



28/4/11

Dear Council Member,

Council Meeting

In accordance with the Constitution I hereby give notice that a meeting of council will take place on **Thursday 5 May** at **6.30 p.m.** in the **Williams Room**.

I would remind you that you are obliged to attend all meetings of council. **If you are unable to attend please send your apologies in writing to me, or the PA to the Permanent Secretary, before midday on Thursday 5 May 2011.**

The Agenda for the meeting will be as follows:

- a) Welcome
- b) Sederunt
- c) Minutes of the last meeting and Matters Arising
- d) Sabbatical Officers Reports
- e) Convenors, Court Assessor and Officers Reports
- f) John McIntyre Building
- g) Consultations
- h) PETs Report
- i) Standardised Student Feedback Questionnaires
- j) PG Social Space Working Group
- k) Handover
- l) Honorary Degrees
- m) Any Other Competent Business

Yours faithfully
Tommy Gore

President

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY MARCH 24 2011 AT 6.30 p.m.
IN THE WILLIAMS ROOM.**

Present : As per sederunt sheets

Apologies : D. Davies, GUSA, C. Fundulea, G. Masiulyte.

Attending : Helen Speirs (Senior Advice Policy and Training Officer), Various Student Members, Subcity Staff

1. WELCOME

T. Gore opened the meeting with details of an emergency motion. It was agreed that this motion would be heard and discussed by Council before agenda issues. It was also agreed that T. Eriksson would chair this portion of the meeting.

Motion as proposed by Matt Morrison, Officer for Clubs and Societies:

The SRC opposes any kind of occupation that affects the quality of learning and teaching, such as the continuing occupation of the Hetherington Research Club. Furthermore the SRC requests that the University takes disciplinary action against:

- a) Any student who vandalizes or damages university property
- b) Any student that assaults university staff
- c) Any student whom actively seek to disturb the learning and teaching environment of the university.

Council reaffirms its commitment to free expression and consultation, in a constructive manner, in keeping with the University of Glasgow's tradition of student representation.

Matt Morrison (Proposer)

Seconded by:

Ana Cohen (Postgraduate Convenor)
Flo Weber (Arts Convenor)*
Hannah Mart Goodlad (College of Science Convenor)
Ellen Grant (Charities Officer)
Stuart Ritchie (College of Social Science Convenor)
Jenny Court (Women's Officer)
Suzanne Milne (General Rep)

*(F. Weber had retracted his signature before the meeting.)

Matt Morrison proposed and spoke for the motion.

The signatories, as representatives of the whole student body, felt it their duty to focus discussion on the need for a resolution to the situation on campus which had been ongoing for fifty days. Although the occupation of 13 University Gardens had originated with, seemingly, positive aims the manner and message of the occupation had quickly changed. M. Morrison highlighted that the occupation had been responsible for the disruption of a full day on campus, damage to University property, and had occupied two University spaces. M. Morrison also noted his concern at a video which appeared to show a student being accosted and harassed by some of the occupiers. M Morrison argued that the occupiers represented no one, lacked any sense of accountability for their actions and should end their occupation. T. Eriksson noted that the SRC Constitution does not allow for amendments to motions. Therefore, the motion would be discussed as it was proposed.

Ellen Grant wished to note the particularly divisive nature of the occupation over the last month. She did not agree with people being called 'Tory Scum' if they did not agree with the occupation. She also felt that after the emergence of the video referred to by M Morrison, the SRC could not condone the actions of the occupation group.

Stuart Ritchie Noted that the main objective of the motion was to highlight the issues associated with some protests and occupations where they were poorly managed; conduct became unacceptable; there was a generally negative impact on the student learning experience.

It was necessary to refer to the Hetherington in the motion to ensure it was accepted for debate as an "Emergency" Motion.

T. Eriksson then opened the debate to the floor.

Tommy Gore spoke to outline the SRC's stance.

He noted that he had had some disagreements with the occupation and was not personally convinced that it was necessarily the way to achieve its aims and that he had said this before. However, he pointed out that in the SRC statement released to the press on Tuesday 22 March, it clearly stated that the SRC supported the University's objective in converting 13 University Gardens into teaching space, but expressed the view that the police presence on campus was disproportionate and heavy handed. This last point was emphasised by the media and certain students interpreted this as a clear sign of support for the occupation. He also stated that campus was divided, and he had to represent all students, both for and against the occupation. If some felt that this was fence sitting, he apologised, but felt that the SRC was there for all students, including those involved in the Hetherington occupation. He noted that this was incredibly frustrating and

that lots of time had been invested in attempting to address such divisive issues when the SRC should have been focussed on addressing the issues thrown up by the recent University proposals.

Chris Walsh (Minority Ethnic Officer) noted that the first line of the motion could not be applied to the occupation of 13 University Gardens as it had been empty for a year and its occupation could not, therefore, be considered disruptive to learning and teaching. He stated that it was laughable for Stuart Ritchie to comment on the impartiality of the SRC given his own stance on the occupation. He noted that it was absurd for the motion to propose that the SRC endorse disciplinary action against students and that it was not the role of the SRC to police campus. He wished to condemn the members of Council who had signed the motion but had not spoken in defence of it.

Matt Morrison explained that the University wanted to use 13 University Gardens for Learning and Teaching. He re-iterated that students must be held accountable for their actions on campus and again cited the video allegedly showing a student being accosted in 13 University Gardens by members of the occupation.

Florian Weber disagreed that the occupation was not disruptive and noted, for example, that the adjoining building had been broken into and vandalized. If the occupation could endorse a policy which would hold their members to account to curb any unruly behaviour, then he would vote against the motion.

Ellen Grant noted that C. Walsh, as an elected student representative, had a commitment to attend Council meetings and asked him to explain his absence from every single Council meeting prior to this one. She also questioned whether he considered the student issues with which the SRC had been concerned over the past year to have been worthy of his attention.

Chris Walsh accepted that he had never attended a Council meeting prior to this but felt that if there were issues with this, they should have been raised at previous Council meetings.

Natalia Tomaszek (Gen Rep) felt that the motion in its present form did not express the intentions of the SRC. She was concerned what the motion would convey to the student body and did not feel the SRC needed to remind the University of its obligations regarding its code of conduct. Finally, she supported Tommy Gore's point that the purpose of the SRC was to represent all students and that further division on campus was not needed. Personal feelings regarding the occupation should not cloud any discourse over the motion.

Ana Cohen felt that one of the reasons that the motion was drawn up was because it did not appear that the SRC was making a strong enough statement. If the SRC's position was that it was not taking a side because it represented all students, then this must be made clear. She also wished to remind Council that many of the people involved in the occupation were not students.

Stuart Ritchie agreed with both Ana and Natalia. He explained that the wording of the motion and the inclusion of the Hetherington Research Club was such so as to make sure that it was fully debated at Council. He had hoped that the motion could be amended in the same way as an ordinary motion, but this had been an oversight. He sought agreement on the point that, if the SRC agreed to represent all students, then it should not take a stance on the ongoing issue.

Fraser Sutherland noted that the Executive as a group had never taken a stance on the occupation and that Tommy Gore had gone to 13 University Gardens on the day of the eviction to make clear that the police presence was not welcome by the students. He stated that the majority feeling on campus supported this. Any student who had a complaint to make regarding the issues in the motion that were also covered in the University Senate's code of conduct was strongly urged to take this to the Senate, if there was evidence. If students were not confident in doing this, the VP Student Support would take on this issue on their behalf. He noted that all of the necessary rules were already in place.

Michael Comerford noted that this was not a debate regarding personal positions. All the motion seemed to be doing was asking Council to re-iterate rules already in place and only served to draw the SRC into a political debate which it did not need to be involved in. Passing such a motion would put the SRC in a very difficult position through a debate in which it should not be involved.

Questions were then permitted through the Chair

Oliver Milne noted that the proposition was regarding points of discipline. He viewed the SRC's key role to support and represent students. If it called for the condemnation of students it would lose credibility for any future cases. He noted that the motion was far too general in terms of wording with regards to definitions of 'disruption'. If Council did not vote the motion down they would not be fulfilling their role.

Lynsey agreed with Tommy Gore's point that the SRC had to represent all students regardless of attitudes towards the occupation. She felt that the SRC would be undermining its purpose if it pursued attempts to have students disciplined. She argued against Florian Weber's point that

university property had been vandalised by explaining that all acts of vandalism had been committed by outside groups or bodies and that this was well-known and proven. She also made the point that most of the people involved in the occupation were students, but that some activists who were not students were also members of the occupation because they supported its aims. She suggested that the motion was pointless because the University had already promised not to discipline students for actions which took place during the eviction and that, in any case, the only assaults during the eviction had been committed by the police and University Security against students.

Lauri Love also agreed with Tommy Gore's point and said that the occupation had more important things to be dealing with, just like the SRC.

Kate Connolly stated that the occupation of 13 University Gardens was no longer an illegal occupation but an ongoing negotiation, as senior management had now authorised the student presence in the building. She referred to the incident which had been videoed the night before when a student had allegedly been accosted by members of the occupation in 13 University Gardens and she emphasised that the occupation could not be held responsible for the actions of people in the building, drawing comparisons between this and comments made by individual Council members on Facebook regarding the eviction. She argued that the division on campus was a true reflection of British society and that arguments between left-wing groups and right-wing groups were always going to be a reality, stating that an undivided campus was an unrealistic ideal. The best to hope for was a peaceful campus, but she advised that this would not happen as long as management were not acting in a peaceful manner.

Matt Morrison acknowledged that the wording of the motion was not ideal and indicated that the proposers were happy to withdraw it but they still wanted to make sure that the SRC had no involvement with such student groups and that any future protests were organised by the SRC only, in order to ensure transparency and accountability future problems would and should be the responsibility of the SRC and no other group. T. Eriksson highlighted that the SRC, as the democratically elected student body, was already accountable for student protests.

Stuart Ritchie agreed that the motion would be withdrawn providing it was noted that there were concerns about the way the SRC had handled the matter. He also acknowledged that the motion was not the view of Council.

The motion was withdrawn.

Lauri Love asked if he could move to reject the removal of the motion and put it to a vote. It was noted that the motion had been withdrawn and that a

vote was no longer possible.

Ana Cohen reiterated that the motion had been brought forward in order to generate discussion regarding the occupation of 13 University Gardens and questioned whether the attendance at this meeting would have been so great if it had been an ordinary Council meeting.

Florian Weber suggested that the SRC enter into open talks with the occupation to ensure that staff working in 11 University Gardens are not disturbed by the occupation in future.

Luke Winter made the point that it was not possible to 'police' large marches and for the SRC to claim full responsibility for organising marches could appear like an attempt to exclude other groups.

Fraser Sutherland also explained that ACAN specifically had worked with the SRC to organise marches in the past and that cooperation had always been forthcoming.

Florian Weber made it clear that Council members did not wish to exclude any groups, but as the democratically elected student representative body the SRC should always be included in any mass, coordinated student action.

Lauri Love explained that the problems surrounding the eviction could not have been coordinated with the SRC as it was not planned. He also explained that the occupation would have been happy to discuss the matter with the SRC had there been time. He also explained that rubbish at the back of 11/13 University Gardens had now been removed and that plans were being drawn up to police entry to 13 University Gardens more formally so that acts of vandalism and damage would not happen again

Chris Walsh explained that all anti cuts march organisers always made the SRC their first point of call to gain their support. SRC speakers were always invited and SRC input was always sought to assist in organisation. It was always positive to receive SRC backing, but marches would still go ahead if the SRC did not wish to be involved.

Lynsey re-iterated that it was positive that Tommy Gore had condemned the scale of the police operation during the eviction and appreciated SRC support but stated that people were not going to feel comfortable where SRC members had expressed inflammatory opinions regarding the occupation on Facebook.

Ellen Grant said that the opinions of those involved in the occupation were clear, but that Council had a responsibility to represent all students. She

drew attention to the fact that there were vocal objections to the occupation among various student groups and cited a petition which had been started to demonstrate this. Many people do not agree with the occupation and as a Council member she felt it was her responsibility to also represent those views.

Kate Connolly extended an invitation to Council members to visit the Hetherington at any time.

Chris Sibbald asked if there had been any discussions with senior management group with regards to the future of the occupation. He expressed his concern that the unions were unclear as to the full situation on campus. Tommy Gore replied that there had been no formal meeting and that he would share any information if the situation changed.

Chris Walsh stated that if the motion had been dealt with, he had to make his apologies and leave the meeting.

Stuart Ritchie made a statement regarding recent events.

Stuart Ritchie explained that he had received several communications concerning his comments on Facebook regarding the eviction of 13 University Gardens.

He wished to apologise unreservedly for his comments. He apologised for the offence he had caused to members of the Occupation. He wished to make it clear that the comments were flippant and had not been intended as a serious wish to see people involved in the occupation harmed in any way. He could understand how people could be offended by both the tone and content of the Facebook posting; the comments should not have been made and he, once again, apologised unreservedly.

Stuart Ritchie requested that people take the apology at face value, but accepted that he would not be able to convince everybody of his sincerity.

Sarah explained that while everybody was entitled to freedom of expression, Stuart was an elected representative for the whole student body. As president elect she felt his comments were inappropriate and she was not sure that his apology was good enough.

Lauri Love accepted Stuart's apology on a personal level, but said that he could not speak on behalf of others.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST COUNCIL MEETING (Feb 17 2011)

Mistake noted regarding point 1. No new Council members had been elected.

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE LAST COUNCIL MEETING (March 24 2011)

3.2. Staff Student Liaison Committee. T. Eriksson explained this was ongoing.

3.4. Increasing PhD Fees. M. Comerford explained that Research and development had assured Council that the money would be ring-fenced, but finance had not confirmed how this was going to be done. T. Gore asked him to keep raising this issue.

3.9. Postgraduate Space. T. Gore explained this was something the SRC was continuing to raise with the University. It seemed as though some progress was now being made on this issue. T. Gore offered to meet with A. Cohen to make sure that efforts were not being duplicated.

3.10. Course Representative Training provision. T. Gore advised that Glasgow was recruiting its own Course Representative Trainers this year rather than indirectly through sparqs. He encouraged Council members to apply for these positions.

3.11 and 6.1. Tutorial Contact time in Central and East European Studies. T. Gore explained that this issue was ongoing.

3.14. Student Accommodation. A. Cohen noted that at a recent PG Forum, a student had asked why University accommodation was so expensive and she had agreed to raise the issue at Council. H. Speirs and F. Sutherland explained that they could not answer for the University, but that it was presumably due to utilities and security being included in the price. S. Ritchie suggested that the standard of maintenance was higher for University accommodation. F. Weber suggested that the University charged high prices for University accommodation because they could. N. Tomaszek explained that conditions, services and support appeared to be declining, citing the recent decisions made regarding charging for washing machines as an example. **F. Sutherland suggested that he could set up a meeting with Neil Campbell, head of the Accommodation Service. F. Weber welcomed this.**

F.
Sutherland

12. UCU Strike. T. Gore explained that he had made the decision that the SRC would be supporting UCU strike action. He felt it was important to support staff when staff supported students. Out of the options UCU had

suggested, strike action was the least disruptive, considering that alternatives could include withholding grades for essays. F. Weber praised the Arts College for re-scheduling lectures where possible.

**MATTERS ARISING FROM SABBATICAL OFFICERS' REPORTS:
FEBRUARY 2011**

**Tommy Gore, PRESIDENT
(Copy of report circulated)**

4.1. SRC Diaries (11 March), raised by I. Smith.

T. Gore explained that no progress had been made on this point yet, but that the matter was ongoing.

4.2. Rectorial Installation (15 March), raised by C. Forster.

T. Gore explained that progress was much further ahead than was reflected in his report.

**Tuula Eriksson, VP (LEARNING & DEVELOPMENT)
(copy of report circulated)**

4.3. F. Weber requested an update on the class representative feedback sheets which S. Ritchie and the other Convenors had been working on. S. Ritchie explained that the model was being piloted in the Business School and that it was something which would most likely be taken on fully by next year's executive.

**Luke Winter, VP (MEDIA & COMMUNICATIONS)
(copy of report circulated)**

4.4. Meeting with Linda Hamilton about Student Life Presentations (10 March), raised by S. Ritchie.

L. Winter explained that this was being dealt with and that Iain Smith would be assisting at next week's open day.

4.5. Digitisation of GU Guardian issues, raised by I. Smith.

L. Winter explained that this would be made public in the near future and that all issues of the Guardian, published since 1933, would be available for search online.

Fraser Sutherland, VP (STUDENT SUPPORT)
(copy of report circulated)

4.6. Tour of the Library (28 February), raised by F. Weber.

F. Weber had been asked by various departments to raise the issue of stricter enforcement of the Traffic Light system in the library as there had been complaints regarding noise levels. **T. Gore explained that this was a matter for T. Eriksson and E. Grant as members of the Library Committee.**

T. Eriksson
E. Grant

4.7. Subdivision of Rooms

F. Sutherland explained that this issue had been developed through Hillhead Community Council and an amendment had been made to the Private Rented Housing (Scotland) Bill, by Pauline McNeill MSP, to include provision for whether any rooms within a property have been subdivided. The Bill was unanimously passed and now allows for local Councils to take action against poor standards regarding subdivision. It was noted that NUS Scotland had disagreed with the SRC position on this, claiming that the amount of student accommodation would be affected, but F. Sutherland reaffirmed his position that the welfare of students should be paramount. He added that new legislation was being introduced in April of this year which closed a loophole through which one-year international Erasmus students were made to pay Council Tax.

Concerns were still being raised (regarding Council Tax) over students who were here until 1 April 2011. There was also an issue over non-EU students and their position regarding Council Tax. **F. Sutherland was seeking clarification from GCC (Glasgow City Council) as to how this issue would be enforced. The matter would also be taken up with the Rector.**

F.
Sutherland

MATTERS ARISING FROM CONVENORS', OFFICERS' & COURT ASSESSOR'S REPORTS (copies circulated)

- Stuart Ritchie, College of Social Science Convenor

5.1. PET Prize Giving (22 March)

S. Ritchie congratulated T. Eriksson and her support for this event which he felt had been a great success.

5.2. Presentation of SRC Annual Report

S. Ritchie noted that T. Gore's presentation of the SRC Annual Report had been excellent and that it highlighted the continuing high standard of the SRC's work.

- Florian Weber, Arts College Convenor

5.3. Meetings Regarding the Consultation

F. Weber sought to highlight the various private meetings he had been involved in with regards to the ongoing Consultation process over the various weeks, which had all been fairly positive. The meeting with the Head of the Arts College regarding Classics and Archaeology, however, had not been positive and F. Weber was of the opinion that the consultation process with regards to this issue was pointless as it appeared that a decision had already been taken.

5.4. Student Life Cycle Project

It was explained that Schools and Colleges had, again, not met their deadlines for submitting data to the SLP which meant that the entire project could be delayed. He accepted that this was unconfirmed information. T. Eriksson and T. Gore confirmed that the project was running behind schedule. **Updates from Council Members from individual Schools and Colleges would be welcomed at any point. T. Gore and T. Eriksson would keep Council informed on any official information regarding SLP.**

T. Gore
T. Eriksson

5.5 WIMBA, raised by J. Henfrey.

F. Weber explained that updates were needed on this issue to make sure that Council were aware of what was happening in the hope that it did not go the same way as SLP.

- Ana Cohen, PG Convenor

5.6. DOGS Meeting (24 February)

A. Cohen highlighted how positive this meeting had been with regards to securing support for PG Social Space. She felt that it was clear that DOGS supported the SRC on this issue and were also supportive of the newly formed PG Society. T. Eriksson noted that this was still an ongoing issue.

It was noted that this was Ana's final Council meeting. T. Gore thanked her for all her hard work on Council over the years.

- Jamie Henfrey, General Representative

Report Noted.

- Michael Comerford, PG General Representative

Report Noted.

6. Update on Cuts Consultation Meeting

A background to this, including the emergency meeting of Senate, was briefed. T. Gore explained that a motion was passed by Senate to include Senate Assessors as members of Consultation Panels and after an SRC amendment, Student Representatives also. He felt it was important for SRC Representatives to have full voting rights on the panels and had considered including this in the SRC amendment to the motion. He took a decision, however, to remove this to ensure that the motion was passed given how close the Senate vote was. It was noted that the margin at the Senate had been 68 to 54.

T. Gore appreciated Lay members' and the Court Convenor's position regarding the Consultation; namely that it would serve little purpose for Senate Assessors and Student Representative members to join the Consultation at the halfway point. L. Winter made the point that when the SRC had originally brought this matter to the Principal the Consultation process had not progressed to the halfway point.

C. Sibbald questioned if SMG had been asked how they would remain accountable to the students and staff of the University. T. Gore explained that this specific question had not been put forward by the SRC, but explained that SMG were planning to allow staff and the SRC to see the proposals from the Consultations before they move further. C. Sibbald said it was important for the SRC to put that question to SMG directly, as the next few months could be very difficult for the SRC if the Executive was second-guessing SMG procedures. S. Ritchie agreed that this question could be put to the Principal. He added that if there was to be any continuing involvement in the Consultation process, the SRC should draw up a written assessment of the process outlining what each specific review had looked like. He added that this was too much work for the Executive to undertake alone and that it could be spread across the Academic Convenors.

F. Weber explained that he had been involved in three panels and was being given full access to the panel, and was able to access the material and submissions that the panel were receiving. He felt that the panels relied on the Student Representatives, but clearly did not want them to vote on important matters. He also criticised the timing of a meeting for the College of Arts regarding the Consultation stating that to hold this meeting after 11 April meeting of Court (when decisions will be made regarding the Consultations) was not helpful as this will be during the holidays when there are very few students on campus. S. Ritchie agreed that meetings were not being timed well.

I. Smith explained that the SRC could be using its mandate better in terms of speaking to the SMG directly, rather than waiting to ask questions at public meetings. He expressed concern that the SRC were being left out of

discussions which concerned students, citing the recent case of the Secretary of Court's and Director of Corporate Communication's meeting with the occupation group. T. Gore explained that this was an issue which he had raised with the Principal, pointing out that the SRC's position as the democratically elected student body was enshrined by law despite the fact that the occupation appeared to be receiving more of SMG's attention through recent actions. L. Winter welcomed solutions to the difficulty of getting SMG to react to the SRC.

M. Comerford expressed concern that the Principal was not willing to engage more constructively with SRC with regards to the Consultation. He suggested that the SRC publicise this difficulty to ensure that as many students as possible were aware of it. F. Sutherland agreed that such publicity had, in the past, seen positive results.

C. Sibbald explained that the University was fortunate that there was a Consultation process and that the SRC was fortunate to be part of it. **If the SRC felt that it was not being given the opportunity to engage in any discussion or debate, then it needed to publically state this as, for the moment, the entire process was being overshadowed by events at the occupation of 13 University Gardens.** T. Gore explained that the SRC had taken a stance over the Consultation, citing recent articles in the Herald. The Principal had met with T. Gore as a result, but had restated SMG's refusal to allow full member rights to Student Representatives.

SRC
Executive

M. Comerford recommended that the Executive release a statement stating that the SRC has no confidence in the Consultation process in terms of its student involvement. It should be a serious issue if the legal student representative body was being excluded from such a matter.

S. Ritchie commented that there was legitimate concern that SMG appeared to be engaged in two separate consultations – one including the SRC and the Consultation panels, and another with the members of the occupation regarding 13 University Gardens. He would like to see, for example, the University account for the seemingly impromptu meeting between Susan Stewart and David Newall outside 13 University Gardens, as it was clear that the SRC did not know what was happening between the University and the occupiers.

T. Gore explained that the consultations were varied with regards to student involvement and there were, therefore, reservations with regards to outright declarations of no confidence in the process. **S. Ritchie suggested that the Executive consider SRC members being assigned individual consultations which the Executive would oversee.** The individual members would produce written comments and these would be compiled in an overall written assessment of the consultation.

SRC
Executive

M. Comerford suggested that a statement could still be made with regards to the higher levels of University management ignoring the SRC, despite the fact that the SRC had been asking for involvement in the Consultation process for a long period of time and was also backed by Senate.

N. Tomaszek felt it was important to express the Council's appreciation to the Executive for the hard work they had been doing with regards to this issue.

I. Smith felt it important to separate the issue of the occupation from the issue of the cuts when communicating with students, as there was a tendency for opinions regarding the occupation to overshadow the important business of university cuts.

7. Rag Week

F. Sutherland thanked all Council members for their support during Rag Week and noted that a total of £1,023.23 had been collected or promised during the week itself. 'One Dress, One Month' had raised £1,600, and nearly £1,600 had also been donated from an anonymous source, bringing the total raised to £4,234. F. Sutherland greatly praised Ellen Grant specifically for her hard work during Rag Week. A written report would follow in the future. C. Sibbald noted that it was good having an SRC presence around the unions during Rag Week and greatly encouraged further cooperation for future events.

8. PETs

T. Eriksson thanked everybody for their support during the process, noting that there had been 170 different nominations amounting to about 500 different students submitting nominations.

Council thanked Tuula for her hard work on this project.

9. LTC (Learning and Teaching Conference) Video

T. Eriksson explained that this was progressing well and that a date (4 April) had been set for filming.

10. AV Vote Referendum

T. Gore wished to put this up for discussion to gauge any opinion on the matter. K. Law sought clarification as to whether this was a discussion to encourage students to vote, or for the SRC to state a particular stance. J. Harrison suggested that the best move would be to mobilise as many

students as possible to vote. **L Winter sought any ideas on how to publicize this. Those who were interested in this were to contact L. Winter.**

Council
L. Winter

11. University Restructuring

T. Gore explained that he had been invited to attend a SMG meeting (in mid to late April) examining the restructuring process one year on. Council Members were requested to contact him with any information or opinions with regards to the restructure, positive or negative. **S. Ritchie suggested that this was a matter most concerning Academic Convenors and that this should be discussed at the next Academic Convenors meeting.**

Academic
Convenors

12. AOCB

F. Weber noted that he had been asked by some students for the SRC to request that the University pay the legal fees of students facing criminal charges after the eviction of 13 University Gardens. It was noted that students would generally fall under the minimum income threshold and may, therefore be entitled to legal aid.

J. Henfrey requested that the SRC move to have the library opened 24 hours a day during exam times. F. Sutherland expressed concern over encouraging students to spend all night studying. T. Eriksson advised that this had been raised at the most recent Library Committee, in the current financial climate however, it appeared that this option was just not possible. It was also noted that Glasgow University library was open for more hours than most Russell group universities.

C. Sibbald asked what the SRC would be applying for in the upcoming Development Fund Project application. T. Gore explained that this had not yet been fully discussed.

M. Comerford noted that the SRC appears to have been largely ignored with regards to the downstairs of the John McIntyre Building. T. Gore explained that a meeting had been arranged with Professor Neil Juster, VP Strategy and Resources, and David Newall for the following week. **T. Gore explained that this issue was being taken very seriously and that any updates would be reported to Council.**

T. Gore

Thanks

T. Gore thanked Council members for their hard work during a stressful period. He encouraged all members to contact him if there were ever disagreements with regards to Council policies or actions.