**MEETING OF SGSU EXECUTIVE – AGENDA**

**Tuesday 13th June 2017**

**5.30pm – H2.6/7**

1. **Business**
   1. Apologies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| RV | Ruth Varney | Communications Officer |
| SS | Sunil Singh | Representation Officer |
| CL | Chantal Liu | International Officer |
| NA | Naireen Asim | Charities Officer |
| LoC | Lorna Chapman | Societies Officer |
| VP | Vikram Patel | Charities Officer |
| LuC | Lucy Chapman | Campaigns Officer |
| KS | Khadija Stone | E+D Officer |
| ET | Eesha Tripathi | Charities Officer |
| SA | Saeed Azizi | Student Trustee |
| GB | Gabriela Barzyk | Representation Officer |
| JC | Joe Clark | Communications Officer |
| RT | Ruben Thumbadoo | Student Trustee |

* 1. Present

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| FH | Francesca Harris | General Secretary |
| KT | Kat Telford | Chair |
| BO | Bukola Ogunjinmi | International Officer |
| AB | Anya Brown | Heritage Officer |
| JT | Jeremy Teo | Events Officer |
| CA | Chandru Amaranathan | Events Officer |
| SJ | Shalu James | Events Officer |
| YK | Yuna Kishimoto | Events Officer |
| CBa | Cameron Barclay | E+E Officer |
| SH | Sarah Hill | Communications Officer |
| AS | Ash Sithirapathy | Societies Officer |
| AD | Alex Denley | Technical Officer |
| EO | Ethan Osborn | Technical Officer |
| WM | Will Morrell | Sports Officer |
| OR | Oliver Ryan | Sports Officer |
| IB | Ishaan Bhide | VP Finance and Student Activities |
| CBr | Corey Briffa | President |
| TA | Tanisha Amin | VP Education and Welfare |

* 1. Minutes from the previous meeting were PASSED
  2. Action Points

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comms | 07/03 | Find out how to change the in office link | **ONGOING** |
| International | 07/03 | Liaise with MSci Y3 on outcome of communication with the ERASMUS student | **COMPLETE** |
| E+E | 21/03 | Talk to Comms about green impact | **COMPLETE** |
| E+E | 21/03 | Get in contact with Kingston E+E rep | **COMPLETE** |
| Heritage | 04/04 | Sent comms photo for app | **COMPLETE** |
| Rep Officers | 04/04 | Speak to senate about how to improve personal tutor system | **COMPLETE** |
| Campaigns | 04/04 | Meet with Corey and Tanisha | **ONGOING** |
| Socs | 04/04 | File constitution and handover for Finance Soc | **ONGOING** |

1. **Reports**
   1. President
   2. VP (Finance & Student Activities)
   3. VP (Education & Welfare)
   4. General Secretary
   5. Events Officers
   6. Sports Officers
   7. Communications Officers
   8. Heritage Officers
   9. Charities Officers
   10. Societies Officers
   11. Community Project Officers
   12. Technical Officers
   13. Equality & Diversity Officers
   14. Environment & Ethics Officer
   15. International Officers
   16. Representation Officers
   17. Campaigns Officers

1. **Students’ Union Issues**
   1. Elections reminder (CBr)
   2. Handovers (FH)
   3. Awards amendment (Loc/JM/AS/NMel)
   4. Awards Committee reflection
   5. Progress Award
2. **AOB**
3. **Date of next meeting**

27th June 2017

**REPORTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **President** | CBr gave a verbal summary of the written report.  BO: is that the most voters we’ve ever had?  CBr: the most we’ve had is 950 and were on around 700  BO: is it SGSU here’s responsibility for the Nicosia students?  CBr: yes, everything they do with support comes through us. They don’t have a SU there but they do have representatives.  BO: in terms of the fire sale how cheap are the drinks?  CBr: they will be the cheapest ever on certain things but Rich is yet to give me a price list.  EO: what has to go from the bar?  CBr: I can’t disclose!  MD: when will be get the reports from the Student Trustees?  CBr: Will ask them  **AP: Fran to request for the next meeting**  MD: will we see the NUS report within exec?  CBr: yes we can do or feel free to ask me and I can show you.  OR: could you get confirmation for everything that’s staying in RLSC as we have had some questions?  CBr: only ergs and small weights if we want to keep them too. But none of the big equipment will stay. | PASSED |
| **VP F+SA** | IB: I have just come back from holiday yesterday so working through emails and backlog. Coming up I have the SGUL finance committee meeting where I will hopefully get information on the subvention for next year. | PASSED |
| **VP E+W** | TA was not present to give a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| **General Secretary** | FH gave a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| **Events Officers** | YK gave a verbal summary of the written report.  BO: will there be an event for the end of first and second year exams?  YK: no  **AP: EO to get smoke breathing dragon for election results**  **AP: Kat to bring Lorenzo!!!** | PASSED |
| **Sports Officer** | OR gave a verbal report: AGM, entry for LUSL winter leagues, cricket ongoing fixtures and have met with incoming sports officers. Will be now working on handover and ongoing fixtures and making sure all entries have gone through.  CBr: what’s happening with the varsity?  OR: we have bene told it’s a bit late with exams etc but may have a date for next year for it to be done! | PASSED |
| **Communications Officers** | SH gave a verbal summary of the written report.  CBr: when will I get the finalized app details?  SH: it’s Joe’s domain but hopefully in the next couple of weeks! | PASSED |
| **Heritage Officers** | AB gave a verbal summary of the written report.  AS: are they t shirts or rugby shirts and are last years getting them?  AB: rugby shirts and yes last years will too! | PASSED |
| **Charities Officers** | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report.  *CBr: why did I receive an angry email from Ronald Macdonald today complaining of you not 4replying to their emails?*  *SH: how did Danceathon and bake swale go and how much did you raise?*  *MD: how successful was PJ day?* | PASSED |
| **Societies Officers** | AS gave a verbal summary of the written report.  MD: how do we get a new gold card if someone lost it?  CBr: we can reprint the certificate but a new card is more difficult. | PASSED |
| **Community Project Officers** | MD gave a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| **Technical Officers** | EO gave a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| **E+D Officers** | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |
| **E+E Officer** | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report.  **AP: Send details of NUS green grant to Ethan.**  *MD: What are you growing in the allotment?* | PASSED |
| **International Officers** | BO gave a verbal summary of the written report.  TA: do you have a feel for what people are worried about with the dissolution?  BO: apart rom the standard issues of what degrees will look like I think most people are pretty clear about what they want and haven’t heard much that’s new. | PASSED |
| **Representation Officers** | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report.  *AB: who will be the cons side for making the list of the liberations officers, if Sarah is the pros side?*  *EO: the opinion poll at the steering group specifies on changes to women’s officer but as this done for the other roles e.g. BME and LGBT?*  *BO: what was the outcome of the discussions about the pathology museum?*  *EO: what do they think the implications of there not being anyone running next year and would you be willing to assist until the next election?* | PASSED |
| **Campaigns Officers** | No one present to give a verbal summary of the written report. | PASSED |

1. **Society Proposals**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ENDO Society | Matthew Anson, Beth Ward and Phoebe Paley gave a presentation on ENDO society including budget, events plan and background.  AS: What are the shifts they spoke about?  MA: for example, people could get certificates at the end of having shadowed doctors on various areas.  CBr: They spoke about biomeds and medics, but what about other courses and how will they be included?  Discussion  EO: they don’t seem the most enthusiastic groups we’ve seen but perhaps that to do with the subject of endocrinology! I think if they can get the interest though it would be good to promote that as its something that people may get into later in the course whereas there’s less at the beginning. Getting people involved and interested early might be a good thing.  OR: didn’t seem that well thought out, more that they just want to set it up and then see from there.  WM: agree, especially in comparison to the other societies we see sometimes.  CBr: I would lean on the side of caution and ask them to come back with more specific plans.  AS: I feel that not passing someone because their presentation isn’t as good as others is very fair when they’ve filled out everything that they need and meet all the criteria.  SH: could be pass them with the suggestion to talk to socs officers to refine their ideas for next year.  BO: I think they just need more thinking and planning to show than they showed us.  AB: I think it was the content of the presentation not just how it was given.  OR: what they have sent in doesn’t add anything to convince me further from their presentation.  AB: I propose that we neither accept nor reject this society and that they work on coming back with a more detailed plan for the society.  Seconded by CBr  Accept: 12  Reject: 0  Abstain: 3  PASSED by simple majority. | **Neither accepted nor rejected.** |
| SGHAC | Craig Brooks and Jack Dickinson gave a presentation on Athletics and Cross Country Society including budget, events and work they have done to look into starting the society.  OR: How would you combat the issues with eligibility within RUMS?  JD: The only question is over biomed so we will be working to push this through. It’s only really one event which is affected.  AD: I propose that we pass SGHAC as a society of SGSU  Seconded by AS  Accept: 4  Reject: 8  REJECTED  CBr: I propose we accept this society with the caveat that they change the name to ‘St George’s Athletics Club’  Seconded by WM  Accept: 13  Reject: 1  Abstain: 1  PASSED by simple majority. | **PASSED** |
| Palestinian Society | Hyat El-Zebdeh, Maxim and Hatidzhe gave a presentation on Palestinian Society including aims, budget, events plan and background.  WM: is it strictly cultural or will there be any political agenda?  HEZ: We are not going to introduce any political agenda to our society. We are aware of the ethical and other implications of having a political agenda and we will be only campaigning on the basis of a charitable agenda.  Discussion  CBr: I propose that 2we accept Palestinian Society as a society of SGSU  Seconded by AB  Accept: 15  Reject: 0  Abstain: 0  PASSED by simple majority. | **PASSED** |
| Sports and Exercise Medicine Society | Chloe Wilson gave a presentation on Sports and Exercise Medicine Society including event plans, budget and background.  BO: has she spoken to the Doctors she mentions on if they’d be interested in doing the talks?  CW: Not yet but I know the names so hopefully will be able to get in contact but didn’t want to bother them with emails incase we didn’t get passed!  BO: are the clinical patients open to all students and would they cost anything?  CW: upon contacting them we will see whether they need DBS etc so that would be something hat would have to be sorted by students so would be easier potentially f they already had DBS but we will see.  MD: how often will the sessions be?  CW: talks will hopefully occur before Christmas and a couple after Christmas but then exam season begins. If there’s good attendance, then we’d run more but probably 3 in first year. Placements will run throughout the year n on how many people want to do it and when.  MD: how will she equalize opportunities across courses?  CW: We could do blood doping for example which would be interesting to biomeds potentially more, and medics might be interested in other things so we are trying to cater for all. Have some thoughts for physios, currently still working on radiographers but I’m sure we will come up with something.  Discussion  AS: I propose we accept sports and exercise medicine society as a society of SGSU.  Seconded by OR  Accept: 15  Reject: 0  Abstain: 1  PASSED by simple majority. | **PASSED** |

1. **Students’ Union Issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Elections Reminder (CBr) | Please encourage people to vote! Results are the 16th and will be handover circles to make sure you’re there! We want 1000 people to vote! |
| Handovers (FH) | Handover deadline 14th July  Must meet with successors by 31st |
| Progress Award | SH: should be able to apply for it, if made great progress we might not know  EO: should have a cap but should be able to be awarded to more than one person or no people. If a society has made exceptional outstanding progress and more than one could have done this. Shouldn’t be an ‘of the year’ type award.  TA: I disagree I think it should be the society that has made the most progress that year  AB: I agree with Tanisha. The two people who have got it this year have stood out as this.  BO: if people put themselves forward for it could others still be considered?  KT: yes, that is constitutionally possible to move them.  AB: if there is a stand out society that has progressed then I think it should be treat3ed as all our other society awards. I think if more than one society can win it then it starts to devalue it  SH: I think I agree with Ethan but needs to be carefully considered how we word it to make sure that it is done well. Perhaps a cap is important.  BO: I don’t think only large societies can win the progress award. Wed can stick to one society and make sure we read all the nominations before we award it.  AS: I think Ethan’s ideas are conflicting with putting a cap on you make the award judged by the quality of the other applications not b the merit of that societies progression.  EO: I completely agree on that. Saying that having it for multiple people would devalue it, this doesn’t happen with laurels. The standard must be clearly laid out which you need to meet to win the award. The criteria needs to be such that it is clear the level.  EO I propose a motion to constitutionally se the progress award ihn such a way that there is no cap on awards given but the requirements for the award is written to specify exceptional and outstanding progress for the award.  Seconded by CBr  Accept: 10  Reject: 4  Abstain: 2  PASSED by simple majority.  EO: I propose that we mandate future exec to form a constitutional amendment for the progress award by next awards committee with the above details.  Seconded by SH.  Accept: 11  Reject: 3  Abstain: 2  PASSED by simple majority. |
| Awards committee reflection |  |

**650 limit**

CBr yes good keep, saw 3 good laurels applications so clearly the word limit didn’t cause a huge amount of damage.

AS the word limit increasing for laurels also defeats the point of bumping if we awarded people who didn’t get laurels gold cards this would be unfair them having more words and giving them a word count

SH agree - having more words makes sense limits the nomination so if someone doesn’t know how to write one well they would be done a disservice

TA - i think we should distinguish some kind of difference that laurels is far higher than the rest and we have seen this year that students can still be awarded it on he 650 words so just the recommendation would be good to show some kind of extra weighting in this award

MD need something so that exec can see something is written passionately and beautifully or if it can be a check box exercise then 650 words is fine

EO - I agree with Ash and Sarah’s points. the way to combat that as would be unfair to bump longer nomination I think the way it would be to by next year come up with a more verbose and thorough guide on how to write an application for people as we saw this year the quality in the 650 words deems whether you get it or not and so if we lower the word limit we should also have a guideline

CBr – people write abut their entire lives in less than 650 words in a personal statement so its possible in a laurels nomination

BO - I think that in addition to the guidelines we can provide an example if people are happy for that to be shared of a successful laurels application so people know what to write. we can combat the word limit by saying if you apply for laurels this cannot be bumped down from laurels except for the first 65 words if you stay in that limit. could submit two nominations gold and laurels

AB - i think we have a big discussion about what Mus said about whether it should be check box and from doing the committee we have all seen that it is a passionate thing and i don’t think students sit and think how to worm their way around the awards process they nominate people that really deserve the award. People don’t calculate how to ply the system

AS - i disagree i know there are people who block apply for awards I think people are aware of this ability. in terms of guidance on what they can include we have done this but people jut ignore it. we can force feed it but they still write what they think is good.

TA - i really think that we shouldn’t provide examples as people will copy and we will lose originality and will do it at last minute and the specialness will be left. its too easy to copy. i can see why we might suggest it but we need to encourage it to be done organically.

CBr - i think no example as if we wanted it to be an easy process for everyone it would devalue it - with a word limit and no examples it makes them authentic and they really have to think about it first

EO - UCAS don’t provide example statements but schools do and i think that its better to provide an example and discount those that are copy and pasted than to base it o an individual society going the best advice. we know that advise is given or awards are written by those who know the system intricately. i think not believing people will bend the system is a noble idea and we don’t want to set up a system where people can do that we should assume the worst regardless of our faith in people. when i said about guideline i meant more fleshed out with contacts i people want help etc

MD - we discuss this each year we want people to write passionately so why not let them write a bit more. Tell them like BO said and see what they do.

SH – completely agree with what BO said

EO I propose we keep the 650-word limit as established this year for next year across all award categories.

Seconded by AS

EO gave a one-minute speech for the nomination.

SH gave a one-minute speech against the proposal.

Accept: 3

Reject: 11

Abstain: 2

REJECTED

BO I propose that for laurels only we change the guidelines to increase it to a higher number to be decided at a later date, but also to increase restrictions on bumping and give clear straightforward guidelines that people can submit other nominations if they wish.

Seconded by SH.

BO gave a one-minute speech for the proposal.

CBr gave a one-minute speech against the proposal.

Accept: 12

Reject: 3

Abstain: 1

PASSED by simple majority

CBr I propose we change the laurels nomination word count to 800

Seconded by SH

Accept: 13

Reject: 0

Abstain: 2

PASSED by simple majority

**constitutional specifics**

CBr I propose that we mandate next years T4, chair and societies officer to make the awards committee more transparent including looking at guidance and support for those writing applications.

Seconded by WM

Accept: 15

Reject: 0

Abstain: 0

PASSED by simple majority

list of those that have won previously

AP societies to put in hand over

sensor proposers

AP hand over

guidance and support considering new word limit

EO I have heard concerns that people are under the impression the only successful ones are exec or close friends of exec

TA I think we shouldn’t be making it as easy as possible but showing how many people apply etc FOI if people want etc publicize these things

AS I think people like to complain but really its not true we opened the committee for the first time this year and people didn’t bother to do it so this shows something its not an issue that we have created it’s the way people see it

BO publicizing stats and myth busting is important

EO I think that is still providing better guidance. I think myth busting is part of that and ask to say that as a group of people in an exec meeting that people are wrong in their concerns so we can’t just dismiss these concerns

CBr to Ethan people haven’t complained officially we can’t just take anecdotes from people’s friends we’ve seen this year that we had high numbers of applicants which wouldn’t be the case if it was that difficult

BO I think we ought to push the external people to join more maybe that should be mandated to the next societies officers and if need more guidance then speak to societies officers and president

BO I propose that we add statistics to the awards advertising, societies officers do more to advertise the external members of the committee and ensure there is a line for more guidance if needed.

Seconded by FH

Accept: 15

Reject: 0

Abstain: 0

PASSED by simple majority.