



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

## MINUTES

Tuesday 2 February 2016 – Committee Room – 6pm

### Present

#### **Member's Name**

Eleanor Mullin  
Charlotte Andrews  
Zara Evans  
Clare Armstrong  
Joe Tantillo  
Alice Pickthall  
Sigrid Jorgensen  
Pat Mathewson  
Sarah Thompson  
Annie Newman  
Louise McCaul  
Alexandre Ciric  
Omar Ali  
Toby Emerson  
Jackie Ashkin  
Holly Johnston  
Alice Lecointe  
Adam Stromme  
Aysha Marty  
Kate Mayer  
Miriam Chappell

#### **Position**

Arts/Divinity Faculty President  
Association Alumni Officer  
Association Chair  
Association Community Relations Officer  
Association Director of Representation  
Association Environment and Ethics Officer  
Association LGBT Officer  
Association President  
President of the Athletic Union  
Rector's Assessor  
Science/Medicine Faculty President  
SRC Accommodation Officer  
SRC Equal Opportunities Officer  
SRC External Campaigns Officer  
SRC Member for Racial Equality  
SRC Member for First Years  
SRC Member for Gender Equality  
SRC Member for International Students  
SRC Member for Mature Students  
SRC Member for Students with Disabilities  
SRC Welfare Officer

### In Attendance

Iain Cupples  
Ilaria Gidoro  
Thadd Hall  
Bernard Munro  
Luke Shaw  
Ondrej Hajda  
Annabel Romanos  
Joseph Cassidy  
Roddy McGlynn

Education Advocate  
Education and Representation Coordinator (Minutes)  
LGBT+  
LGBT+  
LGBT+/Postgraduate Society  
Past Sabb  
SSC Member without Portfolio  
The Saint  
-

### Absent

Nicola Kennedy  
Melissa Turner

Principal Ambassador  
Member for Widening Access and Participation

## **1. Adoption of the Agenda**

Mr Tantillo asked to move the reports of the Sabbatical Officers to the end of the meeting, after item 10.

**The agenda was amended without dissent.**

**The agenda was adopted, as amended, without dissent.**

## **2. Apologies for Absence.**

<b>Member's Name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Chris MacRae	Association Director of Events and Services
Kyle Blain	Association Director of Student Development and Activities
Nils Turner	SRC Employability Officer
VACANT	SRC Postgraduate Convenor

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

The minutes of the last meeting were approved by email.

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

N/A

## **5. Open Forum**

Some of those in attendance expressed their opinions on the item 9.1. J. 16-1 A Motion to Reform the Membership of the SRC.

Mr Shaw stressed that the "members for" should not be removed from SRC because, without a vote, they cannot represent the varied student body.

Mr McGlynn similarly stated that the Equal Opportunity Member would not be able to report the different views of all the "members for" because they would only have one vote, which cannot reflect the contrasting opinions that the "members for" might have.

Mr Munro noted that the members of the LGBT+ committee had not been informed of this motion and only heard of it. Ms Newman replied that they had informed the LGBT Officer. Mr Hall replied that all members of the committee should have been informed.

Mr Ali stressed that the Equal Opportunities subcommittee had not met yet to discuss this motion.

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

### **6.1 Report of the President of the Athletic Union**

Ms Thompson was planning a sports night. She informed of the success of the women basketball team, who made it to the national final, but lost against Edinburgh.

### **6.2 Report of the Association President**

Mr Mathewson was involved with interviews to select the new bar manager and with interviews for new the Principal.

### **6.3 Report of the Association Director of Events & Services**

Mr McRae was not in attendance.

### **6.4 Report of the Association Director of Student Development & Activities**

Mr Blain was not in attendance.

### **6.5 Report of the Association Director of Representation**

Mr Tantillo reminded that the Students' Association's elections were going to happen soon. The NSS opened and he encouraged all relevant attendees to complete it.

## **7. Questions for Committees**

### **7.1. Questions for Association Alumni Committee**

-

### **7.2. Questions for Association Community Relations Committee**

-

### **7.3 Questions for Association Environment Committee**

Ms Pickthall reported that the subcommittee had a meeting about a proposed environmental policy, and they made a draft of it.

### **7.4 Questions for Association LGBT Committee**

Ms Jorgensen reminded that Glitterball was happening on 4<sup>th</sup> March and that tickets could be purchased online.

### **7.5. Questions for Rector's Committee**

Ms Newman informed that, in February, she would work on applications from 3<sup>rd</sup> year students for summer internships.

### **7.6 Questions for SRC Accommodation Committee**

-

### **7.7 Questions for SRC Education Committee**

-

### **7.8. Questions for SRC Employability Committee**

-

### **7.9. Questions for SRC Equal Opportunities Committee**

Mr Ali informed that their event on holocaust happened last week. He was involved in a diversity-in-academia conference. He was also working on a motion with his subcommittee.

### **7.10. Questions for SRC External Campaigns Committee**

Mr Emerson was working on an enactus group.

### **7.11. Questions for SRC Wellbeing Committee**

Ms Chappell said that there would be a self-defence course in refreshers' week.

### **7.12. Any Other Competent Questions**

Ms Turner was working with mature students to create events and was getting feedback from them. She was also working on a campaign with Mr Ali to ask students to make contact with the schools they come from.

Mr Hajda asked for feedback from officers on having to write written reports, since he had introduced them. Somebody noted that the Wednesday deadline was a bit problematic. Ms Armstrong also stressed that the report is usually not complete, if the deadline is on a Wednesday, because things happen between then and the meeting. Ms Jorgensen and Ms Mullin liked the written reports. Ms Pickthall added that it was useful to write reports because they helped to keep track of what a person worked on throughout the year.

## **8. Unfinished General Business**

There was no unfinished general business.

## **9. New General Business**

### **9.1 J. 16-1- A Motion to Reform the Membership of the SRC**

THIS SRC AND SSC NOTE:

1. That the current "Member for" positions on the SRC also sit on the Equal Opportunities Committee.
2. The "Association" positions are intended to reflect the key long term strategic goals of the Student's Association as outlined in the 2014-17 Strategic Report.
3. The remit of the External Campaign Officer overlaps with that of the Association President.
4. The Senior Officers of the SRC and SSC were asked to consider reform of the Association Councils, and therefore SRC membership should be discussed.

THIS SRC AND SSC BELIEVE:

1. Given the nature of the changes made to the nature of SRC meetings, a smaller membership of the SRC will be beneficial.

2. Currently the “Members for” positions hear the same reports and have the same discussions in both the SRC meetings and the Equal Opportunities committee meetings.
3. The Member Without Portfolio position does not require an equivalent amount of work as other council positions, and its remit is not required on the SSC.
4. Representation of LGBT students also falls under the responsibilities of the Equal Opportunities Officer.
6. The Equal Opportunities Committee should exist as a support system for logistical and organizational plans of its members, as well as as a forum for representational concerns.

THIS SRC AND SSC RESOLVE:

1. To remove all “Members for” positions from the SRC, but still require them to be elected by the student body in the annual elections and serve on the Equal Opportunities Committee.
2. To make the ‘Association LGBT Officer’ the ‘LGBT Officer,’ removing its position on the SRC, but continuing its position on the Equal Opportunities Committee and the SSC.
3. To revise and clarify the responsibilities, purpose, and meeting requirements of the Equal Opportunities Committee.
4. To remove the positions of Member Without Portfolio and External Campaigns Officer from the SSC and SRC, respectively.
5. To make the Equal Opportunities Officer the Association Equal Opportunities Officer.

**PROPOSED:** Charlotte Andrew and Annie Newman, Omar Ali

**SECONDED:** Pat Mathewson, Sarah Thompson, Chris Macrae, Kyle Blain, Toby Emerson

Ms Andrew introduced the motion and stated that she wanted the SRC to have a proper discussion before a decision was taken. This motion was the third part of a reform that they were asked to look into by the Sabbs, and was intended to ensure that SRC was more efficient and productive. She stated that the current format was not working and needed to change. They had tried to involve everybody for the purpose of this reform and received different reactions.

Ms Newman explained the actual changes proposed in the motion. The role of the external campaign officer would be removed, as well as the SSC member without portfolio. The “members for” in the Equal Opportunities subcommittee would also be removed.

Ms Jorgensen asked if the proposers of this motion had asked for the opinions of the “members for”. Ms Newman replied that they asked three of them and then spoke to Mr Ali. Ms Chappell asked why the proposers of this motion did not involve all the “members for”. Ms Andrew said that they wanted all officers to discuss the motion in this meeting.

Mr Stromme asked for a clarification on what the SRC structure would be, if this motion passed. Ms Newman replied that the “members for” would not sit in SRC, but would attend the meetings of the Equal Opportunities subcommittee every two weeks—although they could still attend SRC and speak in the open forum, as every student can. Mr Stromme asked if the Equal Opportunities officer would only have one vote in SRC if this motion passed. Ms Newman replied that, yes, only the Equal Opportunities officer would have a vote. Ms Andrew also noted that the Equal Opportunities officer would become an Association role and, therefore, would sit on both SRC and SSC. Thus, their role would be stronger. Mr Ali approved the decision of making the Equal Opportunities Officer an Association role because this would recognise more the event-creating part of the role and would give them more authority to organise events.

Ms Andrew noted that SRC would meet only five times a year, and each member would do a presentation about what they have been doing and about their future plans. She stated that, with less people at the table, there would be more time for discussion and creativity.

Debate was opened on the motion. Mr Emerson said that this motion was drastic. He agreed with removing the External Campaign officer because there is not enough to do for a person in this role. He had tried to engage students who are politically active, or in political societies, but not £1 of his budget had been spent. However, Mr Emerson disagreed with the rest of the motion. He and some others wrote some amendments to this motion that they circulated to all attendees.

#### **Amendment One to 9.1 J. 16-1- A Motion to Reform the Membership of the SRC**

#### **LIST OF AMENDMENTS MADE TO MOTION**

THIS SRC AND SSC NOTE:

1. That the current “Member for” positions on the SRC also sit on the Equal Opportunities Committee, **but that their roles in these two bodies are different.**
2. The “Association” positions are intended to reflect the key long-term strategic goals of the Student’s Association as outlined in the 2014-17 Strategic Report.
3. ~~The remit of the External Campaign Officer overlaps with that of the Association President.~~ **does not have sufficient work or remit to justify the role.**
4. The Senior Officers of the SRC and SSC were asked to consider reform of the Association Councils, and therefore SRC membership should be discussed.

THIS SRC AND SSC BELIEVE:

1. **It does not follow that** given the nature of the changes made to the nature of SRC meetings, a smaller membership of the SRC will be beneficial, **but rather that it may be detrimental.**
2. **‘Members For’ will best carry out their role when able to represent their relevant groups of students with full voting rights.**
3. ~~Currently the “Members for” positions hear the same reports and have the same discussions in both the SRC meetings and the Equal Opportunities committee meetings.~~
4. ~~The Member Without Portfolio position does not require an equivalent amount of work as other council positions, and its remit is not required on the SSC.~~ **The Member Without Portfolio performs many important roles, including - but not limited to - expanding our accessibility through online interaction, as mandated in the 2014-2017 Strategic Report.**
5. ~~Representation of LGBT students also falls under the responsibilities of the Equal Opportunities Officer.~~

6. The Equal Opportunities Committee should exist as a support system for logistical and organizational plans of its members, as well as a forum for representational concerns.

THIS SRC AND SSC RESOLVE:

1. ~~To remove all “Members for” positions from the SRC, but still require them to be elected by the student body in the annual elections and serve on the Equal Opportunities Committee.~~
2. ~~To make the ‘Association LGBT Officer’ the ‘LGBT Officer,’ removing its position on the SRC, but continuing its position on the Equal Opportunities Committee and the SSC.~~
3. To revise and clarify the responsibilities, purpose, and meeting requirements of the Equal Opportunities Committee, ***to be achieved through discussion by the Equal Opportunities Committee, including all who hold a ‘Member for’ position.***
4. To remove the positions of ~~Member Without Portfolio and External Campaigns Officer from the SSC and SRC, respectively.~~
5. To make the Equal Opportunities Officer the Association Equal Opportunities Officer.

PROPOSED: Toby Emerson, Sigrid Jørgensen, Miriam Chappell, Alexandre Ciric

SECONDED: Holly Johnston, Aysha Marty, Melissa Turner, Caroline Christie, Kate Mayer

Ms Emerson explained the changes they proposed. Ms Newman asked why the LGBT Officer should be different from the “members for”. Ms Jorgensen replied that the LGBT officer also sits in the Wellbeing subcommittee and other committees.

Debate was opened on Amendment One. Ms Jorgensen stated that there was no reason to reduce the membership so drastically, since there would be only five SRC meetings a year. Moreover, it would be difficult for one person to represent all these groups. Ms Turner stated that removing these members from SRC would mean having less debate, and this would be detrimental. Mr Ali said that some roles are too overlapping. He proposed to combine some of them to reduce their number. The “members for” were asked to state their opinions.

All current “members for” were in favour of the amendments to the motion and explained their reasons. Ms Romanos stated that the role of SSC Member without Portfolio should remain, in her opinion, although it should be reformed. Students and SRC/SSC members should understand better what this role is. This position could be used to make the councils more accessible to students. She said that she would propose a motion on her role at the next meeting.

Ms Johnston supported the amendment to the motion because she disagreed with taking the “members for” off the SRC. They are elected to represent students, and they need to sit in the SRC to do so.

Ms Newman stated that, during the past year, the “members for” never moved a motion in the SRC to make representational changes. The “members for” and Mr Ali stated the reasons why they never wrote motions. Mr Ali stated that there was not a culture of writing motions in SRC. Ms Turner stated she felt intimidated by proposing motions. Moreover, the students she represents never asked her for representational changes because they are not even aware of the student councils. Mr Emerson stated that, in his opinion, it is important to keep the “members for” in the SRC to debate, even if they do not bring motions.

Mr Hajda informed that the Students' Union in Aberdeen was undergoing a democratic crisis and was re-doing the entire structure from scratch. He encouraged officers to look into this possibility in St Andrews, too. He stated that this was the fourth year he was involved in the Students' Association and he always heard about doing a SRC reform, which never happened. Mr Mathewson agreed with Mr Hajda and stated that they did not need small tweaks but a radical change.

Ms Newman moved to vote. Ms Jorgensen seconded.

**A roll call vote was held in the SRC on Amendment One. Amendment One was passed unanimously.**

The SRC went back to debate the motion J. 16-1, as amended.

Mr Hajda noted that, with passing Amendment One, the role of the External Campaigns officer had been removed. He asked Mr Emerson if anybody had approached him with interested on this role. Nobody had approached Mr Emerson. Mr Hajda stated that, in his opinion, the budget for external campaigns should be kept. Mr Emerson stated that it was £500. **Mr Tantillo proposed Amendment Two: to add clause 4 of the Resolves: "To ring fence £500 to create the SRC Campaign Fund". Ms Armstrong seconded. With no objections, Amendment Two was adopted.**

**Mr Tantillo moved to vote on the motion J.16-1. Ms Jorgensen seconded. With no objections, the motion J.16-1 was adopted, as amended.**

## **9.2 J.16-2- Motion To Adopt The Rules for the 2016 Students' Association Elections**

### **This SRC & SSC Notes**

1. The Students' Association Elections are happening in March.
2. The rules for the elections must be adopted by the Association Councils.

### **This SRC & SSC Believes**

1. It is important to adopt the rules ahead of elections week so that candidates and voters have an opportunity to familiarise themselves with all regulations.

### **This SRC & SSC Resolves**

1. To accept the elections rules for the 2016 Students' Association Elections.

### **PROPOSED: THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE**

Mr Tantillo highlighted the changes made to the elections rules after these had been discussed the previous week. The SRC had a few minutes to read the changes.

Ms Thompson asked if the Elections Committee would advertise the hall hustings. Mr Tantillo replied that it was not mandatory for halls to make hustings. If they did, the Elections Committee would run the hustings. Mr Emerson asked what slating was. Mr Tantillo explained it and said that nobody had done it so far. Pros and Cons of slating were discussed.

Mr Ciric arrived at 8pm.

Ms Newman asked about the PG role that was still uncertain. Mr Tantillo replied that they did not know about the future of the role. Mr Mathewson was going to meet the Proctor on this issue, and the PG Society would help advertising after a decision was taken.

Ms Thompson stated that currently candidates do not have to declare expenses for baked goods and she thought it was an unfair advantage.

Ms Andrew asked if there was an expectation for newspapers to be equal about candidates. Mr Cassidy replied that there was no such expectation, but The Saint do not do it because they think it is not fair.

**Mr Tantillo moved Amendment One to J.16-2.** To add under 6.1: “Any publicity for which receipts are not available, or for which the elections committee find the provided receipt unacceptable for any reason, may be charged against the candidate’s budget at an amount determined by the Elections Committee.” **Ms Mullin seconded.**

**With no objections, the amendment passed.**

**Ms Thompson moved Amendment Two to J. 16-2.** To add: “Ingredients for baked goods must be declared in the candidate’s budget.” in the section 6.1 of the elections rules. **Mr Tantillo seconded.**

**With no objections, the amendment passed.**

**Mr Tantillo moved Amendment Three to J. 16-2.** To add: “Halls have the option to have hustings if they want. Candidates are expected to attend. Halls will make schedule that does not clash with other important meetings. The elections committee will publicise and invite. A member of the elections committee chairs husting.” in the section 3.1 of the elections rules. **Mr Ciric seconded.**

Ms Newman said that it was important that there were hustings in every halls and it should be mandatory for candidates to attend. Mr Tantillo said that he attended hall hustings for four years and the turnout was never very good. Ms Thompson disagreed with Mr Tantillo and said that the Elections Committee should be responsible for organising them. Ms Turner asked what was in place to advertise elections among commuters and mature students. Mr Tantillo said that there would be a live streaming of the sabbs’ hustings.

**Ms Newman moved Amendment One to Amendment Three to J. 16-2.** To strike Amendment One and replace it with: “The SRC mandates hall committees to organise hall events, more conducive to student engagement. Candidates are required to attend.” **Ms Lecoite seconded.**

**With no objections, the amendment passed.**

Ms Mullin objected the use of the word “mandatory”. Mr Cupples said that the Students’ Association does not have the power to mandate halls.

**Ms Mullin moved Amendment Four to J. 16-2.** To strike Amendment Three to J. 16-2 and replace it with: “The SRC suggests that hall committees are mandated to organise hall events, more conducive to student engagement. Candidates are expected to attend unless there are extenuating circumstances approved by the elections committee.” **Mr Ali seconded.**

**With no objections, the amendment passed.**

**Ms Thompson moved Amendment Five to J. 16-2.** To add: “Appeals for Au Pres should be submitted to Lorna Milne, Proctor, on proctor@.” in the section 7.7 of the elections rules. **Mr Tantillo seconded.**

**With no objections, the amendment passed.**

Mr Emerson reported that Ms Pickthall, who was not in attendance, proposed to abolish flyering and **moved Amendment Six to J. 16-2.** To strike 6.1 of the elections rules and to replace it with: “*Budgeting compliance* — All publicity, online or physical, must be budgeted and, as a part of this, matched to receipts as relevant. As such, all publicity should be validated by the Elections Committee. Unauthorised publicity and flyers are prohibited and subject to penalty.” and, consequently, to strike 6.5 and replace it with: “*Required elements* — Each printed poster and flyer must contain the date of the voting (10 & 11 March) and an encouragement to recycle. Posters for AU President candidates must also contain the Saints Sport logo.” **Ms Newman seconded.**

Ms Mullin thought that this was detrimental to the experience of campaigning and an unnecessary limit. Mr Tantillo stressed that flyering was so essential to campaigning in St Andrews.

**A roll-call vote was held in the Students’ Representative Council.**

**With 4 members in the affirmative and 9 members in the negative, the amendment failed.**

**Mr Mathewson moved Amendment Seven to J. 16-2.** To strike all mentions to slating in the elections rules and insert: “The elections committee does not allow slating.” **Ms Chappell seconded.**

Mr Tantillo stated that they should allow students to try slating, as this is a realistic political process. Some attendees stated that slating could improve the students’ engagement with the elections.

**Ms Newman moved to vote. Ms Jorgensen seconded.**

**A roll-call vote was held in the Students’ Representative Council.**

**With 12 members in the affirmative and 5 members in the negative, the amendment passed.**

**Mr Ali moved to vote on the main body of the motion. With no objections, the motion J. 16-2 was passed.**

## **10. Open discussion**

Mr Mathewson encouraged attendees to approach the Sabbs or the relevant members of staff if they were thinking of running for a sabbatical position.

## **11. Any Other Competent Business**

There was no other competent business.

**The meeting adjourned.**