AF/25-26/02/02
13 November 2025

Activities Forum

2. Minutes

16th October Meeting, 6-8pm, held in meeting room 3, Beit Building, South Kensington

Attendance

Name	Initials	Position
Tom Gordon (Chair)	TG	Deputy President (Activities)
Nico Henry	NH	Union President
Emina Hogas	E.H	Deputy President (Education)
Robin Flower	RoFlo	A&E Treasurer
Nathalie Tedfors Lindell	NTL	A&E Chair
Pip Moss	PM	A&E Vice Chair (Media) Sports Vice Chair (Team Field)
Jack Swires	JS	RCSU President
Ben Bishop	BB	A&E Vice Chair (Music Instrumental)
Logan Brooks	LB	RCSU Treasurer
Sean Brunswick	SB	Recreation Treasurer
Imogen Young	IY	Recreation Vice Chair (Games and Hobbies)
Ewan Badcoe	EB	Recreation Vice Chair (Exploration)
Thurston Blount	TB	Recreation Chair
Harry SU	HS	Recreation Vice Chair (Appreciation)
River Pang	RP	Recreation Secretary
Immy Kennard	IK	RSM VP (C&S)
Emma Halford	EH	Sports Vice Chair (Martial Arts)
Tom Edwards	TH	Sports Treasurer
Yirui Xu	YX	CGCU C&S Societies Officer
Aidan Madge	AM	CGCU C&S Chair
Rosanne Choong	RC	Sports Secretary
Junior Mbah	JM	Sports Vice Chair (Individual Sports)
Guillaume Felix	GF	Felix Editor in Chief
Rob Fenner	RF	ICU Activities Manager (Operations)
Kalista Lam	KL	ICSMSU C&S Vice Chair (Sports & Arts)

Yongmin Ju	YJ	ICSMSU Management Group Treasurer
Yousuf Yaqub	YY	ICSMSU C&S Vice Chair (Volunteering & Academics)
Sarah Azam	SA	ICSMSU President
Mohammad Majilsi	MM	In attendance, no position
Stephania Medvetskaia	SM	Sports Chair (attending online)
Anthea Macintosh LaRocque	AML	Council Chair (attending online)
Denis Sharov	DS (from 19:20)	Attending, no position
Alexander Golovshchinskii	AG (from 19:35)	RSS Secretary, attending
Alice Ye	AY (from 19:20)	RSS President, attending
Sacha Kuznetsova	SK (from 19:20)	Attending, no position
Kseniia Kiseleva	KK (from 19:20)	Attending, no position

Apologies

Name	Position
Miriam Foulkes	Sports Vice Chair (Team Sport)
Anisa Price	RSM President

Minutes

Minutes were taken post-meeting via recording and audio transcript. Some parts of the minutes may be inaccurate/ not written due to unclear audio and recording issues (inaccurate parts are highlighted in red, and confidential discussion is highlighted in blue)

1. Welcome

TG welcomed everyone to the first activities forum of the academic year

2. Apologies

As noted above

3. Minutes of the previous meeting / actions arising / confidential items

a. Minutes of previous meeting

All members approved of minutes of previous meetings

b. Confidential items

TG asked members whether the Motion of No Confidence should be released or kept private. They have historically been published as part of the paper pack but some of the contents may be better off kept private.

LB: [completely unclear audio]

SB: ....[unclear]..... Thinks it should be made public unless one of the members appeals, especially the ones being named in this motion, then maybe not

NTL Suggested a middle ground to keep out names of those accused but keep the rest of the people public as it would be good for people to know what has been discussed

NH raised a concern that students will end up talking anyway, therefore, it might be better if something is written down

JS suggested that it should remain confidential unless all parties involved agreed to make it public. They pointed out it may not be feasible to redact the information well enough to truly anonymise the motion, so it may as well remain confidential.

SB asked for clarification what it means to make it public

TG clarified that by default, all papers are posted on the union website; therefore, it's a matter for the board members to decide whether to keep it confidential and not discuss it. TG also suggested that members can be contacted individually after the meeting.

RF: Suggested that, to be cautious, it would be best to keep it confidential.

JS: [unclear audio could not understand]

AM: asked when a motion is confidential, is it the fact that the motion is confidential to people outside of the committee or is it just fine to mention that there is a confidential motion.

TG clarified that it is up to the committee and the fact that there is a motion is currently public due to agenda being published on the website but not the content

TG suggested to keep it confidential for now and contact the relevant people to report to the next meeting

[Person spoke something] [completely muted audio]

TG is also happy for proxies to act on behalf of presidents if they are absent by default

4. Reports/updates

a. Chairs report

TG reported the following updates:

- Manifesto goals for the year: Cut response time when reaching activities team, which has improved a lot since the time manifesto points were written.

- Improve training quality for clubs and societies; expand and increase the usage of the Student Experience Fund (SEF)

- Update on SEF: There have been some challenges in securing funding from the regular funders annually. Has now secured funding from the Union and Imperial, but not the IC Trust. Mentions there is some funding left from the previous year, however. Aiming to launch the fund by early next week. Encourages members to use it and will send out comms for it. Also encourages members to consider it when pricing products as there is no support for split payments for events.

- Build a CSP alumni network, improve provision for fundraising for clubs and societies, and offer tiered membership options.

- ADF: Allocation for ADF this year is 70K, which is available to clubs and societies in full. 30K contingency fund in case there's problems in future years - not touchable for societies. Sub-committee membership will be later on in the meeting, with one round per term

- Trips fund: 25K in the pot from IC trust, which is available for this year; it was fully spent last year

- SEF: The fund is for anyone who is on imperial bursary (home, undergrad student). This can be spent on clubs and societies between £20-70, depending on household income. Last year half of the eligible students accessed it and a third of the money was spent. Wants to improve it this year and aims to expand it to more groups this year.

b. Activities team updates

RF reported the following updates:

- Trainings: So far 2 essential trainings have been done with 468 attendees over the 2 sessions. Wants to improve the provision of training

- Student leadership conference: In-person conference; happy with attendance, which reached 182 signups and 94 attendees over the 2 days. Plans to change the schedule next year to do the in-person training over the summer term to engage and prepare students over the summer

- Autumn elections: There were 410 candidates across clubs and societies elections, the highest engagement in the last couple of years. There are around 400 vacant positions in clubs and

societies, which is less than in previous years, meaning that more students are running for positions.

- Project updates:

    - 177 annual room bookings in clubs and societies, allowing them to submit 3 requests per week consistently throughout the autumn and spring terms
    - 406 core risk assessments, with some duplicates, as there aren't 406 clubs and societies
    - 84 coaches and instructors as part of core processes
    - From events side: [503 from clubs and societies since opened?]

- Opened a new form: Committee Admin form with just under 2,000 submissions, mainly for room bookings. There were 150 email management forms with 2 outstanding, 71 refund requests with 4 outstanding, 89 resignations with 5 outstanding, 1296 room bookings with 29 outstanding, 83 space access requests with 3 outstanding, 203 sponsorship agreements with 73 outstanding, and 11 funding applications
- Activities team encourages members to use the funding boxes, and to direct groups to Trips, ADF and Harlington

- New fund release: The Expanding Reach fund will be released tomorrow, offering a more agile funding option for student groups targeting marginalised or underrepresented groups at Imperial, aiming to expand the reach of clubs and societies. The form in the application process is short, fast, and agile.

- New volunteer of the month recognition scheme: Giving out £50 to a committee member of the month each month. Encourages members to nominate any committee members who deserve the recognition. So far, there have been 12 nominations.

- Around 700 financial documents submitted over past 2 months.

- Drop-ins have not started; comms have not yet been released for it, as they will begin next Monday with a change in location and the way it is handled. RF Flags that if groups need urgent support bring them to the activities team drop in ideally in person on Monday or Wednesday or through the ticket portal.

LB asked for events related lead time when booking a drop-in for events, to which RF replied that for event specifics, it is up to 2 weeks once released, same as previous

LB: [unclear audio, shared good feedback about something]

RF: mentioned that Monday, there will be a few coordinators there, therefore, if there is anything urgent, members can come to the event and will be supported as much as possible

IY asked for clarification with annual reports is it 177 approved per week or 177 applications, to which RF clarifies it is 177 clubs and societies that submitted an annual report

IY asked how many room booking slots were requested, to which RF replied an estimate of 500, but is unable to provide an accurate amount. Can find out after the meeting

IY asked How much is available in the Expanding Reach Fund and what is the criteria. RF replied with 16.1K; would like the funding to be used quickly to request more funding. RF also mentioned that a research assistant was hired at Imperial to do data analysis on the student experience survey to give a breakdown of why people join clubs and societies and why they don't.

RF mentioned that the activities team also created another survey specifically targeted at marginalised groups, to make events more inclusive and accessible to students that align with that research. Clubs and societies will be able to request for that funding straight away if the event is related to marginalised groups, for e.g. needing funding for a food festival event for international students to promote more inclusive events

[Name]: Asks whether there are more examples on how to make the events more accessible for the funding

RF advised that groups could consider factors such as location, timing, cost, or academic commitments. Research from the survey revealed that time constraints and a lack of academic commitment were the primary barriers to participating in extracurricular activities. If groups can address factors like time, academic commitments, low cost, low commitment within events, they will be able to receive the funding as long as it aligns with the research

c. MG/CU updates

Arts and Entertainments Sector

NTL reported the following updates:

- First board meeting yesterday, which went well.

- A few issues with society's reporting theft and items being missing particularly LMS. Would appreciate support in finding a way to address it. Societies are unable to claim from insurance which was switched to for the purpose of wanting CSP's to claim money form it. Whatever needs to be done to ensure there's a secure location and evidence to claim insurance would be great.

- Elected a vice chair for music (vocal) and plans to merge the fine arts and media mini-management groups

- Arts Night is happening next Friday. Guest list invites will be sent out

- Does not like the system for constitutional changes and committee structure changes. Is happy to have a conversation with anyone else who also may dislike these

RCSU

JS reported the following updates:

- Vice President (Clubs & Societies) was unable to attend, so no substantial report from the departmental society side of things. RCSU is generally running well, with well attended events across first term. All branches of the CU generally running without issue.
- Issues with confusion about leadership conference. People feel training is far too late as they've already had to prepare a freshers calendar by the time it's happened.

LB mentioned that this year, there has been a decrease in sales of drink tickets. Might want to consider when planning for events

Recreation

TB reported the following updates:

- Freshers fair was overall fine. Slight problem with [hobbies and recreation?] as they were off to the side, therefore limited signage. Would like next years to be better in signage
- Concern about limited number of maps at Freshers' Fair
- Major issue with proposals this year. Every exploration club has had an issue where activity proposals were submitted then got rejected and said as long as you submit all participants for 10 days you can go ahead. When everyone did that there was no response.
- [More updates regarding form, room bookings, storage, UDH cupboard, and a few societies not getting something approved, however very unclear to make full sentences from audio]

IY agreed and mentioned that it is progressively getting worse since the last 3 years
always impossible to access various things and …… [much space, lots of things being stacked that shouldnt be stacked there….unclear]

[SB and IY mentioned few other things and cases of societies, however, also unclear]

EB: [Unclear..... has been told on.....[unclear].... would appreciate clarification on what that process might be]

TB mentioned that the Trips proposal was a big issue this year, to which TG replied getting back on that. TG is assuming that the form not accepting beyond 10 days might be a mistake

RSM:

IM reported the following updates:

- All is going well
- Lots of signups this year with clubs and societies, more than previous years
- Some clubs, like RSM netball, did not have a risk assessment approved and couldn't make any claims. however, it has been sorted now
- RSM football has had funding issues
- Mainly focusing on prepping for the varsity fair

Sports team:

SM reported the following updates:

- ACC released tickets on Monday. The first drop had 1.1K tickets gone in 2 minutes, the fastest ever sold out. Wednesday was the second drop, with tickets gone in under a minute, with around 200 tickets being sold.
- Looking into ways on how to make sure if committee members got all their tickets. Is happy that there is engagement for the event
- After getting complaints about not being able to transfer tickets, they are now using a platform called Dice. The events team have worked really hard to transition it, hoping to resolve some of these issues
- Fight night sign ups are opened; students don't have to be part of a sports club. Encourages members to spread the word
- Events team have been great; communicating very well, and very easy to work with
- First CSP meeting was quite a long discussion. Societies raised several points, including comments from the fresher's fair, which will be discussed later in the agenda.

- With training, some CSP said they wanted to have someone to have to ask basic questions. Suggested that giving MG's earlier training if possible before the CSP ones would be better

- Frustrations with core risk assessment approval timelines: [some societies seem frustrated due to the gap between core risk assessment being approved and activities being approved]

- Some societies report it being an issue as they wanted to order kits to be ready for the sports season and for freshers. Many have had to pay and claim the money back or delay having kits

- Issues with coach form - not relevant to most MGs. Has spoken to TG about it

- Lots of theft and equipment storage being reported. some societies mentioned equipment stolen from Union Gym, which other MG's have mentioned as well

- Some complaints about Move cutting times for core bookings. This is something they're discussing with Move separately. Has also had discussions about centralising Give It a Go

- Sports stall welcome fair did an amazing job, there was a small competition went on for people to submit ACC themes and claim a free ACC ticket

- Has set up regular meetings with Move and working towards varsities starting next month

- Is in the process of catching up with activities team to ensure there is regular comms

CGCU

Aidan reported the following updates:

- Societies have been running pretty successful welcome programmes, with a whole series of well-received events and a welcome dinner on Saturday

- Gained a new society (prosthetics) and intending to gain another one (cybersecurity)

- Feedback on sponsorships and room bookings, which will be talked about in agenda point

Medics

YJ reported the following updates:

- Doing 121's more: One person on MG team meets with the treasurer and presidents, run through the society and understands how they work and sees where they can support

- [Because they're a part of ICMSU's role, they've helped out with Freshers Fortnight].

- Welcome fair went well this year with significant intake
- First sports night: graduation sports night. All social secretaries and presidents get free entry.
- Created new financial document that teaches ppl how to use eActivities and committee members on how to use the platform
- Some societies are in debt, and the team are trying to figure out how to support those societies
- Some issued with pitch hiring, which have been mostly sorted
- Issues with core risk assessments

5. Welcome feedback

NTL reported the following:

- Very happy with welcome fair and people really appreciated that it was less crowded in 2-day structure
- Lots of more signups and more footfall than last year
- Loved having Blyth at the stall, but would been nice to have been asked ahead of time
- Quiet hour actually felt like a quiet hour which is very appreciated
- Showcases were well attended which is nice, but tech side of things felt disorganised as there were tech equipment that had been requested and promised, but wasn't available on the day. Would appreciate if this issue can be streamlined
- Would also appreciate slightly stricter policy on advertising outside of a stall as it was a hard rule but not enforced very well
- Fortunate weather was good; however, if it started raining, all attendees would've been out, and there didn't seem like there was a backup plan put in place

AM reported the following:

- Societies appreciated extra space

- Lots of technical societies that couldn't have electronic equipment on stalls. It was also not said ahead of time that there wouldn't be power at the stalls, as societies have written it in the [what u were planning to bring to the stall in signup form]. Societies ended up brining power banks to power their own equipment

- There were confusions about whether societies can run events on Monday or Tuesday because of the policy of no starting before October.

TG acknowledged the confusion, as in some places it said start of term, and in some places it said from October. Will be clearer next year

[person]: Mentioned that in the Signup form, it asked to put in dates for give it a go sessions, however, has not received room bookings for CSP, so couldn't confirm when give it a go would be. Has put dates that is not on the form. TG will follow up on that.

NTL also mentioned that the form for the committee member welcome fair stall timetable was very useless, to which JS agreed and said Every society member mentioned the same thing

JS reported the following:

- Didn't see a drop in sign ups for societies.
- Vintage vehicles & Constituent Unions weren't covered so weather provision was worse
- Agreed that the form asking for committee members in welcome stalls was useless

- Enjoyed give it a go sessions being featured

TG shared stats on welcome fair memberships: % of students increased from 18% to 20.2 of students joining during welcome week, slightly higher from last year

Rozan?: Mentioned that the 2-day format works better, but greater comms for MGs on who is where would be better as a lot of people were asking the management team where certain societies were. For next year to improve, it would be good to get laminated maps at MG groups to know who is exactly where everyone is.

[Person]: mentioned that another problem is that some groups have a stall and now showing up in person, creating more confusion for students to find them

[another person: completely unclear].....

6. Feedback on new processes

A. Core activity & risk assessments

NTL mentioned that there was generally good feedback on the form. However, it mentions that the lack of approvals for some societies is completely unacceptable as societies aren't technically allowed to run any activity during the first weeks of the term without approval.

JS also agreed that generally it was really good compared to last year, when some of their MG societies were approved in around April. Occasional problem now is that the Risk Assessment weren't manually submitted on eActivities after approval. Point about the fact it's strange it's off-platform and manual

TG mentions that eActivities flag that lets you spend money is manual and not linked to the new system, but the groups should've been ticked off after their approval. if not, advises to get in touch to sort out asap

AM (audio unclear): Prosthetics society recently moved to CGCU and their core risk assessment being approved was never communicated to them or applied on eActivities. May be because they were moved.

TB: Form itself was quite nice, just.....[unclear]

B. Coaches and instructors:

NTL reported issues with societies getting coaches approved and were told conflicting information about whether they were able to submit late or needed to meet the deadline. People weren't happy with the quality of communications when talking to the activities team. Sometimes it was delays in response times and other times it was conflicting info. NTL also mentioned that students want to know the information and reasoning behind decisions rather than just a 'no' to improve morale and make people feel happy about it as it would make a huge difference

SM also reported that lots of sports societies were stressed about coach forms. A few of them were told it would be opened a week or so later than it actually did and therefore they weren't able to submit on time. Also mentioned that response times from activities team were long, which was understandable due to welcome period however it was a big source of stress for a lot of committees as they did not get support or a solution until their trials were over. Would be helpful to keep it a focus for next year

AM ....[unclear] .....they have more than 100 people....[unclear].....venues timeline is the correc timeline...[unclear]....

EB mentioned that for emergency contacts, it would be possible to make it an attachment or an Excel spreadsheet, as societies find it easy to collect this information, but typing it manually in five boxes per member is very difficult for a trip of 80+ people. Also eliminates error as it will put exactly what students put in. Would be very helpful. EB also suggested that if it works, having it sent 10 days before would be great, as having to put it before October and 2 months earlier, when societies don't know who will be on the trip, but need to write down the names of people going to be approved,

makes it difficult. Mentioned that if there was clearer advice given straight to those societies affected would have saved a lot of time

TB agreed and added that every society this week would ask [what they would do, and they didn't have an answer to solve this, or proper communication and guidance to sort it out]. Mentioned that it was kind of running on anecdotal on what a society was told to do rather than what is the right thing to do

C. Room bookings

IY reported issues had issues with a society that requested 2 rooms and have only been given one, therefore if all projected members were to technically turn up, legally, they couldn't have been able to all fit in that one room. IY is also curious about how rooms are allocated, as they know people with the same room in the same timeslot for many years, and this year they weren't given it. Also requests that it would be nice to know where the list of rooms is to see pics of photos beforehand, as for example with Knitsock, you can't be in a teaching style room. therefore, it would be helpful to see in advance before making a proper booking. Further asked a question about room bookings appeal process to which RF replied that there is no appeals process

IY asked what happens if [theres no space for members] to which RF said members then use the adhoc room booking form as all societies want the same thing and there's not enough capacity. Therefore, they work through first-priority and second-priority requests in a spreadsheet that they can view. If they can't allocate, then they don't allocate anything. They try to go for their first preference or second, ideally that way everyone has a fair chance

IY asked whether it is recommended to book the same timeslot in different days and different rooms to get that timeslot to which RF said that it is subjective and up to each society. Understands that some societies have specific requirements and therefore would go by the specifics written in the form rather than by membership. Due to lack of room allocations, it is very limited; therefore, using the ad hoc form is a good way to try to mitigate it as much as possible

IY asked if there a way they can access more rooms to be available to book, to which RF mentioned the team is trying to and working with departments right now to try to get more rooms. They lost 2 big buildings (RSM cut down on the amount of space given due to C&S problems and EEE). Some relationships have been ruined due to clubs & societies leaving some stuff behind or rooms not being put in the proper layouts, which damaged relations with academics who aren't allowing the spaces to be given anymore.

NTL asked if there is a way to look into societies and see which ones would ideally like a certain space, versus not being able to do any activity in other spaces. Understands flat-floor spaces is the ideal preference for a multitude of reasons, but wants to know if there is a way to factor in how much a society absolutely needs a space vs ideally prefers a space. RF replied that is all subjective, as many societies may be in 'need' of flat floor spaces for whatever reason and so it's hard to make a

judgment call. To keep it fair, it's based on first-come, first-served priority. In the SU building it is prioritised to those societies that absolutely need that space, but everything else is first come first serve

IY mentioned that the form mentions not to worry about first-come first-serve, therefore thought that it wasn't the case to which RF said that the team downloads the spreadsheets and goes in order of submitted (ideally from top to bottom). 4 staff members work randomly on each level of excel spreadsheets to keep it random

IY asked whether if 2 societies request the same room, is it given to whoever sees it first and allocated it to the society to which RF said yes. IY followed up by asking if there was any way of making it more fair, and RF said not at the moment, but is happy to discuss other ways.

AM mentioned that a group chat was made for all societies that used large room bookings in Huxley last year, and people coordinated using a spreadsheet to work out who requested which room. More information on who wants a room is much better than less, so a more formal way to see which rooms have bids in would help societies choose slots. Every room coordinated via this group chat was booked.

PM: [requested if MR1 and MR2 are....[unclear] as theyre the same and thinks if its a mix of annual and adhoc it gets...[unclear]...]Asked why MR1 and MR" are able to be booked separately as they are the same room, and notes that it seems that there has been a mix of annual room bookings and ad hoc bookings that have been allocated the rooms separately. RF will look into that.

PM: [mentioned judo has been given a space that can't do judo in. RF replied saying it comes from staff things trying work out and it is a touch one. The team are trying to see if they can use [....unclear].....]

JS mentioned that they had been given quite a popular room for their activity that they don't need to use very often. If they knew that the room would have been popular (e.g. by seeing how many people requested it), they would've made do with a less popular one. They only use their room once every few weeks so would happily lend it to a society in need. .....[very unclear].....10 CSP's after all we dont need it.....[unclear].....

TG is happy to have a chat but due to time has to move on

D. sponsorships contracts

AM: CGCU has lots of departmental societies and effectively all depend on sponsorship revenue for their income models. Sequencing of processes this year where a lot of stuff can't get approved or started until sponsorship contracts which are vaguely involved are approved. Even if the society

would run it anyway, or has enough SGI to run it, that requirement that it can't run has been painful for quite a few societies. Acknowledges the process itself is a lot nicer, but the sequencing is an issue.

RF understands the budgets situation, however, due to best practice they don't want to approve budgets without concrete income

AM mentioned some societies use income carried over in previous years, therefore even if there's no sponsorships income, it won't put societies in bankruptcy

RF also mentioned that the team ideally asks if sponsorship can be mentioned in events budget and at least the agreement has been submitted to take a first look. Is also happy to look into improving sponsorship processes

7. ICU AGM

TG mentioned that the union this year is having an AGM, and everyone is invited to attend. This would potentially happen in February and invites members to share thoughts on any discussion points if they would like. This will be an in-person event but will also be streamed online.

NH added that, as ICU is a charity organisation, an AGM was supposed to take place every year. However, it was not done so each year, therefore ICU had to host an AGM to talk. Most discussions revolve around broad strategic information.

8. Sub-committee appointments

TG mentioned that Activities forum has 3 sub-committees: new activities, which approves the starting of new CSPs and closures; The Trips fund is a 25K funding pot allocated to trips; and ADF is another funding pot annual 70K for unbudgeted success or a new and growing activity. Generally, there's one person per MG for each funding committee. They meet once a term to look through the list and look where to allocate funding appropriately

TG asked whether members have decided who they wish to nominate for each of the sub-committees (no more than one member per MG):

- For ADF: IK, SB, PM and RoFlo, YJ
- For Trips fund: TE, HS, and SM, KL
- For New activities committee: SM, NTL, IY, AM and AQ

[Note: final appointments confirmed in November Activities Forum paper pack]

9. CONFIDENTIAL: Motion of no confidence

TG briefed members of the below:

- This is new process for all, and a vote like this has never been heard by the forum
- Will allow author of paper or a seconder an option to propose the paper and then give the defender to defend the supporting statement
- There will be opportunities for questions and each person gets 5 min.
- 2/3 majority of votes is required for this, and the vote will be secret and anonymous with CU Presidents and the MG Chairs being voting members
- Everyone who isn't present should've had a proxy but, by default, will alow C&S chairs for the CU's to vote in their absence.
- In the case that there's exact 2/3 vote, then TG has the deciding vote
- This is a new situation for all so requests members to be civil and if anyone needs to leave can leave or need support signpost is available

TG also mentions that as a committee, this paper will be kept confidential and hence won't leave the room. if both parties feel that this would be made public then it'll be done so after both sides consent. After questions are over, the relevant members will be invited to leave after which the forum members will vote, and results will be sent after the meeting

SB asks whether the results would be made public, to which TG is happy to just mention that there was a motion of no confidence, and the result was either upheld or not upheld

TG also mentioned that as the vote is for 6 people, votes will be made line by line. 2 names on the motion however won't be voted today due to either not being in the roles, either because of resignation or separate but related union process. [redacted]

AF/25-26/02/02
13 November 2025

[redacted]

AF/25-26/02/02
13 November 2025

[redacted]

AF/25-26/02/02
13 November 2025

[redacted]

AF/25-26/02/02
13 November 2025

[redacted]

AF/25-26/02/02
13 November 2025

[redacted]

AF/25-26/02/02
13 November 2025

[redacted]

AF/25-26/02/02
13 November 2025

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Voting: Members spent approx. 20 minutes discussing within their CU/MGs, and the presidents and chairs respectively noted their secret votes via pen and paper.

Results:

For Tommy Xu: [redacted] Therefore, Tommy is **removed** from role.

For Alvaro Vicente Tarrago: [redacted] Therefore, Alvaro is **removed** from role.

For Fuchun Zhang: [redacted] Therefore, Fuchun is **removed** from role.

For Alice: [redacted] Therefore, Alice **remains** in the role.

The committee came to a consensus to skip AoB due to time, and to handle any issues offline or raise at the next meeting. No objections to starred items.

END OF MEETING