



# University of St Andrews Students' Association Executive Committee

## MINUTES

Tuesday 28th October 2013 – Committee Room, 8.00pm

### Present

Maxwell Baldi	Association Chair
Daniel Palmer	Association Director of Events and Services
Edward Woodhouse	Association Director of Representation
Kelsey Gold	Association Director of Student Development and Activities
Chloe Hill	Association President
Callum Bryce	SRC Deputy Senior Officer
Hibak Yusuf Mohamud	SRC Senior Officer
Courtney Lewis	SSC Senior Officer

### In Attendance

Elliot Davies	The Saint
Laura Abernethy	The Saint
Harold Dixon	
Radim Dragomaca	

### Absent

David Patterson	SRC Deputy Senior Officer
-----------------	---------------------------

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

Ms Gold asked during which item the guidelines for judging members' absences would be discussed.

Mr Baldi answered that it would be during item 6.2.

The agenda was adopted without dissent.

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

David Patterson	SSC Deputy Senior Officer
-----------------	---------------------------

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

Pursuant to Standing Orders §7.2.2, the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held on 10 May 2013 were laid before the members on 10 May 2013. With no objections registered within 24 hours, the minutes were adopted by electronic mail.

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

There were no matters arising from the previous minutes.

#### **5. Unfinished General Business**

There was no unfinished general business.

#### **6. New General Business**

##### **6.1. Request of Association Chair to Clarify Ambiguity in 4 Laws §3**

Mr Baldi stated that most ambiguities in the laws had been clarified but that one aspect still wasn't clear.

Mr Baldi asked whether an absence from a Joint meeting of the Students' Representative Council meetings and Student Service Council meetings would count as one absence or two absences for those members who were required to attend both Students' Representative Council meetings and Student Service Council meetings.

Ms Gold stated that it should count as only one absence.

**The Executive Committee interpreted the laws to reflect that a member absent from one joint meeting would be considered as having been absent from only one meeting even if their attendance was required by virtue of being a member of both the Students' Representative Council and Student Services Council.**

##### **6.2. Consideration of Reinstatement Policy under Association Councils in Absence Policy**

Ms Gold stated that, as she said she would in the Joint Meeting held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of October 2013, she had drawn up some guidelines for how Sabbatical Officers, both current ones and those in the future, should evaluate whether a member should be reinstated to their position after having been removed for repeated absence. Ms Gold stated that the decision to reinstate or not reinstate a removed member should take in to account the attendance at non-SRC/SSC meetings required by their position, their personal and family circumstances, whether there was an academic conflict such as an evening class, the feedback from the line-managing Sabbatical officer, the content of the personal statement plus other considerations as related to the position. The other considerations should include the fact that Association officers can more quickly trigger their removal due to the higher number of meetings they're required to attend, the lower priority that non-voting members might attach to their attendance at SSC/SRC meetings due to their status, and the fact that many of the members of the SSC/SRC chair subcommittees. The chair of a subcommittee has significant responsibilities and how they have fulfilled those should be considered, it should also be considered that removing a chair from a subcommittee can disrupt the running of the subcommittee in a way that another member might not.

Ms Hill stated that if there was one thing this year's Executive Committee and Councils would be remembered for it was making rules.

Mr Baldi asked whether the members would like the guidelines adopted or just stored in the records of the Executive Committee.

Ms Hill stated that she thought it should be adopted as few people accessed the records of the Executive Committee

**Ms Gold moved that the following be adopted guidelines for the absence policy:**

### **Guidelines for Students' Association Executive Committee – Absence Policy**

#### **Student's Association SRC/SSC Absence Policy:**

3.1 If a member except a Senate Representative, the Rector's Assessor, and Athletic Union President, is absent from three meetings of SRC and/or SSC without adequate apologies or five in total, they shall be removed from office, unless the SAEC reinstates the member, conditionally or unconditionally, within 7 days of the approval of minutes of the meeting triggering this section.

3.2 If a Senate Representative, the Rector's Assessor, and Athletic Union President is absent from three meetings of SRC and/or SSC without adequate apologies or five in total, they shall be removed from the SRC/SSC unless the SAEC reinstated the member, conditionally or unconditionally, within 7 days of the approval of the minutes of the meeting triggering this section.

3.2.1. If a Senate Representative, the Rector's Assessor, or Athletic Union President is removed from the SRC or SSC pursuant to this section, the Association President shall inform the University officials of the same.

#### **Reinstatement:**

The Executive Committee must act to reinstate the member of the SRC/SSC, conditionally or unconditionally, for them to remain a member of the Association Councils.

#### **Guidelines:**

Criteria to be considered for reinstatement

- Attendance at on-SRC/SSC meetings related to their position.
- Personal/family circumstances
- Academic conflict i.e. an evening class
  - Impending coursework deadlines will not be considered a valid academic conflict.
- Feedback from their Sabbatical line manager (where relevant)
- Contents of personal appeal
- Consideration of recommendations below on Association Officers, Non-Voting members and SRC/SSC subcommittees as related to the individual in question

#### 1. Association Officers

1.1. Association Officers are required to attend both SRC and SSC meetings. As such, they can trigger the 'is absent from three meetings of SRC and/or SSC without adequate apologies or five in total' more quickly than an SRC or SSC councillor.

- 1.1.1. The Executive Committee may wish to give these officers more leniency: four meetings without adequate apologies or seven in total is recommended.
2. Non-voting members
  - 2.1. There are several members of the SRC/SSC that do not have voting rights: SSC Design Convenor, SSC Entertainments Convenor, SSC Charitable Development Convenor, Rector's Assessor.
    - 2.1.1. While attendance at SRC/SSC is still compulsory for these members the Executive Committee may wish to be more lenient as these members do not have the ability to vote at SRC/SSC and may therefore deem SRC/SSC of a lower priority, when taken into consideration of other fulfilment of their duties.
3. SRC/SSC Subcommittees
  - 3.1. Many members of the SRC/SSC are the head of a respective subcommittee.
    - 3.1.1. Many subcommittees, in particular SSC subcommittees, have significant time demands on their respective heads. The officer's competency and commitment to their subcommittee should be a significant consideration in their reinstatement to the SRC/SSC
  - 3.2. If you remove an SRC or SSC member they are removed from SRC/SSC AND stripped of post as the head of their subcommittee.
    - 3.2.1. If this occurs, an interim head of the subcommittee will be selected until such time that SRC/SSC may ensure that the position is filled – pursuant to the Standing Orders

**Ms Hill seconded.**

**With no objections, the guidelines were adopted.**

### **6.3. Consideration of Reinstatements under Association Councils Absence Policy**

#### **6.3.1. Peter DaBell**

Ms Hill asked if it was appropriate to have this discussion in open session.

Mr Baldi answered that, generally, only the awarding of honorary life memberships and disciplinary actions were discussed *in camera*.

Ms Hill stated that she viewed the discussion as being disciplinary as the removal of someone from their job was being discussed.

Mr Baldi asked whether Ms Hill would like to move *in camera*.

**Ms Hill moved that the meeting adjourn *in camera*.**

**Mr Bryce seconded**

OFFICE	NAME	AYE	NO	ABS.
Association Director of Events & Services	Daniel Palmer	X		
Association Director of Representation	Teddy Woodhouse			X
Association Director of Student Development & Activities	Kelsey Gold	X		
Association President	Chloe Hill	X		
SRC Deputy Senior Officer	Callum Bryce	X		
SRC Senior Officer	Hibak Yusuf Mohamud	X		
SSC Deputy Senior Officer	David Patterson			
SSC Senior Officer	Courtney Lewis	X		

**With 5 members in the affirmative and 0 in the negative the motion was adopted.**

**The Executive Committee adjourned *in camera*.**

The Committee resolved to reinstate Mr Peter DaBell as Science/Medicine Senate Representative subject to the following conditions:

- The he submit a written report for each SRC meeting he would be absent from and designate a proxy
- The he meet with the Association Director of Representation in advance of the next SRC meeting
- That his performance would be reviewed at the end of the semester

The committee resolved without dissent to adjourn *ex camera*.

#### **6.4. Reply of Radim Dragomaca to Motion to Reconsider and Reconsideration of Honorary Life Membership of Radim Dragomaca of 10 May 2013**

Mr Baldi stated the item 6.4. is the reply of Radim Dragomaca to Motion to Reconsider and Reconsideration of Honorary Life Membership of Radim Dragomaca of 10 May 2013. Mr Baldi stated that, to give the item context, that on 10<sup>th</sup> of May an *in camera* session was convened, a motion was made to reconsider the Honorary Life Membership given on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May, that motion was adopted and, once reconsidered, Mr Dragomaca was not awarded an Honorary Life Membership. Pursuant to section 14 of the standing orders, the letter submitted and his comments was as a result of Mr Dragomaca exercising his right of reply.

**Mr Baldi stated that he would limit the speech to five minutes.**

**There were no objections.**

Mr Dragomaca thanked the chair and the members for giving him the opportunity to speak. Mr Dragomaca stated that he was appearing to exercise his right of reply pursuant to section 14 of the Standing Orders. Mr Dragomaca stated that he would first like to address the procedural aspects that led to this matter. Mr Dragomaca stated that, on the 10<sup>th</sup> of May allegations were made against him, he was not notified, he was not asked for comment, and that, as with everything, there were two sides to the story, and that the allegations were not externally verified. Mr Dragomaca

expressed his hope that the Association would alter their procedure such that nothing similar to what happened to him would ever affect another student. Mr Dragomaca stated that he was not bound by the secrecy like the members who were present during the *in camera* discussion that led to him being stripped of his honorary life membership as so he would outline the allegations and his defence. Mr Dragomaca stated that the charges were that he violated the trust of the Foreign Affairs Society and that, given that the award was based mostly on his work for the Foreign Affairs Society, the award was taken away given that it could no longer be considered that he'd done enough to earn an Honorary Life Membership. Mr Dragomaca stated that the allegation pertained to him releasing information protected by an *in camera* meeting of the Foreign Affairs Society.

Mr Dragomaca stated that he was in possession of information related to the Society's plans to bring a high profile speaker and that an *in camera* meeting of the Committee was held where that information was delivered to the other members of the Committee plus new information to himself. Mr Dragomaca stated that the protection of an *in camera* meeting could be considered as akin to a limited licence and the information was only given on condition of secrecy. Mr Dragomaca stated that an *in camera* meeting could not bind a membership to secrecy over information that they were already in possession of. Mr Dragomaca stated that he had not divulged any information that he was given for the first time in the *in camera* meeting. Mr Dragomaca stated that some might consider that there was only a moral obligation not to share the information that he was already in possession of but that he had a principled objection to society's operating in secret, a fact known to the then and current leadership of the society. Mr Dragomaca stated that the letter from the President of the Foreign Affairs Society vindicated him on that. Mr Dragomaca stated that the letter had been sent prior to consulting the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and that all members had subsequently agreed to it being sent bar on who didn't agree that it should be sent but who didn't disagree with the substance of the letter. Mr Dragomaca stated that he would skip over the events that then transpired but that the society had vindicated him.

Ms Hill stated that she was unclear of the relevance of parts of the submitted evidence and that she had an email from a Foreign Affairs Society committee member related to appendix A. Ms Hill asked why appendix C was included and stated that she thought it should be removed.

**Mr Baldi ruled that appendix C was not germane and would not form a part of the record.**

Ms Gold stated that B would violate the *in camera* record of the mentioned meeting and that she thought it should not be a part of the record and also that it was not relevant.

Mr Baldi stated, with regards to appendix B, members of the *in camera* meeting were bound to secrecy but that non-members were not but that it was the privilege of a the Committee to act to keep the proceedings secret.

Ms Hill asked if the Honorary Life Memberships had been announced when it was stripped, were they *in camera* or were they known publically.

Mr Baldi stated that the way it worked was that the Honorary Life Membership was granted but not awarded, the individuals had not been notified, and that the effect of reconsidering was that it had not ever been awarded.

Ms Hill stated that he wasn't stripped of anything he had been duly awarded but that he was just not given it.

Ms Gold stated that he had not been stripped of an award then.

Ms Gold raised a point of privilege that the inclusion of Appendix B violated the Committee's right to maintain the secrecy of *in camera* proceedings.

**Mr Baldi ruled that appendix B was out of order and would not form a part of the record..**

Ms Hill stated that she had an email from a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee that stated that the committee had not been informed of the letter being sent and who wanted to stress that the letter, though the member of the Committee did not take a position either way on the content of the letter, was from the President, Qi Tian, and not the committee.

#### **7. Any Other Competent Business**

There was no other competent business.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2104.