

Policy Proposal:

Date: 09/09/2026

Proposer/s:

Kaeda Hipkiss and Nduka Akubuo

Current Policy/Situation

What happens at the moment?

During committee elections, communities are currently required to achieve 30% quoracy for an election to be considered valid and for students to be formally elected as committee members.

This means that at least 30% of the community's eligible membership must participate in the election process. The requirement is intended to ensure that committee members are elected with a sufficient level of support from the wider community, rather than being appointed by only a very small number of members.

Where an election does not reach the 30% quoracy threshold, the election cannot be confirmed in the usual way. This can create difficulties for communities, particularly where membership numbers are low, engagement is limited, or students are unable to participate in the election at the time it is held.

The current policy therefore places responsibility on communities to encourage sufficient participation from their members during the election period. However, this can also mean that communities struggle to form a full committee despite having students willing to take on committee positions, simply because the required level of participation has not been reached.

New Proposal

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

Committee members would still be elected through the Students' Union's existing Committee Elections process, ensuring that elections remain transparent, consistent and accessible to all members. However, no minimum quoracy requirement would need to be met for an election to be valid.

This would mean that students who are willing to stand for a committee position could be elected by the members who choose to participate, without the election being invalidated because overall participation falls below the current 30% threshold.

Removals in the standing order can be seen in red -

8.14.3. Communities Committee elections will be limited to the membership of the Community, ~~which should have a quorum of 30%+1 for each position to be successfully elected. If quorum is not met the elections will be reopened.~~

Rationale for the change

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

The proposed change would make it easier for students to be elected into community committee positions and allow communities to establish their committees more efficiently.

Currently, when an election does not reach the required 30% quoracy, elections often have to be reopened or repeated. This can significantly prolong the election process and create additional administrative work for both students and Students' Union staff.

Removing the quoracy requirement would simplify the process by allowing students to be elected based on the participation that does take place, rather than requiring a specific percentage of the community to vote. This would reduce delays, minimise unnecessary administration and make the process easier for both students and staff.

It would also help communities establish and maintain functioning committees, particularly where membership or engagement is lower, reducing the risk of communities being left without committee members due to insufficient participation.

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.*

In previous years, the required level of quoracy has consistently been difficult to achieve during committee elections. The quoracy requirement was previously set at 50% but was reduced to 30% in an attempt to make elections more accessible and achievable for communities.

Despite this reduction, some elections have still failed to reach the 30% threshold. This has resulted in elections needing to be reopened or extended to allow communities further opportunities to reach the required level of participation. The continued difficulty in achieving quoracy suggests that the current requirement may still be creating an unnecessary barrier to the election of committee members.

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.*