

The following questions were submitted to the All Student Meeting through the Q&A function on Zoom. As they were not answered during the meeting, updates have been provided below. Any statements made through the Q&A, either in favour or against motions have not been included.

Question	Update
Will the E&E role be kept?	As part of the next phase of the implementation of the Democracy Review, as outlined by the PG Officer at ASM, the Guild will be consulting our membership on what areas the Community Organisers should include. One of those areas is sustainability (environmental and ethical concerns) and student feedback will be considered when deciding. The Guild of Students is committed to maintaining and continuing working to ethical and environmental values.
how is it that the same people who run a society this year are suddenly a safety concern a few months after graduation?	<p>The decisions made by Trustee Board do not assume that a change takes place as suggested, but the current/previous system prevents the GoS from distinguishing between the types of external members.</p> <p>When any student graduates, and becomes an alumnus, they are not subject to the same level of accountability and sanction through the Guild and (or) University conduct processes as they would have been as a student.</p>
Why was so much action taken on external members before the student body was made aware that discussions were taking place? it seems like this contributed to feelings of a lack of transparency	A number of serious allegations had been made about the conduct of external members. At the time it was deemed that immediate action was necessary to prevent further risk of harm. Due to the serious nature of the allegations, confidentiality was of key importance.

Question	Update
<p>Student Groups seemed entirely unprepared after the decision was made, despite me being assured by the President that they could assist with any issues. Their solutions were not particularly great, and they haven't proposed any ideas since the initial talks. Why were there not plans and discussions being made when this decision was initially considered in October?</p>	<p>When the decision was taken in January by Trustee Board, the Student Activities team were tasked with reaching out to all 67 student groups affected to assess their support needs. It was acknowledged that different groups would have been affected in different way. All 67 groups were contacted, of which 8 groups opted to meet with their Coordinator, and 6 groups met with the President. The Student Activities team remain available to support and work with affected groups.</p>
<p>Given that cases of student misconduct are also frequently handled poorly, would it be interesting to consider a general complaints, misconduct and security review, instead of blaming incidents on external members, who are only a fraction of misconduct offenders?</p>	<p>The Guild has recently reviewed its Complaints and Incidents processes, and as a result, has invested in a new staff role to manage the processes involved. Shortly, the Complaints process will be moving online to the Guild's website in order to streamline and improve the process.</p>
<p>Why isn't there a process for removing external membership? Would it not be the same process as removing a student from the Guild without having to remove their University enrolment? What makes it so much more difficult than a regular student?</p>	<p>There is a process under Byelaw 2 (1.3.4) to remove External Membership from an individual. However, the issue is about accountability in the event of serious misconduct, and the lack of recourse. In the case of external members, specifically alumni and the general public, they are not subject to University Code of Conducts, therefore this essential creates a situation where students have more accountability than external members.</p>
<p>For: some student groups, from personal opinion the tea society, are dependant on external members (staff + alumni) for donations of tea and funds. I'd assume the same applies for other, decades-old societies.</p>	<p>UoB Staff are included in the preliminary list of categories for which external membership is being reinstated. As was noted in the meeting, a solution is being worked on for external members who are UoB alumni.</p>
<p>On the subject of the severity of the initial issues, yes, I agree. Why did it take until February to announce that memberships would be closed, when my meetings with the President has suggested the issues occurred in September/October. 4+ months is far to long to justify the situation as "needing to be dealt with quickly"</p>	<p>As this involved a possible Byelaw change this required discussion and approval of the Trustee Board, which happened in January 2023. The Trustee Board met and discussed the matter, and supported the continued suspension of new external membership applications. It took until February as the Trustee Board wanted to ensure there was a plan in place to support affected groups.</p>

Question	Update
Has the Guild followed up from the points raised from the previous meeting that other unions do this? Since the Democracy review looked at other Unions, has the Guild looked at how other Unions handle misconduct?	The Guild has and continues to look at good practice in the sector, whilst also seeking advice from the National Union of Students.
The president is, according to the Byelaws: "Be ultimately accountable for the Guild of Students complying with the provisions of the Bye-Laws and adhering to changes made through the Member's Democratic Process, particularly where relevant to their Officer portfolio." The Members Democratic Process has not been followed, therefore the President is accountable. Do you agree?	All Officers are accountable to Full Members of the Guild of Students and Byelaw 7 outlines their remit and direction. The Officers are also Trustees and sit with the Student and External Trustees to form the Board of Trustees, who have ultimate responsibility for the organisation and can make changes without consultation should they need to.
The result of the All Student Meeting was to re-open the external membership application form on the Guild website for this year. Regardless of the debate over externals next year, the form has not been reopened yet. Will you be intending to re-open the form this year?	Yes, as soon as practically possible in line with the Trustee Board statement of 16 th May 2023.
could you answer the proposers claim that the illegality comment was misleading?	The President used the word 'illegal' in order to allow the context of ultra vires to be understood within the conversation, as the proper term (ultra vires) is not necessarily commonly known. Ultra Vires is the term for acting outside the scope of charitable objectives, the converse of which is a legal duty on all charities.
I am slightly confused about the terminology used for the "compulsory consent course" when an opt out is there for anyone to misuse, most likely those that need the course will simply opt-out right?	The consent course will be offered to all students and all will be expected to complete it. In partnership with the university, we endeavour to keep our education survivor-friendly and the opt out function is to prevent the implied need for survivors to make disclosures. If you would like to discuss more ideas about how we can create survivor-friendly education, please contact welfare@guild.bham.ac.uk RIS

Question	Update
<p>Is it true that the Guild blocked the release of lineup for valefest? Personally I didn't buy because I didn't know what was playing</p>	<p>The Guild did not block the release of the line-up for Valefest. In order to release the artist line up, a contract is required between the Guild and the artists, which would create a legal agreement to pay those artists (both in the case of the event happening and potential compensation if it was cancelled). Due to the significant financial concerns, it was not appropriate to contract to large artist costs before a workable budget was agreed to avoid the event losing money.</p>
<p>Why have minutes been so slow to be published from basically every major body? The Trustee Board minutes from January took until May to be published, and only once I (and others) started calling this out did the March ones get published... also in May. This shows that they COULD have been published in a more reasonable time frame, but weren't. The FTO minutes since January were only published this week, and were all published at once, proving they were written, but hidden. Student Groups are given only 2 weeks to send minutes to members and SG themselves, why is a similar timeframe not in place for the Guild itself?</p>	<p>We are sorry that we have failed to published minutes to our own expected standards. We are actively working to improve this and commit to ensuring that going forward all minutes, where appropriate, will be published in a timely fashion</p>