AMM Summary

Officer Updates

- The full-time officer team updated the meeting on what they've been working on, including the introduction of Society Forums, the launch of Injury Support Group, plans for a bus service to Coombe Dingle for TB2 exams, the Russell Group SU International Students' Survey, a trial of free period products at the university, work on assessment feedback and the personal tutoring system, and the launch of the Borrow-a-Blazer scheme.
- Attendees asked questions of the officer team. These focussed on personal tutoring, timescales for receiving assessment feedback, the range of optional units on offer to students on small courses, and timetable management.

Introduction to Trustees and Byelaw 10

- Kreeshi, one of Bristol SU's student trustees introduced the role of the trustees, and brought changes to Byelaw 10 to be approved by AMM.
- She outlined the changes, explaining that it is an administrative change to remove mention of the election rules and complaints procedure in Byelaw 10, as these are covered under the complaints policy and election rules.
- Attendees asked questions, clarifying the changes and the purpose of the vote. Kreeshi emphasised that there will be no change to the substance of the rules that are currently included within byelaw 10, they will just be moved to the relevant policies.
- The chair called for a vote, and the majority approved the update, therefore the update to Byelaw 10 passed.

Affiliations

- The groups that the SU is affiliated with the cost of each affiliation was displayed on the screen.
- One student asked for clarification over one of the groups
- The chair called for a vote, and the majority approved the update, therefore the affiliations passed.

Motions

<u>Motion 1: Championing the Wellbeing of Student Groups</u>

Proposer: Ella Lovibond Seconder: Katie Poyner

- Ella Lovibond, the Sport and Student Development officer, gave a speech proposing this motion. She highlighted the importance of having a specific role in student groups to focus on wellbeing, clarifying that this role would not be a therapist, but someone who raises awareness and signposts to support. This

kind of work is already being done in student groups, but as it is not standardised it is difficult to support. The motion is very flexible so that the changes can be implemented in a way that makes sense to each group, and steps have been taken to make it easy to implement changes to the group's constitution.
- Attendees asked questions to the proposer and seconder of the motion, clarifying that the new role can be combined with another on the committee, the training for the role, and the implementation of any changes to constitutions.
- Nobody chose to speak against this motion.
- The chair called for a vote, and **the majority approved the motion, therefore the motion passed**.

Policy Renewals

The following three motions are policy that has previously been passed at a democratic meeting three years previously, that are due to lapse this year. These are being brought to AMM to be renewed for a further three years.

<u>Policy Renewal: Lobbying an in-house guarantor scheme</u>

Proposer: Lucy Pears Seconder: Bakhtawar Javed

- Lucy Pears, the Student Living officer, gave a speech proposing this motion. She explained that she has already been working on this motion with the officer team. She emphasised the difficulties that students experience finding housing, and highlighted that access to a UK based guarantor is a particular barrier for international students, so finding housing is extremely challenging. The motion seeks to lobby the university to take responsibility for supporting students with accessing housing through an in-house guarantor scheme.
- Attendees asked questions clarifying what an in-house guarantor means. Lucy explained that a guarantor agrees to pay if a person is unable to pay their rent; by having an in-house guarantor scheme the university would agree to pay. She further explained that this means the student can be given support, and a repayment plan agreed with the university that is sensitive to the needs of the student. Another question asked about the existing work towards this motion, to which Lucy responded that one option that has been explored so far is whether the SU could become a guarantor.
- Nobody chose to speak against this motion.
- The chair called for a vote, and **the majority approved the motion, therefore the motion passed.**

<u>Policy Renewal: Supporting students who have experienced Sexual Misconduct</u>

Proposer: Linlu Ye Seconder: Lucy Pears

- Linlu Ye, the Equality, Liberation and Access officer gave a speech proposing this motion. She shared some statistics regarding the high number of women who have experienced sexual harassment, and who feel unsafe walking home at night. She outlined some of the work that has already been done while this policy has been active, such as the university creating a new Sexual Violence Liaison Officer team (SVLO), and plans for the Sexual Health Awareness and Guidance (SHAG) campaign which is happening in March.
- Attendees asked questions on what actions would be taken, and whether the University had been supporting students who had experienced sexual harassment in the past. Linlu detailed actions such as developing the SVLO team, consent training and bystander training. They explained how the support process was lengthy and complicated before, but the SVLO team is now directly dedicated to the issue.
- Attendees asked what work had already been done under this motion and Linlu responded with the 'Bristol nights campaign' and 'Lift the curfew' events, which enabled women to run at night. An attendee asked for clarification on the term "bystander training". Linlu explained it as training SU and university staff to help prevent harassment and assault.
- A question was asked on why Bristol University was named by 'Everyone's United', Lucy Pears (SLO) stated she did not know why Bristol were named in particular. She admitted there is a problem that needs addressing but highlights how this is not an issue restricted to Bristol alone.
- Nobody chose to speak against the motion.
- The chair called for a vote, and **the majority approved the motion, therefore the motion passed.**

<u>Policy Renewal: Fossil Free Careers</u>

Proposer: Lucy Pears Seconder: Trixie Panatti-Reeve

- Lucy Pears, Student Living Officer, began the proposer speech, giving an example of how this policy has been enacted recently: BP want to work with Bristol SU and was denied due to this m, otion.
- Trixie Panatti-Reeve, Global Development and Environment Campaigns Coordinator for Earth Justice Society, added concerns about the university's connections to fossil fuel companies, which contradict the sustainability credentials of the university. Oil and gas companies have a huge impact on the environment, driving the climate crisis, highlighting the fact that the climate crisis has the biggest impact on those who contribute to it the least. The motion, which has been policy for the past three years, highlights the support from students for promoting ethical careers.

- An attendee asked whether policy would apply to promotion of all careers within these companies, or just those specifically involved in fossil fuel extraction. Trixie confirmed that the policy applies to all careers at all companies listed on the Carbon Underground 200 list.
- Another attendee asked whether the environmental impact of arms companies are included within this motion. Lucy clarified that they aren't included in this motion, but are covered by other work the officers are doing.
- An attendee asked whether this policy infringed on students' rights to explore employment opportunities, to which Lucy responded that the motion doesn't prevent students from proactively exploring any employment opportunities they're interested in, it just prevents the SU from promoting particular companies. She added that the university is an independent body – the motion only dictates the actions of the SU and the work of the full-time officer team.
- An attendee asked whether the motion would prevent societies from partnering with these companies – Lucy responded that this is complex; the motion would stop them from using the companies' logos, but we've not encountered issues with this in the past.
- Nobody chose to speak against this motion.
- The chair called for a vote, and **the majority approved the motion, therefore the motion passed.**

<u>Motion 2: Implement recycling soft / flexible plastic at Bristol University</u>

Proposer: Anna-Rose Pearce Seconder: Ned Gardner-Thorpe

- Ned Gardner-Thorpe gave a speech proposing this motion, explaining that single use plastics need to be recycled in a specific way, and are usually only recycled at large supermarkets. This means that people either don't recycle them or have to expend a lot of time and energy to recycle them. Other universities have schemes for recycling them, and the motion asks the SU to lobby the university to work with the council on implementing a similar scheme. The proposers would look to add to this motion later to increase the push for bins in a wider variety of university spaces.
- Attendees asked for some clarification on exactly how a recycling scheme for soft plastics would work, but Ned explained that the council would take care of the actual collection and recycling process. The motion aims to make it easier for students to recycle these materials. The motion also dictates that bins would be accompanied by a poster to signpost the bins and what can go in them.
- Another attendee asked why the motion only calls for bins in the university accomodation. Ned explained that this was missed in the writing of the initial

motion, but that the motion proposers would look to extend the locations of bins throughout the university later on.
- Nobody chose to speak against this motion.
- The chair called for a vote, and **the majority approved the motion, therefore the motion passed.**

Motion 3: Transition to Sustainable and Affordable Catering as a Students Union by Adopting a Plant-Based Menu

Proposer: Agnes Sales Seconder: Nathaniel Joyce

- Agnes Sales gave a speech proposing the motion, talking about how the university prides itself on sustainability but the climate impact of animal agriculture is often overlooked. This campaign has support from Carla Denyer, the Green Party MP for Bristol. The motion aims to increase the amount of affordable prepackaged plant-based food in Source cafes at the university, to make plant-based food more accessible to students. The motion also aims to set an example for other universities to follow.
- Attendees asked for clarification over whether the motion mandates 100% plant-based food on campus. Agnes explained that it doesn't it just focusses on expanding and making more affordable the plant-based options. Additionally, the SU doesn't control catering, the motion just dictates that the SU lobbies the university.
- Another attendee asked about how the motion would work with regards to international food fairs. Agnes responded that the only impact of the motion on student groups was with regards to accreditation.
- An attendee asked whether the motion dictates endorsement of the external Plant-Based Universities Campaign. Agnes responded that it wouldn't necessarily constitute an endorsement of the entire campaign – at Bristol it is specific to expanding prepackaged plant-based options.
- The chair asked for speeches against the motion.

Opposing speech

- In the first opposing speech, the speaker argued that cheaper plant-based food doesn't increase sustainability as there will be more processing infrastructure needed for vegetables. They added that there are already vegan options in university spaces, and that the £1 cost difference doesn't make a big difference.

Speech for

- The speaker explained that they support this motion for its climate impact, arguing that demand on water for growing animal feed has a huge negative

environmental impact, and that reducing the consumption of meat would have an immediate positive impact. They added that more affordable food would also be a positive thing, allowing students to make choices to stay nourished while lessening their environmental impact.

Speech against

- The speaker explained that they wanted to critique the motion, rather than oppose it necessarily. They argued that it's not as straightforward as plants = good, animals = bad. They added that the produce sold in Source cafes is sourced from local farms, which could not just be replaced with growing plants.

Speech for

- Lucy Pears, Student Living Officer, agreed with the motion proposer that prepackaged plant-based food options are overpriced, and that this has an impact on students. She added that within her officer role she is already working on these issues, therefore that the motion is in line with student priorities.

Speech against

- The speaker talked about food provenance and meat consumption, arguing that the use of land for arable or other farming varies wildly. They added that stopping consumption of locally sourced meat will not have a large impact on water availability in other parts of the world.

An attendee spoke to the Democratic Standards Committee and requested delaying voting on this motion. The chair asked them to speak in favour of delaying the motion

Speech in favour of delaying the motion

- The speaker explained that they wanted to delay the motion on the basis of outside political influence, emphasising that they felt that the involvement of an outside political party telling students how to vote was a concern, as a politically neutral organisation. [This was in reference to mention of Carla Denyer's endorsement of the motion in the proposers speech]

Speech against delaying the motion

- The motion proposer agreed that the SU shouldn't be affiliated with any political party. They clarified that they had mentioned Carla Denyer's support for the campaign to demonstrate that people with expertise in the relevant topics support the motion; it doesn't mean endorsing anything that any political party does.

The chair called for a vote on delaying the motion. **Majority against delaying the motion, will move to vote on the motion now.**

The chair called for a vote on the motion, and **the majority approved the motion, therefore the motion passed.**

Motion 4: Extending the eligibility criteria for students doing non-modular professional programmes as second undergraduate degrees.

Proposer: Naryce Anderson Seconder: Susie Webster

- Naryce Anderson and Susie Webster gave a speech proposing the motion. They explained that students undertaking their first undergraduate degree can access a bursary that those who are on their second degree cannot access. There is a programme within the veterinary school that you can only take if it is your second undergraduate degree so we want to extend the financial support for these students. One of the criteria for the bursary is that you must have a tuition loan, which we cannot access. It would make a huge difference to students who are currently having to work on top of an accelerated veterinary degree. It's hard to meet the requirements of the course if working alongside it.
- An attendee asked where the money for this would come from – whether it would necessitate cutting other services. The proposers explained that the bursary comes from the university, and as the course is small with an even smaller number of students who would be eligible, it shouldn't necessitate cuts.
- Another attendee asked whether this financial support for those doing mandatory placements would be extended to 5 year as well as intensive programmes. The proposers responded that it was important that support is more widely available.
- The chair called for a vote, and **the majority approved the motion, therefore the motion passed.**

Any Other Business

- A reminder that TB2 elections nominations are open.