

Draft Minutes of
THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
6th Week Michaelmas Term 2018
Monday 12th November 2018
President's Office, 16:00

Present:

The President (Mr Stephen Horvath, *New College*), **The Librarian** (Ms Genevieve Athis, *Christ Church*) **The Treasurer** (Mr James Lamming, *Exeter College*), **The Secretary** (Mr Nick Brown, *Magdalen College*), **The President-Elect** (Mr Daniel Wilkinson, *Oriel College*), **The Librarian-Elect** (Mr Brendan McGrath, *Oriel College*), **The Treasurer-Elect** (Ms Amy Gregg, *Magdalen College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Rebecca Collins, *Balliol College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Sara Dube, *St Hugh's College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Gemma Timmons, *Magdalen College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms. Anisha Faruk, *The Queen's*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Harry Webster, *Worcester College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Mahi Joshi, *Trinity College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Maxim Parr-Reid, *Trinity College*), **The Chair of Debate Selection Committee** (Mr. Lee Chin Wee, *Trinity College*)

Attending:

The Returning Officer (Ms. Louise Kandler, *Lady Margaret Hall*), **The Access Officer** (Ms. Kirsten Stewart, *Trinity College*), **The Bursar** (Ms. Lindsey Warne), **The Senior Librarian** (Mr. Sean Power, *Oriel College*), **The Senior Treasurer** (Mr. Stephen Dixon, *Downing College, Cambridge*), Mr. Ray Williams, *Wadham College*, Mr. Adam Watson, *Hertford College*, Mr. Joseph Sisson, *St John's College*, Mr. Hugh Bellamy, *Lady Margaret Hall*.

Apologies:

The Chair of Consultative Committee (Mr. Matthew Vautrey, *Magdalen College*)

The President opens the meeting at 16.04

Apologies: Matthew Vautrey, CCC on business of society

Passing Absences:

The Librarian says she was unable to attend two-thirds of the previous meeting as she was hosting the Manny Pacquiao event.

The Librarian moves that her absence from the previous meeting be passed on grounds of that she was attending to business of the society of unparalleled importance.

Seconded by President.

Passes Nem Con

The President moves that the absence of Matthew Vautrey, CCC be passed on grounds of the business of the society of the society of unparalleled importance.

Passes Nem Con

Ms Collins enters the room at 16.04

Matters Arising From Previous Minutes

The President is happy with both the in-camera and ex-camera minutes from 4th week and 5th week, with the former containing changes suggested by the President. Though the version containing changes was not circulated, the President and the Secretary, with affirmation from the Senior Treasurer, agree to ratify them.

No objections.

The Secretary moves to ratify the minutes of the 4th Week Ordinary Meeting of the TSC

Seconded by the President.

Passes Nem. con.

The Bursar asks what happens to the version on the notice board, if these are also changed. The President says that no changes were made to the ratified minutes, it was simply the draft minutes that were updated.

The Bursar stresses that in case of any changes, the latest version must go on the notice board. The Secretary and President agree.

The Secretary asks if the President thinks that the business of regarding the Oxford IV, which was unable to be taken in-camera, was suitably minuted. The President says he feels it was well-handled, and was fair.

The Secretary moves to ratify the in-camera and ex-camera minutes of the 5th Week Ordinary Meeting of the TSC

Seconded by the President.

Passes Nem. con.

The Business of the President

The President says that he received no press requests this week, so no business on that front.

Pres moves that the TSC goes in camera on grounds of negotiation of financial contract at 16.07

Passes Nem. con.

The President re-opens the ex-camera meeting of TSC at 12.16

Anisha enters room at 16.12

The President thanks everyone for their patience. Concludes his business.

Questions to the President

There are no questions to the President.

Business of the Librarian

The Librarian has no business.

Questions to the Librarian

There are no questions to the Librarian.

Business of the Treasurer

The Treasurer moves that the TSC pass DSC expenses amounting to £1977.48 on the recommendation of The Finance Committee

Seconded by President

Passes Nem Con

Questions to the Treasurer

The Librarian leaves at 16.13

Business of The Secretary

The Secretary wishes to discuss Standing Orders C1 to C4.

The general aim of these changes is to add a number of places on Speaker Meet and Greets and Debate Dinners which are reserved for Balloted Members.

The Secretary believes that putting these forward would be good for the members, for whom the society is ultimately run, and allow more of them to access Meet and Greet events and Debate Dinners.

The Librarian-Elect mentions how it is quite unfortunate when two Ordinary, Ballotted Members are stuck at the end of each table.

The President seeks to clarify the current procedure applied on these, acknowledges that they have not been followed rigorously in the past but the Chief of Staff and CCC this term have stuck to them.

Each debate dinner this term has been attended by 5-6 balloted members.

Extra ballotted members have not been added to President's Drinks after debates.

Drinks have not been served at Meet and Greet Events this term at all, with the exception of the Jude Law event which featured distinguished guests such as the Lord Mayor, the Chairperson of OLDUT, University Professors. Otherwise, the President does not deem it appropriate to serve alcohol. Most Meet and Greet Events have contained ordinary, balloted members.

The only case where this has not happened is in the presence of an existing co-hosting agreement e.g. The President of Bulgaria to which specifically Bulgarian students were invited, or The Former President of Botswana which the Conservation Society and the Africa Society agreed to put on their newsletter in return for the attendance of five of their members at the Meet and Greet.

Standing Order never waived, unless in each case.

The President mentions that the Debate Dinners have a hard capacity of 60, a number which we have already neared several times this term. Not sure how feasible adding more people to this is.

In regards to the Meet and Greet, the President thinks it is odd to have more than 20 people there as this then resembles the actual event too much. Smaller meet and greets conducive to a more personal experience, thinks this has been done well this term.

The Bursar adds that the addition of more members to dinner has considerable financial implication, not only in terms of food but also in terms of staffing. One staff member required per 8 diners. In terms of receptions, the Gladstone Room can only take a certain number of people. We already have Guest Speakers, Floor Speakers, the Standing Committee, Speaker's Guests etc., addition of Ordinary Members may take the room to loading capacity, result in Standing Committee not being able to get in.

In terms of Meet and Greet, the Bursar has been in a situation when the speakers have confused it to be the event, since they have been overcrowded, taken away personal touch.

The Treasurer-Elect asks about financial implications, if there is a rough figure that can be provided for the cost of each extra diner, and each extra member of staff.

The Bursar says an extra member of staff is around £45-50. The wine and the food used to be around £35-40 per person, considerable amount when it all adds up. Added to this is the Drink's Reception beforehand, President's Drinks afterwards and the space issue. The Bursar also raises issue of sponsors, who may also have seats reserved for them.

The President thinks that this is a good idea for dinners but instead of instead of expanding it at the President's discretion, could change SO to decrease it to fewer than five at the President's discretion. This would apply in cases such as the Justice Debate, where so many spaces were taken up by SGP Law.

The Librarian-Elect says that such instances are few enough such that the SO could be waived as normal.

The Treasurer-Elects asks if there would be a way to prioritise ordinary balloted members over Officer's guests or members of TSC.

The Senior-Librarian says this is all very well-meant. What strikes him is that this is imposing a limitation on what can be done with the space.

The Secretary agrees that flexibility is required in case of sponsorships etc. but also maintains that there is merit in limiting this flexibility if it means increased engagement from members etc.

The President says that in case of Justice Debate, where the Cambridge Union and SGP Law had reserved seating, there is a clear case that can be made to waive the SO.

The President also points out that several more members added to President's Drinks than what first appears. 5 from debate, and 15 more added by SO change.

The President find the idea of balloting for President's Drinks a bit strange, is not aware of one existing. The Secretary agrees that this may be odd. The Treasurer-Elect says that though not full-

proof, the method of making floor speeches does provide the opportunity of attending President's Drinks. Agreement that we should not have a separate ballot for this.

The Secretary realises that technically, the new SO requirement may already be met, since 5 balloted dinner guests, as well as 6 from floor speeches already makes 11 ordinary members.

The Bursar and The President believe that the SO is unclear, odd in its implications, not sure if extra people need to be added or not. The President says that the proposed change is sensible, just the existence of the SO is a bit bizarre.

The Secretary says he might go ahead with 1 and withdraw 2. Bring in a different form of the SO which specifies that the ballot shall be for the debate dinner, and allow entry into the President's drinks.

The Bursar asks about perception that members have of balloted spaces. The Treasurer-Elect says that they are publicised quite well, The President agrees that they seem to have been successful this term.

The Bursar points to C1(iv) where it says that no member shall successfully ballot more than twice in one term. Asks if this should be reduced to once to give more members the chance to attend. Agreement from The President, The Treasurer-Elect and The Secretary that this is fair.

The Secretary agrees to move the first part and discuss the third part.

The Secretary moves that Standing Order C1(iv) be amended as follows in the attached document which includes both the increase from 5 to 10 spaces, and the change from two to one successful ballots per member

Seconded by The President

Passes Nem Con

The Secretary wishes to hold back the second SO change since it is conceptually bizarre.

The President moves on to discuss the third change, and the issue of numbers in Meet and Greet, says he is more critical of the change in numbers proposed since it will prove difficult to retain an overall cap of 20 in Meet and Greet. Acknowledges concerns from members of Secretaries' Committee who were upset that they weren't able to attend that many Meet and Greets. Wonders if this makes it harder for members of committee to attend and enjoy event without overwhelming speakers. Must also account for the Speaker's delegation.

The Bursar concurs that it is essential to not overwhelm the speaker.

The President also mentions that there are some Meet and Greets which should not contain any balloted members, since the speakers have specifically asked to meet Senior Committee. This could be tackled by adding a separate discretion clause, or by waiving SO. The latter, though will work on Debate Dinners which are planned well in advance, may not work since we often get very little warning from Speaker's on Meet and Greet. The Treasurer-Elect concurs since this has happened several times this term.

The President maintains that the number suggested in SO might be too high. The Treasurer-Elect agrees, says ideal Meet and Greet should contain 15 people in total. Agrees with the intention, but not sure how it would work.

The President is in favour of doing this for debate dinner, since having these additional members is not detrimental to quality of event as long as it is under the hard cap. This is not the case for Meet and Greets.

Ms Joshi suggests the possibility of changing the SO to read as a proportion of the event, as opposed to a number.

The President and Librarian-Elect say this would be sensible.

The Librarian-Elect says it would be a fair interpretation to say, in exceptional circumstances, that the speaker demands to meet Committee Members only, and not have a Meet and Greet at all.

The Bursar says that we now run the risk of necessitating multiple, complex rules changes when it was all originally done in good faith.

The President says that the current rule works fairly well, does not require this level of change.

The Treasurer-Elect says that what the Secretary is probably trying to guard against is the potential for a President to not follow this procedure as it should be.

The President argues that the SO change is not bringing in any measures of enforcement, is simply increasing the requirement. Would not prevent the procedure from not working properly in future terms, as the President has seen to take place in past terms.

The Treasurer-Elect argues that this SO change may not substantively change this, but will help diffuse the perception that Union Meet and Greets are only achievable through Committee contacts.

The President does not think this SO change is ready to be passed.

The Secretary thinks that these are reasonable points, if 20 is taken to be the cap for the size of the Meet and Greet.

The Librarian-Elect points out that there are two debates here: the number of spaces in the Meet and Greet and if Meet and Greets should have reserved spaces at all.

The President says that they already do in the rules, the Librarian-Elect says that these are not specified as Meet and Greets.

The President says that we should aim to have another revised SO change next week which requires a proportional reservation for balloted members. The Librarian-Elect says this can be done now.

There remains disagreement on how to present this get out.

The Librarian-Elect says we can just have a separate Standing Order change, the Treasurer-Elect suggests adding clause such as ‘unless otherwise requested by speaker’.

The President-Elect says that there are some cases where this has not been requested by the speaker, but it would just be sensible to do so. The President uses Jamie Vardy as an example.

The Treasurer-Elect asks if The Secretary wants to go away and think about that a bit more.

The Secretary agrees, says he will not be moving that change this week.

Standing Order D2 Change

The Secretary says that the change effectively halves all nomination fees, and that nomination fees are a significant barrier to getting on committee, being quite expensive. He thinks that it is fair that the Union’s general revenue funds some of the cost of elections.

The Treasurer asks whether nominations have yet opened.

The Secretary says that they have and that this change should not apply to this term because some candidates may have already nominated.

The Returning Officer says that there is a part of rule 67 that means the change cannot affect this term.

The Secretary asks whether this affects Standing Orders as well as rules.

The Treasurer says that it does not, and so the change would come into effect this term.

The Secretary suggests that TSC could phrase the motion to come into effect after close of nominations.

The Treasurer says that he does not believe SOs can be changed to come into effect at specific later dates.

The Secretary says that because TSC is the committee of management of the Society, it should be possible for TSC to move that the Standing Order be changed, coming into effect after close of nominations.

The Bursar suggests that the Secretary brings the change next week.

The Treasurer says that if it passes now, some weird things will happen.

The Bursar says that nomination fees have been held the same for 15 years, whilst the costs of elections have been rising.

The Treasurer-Elect asks how much an election costs on average.

The President says that this is negotiated between the RO and Senior Treasurer.

The Returning Officer says it is about £1500.

The Treasurer-Elect asks what this money is being spent on.

The President says this spending is so reasonable.

The Returning Officer lists nomination packs, stationary, food for the count...

The Treasurer-Elect says that this means lots of pizza.

The President says that he thinks the Treasurer-Elect is using an unfair tone.

The Senior Treasurer says that he thinks the budget for this term is not excessive.

The President says that he thinks people should be very careful with their tone in regards to things they don't know about, which are very important and which people work hard on for little to no thanks.

The Senior Treasurer says that self-publishing of manifesto booklets has been attempted, and that this makes the booklets lower quality but that it would save costs.

The Bursar also notes that printing the ballot papers is expensive and the cost of any tribunal after the election.

The Treasurer asks the Secretary what the costs of the change are.

The Secretary adds up the figures for the TT2018 election, and says that for this election there would have been £665 less of revenue - he says this is assuming no access members nominated as it cannot be known whether and for what position any did.

The President says that this is a significant portion of the election budget.

The Senior Treasurer says that the reason for election fees is not necessarily to cover costs, but also to prevent frivolous nominations. He says that he thinks the fees should be sufficient to prevent frivolous nominations.

The Secretary says that he does not think the difference made by this change would encourage significantly more frivolous nominations.

The President says that he has paid a lot of money in nomination fees in his time.

The Bursar says this change has a large financial implication.

The President says that he has paid £140, and that this is a lot of money.

The Bursar says that this fee has not gone up in 15 years whilst membership fees and other costs have.

The Secretary says that it cannot be predicted how many candidates there will be in an election, and so election revenue is necessarily fluctuating. He says that he thinks it is widely acknowledged that the current formulation of access membership is insufficient to account for all those with access needs, especially with international and graduate students.

The Bursar says that she thinks reducing these costs seem inappropriate at this time.

The Secretary asks why at this particular time.

The Bursar says that we have now started subsidising elections because of the long freeze in nomination fees. She says that when she arrived at the Union, nomination fees covered the costs of elections, but that now they do not.

The Secretary says that he thinks this comes back to the principle that TSC must decide on, and that he believes that it is unjust to place the fees as high as they are currently because it is very expensive for those who want to run in elections.

The Bursar says that candidates were still able to run 15 years ago when the real value of the fees was much higher.

The Treasurer-Elect says that if the concern is joke nominations, whether a system of deposits might work.

The President says that he thinks the number of frivolous candidates is low in Union elections because of the nomination speech requirements, and also that it is hard to remain a frivolous candidates once elected and made to do vac days. He also says that he thinks it would be horrible to penalise those who receive fewer votes. He knows a few people who have received some of the fewest votes ever, they have taken the election more seriously than some candidates who did well in those elections. He says the purpose of nominations fees is both to prevent joke candidacies and help cover the costs of elections.

The Treasurer says that he does not think this change can be passed now because of rule 68(c).

The President asks the Returning Officer's opinions on rule 68(c). He says that it applies to Tuesday of sixth week, so it would be possible to change the SO now for this election, but that that would be unfair.

The Librarian-Elect asks whether any candidates have nominated.

The Returning Officer says that she does not think so.

The Bursar says that many nomination packs have already been distributed.

The President-Elect asks whether the motion can be phrased to come into effect next term.

The Returning Officer says it would be better if it were brought next week.

The President says that with Private Business Motions it is possible to add a schedule of implementation, but that it is not clear this is possible for Standing Orders. He says it would be good if it were possible to add this so that it could come into effect after validly nominated candidates have been named.

The President-Elect asks whether it is possible to add a clause saying that it shall take effect on a certain day, and that this shall subsequently delete itself.

The Treasurer-Elect asks whether this means the Standing Order changes now, or changes later.

The Returning Officer says that she thinks it would only be possible to change the SO now with a clause stating it will change meaning at a future point.

The Secretary asks why it is not possible to move the motion with a delayed implementation.

The Returning Officer says that she does not think there is any provision for this.

The Secretary asks if there is any provision against this.

The Treasurer says that given that we all agree this is a messy motion with weird results we should delay its implementation.

The Secretary says that he does not think there will be any weird results.

The Treasurer says that he has interpreted the RO as saying that this is going to cause difficulty, and that he is inclined to defer to the RO.

The Treasurer-Elect asks to what extent TSC can bind future meetings of itself.

Mr. Parr-Reid asks why this is not brought at a subsequent meeting.

The Secretary says that he could but that he would rather bring the change today.

The Returning Officer says that nominations have opened already.

The Senior Librarian says that he thinks changes to election rules so close to the election make him uncomfortable.

The Treasurer-Elect says that she thinks it is clear that the Secretary does not wish to alter the fees charged in this election, but from Hilary term 2019 onwards only. She says that now the discussion has begun, we might as well pass the change this week.

The Returning Officer says that she does not see why the motion cannot be delayed.

The Secretary accepts that he could but says that he would like to know whether it is possible to bring the motion to change.

The Treasurer says that if the Senior Treasurer is unhappy changing this today, given this has financial implications and was not given notice of seven days in advance, it should not be brought.

The Senior Treasurer says that he is not in the least bit unhappy.

The President asks whether the Secretary is open to withdrawing the motion in light of the Returning Officer's advice.

The Secretary says if he is able to move a motion then he will.

The Returning Officer says that it can be moved to affect this election, but that if it were moved for a future election it would need to contain an additional clause. She says that she would rather the Secretary waited for a future week.

The Secretary asks whether it is possible to move the motion to affect future elections only.

The Returning Officer says that there is no provision for a change to be implemented at a specified future date.

The Secretary asks where in the rules it is stated that a change cannot be moved to take effect at a future date.

The President says that it would seem bizarre that we would not be able to do this for SOs when we are able to for rules. He says that the difference is that PBMs have schedules of implementation while SO changes do not.

The Returning Officer says that she does not see how it would be possible given there is no provision.

The Secretary asks whether there is provision for this not to be possible - he says that the Standing Committee is the committee of management of the society and should be able to make such changes if it wishes.

The Treasurer-Elect says that there is no limit on the content of the SO being such that the implementation is delayed.

The Secretary suggests passing the change as normal, and subsequently moving to waive SO D2 for the purposes of the MT18 election.

The President says that SOs can only be waived for named persons at specified times.

The Secretary says that SOs can be waived under any condition TSC think fit.

The President says that he thinks this means any additional conditions on a named person. He says that an additional condition might be location as well as time and person.

The Librarian-Elect suggests a change to include the date in the Standing Order, and a self-deletion clause to mean the change is subsequently implemented.

The Secretary accepts this and writes out the re-worded motion.

Mr. Watson asks about entrenched Standing Orders and says that if there were a self-deletion clause, the Standing Order would still be changed during the barred period.

The Secretary says that he is writing the motion to come into effect on the 1st January to get around this problem.

The Secretary reads his amended proposal.

The Secretary moves that TSC amend Standing Order D2 be amended according to his proposal, with the lower fees to come into effect from the 1st January.

Seconded by the Treasurer-Elect

The motion passes, with 8 votes for (the President-Elect, the Treasurer-Elect, the Secretary, Ms. Collins, Ms. Faruk, Mr. Webster, Ms. Joshi, Mr. Parr-Reid) and 0 votes against

The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee enters the room at 17.09

Event Times

The Secretary asks about speaker events being usually held at 5pm or 8pm. He says that a lot of students have things on that finish at 5pm, especially STEM subjects and graduate students. He asks whether a policy should be made of always hosting events at 5.30pm or 8pm.

The President says that he has always aimed for 8pm, but that 5pm events are used on a day with two events when a time cushion must be left to prepare for the second event.

The Bursar says that the President cannot be in two places at once.

The President says that on days with only one speaker event at 5pm, this is often because of other cancellations.

Ms. Collins asks whether the extra 30 minutes really is significant.

The President says that operating the logistics for events can sometimes come down to 10 minute time frames.

The Secretary asks whether later events should be started at 8.30pm.

The President says yeah.

The Secretary says that it struck him that this would help to ensure a diverse set of students including graduate students are able to engage with the Union.

The President says that he does not think the Union currently suffers from underengagement from graduate students.

The Secretary says that this issue has been anecdotally echoed to him by graduate students.

The President says that this does not affect him at all as all of his events for the rest of term are planned.

The Bursar says that planning at the events is at the discretion of the President.

The Secretary says that he just thought it would be a good idea to raise this.

Business of Ms. Collins

Ms. Collins has no business

Business of Ms. Dube

Standing Order C5 - Ballot Procedure

Ms. Dube says that she has added new clause (d) to this Standing Order because she has noticed in her time on committee that there are many people who are passionate about certain speakers, but who have been unable to get into meet and greets because of the random ballot system. She says that when she has been in meet and greets before there is a clear divide between those who are actually interested in and engage with a speaker, and those who are just there to get a photo.

The Treasurer-Elect says that the Rules committee discussed this proposal, and conveys that in C5(a)(iii), the words 'or failure' should be removed because it is practically difficult for those operating meet and greets to email every unsuccessful candidate.. She also says that the Rules committee proposed adding "and ordinarily" before "not less than 24 hours" because it is not always possible to inform successful candidates a full day before.

The President asks who the Director of Operations is, and if he has one.

The Treasurer-Elect says that this comes from a rules change as of Thursday, and that the President does not have one.

The President asks if he can have a director of foreign policy.

The Treasurer-Elect says that the proposal has been altered to make the SO consistent with the appointed committee rules change from next term onwards.

Ms. Dube says that she is happy to accept as friendly the amendments proposed by the rules committee.

The Bursar says that the randomness of the meet and greet has been reduced.

The President says that this is an additional option to the randomness.

The Bursar says that members will see this as a way of bypassing randomness.

The President says that half the members are still on the random ballot.

The Treasurer-Elect clarifies that ‘up to half’ of those chosen under SO C5 may be chosen according to special interest, so it may be 0 people. She says that she thinks this will help speakers have a good time at the Union because they can discuss relevant issues.

The President-Elect asks whether this will result in such large numbers of people writing under the special interest clause that random ballots will be required for these members.

The President says that special interest guests can be chosen by the quality of their request.

The President-Elect says that this is a way to circumvent the ballot as those without a genuine interest could feign interest to get in a meet and greet. He says that this process already exists, where those who contact the Union can join meet and greets if they make a reasonable request.

Ms. Dube says that the purpose of this SO change is to codify that process into a rule.

The Secretary asks if C5(a)(iv) is another new addition.

Ms. Dube says that this subclause is new.

The Secretary asks if some opt out for when the society might be brought into disrepute might be appropriate.

The President says that he thinks the appropriate body to decide whether behaviour constitutes misconduct is an SDC, and not the Standing Orders.

The Treasurer-Elect says that non-randomness is not an inherently bad thing.

The President says that a SO cannot bind an SDC.

The Librarian-Elect says there is a section of rule 71 that says that misconduct may be additionally defined elsewhere in the rules and Standing Orders, so this is appropriate.

The President says that there are some people for which it would be inappropriate to be at meet and greets.

The Treasurer-Elect says that a clause could be include to account for bringing the society into disrepute.

The President says that there are some people that it could not be proved would bring the society into disrepute, but behave in an unprofessional, inappropriate and frustrating manner.

The Secretary says that part (b) opens the meet and greet system up to abuse, and that it would allow the President to easily let their friends into meet and greets. He says that allowing committee members to recommend members with a special interest makes the issue even worse.

The Treasurer-Elect asks whether a President is currently allowed to bring whoever they want to a meet and greet.

The President says that there are not many rules on meet and greets.

The Treasurer-Elect says that this therefore does not open up any more ability for the President to invite their friends.

The Librarian-Elect says that this allows the President to stuff the balloted members section with whoever they desire.

The Secretary agrees that 5 of the 10 balloted members may now be chosen according to 'special interest'.

The Bursar asks how many ballot responses are currently received.

The President says that hundreds are received.

Ms. Collins asks how much of a logistical burden this would add.

The President says that at the moment, emails from those asking to be in the meet and greet are forwarded to the person in charge of the meet and greet.

Ms. Collins says that the President may get a significantly larger number of emails if this possibility is publicly announced.

The President says that he received over 100 emails of hate mail when the President of Sri Lanka came, and that he was able to read and ignore them all.

Ms. Collins says that actioning these emails requires more than just reading them.

The President disagrees, and says that it would be a reasonable burden.

The Treasurer says that there are clearly speakers for whom members with a special interest should receive better treatment, and describes the example of the University boxing team going to the Manny Pacquiao meet and greet.

The Secretary says that this is not disallowed under the current rules.

The Treasurer says that this codifies this process, and that this change is reasonable because it allows 5 people who have a real interest in the speaker to attend the meet and greet.

The Secretary clarifies that this allows for 5 people who claim they have a real interest in the speaker, and have been chosen by the President. He says this creates a lot of room for doubt as to how valid this special interest is.

The Librarian-Elect says that there may be many people who have an interest in a speaker, and that there is not that much that makes it 'special' most of the time.

The Treasurer says that the ability to include 'special interest' members already exists, but that this codifies it.

The Librarian-Elect says that the difference is that this change allows for half the members who currently enter via random ballot can now be selected by the President.

The Treasurer says that he thinks this is reasonable.

The President-Elect says that he thinks the current system works well and that this change opens the system up to abuse.

Ms. Dube says the current system does not work well, and that she knows many members who ballot as a joke. She says that getting those with a genuine interest in a speaker in the meet and greet will enrich the experience of the guest.

The President-Elect says that he does not think it is feasible for the President to reliably select members with a special interest. He says he thinks it is currently fine that people email when they have a special interest.

Ms. Dube says that the current President says the change is feasible.

The President-Elect says that once people know they can email, that will create huge extra volumes of work.

The Bursar says that she thinks there will be a lot of complaints about the people that are selected under this clause.

Ms. Faruk says that if the President has letters from both a friend and a random person, they will choose their friend.

The Treasurer-Elect says that any SO assumes a certain trust in the President which is necessary for the rules to function. She says that the change ensures there is some randomness in the ballot which was not present before, under the new subclause (a)(iv).

The Senior Librarian leaves at 17.25

The President says that he thinks the existing word 'ballot' implies some level of randomness.

The Treasurer says that we will always be confined to the fact that the President can bring their friends into meet and greets, and that at the very least the President can always just expand meet and greets.

The Treasurer-Elect asks whether passing the change to (a)(iv) but not (b) would prevent bringing people like the boxing team to a meet and greet.

The President says that this is not true, because as long as the balloted members are maintained the President can bring, outside of the ballot, whoever they wish.

The Treasurer suggests moving the special interest clause to SO C4 to keep this provision whilst maintaining the number of balloted members. He says he thinks it is important to codify that some members do have legitimate claims to enter meet and greets because of their relationship to speakers.

The President asks Ms. Dube whether she would want to move the proposed section (b) to Standing Order C4 as discussed.

Ms. Dube says she would.

The Treasurer suggests removing in the proposed C5(b)(i) “saved clause” and to move what remains of C5(b) to a new subclause C4(e).

Ms. Dube accepts these amendments.

Ms. Faruk asks Ms. Dube to summarise the change.

Ms. Dube says that the randomness of the ballot procedure is now protected, but that those members with a special interest may still apply.

Ms. Faruk asks how many members with a special interest would now be allowed.

The Treasurer says there is now no official cap.

Ms. Collins asks if balloted members now have priority over those with a special interest.

The Treasurer says that this is implied by the reasonable maximum size of a meet and greet and the fact that balloted members are mandatory.

Ms. Collins says that the random ballot places are usually oversubscribed.

The President says that this is nearly always the case.

Ms. Dube moves to amend Standing Orders C5 and C4 according to her proposal, including friendly amendments through discussion

Seconded by the Treasurer

The motion fails, with 3 votes for (the Treasurer, Ms. Dube and Mr. Parr-Reid) and 5 votes against (the President-Elect, the Secretary, Ms. Collins, Ms. Joshi, Mr. Webster)

SBS Liaison Officer - Standing Order E3 proposal

Ms. Dube says that this role already exists and that there is already an SBS liaison, and that this codifies that role and gives them more responsibilities under the rules.

The Treasurer-Elect says that in rules committee it was moved that the rules committee recommend that TSC do not pass this change, and that the motion failed as there was a 4-4 tie and the Chair forgot he had a casting vote. The Treasurer-Elect says that rules committee suggested that the word “complete” in E3(a)(iii) be replaced with “undertake” as duties may not be completed until the end of term.

Ms. Dube accepts this amendment as friendly.

The Bursar says that she is confused why SBS has a liaison officer when the Union has more students from Magdalen or Christ Church.

Ms. Faruk says that SBS students are often really well off.

The Treasurer says that this is a scandalous comment.

The Treasurer-Elect says that it is not scandalous, as there are few bursaries and expensive fees.

The Treasurer says that these fees are paid for by people's jobs.

The President-Elect says that this is not the relevant point, and that the relevant point is that other colleges do not have liaison positions.

The Bursar says that many SBS students are only temporarily present in Oxford.

Ms. Dube says that this is not favouritism, but that SBS already has a liaison officer that works with the Union and that this should be codified.

The Treasurer-Elect says that just because SBS elects their own liaison officer who claims to represent SBS in the Union, this does not mean that we should necessarily accept this process.

The Treasurer asks whether the Treasurer-Elect is suggesting having no liaison.

Ms. Faruk says that it is fair for other Oxford institutions to elect their own representatives, but including this person in our own team shows favouritism to SBS.

The Treasurer says that it is more dangerous to have someone purporting to be the Union liaison officer without an official position in the rules.

The Treasurer-Elect says that we do not need to bring such people under the Union's wing.

The Bursar says that we do not have to adopt and give office to others just because their own institution has selected them as a representative.

The President-Elect says that he thinks in practice, the SBS liaison nominates themselves as the first point of contact, but that someone from SBS then runs in the Union elections and becomes the main contact because they are a formal member of committee.

Ms. Faruk says that the liaison is elected by and accountable to SBS and not the Union.

The Treasurer says that we want this person to comply with the Oxford Union rules.

The President, because of the new version of rule 31, he asks whether a position such as this would be in breach of the rules. He says that we cannot restrict the right of SBS to elect their own liaison, but that this is difficult in the context of whether that person applies to be a member of committee.

The President says that this role is already recognised because the President and President-Elect often discuss speaker events and debates with the liaison, and so there is an implicit recognition to work out how SBS can engage. He says the liaison is a communication tool and not an action tool.

The Treasurer-Elect says that there is a reasonable case that this change breaches rule 31, as no temporary appointed role can be created that overlaps with one of the roles defined in rule 31. She says that there is a reasonable case to make that this role overlaps with the graduate officer. She says that there was an argument in rules committee distinguishing between “appointed officials” and “officials who are appointed”.

The Bursar says that she understands the importance of having someone to liaise with, but that she does not see the need for this person to be a member of committee. She also says that MBAs do not exhaust the list of students of the Said Business school, and so the current liaison does not represent all of SBS.

Ms. Dube moves that TSC amend Standing Order E3 as in her proposed change

The motion fails with 2 votes for (the Treasurer, Ms. Dube) and 5 votes against (the President-Elect, the Treasurer-Elect, Ms. Faruk, Mr. Webster, Mr. Parr-Reid)

Business of Ms. Faruk

Ms. Faruk has no business

Business of Mr. Webster

Mr. Webster has no business

Business of Ms. Joshi

Ms. Joshi has no business

Business of Mr. Parr-Reid

Mr. Parr-Reid has no business

Business of the President-Elect

The President-Elect asks TSC about the substance of the survey, which has been sent to members of committee. He says he took all bar 1 of the questions from a previous survey in 2011, along with questions supplied by the Access committee.

The Bursar asks about the wording of question 5, and whether the current wording referring to staff should be changed to “... the service of”

The President-Elect accepts this suggestion.

The Bursar says that question 11 is a duplicate of question 5.

The President-Elect says that he will take out question 11.

The President thanks the President-Elect for spending so much time on this, as he thinks it is really good.

The President-Elect moves to authorise expenditure up to £288 as recommended by TFC for a members' survey to go out before the 7th week meeting of TSC

Seconded by the secretary

Nem. con.

Business of the Librarian-Elect

The Librarian-Elect has no business.

Business of the Treasurer-Elect

The Treasurer-Elect has no business.

Business of the Bursar

The Bursar has no business.

Business of the Returning Officer

The Returning Officer says that the appellate board for Trinity term 2018 asked her to read this summary out in TSC:

- “1. This is a summary of the Final Report of the Appellate Board for Trinity Term 2018.
2. The Tribunal Panel for that election heard 3 claims of Electoral Malpractice and one of innocent Interference. It published its findings on 10th October. Mr Kirk appealed two of his original claims of Electoral Malpractice and one of Innocent Interference on 12th October.
3. The Appellate Board found the Election Tribunal's Final Report was almost 4 months late to the set deadline. It did not comply with the requirements set out in Standing Order 8(f).
4. This delay was due to the failure of the members of the Tribunal Panel and the Returning Officer to properly exercise their duties.
5. The late publication and subsequent appeal meant the Librarian Elect and those elected to Secretary's Committee whose nomination was contested in Kirk v Galloway could not formally take their office a full 5 months after their election. They are confirmed to their offices.
6. This delay raises concerns as to the competence and behaviour of the Tribunal Panel and the

Returning Officer, Ms Galloway. We considered whether it was appropriate corporately to submit complaints under Rule 71 against both the members of the Tribunal Panel and Ms Galloway but could not reach a unanimous decision.

7. We were deeply concerned by the events of recent months. Members offering their service to an Election Tribunal must be mindful of their responsibility to act swiftly and comprehensively. We recommend that Returning Officers remind members of the deadlines required of an Election Tribunal. Members failing to meet this bar in future should not be allowed to serve.

8. Furthermore, we observed inconsistent interpretation of the rules in relation to accession, specifically of the Librarian-Elect versus Elected Members of Secretaries Committee. We also observed that Ms Galloway's failure to procure a Final Report and to allow accession consistently may materially have affected the decisions of Standing Committee this term. Were more evidence available to this that this was not a coincidence, we would take a very dim view.

9. Acting under Rule 33(d)(vi) and with agreement of all parties, the Appellate Board asked the Tribunal Panel to issue a second Final Report that would better comply with the rules. Having sight of that second report, Mr Kirk was allowed to continue his appeal, change the grounds of his appeal, or withdraw. He withdrew his appeal.

10. We issue an interpretation to clarify the rules of an Election Tribunal's failure to report.

11. We uphold the decisions of the Election Tribunal."

The President asks if questions can be asked now that the appellate board is no longer sitting.

The Returning Officer says that this is fine.

The President asks if there are any questions.

Business of the Access Officers

The Access Officers have no business.

Business of the CDSC

The CDSC says that the Oxford IV and Oxford wom*n's were successfully conducted over the weekend, with 114 teams for the IV and 40 teams for Wom*n's. He says there was very good feedback on both tournaments, with a future target of 140 teams for the IV. He says he would like on record his thanks for the support of TSC.

The CDSC leaves at 17.59

Changes to the Composition of this Committee

Date of Next Meeting

- Monday 7th week, 16.00 in the President's Office

The President closes the meeting at 18.00

Signed,

Nick Brown
Magdalen College
Secretary