Societies Executive Committee Meeting 6 Agenda

02/11/2022

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

**Justyna Kardasz – chair**

**Kelsey Murray – clerk**

**Benn Rapson – present**

**Jamie Campbell – present**

**Sheik Malik – present**

**Elaine Keil (Alumni fund) – present**

**Shreya Sachdeva– apologies**

**Emma Reavey – apologies**

**Chris McMahon - apologies**

* KM – reiterates that the societies team have reservations of running competition in Semester 1 – believe spending semester 1 advertising competition and launch in semester 2 would result in better engagement, more entries and awareness of the competition from societies – could advertise in next general meeting, November newsletter and across website and socials
* SM - 1st October as start date of competition, means any semester 1 efforts to widen participation can be eligible
* SM states extending back the way would include amount of societies who can get involved
* KM states that societies team have agreed that the competition needs to run in Semester 2 and advertising focused in semester 1 to raise awareness of the competition
* BR – end of February as closing date gives enough time for societies to engage with the competition
* JC – is it too close to Charity month?
* JK – could move charity month to February
* Elaine – tie in charity month with the competition?
* SM – should both competitions overlap to encourage engagement?
* Refreshers end of January – KM states we want the competition during refreshers as we want to encourage increased engagement during this period of engaging student population already
* JK – socs/students won’t engage during holidays
* JC – could we run the engaging enhancement competition to March?
* BR – too close to exams? Media consumed by elections
* SM – money there to further the efforts of inclusion in their society
* SM – wants to run own blog/news article to promote this
* Elaine – can get a quote from alumni fund
* SM – are we all happy with names and categories?
* KM- are you going to match fund it?
* BR – good idea to match fund, more incentive, £500 from socs exec in the grand scheme is a small portion of our budget
* KM wants to check that the competition is understood by alumni fund as increasing participation, not widening access
* Elaine – alumni fund happy with the competition being widening participation – not understood as widening access, but widening participation – so ‘Enhancing Engagement’ is okay
* JK – criteria is quite vague
* BR asks who the panel is. SM states socs exec is.
* SM – prizes could be accompanied with a certificate which could be presented at the STAR awards
* Elaine – if it is appropriate to be included, sounds good
* SM – need to speak to Lisa about this
* Staff action: Lisa says this is okay
* BR – makes sense to tie in with STAR awards
* KM – what is the criteria? Numbers/increase? Effort
* BR – numbers/increase is a lot on staff to monitor – effort makes more sense
* J- how would this differ from greatest impact? If not monitoring member increase
* SM – would take into account benefits and impact on society members – how is it improving society members take from society events, skills, experience etc
* SM – in terms of judging, would Elaine be willing to co-judge a category?
* Elaine - Depends on how many entries and time – only free mid-March onwards
* To clarify timeline – competition launch Re-freshers – ends end of February
* Elaine – what’s the expectation of prize money? No alcohol agree but what else?
* SM – similar to charity month, intended to re-invest into society
* KM – believe it’s best to go into Alumni account (2114) so to track where the money goes after awarding it – savings account may get lost and be spent on activities that aren’t to directly invest back into society e.g. alcohol
* Elaine – could talk about next round of application for alumni fund for the next year – report back with success of the project
* Logistics of running event, KM will make event with entry forms this semester and speak to Comms about advertising this project

Elaine leaves the meeting.

1. **Approve Minutes from Societies Exec 5**

Approved unanimously.

1. **Matters Arising**
2. **Discussion – Society Policy**

* BR – used to be socs exec which approve motions for the GMs – should this not go through socs exec
* KM – will check with Lisa – push to next meeting with update

1. **Budget Update**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Arts and Culture** | **General Pot** |
| **Total Budget** | £15,000 | £40,000 |
| **Exec 1 Spend** | £375 | £315 |
| **Exec 2 Spend** | £801.91 | £1540 |
| **Exec 3 Spend** | £690 | £1540 |
| **Exec 4 Spend** | £3566.27 | £435 |
| **Exec 5 Spend** | £1178.39 | £350 |
| **Remaining Budget** | **£8523.48** | **£35,820** |

1. **Constitution Change Requests**

* Language Café
* JK – what is the current policy with finances with societies who have not re-affiliated?
* KM thinks that money is wiped after 5 years of not-affiliating – will check with finance team after meeting
* Language café 2.2 – vote of no confidence – socs exec all voice issues that the President has more powers than rest of committee regarding vote of no confidence
* BR – should the draft constitution provided for societies from the Union have a section on vote of no confidence? Also in societies policy?
* KM – will discuss with Lisa
* TO SEND TO LANG CAFÉ – Societies Executive issues with section 2.2 on vote of no confidence. This section voices that president has more power to dismiss the committee than vice versa. This cannot be allowed.
* Section 2.3 states that the Union complaints procedure should be used with issues with the Language Café constitution. Socs exec believe issues with the constitution would not be an appropriate use of the complaints procedure but the complaints procedure would be appropriate for student misconduct within the society.
* Section 3.5 – societies executive do not agree to automated consent given for all members for photo use – would encourage to take this out and instead advertise this in events advertisement and ask people to come forward if they do not want their photos used.
* 1.1.6 – societies do not have the sole authority to ban members – if student misconduct has happened, please go through the complaints procedure with the Students’ Union.
* 1.1.3 Take out (Sole authority cannot be given to the President for this as the society must be democratically run).
* Change USSA to Strathclyde Students’ Union Association.

Not approved – re-apply with changes.

* HPF Strath
* JK – 75% students 25% associate – is this normal?
* Clarified that this is normal – societies have to let in all Strathclyde students but this means you can restrict other groups in associate membership
* BR – society policy states 75% needs to be students or associate members however this doesn’t make sense as you cannot be a society member without being one of these 2 – staff action: follow this up.
* 4D – change life membership to associate membership

Approved on the basis HPF change section 4D unanimously.

1. **Society Name Change Requests**

* Red Strathclyde > Republican Socialists
* BR leaves the room.
* KM reiterates that the name change is in line with a parent organisation of the same name that they are affiliated with. Their aims remain the same, the name change just reflects the group they work with, with this name.

Name change approved unanimously.

BR comes back in the room.

1. **New Affiliation Requests**

* Kuwait Student in Glasgow
* Socs exec voice confusion over the society name as they reference both ‘Kuwait Student in Glasgow’ and ‘Kuwait Society for Social Development and Solidarity’
* SM – need to warn society that they cannot legally give advice not given by experts (referencing society aim 3) – can signpost to other services eg advice hub
* BR – difference from spreading awareness and giving advice

Approved unanimously – must clarify with societies what their name is and were the ?? a typo.

* Blockchain Society
* BR agrees, aims are unclear
* Worries voiced over societies about crypto – same as previous motion, societies cannot give advice legally and this is a grey area.
* SM says does not think they are advocating for investment.
* BR and JC say their aims are not clear so we can’t tell this yet
* Uses term ‘incentivisation’ – unsure of this
* BR – society aims are very important and these are not clear, so we can’t tell what they are aiming to do and unsure of the implications of this
* All agree to re-submit application with clearer aims.

Not approved unanimously – re-submit application with clearer aims. Reminder that they cannot give advice legally.

* Iranian Students Community
* SM voices this is an important society to have and all agree.
* JK likes reference to signposting to services.

Approved unanimously.

* A131
* Large Architecture society – BR states they used to be very big and successful, well supported by their department and lulled during Covid pandemic.

Approved unanimously.

* Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Students Association (MAESA)
* BR states previously very successful.
* Looks at other societies – nothing too similar

Approved unanimously.

* Rubik's Cube Society
* KM informs she has been in contact with them – they want to set this up to host a large competition

Approved unanimously.

* Omani Student Society Glasgow
* Re-affiliation – just missed deadline

Approved unanimously.

* Education Studies Society
* Used to exist, not since Covid pandemic

Approved unanimously.

1. **Welcome Grant Requests (£45) – For Information. Total: £135**

* Greens Strathclyde
* Strath Speechies
* Indonesian Society

1. **AGM Grant Request (£25). Total: £0**

* None.

1. **Grant Requests. Total: £1902.83**

* StrathAIS – **£706.83** (100% of total £706.83) (#1183)
  + Level 1 Rocketry Project
* £706.83 for 4 rockets seems reasonable – all agree.
* BR voices that StrathAIS is asking for grant funding to fund whole project – what about their savings account?
* SM states that their application says some of their parts is provided from Spirit Aero systems – a type of part funding
* BR – no evidence of this arrangement has been provided e.g. an email, which we have asked other societies to provide
* SM counters this, stating big organisations will not write contracts or even emails, might informally support student groups and events due to risk on their business
* Staff action: ask staff if socs exec should be accessing society finances as a factor for if grants are given
* BR voices that AIS should part fund this project
* SM says he knows that this group is supporting student groups from outside socs exec – should put some value on the evidence and argument that has been provided and should be considered as part funding
* SM states societies exec doesn’t typically ask for proof of sponsorships
* BR is clear that they would like more evidence for part funding/sponsorships however JC and SM state they are happy with what StrathAIS has provided

Approved to fully fund. JC and SM approve and BR votes against.

Feedback to society – for next time, make a better cost analysis and breakdown. Attach more evidence e.g. comparative costs and sponsorships. Hard to read the application and add up all the costs so potentially a spreadsheet of cost breakdown.

* TEDx - **£650** (38% of £1500 total) (#1185)
  + TEDx Professional Marketing Videos
* SM leaves the room.
* Socs Exec like that it is asking for part funding and has sourced funding from elsewhere.
* SM enters the room so socs exec can clarify how much TedX are asking for – he clarifies that it is £650 and £100 is coming from savings account (membership fees). SM leaves room.

Approved unanimously. General pot.

SM enters room.

* Arts and Crafts Society - **£346** (66% of £525 total) (#1186)
  + Cass Art Sculpture Workshop
* Socs exec like to provision of comparison for other places – lots of evidence and sounds like a good idea.
* Socs exec voice this would be ideal to come from Arts and Culture fund

**Approved unanimously from Arts and Culture.**

* Musical Theatre Society - **£200** (100% of £200 total) (#1173)
  + A Night At The Musicals
* Clarifying that they are asking to fully fund this project.
* SM states they could have provided a cost comparison for photographers.
* KM states that lots of societies use Bananaprint so seem reputable.
* BR adopts position that they should ask to part fund this. SM and JC agree that they should encourage socs to apply for part fund grants.
* SM states in previous years Socs exec have fully funded many projects.

Approved to fully fund by JC and SM. BR votes against, would vote to part fund.

1. **Budget Update**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Arts and Culture** | **General Pot** |
| **Total Budget** | £15,000 | £40,000 |
| **Exec 1 Spend** | £375 | £315 |
| **Exec 2 Spend** | £801.91 | £1540 |
| **Exec 3 Spend** | £690 | £1540 |
| **Exec 4 Spend** | £3566.27 | £435 |
| **Exec 5 Spend** | £1178.39 | £350 |
| **Exec 6 Spend** | £346 | £1691.83 |
| **Remaining Budget** | **£8042.43** | **£34,128.17** |

1. **AOB**

Grant portal

* SM – change GAS drop down menu for expected expenditure – Staff action: look into adding an other/savings account option.
* Can’t delete, only withdraw – is that a feature that could be implemented?

Part funding vs full funding discussion

* Should socs exec make a position on promoting full funded applications vs part funding
* All agree that socs exec should encourage part funded applications
* BR – should agree a stance to send out to societies
* SM – is there a document of funding resources for societies to access that is still available – made by Jodie? Staff action: find and update, potentially advertise this
* BR – socs exec should advertise how much funding they have left through the year to encourage applications
* KM suggests budget updates at the General meetings to encourage applications
* SM – could reach out later in the year to encourage applications for core equipment that will last past academic year

Emergency fund

* Socs exec all agree to drop this – most applications are valid and this doesn’t seem necessary.