

# Student Council Minutes

From meeting dated 26.03.2026

<b>Chaired by:</b>	<b>Muhammad Razza</b>	<b>MR</b>
--------------------	-----------------------	-----------

## Student Leaders in attendance

<b>SVL – Communities</b>	<b>Twig Smalley</b>	<b>TS</b>
<b>SVL – International Experience</b>	<b>Aamira Waghmar</b>	<b>AW</b>
<b>SVL – Academic Experience</b>	<b>Precious Ikechukwu</b>	<b>PI</b>

## Apologies were received by:

- **SVL – Employability (Badhri Durgapu)**
- **SVL – Inclusion & Wellbeing (Dilpreet Kaur)**

## Election of Student Voting Members

No students were elected as Voting Members since the meeting did not reach quorum.

## Minutes from the previous meeting

The previous minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

## Manifesto Progress Reports: Student Voice Leaders

**Precious Ikechukwu – Academic Experience**

**Twig Smalley – Communities**

**Aamira Waghmar – International Experience**

## Scrutiny Panel Report

The Scrutiny Panel report is available in **Appendix B of this document**.

### **Verbal Trustee Board Update**

No Trustee Board meeting took place between the previous Student Council and today. The next Trustee Board meeting is 30<sup>th</sup> March 2026.

### **Motions**

The following motions were discussed during Student Council but could not be voted on due to not meeting quorum.

#### **Motion to use WhatsApp as a primary form of communication between DSU Opportunities & societies / student groups**

*Proposed by Ellie Strain*

##### Key Highlights of Motion:

The motion aims to ask DSU to use WhatsApp as a primary form of contact to student groups & societies to allow for quicker and easier communication.

##### Discussion:

This is a good idea, as WhatsApp is a well-used and frequented social media platform by students. It also allows for quick changes to events or socials to be communicated quickly and easily. Also used to poll people and gather opinions quickly, as well as providing a space for individuals to chat.

A lot of societies use Discord which is working quite well. If groups wanted to continue using Discord they would still be able to however.

#### **Motion to introduce pre-candidate interviews to the Election nomination process**

*Proposed by Maddie Willey*

Key Highlights of Motion:

The Student Voice Leaders are paid roles, and the motion holder feels there should be a “vetting” process in place due to it being a job. Student fees are, in a sense, going toward the salaries of SVLs so there should be a stricter process to decide who is suitable.

Discussion:

SU staff would conduct interviews. Would it be an idea to get members of Scrutiny Panel involved in interviews as well, as they would work quite closely with SVLs.

Candidates should be interviewed as if they’re going to get the role, then only be allowed to campaign following this.

Appeals process would be something to work out but candidates would be expected to back up suitability with evidence.

There is no vetting process currently in place; the only barrier to entry would be the candidate briefing.

The motion focuses on the abilities required to represent students at different levels, not just if manifesto goals are suitable. Do students realize the SVLs are a full-time paid position?

Other jobs require an interview to determine competency for the role; should the SVL role be different? The interview process should focus on whether the candidate is “doing it for the right reasons” rather than just getting the role itself.

Could the “interview” be replaced with a group interview / debate? Against a panel which can highlight public speaking, dealing with pressure, which are skills expected in the role.

Must ensure that, if passed, it does not impact students’ ability to engage with SU and get involved if they wish.

Requirements and expectations of candidates would be ironed out prior to rollout, but above all the quality of students’ passion should shine through.

There are accountability measures in place already such as Scrutiny Panel, Vote of No Confidence, etc. This adds an extra layer of accountability.

## General Discussion

The theme for this general discussion is:

***“Would it be fair for DSU to share which candidates have received warnings / sanctions with***

### **voters during the Elections?**

Students who ran in the elections feel that, at the very least, candidates should have information on other candidate warnings / sanctions.

Positive reception to this idea because of voter transparency, which helps students make informed choices. However, there should be a degree of control. Voting is down to numbers and popularity, and it could open a culture of spreading false information to get a “black mark” on someone.

Northampton SU display candidate complaints & DRO response, without naming candidate until larger actions e.g. DQ, publicity restraint, are taken to avoid smearing campaigns.

DSU has an obligation to be 100% transparent, and this change is in the best interest to allow students to make the most informed choices.

Important to draw the line between warnings / sanctions. Sanctions are essentially offenses that are proven to have happened, and the difference should be communicated.

There’s been two years in a row where candidates have been disqualified based on harassment, and this information should be communicated to voters not just for transparency but for the safety of other students as well.

Should there be an option for candidate to give response / opinion if flagged?

Council seems to highlight that it’s relatively easy to follow the rules, so voters should be allowed to know if individuals have broken them.

### **Any Other Business**

Any other business that falls outside of the previous topic points will be discussed here.

#### **Open Letter to DSU & DMU – Concerns from Home students**

Concerns about current SVL candidates' ability to effectively champion both international and home student representation. SVL Intl. Experience was created to enhance Intl. Student experience, why isn't there a sister role created?

Students feel there is a lack of support for home students, COL Crisis is affecting home students' ability to park at uni, placement, work etc. Students are facing increasing temptation to drop out based on pressures. Commuting via car is quite a unique home student experience, whereas intl. Students tend to live quite close to campus. It shouldn't be the burden of international students to champion the home students' burden.

Home students often have extra commitments to deal with, e.g. excess part time work, placements, and also attending things like Course Rep meetings, but there is only so much we can attend before something has to give.

**Discussion surrounding whether the Voting Member status should be given to all students rather than just Student Leaders.**

Voting members currently consist of Society Committee, Course Rep, Liberation Officers & Faculty Leads. We can elect students not in these roles to become Voting Members. However, this is reliant on meeting quorum, so should we open this up?

Depending on the motion that comes through, whether it affects all students or just a particular group would decide whether all voting members could vote, or should it just be specific groups?

You don't have to be a Voting Member to submit a motion, so you could submit a motion, but you're not able to vote on your own motion to pass. It can be quite a convoluted explanation about being a voting member.

Could there be a system where voting preference / weighting based on the community that it affects? E.g. WhatsApp motion would affect mainly society members; academic changes would mainly affect Course Reps. However, would this then invite separate quorums and vote weighting which could be overcomplicated.

If we do not hit quorum with specific demographics, then we could open wider student votes. If we opened up meetings to wider student body, we could get better turnouts as well as a wider range of opinions. Motions could come through that all of Council agrees with, but students with no power do not agree with.

Students being allowed to vote could help with people not knowing who their Course Reps are and allows students to directly get involved with Council. It also lowers accessibility hurdles – quorum has not been hit repeatedly; we are struggling to fill roles for Scrutiny Panel.

Quorum would be raised to 50 members if opened.

## Meeting Close & Actions Arising

**At 13:03, the meeting was closed.**

# Appendix B

From Scrutiny Panel Meeting dated 16.03.2026

## Meeting Close & Actions Arising

At 17:17, the meeting was closed.

A vote was taken by Scrutiny Panel and determined the following:

The Students Leaders have made sufficient progress toward their manifesto goals. However, Scrutiny Panel offers the following feedback & recommendations to aid progress toward their goals.

Precious: She could work faster on her projects, rather than starting new ones. It could help to be a bit more experimental with how to achieve certain things, trying new approaches and new engagement methods.

Twig: Communicate stronger re: shortfalls that affect Sports Club & Socs, as well as ensuring communication is farther ahead. They could also explore avenues such as community organizing within Leicester e.g. Cultural Exchanges, Riverside Festival etc.

Dilpreet: Currently happy with progress made

Aamira: Better communication regarding events, campaigns and also working to ensure she spreads the load of representation well, considering the gaps currently in place.

Badhri: Expand outreach & events from just being in the Campus Centre and consider other spaces within the university to host workshops & networking, especially spaces tailor made for employment training, as well as making it accessible for all faculties as there could be an imbalance toward academically focused roles. Also considering the disjointment between TAC students being spread across university.