



# University of St Andrews Students' Association Students' Representative Council

## MINUTES

Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2013 – Committee Room, 7.30pm

### Present

Name	Office
Maxwell Baldi	Association Chair
Daniel Palmer	Association Director-Elect of Events & Services
Teddy Woodhouse	Association Director-Elect of Representation
Meg Platt (Partial Attendance)	Association Director of Student Development and Services
Dominyka Urbonaite	Association Environment and Ethics Officer
David Norris	Association LGBT Officer
Scott Taylor	SRC Accommodation Officer
Ondrej Hajda	SRC Education Officer
Callum Bryce	SRC External Campaigns Officer
Soraya Walli	SRC Member for Ethnic Minorities
Joshua Carlton	SRC Member for First Years
Caroline Rhoads	SRC Member for International Students
Anna Kennedy-O'Brien	SRC Member for University Accommodation
Hibak Yusuf Mohamud	SRC Equal Opportunities and Welfare Officer
Ben Anderson	SRC Member for Widening Access
Sophie Kelly	Arts/Divinity Senate Representative
Mr Cupples	Student Advocate (Education)/HR Manager

### In Attendance

Name	Affiliation
Scott Schorr	Association Postgraduate President Elect
Mr Hamid	None
Keith Cordrey	McIntosh Hall
Laura Abenetry	The Saint

### 1. Adoption of the Agenda

Point 9.7 was moved to be discussed first, otherwise the agenda was adopted as presented.

### 2. Apologies for Absence

Ali West	SRC Member for Gender Equality
Freddie fforde	Association President
Amanda Litherland	Association Director of Representation
Sadie Hochfield	Association Community Relations Officer
Kelsey Gold	Association Director-Elect of Student Development & Activities
Peter DaBell	Science/Medicine Senate Representative

Jules Findlay  
Ruth Cunningham  
Danielle Berrow

Association Director of Events & Services  
SRC Member for Private Accommodation  
Association Postgraduate President

### **3. Adoption of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

These had been circulated and adopted by electronic mail, pursuant to Standing Orders § 7.2.2.

### **4. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

There were no matters arising.

### **5. Open Forum**

There was no business for the open forum.

### **6. Reports of Sabbatical Officers**

#### **6.1. Report of the Association President**

Not present

#### **6.2. Report of the Association Director of Events & Services**

Not present

#### **6.3. Report of the Association Director of Student Development & Activities**

Not present

#### **6.4. Report of the Association Director of Representation**

Not present

### **7. Reports of Officers**

#### **7.1. Report of the Arts/Divinity Senate Representative**

Not much changed from last week. Most school presidents have ignored emails apart from management.

Mr Woodhouse informed Ms Kelly that a tentative school presidents event was being organised, and asked her to get in contact with him about this.

#### **7.2. Report of the Association Community Relations Officer**

Not present

#### **7.3. Report of the Association Environment & Ethics Officer**

Working with 'against plastic bags' campaign committee, asking for money from the association discretionary fund, agreed on a fund for buying textile bags which would have the logo on them. Will be doing another campaign outside Tesco, as well as plans for a petition. Bags should come next week, Campaign will be Wednesday. £255 pounds given from the discretionary fund for this.

#### **7.4. Report of the Association LGBT Officer**

Busy past week- AGM, first meeting as exec committee, tentative plans for events. Still some positions to be handed over.

#### **7.5. Report of the Association Postgraduate President**

Mr Schorr: 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary dinner was very successful, working on summer ball with postgraduate society

#### **7.6. Report of the Athletic Union President**

- Not present
- 7.7. Report of the Science/Medicine Senate Representative**  
Not present
- 7.8. Report of the SRC Accommodation Officer**  
Working on organising halls training, which will be delivering in May. Have contacted cash office to change system for hall finance, meeting with senior students next week for handover.
- 7.9. Report of the SRC Education Officer**  
Met with library staff to discuss opening at 9am as of next September. Coffee spills- will run a campaign 'Don't stain your library'; frames in staircase will be used to display this. Met with school presidents to discuss modules that require prerequisites, for example, those in second year can't currently take first year Spanish, looking into some modules trying to change.
- 7.10. Report of the SRC Equal Opportunities & Welfare Officer**  
First meeting last Wednesday, went well, good idea of where the committee want to go for next year. First committee photo tomorrow should be up some time next week with some points of general aims. Will be meeting with individuals of the committee next week. Will discuss with sabbaticals. Added later that the committee will be making mental health a main priority, and will be working with Mr Woodhouse on this.
- 7.11. Report of the SRC External Campaigns Officer**  
Meat-free Monday motion, discussed with environment and ethics officer, and with Transition. Mr fforde is helping Mr Bryce in setting up a meeting with some people in the union on Friday about this.
- 7.12. Report of the SRC Member for Ethnic Minorities**  
First subcommittee meeting, met with Mr Woodhouse to plan for next year. Some events still in pipeline, decided on a few events, hopefully some time after fresher's week.
- 7.13. Report of the SRC Member for First Year**  
In the process of planning a fresher's week event with ethnic minorities, introductory session, people can ask questions and meet others. Will be thinking about this over next week.  
  
Ms Yusuf Mohamud – last year there was an informal information session for international students at the beginning of the year, with 6 representatives from different countries. This went really well. Might be good to do something similar.
- 7.14. Report of the SRC Member for Gender Equality**  
Not present
- 7.15. Report of the SRC Member for International Students**  
Been in contact with group of students about event for international cultures.
- 7.16. Report of the SRC Member for Mature Students**  
Position vacant
- 7.17. Report of the SRC Member for Private Accommodation**  
Not present.

**7.18. Report of the SRC Member for Students with Disabilities**

Finalising main plans for first semester. Will be in touch with groups to do some joint projects.

**7.19. Report of the SRC Member for University Accommodation**

Been working with CAPOD in working on training. Will be meeting with senior students tomorrow.

**7.20. Report of the SRC Member for Widening Access**

Meetings undergoing, including one with Kerry Campbell. Meetings about access coming up and ones about education.

**7.21. Any Other Competent Reports**

Ms Hill- sabbatical preparation meetings for next year being organised. Encouraged Body to Email Ms Hill or Mr Woodhouse over summer with their 3 main aims for the next year. Also include information about large events/week long events as soon as possible, so that these can be put into the calendar.

**8. Unfinished General Business**

**9. New General Business**

**9.1. Co-option of the SRC Member for Mature Students**

No one present wanting to stand for the position. Co-option will be postponed until the next regular meeting of the Council.

Ms Yusuf Mohamud offered to find someone for the position.

Ms Hill asked how old someone has to be to be a mature student

Mr Cupples stated that the candidate doesn't have to be a mature student to hold the position, they merely have to represent them. Definitions of mature student depend on what you're talking about and ranges between 21-25.

Mr Baldi encouraged members to encourage people to stand.

**9.2. J. 2 – Motion to Update the Charities Campaign Constitution**

Reported from SSC.

Mr Palmer reported this motion on behalf of Ms Gold. Ms Gold amended the charities constitution recently. main changes are: the number of nominated charities; attempting to create branch called 'challenge', as STAG have chosen to become independent, The SSC rose no objections to the amendments.

**No further discussion**

**No objections**

**Motion adopted.**

**9.3. J. 3 – Motion to Amend the Composition of the Association LGBT Committee**

Mr Norris - changes to the committee want to make welfare officer a member of exec committee and change permissions for welfare officer and vice president. Trans, Men's and Women's officers combined to make one position of gender and sexualities officer. Also inclusion of social events officer and wider community relations officer.

**No discussion**

**No objections**

**Motion adopted**

**9.4. J. 4 – Motion to Add University Charities Campaign Societies Coordinator to the SSC Societies Committee**

Mr Palmer on behalf of Ms Gold- societies committee needs to be amended. Ms Gold's changes to the charities committee constitution also mean changes for the societies committee. One officer on charities who works with different groups, this person would also sit on societies committee in order to discuss grants etc. Attempting to bridge gaps between the societies committee and the charities committee.

Ms Hill- asked about the name 'university charities committee'

Mr Baldi- the charities campaign is officially called the university charities campaign. For purposes of avoiding ambiguity, this language was chosen.

**Motion adopted.**

**9.5. J. 6 – Motion to Introduce Association Projects**

Mr Palmer- The motion is to try to create 3<sup>rd</sup> pillar of the student's association- Association Projects. The definition of a subcommittee is that they deliver something all year, for all students. There are projects which don't currently fit into the available system E.g. On The Rocks don't have a place in the association, and while it would be a quick fix to make them a subcommittee, this wouldn't be suitable. There are currently lots of projects that the association would like to support but currently can't.

This motion would put the framework in place, but wouldn't automatically make any groups associated projects. The DoSDA and SSC would decide whether projects become associated. The proposed framework is tidier than making them subcommittees.

Mr Norris asked whether these associated projects would be on the same par as SSC\SRC. For example will they have regular meetings?

Mr Palmer- Stated that they wouldn't be on par with SRC or SSC, but that they would be a bit like 'super committees'. Heads will be elected same way as the design and marketing officer. . Would be annually voted on by the SSC. Not something that happens all year, but do need budget for it. No framework for these kinds of things currently.

Mr Hamid asked whether a budget would be allocated to the DoSDA for this.

Mr Palmer stated that the chair and DoSDA will come up with a budget.

Mr Norris asked whether this will affect subcommittee budgets.

Mr Palmer stated that this is not the plan, but potentially. The money given to all of the projects shouldn't outweigh even one subcommittee.

Mr Cupples explained that the budget is set in summer. The projects which are currently being discussed as potential association projects are those which are already having money spent on them. Things such as On The Rocks are supposed to break even. This would allow it to be formalised, we already give them money, and this would make it more structured.

Mr Hajda asked how a project would apply

Mr Palmer stated the project would come to Ms Gold, who will put it to SSC. It is more likely to concern projects which already exist, less than ground up projects.

Mr Norris asked if it will affect sponsorship from outside funding sources.

Mr Palmer stated that this will require clarification from board. Think we probably could, at the moment; a society can apply for external funding, while a subcommittee cant. Things like On The Rocks would prefer to swap into this. Cupples- it is policy that subcommittees hold events in the union. Issue with sponsorship has always been thorny, don't want to turn money away, but giving to competitors is cutting our own throat.

Mr Hajda asked whether a project would have to be recurring.

Mr Palmer stated that the projects would be reapproved every year, so no. One year events are possible.

Mr Baldi drew Mr. Palmer's attention to points 1.2 and 4.2 on the motion concerning the proposed framework. Suggested that the two contradict each other.

Ms Hill suggested removing 1.2- which prevents one-time events. Some things that have been considered, such as class gift, which is only run by 4<sup>th</sup> years, who have the option to change this every year, would potentially present a problem for this framework as it stands.

Mr Norris asked if this would affect security for recurring events, if there is a demand one year for one-off events

Mr Palmer- at the moment they don't have the security anyway, as it is reapproved every year. If DoSDA thought that one-off events posed a threat to recurring projects, this would go to be voted on.

Ms Yusuf Mohamud asked if this would mean that projects would have to be aware of planning an event far in advance.

Mr Palmer explained that at the moment there are very few things which are falling between gaps. At the moment there are only 3 examples being put forward. Would be likely to remain a small number of projects within this structure. Most things would go through subcommittees or societies.

Ms Yusuf Mohamud- would be a great idea when they have a schedule for next year, for SSC/SRC members to know about what is going on, to hear about events before they happen, to allow people to work together. Would love to have a provisional calendar for the following year. Would allow timetabling.

Mr Palmer explained that this is part of the sabbaticals plan for next year.

**Ms Hill suggested an amendment to strike the first part of 1.2: ‘be recurring in nature and’, Mr Hajda seconded this.**

**No objections to the proposed amendment.**

**Amendment adopted.**

Ms Kelly asked- if a project wanted to plan an event, how early would they have to come forward?

Mr Palmer - would only be for larger scale events. Would have to be around now or before late May/early June for finance meetings to run next year.

Mr Cupples- it says in the motion how much time is given.

Mr Hamid- does this framework not close off last minute sourcing of money? Would it restrict the ability to give last minute funding?

Mr Palmer- this would alleviate structures which are breaking the banks of current systems.

Mr Hamid- conferences such as last weekend’s, does fit into the SRC, would it exclude them?

Mr Palmer- only if they’d affiliated the year before. They could still use the same system they’d used as an SRC group. This system picks up groups which fall in the gaps.

Cupples- The benefit is that if we have notification of an event, we can give guidance to organisers. We can help them to plan the event further in advance.

**No further discussion**

**No objections**

**Motion adopted.**

#### **9.6. R. 3 – Motion to Implement a Meat-Free Monday at the University of St Andrews**

Mr Bryce outlined the motivations behind the initiative of implementing meat-free Monday, including health benefits and environmental benefits. St Andrews currently comes across baldy in terms of sustainable food etc. and could have better policies for sustainable food. Students unions have a positive role to play in the protection of environment. Would be first body to propose this in Scotland. Several institutions over the world including schools in the North West of England have implemented such a scheme.

The initiative would have to put to board. Is more about reducing meat consumption. No meat will be sold on that day.

Mr Cupples stated that this motion is not something that would be taken by board but to the general manager. Stated that while he supported the motivations behind this initiative, and praised the motion for being well-researched, it is still lacking in information. Would be a good idea, but would be good to discuss how it would work.

Might be a good idea to defer the motion until this discussion would happen. The committee don't know right now what they wish to do.

Mr Bryce explained that this motion was designed to provide a mandate to talk to the general manager.

Mr Cupples stated that a mandate is not needed to do this.

Ms Hill explained that this is a mandate to ensure that this is a policy that we all want. It is clear what the motion is saying- would like a meat free day in the union. Believes it to be relevant that we are talking about it now. Explained that if we postpone, it would really put things back.

Mr Norris expressed concerns about the practical issues with such an initiative in terms of planning and stocking an inventory. There's a lot of planning that will go into the menu. There are more structural issues that need to be thought about. Doesn't seem to be enough basis.

**Mr Norris proposed that the motion be postponed  
The motion failed to receive a second.**

Ms Kennedy O Brien- proposal to strike point 3 under 'The SRC Resolves' '*The feasibility of implementing such a policy across halls of residence and all University owned property should be investigated*'. This was seconded by Ms Morrice. Ms Kennedy O Brien stated that this would not be fair on halls residents.

Mr Bryce explained that the idea of 'investigating feasibility' includes asking students. Polling has taken place by Transition, which has previously presented positive results.

Ms Norris stated that even if one person expresses that they eat meat, they should be getting it.

Mr Taylor stated that it would be feasible in halls, and is a lot cheaper to do vegetarian food. But in terms of polling, stated that at the moment, it is very contentious when 2/3 options are vegetarian on a menu in halls, amongst residents.

Ms Urbonaitė - around 800 students have been surveyed by Transition, a lot want more vegetarian options.

Mr Hajda stated that when this poll was carried out, they didn't ask if people want to take out the option of meat, only if they wanted more vegetarian options.

Ms Yusuf Mohamud agreed.

Mr Taylor stated that the biggest complaint by far in halls comes from when there aren't enough meat options. Anecdotally, got about 50 complaints about lack of meat.

Mr Bryce stressed that the motion is not trying to take the option out, rather trying to get an idea of what people think.

Mr Anderson supported striking point 3 under 'The SRC Resolves', asked if it would be better to redefine what 'feasibility' meant?

Ms Hill reminded the Body that this isn't about whether it's feasible in halls, but about changing people's ideas about the food industry. Should be debating whether we support the campaign.

Ms Kennedy O'Brien asked Mr Bryce for clarification on point 3.

Mr Bryce explained that 'investigating feasibility' meant meeting with students in halls, transition, RBS, carrying out scientific polls in halls. Stated that this is about investigating, not imposing. This is a campaign.

Ms Kelly asked whether the Body could move to amend it, rather than striking it.

Mr Baldi stated that it would be better to strike it and replace with an amendment.

Mr Hamid suggested that we should be making use of limited resources, rather than using limited resources for polling something which we already have the answer for.

Mr Cordrey stated that he would suggest that the results of the poll would probably be 'no'.

Mr Cordrey questioned Transition's polling methods.

Ms Urbonaite - the motion is to do what SRC thinks we should do. Not about reducing opportunities to eat meat, rather about introducing a campaign.

Mr Hadja supported the proposal to strike point 3 and then add it back in with amendment

**The question was called on the adoption of the amendment. An objection having been noted, a Roll Call was ordered:**

OFFICE	NAME	AYE	NO	ABS.
Arts/Divinity Senate Representative	Sophie Kelly	X		
Association Community Relations Officer	Sadie Hochfield			
Association Director of Events & Services	Julian Findlay			
Association Director of Representation	Amanda Litherland			
Association Director of Student Development & Activities	Meg Platt			
Association Environment & Ethics Officer	Dominyka Urbonaite		X	
Association LGBT Officer	David Norris	X		
Association Postgraduate President	Danielle Berrow			

Association President	Freddie fforde	Pxy		
President of the Athletic Union	Emily Griffiths			
Science/Medicine Senate Representative	Peter DaBell			
SRC Accommodation Officer	Scott Taylor	X		
SRC Education Officer	Ondrej Hajda	X		
SRC Equal Opportunities & Welfare Officer	Hibak Yusuf Mohamud	X		
SRC External Campaigns Officer	Callum Bryce		X	
SRC Member for Ethnic Minorities	Soraya Walli	X		
SRC Member for First Year	Joshua Carlton	X		
SRC Member for Gender Equality	Ali West			
SRC Member for International Students	Caroline Rhoads	X		
SRC Member for Mature Students				
SRC Member for Private Accommodation	Ruth Cunningham		Pxy	
SRC Member for Students with Disabilities	Fay Morrice	X		
SRC Member for University Accommodation	Anna Kennedy-O'Brien	X		
SRC Member for Widening Access	Ben Anderson	X		

**There were 12 in the affirmative and 3 in the negative. Proposal to strike point 3 under 'The SRC Resolves' '*The feasibility of implementing such a policy across halls of residence and all University owned property should be investigated*' was adopted.**

Mr Hamid- need to change attitudes not menus, should be investing resources in investigating something we already know about.

Ms Hill- this is a 2 part motion- made up of potential implementation across both halls and union. Using the union would be a good way of raising awareness of the issue and would open up debate.

Mr Palmer suggested that the proposed amendment is in paradox with part 1 of 'The SRC Resolves'. As it stands, it seems that we are trying to see what the students want, while trying to implement it.

Mr Bryce stated that the halls part of the motion is open to student opinion, because in halls you don't have the choice of whether to eat there.

**Mr Woodhouse proposed the following replacement for point 3: '*the current student opinion, with particular emphasis or particular attention to senior students are residential students business service, in implementing such a policy across halls of residence and all university-owned property should be investigated.*'**

**This was seconded by Miss Kennedy O' Brien.**

**No objections to adopt amendment, amendment adopted.**

**Mr Bryce proposed the following amendment to - section 4: 'To campaign to educate students on the benefit of a Meatless Monday'**

**Mr Bryce expressed that the food we eat is damaging others, leaving people without food. We should be educating people, so this amendment allows this.**

**No objection to adoption, amendment adopted.**

Debate was opened up concerning the merits of motion itself.

Mr Schorr asked whether evaluation of the effectiveness of this initiative after certain amount of time could be implemented.

Mr Bryce stated that he wouldn't object to this.

Mr Hamid stated that a motion needs to reflect the extent to which the SRC recognises the commercial downsides of such an initiative. Stated that the last time the SRC took a position on services, we lost a substantial amount of money.

Mr Cupples stated that the way 'The SRC Resolves', point 1 was phrased strangely, as it is saying that SRC should be called upon. This is essentially saying that the SRC should talk to themselves. Recommended talking to the staff before this motion is put before the SRC. Wouldn't want to put forward the idea that they SRC have no commercial responsibility. The committee should be aware that the current union services apply only to old union diner, whose customers are not only students. Mr Cupples called the Transition research relevance into question. Stated that the SRC shouldn't be passing motions which stop people from using union services. Catering is likely to make a loss. Understand that motion is only to talk about feasibility, but should call it into question.

Ms Hill expressed that Mr Cupple's idea that we're encouraging people not to be eating at union diner is inappropriate. There's a fairly obvious system which stops the union from losing money. Important that we do this now, as it would be good to include this into redevelopment plans.

Mr Cupples explained that he was not trying to say that the SRC were discouraging business. We're talking about a commercial service, where people can vote with their feet, unlike in halls. The SRC should be aware of these sorts of things.

Mr Norris suggested that the Body do not have enough information to make this decision at this stage. We're taking too much of a leap. Lots of people will leave the union diner.

Ms Hill stated that it is not our job to make commercial decisions. Mr Bryce was elected on the basis of this proposed initiative. Passing this motion would establish whether it's a good idea or not.

**Mr Norris proposed postponement of the motion, this received no second.**

Ms Hill stated that our concern isn't commercial services, but running campaigns- the commercial services make commercial decisions, we make a decision about whether

we support something. Each of the points in the motion covers it. We are voting on in the first section; whether we think it's a good idea.

Mr Norris stated that it being a good idea is more than that of meat free Monday. Money affects each of the positions and what they can do. Want to have more knowledge about this motion and its implications. Don't have knowledge to know what we're supporting.

Mr Cupples suggested that the intention of point 1 is not clear.

**The following amendment to the original amendment was proposed by Mr Palmer, and seconded by Ms Norris: to strike points 1, 1.1 and 2 under 'The SRC Resolves', and replace with a new point 1 as follows: '*That a policy should be discussed with the commercial services of the Union, to provide only sustainable, meat free meals at least one day a week (not necessarily Monday)*'.**

Ms Urbonaite suggested that this amendment only encourages investigation.

Mr Palmer stated that this is fair as we are not yet sure of student opinion.

Mr Woodhouse stated that if the amendment is put into place, the idea that the SRC endorses you is part of the motion. We are coming with a degree of hesitancy.

Ms Hill asked whether this made the motion redundant, because he could have done this anyway without bringing it forward.

Mr Bryce suggested that this amendment would mean 'putting the horse before the cart'

Mr Palmer- stated that it would be necessary to bring this back to consider after talking to manager. Not necessarily unanimous about supporting motion.

The amendment was put before the Body, Mr Bryce objected to Palmer's amendment.

Vote for the Palmer amendment:

OFFICE	NAME	AYE	NO	ABS.
Arts/Divinity Senate Representative	Sophie Kelly	X		
Association Community Relations Officer	Sadie Hochfield			
Association Director of Events & Services	Julian Findlay			
Association Director of Representation	Amanda Litherland			
Association Director of Student Development & Activities	Meg Platt			
Association Environment & Ethics Officer	Dominyka Urbonaite		X	
Association LGBT Officer	David Norris	X		
Association Postgraduate President	Danielle Berrow			
Association President	Freddie fforde	Pxy		
President of the Athletic Union	Emily Griffiths			

Science/Medicine Senate Representative	Peter DaBell			
SRC Accommodation Officer	Scott Taylor	X		
SRC Education Officer	Ondrej Hajda	X		
SRC Equal Opportunities & Welfare Officer	Hibak Yusuf Mohamud	X		
SRC External Campaigns Officer	Callum Bryce		X	
SRC Member for Ethnic Minorities	Soraya Walli	X		
SRC Member for First Year	Joshua Carlton	X		
SRC Member for Gender Equality	Ali West			
SRC Member for International Students	Caroline Rhoads	X		
SRC Member for Mature Students				
SRC Member for Private Accommodation	Ruth Cunningham		Pxy	
SRC Member for Students with Disabilities	Fay Morrice	X		
SRC Member for University Accommodation	Anna Kennedy-O'Brien	X		
SRC Member for Widening Access	Ben Anderson	X		

**There were 12 in the affirmative and 3 in the negative. Mr Palmer's amendment: to strike points 1, 1.1 and 2 under 'The SRC Resolves', and replace with a new point 1 as follows: '*That a policy should be discussed with the commercial services of the Union, to provide only sustainable, meat free meals at least one day a week (not necessarily Monday)*' was adopted.**

**The body moved to a vote to adopt the motion R3 as amended.**

**No objection to adopt R3 as amended.**

**Motion was adopted.**

## **9.7. Consultation on Working Paper on Gifts Recognition**

Ms Platt presented the motion on behalf of the association board. The university development office is seeking funds for the redevelopment of the union. They are trying to get gifts on behalf of the association. At the moment, the gifts come from a number of departments including corporations, private trusts, individuals and legacies. There is a need to come up with guidelines to decide what we do with these grants. For example, the new medical science building has plaques commemorating its donors. There are no set standards at the moment, need to gather student opinion and feedback. Trying to establish what is appropriate in terms of recognising gifts. Ms Platt expressed that she personally would be happy to recognise gifts from individuals but not corporation, but that she would welcome others' thoughts on this. Opened floor to debate.

Ms Hill asked how many might we have/be getting.

Ms Platt- putting plaques on chairs is an idea that we could use within the performance space, would work from the model of the medical science. Thinking of naming rooms, as after redevelopment, there will be much more than there are right now. Also the

possibility of naming pool tables. The best way to get funding is by naming things. In the union, there are more opportunities. Unsure of the number of donors at the moment.

Mr Baldi stated that Harvard law school recently named its toilets after individuals. We are looking to put student feeling in a paper to put to board for May 30<sup>th</sup> when they will be considering policies.

Mr Cupples- looking to raise around 2 million to defray their costs. The university will decide whether to accept a gift, however if we decide a rules, this will influence their decisions about naming etc. By not naming, it would have the effect of not accepting.

Mr Norris asked whether there were plans to cap donations

Ms Platt explained that this is something which we would look into.

Mr Norris suggested the idea of a wall for putting plaques?

Ms Platt stated that this is one idea being considered. Specifically a digital donor wall, as in Glasgow University, which could be updated on a regular basis.

Ms Hill suggested that putting names to rooms is a good way of getting bigger donations- people prefer to be told that they're naming something specific. For example, theatre related people can give donations for chairs in the performance space.

Ms Hill suggested that the biggest question was whether we are comfortable with any corporations giving plaques. If we start screening, what are we measuring it on? The university has its own ethical investment policy, but might be uncomfortable with saying that any company can put their name on a plaque.

Ms Platt explained that we don't have right to refuse gift that doesn't directly violate aims. For example, if Tesco wanted to give £200 for example, we couldn't refuse that as they don't violate our aims.

Mr Norris asked what would happen if an issue with a company or individual arose after we accepted a donation.

Ms Platt stated that if this happened after the fact, we'd have the right of refusal. This is true of any charity.

Mr Palmer stated that at the moment the Body seemed to be suggesting not accepting corporations at all, in terms of creating plaques. This would be neater and simpler.

Mr Baldi asked whether anyone thought that corporations should be accepted  
No one spoke.

Mr Baldi put forward the possibility of trusts or foundations funded by corporations?

Ms Platt accepted that this was an important issue and should be discussed.

Ms Hill stated that lots of problems arise from accepting corporations. Used the example of Brian Souter, head of Stagecoach, who is openly anti- equal marriage.

Mr Cupples stated that something like that would be in contravention of policy. Whether it comes from an individual or something he funds, it could be refused.

Ms Hill suggested that we could refuse corporations and have a screening process for others.

Ms Platt stated that she didn't know how a screening process would work.

Mr Cupples stated that this would be difficult for private individuals, because it's hard to know what to believe and where to find information.

Ms Platt suggested the possibility of screening after a certain amount.

Mr Cupples suggested that the constitution and the equal opportunities policy could put be used for screening.

Mr Woodhouse asked whether the committee would be able to choose what's being named

Ms Platt confirmed that any feedback or ideas would be good.

Mr Woodhouse expressed that he would be interested in having advocacy centre and students services kept until last, if both of these are being kept in the building.

Ms Hill naming beer taps and pool tables wouldn't work, as pool tables are rented, and taps have to be named with beer. Pool tables would be good if we owned them.

## **10. Any Other Competent Business**

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 21:34.