

MINUTES OF EMERGENCY COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD ON THURSDAY THE 2<sup>nd</sup> FEBRUARY 2023 AT 5PM  
ZOOM

ACTION

Present : As per sederunt

Apologies : A Saxena, L Trundle, E Makipere, M Bah, X Zai

Attending: P Swinton, G Connor

- 1) Welcome, Apologies and Sederunt
- 2) Motion: Establishment of Home Students Officer

K Fish said this motion has been proposed as one third of students at the University are home students, however, there is no formal representation for these students. The motion therefore seeks to amend Council to provide this representation in the form of a Home Students Officer.

A vote was taken on Mentimeter.

The motion passed with 21 votes in support and 7 votes against.

- 3) Motion to Restructure the SRC Academic Officers

M Levesque said this motion is being proposed at an Emergency Council Meeting to allow enough time for outcomes to be actioned before the SRC Spring Election. Since the motion was originally submitted at the previous full Council meeting, the University has confirmed it is unable to allow for the Life Sciences Portfolio Representative role to be elected as a combined role representing 5 Schools, owing to an IT issue whereby the codes for each School position cannot be combined into one position. This may be possible in the future but would not be possible in time for the Spring Election. M Levesque said the motion therefore contains an amendment to this effect.

M Levesque said a further amendment to the original motion is that School Representatives may continue to represent both undergraduate and postgraduate taught students. This is due to some of the Life

Sciences Schools containing almost exclusively PGT students. The motion also outlines that the proposed PGR and PGT positions would be elected next year in the SRC Autumn Election.

D Correia said he strongly opposes the motion as he does not feel extra representatives are required in the School of Life Sciences. He said, in his experience, some Learning & Teaching Committees only meet twice a year and that all Schools meet in one single portfolio committee. As such, he does not believe it is efficient for more representatives to be appointed.

R Väre said the SRC's preference would be to have 1 Life Sciences Portfolio representative rather than multiple positions, however, the University has confirmed this is not possible. She said these positions could not be voted on at the Autumn Election as all School Representative positions must be elected in the Spring Election. She said even if the SRC votes against having multiple Life Sciences representatives, these positions need to be implemented due to the University's stipulation. R Väre said the SRC should strive for a single position to be implemented after next year.

M Levesque said the University said the one unified committee referenced by D Correia was initially pitched as a temporary committee. She said having multiple School Representatives would ensure SRC representation across any future shifts to an individual School-based structure. M Levesque said, while she feels one portfolio representative suits the current Life Sciences School structure, the proposal outlined in the motion would be the most appropriate plan of action.

M Mojsiej asked if PGR students are currently represented by School Representatives.

M Levesque said currently all students within a School are represented by School Representatives. She said, however, due to the way Learning & Teaching Committees are organised, PGR students do not currently have committee representation. She said it therefore makes sense to appoint separate PGR and PGT representatives. She noted that University staff support this.

M Mojsiej asked why the proposed amendment to the motion was not circulated to Council in advance of this EGM.

M Levesque said the SRC has been communicating with the University on these School representation issues for some time and that the necessary clarity has only been obtained very recently.

R Väre apologised for the late nature of the proposed amendments.

P Su said he agreed with D Correia. He asked what would happen in the Spring Election if Council voted against the motion.

R Väre said even if Council vote against the motion, a representative for each Life Sciences School would have to be elected in the Spring Election. She said the other outcome of voting against the motion would be that Council remains with one PGR Convenor instead of two. If voted through the PGR positions would be elected in the Spring Election.

R Whip asked D Correia if there are currently 5 separate LTCs and a group LTC within the School of Life Sciences.

D Correia said he attends 1 Life Sciences portfolio meeting. He said he has been advised by staff in the School that this structure will remain in place until 2025.

R Whip said voting against the motion would ultimately only deprive students of another PGR Representative role on Council.

A Symington asked if term time would be extended beyond July 1<sup>st</sup> if the motion was passed and PGT Convenors were elected in the Autumn Election.

M Levesque said these representatives would undertake their roles in line with Council's First Year Representatives and they would leave office at the same time. She said these arrangements could possibly be changed in the future if Council felt it necessary.

T Frater said the University does not have the authority to instruct the SRC on how many representatives it needs to have. He suggested that the issue could be raised at the next meeting of University Court and an open action point could be left for the next Sabbatical team to explore how this can be worked around.

T Anderson asked what would happen to the SRC's constitution if Council members voted against the motion.

M Levesque said a constitutional review will soon take place to address some factual inaccuracies in the SRC's constitution. She said, if the motion passed, required constitutional changes would be ratified by the University Court.

P Su said in the last election cycle, students within the School of Psychology were unable to vote for MLVS Convenors as they were not registered within this College. He asked if issues like this could be avoided in future elections.

R Väre said the SRC can follow up on this to ensure all students can vote for candidates within their Colleges/Schools.

M Mojsiej asked if there would be over 50 representatives on Council if this motion was voted down.

R Väre confirmed there would be over 50. She clarified that the SRC would ask David Duncan to approve a constitutional change to allow for more than 50 representatives on Council.

M Levesque said a review of the constitution will take place to address this cap as well as other issues which have been identified within it.

After several voting discrepancies, Council successfully voted on the motion via anonymous Microsoft Form submission.

The motion passed with 22 votes in support, 3 against, and 2 spoilt votes.

- 4) Date of next Council meeting – Thurs 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2023