



SU Council Meeting - Agenda

12th July 2022 at 6:15pm

via MS Teams

Meeting chaired by: Dani Golds (VP Rep Comms, Deputy Chair)

Attendees: L = Late arrived

Staff: Jack Conway, Fuchsia Stocker, Willow Gibson, Dave Sherlock-Jones

Officers: Samuel Fenton, Matthew Clarkson, Gareth Jones, Chantelle Woodward-Iles, Katie Strathdee, Jade Urquhart-Gilmore, Eleanor Irvine, Victoria Lindsay, Tamas Berczik (L)

Incoming officers (non-voting): Morley Jones, Kan Tang, Victoria Body, Legend Thurman

Other: Gianpaul Lui (MSA President)

1. Welcomes and Apologies DG/SF

- a. **Apologies received from:** Alex Richardson, Priya Toor, Sebastian Miller, Anantha Kumaravel, Hasita Dodhia
- b. **Acknowledgement of final years' 'student' status and SU Membership**
 - i. Background information from DG on situation. MC states has to be changed by charity commission. VL states dependent on conversation with college. DSJ states will take longer than people think. Has to go to college council
- c. **Welcome:** Incoming officers attending today's meeting

2. Vote to confirm minutes from last meeting: DG/SF

- a. **To Vote:** Minutes of 26th April 2022 meeting

- i. VL calls *quoracy. Counted. No quoracy. Discussions and vote by correspondence. Chair approves minutes.

3. To note: RVCSU Officer Election & By-election results for 2022-23 team **DG/SF**

- a. Sent via email on 12th May 2022. Has also been sent to college.

4. To note: Results of vote by correspondence on 12th May 2022 **DG/SF**

- a. Regarding byelaw change to be in line with Education Act
- b. *"Do you approve the bye-law addition under 10.1 All officers will: "10.1.15 not hold sabbatical office, or paid elected union office, within RVCSU, for more than two years in total, in accordance with The Education Act 1994 Section 22 (2) (f).?"*

- i. **Results:** 10 votes recorded. 10 Yes votes. 0 No votes. 0 Abstentions.

5. To discuss: RVCSU Policy on Club/Society alcohol expenditure **MC**

- a. Student speaker: Gianpaul Lui of Mature Students Association (*NOT PRESENT*)
 - i. MC to give background on club and society funding on not spending funds on alcohol. 7 years of precedent (found by GJ) from 2015. Group of students want to change policy as they "find it too restrictive". Multiple issues with this precedent including encouragement of binge drinking, reduction of funding from college etc. DSJ states as regards to the policy, clubs and socs can bring it to council to be voted on and states the basis of wine society. Have to be careful on what ground the SU gives. Depends on a reasonable argument. GJ states it depends on proportionality and is situational. Is policy in regulations that allows council to change this. In absence of information, no compelling argument to change stance. MC states on survey, only went out to certain societies and at least 2 sent back saying it is not something that is agreed with. VL has the opinion that we shouldn't be discussing this as the speaker is not here. SF states that speaker has RSVP'd. JUG stated that if the student

hasn't turned up then it can't be that important to the speaker. DSJ agrees.

- ii.* GL arrive 19:15. MC to give background on issue. GL brings up that it hasn't been an issue for other societies. Sent out a survey and "2/3rds" have responded in support of the point. (no proof provided). "8 responses". GL feels this regulation is a bit overbearing but does recognize arguments against it. In relaxing the rules, it expects clubs to have a level of maturity. Asks SU to review policy. DSJ doesn't think it's draconian with alcohol rule. Avoiding public money for providing people to go to the pub. Strongly object to the SU being draconian. GJ states it's an interesting point. What is the purpose? Difficulty is spectrum of clubs and society. Clubs' expenditure is vastly different per club. Relaxing rules chips away at funding. Best to come to council and have the discussion on case-by-case basis. Don't have the scope to spend money on alcohol. Don't want to open a can of worms. MC echoes that a structure is set up and it's not an absolute zero policy. Understands the issues with calling a meeting with council but SF states we can vote by correspondence. MC states that we have policy to reduce hazing (note: hazing is "initiations"). All funding has to be approved by the treasurer. Certain clubs may take advantage of loosening policy. EI states as social secretary they would crowdfund for socials. Second point states that freshers may not want alcohol especially after COVID. As much as some clubs would use or abuse it, some others would not use it. GL states a stark difference between a social society and an activity society. Focus of MSA is social events. Other point is that if a club went to a very expensive restaurant and bought steaks nobody would say anything. VL states as a mature

student and “not down with the kids” and when she goes with her research group, they are not allowed to expense alcohol from who pays. Very common to not allow alcohol in most groups to not be expensed. Recognizes that they are a different type of club. If already getting socials paid for then doesn't see an issue with a crowdfund for alcohol. Also using club funds shows inequality to people who do not drink. Understands restrictions of not being able to just have a drink as an adult. GJ states good points but agrees with VL. Already scope to use funds in many ways. If reduce policy harder to put breaks back on. Clubs can get carried away. GJ suggests taking view on board and suggests seeing how current policy works. Increase visibility of existing avenues. GL states fair in what GJ proposes, making it clear that its not a hard and set rule and to encourage people to bring requests council and to have response in good time. MC will inform successor and should either go through activities or treasurer. GL to pass information onto successors

b. To vote: Amendment of RVCSU Policy on Club/Society alcohol expenditure (*NO QUORACY, VOTE BY CORROSPONDENCE*)

6. To discuss: Course representative engagement **EI/DG**

a. DG gives background that course reps struggling with engagement in some cohorts spread across both UG and PG. Noted at course management committee. Stated they don't have to attend all but can share them out between course reps. No attendance from any rep. Students unhappy about no change from feedback but no feedback provided
EI states that courses were getting negative feedback but course reps not turning up. Struggle to get course reps involved. GJ states that the structure is not the best to give honest feedback. Topic brought up by Michelle Milner that there is

some things for the SU to do. Forum that students give feedback sometimes not accepting feedback. VL states engagement is not unique to course reps. Increasing disconnect for a while. Surveys don't get a good return rate. Put something in place to remove if course reps don't send a deputy. DSJ states that if we get rid of the shop, WG could become more involved. No formal backbone training for support. Lack of training and confidence. JUG brings up college member who should do formal training. Feedback to college and responsibility of college to give backing to reps. Suggest revoking privileges if role not fulfilled. DG and WG turned up to weekly meetings course rep drop in sessions. Main issue is engagement. VL and GJ have emailed postgrad reps before meetings. Plenty of training. DSJ states issue we're not selling the role and what impact they can have. Are we selling it enough? DG asks if we need to restructure the role. EI states MB is doing a great job and unsupported by the college. If any feedback, please provide to DG.

7. To discuss/vote: Updated expenses guidelines **CWI**

- a. CW provides background and asks for points for non-trustees. GJ suggests review it.
- b. No vote. To review. Email CW for feedback.

8. To discuss/vote: Update to finance regs RE social events and gifting. **CWI**

- a. To Vote: Addition to finance regs: (*NO QUORACY, VOTE BY CORROSPONDENCE*)
 - i. *A budget for each of any social events (including "Leaving Do's") which are not related to the workings of the Union are to be approved by majority Vote by Correspondence of the Trustee Board prior to the event in question.*

b. To Vote: Addition to finance regs: (*NO QUORACY, VOTE BY CORROSPONDENCE*)

i. Expenditure for gifts (to staff or voluntary workers) is to be approved prior to purchase by the General Manager or Acting General Manager (in absence of GM) plus at least 2 of the following:

- President*
- Treasurer*
- Any other trustee*

FS – would like more transparency on spending. Watering it down would negate point of changes. GJ states increases transparency and transparency to student body. Some events may be seen as being events for friends. Not to be draconian but need right balance. Collective responsibility. Consensus from previous meeting 12/07. CW reminds as trustees they are responsible for spending. Not fair for people to be responsible and not know about it. Send feedback to DG.

9. AOB

a. NO AOB

10. Thank you to all 2021-22 Officers

11. Date and time of next meeting:

a. Next scheduled meeting in Autumn term of 2022-23 Academic Year with new officers

* **Quoracy** (uncountable) The condition of being quorate, or having enough members to carry out business and cast vote