



University of East Anglia Students' Union (SU)

UEA50 May 2026

22/05/2026 - 16:00-18:00

Council Chamber – UEA

Minutes

Useful Information

Code of Conduct

All students are members of the union, and so should behave appropriately in line with our Code of Conduct.

[Code of Conduct Complaints](#)

Articles of Association and Byelaws

The Union's governing document, the Articles of Association, and its rule book, the Byelaws, can be found online.

[Constitution](#)

Quorum

Business shall not be conducted by the UEA50 unless 50%+1 of voting members are present. In the case of the UEA50, this is 26 voting members.

General Information

Author:	Nicole Ajibade
Status:	Complete
In attendance:	<p>Beth Plant (Facilitator) Nicole Ajibade (Minuting) Ayane Hida-Stringer (Staff support) Jumara Stone (Staff support) Yusra Carroll (Staff support) Kathryn Redfern (Staff support) Turaiya Lemard (Staff support)</p> <p>Engji Salihu (Proposer) Wilym Dunnell (Proposer) Jaz Brook (Proposer)</p> <p>30 members of the UEA50, quoracy is reached (26 required).</p>
Agenda Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registration, welcomes and housekeeping • Ban the use of images produced by generative AI at uea(su) • Proposal to Improve SU Committee Attendance and Accountability • Ensure the SU retains use and management of the LCR, not the UEA • Keeping the LCR and SU Commercial Services Student-Led and Within the SU • Confirmation of decisions, thank you and goodbye

Minutes

001	<p>BP welcomes attendees and performs soundcheck and housekeeping. Room waits for 5 minutes for any latecomers. BP introduces self and introduce the new system of the UEA50. She is acting as the facilitator only, encouraging conversation between the members of the UEA50 and will not be giving opinions in the discussions. BP encourages UEA50 members to treat each other kindly and fairly and be respectful in discussions with one another and reminds members that this is not a parliament-like discussion with two opposing sides, rather a discussion meeting to try and reach a consensus based on arguments and changes suggested by the attendees.</p>
002	<p>Practice proposal: Painting the LCR blue – practise proposal</p> <p>Everyone splits into groups to discuss the fake proposal of “painting Union House blue”. Each group was asked to discuss the topic in these small groups before the discussion in brought into the centre of the room and a consensus will be reached. Groups discussed arguments linked to the proposal, including visual appeal, added ‘whimsy’, reduction on temperature, and reasoning. BP then calls for a vote and all members vote.</p>
003	<p>Proposal 1: Ban the use of images produced by generative AI at uea(su)</p> <p>BP gives members a few minutes to read through the proposal and discuss it in groups.</p> <p>Attendee states that their group had mixed opinions about the proposal. On one hand, using generative AI saves time which could be beneficial for committee members, making ads for society events as well as marketing teams within the SU. On the other hand, using AI in this way does seem sort of lazy and removes an element of creativity, which is not favorable when having access to so many creative people across the university. They also point out the fact that accepting AI use may contradict the universities' green initiative as AI is actively harmful to the environment and in turn, notably not eco-friendly.</p> <p>An attendee states that her group agrees with the previous groups' points but also wants to raise the idea that by using generative AI, we would be taking away from the income of photographers paid for these shoots and the models they are photographing which may also be students.</p> <p>An attendee points out that although they agree with the talk about AI use possibly taking jobs away from some people, they add that it does not take a long time to create adverts and take photographs oneself and therefore shows there is no need for AI use for that reason.</p> <p>An attendee agrees with benefits outlined in proposal but notes that as the SU is a charity, banning the use of AI is important. They make the point that students shouldn't get penalized for using AI considering it is integrated in everything nowadays and so it would not be fair to continue penalizing them for taking shortcuts.</p> <p>With the environmental and moral impacts of AI being considered, there is a difference between the SU as a business using AI compared to a student as part of a society using</p>

	<p>generative AI, especially as they are not paid for their time unlike staff working for a business.</p> <p>An attendee agreed with the motion, adding that as a computer science student they are given explicit permission to use AI in their work. They state that AI's power is held in the perceived power we as people give it and so with a lot of the motion being 'emotional in tone', the proposal can be a little bit misleading. This attendee believes the motion so go ahead but should come from an angle of understanding AI and that it is not that scary.</p> <p>BP asks for the consensus with a majority in support of the motion - 24 attendees voted in favour and the proposal passes.</p>
004	<p>Proposal 2: Improve SU Committee Attendance and Accountability</p> <p>BP asks the room if anyone has any questions about the motion to start.</p> <p>An attendee asks for more information about how the meetings run because although they like the gist of the proposal, it is unclear how it will accommodate peoples schedules and it may become an issue if it requires people to miss key life moments in order to attend. They ask whether members agree on the times or whether it is a set time given to them.</p> <p>BP responds that the times are set ahead of time for the whole year, and the dates and times are shared with members at the start of the year and added to people's diaries.</p> <p>An attendee asks what the remit of the committee is, what changes they are making and what the impact of the changes have on students.</p> <p>BP explains that proposals go through the UEA50 system and are either sent to UEA50 or the relevant subcommittee.</p> <p>An attendee asks if the proposer has a quota for the number of emergencies a member can request accommodations for before it no longer becomes acceptable. They ask whether that will be decided on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>BP states that she is unsure as it was not made clear in the proposal by the proposer.</p> <p>JS states that if there is a reference in proposal of how clubs run their attendance management then she would imagine it would be the same for the proposal.</p> <p>An attendee states that as a member of a student group, they have observed that clubs and societies don't have formal structure, and that they just complain to SU when people fail to attend repeatedly.</p> <p>Another attendee states that the proposal isn't actually proposing a change. They state that it is too vague, and they suggest an amendment to motion, resubmitting it with concrete rules of what actually needs to change. They state that they agree with points outlined in the proposal but state that it needs something more concrete laid out.</p> <p>An attendee states that from a committee member perspective, it is hard to kick someone out for not carrying their weight as a committee member. They state that they need to convince SU to remove that person from their position or ask the committee</p>

directly to step down. They state that as far as they are aware, the SU has a rule of immediate removal from their committee position if they fail to turn up to three meetings in a row but that in their experience, they had someone attend every third meeting as a loophole to the rule. They state that there is no concrete way of getting rid of someone with the current society processes.

An attendee asks what the frequency of the subcommittee meetings is. They ask if they could be moved online. They also ask if each meeting has the same members or if there are backup members in the event that the core members cannot attend.

BP responds that the subcommittees meet once a month during term time and that the meetings are hybrid. BP also states that there are currently no backup members.

An attendee states that the proposal is too vague, and they are unsure what's being proposed. They express concerns that the proposal passing could lead to exclusion of those with care responsibilities and professional commitments. They share that they are worried that due to the proposal's vagueness, it can be used to bully or persuade people. They suggest implementing wellbeing checks ahead of removals.

An attendee states that due to the nature of the proposal; it is hard for the proposer to be more concrete. They state that it can be a bit of an intersociety thing, and that they can't lay blank rules across all societies. They state that they have friends in sports clubs who use the 3 strikes method, have official meetings once a month, and it becomes hard to not say if you can't be there across the span of three months, which then becomes unfair for everyone.

An attendee states that while they understand that others have life-commitments, if someone applies for a role, they are aware of the commitments that come with that role. As long as it is clear when the meetings are, they know what they are signing up for.

BP asks for the consensus on whether they proposal should be approved with no changes recommended - 6 attendees voted in favour of approval without changes and the room continued in discussion.

An attendee states that the proposal needs significant amendments. They recommend the proposer submits a new one, and request that the three-strike rule is extended to societies. They note that the PG Committee is important enough to have a degree of variability between committees. The attendee recommends they provide a stand-in for absent members and that the standard UEA EC rules should apply for people's reasons for failure to attend, so if they have a valid EC then it won't count as a strike.

An attendee asks what the proposer means by attendance. They ask whether people have to be there online/in person or if it would count as having attended if they could give their comments ahead of time.

An attendee states that the term 'committee' covers too much and needs to be clearer in the proposal before they can make an informed vote.

BP asks for the consensus with a majority against the motion - 22 attendees voted against and the proposal was rejected.

BP states that any amendments can go back to proposer; they can reflect and resubmit for the UEA50 meeting.

005	Break
006	<p>Proposal 3: Ensure the SU retains use and management of the LCR, not the UEA</p> <p>Proposers, ES and WD, introduce themselves and read out the summary.</p> <p>An attendee has a question for the proposers. They state that they agree with the proposal but is confused where it comes from. They ask if this something UEA is actually proposing to do. ES confirms that the university is currently proposing what is detailed in the proposal. The attendee states that in that case, it should remain student led.</p> <p>An attendee questions what the impact of their vote at UEA50 on this matter would be.</p> <p>WD responds that their vote and the decision from UEA50 will serve to mandate the SU to do as much as they can to stop what the proposal is fighting against from happening.</p> <p>An attendee asks if the university taking over management of the LCR means that it will no longer be student led and asks if the events that currently go on will cease. ES responds that she cannot give concrete answer as to whether or not things would change however she recounts evidence from services that were previous under the control of the SU that have since fallen under the control of the university. ES mentions the UNIO coffee space that since the change now closes at 5pm instead of 10pm and notes that majority of its employees are not students. She notes the same for campus kitchen.</p> <p>BP asks the room if anyone else has any questions for the proposers.</p> <p>An attendee asks if so many people in the SU are against this change, is there the possibility that people in the SU can just say no to UEA's request. ES responds that that's not how it works but reiterates that the SU thinks that it is important that they get the input of students as we are student led and we care of their thoughts on student spaces.</p> <p>An attendee asks where the money goes when the LCR events sell out. They also ask if there has been any attempt for incorporating what students want to do instead and putting on things that come from that research. WD responds that there has and continues to be effort from the SU to do so, citing the 'No Scrubs' club night which came as result of students not enjoying the other club nights and requesting this specific one. WD states that effort is there for the SU to listen to what students want and put that back out to them.</p> <p>An attendee agrees with the proposal that the LCR needs to be kept student run, but questions that if UEA takes over, what would that do for them financially. They state that student led activities have helped them and their friends personally in their university experience and states that people value and enjoy student led activities.</p> <p>An attendee recounts that as a student ambassador; they always share with parents and prospective students that the LCR provides one of the safest club nights out there. They note that as they have worked in the bar before they can vouch that bar staff are trained well, as well as providing services to ensure a safe night out such as St Johns Ambulance team, SU security on doors, 24-hour campus security, cheap club night, no need for travel costs into town. This is a genuine pull that the attendee believes that UEA wouldn't fully appreciate and will treat the change as more as a financial gain.</p>

	<p>An attendee states that if the university gains ownership of the LCR, they will not stop at just the LCR. The attendee acknowledges that finances across the country are bad and that it is reflected within the UEA, but if they get it, they will try to reduce the block grant, weaken the position on the contract, the university will try to reduce our existence.</p> <p>An attendee asks a question to everyone else in the room requesting if anyone has any reasons they would like to share why this would be a good thing. No one volunteers their opinion.</p> <p>BP asks for the consensus with a majority in favour of the motion - all attendees voted in favour and the proposal was approved unanimously.</p>
007	<p>Proposal 4: Keeping the LCR and SU Commercial Services Student-Led and within the Students' Union</p> <p>JB introduces self. She acknowledges that the previously discussed proposal was very similar to hers but states that she will be representing more of the business case for this proposal. She reads the proposal summary and outlines the differences between the SU being a charity vs being a for-profit business.</p> <p>An attendee asks when UEA took over UNIO. JB states that the change in ownership happened around 2020.</p> <p>JB states that SU pays rent to the University and doesn't own Union House. JB shares that during Sustainability Week, she had a few events booked in advance with dates and locations agreed but closer to the time, it came up that an external business wanted that space and the SU had to move things around to accommodate and keep JB's events where they were – an accommodation JB notes might not happen if UEA gains ownership.</p> <p>JB states that the SU operates on democracy and that it has in place democratic process such as UEA50 to allow for students to vote on things such as reservations for specific nights being student booking only, which is not guaranteed with the university managing operations.</p> <p>An attendee states that on the financial side from a student consumer perspective – there are several students who work in the LCR that they know that get paid well and they would not want that element to be removed. They suspect that with ownership going to the university, the prices for drinks and tickets will go up compared to the tickets and drinks prices that are currently affordable.</p> <p>An attendee asks the proposer how a change in ownership would work. JB responds that UEA already owns the building and that the SU pay rent, and so they will hire a new team to control the commercial spaces. JB states that it is a longer process than proposals coming to UEA50 and with time scales being lengthy, it could be until October before agreements are finalised.</p> <p>BP asks for the consensus with a majority in favour of the motion - all attendees voted in favour and the proposal was approved unanimously.</p>

008

BP thanks everyone for attending and concludes the meeting.

Meeting dismissed.