Societies Executive Committee Meeting 4 Agenda

11/10/2023

1. Welcome and Apologies

Apologies from Elohor and Karen/ This semester Karen will be joining from 3 pm due to placement requirement.

1. Approve Minutes from Societies Exec 3

Justyna has amendment suggestions to make to the last Soc Exec minutes. Typos and committee members leaving and re-entering the room should be reflected in the minutes to reflect democratic processes if society discussed is from Society Exec member.

Minutes were approved after the ‘Societies Exec competition/initiative for 2023/24’ agenda point.

1. Matters Arising

Battle of the societies quiz

5 societies turned up to the quiz so only £50 was put into pot.

The Societies Exec are happy to cover the rest of the money to make up £100.

It is confirmed by the Societies Exec for Justyna that if this situation arises again, Societies Exec will be happy for this to be the precedent.

* Societies Exec competition/initiative for 2023/24

Jamie presents the idea of holding a Charity Month related to wellbeing, welfare or climate action fundraising as competition is a great way to engage societies. This is agreed upon by Justyna, who asks the Exec for opinions on the competition ran last year. Jamie responds that this did not enhance engagement; it was a good idea in theory but did not work. Justyna adds that it was not advertised enough, and that a switch in initiative is a good idea.

The Societies Exec were unsure what the Charity Month concept is – Jamie provides: The Charity Month is a month where societies raise money for charities. In previous years, Book Club and Marys Meals won the prize for Best Collaboration. Another award which was presented was for Best Event. The money raised by societies can be donated to any charity of their choosing.

Jo questions if Charity Month is a set month in the calendar – Jamie responds that it can be any month the Exec choose, although in previous years it was at around March time. Following this, Justyna proposes that we hold Charity Month in February/March time, or at a point where societies would have enough time to plan and hold events.

On the entire suggestion of Charity Month as this year’s society initiative, Erin says that it is up to the Exec, and that it would fall under Justyna’s manifesto and align with the Union’s larger values. She does recommend getting societies input on what they would like to fundraise for and makes the Exec aware that 16 Days of Action and Fight for the Night is approaching soon and there could a potential for alignment here. Ultimately, it depends on the timing that the Exec choose.

Erin offers to do a check-in of what’s going on operationally at Strath Union, to see when there may be availability from comms and other teams to best support this initiative.

Justyna suggests that Charity Month is structured as being well-being and sustainability-based instead of the categories of previous years.

The Societies Exec also agree that the sole focus on quantitative judging from last year was not good and that quality should be integrated also, as some societies have an unfair advantage otherwise. Justyna does raise the question though of what the judging criteria would then be for the ‘Best Wellbeing Event’, for example. Erin summarises that there is a decision to made about whether Charity Month focuses on fundraising or impact, and this is up to the Societies Exec. She also notes that quantitative metrics would be easier to judge, but that if they chose to judge qualitatively, it should be done in alignment with the Strath Union and the initiatives currently being run, such as Active & Engaged. This way, societies could use the Charity Month to gain their Active & Engaged badges. Erin agrees with Justyna that going for 2nd semester would mean that there would be time to plan and encourage societies to participate. Justyna adds that if we had dates for Charity Month to present at the next GM, the level of engagement with societies could be higher.

Justyna delegated the next actions to be taken by the Societies Exec following this discussion. Jamie and Olivia are tasked with thinking about which prizes could be given for the awards. Cameron and Jo are tasked with defining the judging criteria for the awards. After Jo’s suggestion, Justyna confirms that she will set up the categories for the awards after the meeting, as these will need to be defined first before the rest of the Exec can act. After Erin’s suggestion, Justyna also confirms that she will create a shared document for this work. It is then decided that those who were not able to attend the meeting at that point will be included in the shared document, and caught up properly at the next meeting, and in the meantime, they can provide their overall suggestions on Charity Month. The Exec agree to report back on their progress at the next Exec meeting.

1. Budget Update

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Arts and Culture** | **General Pot** |
| **Start of year** | £15,000 | £40,000 |
| **After Exec 1** | £14,410 | £38,785.26 |
| **After Exec 2**  | £12,964.82 | £38,135.26 |
| **After Exec 3** | £10,324.82 | £36,328.79 |

1. New Affiliation Requests
* Seventh Day Adventist Students’ Association (SDASA)

Faith & Culture – agreed

APPROVED

The Societies Exec wish to communicate that the society needs to elect committee positions in an EGM and that they should refer to the constitution to find out what an EGM is.

* Clyde Capital

The Exec have affiliated societies with similar aims before such as Business Boost. The main point of contention from the exec is the society’s seeming desire to be ‘practical’, invest and give financial advice, which cannot be allowed. The Societies Exec also question whether the society would be using their own money or money from Strath Union to invest, though they suspect that the society would have their own capital to begin with. Following this, the exec wonders if it would be a requirement for members to invest and risk their own money for the society to function. Strath Union would then face the consequences for this if members were to lose money. The Exec questions why they don’t instead focus on education, and there are existing societies who serve this purpose.

REJECTED

* Artificial Intelligence society (AISoc)

The Society Exec note that in the society’s affiliation application the President is noted as the Treasurer also. The application also provides a membership fee of ‘ABCDE’? The acronym of the society ‘AISoc’ is also too similar to other existing societies such as StrathAIS. The Exec note that the society does not need to use acronyms but if they desire it should not be like those of existing societies. The Exec find no fault in the society’s aims, they only wish to see amendments to the committee roles, the society name and details of the membership fee.

The Societies Exec also wish to communicate that the society needs to elect committee positions in an EGM, not appoint, and that they should refer to the constitution to find out what an EGM is.

REJECTED

* Strathclyde RAVE Community

The Societies Exec comment that the proposed £25 a year membership fee is quite expensive – they would like more information on what this would be used for and why it is £25. The Exec also observe that the society is too similar in aims to the Electronic Music Society, another society which has applied for re-affiliation. The Exec have decided not to affiliate either society, but to recommend that they link up with each other to apply as one society, or otherwise specify how they are different and then re-submit their applications.

REJECTED

* Irish Society Strathclyde

The Exec appreciate that the society’s committee has a well-being officer.

APPROVED

* PGR Wellbeing Society

The Exec appreciate that the society has a well-being officer. The Societies Exec are aware of this societies journey to be considered as an official body at the Sports Union/university and current application to affiliate to Strath Union.

The Societies Exec wish to remind the society that they need to elect committee positions in an EGM, not appoint, and that they should refer to the constitution to find out what an EGM is. They also wish to remind the society to submit a risk assessment for their activities going forward.

Apart from this, the Exec recommend that as well as seeking Strath Union grants for their society activities, that they enquire about funding from the Student Experience Committee, they are one of few societies that are eligible to be considered for this as a PGR Wellbeing society.

APPROVED

Essentially reaffiliations:

* Electronic Music Society (EMS) – **reaffiliation**

The Societies Exec agree, after some discussion, that as the society wishes to hold music nights that the Media, Art and Music category is correct for this society. They also appreciate that the society’s committee has a wellbeing officer. Music, Hobbies and Interests categories are quite tight.

However, the Exec observe that the society is similar in aims to the Strathclyde RAVE Community, another society which has applied for affiliation. The Exec recommend that they link up with each other.

APPROVED

* Arab Society – **reaffiliation**

APPROVED

* Antimicrobial Resistance – **reaffiliation**

The Societies Exec observe that the society wishes to re-affiliate their society with new committee members but haven’t confirmed if they have properly elected people. As such, the Exec wish to remind the society that they need to elect committee positions in an EGM, not appoint, and that they should refer to the constitution to find out what an EGM is.

APPROVED

* Equate – **reaffiliation**

APPROVED

* Postgraduate Psychology Society – PGPS – **reaffiliation**

The Society Exec note that the email provided for one of the committee members is their personal email and not their university email. This should be changed and if this committee member is not a student, they are not allowed to be on the committee.

APPROVED

* Indonesian Society – **reaffiliation**

The Societies Exec wish to remind the society that they need to elect committee positions in an EGM, not appoint, and that they should refer to the constitution to find out what an EGM is.

APPROVED

* Economic Society – **reaffiliation**

The Societies Exec agree that this society is Course-related. They also observe that the society has answered the question ‘Do you have any other committee members?’ with ‘Yes’. This response, although not providing the information that the Exec require, is accepted as a reasonable misinterpretation. The Exec ask that the society provides full details, including name, DS number and university email of the other committee members.

The Societies Exec also wish to remind the society that they need to elect committee positions in an EGM, not appoint, and that they should refer to the constitution to find out what an EGM is.

APPROVED

* Omani Student Society in Glasgow (OSSG) – **reaffiliation**

APPROVED

1. Welcome Grant Requests (£45) – For Information. Total: £45
* Marine Robotics - DONE

1. AGM Grant Requests (£25) – For Information. Total: £0
2. Silver Active and Engaged Societies (£15) – For Information. Total: £0
3. Gold Active and Engaged Societies (£30) – For Information. Total: £0
4. Grant Requests. Total: £4819.34

**Society: WILN+**

Grant Name: WILN+ Sisters Event (#1466)

Grant Amount: £14.08 (100 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 176

As this grant was submitted for consideration after the event, this request has been rejected. The Exec recommend that the society is signposted to the grant guidelines and the finance training also. The Exec wish to communicate that they do not give retrospective funding, with the exceptions of the Welcome and AGM grants.

REJECTED

**Society: Aerospace Innovation – Strath AIS**

Grant Name: Level 2 Rocketry Project (#1467)

Grant Amount: £791.47 (100 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 154

The Society Exec recognise a request of the exact amount has been approved before. This needs to be checked as they may have withdrawn this request – to be double checked by Erin.

**Society: Marine Robotics**

Grant Name: Autonomous Vehicle Pond Testing (#1471)

Grant Amount: £176.19 (100 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 13

As the project for which they have applied for funding starts on the date they have submitted the grant request, this has been rejected. The Exec recommend that the society is signposted to the grant guidelines and the finance training also. The Exec wish to communicate that they do not give retrospective funding, with the exceptions of the Welcome and AGM grants.

REJECTED

**Society: Arts and Crafts**

Grant Name: Sharmanka Kinetic Theatre (#1474)

Grant Amount: £91 (55 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 60

APPROVED – from Arts & Culture fund.

**Society: Jazz Orchestra**

Grant Name: Christmas Sheet Music (#1475)

Grant Amount: £289.70 (100 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 63

The Exec note that if the price of the pound changes, they cannot give the society more money. They also observe that the society applies for many grant requests but rarely part funds these, and that if this were the case the Exec would see it as an indication of planning and consideration and would be more likely to approve their grant requests.

At this point, Karen joins the meeting virtually, as the discussion of music societies is ongoing. Karen offers her perspective as someone greatly involved with music societies ­- The Arts & Culture fund was made for the music socs after the music department was disbanded. It’s widely understood that we are allowed to apply for full funding.

The rest of the Exec confirm that the language they wish to communicate to the society is that part-funding is encouraged as it is an indication of planning and consideration. The Exec will grant the funds, the Exec are just proposing out of curiosity that they never go for part funding although they apply for a lot of grants. It may improve their application success.

APPROVED – from Arts & Culture fund.

**Society: TEDx**

Grant Name: TEDx Professional Marketing Videos Project (#1477)

Grant Amount: £1750 (40 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 4

The Exec discuss the grant request of the society in detail:

Olivia asks – What is the TEDx society?

Cameron clarifies the reason for the video that the society has applied for funding to create – They will give it to the TEDx people, who will display it on their webpage.

Justyna questions the expected expenditure, specifically the video editing costs – There are already students who are paid by the Union to do this sort of stuff. How professional do they need this to be?

Jo offers – It doesn’t seem like the reach is worth the amount. The members can post it on their LinkedIn, but that doesn’t promote anyone but themselves. If it was done by the Union, it would have a wider reach for people to join the society. It seems that they are mainly focused on trying to improve the university reputation.

Jamie responds – TEDx has guidelines for video creation. The person they wish to pay the create the video will understand the guidelines and know how to implement this.

Cameron adds – These people have a specific style.

Karen asks – What is the video for?

Jamie answers – New sources of funding and sponsorship that help support activities for the year.

Cameron adds – They will officially publish the video on TEDx.com website and use it as promotional and marketing content.

Olivia comments – There are only 4 people benefitting but it would eventually bring in more students to the society.

Jo questions – If people are going to their events, why aren’t there more members in the society?

Cameron offers – Having professional videos would help them attract higher profile individuals.

Karen seeks clarification on- a contradiction in the grant request details – They say they are partially asking for Arts and Culture fund, but they say that it isn’t Arts and Culture.

Jamie offers – This may be a limitation of GAS.

Jo and Karen agree – It has been incorrectly placed in expenditure.

Justyna queries the grant request details also – They say that the other costs are meant to covered by sponsorship/Alumni fund. But they wouldn’t have that money until next Spring if it would be approved at all.

Cameron also queries the other funding sources – What would the department funding be, there is no evidence for this.

Erin decides – It is not an application of quality.

Justyna also summaries – There is no information on the outcomes and no summary.

Karen offers on the final decision – I wouldn’t suggest we approve it, but instead send it back and ask for clarification.

Justyna agrees – They should remove the fluff and give us evidence of the other funding source and what are they filming in plain language.

REJECTED

**Society: African Caribbean Society**

Grant Name: Art and Culture Grant (#1478)

Grant Amount: £286.90 (100 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 98

The Exec discuss the grant request of the society in detail:

Jamie asks – Will it benefit Strath students only or Strath and Glasgow students also? It would be helpful to know what the other party (GU) is contributing.

Olivia confirms the society category – Community-based society.

Erin agrees – The society is community-based. The event is a collaboration event with like-minded liberation groups.

Karen asks – How much they already have in their funds since they are asking for full funding?

Erin confirms – They have in their savings, £852.

Cameron comments – It seems rushed, 2 days and they are asking for 100% of funding.

Karen adds – With a 100% funding request, it would be good to know how the funding is being split with the other party.

Erin – If the Exec are agreeing to fund it in principle, we should arrange an offer to make to the society.

Erin provides context of the precedent to Karen – A previous society applied for full funding however half of the money was accounted for, in the grant request and the rest lacked evidence, we part funded until they submitted evidence for the rest of the money and obtained this.

Olly comments – The society having £800 in savings has put me off.

Jo offers – Normally, if they do have money in their account, they usually say why they are saving this.

Erin suggests – We could ask them if they have sought other sources of funding and if they considering part funding this through their savings.

APPROVED - 50% part-funding - £143.35 – from ARTS & CULTURE

**Society: EEE**

Grant Name: Women + In Engineering Event (#1480)

Grant Amount: £1000 (80 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 59

At this point, Jo has left the meeting. The Exec then discuss the grant request of the society in detail:

Jamie – They are part funding this as a big collaboration event.

Erin gives context as to why MAESA are part funding the request – MAESA say they have lots of money and want to give it out. Investing in an event like this is a great way to start with this.

Karen asks – What exactly is the meal for? Is it for the Venue another location? What is the actual evidence?

Jamie answers – It is a set menu, there won’t be a set cost. It is essentially a large group booking with free venue hire.

Karen asks – Is it full funding of the meal?

Jamie & Erin answer – They want it to be free. Their goal is to make it accessible for as many Women+ in Engineering as possible.

Justyna suggests – If you make something free, the participants are more likely to not go. £1/2 deposit that they can get back is better than a free offering.

Erin responds – We can ask them to consider this. Though the grant is not about a party, it’s about widening access.

Justyna provides – We want them to know that the risk of not assigning cost to the event, is that numbers of attendees will not match ticket holders. Meaning that there will be food and money waste.

Cameron offers – We could suggest that they put down a deposit for a free drink for example.

Erin adds – They could have a retaining deposit for attendees?

Karen agrees with Justyna’s point – They likely won’t have accurate numbers on the attendees without a deposit.

APPROVED

As Karen is joining the meeting virtually, her further comments were not noticed by the Exec until after the approval decision had been made. Due to this exception, further delayed discussion on the grant request was allowed:

Karen asks – With us giving us them the money and the suggestion of a deposit, what happens if they don’t have a good turnout? I would be hesitant to get them funding and rather wait until we get a clearer idea of numbers.

Erin responds – The request will not be taken from Arts & Culture. With Arts & Culture grant requests, they would have to give a report. We will leave it for now.

The Societies Exec come to a consensus on this.

Karen – Evidence of deposit sales is needed.

**Society: Arts and Crafts**

Grant Name: Mandela Workshop (#1479)

Grant Amount: £20 (100 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 60

Erin – Submitted at midday exactly. It is a craft workshop.

Jamie – Have they sold tickets? Yes, they have. They will get supplies from the grant.

Cameron – Workshop is £25 an hour.

APPROVED – Arts & Culture

**Society: CSSA**

Grant Name: Strathclyde Halloween Event (#1483)

Grant Amount: £400 (70 % of total funding)

No. of Members: 59

**Note:** This application was submitted ~9 hours late, however they have emailed to explain why it was late. Any delay to processing this application would likely mean the event itself could also not run due to time constraints.

The Societies Exec have not considered this grant application as it was submitted late.

NOT CONSIDERED

1. AOCB

Erin Updates

The start date is November for new Activities co-ordinator. They were involved in music societies in the past so they will be able to provide consultation for this area.

The Active and Engaged webpage is now live and ready to go for this year. The link can be reshared if anyone needs it. It is refreshed and the application process should be simplified.

Agenda Amendment Request

Jo asks if the grant request number can be included in the Agenda.

Clyde Capital - Wider Investment Societies Discussion

The discussion of affiliating Clyde Capital prompted a wider discussion of including policy details of whether offer financial advice and investing as a society is allowed in the first place. Erin provided further insight that for example, raffles are not allowed on Native, due to a conflict with society policy. Justyna asks what the phrasing would be if this were to be included in policy. Erin responds that she will follow up on this, and that the Union may want to add a note to the society grant guidelines, and it may not just be limited to this. Erin adds that communicated to the trading societies that they cannot ask for funding to invest is needed.

PGR Wellbeing – PGR category and society discussion

Following the affiliation of the PGR Wellbeing society, the Exec notes that a wider conversation should be had if PGR should be made a society category if the number of PGR focused groups continue to emerge, and if these should be societies at all. Erin also comments says that PGR related societies will have student staff support in the future with their activities, and provided a breakdown of each student staff member’s remit in the future:

Chris – Societies

Sarah – PGR

Alexandra – Volunteering and Societies

Ashanti - Campaigns

Anti-Microbial Resistance - Re-affiliation and Society Aims

Following the re-affiliation of the Anti-Microbial Resistance Society, Cameron asks if societies are given their old society aims once they re-affiliate. Erin confirms that this is the case.

Economics Society – Society Affiliation Form Amendments

Following the economic society’s misinterpretation of the affiliation form question ‘Do you have any other committee members?’, a discussion follows of whether this question can be amended to be clearer. Erin agrees and suggests that the questions asking for the society email address be changed also, as it is unclear as to whether the Union is asking, would you like us to set up an email address for us, or do you have one already.

TEDx Society – Alumni Funding and Wider Society Aims

Following the lack of evidence for other sources of funding, including the Alumni Fund, apparent in the TEDx society’s grant application. Erin offers context on the Alumni Fund to the rest of the Exec and shares that there is one application window in January this year, which is different from last year, where there were two application windows. She adds that this affects who comes to the Exec for funding and what for.

As well as this, the Exec observe that the TEDx society committee members have a history of applying for large amounts of money, and that the outcomes of these tend to exclusively benefit an incredibly small number of students.

**Budget Update:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Arts and Culture** | **General Pot** |
| **Start of year** | £15,000 | £40,000 |
| **After Exec 1** | £14,410 | £38,785.26 |
| **After Exec 2**  | £12,964.82 | £38,135.26 |
| **After Exec 3** | £10,324.82 | £36,328.79 |
| **After Exec 4** | £9780.77 | £35,233.79 |

**Next Meeting: 25/10/23**