

The Ratified Minutes of
THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
4th Week Hilary Term 2018
Monday 5th February
President's Office, 16:00

Present: **The President** (Ms Laali Vadlamani, *Trinity College*), **The President-Elect** (Mr Gui Cavalcanti, *Pembroke College*), **The Librarian** (Ms Sabriyah Sayeed, *Somerville College*), **The Librarian-Elect** (Ms Shivani Ananth, *St. Anne's College*), **The Treasurer** (Mr Stephen Horvath, *New College*), **The Treasurer-Elect** (Mr Daniel Wilkinson, *Oriel College*), **The Secretary** (Ms Molly Greenwood, *St. Hilda's College*), **The Elected Member**, (Mr Shanuk Mediwaka, *Lincoln College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Adam Watson, *Hertford College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Charles Wang, *Hertford College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Izzy Risino, *St. Catherine's College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Chris Garner, *St. Peter's College*), **The Chair of the Consultative Committee** (Mr Julian Kirk, *Magdalen College*), **The Returning Officer** (Mr Harry Samuels, *New College*), **The Bursar** (Ms Lindsay Warne), **The Senior Treasurer** (Mr Stephen Dixon, *Downing College, Cambridge*), **The Senior Librarian** (Mr Sean Power, *Oriel College*), **The Chair of the Debate Select Committee** (Mr Andrew Seow, *Lincoln College*), **The Access Officer** (Ms Vaby Endrojono-Ellis, *Kellogg College*)

Attending:

Apologies:

Absent:

The President opens this Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee at 16:01.

Requests to Pass Absences from Previous Meetings

The President deems Mr Garner's absence from the Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee in 3rd Week of Hilary Term 2018 as to have been with good reason, due to a pressing and extraordinary engagement, namely a job interview.

nem. con.

The President moves to pass Mr Garner's absence from the Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee in 3rd Week of Hilary Term 2018.

nem. con.

The President deems Ms Risino's absence from the Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee in 3rd Week of Hilary Term 2018 as to have been with good reason, due to a pressing and extraordinary engagement, namely a job interview.

nem. con.

The President moves to pass Ms Risino's absence from the Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee in 3rd Week of Hilary Term 2018.

nem. con.

Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

Ratification of Minutes

The Secretary explains that she since has received suggestions for amendments from **the Treasurer** to the draft minutes from the Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee in Third Week, and asks that the ratification of these minutes be pushed back to the Fifth Week meeting so that she can make these amendments.

The President agrees to postpone the ratification.

The President

Business of the President

The President explains that **the Ex-President**, *Worcester College* has not responded to the question put to him in the previous meeting.

The Senior Treasurer leaves the room at 17:07.

The Returning Officer advises that Rule 39(e) would require a presidential interpretation in relation to the question that had been put to **the Ex-President**.

The Treasurer mentions perhaps this should not be in a public business meeting.

It is pointed out that the OPBM is in the coming weeks.

The Returning Officer explains that private and public business have very specific definitions under the Rules.

Questions to the President

There are no questions to the President.

The Librarian

Business of the Librarian

The Librarian has no business.

Questions to the Librarian

There are no questions to the Librarian.

The Treasurer

Business of the Treasurer

The Treasurer moves that following the recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Standing Committee pass DSC expenses of £564.63.

Seconded by the President-Elect.

nem. con.

Mr Garner asks what these expenses are for.

The Treasurer explains that it is expenses for debating competitions, and that a reason that this week's expenses are higher than normal is because of the Oxford Schools competition, and competitors are travelling to regional rounds.

Ms Vaby Endrojono-Ellis enters the room at 16:04.

The Senior Treasurer suggests that a weekly report be made from debaters fully detailing the expenditure, so that it may be brought to the Standing Committee and minuted.

The Treasurer explains this week's expenses to the Senior Treasurer as being travel costs from judging the Oxford Schools rounds, competing at the Inner Temple IV, or the Trinity College, Dublin IV. He says that he will leave the reporting to the Chair of the Debate Selection Committee.

The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee asks whether he should do this right now.

The President and **the President-Elect** note that this can wait until the business of **the CDSC**.

The Treasurer notes also that Milkround still haven't paid, and he has passed this to accounts.

Questions to the Treasurer

There are no questions to the Treasurer.

The Secretary

Business of the Secretary

The Secretary has no business.

Questions to the Secretary

There are no questions to the Secretary.

Mr Shanuk Mediwaka

Business of Mr Mediwaka

Mr Mediwaka has no business.

Questions to Mr Mediwaka

There are no questions to Mr Mediwaka.

Ms Genevieve Athis

Business of Ms Athis

Ms Athis has no business.

Questions to Ms Athis

There are no questions to Ms Athis.

Mr Adam Watson

Business of Mr Watson

Mr Watson has no business.

Questions to Mr Watson

There are no questions to Mr Watson.

Mr Charles Wang

Business of Mr Wang

Mr Wang has no business.

Questions to Mr Wang

There are no questions to Mr Wang.

Mr Charlie Cheesman

Business of Mr Cheesman

Mr Cheesman has no business.

Questions to Mr Cheesman

There are no questions to Mr Cheesman.

Ms Izzy Risino

Business of Ms Risino

Ms Risino has no business.

Questions to Ms Risino

There are no questions to Ms Risino.

Mr Chris Garner

Business of Mr Garner

Mr Garner has no business.

Questions to Mr Garner

There are no questions to Mr Garner.

The President-Elect

Business

The President-Elect suggests amending Standing Order E18, and hands relevant documents to the Standing Committee. He explains that it is in relation to the bar privileges for members of elected committee, and that those ex-Officers who register their vote with the Standing Committee, under the rules, are eligible for the bar privileges on offer, that being free tea, coffee and other beverages on Mondays and Thursdays throughout the term time. He believes that this benefit should be extended if they are on the premises for Society business, believing it to be unreasonable for a President from four or five terms ago to have free beverages.

The Treasurer asks whether we would ordinarily classify attending Standing Committee as being on Society business.

The President-Elect believes this to be the case, but that the decision is at the discretion of the President.

The Treasurer asks if attending a debate dinner on a Thursday would also count.

The President-Elect says yes, and gives the example that occasionally ex-Officers will help logistically with events.

The Treasurer notes that if the decision of what constitutes being on Society business is at the President's discretion, then perhaps it should not be limited to specific days of the week.

The President-Elect explains the importance of limiting to specific weekdays because of the scheduling of Public Business Meetings, so helping on an event would mean that the privilege exists for only that day, keeping it consistent with the rest of the Standing Committee.

The Treasurer notes an inconsistency with this due to the example of someone helping with an event on another day, but not getting the bar privileges if it is not a Monday or a Thursday. He argues that it would be more likely for an ex-President to help on days other than a Thursday, which tends to be just the debate.

The President-Elect explains that the reason for choosing Mondays and Thursdays is due to the meetings scheduled on a Monday afternoon which ex-Officers are allowed to attend, and the debates on a Thursday. He explains that it would be inconsistent to change the days from those allowed to elected members of Standing Committee, because they too work events that are not on a Monday or Thursday.

The Bursar explains her concerns for the bar staff if this becomes too complicated and requires the President's permission.

The President-Elect explains that because this is just for Mondays and Thursdays, the President can be called to authorise ex-Officers who have been working on society business. He notes that the

President is unlikely to be away from the Union on a Monday and Thursday due to meetings and debates. He notes that when in doubt, they should be charged.

The President notes the possibility of refunds, as it would simply be petty change.

Mr Kirk explains that the President would generally be aware if an ex-Officer were to be turning up to a meeting, and in this case the President could inform the House Manager or bar staff as to who would be turning up.

The President explains that it would simply be a case of informing the relevant people when she knows that certain people would be attending meetings.

The Treasurer mentions that often we are not aware when ex-Officers intend to attend Standing Committee, because often they turn up to vote as a surprise.

The President says that if you are noted as present at the meeting, then you can have the coffee.

The Treasurer-Elect questions whether we actually need to change the Standing Order from how it is already.

The President-Elect moves to amend Standing Order E18 as proposed.

Seconded by Mr Watson.

The motion passes with one abstention.

Questions

There are no questions to the President-Elect.

The Librarian-Elect

Business of the Librarian-Elect

The Librarian-Elect has no business.

Questions to the Librarian-Elect

There are no questions to the Librarian-Elect.

The Treasurer-Elect

Business of the Treasurer-Elect

The Treasurer-Elect has no business.

Questions to the Treasurer-Elect

There are no questions to the Treasurer-Elect.

The Ex-Officio

Business to the Ex-Officio

The Ex-Officio have no business.

Questions to the Ex-Officio

There are no questions to the Ex-Officio.

The Senior Librarian

Business of the The Senior Librarian

The Senior Librarian has no business.

Questions to the The Senior Librarian

There are questions to the The Senior Librarian.

The Senior Treasurer

Business of the The Senior Treasurer

The Senior Treasurer has no business.

Questions to The Senior Treasurer

There are no questions to The Senior Treasurer.

The Bursar

Business of The Bursar

The Bursar has no business.

Questions to The Bursar

There are no questions to The Bursar.

The Returning Officer

Business of The Returning Officer

The Returning Officer points out that in the previous meeting, the discussion made it to reasons for immediate disqualification due to how the nomination form is filled out. He notes that **the Ex-Returning Officer**, Alistair Graham has agreed to drop the requirement that a candidate must provide both a valid email address and phone number, or suffer disqualification - now they are required to submit at least one. He notes that this is not to say that the phone number will not be asked for, but just that it would no longer result in immediate disqualification.

The President-Elect asks if a candidate submits a nomination pack without an email address and then proceeds to email the RO explaining who they are and for what they have nominated, whether they would be disqualified due to the technicality of the rules.

The Returning Officer believes that the rule distinguishes between the nomination envelope and nomination as a larger concept, and that the email is part of the nomination process. If the RO does not have an email address for a candidate, and the candidate does not provide one in time, this would be a disqualification. He moves on to explain the next part of the rules remain the same in regard to omitting to sign and date, and where a candidate is ineligible to nominate.

Mr Watson highlights an incident last term where a candidate did email, but this did not change the fact that they were considered to have invalidly nominated.

The Returning Officer explains that in this case, he could issue an interpretation. He notes the change in regard to the fact that photos must now be identical, and the rectification time for photos has been extended. The eligibility criteria has not been changed. He moves on to discuss comment AG15 in reference to the repayment of monies, which must be paid back within 28 hours of the close of nomination, which is the same substantive rule, but now says that candidates must be notified within six rather than four hours in line with when the RO pins this to the noticeboard. A note mentions handing money into the bar, but this is from a previous draft of the rules change and is no longer required.

The Treasurer asks to where money must be handed, and to whom.

The Returning Officer responds that it will go to a designated location within the Society, which will almost always be the General Office, and to the Returning Officer or an agent thereof. He clarifies to **the President-Elect** that members of staff are technically agents of the Returning Officer in regard to the elections. He explains that the location is not specified because of the different categories of monies that may be owed, for example it would be difficult to hand library fines to the bar etc. He moves on the Section (d), Election Notifications and Timelines, which he explains to be the same but with many elements brought from different places, codifying the order for the benefit of the RO. Election expenditure explains how the RO funds the election, and accountability of elected officials remains the same. He notes that this concludes the changes to Rule 34, and asks the Standing Committee if they have any questions. They do not, and he moves on to discuss Rule 35.

He explains that Rule 35, Conduct of the Poll clarifies how the election is administered. The first part incorporates a Standing Order into the top paragraph, and areas referring to the Order of the Ballot remain generally the same but information has been gathered into one place. The next part clarifies the number of words in the manifesto, both short and long, in a prominent place. There is an amendment that refers to experience and capability in manifestos, and the change makes this Rule more lenient. Previously experience and capability was quite narrowly defined and interpreted loosely, and so this codifies the fact that relevant transferable skills outside the Society are relevant, and also means that words which in the past could only be used for specific things can now be used more widely.

The CCC ask how relevant transferable skills are determined.

The Returning Officer explains that it is skills from outside the Society that are relevant to the position within the Society, at the discretion of the Returning Officer as has been in previous terms.

Mr Mediwaka asks whether the line that requires experience and capability is not subsumed by that which requires evidence for suitability.

The Returning Officer explains that it can be, but it can also refer to personal traits.

The President points out the wording could be troublesome. She mentions that were a Treasurer candidate to argue for their creativity, it could be considered not relevant to Office when it arguably is a wider personality trait that a candidate may wish to broadcast to the Membership.

The Returning Officer says that this is the kind of discussion that occurs during scrutiny under this and the previous Rule. In response to **the President's** comment, he mentions that he is personally not attached to this line and suggests removing the phrase 'regarding to the Office or Committee for which they stand'.

The Treasurer broadly disagrees with this concept, because it is so easy to find relevant capability, the requirements for which are so broad. He notes he considers it valuable to have this experience related to work done in the Society, and it would be regrettable to make an equalisation between experience inside and outside the Society.

The Returning Officer takes this point, and looks to the current rule. He suggests coming back to this at the end. He notes that the Tribunal Report of Hilary 2005, which explains that the Returning Officer must ensure democratic choice be given to the members within the Rules, should not be required to be given, and candidates can simply request it. He points to the section explaining all monetary values in manifesto must exclude VAT, which already exists in the Rules, so this is an extra part explaining what that means.

The President-Elect makes the point that there seem to be far more changes than are highlighted, and that many things are reworded. He says that it is not clear how rewording has been done and repositioned. He notes that he has an issue with how the Rules change has been presented.

The Returning Officer explains that **the Ex-Returning Officer** distributed the copy that highlights in red and green, and the later draft only removes rather than adds changes. He explains that the substantive changes are rewording and moving items, to make the Rules easier to read and follow. It is not an attempt to suspiciously change the Rules.

The President-Elect notes his concern at creating new ambiguities through the re-wording that would potentially require new interpretation. He gives the example that the rewording has made it seem more convoluted, as orders of lists have changed.

The Returning Officer explains that the logic behind this is to make things that relate to each other closer together and clearer to read. For example paragraph (b)(ii) has extra information inserted to explain experience and capability, but the areas around it are just parts that have been moved elsewhere.

The President-Elect accepts that things have been moved around, but even so they have been slightly reworded, and since the Rules often rely on interpretation which is heavily influenced by wording, we should analyse this and not risk new ambiguities, or get rid of old ones that required interpretation.

The Treasurer-Elect requests a document that shows tracked changes, as he is finding it difficult to see them. **The President-Elect** supports this.

The CCC asks if the motion is valid if it is not presented showing tracked changes.

The Returning Officer says that he will be more detailed in his explanations from now on. He explains that the current format follows the Rules, as he will move in this meeting for the Standing

Committee to endorse the changes, and then they will be presented as a motion to pass in Public Business, where they will have to be formatted differently.

The President-Elect makes the Standing Committee aware that once TSC endorses this Rules change, they can no longer publicly speak against it, and so we are binding ourselves to something quite serious.

Andrew Seow leaves the room at 16:34.

The Returning Officer states that he will return to a question posed by the President-Elect about which members of Standing Committee are bound by the decision of the Committee, but believes that it is present and voting members. He moves back to the topic of the Hilary Term 2005 Tribunal Report not being in nomination packs, and the exclusion of VAT in manifesto figures. He notes that this information about VAT used to be under Rule 35(b)(iii). He explains that the Rule now clarifies exactly what must exclude VAT.

The Bursar points out that this doesn't make sense, and she and the President agree that there is not much point changing this.

The Returning Officer accepts this. He notes the next clause talks about libel in manifestos and not being able to mention other name by implication, bringing together Rule 35(b)(iii)(i) and Rule 35(b)(xiii) which is the same text saying that no one may be libellous.

The Treasurer notes that it is quite strange that the Rules point out that no racist statements can be made, but it does not specify any other type of discrimination.

The President notes that it is under Rule 71 for other types of discrimination being against the Rules.

The Returning Officer notes that he is very happy to insert these into this section of the Rules also.

The Treasurer suggests the phrase 'discriminatory language as referenced in Rule 71'.

The Senior Librarian leaves the room at 16:39.

The Returning Officer suggests a way that includes the phrase 'discriminatory language, as defined', to be inserted into the Rule.

The Treasurer notes that phrases can be struck from a manifesto for being frivolous or malicious, but gives the example that somebody could make calculated and false statements to further their own chances without it being either frivolous or malicious.

The Secretary argues that this would then be frivolous.

The Returning Officer explains that the RO has a general duty under Rule 32 to ensure that no breaches of Rule 33 take place, and candidates cannot bring the Society into disrepute. Therefore, part of the duty of the RO to ensure such statements are not made.

The Returning Officer explains that comparative claims are fine so long as they are not misleading, but it is mentioned that surely that can be difficult to gauge. **The Returning Officer** believes that is a decision for scrutiny. Since the Returning Officer has the power to strike an entire

manifesto on the grounds of misleading claims, candidates are taking a real risk in submitting false ones.

The Treasurer points out that claims can get very silly in terms of extracurricular topics.

The Returning Officer says that the solution is inherent in the Rule, and that the validity of silly manifesto claims are for the electorate to decide.

The Librarian-Elect believes that **the Returning Officer's** explanation is clear, but that the written Rules are not.

The President-Elect asks about extenuating circumstances resulting in a candidate not being able to appear at scrutiny.

The Returning Officer says that the candidate can have a representative.

The President-Elect thinks it more beneficial for a representative to be there instead.

The President notes current practice is both people turning up because this gets the strongest claims.

Mr Watson believes there should be a provision for a candidate to be absent.

The Librarian leaves the room at 16:52.

The CCC asks why someone who is running for another position in an election cannot act as a representative for another candidate.

The Treasurer explains about how it can become a trap for the candidate, because they could be tripped for things said as a representative. This prohibition protects them.

The Bursar leaves the room at 17:16.

Mr Watson brings up a scrutiny from the previous term.

The President notes that this particular scrutiny was *in camera*.

The Treasurer notes that himself and **the President-Elect** were excluded from this.

The President-Elect asks **the Returning Officer** what would have happened if he had refused to leave the room, a question to which **the Returning Officer** does not know the answer.

The Returning Officer discusses how objections are a big part of the scrutiny process, and they can now be brought if a Rule or Standing Order had been broken, and that frivolous objections can be thrown away without the candidate there, and also that now evidence would have to be submitted alongside the objection.

Mr Mediwaka agrees that **the Returning Officer** should pursue things further, but the provision should be expanded for frivolous and malicious objections to be thrown away.

The Treasurer believes that frivolous and malicious manifesto objections should have the same weight, and there should be sanctions applied to people who make them.

The Returning Officer suggests a nominal £10 fine.

The Treasurer suggests fining per claim.

Mr Watson makes point that when objections are sent by email, surely they are sent via someone else.

The CCC notes that you can falsify email accounts.

*At this point **the President** designates the Chair to **the President-Elect**.*

The President leaves the room at 17:27.

The Treasurer notes that a large volume of objections would already be delaying the RO, so would be a breach under Rule 33.

The Returning Officer moves to the redefinition of some claims, explaining that some incorporate interpretations into the Rules. He notes that at present, there are two elements to a claim: inception and development/fulfilment. At the moment, to get the 'organised', claim you have to prove both, and sharing this with someone else becomes 'co-organised'.

The Treasurer asks what the case would be if you have sole inception of something but are not involved in the development?

The Returning Officer notes that this would depend but would probably warrant 'co-arranged'.

Mr Watson says that using a similar word can get round it.

The CCC asks if we could insist claims refer to the Society.

The Returning Officer notes that under Interpretation A68, external organisations must be held to same standard of proof.

The Returning Officer notes that he is looking at page 7 of the document, and suggests adding a subsection (iii).

The CCC suggests phrasing it as something like, any claim specified under the Rule below for experience the candidate has had in institutions other than the Society, this must be specified.

The President enters the room at 17:37 and reassumes the Chair.

The Returning Officer verbally finalises the phrasing.

The Librarian-Elect leaves the room at 17:38.

The President-Elect asks if changes to each definition for each claim can be gone through individually.

The Returning Officer agrees and begins to do so. Raised and secured change to require primary responsibility for a contract secured, not just the signing of it.

The President-Elect asks how primary responsibility is defined. For instance, if the Treasurer spends a lot of time training the Partnership Officer, and gives the Officer a template from which they are able to negotiate something, who then has the primary responsibility, and how would the Treasurer prove this.

The Returning Officer states that the Treasurer would then have to make this case in scrutiny. He believes such examples could not be captured by the Rules.

The Librarian-Elect enters the room at 17:40.

Ms Risino and Mr Garner leave the room at 17:40.

Mr Watson asks if such a thing were captured in the Rules, whether it could cause further problems. He asks if, for example, more senior members of Committee give drafts for blurbs, would this also cause a problem.

The Returning Officer notes that each Committee operates itself very differently, and as a result it is difficult to legislate for all of them. Therefore, it comes down to presentation of evidence to a scrutiny panel and the discretion of the Returning Officer.

The President-Elect notes that the Rule would state that there must be primary responsibility in the negotiation of the contract, but points out that there is much more to it than negotiation.

The Returning Officer notes that this is specifically in reference to the 'raised' and 'secured' claims.

The Treasurer says that a change in definition should expand the number of people able to make raised claims, rather than making it harder for the Treasurer to make the claim. He says that it is the case that raised claims come from long standing arrangements resulting from quick emails sent. While he agrees that that no one should be able to claim 'raised' from other people's work, there is often not much primary responsibility involved.

The Returning Officer says that the renewing of communication, according the precedent, is the renewing of the process and thus is primary responsibility.

The Treasurer mentions that emails are forwarded between accounts, making responsibility difficult to decide.

The President says that much time is spent training, and giving vision and direction to a Partnership Officer and so it is not the case that they simply send emails.

The Librarian-Elect says that raised is a very strong claim, and that many emails do not equal a raised claim, and believes it was said that a re-initiation of the contact would be sufficient for the claim.

The Returning Officer reiterates that this is something scrutiny would decide, and that it is very difficult to capture the every example. We should take the principle that the person who did the most work should get the claim.

The President disagrees that it is so simple, believing that building up a sponsorship database takes time, and that long-standing relationships don't mean that arrangements will continue.

The Returning Officer suggests sticking with the current phrasing for raised.

The President-Elect notes that if a Treasurer or President dislike a member of Committee, or are running against them, they could not allow that person to sign things.

The Treasurer points out that the Treasurer does a lot of work by writing a contract.

The President says that raising money requires prior logistical arrangements.

Mr Watson notes how, during the summer vacation, members of Committee had looked up and found addresses and had written handwritten letters, but the email goes out under the President's name, and so he mentions he could only claim 'helped confirm'.

The Returning Officer apologises that this happened, and states that it is wrong to have happened. He says that adding it into the Rules codifies this and stops this situation reoccurring.

The President-Elect notes that since the President can no longer run for any position, them jumping in on correspondence should not be able to have an effect.

Mr Watson asks if it is worth having a more comprehensive section of the things required.

The Returning Officer is concerned we could run the risk of over-legislating, and given the enormous range of possible claims, it would be very difficult to do. He defends the RO's prerogative to make the decisions on this occasion.

The President suggests changing the wording to say primary signatory 'or' responsibility.

The CCC notes that this wording means the Treasurer could claim things in situations where we have just discussed they shouldn't.

The President suggests 'primary signatory with some element of involvement or primary responsibility of the negotiation of a contract'.

The Librarian-Elect asks whether it is only the President or the Treasurer who can sign contracts.

The President-Elect explains that the Treasurer can allow members of Standing Committee to do it.

The President points out that the Treasurer may not allow some people to.

The Librarian-Elect raises the point that contracts could be given to members of Standing Committee to sign when they have had little involvement in its development, purely so as to be able to make the manifesto claim.

The Treasurer raises the new point that not all 'raised' claims involve contracts, giving work done during the membership drive as an example. He explains that recently, a sponsor wanted to receive only an invoice, with the legally binding contract in the form of an email chain. He points out that this is raising money, but there is no contract to sign.

The President notes that someone is clearly responsible when money is coming into the Society.

The Returning Officer suggests leaving out the part about written contracts.

The CCC suggests not repeating the word ‘raised’, and suggests ‘primary responsibility for the production of a contractual arrangement.’

The Treasurer agrees that this would be good phrasing.

The Returning Officer agrees with this, and notes that he would be able to tell who has done the most work. He moves on to the claim ‘brought’, and then ‘confirmed’. ‘Confirmed’ incorporates the Cordon interpretation on this.

The President asks if someone had written a letter, would it be sufficient to prove via Civi.

Mr Watson asks if you would need testimony.

The Returning Officer says that Civi is useful evidence.

The Treasurer notes that sometimes earlier work cannot be checked from previous terms.

The CCC tells everyone that it is possible to get full records of invitations on Civi.

The Returning Officer moves on to ‘organised’.

Mr Watson notes confusion about inception for speakers. He notes that often the President and Senior Officers have strong ideas of what they want to do in regard to debates, and it is then decided as a group by Committee. He mentions he knows no example where one person has been solely in charge of a debate.

The President explains the four stages of inception that would be relevant in this case, those being the initial idea, development, further shaping the debate and deciding speakers.

The Returning Officer notes he theorised the four stages of inception, and this can be used to decide claims.

The President says that this can be used to determine what claim can be had.

The Librarian-Elect asks if there is a hierarchy in these stages. She suggests that the wording of the motion would require more work than a list of speakers for example.

The President, President-Elect and Treasurer agree that it would be decided on a case by case basis. **The Treasurer** notes how in the case of a vague motion, the blurb writing might be more significant, for example.

Mr Watson explains that he had been unable to claim ‘organised’ because he had not been able to prove he had set the debate motion, despite having then confirmed speakers.

The Returning Officer moves on the ‘responsible for/led/run’, which combines them. He then explains ‘arranged’ as being in the manifesto book for the first time, and explains it as being ‘organised’ without inception. ‘Negotiation’ is also new, and requires ‘primary responsibility’, and ensure the negotiation is genuine or ongoing. He moves to the weaker claims and explains those.

Mr Watson brings up the concept of ‘contributed significantly’ and asks what is meant by ‘significantly’.

The CCC explains that precedent sets that if a member of Secretary's Committee is rotated onto an event, and then turns up and does their duty, this counts as facilitated.

The Treasurer notes the issue of being simply peripheral relevance and then claiming facilitating.

The Returning Officer explains the next section that incorporates the Librarian not being allowed to call themselves Vice-President.

The Librarian-Elect asks if this refers to manifestos, or for other things like stash as well.

The Returning Officer explains that it is just in reference to manifestos.

The Treasurer notes that having Vice-President on social media or LinkedIn during an election would be a problem. The Returning Officer agrees.

The Returning Officer explains the next part, that removes the requirement for the RO to put posters in every college. He notes the part regarding emailing manifesto booklets, and believing this to be a success wishes to continue this. He thinks more things like this should be done.

The President believes that the Returning Officer should not 'seek' to print manifesto booklets, seeing as this is their job.

Mr Watson asks if there is provision for unavoidable printer problems, and if there is why does that not extend to other things.

The Returning Officer removes this part. The next part is ensuring that candidates distribute manifesto booklets, and the part after that allows the RO to remove the ballot from a member after disruption for ten minutes, reduced from half an hour. The RO must put the notice on the board after an hour; and the next Rule allows the RO to remove torn ballots and put them in an envelope. He runs through the last changes that are not contentious and are not opposed.

The question of experience and capability is now reconsidered. **The Returning Officer** believes the Rule is more lenient, and take the point about wanting to distinguish between Society and non-Society which was solved by adding an appropriate clause. He believes this make it more open for members.

The Treasurer notes there is a visual element to a manifesto before the textual element, and agrees with adding the distinction, but believes it wrong for experience out of the Society to be equal to that within the Society.

The Returning Officer suggests that external experience be removed as being experience that counts.

The Treasurer suggests the current Rule is fit for purpose. He then suggests that we could end up with situations where a candidate for Standing Committee who has previously been on Secretary's Committee could have done good work, but someone with a hugely impressive achievement outside the Society could eclipse them. He believes this to be wrong, and thinks that experience within the Society should be more greatly weighted.

The Secretary disagrees, believing that by closing the Rule to only allow experience from within the Society, we perpetuate this funnelling of the ranks and make Committee further impenetrable.

The CCC notes that the process by which speakers are invited in the Union is likely different to other societies, and therefore the point of experience within the Society applies.

The Secretary believes that codifying this too strongly would restrict an RO in their ability to make judgement on experience and capability.

The Treasurer expresses concern for things that are misleading, looking like a Union claim but not being. This is a problem perpetuated by formatting in manifestos.

The Returning Officer notes that it is very difficult to distinguish within the text of the Rules.

Mr Watson suggests codifying percentages that apply to work within the Union.

The CCC suggests that RO discretion be used in deciding what can be allowed for experience and capability.

The Treasurer agrees with **the Secretary** that genuine experience be credited. He notes that it is easy to make big claims from external things, but in line with **the Secretary's** argument, he believes we must not devalue genuine experience.

The Returning Officer believes the RO can use their discretion, and notes that it is for the members to decide.

The Treasurer says that the onus is on the RO to have more awareness of how external claims can be misleading. He mentions he has seen past scrutiny panels make poor decisions based on external claims.

Mr Watson asks the Returning Officer what his interpretation would be in this case.

The Returning Officer says that, off the top of his head, he wouldn't be able to say, but something in regard to 'misleading'.

The CCC believes the phrase 'regarding the Office or Committee for which they stand' should remain in the wording.

The Returning Officer asks if anyone has any questions. There are no questions. He explains that all members of Standing Committee are collectively bound by the decision that is made.

The Returning Officer moves that the Standing Committee waive Standing Order B5 subsections (b) and (c) for the next fortnight.

Seconded by the President

nem. con.

The Returning Officer moves that the Standing Committee move that the Rules changes as discussed go before the house as a motion moved by recommendation of the Standing Committee at the Public Business Meeting this Thursday 8th February 2018.

Seconded by Mr Watson.

Passed with 4 abstentions.

The Returning Officer brings up Standing Orders F5 - 7. He explains that people have been phoning asking about membership eligibility which is confusing and there is an imbalance. As the University has created new institutions, the Union has not caught up, and so there are discrepancies for non-matriculated students.

The Treasurer says we should discuss this with the Bursar.

The President thinks we should wait to discuss this, due to a lack of people present.

The Returning Officer notes that nomination packs will be available from Wednesday next week.

The Returning Officer notes that this time last year a motion was passed for the pride flag to be flown during Pride Week, and that this is still binding on the Standing Committee.

The President says that she will speak to the Bursar regarding the whereabouts of the flag.

Questions to The Returning Officer

There are no questions to The Returning Officer.

The Chair of the Consultative Committee

Business of The Chair of the Consultative Committee

The Chair of the Consultative Committee has no business.

Questions to The Chair of the Consultative Committee

There are no questions to The Chair of the Consultative Committee.

The Access Officers

Business of The Access Officers

The Access Officers have no business.

Questions to The Access Officers

There are no questions to The Access Officers.

The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee

Business of The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee

The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee has no business.

Questions to The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee

There are no questions to The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee.

Changes to the Composition of this Committee

There are no changes to the composition of this Committee.

Any Other Business

The President mentions that the Officers received an email from a member who was denied entry to the Tech Debate for not having his membership card, and he explains that his wife was not allowed to sign him in as a guest.

The Bursar says that members should not be allowed to sign in.

The Treasurer suggests that we should send a nice email back, highlighting the fact that we have taken his concerns into account but that his suggestion of an electronic check in would be difficult because of the closing of the Office after office hours.

The Treasurer-Elect believes that to pay £10 on the door is not unreasonable.

The Bursar expresses that she would wish to see **the House Manager** first to establish exactly what happened. She says that the main thing is that he accepts he was at fault.

The Treasurer reiterates that an email should be sent.

The CCC notes that anyone could say they were a member and forgot their card, which complicates the situation.

Ms Vaby Endrojono-Ellis leaves the room at 17:02.

The President says she will email a reply saying that the issue was discussed in Standing Committee, but the suggested solution is not feasible.

Date of Next Meeting

- Emergency Meeting at 15:45 on Wednesday afternoon.

The President closes this Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee at 18:40.

Signed,



Molly Greenwood
St. Hilda's College
Secretary