

Policy Proposal:

Date:
02/11/2023

Proposer/s:
Dominic White – Union President
Holly Lloyd – Vice President Education

Current Policy/Situation

What happens at the moment?

At present only members of the sports and societies council, elected student officers and SLS Executive committee members can serve as scrutiny panellists.
There is also no representative from the University present as an observer.

New Proposal

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

4.6.1.6. Scrutiny Panel Panellists shall consist of the Chair and 6 members. Representatives from each of the following areas must be invited to the panel:

- 4.6.1.6.1. Student Officers;
- 4.6.1.6.2. Members of the Sports Council;
- 4.6.1.6.3. Members of the Societies Council;
- 4.6.1.6.4. Executive Committee Members of Student-Led Services;
- 4.6.1.6.5. Members of Sports Club Committees;
- 4.6.1.6.6. Student Course Representatives; and
- 4.6.1.6.7. Members of Society Committees

Additionally, an invitation shall always be extended by the Union President and/or Vice President Education to senior members of the university to attend the panel as observers of the proceedings. Only one University observer may be privy to one closed-session deliberation process per academic year. The University observer may indicate which panel they wish to attend for the deliberation process, subject to the approval of the Union Democracy and Governance Coordinator, Voice Manager and Head of Membership. The Union Executive Officers and any individual who is being scrutinised must be informed if a University Observer will be present and the identity of the individual at least 24 hours in advance. The University observers shall have no voting rights and cannot advise panellists in any fashion so as to not influence the panel's outcomes.

Rationale for the change

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

Pro – Enables a much wider base of students the opportunity to be a part of the scrutiny panel process and to hold the officers to account

Gives the University a clearer insight into our accountability and how the students are able to hold us to account.

Cons – Students who may not have won in officer election may use this as a route to bring up grievances against those who are elected.

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.*

Having spoken to the Officer team and thinking about our communal themes, in particular Exploration Opportunity Change and Voice Visibility Presence. Enabling more students to take part gives them further opportunity in skills development and boost awareness about the Union and what we as Executive Officers do.

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)*

N/A

Appendices *if necessary.*

N/A