

Student Senate
Tuesday 14th May 2019
4J, Students' Union, 6pm

Attendance:

Senators

Janet Williams	Zhihan Li	Alex Keyter
Daniel Onafuwa	Tomos Evans	Hannah McCarthy
Tom Kelross	Shekina Ortom	Elly Owen
Caitlyn Parr	Benjamin Leonard	Josh Prior (Vice Chair)
Takura Nyamowa	Josh Eynon	Nick Fox (Chair)

Campaign Officers

Nia Jones
Hannah Ryan
Orla Tarn

Sabbatical Officers

Henri Page
Georgie Haynes

Student Academic Reps

Sai Woebking

Students' Union Staff

Steve Wilford - Director of Engagement and Participation
Taz Jones - Student Voice Coordinator (BLS) (minutes)
Lucy Davies – Student Voice coordinator (PSE)

I Standard Items:

A. Apologies

Apologies received from: Dimitra Psychari, Daniel Mapatac, Jacob Lloyd, Jacob Morris, Julia Rooke, Ollie Copleston, Jeevan Kaur, Kathryn Cribbin, Ayat Almezal and Zachary Edge.

B. Minutes from previous meeting

JP raised that Jen Kent's name is spelt incorrectly and needs to be amended.

Minutes were approved.

II Students' Union Items:

A. Election of Chair (for 2019/20)

JP spoke for two minutes
BL spoke for two minutes

Josh Prior elected as Chair.

B. University-Nominated Trustee Ratification

NF explained about the Board of Trustees, and that trustees need to be ratified by Student Senate. The University-Nominated Trustee is Jayne Sadgrove.

EO asked why they weren't circulated before today, including to the student trustees.

TJ explained that they did not have the details before today.

Jayne Sadgrove was ratified.

C. Student Trustee Ratification

NF explained that the student trustees have gone through a shortlisting process to be offered a position as a student trustee.

DO gave a 30 second speech about why senators should ratify them.

Gabriella Gropper, Ryan Singh and Daniel Onafuwa were ratified.

D. Amendments to Bye Laws

NF stepped down as chair for this section as they had submitted half of the amendments and JP chaired.

i) Activities Executive Committee

GH spoke for the motion, explaining it's important to have a broad range of members of the committee and to select them themselves.

EO asked if there is any evidence that selection shows more diversity rather than an election.

HP explained that students are more confident to apply rather than run in an election.

GH explained that students have not engaged with the election process for their exec.

AK asked what the selection process would consist of.

HP replied it would be like what the other execs go through - a short questionnaire and questions to candidates.

EO commented that the amendment does not say that the selection is done by a committee.

HP suggested changes to the amendment to include committee

Amendment of bye law to read "No less than five and no more than eight student members annually selected from the Guild of Societies membership by a panel chaired by the Vice President Societies and Volunteering" and "No less than five and no more than eight student members annually selected from the Athletic Union membership by a panel chaired by the Vice President Sports"

Amendment passed.

ii) Notice of Poll

HP explained that notice of poll would be released as soon as possible.

GH added that it will aim to be in 24-48 hour period.

Amendment passed.

iii) The Count

GH explained the amendment and that it is a preventative measure.
SO asked for clarification.
GH further explained and read out the rationale for the amendment.

Amendment passed.

iv) Complaints and Appeals Procedures

HP explained it's a clarification about what already happens.

Amendment passed.

v) Order of Business

GH explained the amendment and added that it should be advertised to students which motions are going to AGM and which to Student Senate, and the Chair can choose to table some motions for Student Senate.
SW asked for clarification.
JP and NF clarified what the amendment means for AGM and Senate.

Amendment passed.

vi) Scrutiny Committee Membership

NF explained the amendment. Change committee membership for Scrutiny, reverting back to elections but keeping in the option for applications and selection.
NJ asked if this goes against the societies and AU exec selection process.
NF explained that the time that it takes to set up interviews is too long when Scrutiny Committee is needed by November.
AK asked if there is a reason that it's not run more regularly.
JP explained that isn't related to this motion. You could suggest an amendment for next year to change how often Scrutiny meets.

Amendment passed.

vii) NUS Conference Delegate Replacement

NF explained the motion and that it allows any spaces to be filled by Student Senate and the Sabbatical Officer team. The second part means that the President can go as an observer, but if they are elected as a delegate then they can nominate a VP to go as an observer in their place.

Amendment passed.

viii) AGM Motion Amendments

NF explained the motion. Anyone can submit a motion to AGM, and anyone can submit an amendment up to 24 hours to AGM. This is to move it to 48 hours before AGM starts so Student Voice and students can prepare.

Amendment passed.

ix) Sabbatical Budget over £500

NF explained the motion. It's to provide more transparency about what the officers are spending money on and to allow better scrutiny.

EO explained that they haven't seen any disagreement from students or staff about SU President travelling to Namibia. Questioned the motive behind this amendment.

NF explained that this motion was not to allow Senate to vote on whether they should have spent the money, it is just for transparency.

EO asked what Senate could do if they disagreed with spending after it had happened.

AK asked if large spends should come to Senate as a motion

NF replied that it's for Senate to see for transparency and to scrutinise.

EO explained they didn't see the point of the motion as the money will have already been spent and discussion wouldn't change anything.

HP explained that the campaigns budget is discussed between all Sabbatical Officers. The Sabbatical Officer team then vote and if it's approved then the SU President signs it off. There was a long discussion before the President travelled.

JW explained that they may be issues with the wording of the rationale.

TN asked if there were any more examples about where you would like to see transparency.

NF explained that they haven't seen any campaigns as an engaged student and haven't seen anything about expenditure.

JW disagreed and explained they have seen a lot in Scrutiny committee.

JP ended the discussion to let voting commence.

Amendment passed.

EO departed from the meeting.

NF resumed as Chair.

III Submitted Items:

A. Nextbike at University Halls

BL asked if this is necessary.

HP explained that students want this.

NJ commented that Cardiff University is in partnership with Nextbike.

OT explained they are currently living at Uni Halls and are a Resident Life Assistant. Concerned that many students would use the bikes away from Uni halls but not back again.

NJ replied that there are trackers on the bikes and team of people redistribute bikes around bike racks. Doesn't know when a Nextbike station would be considered ineffective.

Motion passed.

B. Adopt 'Climate Change' Emergency Status in solidarity with other UK Universities

NJ spoke for the motion and congratulated proposer on the large engagement. Wants to change the wording of the motion to lobby Cardiff University to announce a climate change emergency. UK universities are behind on their climate change targets.

Motion passed.

C. Getting rid of 50 supports for a motion limit

JW spoke for the motion and explained that although the last motion had lots of votes, often smaller motions don't get through. 10 people is more viable as minorities may not be getting their voices heard.

AK spoke against the motion and suggested that the platform needs to be brought to the students. If it's less than 50, a less serious motion could get through. Asked why they can't get 50 votes.

SW added that they hadn't heard of it and it needs more publication.

NF explained that any student can do it, just need to log on to cardiffstudents.com.

JP proposed an amendment to not put a number on the engagements.

JW replied that the system is not well known and accepted the amendment.

NJ asked why it was changed.

HP explained that there was an extensive consultation last year.

JP added that 16-17 senators wanted it to change.

NJ submitted a motion early this year and it took a lot of effort to get the 50 engagements. A student who was not an officer or confident enough may not feel that they can put forward an idea.

GH asked if there was a screening process for joke motions.

NF explained the difference about operational and political and that this means that not all ideas will go up on the website if the issue can be dealt with by staff in an operational manner.

HP commented that the system has been successful so far and helps to avoid debates on topics that only a couple of people care about. It should be a senator's responsibility to go out and talk to peers and encourage engagement on the topics.

SW added that they feel that the SU underestimates the students to engage in a serious manner.

TK explained they didn't think the climate change issue would've received as much engagement without the system. Thinks that 50 is a reasonable number.

NJ explained that they submitted a motion about the balloon ban, but it took time for students to vote for it. We shouldn't expect students who are just dealing with degrees and have other issues to put in that time. I had to put in the effort to get it to 50 votes.

OT added that it is Senate's responsibility to represent the voice of students, even if it's just one student.

SW commented that the updated system would show the number of students engaged with it

JP added that you can already see this.

AK suggested having a senator second the motion for it to be brought to senate.

AK proposed an amendment to keep the 50 engagement or add that if a senator seconds the idea then it comes to Senate.

JW disagreed as there are students who don't have the confidence to approach a senator.

AK asked if lowering the number would be accepting that students won't get involved with the Students' Union.

HP proposed a procedural motion to go straight to a vote.

OT seconded.

Motion passed.

D. Lift Accessibility

Submitted by Rhiannon Lunney.

JW spoke for the motion and explained about accessibility issues and that they feel that the University don't always take this into account. In the Main Building the lift is on other side of the building and is old fashioned.

GH did not disagree but explained that the motion isn't around limited accessibility. It's about signage around lifts and who can use them.

BL added that it's asking for signs to consider people who have disability when using the lift, but it contradicts itself when it says not every disability is visible.

HP replied that it's just asking to consider everyone and not assume people are lazy.

BL suggested a sign saying, "please only use this lift if you're disabled".

JW added that a sign that says not all disabilities are visible would be useful.

OT this motion is about another stop and think point, it's a point of consideration about people with disabilities.

Motion passed.

IV Any Other Business:

A. Lapsed motions

There were no lapsed motions this year.

B.

TK asked what is the scope of AOB.

NF explained it's for any other items that weren't on the agenda for the meeting.

TK commented that it's been a good year in senate and has enjoyed it.

HP asked for any more ideas about how to engage with students.

SW suggested putting everything in one place, with summaries as the intranet is confusing.

Need basic links to websites etc that can be used.