doesn't happen is so small

LH: The SU associations don't have a dedicated SU person so who would be their voting member?

AW: At the moment it is each Association President

LH: There is so much divide it feels pointless to have all these bodies. When I was LGBTQ+ Rep we had a groupchat with the association but there was no communication on it at all



JV: The point of this is to be like we have conducted a review, concluded no engagement but have gone with the take that students who don't engage with us instead of we don't engage with students. They have just introduced more roles - that does not increase transparency. Opportunity doesn't matter if people don't care

DM: Don't understand how there is only one Rep for all of religion and faith?

JV: And how would there be just one for Political & Causes? We'll surely have someone from each different University political club, it won't work

LH: What is professional development?

AW: It could be Law Soc or Women in Stem

JV: But how are the academic Reps elected and from who

AW: I think they are meant to be like Maths Soc, Chem Soc

JV: That makes no sense and that has not been explained here anywhere

LH: Why is it Womxns Association? That's so exclusionary

AW: They wanted the Open Places to link them to specific groups and are they still doing that? I don't agree with that as what is the point of having a Rep who represents the college and then encouraging students not to go to them and go to the Open Place Reps instead?

JV: But no one would go to anyone here no one knows who they are

AW: No one will know who the open place reps are either. There was a motion last year to make the assembly membership public and the SU said ok but you have to get people's permission

JV: Surely by applying to the role you accept that?

AW: What is the point of being a representative and not being accessible at all?

LH: I still don't know who is on governance and grants

AW: I raised that with ST and she said "it is just not public facing in that way" but it should be. What would we want assembly makeup to look like?

LH: I say keep association reps, academic reps, college reps, the sabbs and to some extent you need the open place and wider student experience reps but not in this way

JV: It would make sense if there was a rep for each wider student group

LH: Should it not be the opportunities officers job to represent them

AW: I am of the opinion there are not enough sabbatical officers in the SU. I have priorities but I find time for them in between the things i have to do but they just focus on priorities and there needs to be more of them with more specific domains. But back on topic, would this be better than current makeup?

LH: I think it would



AW: Provided we fix the college issue

LH: I wonder how many of the SU Officers said they wanted to improve SU-JCR relations and then did that. I would like an amendment on the college rep and more clarification on the makeup as a whole

AW: I have a meeting with JB who submitted this on Monday. Still have substantial questions - to be a rep of the college you have to be elected by college at large. I think the issue is it should be a common room rep and that should include both JCR and MCR; colleges can facilitate elections where both can vote. Then you have the question of are you levy-gateing it? Some common rooms do require you to have paid the levy to vote - we don't

LH: I don't think the way SU reps are elected is the thing that needs changing here. I would say we vote for it if the amendment passes

AW: If the amendment does not pass I think we should strongly vote against it

LH to vote for this if amendment passes

LH to vote against if amendment does not pass

LH: The freedom of speech bill has apparently been amended to exclude Durham common rooms

AW: Why didn't JB tell us that? Like that is big but where is the communication? Why aren't we working together on things like that?

LH: It is annoying that associations don't work with common rooms so much more would get done

DM: 93% club does way more than the WCS association do, this really makes no sense to me why they would have a vote