

Policy Proposal: Removed elected individual renomination policy.

<i>Date:</i> 28/03/2024	<i>Proposer/s:</i> Jack McGuinness – Vice President (Welfare) Holly Lloyd – Vice President (Education)
--------------------------------	--

Current Policy/Situation

What happens at the moment?

Elected students removed from their position, whether that be via scrutiny panel or other authentic channels, due to not fulfilling their responsibilities or bad / unprofessional conduct are able to nominate themselves for another term as a Student Officer or for an Executive Officer position and be elected to the position.

New Proposal

What is your new proposal? This must include the exact wording that you would like in the Standing Orders?

*Make those who have been **removed** from elected positions be ineligible for nomination in all Union Officer elections in the following year.*

Rationale for the change

What are the pros and cons of the change? How will any cons be managed/mitigated?

Currently, there is the potential for students removed from elected positions to nominate and be elected to positions regardless of whether they were not fulfilling their responsibilities of the position they were elected to or were removed due to bad / unprofessional conduct.

In some instances, there is a significant issue that could occur if the individual(s) were removed from position due to safety issues but were then elected to positions that had safety within the remit. This issue, if it were to occur, would result in lowered confidence from all students and staff at the university for the union to keep to its safety responsibilities.

For students, having lowered confidence would drive disengagement at all levels; student voice – e.g. college and ideas forums – activities – sports, societies, student led services and other union events – and more.

Having lowered engagement has negative consequences for students who look to these groups to feel sense of community during their time at university, experience personal growth in areas such as confidence.

A lowered confidence from the University staff, especially University Leadership Group and Executive Board, would result in the issues and work brought forward by Union of Students Executive Officers being diminished, as these members would not invest trust that this work is reflective of the entire student demographic at Derby.

All of these areas would result in a decrease in public perception of the Union of Students which would further lower the performance of the Union of Students, via a decrease in external organisations wishing to have partnerships and the University decreasing block grant funds, which is the primary source of income for the organisation, allowing the charity to employ individuals with the skills and knowledge necessary to function.

Additionally, there is the reality that in some positions which work with councils, politicians, and police organisations, such as the president and VP (Welfare), would result in disengagement with these groups, resulting in the student voice not being effectively implemented into necessary conversations.

Pros – ensures those previously removed from positions due to not fulfilling the responsibilities of the position or due to bad / unprofessional conduct are not able to nominate themselves for positions again in the following year.

This would imbue confidence those elected to positions are able to uphold the necessities of the positions and the conduct standards of the Union of Students.

Cons – Students can experience much larger quantities of workload than they originally expected when nominating themselves for and being elected to positions. And, the Union of Students always says for students to prioritise their education.

Additionally, students can have experiences outside of their formal studies that can have negative impacts on their mental and physical health.

Both factors can impact the performance of individuals within the positions, and some may see this policy as ignoring this and stopping those that have had these experiences from progressing into certain positions.

It must be noted that there is a lengthy process of what individuals in positions go through before being removed, such as check-ins, to ensure the wellbeing of students. Additionally, the permanent staff members within voice, advice and activities are there to provide any support or advice those in elected positions may need.

Scrutiny panel is the very last step in the process and provides the opportunity for individuals to share the work they have completed as part of the responsibilities the position they are in requires.

Additionally, students in these positions must reflect on their own capacity and should communicate with the permanent staff members any personal or professional issues that may hinder their performance. As and where the student(s) feels necessary, this should be stepping back from the position if they are above capacity and unable to fulfil the responsibilities of the position they are in.

Stepping back from the position would allow another student to be elected to the position.

The Executive Officers proposing this policy would like to make clear that stepping down for a position for any reason would not stop individuals from nominating themselves in the future.

This policy is aimed at those who have to be **removed** from positions.

What consideration or consultation have you taken prior to submitting this proposal? *All proposals go the exec team to be confirmed, so having insufficient consultation/consideration could mean the proposal is rejected.*

Have you considered any impact of the new proposal on any of the protected characteristics as listed in the Equality Act 2010? *What are the impacts and how will any negative impacts be managed/mitigated? For more information on the protected characteristics please see [Equality Act 2010 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://legislation.gov.uk)*

Appendices *if necessary.*