



University of St Andrews Students' Association Students' Representative Council

AGENDA

23rd January 2024 – Parliament Hall – 18:00

Present

Name	Position
Barry Will	Association President
Cam Brown	Director of Education
Caitlin Ridgway	Director of Wellbeing
Sam Gorman	Director of Student Development and Activities
Fiona Waddell	Athletic Union President
Will Christopher	Association Chair
Guillermo Canales	Alumni Officer
Jack Kennedy	LGBT+ Officer
Alro Bitcon	Gender Equality Officer
Alasdair Richmond	Societies Officer
Molly Reade	Disability Officer
Hitanshi Badani	Arts and Divinity President
Noah Schott	Accommodation Officer
Eva Neill	Environment Officer
Jack McNealy	Community Relations Officer
Alice Chapman	Charities Officer
Cooper Smith	PGT President
Callum Irvine	PGR President
Jacob Carey	Employability Officer
Mandy Thompson	Carers, Commuters, Mature and Flexible Learners Officer

In Attendance

Iain Cupples

Advocate (Education) / HR Manager

Ishani Khemka

Student Councils' Intern

1. Adoption of The Agenda

2. Apologies for Absence

2.1. Nuttaricha Ngarmskullert, SRC Secretary

2.2. Lucy Brook, DoES

2.3. Gabriel Vargas Berroa, International Students' Officer

3. Adoption of the Minutes from the Previous SRC Meeting

3.1. 21-11-23 SRC Minutes

Amendments (Daniel, Sam Gorman absent with apologies)

Passed

Adopted

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

5. Open Forum

6. Reports of Sabbatical Officers

6.1. Association President

Barry Will (BW) updated the SRC on the campus larder which he shared had helped 200 students and staff and it was operating well, he also requested feedback on the larder. BW shared that he was helping organise a community response to the ongoing violence between Israel and Hamas. He was also pushing the university to build affordable accommodation and had managed to get a commitment to scrap the construction of Albany Park. The university also expressed an interest in building the Want to build the most affordable model of student accommodation in the UK. BW also spoke about his Westminster, where he spoke of the lack of government funding for UK universities. He also presented a workshop on food sustainability and had successfully increased the number of plant-based options for students in halls.

6.2. Athletic Union President

FW was late to the meeting and couldn't provide an update.

6.3. Director of Education

Cam Brown (CB) shared that the academic calendar was passed in the senate and model 2a has been formally adopted. Because of this the exam schedule would need to be amended for the coming semester 1. He was also working on academic extension policy and was formally consulting deans from various schools. CB added that he was also involved in the change programme that had been implemented in the union.

6.4. Director of Events & Services

6.5. Director of Student Development and Activities

Sam Gorman (SG) shared that Refreshers Week was a success with 92 stalls and thanked the Societies Committee and Association staff for organising it. Applications for the Anthony Tudor fund are closing tomorrow. The new University Student Activities Fund Committee is meeting for the first time next week. SG added that Race2 prep was currently underway and that they were on the EU safety team for this year. SG had also been working with cash office to amend the Society award grant process and that the backlog on the volunteering portal would be cleared soon. Finally, SG spoke about putting together a project team to help secure workshop space for Mermaids.

6.6 Director of Wellbeing & Equality

Caitlin Ridgway (CR) attended the Emily test Charter conference, where the University was one of the first to receive an award. They had also submitted a consideration for the Athena swan gender equality silver award. The development of support resources for sex workers was complete and awaiting approval from student conduct. CR met with Transition and estates cleaning for period product distribution. CR also worked with Jack Kennedy (JK) and Iain Cupples (IC) to update the equality policy. CR also met with Barry and SRT to discuss updates for the safe zone app.

7. Questions for SRC Members

- 7.1. Accommodation Officer
- 7.2. Alumni Officer
- 7.3. Arts and Divinity Faculty President
- 7.4. BAME Officer
- 7.5. Careers, Commuters, Mature, and Flexible Learners Officer
- 7.6. Charities Officer
- 7.7. Community Relations Officer
- 7.8. Disability Officer
- 7.9. Employability Officer
- 7.10. Environment Officer
- 7.11. Gender Equality Officer
- 7.12. International Officer
- 7.13. LGBT+ Officer
- 7.14. PGT President
- 7.15. PGR President
- 7.16. Postgraduate Development Officer
- 7.17. Rector's Assessor
- 7.18. Science and Medicine Faculty President
- 7.19. Secretary to the SRC
- 7.20. Societies Officer
- 7.21. Student Health Officer
- 7.22. Widening Access and Participation Officer

8. Unfinished General Business

9. New SRC Business

9.1. Change Program

9.1.1. Change Program Introduction (01-24doc1 Change)

CB introduced Anthony and Natalie who would be leading the implementation of the change programme at the Union. He continued that Anthony would be acting as the Change Director. Anthony has previously had 35+ years of experience in working with students and has held 30 senior roles across the UK. Natalie, who has previously worked at the University of Royal Holloway, has held various leadership roles in her career and will be involved in research surrounding student voices.

9.1.2. R-24-01 Motion to Endorse and Support the Association Change Programme

CB continued with regards to the motion, that the board had decided to initiate the Change Programme in November, and since then has garnered support and secured the funding for the same post a meeting with Sally Mapstone. They have also secured the largest increase in grant money since the redevelopment of the union.

BW added this programme provided the opportunity for the association to do better and would help them encompass aspect of student experience.

The motion passed by a show of hands.

9.2. SESMG

9.2.1. SESMG Introduction (01-24doc2 SESMG)

Ros Claase (RC), the Director of Student Experience adopted the proposal produced to recognise the need for more structure in hall committees. Some resolves included centralised ways to spot check finances and observe how hall committee members can fulfil their responsibilities.

AK began by contextualising how hall committees have worked thus far. AK emphasised the importance of hall committees and the impact they have on first years and their university experience. The proposal changes ways in which support will be offered to the hall committees, provides them with financial and legal safeguards, enhances their engagement, offers them with training, and strategic support. AK also emphasised the need for the union to engage with hall committees.

SG asked whether the hall committee officers would fall under the unions conduct policy of officers. SG asked this on behalf of LB.

AK responded saying this would be separate, the rules in halls are completely different to those in the Union. The policy group didn't want to hinder hall committees by placing a conduct policy on them that wasn't written with them in mind.

RC added that what the SESMG hopes to do is liaise with the association and saints sport to understand their conduct practices and take inspiration from them.

SG asked whether there was a plan in place for who in the association would be responsible for the training.

AK stated the proposal didn't specify this due to possible contradictions with the change programme and they wanted there to be flexibility for who would be able to take it on.

Alice Chapman (AC) asked if there was a way to get charitable officers more involved with the hall committees and the union.

RC responded saying that they were looking to appoint interns to look at the full suite of roles and formulate a structure where there may be some core roles and other roles supporting ones. A budgetary would be of utmost importance but they would consider having charitable officers as well.

SG referring to appendix 2 asked who would be delivering the trainings mentioned on that page. AK responded stating that this was how the current model worked and was training that had already taken place.

9.2.2. R-24-02 Motion to engage Hall Committees and endorse to SESMG the paper Project proposal

The motion passed by a show of hands.

9.3. Student Partnership Agreement Draft (01-24doc3 SPA)

CB introduced the SPA. He said this was traditionally a document written by DOE and represented an agreement between the sabbatical officers and the University. CB decided to change this and involve the rest of the sabbatical team. This document represented how the university and the union could work together, and both parties have approved it already.

RC added that it brought together the shared priorities of the university and the union and communicated the main focus areas. The way in which these actions would manifest themselves, how the University worked with Sabbs and other elects, and hoped the University would get more engagement with elected officers.

AK asked how they could ensure its ability to mould itself to individual officer priorities over the coming years.

RC responded stating the headline focusses were sufficiently broad, and that they didn't provide specific action plans for specific officers as they believed those would change over the years. The actions that underpin priorities would be delivered by the current officers. CB added that it was a four year not a one-year plan, so was more strategic in its approach and was not action point related.

9.4. R-24-06 (Pending) Motion on Palestine

Will Christopher (WC) introduced how the motion on Palestine would operate. Once the motion was presented, officers of the SRC would get to share their opinions on the motion for a time limit of one minute. After this the floor would be opened to comments from the crowd, which would also be a minute each. This motion would be voted upon in two weeks' time, at an emergency SRC meeting.

The first presenter (R) elucidated the integral role of Students' Association had in giving a voice to the Palestinian people. They spoke of how scholars, governments and international organisations have declared the bombing, siege and starvation taking place in Gaza as genocide. They implored the officers to demonstrate their internationalist and progressive outlook by speaking up against this violence. South Africa's case demonstrates that Israel has violated the Genocide Convention. R spoke of how the sanctity of student life was of utmost importance and explained how this motion would achieve the same. One of the objectives of the Union is to promote and maintain good relations between its members, the local community and the world. R said the officers must engage as future leaders critically and compassionately, following the example set by the international court of justice.

Sam Gorman (SG) asked what action this motion was asking the association to take.

S (2nd presenter) responded, stating that students are being attacked on campuses and this motion hopes to make students feel heard and represented. The report on the 25th of January by UN stated that 94 university professors and many students and teachers have been killed by the violence in the region. S spoke of how the University has fostered a culture of silence, which is why she believes there has been little pressure on university officials to take a stance. The email sent out by the association on the rights to protest, they continued, had made a marked difference, and students were taking more action which they previously thought they weren't allowed to do, particularly students of colour and minority groups. This motion received 220 signatures in less than 24 hours. The goals are to support students, make them aware of rights and provide backing for that. It also involves providing support for educational events and dialogues regarding education and history about the apartheid in Palestine.

Arlo Bicton (AB) asked how this motion would help Jewish students who felt silenced by the conflict.

A, (3rd presenter) responded, first describing how they had left Gaza last August. This motion, A reiterated, is about Palestine. A spoke of how Palestinians were feeling unheard and unseen at this university, especially with the formal position of the university of seeing an end to the mass killings as "controversial". Palestinians, and POCs, people from the Middle East and Africa, have been feeling unseen. During their discussions they knew this would bring of conversations of antisemitism and islamophobia, but in doing so this only erased the identity of the Palestinians. This motion is not meant to negatively affect students who identify with another religion, it was about Palestine and Palestinian students.

Cooper Smith (CS) requested the presenters to explain what they envisioned under item 11 of the resolves.

A responded, clarifying that the article was a commitment to support Palestinian academics and workers during this time, and aid by providing scholarships funds according to their needs. They elaborated that all the universities in Gaza have been destroyed. There is a responsibility on the wider university community around the world not only to prevent the destruction of the universities but to help rebuild the academic structures that have been destroyed. Referencing the email sent by the Vice Principal, they said

when you take no side, you claim that what is happening is okay, when one does that, it is the wrong side of history. The University of St Andrews should be a part of stopping this.

S requested if they could read out a message from a Palestinian student. The message was as follows “Everything is out there for those who are interested to know and see what's going on. As a Palestinian I am not only concerned about my families' lives threatened by the aggression but also the famine they are facing. The Palestinians are left with nothing, no basic rights, no education. There's nothing to say, were asking for you to save our lives, were being killed. When you eradicate a people you eradicate a culture, a history, documents, and civil registry. In terms of a stance, we can take as an institution at the forefront of change, decolonisation, and social policy we must support universities and education in Gaza.”

CS said that while he was very sympathetic to this statement but still wanted to clarify what the resolve of organising funds looked like.

S responded saying the way this motion was built was to support student voices and thus have the Union support drives to raise funds and education. Initiatives that might look like fundraising.

R added describing how universities are twinned across the world and have twin departments. These ‘twins’ or connections could pledge to help rebuild one of the destroyed University buildings for specific departments.

A also shared that when he was a student in Gaza they were in a programme in collaboration with the University of Durham, and they organised workshops related to culture studies. When A worked at the university they worked with the University of Glasgow, so many buildings were built in cooperation with universities worldwide. That is a tangible example of this resolve in practice. Whilst this has been ongoing for many years, this would be affirmative action as schools and universities in Gaza would take years to rebuild otherwise.

Alice Chapman (AC) asked if this was something the association could do or something the Union would be asking the University to pursue.

S said that the Unions role would be to support student voices at the forefront of these conversations and have the Union backing them to keep students safe.

BW asked how the Union can action things, how they could amplify voices and what events they can hold.

R suggested week-long event where the Union could bring in different speakers from Palestine, and making it interdisciplinary, shedding light on both history and the current situation. A conference, or something more substantial that runs for a few days wherein the Union could provide pamphlets to students created by those people who attended these conferences as well as hand out to students on campus, taking into consideration an academic and community aspect.

S agreed and said interdisciplinary workshops like those run by “War and Context” who organise museum and art exhibitions by people who have been displaced. They added that given that the association has an emphasis on unity, the Union could use education to emphasise the diversity in ethnic groups and identities at the University.

Hitanshi Badani (HB) taking note from other motions that have been passed by other universities suggested and advocacy for more transparency in terms of the investments of the institution and wondered whether this had been considered for the motion.

S stated that they had been discussing this a lot with various parties, and this would not be a large focus for this motion. First, they wanted an acknowledgement of what was happening to break the culture of silence in the University, and then move on to tangible things that can be done.

Meagan Neves (MN) added that many of student groups are doing lots of things to raise awareness, which also means that many students are being pulled in many directions. She asked if this motion would be an addition of those efforts, or if all the efforts could be integrated within this motion.

R said they were really looking forward to affiliating a Palestinian Solidarity Society, which is currently in the process of being formed. They would hope that this would be one of the driving roots for the spread of awareness of the situation and would help centralise focus.

AB pointed out that section 4c noted a lack of awareness by the Chaplaincy. Having noted the Chaplains efforts in helping Jewish students, AB wondered what the presenters envisioned the Chaplains support would look like for the Palestinians.

S clarified that 4C was also referring to communications from the principal, which was a large part of the focus. S stated that in terms of the chaplaincy, there have been numerous reports from students that the discussions held have not been representative and are slightly hostile. The motion hopes to break this silence and open dialogue with the Chaplaincy.

Debate

CS wanted to echo the suggestion of adding many more specifics, particularly delineating what the presenters wanted the University and the SRC to do. This was agreed upon by FW, JK and CR. MN added that if the motion was passed the presenters should also consider how they would like to keep the association accountable.

AK suggested adding writing specific people into action so that they can be held accountable, and the resolves are put into action. HB also suggested looking over motions passed by other unions with good actionable point. BW added that there could be a bit more context about communications from Sally Mapstone and how they've been impacting the groups she's been in contact with, so appropriate steps can be taken.

Comments from the floor

An audience member wanted the Union to consider the impact of adopting a motion that will ostracise students. He continued that the motion did not reflect all students, which the union strives to do and thought this debate was illegitimate. AF said that Jews feel unsafe in St Andrews and this motion should not have the full backing of the student union. A vast majority of the quotes have been disputed. He rejected the first point speaking of the Occupation of Palestine and said the motion didn't define the borders of Palestine. He continued that the motion fails to recognise Hamas and their use of human shields, fails to call for the immediate release of hostages and it is deeply contentious. He added that this motion should not be brought to places of education which would increase hostility, these are places of wellbeing.

Stella Maris spoke stating that something we have seen in this conversation has been a silencing of Palestinian and pro-Palestinian voices as automatically signalling anti-Jewish sentiments. This is unfortunate, she continued, as there are only so many times one can explain that their advocacy for Palestinians did not mean anti-Semitism. A part of the work needed to be done outside this motion was how representatives can restore that trust as pro-Palestinian voices wanting to engage in good faith and not have the negative and harmful intentions behind this speech. SM ended by opening the opportunity for all Jewish students who wished to speak with her to do so.

An audience member spoke of his disdain at having to cap his speech in one minute and said it was impossible to address all the claims made in this motion. He continued that as a Jewish student, biggest problem they have faced is the spread of misinformation, which he said was not only stated in the motion but was also spread by the union in their email last week. The email included a 'Friends of Al Aksa fact sheet' which claimed, erroneously, that the Jews we're trying to tear down the Al Aksa Mosque and were trying to build a synagogue. He stated this was false as religious Jews don't want to tear down the mosque, they just want to pray outside it, as it is the only holy site of Judaism. He also said that it was the Israeli government prevents Jews from praying in their own holy site. PB clarified he didn't bring this up to correct the record but to display that while Palestinians are feeling unheard, the pro-Palestinian message has been broadcast by the union, university and rector, and their advocacy for Jewish survival and protection is unheard, and the anti-Israel message is blasted at students 24/7. He continued that

antisemitism is up 400% in the UK, and malicious lies are being spread. He hoped that anyone with a conscious would consider against this motion.

In response to floor comment that the motion presenters were given time and floor comments were limited to a few minutes, JK said that the way SRC operates is judged by standing orders and laws, not discretion of individuals. Anyone is free to submit a motion following the requirements outlined in the laws

An audience member expressed their concern for how this issue would affect the Jewish community, and having previously expressed the same they said their concerns were dismissed. They said they understood that Palestinian voices needed to be heard and the devastating impact this conflict has had on Gaza. Yet, they continued, that when the concerns of the Jewish community are dismissed, the community feels unsafe. They questioned whether the Union was you supporting the student body and said that didn't want to feel like they were being killed.

An Audience member thanked the presenters for speaking and said they wanted motions that Jewish students could support despite the actions of Hamas, motions that would allow Palestinian voices to be heard, but also motions that made space for Jewish voices. They said they would like the motion to become more specific and that it should focus on the humanitarian support of civilians, that individuals could support no matter what the outcome of the criminal tribunal would be.

An audience member questioned why "the f**k" people were pretending that this motion was more political than other stances the University has taken. He said the University has decided that this is a political and other conflicts aren't, such as the Russia-Ukraine conflict. He believed that the university is designating protecting some people's lives as political and protecting other people's lives as simply "the right thing to do". He pointed out that the university has not publicized or offered a fraction of the support it extended to Ukrainian students and academics with programs such as CARA to Palestinian students, and that that sends a message that some people are less deserving of help because of their identities. He said, "we would not all be standing here today debating whether or not we should help Ukrainian civilians affected by the war, we just accepted that we should" and "the fact we are having to debate this sends the message to politicized students that we are less worthy of protection because politicians weaponized hate towards us for votes.

Another audience member stated they supported Palestine, and this did not mean they were antisemitic. They wanted to bring the focus back to the fact that people and children are dying. They understand the need for the Jewish community to feel heard and want to listen. While people condemn what happened in October and feel for the deaths that took place that day, those who were dying now were Palestinians. They said they would love to see the Jewish community supporting Palestinian voices.

Other audience members expressed support for rector and the motion.

Another audience member spoke against the motion and stated that anyone who agreed or disagreed with them could speak to them after the meeting. Israeli and Palestinian voices should both be heard through this motion. The motion, they believed, used many incorrect terms like "colonialism" which to many Jewish students was offensive, due to their connection to the land of Israel. They continued that Jews didn't colonise anything 'except for maybe Golders Green'. They stated that the Union was not the United Nations, they can show solidarity and work towards humanitarian efforts, but cannot solve this issue.

BW added that next steps would involve himself and other representatives to meet with the Jewish community and try to understand how a motion like this would impact Jewish students. The principles of the Union are to represent the student body to make them feel safe, seen and heard. Representatives have had a difficult time engaging with many different members and communities. BW asked audience members to reach out to him to discuss this further.

An audience member stated that "This war, genocidal campaigns and offensive by the Israeli regime is not a political issue, including this is a war on Gaza, Israel is attacking areas, towns, villages in many parts of the region; it is a regional war. This is affecting hundreds and thousands of students in the area. It's not a war on one location or on Gaza and I ask you to [the Union] to consider this. The Israeli regime is

attacking many countries in the region, including Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon, and tens of innocent civilians died because of the Israeli attacks on Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq. Israel has been conducting airstrikes on Syria for 20 years, and more than 100 airstrikes have been conducted and attacks during the last two years, before the 7th of October”

A reminded everyone that this is about Palestine and Palestinians. Individuals speaking of something else are not considering Palestinians.

S clarified that Jewish voices helped write this motion. They asked the audience to note point 2 of the motion that mentions the 1200 Israeli civilians killed, and point 8 that acknowledges anti-Palestinian, antisemitic and Islamophobic sentiments. They also said they would be open to including other points in the motion and everything detailed in it is supported by the UN and humanitarian organisations.

A Motion to table this for an emergency meeting in two weeks passes.

SRC took a 10-minute break

9.5. R-24-03 Motion to update the Equality and Diversity Policy

JK mentioned last time that the ED policy hadn't been updated since 2019, and most changes were redirects for things that don't happen anymore. They also added information about the report and support. JK said the resolutions weren't things that could be widely changed, instead they were highly recommended actions.

CR added that policies were reviewed so everything would be aligned and up to date. This was important for the EDI policy to stay relevant so that it wouldn't need as much review in the future.

CS asked if the policy could be amended due to incorrect grammar. CS asked to change “it is resolved that to adopt” to “this SRC resolves”.

AK asked if IC could give a quick rundown of how report and support worked and how it would change under the new policy.

IC responded saying if a report was made to report and support which concerned someone who was a member of student association staff, this would be dealt with by IC as HR manager. If it was a student, it would be dealt with through the report and support policy.

SRC began debate

AK in reference to point 5.3 asked if they could change “report complaints or concerns to university” to “report concerns or complaints to the university and union as relevant.”

The amendment passed by a show of hands.

The motion passed by show of hands.

9.6. R-24-04 Motion for the Students' Association to adopt and advocate for a harm reduction stance on sex work

CR introduced the motion, specifying that the appendix has most of the in-depth points. CR has been working on support resources for students in sex work and spoke about how demographically marginalised groups are disproportionately represented amongst sex workers. CR specified that places that have taken harm reduction and decriminalisation stances on sex workers are safer. This motion would allow the association to have a specific stance on it. Many other Unions has passed motions similar to this in the past, and it would be an important step forward to best support our students.

JK added that this was a big issue for their community and harm reduction work would set a great precedent for the association.

Motion passed by show of hands.

9.7. R-24-05 Motion to Fill the Vacancy of the Science and Medicine Faculty President

CB began by stating that the science and medicine faculty president had offered their resignation and Educom was looking to fill the vacancy. This needed to take place as soon as possible, and for that reason Educom needed the SRC to pass over the need to undergo the general procedure.

SG asked if the motion were to pass what the timeline would look like.

CB responded saying it would need to be extremely quick, so if it were passed, current school presidents would be asked if they'd be interested to take on the role. If one candidate decides to run, Educom would co-opt the position, but if there are multiple, they'd take interviews. The position would need to be filled by the end of the week.

AK asked if they felt like Educom would have the capacity to train someone new, to re-shift the role and elect a new president.

CB responded that they've done a great job to fill positions that have been vacated since last semester and believed that they do have the capacity.

SG asked whether it would be Educom or Eduexec selecting someone and if a school president did put themselves forward would the role not be advertised to the student body?

CB responded saying that Eduexec was a subcommittee of Educomm, and that they'd prefer it to be from someone in the school of science and medicine, who's on educomm and already knows class reps.

Motion passed by show of hands.

9.8. Union Retail Space Discussion

BW introduced the discussion, stating that there was a retail space available in the union and a few different groups had sent in proposals. BW reminded the SRC that it was not within their remit to decide what comes up there. BW then introduced presenters from transition, Isaiah and Leela, who had made a proposal for how the space could be used and wanted to know what students would think about it.

Isaiah and Leela introduced transition, stating they were a network of different groups working towards sustainable action. They are currently located behind Uni Hall and their efforts were saving students 100,000 pounds a year and prevent 8000 kgs of those objects ending up in landfills. But they believe they have the capacity to distribute more. So, they introduced the idea of a community hub.

The Union would be the perfect location for this. They were also open to ideas on how they could make this a collaborative space, hoping to work with groups like the BAME subcom and Saints LGBT+. They hoped that this would help students discover community groups easily and believe it could increase foot traffic to rectors and other areas in union.

HB asked if transition was affiliated with the eco hub, and if so thought that it could be an interesting addition to the space. Leela said that while transition wasn't affiliated with the eco hub they could work with them and possibly create a refillery.

SG asked who'd the member of contact for this space be, whether they'd be someone in the Union or if it would be controlled by transition.

Isaiah said they were hoping for it to be a community driven space where different groups could use this to talk about sustainability and how it would intersect with other issues. They added that Transition has 8 staff employed who can work more full time, but as the idea stands it acts as a very community driven space.

SG asked if they were envisioning it to be open every day.

Isaiah said yes, it would but this would be dependent on their funding. Leela added that this hub would contribute to the associations' sustainability, and it would make it more accessible for students. Financial obligations aside the hub would help build connections to different communities and would display a sustained commitment to sustainability.

FW said that while this was fantastic proposal, they needed more details on the financial aspects of the hub. IC interjected saying this body could not take the final decision on this matter and while it would be fine to discuss the intricacies of proposal it would not be fair to other people interested in the space to discuss financial issues. FW replied saying she'd only want them to discuss these aspects if they were comfortable doing so and if they're applicable.

Leela said that allowing Transition to set up a community hub would save students money and time, and it could be done in a way that would use existing networks. This would be efficient and cost effective. There would also be possibilities to discuss income generation for example they have a charge amount on clothes. The service Transition would be providing would include funding staff and their existing connections and tools would save the union money in the long run. Some of the staff at Transition are employed by the university or external funding which allows for part-time, short-term employment; however, the team wouldn't rely on this as would not be dependable. They would like to use resources they already have.

MN said this was a good proposal and it was valuable.

SG said he would like to see the space used every day and wanted it to be clear who needed to be addressed for the same.

Eva Neill (EN) said she couldn't speak much on the financial aspect but since this hub would be so good for community sustainability, and the environment subcommittee could consult the transition staff on funding, it could be taken as a more inventive approach to use the space.

AK said this would enhance student experience and give back to the community. AK also felt it would be a great opportunity for outreach and visibility of services. Having previously suggested an advice hub on advocacy and representation, they said they would love to see it be a part of the proposed idea and asked whether this would be possible. The presenters said that would be a welcome addition.

BW finally added that the union already does so much that costs a lot of money, that is already invested in an array of student activities. BW requested the SRC to note how much the union does on a small budget and consider the same when making a decision.

10. Open Discussion

JK said that student services want to offer decompression sessions for well-being

AK added that halls applications would open beginning February at a reduced capacity, and that there were many resources for the same on the website.

EN advertised green week taking place next week.

FW said the AU was working towards making sport more engaged in subcommittees.

AC advertised RAG week coming up soon.

IC spoke about elections coming up and encouraged current officers to about whether they wanted to stand up again for elections and to encourage others using the nudge form. He also encouraged everyone to complete their handovers.

11. Any Other Competent Business

Motion to adjourn passed by a show of hands.

