



Oxford SU Student Council Minutes

Date: 16/06/23, Friday 8th Week TT23

Time: 17:30

Venue: 4 Worcester Street and Online

Chair: Yasmin Poole, Wadham College

Minutes: Joe Bell, Merton College

Present	Michael-Akolade Ayodeji, President Jade Calder, VP Education and Access Shreya Dua, VP Graduates Yasmin Poole, Chair Gabriel Lazar, Returning Officer and other Council Members
Apologies	Anna-Tina Jashapara, VP Charities and Community Grace Olusola, VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities
Absent	

In Attendance	Other Student Member(s)
---------------	-------------------------

A Welcome

The Chair welcomed all those present.

RECEIVED

B Minutes and matters arising from the last meeting

This item was mistakenly included on the agenda and was not discussed.

C Items for Resolution

C1 Interim Changes and Reform Proposals

The President proposed the motion, noting recent efforts on better communications from SU and the production of the Council Round-Up social media posts, as a summary of all SU-led activities and an ability to tag volunteers in the SU. They wanted to institutionalise this process and also work on proposing other student council reform changes to improve council's effectiveness in Michaelmas.

Bella Done (LGBTQ+ Campaign Co-Chair, *Hertford*) noted that they see the round-up on Instagram and it was great.

The Chair sought opposition to the motion and, there being none, allowed the motion to pass without opposition in the following form:

Council Notes:

- 1) Student council reporting has received an aesthetic facelift with the Student Council Round-Up Initiative designed by the SU President.
- 2) This has the aim of improving communication with students, and is based on feedback received at council.
- 3) Members of student council expressed this was an effective way to summarise what occurs in council to students who may not attend.

- 4) Academic commitments meant that the SU president could not be present at the last ordinary meeting of student council to propose his student council reform changes to improve the effectiveness of student council in light of recent events.
- 5) That as can be seen in the attached email dated 26th May, the SU President the SU president consulted with Common Room Presidents and Campaigns on the Student Council Round-Up Initiative and interim changes.

Council Believes:

- 1) Student council better fulfils its purposes when it is able to disseminate information on its activities to as many students as possible, in order to boost engagement.
- 2) Student council should be given the opportunity to consider the SU president's proposals and determine whether to accept, amend or reject them.

Council Resolves:

- 1) To do the necessary work to institutionalise this with clear responsibilities defined for elected members of council to ensure this reporting through 'Student Council Round-Up' continues for the long term.
- 2) To mandate the President to devise the necessary student council reform proposals aimed at improving effectiveness of council and permit him speaking rights to present these proposal council's consideration in meeting of MT23.

PASSED**C2 UCU**

Ivan Larin (Exeter) became the Seconder to the motion.

The President proposed the motion, noting: this motion ('the SU Motion') aimed to achieve two things. The first was in relation to motion 5 passed by the UCU Congress¹ ('the UCU Motion') which had problematic elements relating to the war in Ukraine and links to antisemitism. The SU motion resolves to condemn the UCU motion and call on the proposers of the UCU motion to withdraw it. The second aim of the SU motion relates to the strikes occurring in Oxford University, and the attempts of the University to circumvent the effects but not the causes of the strikes, which some students thought was bad for their academics as well as the strikers. The motion resolves to mandate the VP Education and Access to consult on the SU's strikes policy to consider these aspects.

Ivan Larin read out parts of the UCU Motion, stressed the need for Ukraine to be armed by governments such as the UK, noted Russia's bombing last week of the Kakhovka dam and war crimes committed and human rights issues caused by Russia's activities. They observed that the UCU Congress passing this motion likely harmed its own members, and that it was important to condemn the motion, and hoped that, if other SUs also expressed this view, it may prompt the UCU to row back upon it.

¹ <https://www.ucu.org.uk/article/12945/Business-of-the-strategy-and-finance-committee-open-session#5-composite-stop-the-war-in-ukraine--peace-now>

The VP (Access and Education) observed that the motion was not clear about which officer(s) were being mandated **The President** responded, thanking those who assisted him in drafting the motion, and noting it was intended to mandate both PG and UG Vice-Presidents (Education and Access).

The President proposed an amendment to replace 'VP of Education and Access' with 'Postgraduate and Undergraduate VPs (Education & Access)'. There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

The VP (Graduates) asked for clarification for what the motion was aiming to do; is the desire to bring the University back to the negotiating table? **The President** responded, quoting the motion, that the mandate was broad and for the mandated officers to figure out in consultation with students and UCU Oxford.

Luca Di Bona (*St Hilda's*) raised concerns about why the mandate involved consultation with the University. **The President** stated it was necessary to determine the University's actions precisely so that the updated policy could accurately respond to those actions.

After a discussion about wording, **Luca Di Bona** proposed an amendment to insert to resolves point 9(c): 'Ensure Oxford University does not influence Oxford SU's strike policy.' There was no opposition, and it was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Luca Di Bona stated that they personally don't believe the SU should be condemning the specific point in the UCU motion calling Israel an 'illiberal outpost of US imperialism', and that they deemed that position a legitimate one to hold; they clarified that in the context of the motion, the remark was possibly inappropriate. They also drew to Council's attention the UCU motion 6, proposed by the National Executive of the UCU, which was passed by a greater majority, and read out that motion.² They argued that as a whole the UCU's policy towards Ukraine was generally positive, especially considering the most possible campaigning objectives.

Ivan Larin agreed that UCU motion 6 was nicer, but observed that the UCU Congress rejected amendments to make motion 5 more acceptable, and that the UCU Congress was the higher governing body to the National Executive.

The President emphasised that the SU motion itself does not mention antisemitism. They stated that it is for people to define what they think is racist. They did not think the antisemitism discussion was directly relevant to the SU motion as written. They emphasised that it condemns the UCU motion as a whole, not the UCU or those who proposed it.

Joel Aston (LGBTQ+ Campaign Co-Chair, *St Hilda's*) raised a concern about the inclusion of two different aims in the same motion which risks mixing the two aims. **The President** responded that it was possible to have different resolutions with different themes in the same motion without those resolutions being practically joined following the motions passing.

Joe Bell (*Merton*) moved to put the question (end the discussion on the motion). A brief procedural discussion on separating the two parts of the motion ensued.

² <https://www.ucu.org.uk/article/12945/Business-of-the-strategy-and-finance-committee-open-session#6-solidarity-with-ukraine-supporting-education-and-humanitarian-work>

Samuel Lam (*University*) asked about Oxford UCU's position on the UCU motion and observed this would determine how the SU motion was implemented. They further raised concerns about the potential for the word 'condemn' in the SU motion to be misinterpreted, especially in light of recent experience regarding the Oxford Union Society motion. They raised the possibility that the SU motion might be interpreted as condemning anti-war stances. They suggested altering the wording of the motion.

The President noted the motion was already somewhat watered down, and that last Council, the room felt a strong stance should be taken on the UCU motion. They had no answers regarding Oxford UCU's stance but stated that the motion was not directly related to Oxford UCU. They clarified that the condemnation would happen through private channels to UCU Oxford, rather than a public statement.

The President proposed replacing 'condemn' with 'express strong concerns regarding' in resolves point 8.

Joe Bell (*Merton*) opposed this, saying that the SU motion is perfectly clear; the UCU motion was very bad, and the SU should condemn it. **Ivan Larin** agreed with his opposition, and added that the best first steps would be approaching Oxford UCU privately.

Joe Bell proposed an amendment to replace the word 'can' with 'shall' in the second sentence of resolves point 8. The President seconded the amendment. There was no opposition.

AMENDED

Luca Di Bona proposed an amendment to add 'any public statement of condemnation will only be made by democratic approval of Student Council', on the grounds that the decision to make a public statement is a significant further step beyond this motion.

The President opposed the amendment, on the grounds that the Council minutes will show Council's intentions clearly, and that the amendment would be formally pointless for two reasons; there was no intention to do so and the amendment is unenforceable given sabbatical officers freedom of expression cannot be suppressed by or subject to council's will.

Gabriel Lazar also opposed the amendment, stating the motion as amended was perfectly clear.

Council voted on the amendment, with one vote for, three against and three abstentions. The amendment did not pass.

Ivan Larin proposed an amendment to insert 'initially' after 'shall' in the second sentence of resolves point 8 as amended. **Luca Di Bona** opposed the amendment on the grounds that again the amendment was technically meaningless.

Council voted on the amendment, with four votes for, three against and one abstention. The amendment passed.

AMENDED

Samuel Lam proposed an amendment to replace the first sentence of resolves point 8 with 'Oxford SU shall express our deepest concern to the findings of the aforesaid motion to the

proposers of the UCU motion, calling on the proposer to amend, or if not, retract the motion.³ Three members opposed the amendment.

Council voted on the amendment, with one vote for, two votes against and four abstentions. The amendment did not pass.

The Chair sought opposition to the motion; there being none, they allowed the motion to pass without opposition in the following form:

Council Notes:

- 1) The SU has a positive and strong working relationship with UCU Oxford.
- 2) The SU doesn't have a strong connection to UCU Congress as an entity though it shares similar interest as identified in the SU's Policy book.
- 3) There are other actions, beyond strikes, being organised by the UCU that affect those in the University of Oxford which Oxford SU does not sign up to.
- 4) At the annual University and College Union (UCU) conference, the UCU passed a motion, describing the Russian invasion of Ukraine as a 'war between Russian and US imperialism', blaming it on the NATO expansion and calling for the UK government to stop arming Ukraine; it further resolved to support protests by stop the war, CND etc. (Note: The UCU motion is at <https://www.ucu.org.uk/article/12945/Business-of-the-strategy-and-finance-committee-open-session#5-composite-stop-the-war-in-ukraine--peace-now>)
- 5) This above issue was brought as an item for discussion at the last student council in Week 7 where Student council members raised concern and expressed a desire for strong action by Oxford SU in response.
- 6) The next ordinary meeting of student council is in MT23 and as such, any action sanctioned by an Ordinary meeting of Student Council will have to wait till October
- 7) Student have raised to the SU President additional concern's regarding the effectiveness of strikes in face of the University's possible mitigations of their effectiveness which they belief disproportionally affects students.

Council Believes:

- 1) The SU should put more pressure on the University to make some movement on the pay negotiations.
- 2) Since students have raised concern that the University has put in place mitigations to nullify the effect and impact of strikes, the SU must address this and seek reassurance or push for movement in directly addressing the causes of strikes than mitigating the effects.
- 3) It is important that we have a clear line agreed in negotiations with the University.

³ Original: 'Oxford SU shall condemn this motion, calling on the UCU members who proposed it, to retract it and apologise.'

- 4) We should ensure that the UCU doesn't continue with their existing line on the war in Ukraine.
- 5) Lobbying of the UCU on the conference motion noted above should not impact the important issues they stand for, nor Oxford SU's relationship with them.

Council Resolves:

- 8) Oxford SU shall condemn this motion, calling on the UCU members who proposed it, to retract it and apologise. This shall initially be done by communication via UCU Oxford.
- 9) Mandate the Postgraduate and Undergraduate VPs (Education and Access) to consult with students, the University and representatives of UCU Oxford to propose amendments to the current "UCU Strikes Policy" which:
 - a) Ensures that students are better protected, and that the University is incentivised to demonstrate clearly they're working to address the causes of strikes and not just limit their effectiveness through measures which are seen lead to students being unfairly affected.
 - b) Makes Oxford SU's relationship with the UCU and UCU Oxford clearer. Ensuring a delineation between Oxford SU's support of what both organisations seek to achieve and who Oxford SU has direct contact and established relation with.
 - c) Ensure Oxford University does not influence Oxford SU's strike policy.

PASSED

The President thanked Ivan Larin for bringing the matter to the attention of Council.

C3 Oxford SU 50 Year Anniversary Review Proposal

The President proposed the motion, saying that it was pretty clear from reports from students involved and those not involved in the SU that the SU is not seen to be fully fulfilling its objectives, and there are problems with confidence in the SU and decreasing engagement. Having existed for about five decades, it may need to adapt to fit its times, and the anniversary presented an opportunity to transparently review the SU's operations in a way which centred students and their voices. He believed it was important to take into account the perspectives of the SU's staff, who are hard-working and those who would have to implement many of the review's recommendations, and the University, who controls the SU's budgets and is right to have an interest in whether the SU is fulfilling its objectives. He proposed a panel involving the three main stakeholders: students, operational staff and the University to look at how the SU is and can serve students and how that interacts with support for operational staff and University interest. They thought it was important for Council to examine how Council can influence the structure of the review.

Niall Pearson-Shaul (*Merton*) proposed an amendment to replace resolves point (2) with the following points (2) and (3):

2. To give the Review Board the following terms of reference:

- a. To investigate all aspects of the Student Union's structure and operations with regard to, and interactions with, its student members including but not limited to:
 - i. To consider the means of allocation of budgetary resources to constituent organisations of the SU,
 - ii. To consider the current forms of representation of Common Rooms, Academic Divisions, and individual student members within the SU,
 - iii. To consider the SU's current relationship with the University and other external organisations,
 - iv. To consider the SU's compliance with legal requirements, including whether compliance is frustrated but not prevented by any structural feature of the SU;
 - b. To be led in any investigation under a. by the experiences of the SU's Student Members, and of the Committee Members of the SU's Constituent Organisations;
 - c. To produce a report based on its work under a. and b. by December 2023 containing recommendations to the Student Council for reform to help the SU meet its objectives, and if such a report shall not be forthcoming by December 2023, to bring a motion to Student Council to extend that deadline.
3. To permit the Chair of the Review Board to control the Board's procedure except that:
- a. Only the Student Council may define the number individuals who may sit on the Review Board, and the number of non-Student Members who may sit on the Review Board;
 - b. Only the Student Council may appoint the Chair of the Review Board, who must be a Student Member;
 - c. The Review Board's procedure will otherwise be the same as the Student Council's procedure.

Joe Bell noted that it was possible to pass the amendment and then adjust it later.

The VP (Education and Access) asked whether December 2023 is a realistic timeline.

Niall Pearson-Shaul noted that the amendment did not alter the original timeline, and the panel could request an extension.

The Chair sought opposition; there being none, they allowed the amendment to pass.

AMENDED

Niall Pearson-Shaul proposed an amendment to insert 'to be composed of no more than 15 members, of which 9 shall be student members.' after 'review board' in resolves point 1. He emphasised the importance of imposing some degree of control over the composition of the review board.

The President opposed the amendment, arguing that without a thorough creation process of the review board, it would not be ideal to pre-judge the size and composition of the board, and would risk endangering the ability of the review board to function properly.

Niall Pearson-Shaul withdrew the amendment.

Niall Pearson-Shaul proposed an amendment to insert a final resolves point: 'To delegate its power to appoint the Chair of the Review Board to the SU President, to be exercised no later than July 10th 2023, and for a single time only.', arguing that during the Vacation, Council would have no opportunity to appoint a Chair, and so that power should be delegated to the President to get the review board started as soon as possible. The President expressed discomfort and several members concurred, also expressing opposition to the idea of the SU President having this power but supported the principle of giving some group of people that delegated power.

There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass without opposition.

AMENDED

At this point in the discussion, the resolution section of the motion stood as follows:

- 1) *To approve the proposed complete review of the SU and create the suggested review board.*
- 2) *To give the Review Board the following terms of reference:*
 - a. *To investigate all aspects of the Student Union's structure and operations with regard to, and interactions with, its student members including but not limited to:*
 - i. *To consider the means of allocation of budgetary resources to constituent organisations of the SU,*
 - ii. *To consider the current forms of representation of Common Rooms, Academic Divisions, and individual student members within the SU,*
 - iii. *To consider the SU's current relationship with the University and other external organisations,*
 - iv. *To consider the SU's compliance with legal requirements, including whether compliance is frustrated but not prevented by any structural feature of the SU;*
 - b. *To be led in any investigation under a. by the experiences of the SU's Student Members, and of the Committee Members of the SU's Constituent Organisations;*
 - c. *To produce a report based on its work under a. and b. by December 2023 containing recommendations to the Student Council for reform to help the SU meet its objectives, and if such a report shall not be forthcoming by December 2023, to bring a motion to Student Council to extend that deadline.*
- 3) *To permit the Chair of the Review Board to control the Board's procedure except that:*

- a. *Only the Student Council may define the number individuals who may sit on the Review Board, and the number of non-Student Members who may sit on the Review Board;*
 - b. *Only the Student Council may appoint the Chair of the Review Board, who must be a Student Member;*
 - c. *The Review Board's procedure will otherwise be the same as the Student Council's procedure.*
- 4) *The reforms shall be proposed to Student Council, and those approved by the Council shall be taken to the relevant bodies to bring them into force.*
 - 5) *The SU should petition the University to fund this review.*
 - 6) *To delegate its power to appoint the Chair of the Review Board to the SU President, to be exercised no later than July 10th 2023, and for a single time only.*

Joe Bell proposed an amendment to replace 'SU President' with 'Sabbatical Officers' in the resolves point 6. Following an extended discussion, members accepted that the motion need not specify the particular process the Sabbatical Officers should use.

There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Joe Bell proposed an amendment to insert 'to be composed of a two-thirds majority of Student Members' at the end of resolves point 1. There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Joe Bell expressed concern that the terms of references specified in resolves point 2(a)(i)-(iv) were too restrictive and that it was important to give the review board flexibility to consider overarching institutional changes. **The President** agreed, noting their attached correspondence included only a small subset of issues that could be considered.

Joe Bell proposed an amendment to insert as resolves point 2(a)(i): 'to consider how the SU can effectively use its position to support student in the University of Oxford'. There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Gabriel Lazar proposed an amendment to strike from resolves point 2(a) all words following 'operations'. Members opposed this, reasoning that the list under 2(a) was important to give a guide to the review board. The amendment was forgotten.

The President and **Joe Bell** collaboratively proposed an amendment to insert a point 2(a)(ii): 'to consider how it can holistically support its operational staff in achieving those things mentioned in point (i) and how it can demonstrate those achievements to the University.' There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Luca Di Bona, referring to point 2(a)(iv), suggested adding a reference to possible overcompliance with legal requirements. The President responded that overcompliance was perhaps not a meaningful term but that he understood the aim of the suggestion. **Niall Pearson-Shaul** made a legal argument. The discussion was deferred and picked up again.

Joe Bell proposed an amendment to resolves point 2(a)(vi) (originally 2(a)(iv)), to replace 'compliance with legal requirements' with 'effective operation within the legal framework'. There being no opposition to the amendment, it was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

The President proposed an amendment to insert point 2(a)(v): 'to explore the needs of students in terms of societies, sporting societies, events and activities.' There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Samuel Lam asked whether adding further points to 2(a) was appropriate. **The President** emphasised the need to consider postgraduate experiences. **Joe Bell** proposed an amendment to insert a further point to 2(a): 'to consider especially the needs of Postgraduate students and students of the Continuing Education Department.' There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Samuel Lam proposed an amendment to insert a further point to 2(a): 'To consider the SU's engagement and communication strategy, including social media promotion and response to public media enquiries.' There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Samuel Lam (with input from the **President** and **Joe Bell**) proposed an amendment to insert a further point to 2(a): 'to evaluate SU resilience to urgent or crisis situations.' There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Niall Pearson-Shaul asked whether it would be worth considering requiring a specific proportion of the panel to be Postgraduate students. **The President** supported this, but members considered the proportion decided in Council would likely be arbitrary, and expressed confidence future SU leadership would be keen to ensure a high proportion.

Joe Bell proposed an amendment to strike resolves point 3(a), on the basis that it was consequential of an earlier amendment. There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

Members almost forgot that they had to consider whether to pass the motion itself. They had an extensive discussion on how the review board's progress should be reported.

Joe Bell proposed an amendment to insert resolves point 3(c): 'The Chair of the Review Board shall report progress and changes in the composition of the Review Board regularly to Student Council.' Members discussed the meaning of the word 'regularly'. Members

considered that the Chair would not be operating in bad faith, and that Council would have the power to appoint a different Chair if it so desired.

There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

The President proposed an amendment to strike resolves point 3(b). There being no opposition, the amendment was allowed to pass.

AMENDED

The Chair sought opposition to the motion; there being none, they allowed the motion to pass without opposition in the following form:

Council Notes:

- 1) 2024 marks 50 years since the OUSU's was established.
- 2) That as can be seen in the attached email dated 26th May, the SU President the SU president reached out to with Common Room Presidents and Campaigns regarding writing a paper on improving student engagement which will look into:
 1. RepCom Reform
 2. Student membership/Attendance Student Engagement Sub-Committee of the Oxford SU Trustee Board.
 3. Proposals to redistribute SU budgets to better serve students and make its more clear and transparent and to where SU money is spent
 4. New SU Strategies to properly engage JCRs and MCRs, and Societies.
 5. Rethinking SU communications and PR strategy
 6. Rethinking how/if we do what we do, some of the things we do. For example, sabbatical officers spend 70% of their time in meetings and committees. This means it might be difficult for the average student to notice our impact as most of our work is in policy and initiative design with the university and colleges. It also means sabbatical officers' working hours tend to operate 9-5, which is usually outside the time students may have the opportunity to engage and observe our impact.
- 3) The SU President has proposed a complete review of the SU, which is being taken to SU Trustee Board, Student Engagement Subcommittee, and the University. Student Council plays a key role in assessing this proposal and approving it if the Council finds it suitable.
- 4) A review in this form has been positively supported by Common Rooms

Council Believes:

- 1) The needs of Oxford Student might have changes since the current model of Oxford SU was established
- 2) In the busy environment of the SU, implementing 'bandage' solutions to problems is frequently easier and so is more commonly done.
- 3) The review proposed should be approved by Student Council, and the review board suggested should be created. This board will consist of Students, University Officials, and external experts.

- 4) The board should go to ordinary students, sports clubs, societies, and engage with them to create a report of recommendations to be implemented by the Trustee board to solve the SU's systemic problems.
- 5) Staff play a key role in the SU, and as such, staff would be included to ensure practical considerations were kept in mind.
- 6) This review board should be led by students, and place the interests of students first, so to ensure that non-student members of the board don't possess undue influence on the SU's path going forward. The review board should be independent from the University.
- 7) A whole range of possible solutions to the SU's problems should be prepared.

Council Resolves:

- 1) To approve the proposed complete review of the SU and create the suggested review board.
- 2) To give the Review Board the following terms of reference:
 - a. To investigate all aspects of the Student Union's structure and operations with regard to, and interactions with, its student members including but not limited to:
 - i. To consider how the SU can effectively use its position to support student in the University of Oxford,
 - ii. To consider how it can holistically support its operational staff in achieving those things mentioned in point (i) and how it can demonstrate those achievements to the University,
 - iii. To consider the means of allocation of budgetary resources to constituent organisations of the SU,
 - iv. To consider the current forms of representation of Common Rooms, Academic Divisions, and individual student members within the SU,
 - v. To explore the needs of students in terms of societies, sporting societies, events and activities,
 - vi. To consider the SU's current relationship with the University and other external organisations,
 - vii. To consider the SU's effective operation within the legal framework, including whether compliance is frustrated but not prevented by any structural feature of the SU,
 - viii. to consider especially the needs of Postgraduate students and students of the Continuing Education Department,
 - ix. To consider the SU's engagement and communication strategy, including social media promotion and response to public media enquiries,
 - x. To evaluate SU resilience to urgent or crisis situations;
 - b. To be led in any investigation under a. by the experiences of the SU's Student Members, and of the Committee Members of the SU's Constituent Organisations;
 - c. To produce a report based on its work under a. and b. by December 2023 containing recommendations to the Student Council for reform to help the SU

meet its objectives, and if such a report shall not be forthcoming by December 2023, to bring a motion to Student Council to extend that deadline.

- 3) To permit the Chair of the Review Board to control the Board's procedure except that:
 - a. Only the Student Council may appoint the Chair of the Review Board, who must be a Student Member,
 - b. The Chair of the Review Board shall report progress and changes in the composition of the Review Board regularly to Student Council.
- 4) The reforms shall be proposed to Student Council, and those approved by the Council shall be taken to the relevant bodies to bring them into force.
- 5) The SU should petition the University to fund this review.
- 6) To delegate its power to appoint the Chair of the Review Board to the Sabbatical Officers, to be exercised no later than July 10th 2023, and for a single time only.

PASSED

Members exchanged expressions of gratitude, variously, for those present, the Chair, Returning Officer, and the Sabbatical Officers. The meeting ended at 19:29.