



University of St Andrews Students' Association Students' Representative Council

MINUTES

Tuesday 19th November 2013 – Committee Room, 7.00pm

Present

Sophie Kelly	Arts/Divinity Senate Representative
Maxwell Baldi	Association Chair
Katie O'Donnell	Association Community Relations Officer
Daniel Palmer	Association Director of Events and Services
Edward Woodhouse	Association Director of Representation
Kelsey Gold	Association Director of Student Development & Activities
David Norris	Association LGBT Officer
Scott Schorr	Association Postgraduate President
Chloe Hill	Association President
Jess Walker	President of the Athletic Union
Pat Mathewson	Rector's Assessor
Ondrej Hajda	SRC Education Officer
Hibak Yusuf Mohamud	SRC Equal Opportunities Officer
Callum Bryce	SRC External Campaigns Officer
Soraya Walli	SRC Member for Ethnic Minorities
Joshua Carlton	SRC Member for First Years
Ali West	SRC Member for Gender Equality
Ruth Cunningham	SRC Member for Private Accommodation
Fay Morrice	SRC Member for Students with Disabilities
Anna Kennedy-O'Brien	SRC Member for University Accommodation
Ben Anderson	SRC Member for Widening Access
Avalon Borg	SRC Wellbeing Officer

In Attendance

Keith Cordrey	Student Services Council
Caroline Magee	The Saint
Michael Telfer	Minutes Secretary
Tania Struetzel	Postgraduate Society
David van Brussel	Postgraduate Society

Absent

Dominyka Urbonaite	Association Environment & Ethics Officer
Iain Cupples	Education Researcher
Peter DaBell	Science/Medicine Senate Representative
Scott Taylor	SRC Accommodation Officer
Lonie Sebahg	SRC Employability Officer
Caroline Rhoads	SRC Member for International Students

Melissa Turner SRC Member for Mature Students
Ross Quinn SRC Member for Mature Students

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr Baldi stated that he did not know what to take for snacks so he decided to bring all the snacks.

Mr Baldi asked if there were any objections to the agenda.

The agenda was adopted without dissent.

2. Apologies for Absence

Dominyka Urbonaite Association Environment & Ethics Officer
Iain Cupples Education Researcher
Peter DaBell Science/Medicine Senate Representative
Scott Taylor SRC Accommodation Officer
Lonie Sebahg SRC Employability Officer
Caroline Rhoads SRC Member for International Students

The apologies were accepted without dissent.

Mr Baldi noted that there was a lot to consider and that all motions deserved full debate, but asked the members to present their reports and positions as concisely as possible so that the meeting could be completed as quickly as possible. Mr Baldi stated that if the meeting continued on for too long, he would call an emergency social. Mr Baldi stated that an early ending would be reward in itself.

3. Adoption of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Pursuant to Standing Orders §7.2.2, the minutes of the Students' Representative Council on the 5th of November 2013 were laid before the members of the Council on the 13th of November 2013. With no objections registered within 24 hours, the minutes were considered adopted by electronic mail.

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There were no matters arising from the previous minutes.

5. Open Forum

There was no business for the open forum.

6. Reports of the Sabbatical Officers

6.1 Report of the Association President

Mr Baldi noted that there was a lot of substantive business on the Agenda and requested that members who were not working or researching those switch their electronic devices off.

Ms Hill informed the Council that she was finally at liberty to discuss the outcome of the Governance Review that had been taking up a lot of her time. Ms Hill stated that an external consultant had

come in and completely reviewed the Association, with the report made available in September. Ms Hill stated that she'd been collating the results from that and bringing them forward. Ms Hill stated that a lot of the review was explaining what the Board was and what it did. Ms Hill stated that it was boring but important stuff. Ms Hill stated that the hiring of a commercial manager, which Mr Palmer was likely to talk about, arose out of the recognition of the gap in staffing. Ms Hill stated that the review also concerned things such as building a staff appraisal system, clearly defining the roles of Sabbatical Officers, and reviewing the Laws to update them. Ms Hill stated that she would be putting together a condensed report for those members of the Councils that were interested. Ms Hill stated that Mr Baldi had kindly agreed to help draft amendments to the Laws in January, and those amendments would be put before the members in January.

Ms Hill informed the Council that she had been working on a lot of accommodation related matters recently. Ms Hill stated that the Right to Rent guide was finished and that she had been delivering accommodation talks in halls, which had been well attended. Ms Hill stated that the intent of the talks was to stop students from panicking. Ms Hill stated that Ms Allen had gone through the Right to Rent guide with the students, and Mr Carlton had been present to answer questions from a student's perspective.

6.2. Report of the Association Director of Events & Services

Mr Palmer informed the Council he would be leaving the meeting early to assist at an LGBT event in Venue 2. Mr Palmer stated that Venue 2 was fully booked until the end of the semester.

Mr Palmer informed the Council that the living wage proposal passed by the Students' Representative Council earlier in the semester had gone to the Staffing Committee. Mr Palmer stated that they had agreed with the motion in principle but also recognised that once a wage was committed to it was hard to change it again. Mr Palmer stated that it was under review and would be raised at every opportunity to see whether it could be actioned. Mr Palmer stated that it was also now a part of the block grant negotiations. Mr Palmer stated that the Staffing Committee was on board but couldn't yet commit.

Mr Palmer informed the Council that the Association now had a commercial manager who would work for bars and catering as well as Bess. Mr Palmer stated that the main job would be opening the coffee shop and other venues and integrating them in to one cohesive whole.

Mr Palmer informed the Council that he had been working on converting Venue 1 in to a bar space, deciding on how many pool tables it would have and similar matters.

Mr Palmer informed the Council that it was £1 week in Venue 1.

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

Ms Gold informed the Council that she had been working on wrapping things up and started working on things for semester two.

Mr Gold informed the Council that the Class Gift Committee would be having a vote on how the money raised was spent, the refurbishment, or family book fund. Ms Gold encouraged the members to vote, as it was an Association Project. Ms Gold stated that On the Rocks was looking good. Ms

Gold stated that the Scott Lang dinner was also getting set up. Ms Gold stated that subcommittees were also finishing things off for the semester and that the Mermaids' Ball looked fantastic.

Ms Gold informed the Council that the big thing she had been working on was space proposals for the next semester and the next academic year and trying to figure out alternatives to Venue 2 and the Salad Bowl. Ms Gold stated that she was working with various University units on that.

Ms Gold informed the Council that she had been working on rebranding, in particular the designs for Sandy's and the top floor bar.

Ms Gold informed the Council that she had been working with Societies and given out over £8,000 that year, keeping them well funded.

Ms Hill asked if Ms Gold could talk about the 50th Anniversary.

Ms Gold answered that she could. Ms Gold stated that they would be celebrating the joining of the Men's' and Women's Unions in week 3. Ms Gold stated that it would tie in alumni and other speakers. Ms Gold stated that Venue 1 would look like it never had before.

Mr Palmer stated that the Sabbatical Officers would be celebrating another anniversary on the Radio show.

Ms Hill stated that it would be the 50th Anniversary of Dr Who.

6.4. Report of the Association Director of Representation

Mr Woodhouse informed the Council that the last School's President Forum had taken place, and that they had enjoyed it.

Mr Woodhouse informed the Council that the In Good Health campaign had gathered just shy of 500 signatures. Mr Woodhouse stated that the postcard campaign would be held in the Main Bar and international students should stop by to fill them in.

Mr Woodhouse informed the Council that he had appointed a new president for the School of Art History.

Mr Woodhouse informed the Council that he would be in London to represent the interests of International students. Mr Woodhouse stated that he would be the only delegate from a Scottish institution.

7. Reports of Officers

7.1. Report of the Arts/Divinity Senate Representative

Ms Kelly informed the Council that the next Academic Council meeting would be on either the 4th of December and that she would be attending the meeting of SOAC to discuss the agenda. Ms Kelly encouraged members with questions or issues they would like discussed in the Senate to contact her.

7.2. Report of the Association Community Relations Officer

Ms O'Donnell informed the Council that she had helped put the head of community events, for On the Rocks, in touch with Madras College. Ms O'Donnell stated that they hadn't yet got back to them, but that once they had she'd focus on contacting other people.

7.3. Report of the Association Environment & Ethics Officer

There was no report from the Association Environment & Ethics Officer

7.4. Report of the LGBT Officer

Mr Norris informed the Council that the LGBT musical was being held that evening at 9pm and encouraged the members to attend should the meeting be finished in time. Mr Norris stated that the next day, at 3pm, the LGBT society would be holding a pier walk to raise awareness of Trans* rights and issues. Mr Norris stated that it would be candle lit. Mr Norris stated that there would be a movie night on the following Monday. Mr Norris stated that the Glitter Ball venue had been booked. Mr Norris stated that the RAG Week events had been organised.

Mr Norris informed the Council that, in cooperation with LGBT representatives at Robert Gordon University, and the Universities of Stirling, Aberdeen, and Glasgow, he was working on a campaign to raise awareness of LGBT rights issues in Russia.

Mr Norris informed the Council that an LGBT EGM would be held the following week to elect a treasurer as the current one was stepping down.

Ms Hill asked what time the pier walk would be held.

Mr Norris answered that it would be held at 1500, as the sun would be setting at 1530.

Ms Cunningham asked what date the ball would be held on.

Mr Norris answered that it would be held on the 8th of December. Mr Norris stated that a kilogram of glitter had been purchased for the event.

7.4. Report of the Association Postgraduate President

Mr Schorr informed the Council that a pub night had been held in the main bar the previous Friday, that a Running Dinner would be held on the following Sunday, and that the weekend following that would be graduation weekend. Mr Schorr stated that for the graduation weekend, the Society was partnering with the University to get tickets for the 600th Finale Ball, and that the University had funded a wine reception. Mr Schorr stated that a brunch was organised for the Sunday but that attendance looked as though it would be a problem.

Mr Schorr informed the Council that the Society had finalised the calendar for semester 2 and he was working on putting a budget together for that. Mr Schorr stated that events for the semester would include coffee nights, pub nights, stand talks, movie nights, and, in terms of larger scale events, three and a half balls. Mr Schorr stated that the number of balls depend on how you classified them.

Mr Schorr informed the Council that he had met with various postgraduate representatives, with the help of Ms Struetzel, and that he had also organised a meeting with the Provost to lay their concerns before her.

Mr Woodhouse asked if Mr Schorr would like him to advertise the brunch via his weekly email.

Mr Schorr answered that he would.

7.6. Report of the Athletic Union President

Ms Walker informed the Council that she was now taking presentations from the new kit suppliers, although the contract with Kukri had not yet been terminated. Ms Walker expressed her frustration with the situation.

Ms Walker informed the Council that the AU Ball would be held in London on the 22nd of March.

Ms Walker informed the Council that she had finalised proposals for events celebrating the Commonwealth Games throughout Fife.

Ms Walker informed the Council that she had been dealing with interclub disciplinary issues and that those could be read about in the Athletic Union Executive's minutes. Ms Walker stated that the Athletic Union was looking at a disciplinary procedure that would be separate from the University's.

Ms Walker informed the Council that a former Rugby Club captain would be attending to discuss issues surrounding homophobia in sports clubs.

Ms Hill asked how Ms Walker's social media discipline policy was coming along.

Ms Walker answered that they were trying to include it in an overarching agreement between the sports clubs and the Athletic Union.

Ms Hill asked if anyone had been disciplined.

Ms Walker answered that no one had as it currently had to happen through the University's discipline procedures. Ms Walker stated that the University had agreed to allow the Athletic Union to come up with its own procedure.

7.7. Report of the Science/Medicine Senate Representative

Mr Kelly read a report from Mr DaBell that stated that the next Academic Council meeting would be held in early December; that Mr DaBell would be attending a meeting of SOAC to discuss the agenda; that Mr DaBell was pleased with the library survey; and that encouraged the members of the Council to fill in the library survey.

7.8. Report of the SRC Accommodation Officer

There was no report from the SRC Accommodation Officer

7.9. Report of the SRC Education Officer

Mr Hajda informed the Council that he was working on the library survey and that 200 responses had already been received of the target 1000. Mr Hajda requested that members continue to share the survey on Facebook. Mr Hajda stated that it would only take 3 minutes.

Mr Hajda informed the Council that he was looking at setting up a peer reading group for non-native speakers. Mr Hajda stated that the Edinburgh University Students' Association had briefed him on how it worked there.

Mr Hajda informed the Council that he had met with representatives from the library and discussed having a day where all fines paid would go in to the Students' Association Bursary Fund. Mr Hajda stated that it would likely be towards the end of semester 2 but still required clearance from the directors of the library.

Mr Hajda informed the Council that the new Martyrs Kirk reading room would be having an open day the following day from 10am to 3pm. Mr Hajda stated that it was a very nice space and he wished he could study there.

Ms Hill stated that it was beautiful.

Mr Hajda informed the Council that he had been working with Ms Borg on the Take Care campaign.

7.10. Report of the SRC Equal Opportunities Officer

Ms Mohamud informed the Council that she had been working with Mr Woodhouse, Mr Hajda, and Ms Rhoads on the In Good Health campaign, which had now been running for a week. Ms Mohamud stated that she was trying to get in touch with senior students and international representatives in halls to make the campaign accessible. Ms Mohamud stated that she was specifically working on DRA due to the high number of international students resident there. Ms Mohamud stated that there were a lot of people who were passionate about the campaign and requested that members continue to share the campaign and petition on Facebook. Ms Mohamud stated that there was a three minute long video online that contained factual information about the campaign and what was going on. Ms Mohamud encouraged those members who were international students to attend the postcard signing the following day.

Ms Hill asked Ms Mohamud and Mr Woodhouse to contact Mr Mackenzie about the signing if it had been moved to during the day as she had informed him it would be held in the evening.

Mr Woodhouse stated that he would contact Mr Mackenzie.

7.11. Report of the SRC Employability Officer

Ms Gold read a report from Ms Sebagh that stated Ms Sebagh had secured funding to reduce the cost of the employability conference; that Accenture, Npower and RBS would be at the conference; and that, for those who were still considering what to do after university, it would build skills that would be useful at assessment centres.

Ms Mohamud asked what day the conference was on.

Ms Gold answered that it would be on during the final three days of the intersemester break.

Ms Mohamud asked why it was being held during intersemester

Ms Gold answered that it was part of the intersemester initiative to better utilise the time between halls opening and classes starting.

Ms Cunningham asked where it was possible to apply for the conference.

Ms Gold answered that it was possible to reserve a place at yourunion.net/careers

7.12. Report of the SRC External Campaigns Officer

Mr Bryce stated that he had nothing to report to the Council.

7.13. Report of the SRC Member for Ethnic Minorities

Ms Walli informed the Council that she had met with a representative from Music is Love to organise an international music festival that would be held in the third week of February. Ms Walli stated that the committee had been put together for that and that they had linked up with the Art Society to organise it.

7.14. Report of the SRC Member for First Year

Mr Carlton informed the Council that he had attended some of the information sessions in halls and the Have Your Say event the previous week.

Mr Carlton informed the Council that he was working on projects to help settle JSA students in during refreshers week.

Ms Hill stated that she would email Mr Carlton ideas for that.

7.15. Report of the SRC Member for Gender Equality

Ms West informed the Council that she had been out of St Andrews for a while and so she didn't have much to report. Ms West stated that the Feminist Society had been doing a lot of good work.

Ms Hill informed Ms Borg and Ms West that she had met up with the student who was proposing to carry out a sexual harassment survey. Ms Hill stated that she had some concerns about it but that she'd raised them with him.

Ms Borg asked what survey Ms Hill was talking about.

Ms Hill answered that it was the psychology student survey, and that it would include some things about the Zero Tolerance campaign that was on going.

Ms Borg asked if Ms Hill could forward her the information about that.

Ms Mohamud asked if Ms West could give the Council some information about the Zero Tolerance Campaign.

Mr Mathewson asked if Ms West had contact other clubs about the campaign.

Ms Hill answered that they would be in contact.

Ms Gold asked if there had been any progress on self-defence classes, such as aikido.

Ms West answered that she had been out of town for two weeks so there had not been.

7.16. Report of the SRC Member for International Students

There was no report from the SRC Member for International Students.

7.17. Report of the SRC Member for Mature Students

There was no report from the SRC Member for Mature Students.

7.18. Report of the SRC Member for Private Accommodation

Ms Cunningham informed the Council that the Have Your Say had been successful. Ms Cunningham stated that, as Ms Hill couldn't attend, she had read her speech. Ms Cunningham stated that she was working on the minutes from the event and that the Community Council wanted to add to what was contained in them.

Ms Cunningham informed the Council that Ms Allen had been carrying out renting workshops with members of the accommodation team.

Ms Cunningham informed the Council that the speed flat mating event was planned for the beginning of February. Ms Cunningham stated that it was decided it would be better to have the event after the estate agents had released the lists. Ms Cunningham stated that wine would be provided.

Ms Cunningham informed the Council that, as part of the Don't Panic campaign, she Mr Ta andylor had appeared on STAR.

Ms Cunningham informed the Council that she had been getting emails from students with accommodation issues that were raising things would have to be looked at, such as accommodation for students who were abroad.

Ms Mohamud stated that it might be a good idea to have another speed flat mating event towards the end of April to help students whose plans hadn't quite worked out.

Mr Mathewson stated that an event then would be helpful for students who had been left stranded.

Ms Hill stated that she would organise that, as the current members' terms would have ended by then.

7.19. Report of the SRC Member for Students with Disabilities

Ms Morrice informed the Council that the Question Time event had taken place, that it had been an interesting evening with great speakers, and that the attendance had been acceptable.

Ms Morrice informed the Council that she was working on an inclusive learning policy.

Ms Morrice informed the Council that she would be meeting with Ms Sebagh to discuss an employability fayre.

Ms Hill asked if the accommodation advocate had contacted Ms Morrice.

Ms Morrice answered that she had not.

Ms Hill stated that there was a new How to Rent guide for students with disabilities and that she had wanted Ms Morrice to meet with her about it.

7.20. Report of the SRC Member for University Accommodation

Ms Kennedy-O'Brien informed the Council that she was in consultation with hall senior students about the hall subsidies for the following year. Ms Kennedy-O'Brien stated that they were all asking for a lot more money and being a bit unrealistic.

Ms Hill asked if Ms Kennedy-O'Brien could remind DRA that their hall subsidy was currently larger than the Association's block grant.

7.21. Report of the SRC Member for Widening Access

Mr Anderson informed the Council that a date had been set for the Widening Access and Participation groups meeting and that it had not happened yet.

7.22. Report of the SRC Wellbeing Officer

Ms Borg informed the Council that she was in the process of planning the Take Care campaign. Ms Borg stated that it would take the form of a poster campaign featuring transferrable skills that could be taken in to the library, and alertness improving food. Ms Borg stated that she had met with the library and discussed wall space for the posters. Ms Borg stated that she would be meeting with the designer of the campaign's logo to discuss the appearance of the posters. Ms Borg stated that there would be a committee meeting the following day to approve the budget.

7.23. Any Other Competent Reports

7.23.1 Report from the Students' Association Executive Committee

Mr Baldi informed the Council that the Executive Committee had met, considered the reinstatement of a member of the Councils, and reinstated that member without conditions.

7.23.2 Report from the Rector's Assessor

Mr Mathewson informed the Council that there was bad news in terms of Saltire Funding and that it was likely to be limited to only three international places. Mr Mathewson stated that, if he were being frank, it was his opinion that the Careers Centre had been less than forthcoming about who had been making the decisions on the funding.

Ms Hill stated that she had met with the Proctor and, though she hadn't told her who had made the decision, she had pointed towards Mr Paul Brown. Ms Hill stated that the Proctor has said the council shouldn't expect there to be full funding.

Mr Mathewson stated that Mr Brown had pointed to someone else as being responsible.

Mr Mathewson informed the Council that the Rector's Scholarship would be giving out 13 £500-scholarships.

Mr Mathewson informed the Council that he was looking to hold a meeting of Scottish Rectors in St Andrews to discuss nationally important issues.

9. New General Business

Mr Baldi, noting that Ms Gold was temporarily not present, asked if there were any objections to considering motion R. 16 before J. 15.

With no objection, R. 16 was taken before J. 15.

9.1. R. 16 – A Motion to Lobby the University for Further Study Space

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCILS NOTES:

1. The Main University Library has undergone a recent £14 million redevelopment and investment in its collections, providing additional study spaces (now 334 total), improved heating and lighting, a new café;
2. The Main University Library was designed in the 1960s and built in the 1970s, for a student population of 3,000;
3. The student population is now over 7,000;
4. The Main University Library was twice planned for further extensions out beyond the rear of the current building to provide additional study spaces, a variety of study environments, and more computers for student use;
5. Since its redevelopment, the Library has reported increases in footfall of approximately 50% with a daily average weekday count of more than 6,000 visits;
6. The Library has reported increased usage at the JF Allen and St Mary's College Libraries;
7. The University of St Andrews earned the lowest satisfaction rate with library resources of any Scottish higher education institution (HEI) in the most recent National Student Survey;
8. The University of St Andrews earned scores in the most recent National Student Survey for learning resources generally within the bottom half of all Scottish HEIs and was the only Scottish Ancient to do so;
9. The University recently opened the Martyrs Kirk facility and only permits research postgraduates and academic staff to use the facility in stated anticipation that the facility could not handle additional population demands; and
10. Various departmental study spaces for students have been threatened, relocated, or minimised to make way for staff or other expansions.

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL BELIEVES:

1. The University has a commitment to provide quality study spaces to promote independent learning amongst its student population;
2. The University is failing to provide adequate or sufficient study space for its students;
3. The University has undervalued the priority that the provision of study space should take within capital expenditure plans; and
4. The University is ultimately harming its own objectives of offering the best student learning experience.

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL RESOLVES:

1. To oppose any further expansions of the current student population by the University until it provides substantial and proportionate investment into the provision of adequate and sufficient study spaces for independent learning;
2. To recognise the provision of adequate and sufficient study spaces for students as a priority area for the SRC Education Committee;
3. To lobby the University to establish the provision of study spaces for students as a key performance indicator and to incorporate the expansion of that provision as part of its strategy for the University;
4. To mandate the SRC Education Committee to undertake a campaign to demonstrate the urgency of this matter to the University and to clarify and report where the widest deficiencies between student expectation and actual provision lie; and
5. To authorise the SRC Education Committee's use of up to £250 of the SRC Discretionary Fund in supporting the campaign within this motion.

Mr Woodhouse proposed the motion, Mr Hajda seconded.

Mr Baldi noted that this motion asked for funding from the Students' Representative Council's discretionary fund which, having not been spent that year, had a current value of £3000.

Mr Woodhouse presented the motion as such: to put this in context, one of the University's priorities is to grow the institution as a whole. We're already bigger than we used to be but it's a discussion point that maybe we should be larger. Mr Woodhouse stated that the motion was a 'hold up' motion. Mr Woodhouse stated that he wasn't opposed to the principle but it shouldn't come at the expense of the St Andrews experience, which was what made the University stand out. Mr Woodhouse stated that this motion said that, if the University wanted to expand, it had to increase the provision of study space rather than treating the library as a sort of clown car, trying to cram as many students in as possible.

Ms Cunningham stated that she thought the motion was awesome and asked why Mr Woodhouse was asking for £250 and if he wanted more.

Mr Woodhouse answered that he didn't have full ideas on what the money would be used for, besides printing, and that he was happy to keep it as is and come back for more funding if necessary.

Ms Gold asked Mr Woodhouse to clarify if the campaign would be for additional study space, to oppose expansion, or a combination of both.

Mr Woodhouse stated that it would be a combination of both and that resolving clause 4 clarified that it was a matter that was important to the Students' Representative Council, and that it was something that they needed to address.

Ms Hill stated that she was in favour of the motion but wanted to raise the controversial nature of the motion. Ms Hill stated that the motion had the potential to mandate the student officers on court to lobby against the increase in the size of the university. Ms Hill stated that the officers currently did so during the regular discussions – during which the University says it has to increase in size - on the size and that this motion meant they would continue to do so.

Mr Mathewson stated that it was his understanding that the Court's open day had led to the understanding that, while an increase was desirable, it wasn't currently feasible. Mr Mathewson stated that the University was not on the precipice of increasing in size by three thousand students.

Mr Schorr stated that study space was key for postgraduate students and that a small increase in them, either taught (PGT) or research (PGR), would have a big impact on them.

Ms Borg stated that, as a postgraduate, she found it difficult to find space in her department.

Ms West stated that a postgraduate had kicked her out of a carousel in the library.

Ms Hill stated that it was their space.

Ms Cunningham stated that it was often PGR students, and that PGT students were lumped in with undergraduates.

Ms Borg stated that that dichotomy had to end.

Mr Schorr stated that, from a postgraduate perspective, it wasn't a case that undergraduates shouldn't get more space but that it was a problem for both groups.

Ms Borg stated that it was a struggle for everyone.

Ms Gold asked, while stating that she was happy with the motion as is, whether the motion should be expanded to include things beyond study space as well.

Mr Woodhouse answered that his rationale was that study space was in his remit and that accommodation wasn't, and that was why the motion was coming from the Education Committee. Mr Woodhouse stated that study space should be prioritised over accommodation as accommodation could be solved by private means while only the University could solve the study space issue. Mr Woodhouse stated that it was not possible to ask a private company to provide a desk.

Ms Hill asked the Students' Representative Council if they understood and were happy with resolving clause one, specifically who would be opposing the motion, stating that it was strongly worded but also vague enough to cause problems. Ms Hill asked if it was the Sabbatical Officers or the Students' Representative Council who would be opposing the expansion.

Mr Mathewson stated that, legally, it was tricky to mandate particular positions.

Ms Hill stated that the Sabbatical Officers were trustees on Court and not Sabbatical Officers.

Mr Mathewson stated that the undergraduate and postgraduate experience at the University was only one part of what the University was concerned with and that the marginal benefit might be worth it.

Ms Cunningham asked whether a joint motion opposing expansion without accommodation being sorted would be worthwhile looking at.

Ms Kelly stated that she had brought the issue up in the Education Committee but that she agreed with Mr Woodhouse. Ms Kelly stated that this was University and that a private company was not going to solve this, only the University could. Ms Kelly stated that the University had to realise that the students studying was their priority and that expansion without increasing study space couldn't happen. Ms Kelly stated that there should be a separate motion opposing expansion until accommodation issues were resolved.

Ms Borg stated that the motion stood on its own and didn't need to go hand-in-hand with anything else and that accommodation was the University's responsibility. Ms Borg stated that it was ridiculous that people had to leave their belongings in the library for 12 hours to keep a seat.

Mr Woodhouse stated that, from his perspective, the Students' Representative Council could not tell him what to do in Court. Mr Woodhouse stated that what he did on Court and what he did on the Students' Representative Council were two separate things. Mr Woodhouse stated that things that were bad for students were bad for the University, so he would bring them up in Court, but that he did not interpret the motion as mandating him to do so.

Ms Hill stated that it was likely the University would state that they were concerned about the amount of research funding they got and that the University was currently 25th, after which there was a big drop off in funding. Ms Hill stated that their argument would be that by increasing in size they can become more secure in their funding arrangement. Ms Hill stated that they would say that it wasn't realistic to not expand because of a lack of study space at the risk of becoming a non-research institution.

Ms Borg stated that the University said that about everything and that shouldn't restrict the Students' Representative Council. Ms Borg stated that the University could always spin a PR web.

Mr Schorr stated that postgraduates were an integral part of the research process and that part of aiming to be number one, as opposed to falling off a cliff, would be ensuring the students had enough space to carry out their research.

Mr Hajda stated that motion did not oppose an increase in students but that they'd only support it if there was the necessary increase in study space. Mr Hajda stated that it meant they were happy to grow but the study space and other facilities had to be put in place.

Ms Cunningham stated that they needed the infrastructure.

Ms Mohamud stated that the numbers and the quality were important and that it was important to realise that, if the facilities didn't increase proportionally with the size, the quality might suffer.

Ms Gold moved that the previous question be ordered.

Without objection, the question was called on R. 16.

Without dissent, the motion was adopted.

8. Unfinished General Business

8.1. J. 15 - A Motion to Amend the Structure and Duties of the SSC Societies Committee and its Members (Resolving ¶17, §7)

THIS SSC AND SRC RESOLVE:

To report amendments to effect the following changes to the Laws to SAB with the recommendation that the same do pass:

...

7. To strike all text in Chapter Nine, and insert the following:

...

7. Disaffiliation.

7.1. The Societies Committee may disaffiliate a society in accordance with the terms of the Affiliation Agreement.

7.2. The decision of the Societies Committee to disaffiliate a society shall be subject to appeal to SAEC, provided that an appeal is lodged within 72 hours of the transmission of notice of the decision and right to appeal, and only on the following grounds:

7.2.1 Information not known at the time of the original decision.

7.2.2 Procedural irregularity that could make a material difference to the original decision (including inaccurate information, etc.)

7.2.3 Bias or prejudice.

7.3. Notwithstanding the foregoing provision, if the Societies Committee declines to renew a society's Affiliation Agreement or declines to otherwise offer a society a new Affiliation Agreement, such decision shall be subject to appeal to the Student Services Council.

Proposed by Mr Dixon, Seconded by Ms Lewis.

Mr Baldi stated that the motion had been considered, divided, and this question postponed at the most recent meeting of the joint councils. Mr Baldi stated that it had been called up by the Student Services Council and that the Student Services Council had adopted it with an amendment. Mr Baldi stated that the first thing that would need to be considered was the amendment.

Ms Gold proposed an amendment to the motion:

To Strike 7.3;

To insert a new section 8, with the following text:

8. Re-Affiliation

8.1. Any Affiliated Society meeting the requirements for re-affiliation set out by the SSC Societies Committee on the date that its Affiliation agreements expires shall be offered a new Affiliation Agreement

8.1.1. The terms of a new Affiliation Agreement may differ from the terms of any previous ones.

8.2. Any Society not offered a new Affiliation Agreement may appeal the decision to SSC by petition

Ms Lewis Seconded.

Ms Gold stated that the amendment had been accepted in the Student Services Council but that it would still have to be accepted by the Students' Representative Council. Ms Gold stated that the controversy about §7.3 had been about whether the Association had to grant another affiliation agreement in case, for example the Cash Office had restricted the number of societies to 100. Ms Gold stated that they had wanted the laws to reflect current practice rather than for hypotheticals. Mr Gold stated that this amendment would protect societies but also allow for flexibility.

Ms Hill stated that the amendment looked beautiful.

The Gold Amendment was adopted without dissent.

The motion, as amended, was accepted without dissent.

9. New General Business

9.2. R. 17 – A Motion to Oppose the Development of a PGT College without Full Consultation

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCILS NOTES:

1. The development of a cohort identity for the taught postgraduate student community is an identified learning and teaching priority for the University;
2. The University management remit for research postgraduates currently falls under St Leonard's College, led by the Provost, while the remit of taught postgraduates falls under the remit of the Proctor;

3. There currently is no college for taught postgraduates;
4. Discussions are currently being held about the possibility of creating a second postgraduate college exclusively for taught postgraduates; and
5. The Postgraduate Society represents and supports both taught and research postgraduate students.

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL BELIEVES:

1. Postgraduate students should be able to influence and determine the future of the postgraduate community at St Andrews; and
2. Student engagement, at all levels, is a foundational requirement for a thriving relationship between students and the University.

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL RESOLVES:

1. To oppose any attempt by the University to establish a college exclusively for postgraduate taught students without a full referendum organised by the Students' Association;
2. To support the Postgraduate Society as the representative voice for all postgraduate students; and
3. To mandate the Postgraduate President, the Director of Representation, and the Postgraduate Vice President for Academic Relations to begin a dialogue with the University on determining the future for the postgraduate community, ensuring that the postgraduate community is fully consulted on the matter.

Mr Schorr proposed the motion, Mr Woodhouse seconded.

Mr Schorr stated that he would divide his discussion into three sections. Mr Schorr stated that the first, the history, was that the University recognised that PGT and PGR and have decided to sever the connection between the two groups with the rationale that PGT students were more like undergraduates and in St Andrews for a year and PGR students were in St Andrews for three years of research. Mr Schorr stated that the Provost and Proctor represent them separately and that currently there was no college for PGT students, and that they were not a part of St Leonard's College. Mr Schorr stated that the problem with separating them was that his community was both PGT and PGR. Mr Schorr stated that there were people in high-level meetings who were actively proposing establishing a college that would divide the community. Mr Schorr stated that the current motion would ensure that there was student consultation. Mr Schorr stated that was just his position but that the Postgraduate Committee had been unanimous in that and the postgraduate class representatives had been hugely against the college without. Mr Schorr stated that there should be a reconsolidation of the Provost/Proctor division so that there was one college serving both PGT and PGR students. Mr Schorr stated that the action items of the motion were that they speak to the University while leaving the option open for a referendum.

Ms Hill asked if Mr Schorr had had any meetings with the relevant people in the University, such as the Provost, where he had asked them for consultation and they had said no.

Mr Schorr stated that the Provost's Office had been communicative but that the Proctor's had been less so. Mr Schorr stated that at the previous meeting there were people discussing the future and advocating for the creation of a second college. Mr Schorr stated that it was clearly on the agenda. Mr Schorr stated that he had spoken the Provost's Office and they were in favour of it, and that both the Provost and Proctor had agreed to a joint student staff meeting with the pro-deans.

Ms Hill asked what consultation there had been.

Mr Schorr stated that they had asked his opinion.

Ms Hill asked what consultations had taken place that meant Mr Schorr could say that most students were opposed to the second college.

Mr Schorr stated that the meeting of the postgraduate class representatives had been 90-95% opposed and that the Postgraduate Committee was unanimously opposed. Mr Schorr stated that if the University were to create a new college without their consent there should be a referendum and their actions be opposed.

Ms Hill asked if the consultative meeting had been mixed between PGR and PGT students.

Mr Schorr answered that it had been.

Ms Borg asked who was pushing for that creation of the second college.

Mr Schorr answered that four had been at the beginning of the year but two were now.

Mr Mathewson stated that College Gate operated on a 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it' rationale and asked if there were any benefits to the proposal.

Mr Schorr stated that the academic gown had been redesigned for PGT and PGR students but that they thought it was solely for PGR students. Mr Schorr stated that they thought there was a division between the two groups but that wasn't the case.

Mr Mathewson stated that there must be a break in the flow of information, as College Gate wouldn't take action without a reason.

Mr Woodhouse stated that starting from this year there was a new Pro-Dean who worked with the Proctor and not the Provost. Mr Woodhouse stated that new college was to make the PGTs feel like part of the St Andrews family and it was being kindled by the University's administrative restructuring.

Ms Gold stated that, as she understood the motion, it didn't resolve to support the reconsolidation. Ms Gold asked if Mr Schorr thought that was outwith the scope of the motion or whether it was a part of it.

Ms Cunningham asked whether the motion said the Students' Representative Council would oppose the new college until there was a referendum but didn't state their opinion.

Mr Schorr answered that Ms Cunningham was correct.

Ms Morrice asked, while stating that it may be a misunderstanding, if there had to be a motion to have a survey.

Mr Schorr stated that the main thing was the University wasn't working with them so the motion would give them backing.

Ms Hill stated that she had an objection to the name and the consultation. Ms Hill stated that a referendum was not a consultation process but rather the final step in a process, and then you make a decision and are tied to it. Ms Hill stated that Scottish independence was an example, a consultation was held and now a referendum was to be held. Ms Hill stated that she was keen to ensure everyone understood what was going on as every referendum with more than two options had failed. Ms Hill stated that it was a decision process and, when she had read the title, she had thought it was something else. Ms Hill stated that she would like to see a consultation, like an EGM, for all students where more than just the two options were presented, for example asking if they should all be in St Leonard's College. Ms Hill stated that there were lots of options to discuss and those without a yes or no position had to be included. Ms Hill stated that she did not think a referendum was a consultation but, other than that, she supported the motion. Ms Hill stated she would rather the referendum provisions were removed and a more rounded discussion held.

Mr Schorr stated that he felt the consultation had already taken place and had done so democratically.

Ms Hill asked if there had been a survey presented to everyone or a meeting where everyone could attend.

Mr Schorr stated that he thought the motion gave him the power to do that.

Ms Hill stated that was the premise but it was not what was written down in the motion.

Mr Woodhouse stated that a full consultation meant something different to him and that a referendum was a simple mechanism. Mr Woodhouse stated that the debate a referendum brought around was the most ultimate form of the democratic process. Mr Woodhouse stated that the creation of a college was important and that he'd want to see the name changed to include 'control' as it wasn't right that the University would create the college without student input.

Ms Cunningham asked whether it would be appropriate to amend the motion to say that they should hold a consultation and, if necessary, move towards a referendum. Ms Cunningham stated that if the question could be boiled down to supporting either the reconsolidation or supporting the creation of a new college, then a referendum could potentially be held.

Ms Hill stated that would improve the motion. Ms Hill stated that her second objection was why, if a referendum was necessary for the creation of a new college, a referendum wasn't necessary to support the reconsolidation. Ms Hill stated that if Mr Schorr that it was appropriate for one then it should be appropriate for the other.

Mr Schorr stated that there had been the discussion of a three-option referendum.

Ms Hill stated that she was totally opposed to that idea as it was not appropriate. Ms Hill asked why, if Mr Schorr wanted a referendum for the creation of a new college, did he not want a referendum for the reconsolidation.

Mr Schorr stated that the support was so universal that the reconsolidation would be appropriate. Mr Schorr stated that the current format could continue but that splitting them would have ramifications. Mr Schorr stated that they'd isolated the matter of greatest concern for the referendum.

Ms Borg stated that the problem was students hadn't been consulted and that the University thought it was a good idea. Ms Borg stated they needed to be consulted and then a second step would be voting. Ms Borg stated that no consultation was the problem.

Mr Schorr stated that it was not possible to have a referendum with three questions.

Ms Borg stated there should be an open meeting where those who cared could turn up and voice their opinions.

Mr Schorr stated that he wanted to respect how the representatives that were consulted were elected. Mr Schorr stated that they were elected to represent the views of the students. Mr Schorr stated that they had reached out to them, in the equivalent of an open forum meeting and the response had been so overwhelming that it was clear what had to happen.

Ms Borg stated that the problem was she hadn't found out about the issue until she had read the meeting's agenda. Ms Borg stated that her class's representative was doing a conversion course while she was carrying out research. Ms Borg stated that she wasn't sure she trusted the class representative to disseminate the information.

Ms Hill stated that she thought it was a conflicting position to state that there need not be any more consultation but then to call for a referendum. Ms Hill stated that Mr Schorr had to set out what he wanted including meetings of class representatives, an open forum, an email explaining the proposals, then a survey where students could fill in their opinions. Ms Hill stated that it was possible a student had the best idea ever but hadn't been presented with the opportunity to present it yet. Ms Hill stated that process would be more beneficial in collecting a wide range of ideas. Ms Hill stated a referendum would be a big deal and they couldn't jump in without full consultation. Ms Hill stated that if the University didn't then listen, then a referendum would be appropriate.

Ms Struetzel stated that she agreed with Ms Cunningham and that the ideas for an open forum could be included but that the referendum had to be included in the motion. Ms Struetzel stated that she had had a tonne of discussion with the postgraduate representatives and that the motion, as presented, was toned down from the initial position, which had been to call a referendum and have it immediately. Ms Struetzel stated that she liked Ms Cunningham's wording but that the referendum had to be in there as discussion, especially with the Proctor, had been closed with them saying what they said didn't matter as they weren't representing student opinion.

Ms Gold stated that she was glad the discussion was happening and asked whether it would be appropriate to change the wording of resolving clause 3 to say that the postgraduate community must have the opportunity to speak before any decision is made. Ms Gold stated that she was

strongly in favour of the referendum provisions remaining in the motion but possibly moving them down so that it only takes place should the University ignore the consultation.

Ms Cunningham proposed an amendment to the motion:

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL RESOLVES:

1. To oppose any attempt by the University to ~~establish a college exclusively for postgraduate taught students without a full referendum organised by the Students' Association;~~ **alter the structure of the postgraduate collegiate system without a full consultation in which all postgraduate students are able to actively participate run by the Students Association supported by the Postgraduate Society which if deemed appropriate may move towards a full referendum of students.**

Ms Hill seconded Ms Cunningham's motion.

Mr Schorr stated that he was trying to be confrontational or antagonistic as, generally, the University, Provost, and Proctor had been responsive to the concerns of the community. Mr Schorr stated that this was one example out of one hundred and they had been funding events. Mr Schorr stated it wasn't 'us versus them' but trying to work out the best way to work with them.

Ms Borg stated that, be that as it may, it was still wrong that they had not consulted the students.

Ms Hill stated that she had wanted to propose an amendment that would have simplified resolving clause one, calling for a full consultation, and insert a fourth clause calling for a referendum if the consultation failed.

Ms Hill proposed an amendment to Ms Cunningham's amendment:

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL RESOLVES:

1. To oppose any attempt by the University to ~~establish a college exclusively for postgraduate taught students without a full referendum organised by the Students' Association;~~ alter the structure of the postgraduate collegiate system without a full consultation in which all postgraduate students are able to actively participate ~~run by the Students Association supported by the Postgraduate Society which if deemed appropriate may move towards a full referendum of students.~~ actively.

[...]

4. Agree that failing proper consultation, a full referendum may be an appropriate course of action to allow all postgraduate students to have their opinion heard.

Ms Cunningham seconded the motion.

Mr Woodhouse asked, on a point of order, if second-degree amendments were admissible.

Mr Baldi answered that standing order 11.6 stated that amendments in the second degree were permissible. Mr Baldi stated that third-degree amendments were not. Mr Baldi, therefore, ruled that the point of order was not well-taken.

Ms Hill stated that she had tried to address the issues that had been raised, such as the referendum being step one when a consultation should be the first step, followed by a possible referendum. Ms Hill stated that she had followed the title of the motion in calling for a full consultation and, not wanting to remove the referendum, had moved it down the scale.

Mr Schorr stated that for the first part, the unamended motion ensured that there was full consultation. Mr Schorr stated that didn't think the motion fully respected the opinions of the representatives or the committee, which was unanimously against the proposal.

Mr Woodhouse stated that what he understood by a consultation failing was that the process had failed rather than if the University had a different stance to that found by the consultation process. Mr Woodhouse stated that a referendum wouldn't be triggered in the latter case.

Ms Borg stated that she thought that this issue was big enough that it should come to the students and not just the class representatives. Ms Borg stated that she didn't necessarily trust hers.

Ms Struetzel stated that her problem with the motion was that it was a little too vague and that resolving clause 4 could mean anything. Ms Struetzel stated that she was happy for the order to be changed but felt like the issues had all been addressed. Ms Struetzel stated that if the feeling was that they should be reordered then they would hold a consultative process.

Ms Gold stated that, in resolving clause four, someone would have to decide whether the process had failed or not. Ms Gold stated that it should be made clear that, should the University not take in to account the consultation, a referendum would be held.

Mr Baldi stated that the Students' Representative Council would have to resolve to hold a referendum and that an event could not be used as a trigger for one.

Ms Hill stated that it was important to recognise what Ms Borg was saying i.e. that just because the postgraduate society committee is unanimously against the proposal it didn't mean there shouldn't be a referendum and that everyone should be consulted. Ms Hill stated that all students should be given the opportunity to be involved and it should be a consultation on the options.

Ms Cunningham asked if she would be correct in thinking that the unamended motion would not have triggered a referendum.

Mr Baldi answered that she was correct.

Ms Cunningham stated that they weren't altering the outcome of the motion in that case. Ms Cunningham stated that she would like to modify the wording in the Hill Amendment to cover what would happen should the consultation not be taken in to account.

Ms Hill moved that the previous question be ordered.

Mr Bryce seconded the motion.

Without dissent, the previous question was ordered.

A roll call vote was taken in the Students' Representative Council:

OFFICE	NAME	AYE	NO	ABS.
Arts/Divinity Senate Representative	Sophie Kelly	X		
Association Community Relations Officer	Katie O'Donnell	X		
Association Director of Events & Services	Daniel Palmer	X		
Association Director of Representation	Edward Woodhouse		X	
Association Director of Student Development & Activities	Kelsey Gold			X
Association Environment & Ethics Officer	Dominyka Urbonaite			
Association LGBT Officer	David Norris			X
Association Postgraduate President	Scott Schorr		X	
Association President	Chloe Hill	X		
President of the Athletic Union	Jess Walker			X
Science/Medicine Senate Representative	Peter DaBell	X		
SRC Accommodation Officer	Scott Taylor	X		
SRC Education Officer	Ondrej Hajda			X
SRC Employability Officer	Lonie Sebagh			
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	X		
SRC Member for International Students	Caroline Rhoads			
SRC Member for Mature Students	Melissa Turner			
SRC Member for Private Accommodation	Ruth Cunningham	X		
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		
SRC Welfare Officer	Avalon Borg		X	

With 12 in the affirmative, and 4 in the negative, the motion was adopted.

The Cunningham amendment, as amended, was placed before the Students' Representative Council.

Mr Schorr asked what, in the event that he got an email saying that the college had been created in the next week, should he do.

Ms Hill answered that he should return with a motion to call a referendum.

Mr Woodhouse propose an amendment to the Cunningham Amendment:

THIS STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL RESOLVES:

[...]

- ~~4. Agree that failing proper consultation, a full referendum may be an appropriate course of action to allow all postgraduate students to have their opinion heard.~~
To endorse a referendum as a means to establish the student opinion where dispute remains after the consultation process.

Mr Mathewson seconded.

Mr Woodhouse stated that the amendment picked up on Ms Gold's point that there should be stronger wording in clause four and answered the question on how a failed consultation would be identified.

Ms Hill stated that she had the same issue with Mr Woodhouse had with hers in that dispute was unclear. Ms Hill asked if Mr Woodhouse meant percentage wise.

Mr Woodhouse answered that he would define dispute as the Students' Representative Council identifying the existence of a dispute.

Ms Hill asked how they could decide if there was dispute.

Mr Woodhouse stated that it would be if the University had created a second college and two people on the Council disagreed, they could put forward a motion calling for a referendum given that the consultation had come out as against the proposal.

Mr Schorr stated that there clearly wasn't a narrow divide on the opinion on his committee.

Ms Hill asked if that meant there would need to be a vote.

Mr Baldi answered that there would need to be.

Ms Hill stated that a referendum was a final step and not an easy thing.

Mr Baldi stated that, for the avoidance of doubt, there had to be a motion with a resolving clause that called for the Elections Committee to convene and setting a date certain for the referendum. Mr Baldi stated that if the clause did not do that, a referendum would not be held.

Mr Schorr stated that the fallacy was that a referendum could only be held if there were three questions.

Ms Hill stated that she agreed and thought that there were at least four questions to be answered. Ms Hill stated that was definitely not a situation in which a referendum could be called.

Ms Cunningham stated that she realised Mr Schorr had received input from postgraduate representatives but that some students hadn't heard about the issue. Ms Cunningham stated that she moved there be a consultation, reach a stage where there are two clear options to be discussed and then call a referendum. Ms Cunningham stated that if the University made a move that was contrary to the consultation, then they could say they didn't agree with it. Ms Cunningham stated that they could then say the students were against the formation of a PGT college and not just the postgraduate representatives.

Ms Borg stated that the referendum was an important question and they could use it to question what the University was doing. Ms Borg stated that it wasn't necessary to a referendum to find the solution but that it was good as a back up plan.

Mr Woodhouse stated that he wanted to reiterate the point that at no point had there been the proposal to hold a referendum and that it was unfair to discuss the motion as if that was the case. Mr Woodhouse stated that the motion only recognised that a referendum was a valid option.

Mr Mathewson stated that the motion would help them to kick the door down in College Gate as the possibility of a referendum would give them more bargaining power.

The previous question was ordered.

A roll call vote was taken in the Students' Representative Council:

OFFICE	NAME	AYE	NO	ABS.
Arts/Divinity Senate Representative	Sophie Kelly	X		
Association Community Relations Officer	Katie O'Donnell	X		
Association Director of Events & Services	Daniel Palmer	X		
Association Director of Representation	Edward Woodhouse	X		
Association Director of Student Development & Activities	Kelsey Gold	X		
Association Environment & Ethics Officer	Dominyka Urbonaite			
Association LGBT Officer	David Norris	X		
Association Postgraduate President	Scott Schorr	X		
Association President	Chloe Hill	X		
President of the Athletic Union	Jess Walker	X		
Science/Medicine Senate Representative	Peter DaBell	X		
SRC Accommodation Officer	Scott Taylor	X		
SRC Education Officer	Ondrej Hajda	X		
SRC Employability Officer	Lonie Sebagh			
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	X		
SRC Member for International Students	Caroline Rhoads			
SRC Member for Mature Students	Melissa Turner			
SRC Member for Private Accommodation	Ruth Cunningham	X		
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		
Students' Representative Council Welfare Officer	Avalon Borg	X		

With 22 members in the affirmative and 0 in the negative, the motion was adopted.

The Cunningham amendment, as amended, was placed before the council.

Mr Baldi noted that the meeting had been in session for 2 hours. **Therefore, pursuant to Standing Orders § 1.6.1, the Council stood in recess for 10 minutes.**

The Council was called to order.

Mr Woodhouse asked if Mr Schorr wanted a mandate to consult on merging in to St Leonards College.

Ms Hill stated that the current language was if there was any change to the system.

Without dissent, the amendment was adopted.

The motion, as amended, was placed before the Council.

The question was called on the adopted of the motion.

A Roll Call vote was called in the Students' Representative Council:

OFFICE	NAME	AYE	NO	ABS.
Arts/Divinity Senate Representative	Sophie Kelly	X		
Association Community Relations Officer	Katie O'Donnell	X		
Association Director of Events & Services	Daniel Palmer	X		
Association Director of Representation	Edward Woodhouse	X		
Association Director of Student Development & Activities	Kelsey Gold	X		
Association Environment & Ethics Officer	Dominyka Urbonaite			
Association LGBT Officer	David Norris	X		
Association Postgraduate President	Scott Schorr	X		
Association President	Chloe Hill	X		
President of the Athletic Union	Jess Walker	X		
Science/Medicine Senate Representative	Peter DaBell			
SRC Accommodation Officer	Scott Taylor	X		
SRC Education Officer	Ondrej Hajda	X		
SRC Employability Officer	Lonie Sebagh			
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			
SRC Member for Mature Students	Melissa Turner			
SRC Member for Private Accommodation	Ruth Cunningham	X		
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		
Students' Representative Council Welfare Officer	Avalon Borg	X		

With 20 members in the affirmative and 0 in the negative, the motion was adopted.

9.3. R. 18 – A Motion to Provide Funding for an Art Exhibition Organised by the Coalition for A Conflict Free St Andrews

THIS SRC NOTES:

1. The Coalition for a Conflict Free St Andrews has organised a photography exhibition consisting of photographs and artwork documenting the situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo as well as a talk by Bandi Mubi, Congolese activist and founder of *Congo Calling*;
2. The Coalition for a Conflict Free St Andrews lacks the available funds to cover the projected costs of such an art exhibition;

3. Its remit to represent the students of the University in all matters affecting their interests;
4. Its remit to represent the interests of all the students in physical, social and academic matters;
5. Its remit to provide such services for students as the SRC may deem desirable; and,
6. Its authority under 2 Laws § 3.3 to appropriate a sum of up to £1000.00 at any meeting.

THIS SRC BELIEVES:

1. That it should support the efforts of the Coalition for a Conflict Free St Andrews in raising awareness of the situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo and of its advocacy efforts within the University;
2. That the existence of the Coalition for a Conflict Free St Andrews and the support it garners through its 15 member societies render the aims of the Coalition for a Conflict Free St Andrews an interest of the students;
3. That supporting the “This is Congo/Voici Le Congo” Exhibition and talk are in the academic interests of the students; and,
4. That the provision on an art exhibition to raise awareness of the situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo is a desirable service for students.

THIS SRC RESOLVES:

1. To appropriate a sum not to exceed £1000.00 from its discretionary fund to cover reasonable expenses arising from an exhibition organised by the Coalition for a Conflict Free St Andrews in November 2013.

Mr Bryce proposed the motion, Ms Cunningham seconded.

Mr Bryce proposed an amendment to motion:

THIS SRC RESOLVES:

1. To appropriate a sum not to exceed ~~£1000.00~~ **£225.00** from its discretionary fund to cover reasonable expenses arising from an exhibition organised by the Coalition for a Conflict Free St Andrews in November 2013.

The amendment was adopted without dissent.

Mr Baldi noted that the resolving clause called on the Students' Representative Council to spend some of its discretionary fund, the balance of which stood at £2,750.

Mr Bryce stated that the exhibition was raising funds for a hospital in the Congo that supported the victims of rape. Mr Bryce noted that the Congo was the rape capital of the world. Mr Bryce stated that the grant would cover the shortfall from the conference.

Mr Woodhouse asked if there the SRC had any ownership of the event.

Mr Bryce replied in the negative.

Ms Gold asked if Mr Bryce had any relationship with the Coalition.

Mr Bryce answered that he had been on the committee for a few years.

Ms Gold asked if the event had happened and what the cost was.

Mr Bryce answered that it had cost £820.

Ms Gold asked what the shortfall was.

Mr Bryce answered that it had been £380.

Ms Gold asked if all the societies in the coalition were affiliated to the Association.

Mr Bryce answered that they had been the last time he had checked.

Ms Gold asked which societies were in the coalition.

Mr Bryce stated that they were not all affiliated.

Ms Gold asked what the societies' financial situations were and if they had money in reserve for the shortfall.

Mr Bryce answered that he did not know.

Ms Cunningham asked Mr Bryce if more money would be helpful or if £225 was what he needed.

Mr Bryce answered that he wouldn't want to take any more.

Ms Borg asked why it was appropriate to take the request to the SRC.

Mr Bryce answered that the discretionary fund was intended for such things.

Ms Cunningham stated that the SRC had funded the previous event by the Coalition.

Mr Schorr asked if any other members of the SRC were in the organisation or involved with it.

Ms Cunningham answered that she wasn't in it but had attended their events and her professor was keen on the organisation.

Ms Mohamud answered that she was in STAND which had a lot of overlap.

Ms Hill answered that she had helped Bennett Collins with it.

Ms Gold stated that not all of the societies were affiliated, listed the societies in the coalition, and noted that four were not affiliated.

Ms Cunningham stated that she did not think Left Soc, one of the listed societies, existed.

Ms Gold stated that the SSC Societies' Committee had recently seen an application from STAND for a grant and, unfortunately, when they had reviewed the request and asked if STAND were holding the event, they said they weren't and the Coalition had asked them to apply. Ms Gold stated that the Association had strict rules and couldn't consider the application. Ms Gold stated that she, and the Committee, thought that was the right decision. Ms Gold stated that she thought it was inappropriate for them to come to the SRC for the grant. Ms Gold stated that she wanted to fund as

many things as possible but they had mechanisms in place and the discretionary fund was not for this.

Ms Hill stated that she was struggling to understand the conflict, noting that the Coalition was an umbrella organisation, and asked if it would be possible for them to submit a joint application like others had for events.

Ms Gold stated that there was a precedent for joint applications, such as for balls, but the stumbling block here was that some of the societies were not affiliated. Ms Gold stated that she had never seen a constitution or agreement between the societies despite specifically asking about the relationship, such as what the buy in from each society was. Ms Gold stated that they could apply like that in the future but she didn't want to speak on behalf of the Societies Committee.

Ms Hill asked if there was the possibility of them submitting a more appropriate application.

Mr Woodhouse stated that the reason he had asked about ownership earlier was that when he was at the table to set the budget for the discretionary fund, there needed to be an element of ownership from the SRC. Mr Woodhouse stated that, if there had been, they could have funded the event. Mr Woodhouse stated that he would feel uncomfortable with the SRC being directed to do something that it had no ownership over and that he'd be uncomfortable giving money in this case.

Ms Cunningham stated that she remembered funding the conference in the past and asked why that had happened based on the objections being raised at this time. Ms Cunningham stated that there had been discussion then of putting something in the laws for coalitions to be able to do things.

Mr Baldi stated that it was appropriate to talk about what you thought of motion R1 but not to speak on behalf of the entire body.

Ms Hill stated that she had understood the funding as being for the Coalition's conference, that it had been at the end of the year and there was a huge amount left, and that it had been more feasible. Ms Hill stated that the conference was a huge and international that would have had a big impact on the students participating as part of their learning experience. Ms Hill stated that it had been a considerably larger event that never understood to be a recurring thing and that the photo exhibition was not the same level of event.

Ms Gold, in relation to other forms of funding, stated that they had been working on different forms of funding and that they had societies, affiliated student projects, which they didn't meet the criteria for becoming a society, and association projects that are considered to be of high value and hold recurring activities. Ms Gold stated that there was also the student development fund that supported different things. Ms Gold stated that the Association was growing and evolving and that there was still the opportunity for the Coalition to fit within the different structures in the Association. Ms Gold stated that the discretionary fund was not an appropriate mechanism.

Mr Palmer stated that the last time they had been funded as it was a one off, high profile event. Mr Palmer stated that he had spoken about, if it were to be a recurring event, making it fit within one of the structures. Mr Palmer stated that they had now come back without going through the proper procedure. Mr Palmer stated that, given the topic it was covering, it should be a society or a project.

Mr Palmer stated that you should only access the discretionary fund if you were an officer of the SRC.

Ms Hill stated that she agreed but that it also had to be recognised that there were students out of pocket. Ms Hill stated that she wanted to state they would help them to get funding. Ms Hill stated that, as they had received funding the last time around, students were out of pocket, and they weren't asking for funding for a future event, they needed to come up with a plan to help them. Ms Hill stated that, to be fair to the Coalition, the vast majority were affiliated societies and students, and they had only done what they had done the previous year. Ms Hill stated that they had to help resolve the problem.

Mr Palmer stated that the structures were in place to prevent students going out of pocket and that it had been made clear it had to be a one off project.

Ms Hill stated that they couldn't become a project as it was a conference. Ms Hill stated that they weren't being as flexible, as it wasn't appropriate, but they needed to come up with an alternative.

Mr Woodhouse asked if they could make it an action point.

Ms Hill stated that she would support the motion unless there were guarantees to ensure that students weren't out of pocket for following the same procedure as they had in the past.

Mr Palmer stated that they couldn't bail out a group every time if they didn't follow the procedure.

Ms Hill stated that, when they were initially denied a grant, they should have been told the correct procedure.

Mr Palmer stated that they had been told they wouldn't get the money and spent it anyway.

Ms Gold stated that she wanted to point out that they had sought funding before the event the last time and now they were seeking it after the event. Ms Gold stated that she didn't feel comfortable with the SRC mandating it as they weren't a lender of last resort. Ms Gold stated that if a group came and said they had messed up then there were student officers in place to help them and that they had mechanisms in place. Ms Gold stated that they couldn't guarantee that the SRC would bail people out as they didn't have an unlimited pool of money. Ms Gold stated that, although they weren't talking about huge sums of money, she would rather it be handled on an individual basis rather than the SRC mandating it.

Mr Bryce moved that the previous question be ordered.

Mr Baldi stated that it was not in order, as the speaking rights of all members of the Council had not yet been exhausted or waived.

Mr Schorr stated that it was his recollection that someone had given a presentation on the conference.

Mr Baldi stated that was correct.

Ms Hill stated that this motion had raised the problem that they didn't have a sensible process for: umbrella groups of societies.

Ms Kennedy-O'Brien stated that there was a process but that some societies weren't affiliated which made it difficult.

Ms Gold stated that no one from the coalition had spoken to her and asked for help and that the grant had been submitted by Stand but not from them.

Ms West stated that the minutes from the joint meeting of the Councils, held on the 2nd of April, stated that the Societies' Committee had funded them previously and asked why that had changed.

Mr Cordrey answered that the Societies Committee's procedures had been changed.

Ms Cunningham stated that motion R1 had been amended to increase the value of the grant so that it would be used to fund the conference rather than the photo exhibition. Ms Cunningham stated that had been because it was better for student education. Ms Cunningham stated that the motion had been considered in April and that the money would have been lost if it had not been spent, so it was put to good use. Ms Cunningham stated that the minutes from that meeting on the 2nd of April made it seem like a grey area.

Ms Morrice asked whose remit it was change the process to keep things like this from happening in future, specifically designing a process for umbrella groups where there were non-affiliated groups as members.

Mr Woodhouse answered that it was part of Ms Gold's remit but also that it was up to the groups whether they wanted to affiliate or not. Mr Woodhouse stated that if a group doesn't want to affiliate then they couldn't expect to draw up Association resources.

Mr Palmer stated that it was a case-by-case thing. Mr Palmer stated that it was a shame they hadn't come and spoken to them about it.

Ms Mohamud moved that the previous question be called.

Mr Bryce seconded.

The previous question was ordered without dissent.

A roll call vote was held in the SRC:

OFFICE	NAME	AYE	NO	ABS.
Arts/Divinity Senate Representative	Sophie Kelly			X
Association Community Relations Officer	Katie O'Donnell			X
Association Director of Events & Services	Daniel Palmer		X	
Association Director of Representation	Edward Woodhouse		X	
Association Director of Student Development & Activities	Kelsey Gold		X	
Association Environment & Ethics Officer	Dominyka Urbonaite			
Association LGBT Officer	David Norris		X	
Association Postgraduate President	Scott Schorr		X	
Association President	Chloe Hill			X
President of the Athletic Union	Jess Walker			X
Science/Medicine Senate Representative	Peter DaBell			
SRC Accommodation Officer	Scott Taylor			X
SRC Education Officer	Ondrej Hajda		X	
SRC Employability Officer	Lonie Sebahg			
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			X
SRC Member for International Students	Caroline Rhoads			
SRC Member for Mature Students	Melissa Turner			
SRC Member for Private Accommodation	Ruth Cunningham			X
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	
Students' Representative Council Welfare Officer	Avalon Borg		X	

With 1 in the affirmative, and 10 in the negative, the motion failed.

9.4. R. 19 – A Motion to Outline the Students' Association's Position Regarding the Development of Private Halls of Residence for which the Target Market are University of St Andrews Students

THIS SRC NOTES THAT:

1. There has been an overall upward trend in the creation of private halls of residence throughout the UK in recent years.
2. This development has now reached St Andrews with one such application currently approved and another under consideration:
 - 2.1. As of 3rd July 2013 Fife Council received a planning application for the erection of a student residence facility at the former Memorial Hospital site on Abbey Walk, St Andrews. As of 4th November 2013 this application has been approved.
 - 2.2. As of 26th September 2013 Fife Council validated a further application for a

private student hall of residence at the current Wonder Years Nursery site at East Sands, St Andrews. If approved this development will create 135 student bedrooms.

THIS SRC BELIEVES THAT:

1. Private Halls of Residence may provide a convenient and affordable accommodation option for some students.
2. The construction of purpose built private student accommodation may alleviate perceived housing pressures within St Andrews.
3. Without proper round the clock pastoral care, such as that provided by wardennial teams, halls of residence may fail to provide the level of service that students can reasonably expect from anywhere termed a 'hall of residence' as opposed to a private house or flat.
 - 3.1. This especially applies when accommodation is allocated in individual rooms rather than groups applying together for complete flats.
 - 3.2. There have been problems in other parts of the UK where this wardennial service has not been in place in private halls of residence especially throughout the night.
 - 3.3. The wardennial team model as used in the University of St Andrews Halls of Residence is to be commended as providing the level of support that students can expect from a hall of residence.

THIS SRC RESOLVES:

1. To support the development of private halls of residences in St Andrews only where there are plans for a satisfactory on site wardennial team (or other pastoral care provision) that residents can access throughout the night.
2. To oppose the development of any private halls of residence that have not made provision to provide satisfactory pastoral care to residents.
3. To continue to monitor the development and construction of present and any future proposed private halls of residences targeted at University of St Andrews students in order to properly support and advise students.
4. To consistently advocate for pastoral care provision in the form of on-site wardennial teams within private halls of residence.

Ms Cunningham proposed the motion, Mr Taylor seconded.

Ms Cunningham stated that an application had been accepted by Fife Council for the construction of a private hall of residence and that another had been altered subsequent to a rejection. Ms Cunningham stated that they now needed to have a position on them and the University's position was a bit woolly. Ms Cunningham stated that she wanted the Association to have an official position. Ms Cunningham stated that the motion really only spoke about requirements for pastoral care in private halls for the Association to support it. Ms Cunningham stated that there had been problems in Dundee with private halls, specifically at The Hub, where students were left out overnight resulting in the Hub being blacklisted by the University. After they were blacklisted, Ms Cunningham stated they implemented pastoral care. Ms Cunningham stated that there would be support from the Association so long as there was pastoral care. Ms Cunningham stated that the motion did not talk about deposits as that was now covered by Scottish law. Ms Cunningham stated that pastoral care was particularly a problem when students applied separately rather than as groups of friends

and that she wanted the motion passed before Christmas in case there were developments over the break.

Mr Schorr stated that clearly demand existed in the town but that he was unfamiliar with the legal structure. Mr Schorr asked if there were substantive issues with competition law, such as if the University owned a hotel.

Ms Cunningham stated that they were allowed to object, advise students, and speak in the press and that the motion established the Association's position on private halls. Ms Cunningham stated that it was important to have a coherent position as they were the voice of students and what they said in the press mattered. Ms Cunningham stated that the default position was this anyway but, to draw an analogy IR students would understand, it was soft power versus hard power.

Ms Gold asked if a private hall of residence was the same thing as a developer building flats.

Ms Cunningham answered that it wasn't and there were exemptions from having to build affordable housing and also that they were allocated on a room-by-room basis rather than on a flat-by-flat basis. Ms Cunningham stated that it was effectively a hall, just not run by the University.

Mr Woodhouse stated that he hadn't noted a distinction being made between privately owned and privately operated and if that was being split.

Ms Cunningham stated that it was different and that if it was privately owned they would expect the University to do as they currently did.

Mr Schorr asked if they would be listed on the University's website.

Ms Cunningham stated that would only happen if it was run by the University. Ms Cunningham stated that if they thought it was a good development, they could recommend it to students as a good choice.

Ms Kennedy-O'Brien stated that, from the University point of view, they wouldn't be marketing this as an alternative for the next few years as they could guarantee spaces for first years.

Ms Hill stated that was because they weren't talking about Fife Park.

Ms Kennedy-O'Brien stated that, even in that case, it would be University managed.

Mr Woodhouse stated that he liked that the position was being laid out and wondered if he could propose an amendment as the current motion currently tied their hands to support all developments with pastoral care.

Ms Cunningham stated that she had been aware of that when she was writing the motion but that the way the support section was written meant they could support it if there was pastoral care but would have to oppose it if there was wasn't.

Mr Woodhouse proposed an amendment to the motion:

THIS SRC RESOLVES:

1. To, **in principle**, support the development of private halls of residences in St Andrews only where there are plans for a satisfactory on site wardennial team (or other pastoral care provision) that residents can access throughout the night.

Mr Schorr seconded.

Mr Woodhouse stated that he didn't think the only issue with private halls was the provision of pastoral care and that there should be flexibility and that he wanted to make clear that the support was in principle only.

Mr Palmer stated that he did not think the motion needed the amendment as the motion only said they would never support it if there weren't wardens but that they could oppose it on other grounds too.

Mr Woodhouse stated that he was reading the motion as saying that they would support all private halls that had wardens regardless of other problems.

Mr Palmer stated that was incorrect and that if there were wardens they had the option to support it.

Ms Cunningham stated that they recommended a wardenial team but that there were other forms of pastoral care that would be adequate and so could be supported. Ms Cunningham stated that they could still oppose the motion on other grounds.

Ms Hill stated that, unexpectedly, she had worked on the issue quite a lot. Ms Hill stated that the accommodation survey held the previous year had shown that students would be unhappy with private halls but the problem was they had no way of stopping them being built, only trying to have them built in ways they were happy with. Ms Hill stated that she had been for coffee with the developer as he had wanted her input so they could secure student support. Ms Hill stated that it had to have 24/7 support and has asked what the rent costs would be. Ms Hill stated that, embarrassingly, the rent was less than the University currently charged. Ms Hill stated that they were recognising they were opposed to private halls but that this was how they could influence the process so that they could be happy with the result and that it was important they took a position on it.

Mr Woodhouse moved to suspend the rules to permit the withdrawal of the amendment.

With no objections raised, the rules were so suspended and the Woodhouse amendment withdrawn.

The motion was placed before the council.

Ms Cunningham stated that the motion was worded as target market, and not just the town, so that it wouldn't be necessary to pass another motion should a developer propose a hall in Guardbridge or somewhere else.

Without dissent, the motion was adopted.

9.5. J. 17 – A Motion to Remove the SSC Film Production Subcommittee from The Student's Associations' Laws

THIS SSC AND SSC NOTE:

1. The Rè Pictures Committee has several vacant committee positions including SSC Film Production Officer (President), Vice President, Treasurer, Secretary, Technical Officer, Design Officer and First Year Representative.
2. Currently, only the following positions on the Rè Pictures Committee are filled: two Publicity Officers, Outreach Officer, Events Coordinator and Equipment Officer.
- 2.1. Of these positions, only one Publicity Officer is a voting member of the committee as per the SSC Film Production Constitution.
3. The Association Constitution & Laws still refers to the Rogue Productions Subcommittee, and the SSC, SRC, and Association Board have never ratified the updated Rè Pictures Constitution.
4. The primary aim of the SSC Film Production Subcommittee is to encourage and promote the interest of the St Andrews community in filmmaking through funding, provision of equipment, expertise and screening opportunities.
5. The Director of Events and Services has had responsibility over equipment loaning of cameras, instead of the SSC Film Production Subcommittee, since October 2013.
6. The SSC Film Production Subcommittee hosts the annual Half Cut Film Festival.
7. The following: [FN 1].
- 7.1. Rogue Productions was founded in 2000 as the St Andrews Student Filmmaking Society;
- 7.2. Rogue Productions changed from a society and became a Students' Association subcommittee in 2010; and
- 7.3. Rogue Productions was rebranded to Rè Pictures in 2012 for copyright reasons.

[FN 1] <http://cinemastandrews.org.uk/production/rogue-productions-st-andrews-student-filmmaking-society/>

THIS SSC AND SRC BELIEVE:

1. That the SSC Film Production Subcommittee currently does not meet the organisational and administrative expectations held for Association subcommittees.
2. The Association Laws should accurately reflect the activities of the Students' Association.

THIS SSC AND SRC RESOLVE:

To report the following amendments to the Laws of the Association to SAB with a recommendation that the same do pass:

1. To remove the SSC Film Production Subcommittee chapter of the Association Laws.

2. To strike all references to the SSC Film Production Subcommittee from the Association Constitution & Laws.
3. To strike all references to the SSC Film Production Officer and/or SSC Film Production Convenor from the Association Constitution & Laws.

Ms Gold proposed the motion, Mr Palmer seconded.

Ms Gold stated that this motion was another one that had gone through the Student Services Council and was now laid before the Council. Ms Gold stated that the Rè Committee no longer existed and that they were now removing it from the laws. Ms Gold stated that it would officially and formally make them no longer a subcommittee of the Association.

The motion was adopted without dissent.

9.6. J. 18 – A Motion to Amend the Postgraduate Society Constitution

**THE STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL AND STUDENT SERVICES COUNCIL
NOTE:**

1. The Postgraduate Society is a vital component to the University of St Andrews' Postgraduate Community.
2. The Postgraduate Society is led by the Postgraduate Society Committee.

**THE STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL AND STUDENT SERVICES COUNCIL
BELIEVE:**

1. To further improve the Postgraduate Society's ability to represent, entertain, and advocate for postgraduate student concerns, the Postgraduate Society may update its previous Constitution to better articulate its role within the postgraduate community and within the Students' Association.

**THE STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL AND STUDENT SERVICES COUNCIL
RESOLVE:**

To report amendments to effect the following changes to the Laws to SAB with the recommendation that the same do pass:

1. The Postgraduate Society Committee's previous Constitution be struck entirely, and replaced with the attached text.

Constitution of the Postgraduate Society of the University of St Andrews

Aims

We, the postgraduate students of the University of St Andrews, in order to create the 'home society' for postgraduates living in St Andrews to host events, advocate for academic concerns, and foster postgraduate community, establish this constitution of the Postgraduate Society Committee of the University of St Andrews.

Remit

The Postgraduate Society shall hold at least four events during the year for the recreational benefit of the postgraduates of St Andrews. One of these will be an annual ball, usually held during the Summer Vacation.

The Postgraduate Society shall be competent to make loans or grants to individuals or bodies endeavoring to provide entertainment to the postgraduate community.

The Committee shall take special responsibility, via the Association Postgraduate President, for ensuring that SSC and SRC take sufficient account of the needs and wishes of postgraduate students during vacation periods.

Article I – Name

The organisation shall be known as the Postgraduate Society of the University of St Andrews.

Article II – Members

Section 1:

The membership of the Postgraduate Society Committee shall consist of postgraduate students elected at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) to be held no later than Week 4 of Semester 1.

Section 2:

The duties and responsibilities of the Committee are:

- a. To act as the official voice and to promote the interests of postgraduate students;
- b. To consider any proposal or request that a postgraduate student or group may present in the best interest of the postgraduate community;
- c. To uphold and defend the Constitution and By-Laws of the Postgraduate Society Committee.

Section 3: Resignation

A Committee member may resign if he or she finds that they are no longer able to fulfill the requirements of membership. Resignation will take effect immediately upon announcement. Discussion and questions regarding resignation may be

dealt with in confidence via communication with the Association Postgraduate President.

Section 4: Quorum

The quorum shall be three-fifths of the voting membership of the committee.

Section 5: Membership

All matriculated postgraduate students of the University of St Andrews, save those who have exercised their right under the Education Act of 1994 to cease to be members of the Students' Association, shall be deemed to be ordinary members of the society.

Section 6: Extraordinary Membership

The committee may award extraordinary membership of the Society to such individuals as it deems fit.

Section 7: Annual General Meeting

- a. Procedure- The AGM shall be held during Semester One before the Christmas Vacation, and shall:
 - i. Require 14 days notice;
 - ii. Be publicised widely in such places and by such methods as the committee shall determine from time to time;
 - iii. Be open to all members of the Society, although only ordinary members shall be eligible to vote, propose, second, or stand for elections.
- b. Business- The order of business shall be:
 - i. Report of the Association Postgraduate President;
 - ii. Report of the Postgraduate Society Treasurer;
 - iii. Elections of all non-Association voting posts;
 - iv. AOCB.
- c. Elections- No one shall hold more than one position on the Committee at any one time. Elections shall be conducted by a secret ballot using the STV system.

Article III – The Postgraduate Society Committee

Section 1:

The Postgraduate Committee shall adopt a structure to lead the Postgraduate Society. A recommendation is provided below:

1. Association Postgraduate President*
2. Vice President, Finance*
3. Vice President, Ball Convener*
4. Vice President, Event Convener
5. Vice President, Pub Convener
6. Vice President, Academic Relations*
7. Vice President, External Relations
8. Secretary*
9. Parliamentarian

10. Association Director of Student Development & Activities
11. Association Director of Representation.

The above positions provide a recommendation to future Postgraduate Presidents and Committees on how to structure themselves. They may also consult Appendix A. Positions marked with an '' are required. Positions not marked with an '*' are recommended.

Section 2:

The Association Postgraduate President shall, in addition to those responsibilities set out in Chapter Three of the Laws:

- a. Be the official representative of the postgraduate students within the University community;
- b. Be responsible for all external Committee correspondence; and
- c. Perform any additional duties as needed.

Section 3:

The Vice President, Finance shall:

- a. Serve as the liaison with accounting in the Students' Association;
- b. Oversee the reimbursement process; and
- c. Perform any additional duties as needed.

Section 4:

The Vice President, Ball Convener shall:

- a. Serve as the liaison with hotel partners for Postgraduate Society balls.
- b. Propose ball themes, decorations, and entertainment options.
- c. Explore different venue options and present ideas via 'ball proposal(s)' to the Committee, in consultation with the Association Postgraduate President.

Section 5:

The Vice President, Academic Relations shall:

- a. Work closely with the Association Postgraduate President to represent postgraduate student interests within the Students' Association and University. This is done through attending multiple meetings at the invitation of the Association Postgraduate President, either alongside the President or in lieu of him/her. In the latter circumstance, the Vice President, Academic Relations speaks on behalf of the Committee.

Section 6:

The Secretary shall:

- a. Keep detailed minutes of the meetings of the Postgraduate Society Committee;
- b. Collaborate with President in writing "The Sunday Postgraduate" (or alternative newsletter) and
- c. Perform other duties as needed.

Section 7:

The Parliamentarian shall:

- a. Interpret, enforce, and defend the Constitution and By-Laws should they need clarification;
- b. Assist the Chair in keeping order during Committee meetings;

Article IV – Standing Sub-Committees

Section 1:

The Committee shall have a number of standing sub-committees as outlined in the By-Laws. These standing sub-committees shall be charged with the specific duties of the Committee.

Section 2:

Each standing Sub-Committee shall be chaired by an appropriate Committee Vice President.

Article V - Meetings

Section 1:

The Committee shall meet at least once a week during teaching weeks. In the event of extenuating circumstances, meetings may be cancelled by a consensus of the Committee.

Section 2:

Standing sub-committees are encouraged to meet at least bi-weekly during teaching weeks.

Article VI - Parliamentary Authority

Section 1:

The Postgraduate Committee shall be governed by this Constitution and duly passed by-laws and the Standing Orders of the Students' Association. The most recent version of *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* may be treated as a pervasive authority in the event that these documents do not clearly identify a course of procedure.

Section 2:

The Parliamentarian shall ensure that the Constitution and By-Laws in addition to proper parliamentary procedure are adhered to at all times.

Article VII- By-Laws

Section 1:

The Committee shall adopt a body of By-Laws, which may be amended at any time by a two-thirds majority vote.

Section 2:

This Constitution shall take precedence over the By-Laws of the Postgraduate Society Committee.

Appendix A

Postgraduate President	Vice-President (Ball Convener)	Vice-President (Event Convener)	Vice-President (Pub Convener)	Vice-President (Academic Relations)	Vice-President (External Relations)
Vice-President (Finance)	Formal Balls – Finance Officer	Academic & Non-Academic Events – Finance Officer	Pub Team – Finance Officer	Students’ Association Representative (Taught Postgraduate)	Chamber of Ideas Representative
Social Media Officer	Formal Balls – Venues Officer	Academic & Non-Academic Events – Venues Officer	Pub Team – Venues Officer	Students’ Association Representative (Research Postgraduate)	External Partnerships Representative
Marketing Officer	Formal Balls – Decorations Officer	Academic & Non-Academic Events – Decorations Officer	Pub Team – Quiz Officer	University Representative (Taught Postgraduate)	
Committee Social Officer (Internal)	Formal Balls – Drinks/Catering Officer	Academic & Non-Academic Events – Speakers Officer	Pub Team – Movie Nights Officer	University Representative (Research Postgraduate)	
Secretary + Co-Editor	Formal Balls – Publicity Officer	Academic & Non-Academic Events – Publicity Officer	Pub Team – Publicity Officer	Athletic Union Representative (Taught or Research Postgraduate)	
Audiovisual Officer (Video + Photos)	Formal Balls – Entertainment Officer	Academic & Non-Academic Events – Bonfire Officer		Mature Students Representative (Taught or Research Postgraduate)	
				Employability Officer	

Mr Schorr proposed the motion, Mr Woodhouse seconded.

Mr Schorr stated that the previous constitution had been rather lean to cover all the events they wanted to do and so they needed to do something new. Mr Schorr stated that he had consulted with people in the Association, and this was trying to set out guidelines for the long term stability.

Mr Woodhouse stated that the byelaws gave missions statements and outlined the roles of subcommittees.

Ms Gold asked if the Chair had reviewed the constitution and recommended that it fell within the appropriate guidelines

Mr Schorr answered that the Chair had kindly reviewed the constitution and found that it did.

Ms Hill, referencing Article 3, section 2 of the constitution, asked if Mr Schorr thought that the wording was appropriate given that the Association President was representative is for everyone while the Postgraduate President was only the representative on specific things but not in general. Ms Hill expressed her worry that Mr Schorr was giving himself a lot of work. Ms Hill stated that the President was elected to cover everything for everyone, regardless of year.

Mr Schorr stated that he'd argue that his position was being representative for most things and that was how the University viewed the position.

Ms Hill stated that fell under the academic remit, which was key, and that Mr Schorr was not the representative for everything related to postgraduates.

Mr Palmer stated that it was difficult for there not to be an overlap but that'd he specify the position was 'a' rather than 'the' representative or specify that the position was the representative for the matters outlined in the aims, bringing the remit closer to that of the committee.

Mr Palmer proposed an amendment:

Constitution of the Postgraduate Society of the University of St Andrews

Article III – The Postgraduate Society Committee

[...]

Section 2:

The Association Postgraduate President shall, in addition to those responsibilities set out in Chapter Three of the Laws:

- a. Be the official representative of the postgraduate students within the University community **on the topics laid out in the aims set out in this Chapter;**

Ms Gold seconded.

Mr Palmer asked if Mr Schorr was happy with the amendment.

Mr Schorr answered that he had not written the constitution and that it should reflect the job.

Ms Hill stated that her intention was not to increase her own workload.

Mr Palmer stated that the amendment meant it was clearer on what the role was.

Mr Schorr stated that the discussion would need to be returned to in the future.

Ms Hill stated that nobody understood Mr Schorr's role s being the representative of students on matters like external campaigns, bar prices, or sexual health. Ms Hill stated that sabbatical officers covered those things.

Mr Schorr stated that it was fuzzy in that people in the University viewed it as being that way.

Without dissent, the amendment was adopted.

Ms Hill, referencing the section 2b, that for issues related to the Council, the press would have to deal with a sabbatical officer or the President. Ms Hill stated that was how the Association works and that Mr Schorr could not be a press officer.

Mr Schorr asked if Ms Hill's comments were germane.

Ms Hill stated that she wanted to confirm that it was clear.

Mr Palmer stated that Mr Schorr could speak within the University but that, outwith the University, there was an established procedure that had to be followed.

Mr Baldi stated that the constitution wouldn't alter the procedure.

Ms Cunningham asked whether there should be an amendment referencing the procedure.

Ms Gold answered that constitutions should be as simple as possible and that training would cover the relevant procedures.

Ms Hill stated that they had to ensure that training was suitable, given that this was the first year in which training had taken place.

Ms Cunningham asked for clarification on when AGMs should be held given the conflict between Article 2, Section 1 and Article 2, Section 7a.

Ms Hill stated that Mr Cordrey had already pointed the conflict out.

Mr Cordrey stated that the earlier date would be the one that would take precedence.

Ms Hill proposed an amendment:

Constitution of the Postgraduate Society of the University of St Andrews

Article II – Members

[...]

Section 7:

- a. Procedure- The AGM shall be held during Semester One ~~before the Christmas Vacation~~ **no later than week 4**, and shall;

Mr Woodhouse seconded.

Without dissent, the amendment was accepted.

Ms Hill asked if Mr Schorr had confirmed that he was not the only person on the SSC/SRC.

Mr Baldi stated that the membership of the SSC/SRC is defined, and that there are separate definitions, but some had changed following the omnibus modernisation motion in December of 2012 and things might need to be modernised.

The question was on the adoption of motion J18, as amended.

The motion, as amended, was adopted without dissent.

9.7. A Motion to Amend the Union Debating Society Constitution

THIS SSC AND SRC NOTE:

1. The Union Debating Constitution currently states the following: 'The Annual General Meeting of the Society shall be held not more than four weeks after the Students' Association annual diet of elections'.
2. The 2014 Students' Association Elections will be held from 8-14 March.
3. The University Spring Vacation will be held from 15-30 March.

THIS SSC AND SRC BELIEVE:

1. The Union Debating Society should host their AGM following the Association Elections, but it may not always be feasible for the subcommittee to hold their AGM within four weeks of the Association elections.

THIS SSC AND SRC RESOLVE:

To report amendments to effect the following changes to the Laws to SAB with the recommendation that the same do pass:

1. Strike from § 5.1 of Chapter 13 of the Laws of the Association 'not more than four weeks after the Students' Association annual diet of elections' and insert 'following the Students' Association annual diet of elections and before the end of teaching in the second semester'.

Ms Gold proposed the motion, Mr Carlton seconded.

Ms Gold stated that the way the constitution was written, the society was obliged to hold their AGM during the spring break, by passing this motion, they would be given more flexibility.

Mr Mathewson asked if there were any other changes.

Ms Gold answered that there weren't.

The motion was adopted without dissent.

10. Any Other Competent Business

10.1. Announcements

Mr Baldi announced that if any member had not yet paid their money for the Christmas dinner, they could do so now and that semester 2's schedule of meetings would be announced in the near future. Mr Baldi clarified that calling for the previous question was only in order when everyone had spoken or had waived their right to do so. Mr Baldi announced that due to the length of the meeting, some wine had been provided in the main bar for the members. Mr Baldi wished the members luck in their exams and happy holidays.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2234