

## Student Senate

Members of Student Senate are notified that the next meeting will be held:

**Tuesday 17 March 2020**

**Room 4J, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Students' Union 6pm**

---

## Agenda

Please contact the Student Voice Team on 02920 781434 or email [democracy@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:democracy@cardiff.ac.uk) to discuss any additions or amendments you may have or to request further information on any of the below agenda items.

### Section I Standard Items:

- A. Apologies
- B. Minutes from previous meeting

### Section II Students' Union Submitted Items:

- A. Re-appointment of External Trustees

### Section III Submitted Items:

- A. Bye Laws Amendments
- B. Stop Timetabling Exams on Consecutive Days
- C. Mature Wellbeing personal to solve mature persons issues =
- D. Agiesm
- E. Mature Accommodation Mature Induction

### Section IV Any Other Business:

- 1. Lapsed motions

The next meeting with take place at 6pm on Tuesday 21 April in 4J,  
Cardiff University Students' Union, Park Place

## SECTION I

### B. Minutes from previous meeting

## Student Senate Tuesday 28 January 2020, 4J at 6pm Minutes

#### In attendance:

Joshua Prior ( <i>chair</i> ) (JP)	Ahi Shahid (AS)	Flavie loos (FI)
Christopher Dunne (CD)	Zachary Edge (ZE)	
Jennifer Geminani (JG)	Razvan Timis (RT)	
Luke Doherty (LD)	Marshall Tisdale (MT)	
Hannah Doe (HD)	Kavian Shirkoohi (KS)	James Wareham (JW)
Janet Williams (JWi)	Sareena Ashdown (SA)	Orla Tarn (OT)

#### Apologies received:

Ashly Alave Garcia	Yiming Zuo	Edel Anabwani
Caroline Pilat	Jonathan Mace - Rep	Charlotte Malinson
Jeevan Kaur	Nia Condon - Rep	Rachel Beany
Rachel Beany	Josephine Acheampong - Rep	

#### Students' Union Staff in attendance:

Steve Wilford – Director of Engagement and Participation

Tim Fry – Student Voice Coordinator (AHSS)

April Beech – Student Voice Assistant (Democracy and Campaigns) (*minutes*)

**Section I**

C. Minutes from previous meeting

*Minutes were accepted.*

**Section II Submitted Items:****A. Should we lobby for the USS Pension Fund to Divest?**

NF: explains that some students have come forward to suggest that the University start lobbying for the USS Pension Fund to Divest because this is the heart of the Pension dispute with UCU for Academic Staff. University has divested it's own holding, and the next step is for the University to lobby the pension provider UCU. Shows power message if we pass this motion today.

No speakers against

JP asks for questions.

CD: Regarding your What other topics would you use your 30 mins on?

NF: Firstly any Postgraduate issues are discussed and then any other issues the staff can name that come to mind. Also any long term things that we get their opinion on.

No other questions for Nick.

*Motion Passed*

## B. Changing Society and Sports Club Membership Fees

CD: explains that it is unfair of societies to charge more or less depending on year of study, or new membership. Examples of this are Optometry Society and Law Society Cardiff. Societies that do are in the minority but those that are charging double than that of a returning member is wrong unless justified. Proposes that societies need to prove additional costs for new members as justification.

No speakers against

JG: How do the Optometry Society and Law society justify that behaviour?

CD: Not sure, question for the society.

RT: Are you for or against different societies charging differently for students to be part of the society? For example, Physics Society charges differently to Chemistry Society

CD: No. You should be able to join either society for the same price as other students.

No other questions

*Motion passed.*

## C. CU and CUSU Official Commitment to the Freedom of Speech.

LD: explains that students are reporting a culture of non-tolerance towards particular opinions and ideologies. For example, there have been a number of social media comments about the pro-life protest outside the university gates. Aim is to change the culture on campus from intolerance to one where diversity of thought is encouraged and for student to feel safe. Proposes a policy by CU and CSU to make a bold commitment to freedom of speech at public events and wants a default neutral approach towards issues. Three aims: 1) Removal of non-platforming policies, 2) Blanket removal of censors on papers, 3) Default stance of neutrality on politically charged issues. Also wants CUSU to introduce workshops to promote open-mindedness toward free speech.

JP: Charlotte Mallinson was unable to attend tonight but emailed a speech across to be read out. This doesn't reflect the view of me or the Chair, it is being read out verbatim.

“Feels that an official stance is not needed as free speech is already ingrained into the university as it is. Wants to disapprove this. By un-censoring newspapers, it allows exposure for hatred and foul opinions. By not adopting this approach we are not stifling others opinions, we are protecting those individuals that may be affected by harmful comments.”

JP: asks if the room would like another round of speeches.

*Another round of speeches is approved*

MT: statement from a student who couldn't be here tonight. Spoke for saying that this is an opportunity to make sure that everyone's rights for free speech are protected.

JWi: spoke against saying there should be checks and balances on freedom of speech in order to protect things/people from hurtful comments.

JP: Asks if another round of speeches is required?

*Another round of speeches is approved*

LD: responds by says we cannot label opinions that are not the same as our own as harmful/vulgar. It is the culture of intolerance that we should be looking to change. This is why it is a good idea to introduce workshops to promote people to accept a diverse range of opinions to help change this culture.

CD: spoke against saying that freedom of speech is important but that the remedied in place to remove hate speech are just as important. Furthermore, we do not want to affect the reputation of the university to be affected.

JP: Ask if another round of speeches is required.

*No more speeches required, move to questions*

JG: how CU and CSU should monitor hate speech on platforms not regulated by themselves and how can this censorship be justified?

LD: they're not talking about hate speech as this is a separate issue to culture of non-tolerance. It is the culture of intolerance we want to change.

JW: how do these ideas contribute to challenging the culture?

LD: will give a bold message to students that we're committed to freedom of speech. Regarding the un-censoring of newspapers, like to the Daily Mail, these newspapers are readily available anywhere else. The debate on pro-choice wasn't framed as a political issue.

AAG: asks for more elaboration on what actions should be expected of CU and CSU.

LD: proposes healthier non-platform policies, public events held in a non-partisan way and workshops promoting open-mindedness and tolerance.

OT: asks for Luke's definition of politically charged issue.

LD: example of Pro-Choice stance because of how divisive issue it can be. Nothing specific about what a politically charged issue.

JW: asks for clarification regarding if our stance on an issue should be neutral until the issue is raised in senate or if a change of protocol is needed so that this can no longer happen.

LD: CU and CSU should never take one position over another, it would always remain neutral and have no stance on any issue.

JW: responds by asking if that means they should remove the role of Student Senate or AGMs?

LD: clarifies that they want to remove AGM's ability to decide on a CSU stance.

JP: to clarify, you would to see AGM removed of its power to set policy?

LD: no to set a stance of the University on a politically charged issue.

OT: raises the point that this could remove freedom of speech in itself, as stances are democratically chosen.

LD: further clarifies that people would still have opinions as independent students but that is where the political opinions would end.

NF: explains that if this were to pass, the Student Senate does not have the power to strip previous things passed this academic year by AGM so the pro-choice stance or anything that is politically charged that has recently been voted cannot be changed this year. Furthermore, CU does not take stances as it is neutral and Student Senate cannot strip AGM's powers because it is constitutionally incorrect.

### *General discussion*

OT: adds that this is what CSU already does; it is always neutral to begin with until mandated by students to take a stance.

JW: policies for censoring for newspapers, etc is not currently in place. If there has been in the past, they are not active. Furthermore, CSU do not hold events that are left or right wing. It is up to the different political societies to put on those events and the number of events held by all are fairly shared out. If CSU were to try and regulate this, then it would involve removing some autonomy from societies.

KS: emphasised that the freedom of speech doesn't infringe upon anyone's protected characteristics. Proposes amendment to add "as long as that doesn't infringe on protected characteristics" to the motion so it would read:

"CU & CUSU commit to the Freedom of Speech by removing non-platforming policies; the blanket removal of censures on newspapers; and a default stance of neutrality on

politically charged issues as long as that doesn't infringe on protected characteristics"

*Amendment accepted*

JG: the proposer of the pro-choice motion was harassed by the Christian Union and threatened to the point that CSU had to intervene. This shows there is a conflict of ideas because by being neutral we cannot protect those who are affected by hate speech.

LD: there are clear distinctions between 'freedom of speech' and using loaded terms such as 'hate speech' for opinions we dislike. By removing the culture of non-tolerance it should be easier engage with people that you disagree with.

OT: proposes procedural motion 3 – question not to be put.

JW and CD seconded.

OT: spoke in favour of the motion. The proposed motion does not do anything that CSU does not already do.

*Procedural motion 3 is passed. Discussion ceased.*

*Procedural motion 3 - No vote taken*

#### **D. Support and advice to pregnant mothers.**

LD: explained they want CSU to provide pregnant mothers with balanced information about the choices they can make regarding their pregnancy. Proposes equally helpful pro-life as well as pro-choice advice and website links on the SU website to help eradicate the current stigmas.

CD: spoke against saying this attacks the pro-choice stance that was passed at AGM. AGM is our highest policy making body and we should abide by their decision. The pregnancy support is on the website and there is no preference on them. Links on that page are to the NHS which is a medical organisation which is neutral.

JP: asks is another round of speeches is required.

*Another round of speeches is approved*

LD: disagrees saying it is unfair to say that this motion is attacking the pro-choice stance. The intention is to try and offer equal information about all options by filling in the gap of information.

JP: reads from Charlotte Mallinson's email (verbatim). This is not the view of the Chair.

With reference to the 2<sup>nd</sup> motion. This motion is irrelevant, the pro-choice motion taken to AGM was due to the fact that there was not sufficient information available. The issue that

should be being dealt with is the abhorrent stance of CRB protesters outside the university.

JP: Is another round of speeches required?

*Another round of speeches is approved*

LD: intending to close the gap of information as the NHS pages does not have much specific information and does not include emotional support. Furthermore, post-abortion support should be made available.

JG: disagree saying they believe that every woman knows their own body and their circumstances. The NHS offers all the information needed and there is a lot of support available at CSU at Student Advice.

### *General discussion*

OT: adds that CUSU website should not be the gateway for whether someone should terminate or keep a pregnancy and that it should just be signposting people to neutral organisations like the NHS. This makes sure the person is better informed of all choices and CSU does not bias itself in anyway.

JWi: at the time you are effected mentally and you have to go somewhere neutral and have the correct medical information and then you can make the choice as an individual. It's a women's choice, it could also affect members of the trans community.

LD: reiterates that CUSU website it only directs you to the NHS which does not have detailed enough information and it does not deal with emotional support. Furthermore, it does not take into account cultural/religious lifestyles. CUSU website should close this gap in the information.

SA: asks if it is just the NHS website on CUSU.

JP confirms.

OT: states that this conflicts with one of the issues at AGM which was to have neutral info on SU website.

ZE: the motion is seeing the word pro-choice and saying that it is pro-termination. The argument is we should have pro-life links on the webpage but pro-choice is neutral.

LD: confirms that that is not the case.

JW: proposes an amendment to change all gendered words to be more trans-inclusive (gender neutral). All references to “women” be changed to “individuals” and “motherhood” to “parenthood”.

“Whilst individuals are entirely free to choose a termination, they are equally free to keep their pregnancy. Thus, information and links to pro-life organisations who offer counselling and practical support to individuals in crisis pregnancies should be made available on CU's Pregnancy Support Page. Post-Abortion support should be made equally available, too. CU & CUSU should work to actively eradicate the stigma attached to pregnancies and parenthood whilst at University.”

*Amendment passed*

JW proposes an amendment to remove the words ‘pro-life’ so means that any information provided by CSU is not in reference to any other organisation.

“Whilst individuals are entirely free to choose a termination, they are equally free to keep their pregnancy. Thus, information and links to organisations who offer counselling and practical support to individuals in crisis pregnancies should be made available on CU's Pregnancy Support Page. Post-Abortion support should be made equally available, too. CU & CUSU should work to actively eradicate the stigma attached to pregnancies and motherhood whilst at University.”

*Amendment passed*

CD: proposes procedural motion 2 – goes straight to a vote on the motion.

JG seconded.

CD: all relevant amendments have been put forward and accepted by the proposer, so we should move straight to a vote.

*Motion passed*

## E. Protection of Religious Freedoms

LD: explained that people should be able to express their religious views openly, some religious societies such as the Catholic society wanting to be disaffiliated from the Guild of Societies after the Pro-Choice motion passing at AGM due to moral straining. This raises questions about inclusivity. Proposes a commitment by CSU to ensuring people can express them and therefore protect their religious freedom. Wants the university to have a bold commitment to protecting religious freedom, open to discussion about how the University and the Students' Union can protect religious freedoms.

JP: reads statement from Charlotte (verbatim)

“SU has always had religious societies. It was due to the Student for Life society that prompted the Pro-Choice AGM motions. whatever personal opinions are to the pro-choice stance; the stance was passed democratically to support the views of the majority of students. This has brought sense of security to women at the university and these motions would negatively impact the student body as well as disrupting The SU has not adopted a religious stance. “

JP: asks if another round of speeches is required.

*No more speeches required  
General Discussion*

Jennifer proposes procedural motion 2 – move to vote.

No one seconds.

CD: How do we accommodate religious students and what specifics are there about CU and CUSU protecting religious freedom?

OT: asks for clarification regarding the word ‘actively’ as by law CU and CUSU already have to protect religious freedom.

LD: didn’t want to be prescriptive as this should be a round-table discussion and engaging with the communities. Wanted to make a bold commitment and that could open doors. What ways can we as the Students’ Union change the culture?

OT: we already hold protection of religious freedoms highly as it is the law. We are an inclusive organisation and we welcome this.

LD: there was the threat of excommunication from the point of a Catholic. Some may not feel the moral stain but it is very important that we’re at the advice of our chaplain and some students feel that we cannot re-join the Guild of Societies until significant issues are explored. The question of inclusivity is an important one.

OT: please come and talk to us about this.

CD: doesn't know of any Catholic student who has been excommunicated for having pro-choice views.

LD: If you are a member of a pro-choice organisation it can lead to excommunication.

CD: what are the lines of communication with the Catholic Society?

OT: SU reached out to Catholic society but they were advised by the chaplain not to meet with the SU.

ZE: if they re-join then what does that mean for the pro-choice decision decided at AGM?

LD: doesn't speak on behalf of Catholic society of chaplain, that is a question for them. There would be questions surrounding the compatibility.

CD: come other societies have decided to stay. Proposes amendment to add "Student Senate mandates VP Societies and Volunteering to periodically contact recently disaffiliated societies about the reasons that prevented them from re-affiliating"

*Amendment accepted*

JG: if the society wishes to disaffiliate it is their decision.

SW – the Catholic society have expressed a wish to disaffiliate themselves, this is awaiting discussion before being finalised.

JG: if the society wishes to disaffiliate it is their decision. It is clear that they are allowed to come and discuss with the Students' Union.

OT: proposes procedural motion 3

JG seconded

*Procedural motion fell*

LD: there is no talk at the moment that the catholic society re-affiliating. If a guild wants to leave because of religious convictions, this motion is trying to protect this and the students it involves.

JG: majority of Catholics at the university may not be part of the catholic society.

OT: proposes procedural motion 3

ZE seconded

OT: another policy on this is unnecessary because it is already a protected characteristic and ingrained in law. Please come and see us on societies and disaffiliation in this case.

LD: spoke against procedural motion, a community of people feel that their views have been contravened and the culture needs to change.

*Procedural motion 3 passed – discussion ends*  
*Procedural motion 3 - no vote taken*

### Section III Any Other Business

1. No lapsed motions
2. Nominations for the Spring Elections are open and closes Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> February.

*Close of meeting*

# End of minutes from Tuesday 28 January 2020

## **SECTION III Submitted Items**

### **A) Bye Laws Amendments**

Introduction:

The Bye Laws and their Appendices form part of the governing documents of the Students' Union. The Memorandum and Articles of Association is the main document which is hard to change and doesn't involve many details. This just says what the Students' Union is for and what it will involve. The Bye Laws flesh out the Art and Mems by providing more details about what will happen within the Students' Union, and the Bye Laws Appendices lay out the processes for how these things will happen. The Bye Laws and Appendices can be changed jointly by the Student Council (Senate) and the Board of Trustees. You can find all three of these documents here: <https://www.cardiffstudents.com/about-cusu/governance/mem-arts/> Together, these three documents govern this Students' Union. What most of the below amendments seek to do is tidy up the Bye Laws in terms of where they conflict with each other, and where they may be open to interpretation. Some of the below are also my personal views on how the Students' Union (mainly Senate and Scrutiny) should be conducted. These are views that I have accumulated during my three years on the Senate, including my current year as Chair.

Bye Law	Current	Proposed	Rationale
<p>Bye Law 4.8</p> <p>This Bye Law relates to Members Meetings and the timeline from petition to meeting.</p>	<p>A members' meeting shall be organised by the Union as soon as possible after the trigger, but no longer than 10 working days.</p>	<p>A members' meeting shall be organised by the Union as soon as possible after the trigger, but no longer than <b>21 days</b>.</p>	<p>The current timetable requires quite a tight turnaround for an EMM to be held after the trigger. By increasing the number of days required from 10 working days to 21 days, the Union gains an extra week for flexibility. This is needed for discussions with the Chair and the proposers of motions, as well as Welsh translation.</p>
<p>Bye Law 5.2.1a</p> <p>This Bye Law relates to the composition of the Student Council (Senate)</p>	<p>Any two Sabbatical Trustees of the Union</p>	<p>Any two Sabbatical Trustees of the Union <b><u>for the term of the Council</u></b></p>	<p>Currently the Sabbatical Trustees choose who attends on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which I don't believe the Bye-Laws intended for. This addition clears up confusion. The document later specifies that ten academic reps will be selected on a meeting by meeting basis. This is how Students' Unions such as Loughborough organise their council. Sabbatical Trustees, like all student members, will be invited to attend and debate as appropriate, however I believe the Bye-Laws only intended for two Sabbatical Trustees to be permanent members.</p>
<p>Bye Law 5.2.1c</p> <p>This Bye Law again relates to the composition of Student Council (Senate)</p>	<p>25 Student Members, elected by way of cross campus ballot, with 12 places reserved for self-defining women</p>	<p>25 Student Members, elected by way of cross campus ballot, <del>with 12 places reserved for self-defining women</del></p>	<p>Whilst I do of course support a gender balance, I don't believe reserved spaces are necessary. Cardiff is an incredibly egalitarian Students' Union which empowers women - the last 5 Students' Union Presidents have been women.</p>

<p>Bye Law</p> <p>5.2.1f</p> <p>This Bye Law again relates to the composition of Student Council (Senate)</p>		<p><u>The Chair of Student Senate</u></p>	<p>Just as the Chair of the Board of Trustees is a member of the Board, I believe the Chair of Student Senate should be a member and consequently entitled to a vote. If passed, it is recommended that Bye Law 5.5.5 changes to add "in addition to the vote that they have already cast"</p>
<p>Bye Law</p> <p>5.9.2</p> <p>This Bye Law talks about Student Council (Senate)</p>	<p>If deemed appropriate a vacancy on Student Council can remain vacant but quorum shall not be adjusted.</p>	<p>If deemed appropriate a vacancy on Student Council can remain vacant <b><u>and quorum will be adjusted accordingly.</u></b></p>	
<p>Bye Law</p> <p>6.1.7</p> <p>Bye Laws 6 is about the Scrutiny Committee. 6.1 is about its composition</p>	<p>[Does not currently exist]</p>	<p>Any member of the Student Council shall be invited to attend, but shall not be a member.</p>	<p>As a committee of Council, the members of Council should be offered the opportunity to attend.</p>
<p>Bye Law</p> <p>6.1.8</p> <p>Bye Laws 6 is about the Scrutiny Committee. 6.1 is about its composition</p>	<p>[Does not currently exist]</p>	<p>The Chair of Student Council and any Councillors attending (if not elected as Scrutiny Committee Members in their own rights) shall, with the permission of the Chair, be entitled to speak and ask questions - however will not be entitled to a vote.</p>	<p>Clarifying the status of the above members.</p>

<p>Bye Law</p> <p>6.2.2</p> <p>Bye Laws 6 is about the Scrutiny Committee.</p>	<p>In order to transact business at least six Scrutiny Committee Members shall be present.</p>	<p>In order to transact business at least <u>half of the members of the Scrutiny Committee plus one</u> shall be present.</p>	<p>Six is currently half plus one, however if the number of Scrutiny Committee members ever changes, it's good practice to have this bye law written as half plus one as is done with the Bye Laws relating the Student Council</p>
<p>Bye Law</p> <p>6.2.3a</p> <p>Bye Laws 6 is about the Scrutiny Committee.</p>	<p>Six Members of the Committee</p>	<p><u>Half of the Members of the Committee plus one</u></p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Bye Law</p> <p>6.2.3c</p> <p>Bye Laws 6 is about the Scrutiny Committee. 6.2.3 discusses how an extraordinary Scrutiny Committee Meeting may be called.</p>	<p>A majority of members of the Sabbatical Trustees' Executive Committees</p>	<p>A majority of members of any one of the Sabbatical Trustees' Executive Committees</p>	<p>For clarity. If a Scrutiny Committee is being called by an Exec, it should only be needed to be called by one of the Execs, for that Sabbatical Trustee.</p>
<p>Bye Law</p> <p>6.3.4</p> <p>Bye Laws 6 is about the Scrutiny Committee.</p>	<p>Where appropriate to support and empower Sabbatical Trustees and Campaign Officers in the projects that they undertake</p>	<p>[Remove this Bye Law, 6.3.5 becomes 6.3.4]</p>	<p>There is no actual way for the Scrutiny Committee to support officers. This bye law is therefore redundant.</p>
<p>Bye Law</p> <p>7.4</p> <p>This Bye Law discusses the Sabbatical Trustees of the Union</p>	<p>[does not currently exist]</p>	<p>Each Sabbatical Trustee shall be entitled to an Executive Committee. An Executive Committee shall refer to any group of student volunteers who aid the</p>	<p>Currently most Sabbatical Officers have Executive Committees, but there is currently no constitutional provision which lays this out. This proposed addition seeks to clear this up, as well as outline what an Executive Committee is, which will help Bye Law</p>

		Sabbatical Trustee in their duties. Each Sabbatical Trustee shall recruit these Executive Committees however they so choose, other than the Vice President Sport and AU President, and the Vice President Societies and Volunteering - whose Executives shall be laid out in Bye Law 12 and Bye Law 14 respectively.	6.2.3c (above) which refers to Executive Committees.
Bye Law 16.1  This Bye Law only discusses the Policy Book	The Union shall keep a Policy Book, published on its website and shall ensure it is maintained as a true record of the Policy of the Union as resolved by Members Meetings and Student Council	The Union shall keep a Policy Book, published on its website and shall ensure it is maintained as a true record of the Policy of the Union as resolved by Members Meetings, and Student Council, <b><u>and Referenda.</u></b>	Per 18.3 or the Memorandum and Articles of Association, Referenda may also set the Union's policy
Appendix 2 Section 1 4.b  This Appendix discusses the elections process for elected officers.	The Union will provide a platform for the wider student population to scrutinise and question election candidates	[Remove]	Is not always possible. Has never, in my memory, happened for Autumn Elections and has not happened in 2020 for the Spring Elections. This Bye-Law is also believed to have already been removed.
Appendix 2	If the office of a Sabbatical Trustee becomes vacant in accordance with	If the office of a Sabbatical Trustee becomes vacant in accordance with	The assumption should always be to replace the Elected Officer unless the Council disagrees by a supermajority. By assuming

<p>Section 1</p> <p>9c</p> <p>This Bye Law discusses what to do if a Sabbatical Trustee resigns or is otherwise removed from office.</p>	<p>Article 30.2 the office shall remain vacant for duration of the term, unless Student Council calls for the vacancy to be filled by cross campus ballot by a 75% majority vote.</p>	<p>Article 30.2 the vacancy shall be filled by way of a By-Election unless Student Council calls for the vacancy to remain vacant by a 75% majority vote.</p>	<p>the office to remain vacant, the implication is that this office is not essential. The 2019 AGM voted that all the current roles are essential and rejected any calls to reorganise the Elected Officer Team. Also Appendix 2: Section 1: 9a and 11a assume vacancies should be filled.</p>
<p>Appendix 3</p> <p>This proposed Appendix talks about who can submit a motion of no confidence in an elected officer.</p>		<p>Add 6b(i.iii): A Student Member</p>	<p>Any student member should be able to submit a motion of no confidence in a Sabbatical Trustee or Campaign Officer at Student Council</p>
<p>Appendix 3</p> <p>7c</p> <p>This Appendix discusses the procedure for how to conduct a Senate or Members' Meeting.</p>	<p>Amendments may negate the substantive motive but no amendment shall be discussed which is not relevant to the content of the substantive motion. The Chair's ruling on the question is final.</p>	<p>Amendments may <u>not</u> negate the substantive motive <u>and</u> no amendment shall be discussed which is not relevant to the content of the substantive motion. The Chair's ruling on the question is final.</p>	<p>The Bye-Laws, 4.5 states that "amendments must be relevant and not frustrate the intention of that business, as determined by the Chair." Negating the substantive content, however, is frustrating the intention of that business.</p>

## B) Stop Timetabling Exams on Consecutive Days

### What is the issue?

The last couple of days before an exam are important ones and if they have to be split up between multiple exams it means sacrificing effort in one exam for another.

### What is your idea?

Make it a priority when timetabling exams to ensure that the exams for a specific course are as spread out as possible.

## C) Mature Wellbeing person to solve mature persons issues

### What is the issue?

Mature people especially family people find it difficult to air their issues in the drop-ins to someone much younger (inexperienced as it has been indicated to me).

### What is your idea?

A need to identify and train persons who the more mature students will feel comfortable confiding to in matters relating to wellbeing.

## D) Agiesm

### What is the issue?

Relationship between the two generations can cause a problem.

### What is your idea?

Creating awareness that the university is a space for all irrespective of age. Especially during orientation wk when mature students have been asked if they were bringing their child to join university when they themselves were the students.

**E) Mature Accommodation Age Indication****What is the issue?**

Most mature students feel it is time mature was defined categorically. When one wants to get accommodation with mature persons and the flat ends up with 3 persons aged 23,24,25 relating becomes a problem as they (mature 30 and above) feel out of place.

**What is your idea?**

Residence to indicate age category when offering accommodation for anyone to make an informed decision of acceptance.

### Section III Any Other Business:

#### 1. Lapsed motions (28/03/17 – 28/03/20)

### Gender Neutral Toilets in Union and University Buildings

The Student Senate Notes

- The current arrangement for gender neutral toilets to be made accessible in all university buildings has been noted, but no official policy has been passed regarding this.
- To have documented policy in promoting gender neutral toilets will ensure all students of any gender identity are catered for in the facilities provided by the Students Union.
- To have documented policy will provide a basis upon which to structure any progress and a cornerstone document to reference in the event of further changes (e.g., construction of new buildings, renovations, etc.).
- The gender neutral toilets in the SU are multipurpose in that they also serve as disabled toilets. This means that these toilets which can be accessed in the Taf and during club nights in Y Plas require radar key access to prevent misuse. (NB: other gender neutral/ disabled toilets in the SU (e.g., the toilet on the third floor of the SU) do NOT require radar key access).
- There is no current formal arrangement for nonbinary students to gain access to these purportedly gender neutral toilets, nor to find out about how to ask for access, except via word-of-mouth.
- This grapevine/informal approach is insufficient and unsatisfactory, in that there is no formal pressure to heed the students' wishes, no formal channels by which to do so, and no legal mandate that staff and officers must give this priority. This leads to vulnerabilities to the informal system as well as general confusion as to how to operate when presented with students asking for access every single time. Furthermore, due to the nature of terms of officers requiring frequent changes, there is no guarantee that this information will be passed on.
- In many instances of having to request radar key access, students may feel uncomfortable, in cases of both disabilities and gender identity. Thusly, the need for a discrete system is paramount.
- The 'Cardiff University Strategic Equality Plan, 2016-2020,' published in 2016, notes in Objective 4, page 13 of its Equality Objectives that an 'Issue/Area for action' is 'Ensuring that the physical environment is inclusive of all those with protected characteristics,' and a need to focus on the 'provision of gender neutral toilets'.

### The Student Senate Believes

- Publicising the information that gender neutral/inclusive toilets are accessible for students who do not feel comfortable using men or women-only toilets is the only way to ensure fair process with regards to making sure these students feel represented and comfortable in the Union (specifically the toilet in the Taf and in Y Plas).
- Making the toilets multifunctioning for both disabled students and nonbinary students\* should not impede upon their usage, as this is in both instances a minority demographic within the student body. The proposer would moreover hope the disabled community would be welcoming to the LGBT+ community, and acknowledges that some students identify with both.
- The current radar key system, informality aside, requires a nonbinary\* student to essentially out themselves to a staff member in order to gain access to the radar-key-access-only gender neutral/disabled toilets in The Taf and Y Plas. This may cause students undue discomfort, and is absolutely not optimal to require nonbinary\* students to essentially prove their need to use the gender neutral toilets comfortably.
- The University should make strategic progress towards including at least one gender neutral toilet in each University building.
- Strategic progress towards including gender neutral toilets in university buildings is in line with the Cardiff University Strategic Equality Plan published in 2016.

### The Student Senate Resolves

- Nonbinary\* students who disclose need or want to use the gender neutral disabled toilets in the Student's Union must be given access via radar keys with which to do so.
- This option must be well-publicised in order for the said students to be able to find out about this option; this process of accessibility should not rest on the shoulders of the LGBT+ officers or association alone, as the ever-shifting composition of the group would require more training with regards to this programme, and could lead to oversight– as has happened in the past with the informal set-up.
- The Union/sabbatical officers must designate a consultant for the students to speak with who will then arrange for the individual to be given access.
- The Union must provide signage in all bathrooms in the Taf or Y Plas with regards to the radar key scheme for nonbinary\* students to find out about the scheme.
- The radar key system will only be used for future gender neutral/disabled toilets only in instances in which it can be explicitly proved that the radar key access system is the only way the toilets can be operated safely by the Union/University. The clear preference of this motion is for the radar key system to not be chosen as it may cause undue discomfort and inconvenience for many individuals who would seek to use these toilets.

- The Union will lobby the University to maintain efforts to include at least one gender neutral toilet in each University building, whether these buildings are current or planned for construction.
  - The Union shall lobby the University for the new Centre for Student Life building to follow this ethos and include gender neutral toilets.
- \*or others of the LGBT+ community who do not feel comfortable using the gendered toilets
- Cardiff University Strategic Equality Plan: [www.cardiff.ac.uk/\\_data/...](http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/_data/...) target="\_blank

## Establish a Welsh Speaking Students' Union

This Senate notes

- The relationship between Welsh speaking students and the Students' Union has not been productive and acceptable during recent years.
- The community of Welsh speaking students in the University is isolated from the main body of students within the University.
- The community of Welsh speaking students in Cardiff do not feel like they belong in CUSU, and they do not feel that they are being adequately represented. As a result of this, they do not take advantage of CUSU's facilities, and they do not take part in activities arranged by CUSU.
- Whilst positive steps have been taken during recent years to improve CUSU's Welsh language provision (f.e CUSU's Welsh language policy), the provision is still lacking in comparison to other universities in Wales, and the relationship between Welsh speaking students and CUSU continues to be insufficient in comparison to other universities in Wales.

This Senate believes

- The poor relationship between Welsh speaking students and CUSU is a big problem, and CUSU should work closely with the Welsh Language Officer, and the Welsh language societies in order to solve this problem as a matter of urgency.
- The best way to improve on this relationship is by establishing a body within CUSU that will be responsible for representing Welsh language speakers and learners socially, academically, linguistically, politically and with welfare issues, similarly to the bodies that were established in Bangor (UMCB) and Aberystwyth (UMCA) in the 1970's.
- Welsh speaking students in Cardiff should not receive poorer representation in Cardiff University – the university in the capital city of Wales, and the university with the highest number of Welsh speakers – than in other universities in Wales.

This Senate resolves

- A body will be established within CUSU that will be responsible for representing Welsh speaking students and learners socially, academically, linguistically, politically and with welfare issues within CUSU and the University.
- The name of this body will be 'Undeb Myfyrwyr Cymraeg Caerdydd'
- CUSU's 'UMCC and Social Integration Committee' will be responsible for making arrangements regarding establishing UMCC within the next weeks and months, with the aim to assure that UMCC will be established by the start of the 2017/18 academic year.

## Ablution Facilities in the SU

The Student Senate Notes

- Ablution is a ritual washing that Muslims undertake before praying which involves washing the hands, mouth, nose, face, lower arms, head, ears and feet.
- Currently there is no Ablution facilities in the SU so before using the prayer room on the 3rd floor the majority of Muslim students have to use Union toilets. The majority of these students use the 3rd Floor disabled toilet.
- Across the University buildings, quiet rooms are available for religious worship – but again suitable ablution facilities are lacking at the majority of these locations.

The Student Senate Believes

- The current Students' Union goals include being "Excellent at what we do by being totally inclusive" and having good facilities in place. There is an obvious lack of this facility in the Union and it should act to be more inclusive by offering this facility to the Muslim student population.
- Many Muslim students do not feel comfortable performing the ritual washing in normal toilets in case people walk in, which is why many use the disabled toilets.
- In discussion about this topic with the President of ISoc he said "practicing as a Muslim within daily uni life has proven to be a challenge for a lot of people, particularly in regards to praying 5 times a day. What we really need is a prayer room, ideally in every university building, complete with Ablution/ ritual washing facilities. This would be our main priority I feel to address the needs of Muslim students"
- There are over 1000 Muslim students in Cardiff University, with Muslims having to pray 5 times a day means that investment in ablution facilities would be well used and benefit a large number of students. Not to mention last for a number of years.

### The Student Senate Resolves

- The Union should look into installing ablution facilities within the SU ready for use at the latest at the start of the next academic year.
- The VP Welfare should lobby the University to install ablution facilities near quiet rooms that don't currently have them.