

RCSA Open Meeting Minutes

Sunday February 22nd - 6pm JCR

1. Apologies for absence or lateness

Apologies were received from Grace Parker (GP, playing football in Bedford) and Amanda Myers (AM, with her family).

2. Announcement of the presence and purpose of guests

There were no guests.

3. Approval of the presence and speaking rights of guests

There were no guests.

4. Approval of the order of the agenda

The order of the agenda was approved.

5. Reading by the secretary on request by any member, amendment if necessary and approval of the minutes of any previous Open Meeting not yet accepted by an Open Meeting.

The minutes of the previous open meeting were approved.

6. Matters Arising from the minutes

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

7. Reports from the Committee

a) Presents for previous committee members

RM presented the former chair with a (book) chair and a copy of the constitution. He said Tom Kelly (TK) would also be getting book vouchers with which to fill said chair.

RM presented the former president a power drill. Iain Barr (IB) declared it the best present ever. Duncan Stibbard Hawkes (DSH) was thanked for attaching the Robinson crest to the drill.

b) Ethical Guidelines for *The Brick*

DSH said that he had had a meeting with the Dean of Discipline where a set of ethical guidelines were demanded as a consequence of the last issue of brick. DSH said that he had written the guidelines as asked and they were contained in the addendum. He continued that we couldn't hand them on to further editors without voting on them.

RM requested that people put their hands up if they had any complaints. TK asked if these had been imposed. DSH said no, they had not. RM clarified that the Dean did not have the power to impose any such rules. He said that Duncan had written them, but the dean had suggested a few

including number 4. DSH said he had made them pretty lenient, based on the reasoning that he would not expect the RCSA to pass anything more binding.

RM asked for an indicative vote. IB asked what would happen if we didn't pass the guidelines. DSH said he would get told off. TK said that the RCSA should circulate the guidelines and only approve them at the next open meeting. Dave Bewicke (DB) suggested a referendum. DSH said nothing in the guidelines would change the way that the brick was written. BM clarified that they were guidelines, not rules. RM suggested that Duncan could voluntarily approve them and the RCSA would then vote on keeping them for perpetuity at the next open meeting. IB asked what would happen if we accept them and they are subsequently broken. RM said there was no set procedure. DSH added it would be difficult to break the ethical guidelines as they were currently proposed. DB asked if we could take 4 out, as it was an issue of privacy. PW said it wasn't, as people were still allowed to submit anonymous articles. Further, the practice of editorial responsibility for anonymous articles was not that surprising, and was standard practice for many such publications. TK said it shouldn't be shoehorned into the reports. JC suggested Duncan adopt the guidelines himself and they would be voted on at the next open meeting.

c) Senior Scholarships

JC read a statement from GP: "After the last open meeting I managed to find out from Liz Guild that if a student taking a three year course decides to extend their studies by doing a part III they must also receive a first in that year in order to qualify for a senior scholarship. We think this is pretty unfair so based on the motion put forward by James Mott I'm taking a proposal to Education Committee to try and change this either so such students receive senior scholarships on completion of third year or, failing that, when they graduate after part III, regardless of their part III result."

d) Room Ballot

RM said the room ballot had gone smoothly and thanked JB for his efforts. JB thanked his helpers.

e) Observer on Sunday

BM said there would now be the Observer on Sunday.

8. Questions to the Committee

PW said someone had stolen the scart lead from the JCR TV. RM said we would look into it.

9. Extraordinary Motions

There were no extraordinary motions.

10. Ordinary Motions

a) Trunk Room

THIS MOTION REQUIRES TWO THIRDS ASSENT TO PASS.

RCSA Notes:

1. The second large scale clearout of the trunk room occurred on Saturday 23rd January.
2. This was made necessary by the prolonged misuse of trunk-room facilities by a minority of small and current students.
3. A skip was hired at the cost of £115 in order to dispose of unwanted items.
4. Money was raised from the sale of items to contribute towards the skip hire.

RCSA Believes:

1. The provision and maintenance of vacation storage facilities is essential for current students, especially international ones.
2. That while a significant number of items have been sold by the RCSA, there were still a considerable number of unusable or valueless items that could not be sold and must be disposed of in order to maintain a clear and usable storage facility.
3. That the trunk room is a general student amenity and costs incurred in its maintenance should not be met by the ordinary Open Meeting budget.
4. That in order to maintain the trunk room as such a usable storage facility, all members must ensure that they abide by the new registration system in place for vacation storage.

RCSA Resolves:

1. To allocate from the reserves the sum of £50 to contribute to the hire costs of the skip.
2. To support and abide by the new registration system as a matter of policy.

Proposed: Robin "I'll make him an offer he can't refuse" Lawther

Seconded: Rahul "Don Vito Mansigani" Mansigani

RL said that we need more money to cover the cost of the skip and disposal of electrical items or clothes from the clearout of the trunk room earlier this term. Lucas Fear Segal (LFS) asked if Robin Lawther (RL) would have to pay for the skip himself if the money wasn't allocated. RL responded that he would.

JC invited the meeting to vote on motion a):

For: 24

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion a) duly passed.

b) RCSA Newsletter Ethical Guidelines

RCSA Notes:

1. College authorities have called for ethical guidelines to be established for the RCSA newsletter.
2. These ethical guidelines must be presented to the College authorities for scrutiny.

RCSA Believes:

1. The Students Association should reflect the will of the students it represents, and not that of the College.
2. Thus it is for members of the Students Association to decide whether the RCSA newsletter should have ethical guidelines.
3. Whether the RCSA feels ethical guidelines are needed should be decided at this meeting, thereby making our will known before ethical guidelines are enforced under College pressure.
4. Furthermore, if RCSA members feel the content of the RCSA newsletter is inappropriate or unethical, or has overstepped a mark, they can express this in the vote of no confidence.

RCSA Resolves:

1. That the RCSA newsletter requires ethical guidelines.
2. That the RCSA newsletter does not require ethical guidelines, the content of which is under the scrutiny of the elected RCSA newsletter editor.
3. That any ethical guidelines need only be approved by the RCSA, irrespective of the outcome of Resolves (1) and (2)

Proposed: Luke "Skywalker" Snell

Seconded: Will "The Conqueror" Ratoff

Luke Snell (LS) said that as we had just heard there were now some proposed new guidelines for The Brick. The RCSA would not have proposed them if College authorities had not asked for us to do so. LS continued that this was the wrong way of doing things, we should vote on whether we do or don't want guidelines in principle before we vote on the specific guidelines. This motion would naturally lead on to a vote on the actual rules at the next open meeting. LS asked if we could vote on the points of RCSA Resolves separately. It was agreed that we could not, and the motion would have to be amended to strike either resolves 1 or 2 before it could pass. JC asked for speeches against any part of the resolves. DSH said it wouldn't be too political to pass this motion at the moment. It might be better to just wait until the next meeting and vote on them specifically. LS said that we were making an important distinction by voting on whether or not we want them first, so that we were not just bowing to college demands. TK noted that the CUSU equivalent was TCS, which did have a set of ethical guidelines. TK further said that the newsletter editor should be protected by the rest of the RCSA. In this instance, College authorities had not gone through the correct disciplinary channels as set out in the constitution and did not have the right to impose punishment e.g. working at a homeless shelter. TK said the brick had previously published a similar article involving the head porter and it had been handled differently. Ben Henriques (BH) said he understood that DSH's balls were on the line, but he hadn't brought the motion so he needn't be worried about the outcome of the discussion reflecting on him personally. LFS said there was a similar publication in the US called "The Onion" which had entirely satirical content. He asked what would happen DSH didn't agree to any guidelines? DSH said the college rules would allow a fine or banning from college premises. LFS said that we as a college should be supporting the editor. There was no point in guideline 5, as this would simply mean another editor editing Duncan. He felt that we should be doing something more to help Duncan. PW said that the ethical guidelines as proposed didn't really say much. What was more important was to clarify whether the newsletter editor is writing as himself or on behalf of the RCSA as a whole, as this would clarify who would be punished if there was any infraction. IB pointed out that there was a complaints procedure in the constitution, and asked whether there was a specific complaints against students? JC clarified that there was a complaints procedure for RCSA committee members. TK said that Duncan wouldn't be in trouble if he wasn't writing for the RCSA. He proposed that the motion be amended to add the following to RCSA Resolves: "That the RCSA president shall complain through the appropriate channels that the complaint against the RCSA Newsletter Editor wasn't made through the RCSA". LS accepted the amendment. He went on to say that we could protect Duncan by voting for the guidelines and protect future editors if we vote against them. The question was which would give the greatest level of protection? BM said the guidelines wouldn't have much of an effect and added that he would have published the offending article if it had been submitted to him during his term as editor of The Brick. He proposed that the motion be amended to strike RCSA

Resolves 3. LFS said this sort of thing should happen again, and there was a reason why DSH was elected editor of The Brick. He continued that this issue was just bureaucracy. BM said we should reject the guidelines in principle. BH raised a Point Of Information: College authorities had alleged that the article was actually libellous. DSH confirmed that this was true. RM said that he had contacted the CUSU legal team who had replied that we would be in a very poor position should a suit be filed as there was no defence of satire in English law. BH asked whether they would potentially sue the RCSA or DSH personally? RM replied that they would have to sue DSH, but this was unlikely as it would bring more attention to the issue. DB said there was a European right to freedom of expression. RM said that there was no right to libel. BM proposed that the motion be amended to remove resolves 1. LS accepted the amendment.

JC invited the meeting to vote on motion b):

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 5

Motion b) duly passed.

c) Ethical Investment

RCSA Notes:

1. Robinson College currently takes no ethical considerations into account when making its investments
2. Although the college has no direct investments we invest through a tracker fund which places no ethical constraints on its investments
3. Several other colleges, such as Murray Edwards and Clare Hall, have implemented SRI (Socially Responsible Investment) policies
4. CUSU is currently campaigning for the University to implement an ethical investment policy. St. Andrew's, UCL and Oxford all have SRI policies for ethical investment, yet Cambridge does not.
5. The University should not invest in corporations whose activities conflict with its institutional aims (for example education) or that damage fundamental human rights

RCSA Believes:

1. That Robinson College, as Greenest college, should act in support of the wider University campaign for an SRI policy by engaging with ethical investment at college level
2. That Robinson should research ethical tracker funds to manage its investments
3. That Robinson should have an investment policy which reflects its commitment to sustainability and education.

RCSA Resolves:

1. That the RCSA should endorse and actively support the implementation of an SRI policy in college
2. That the RCSA will support a petition in favour of this policy organised by Amy Woolloff (Green Officer) and Catherine Lough (Cambridge Amnesty Chair)

Proposed: Amy "Do you feel lucky punk?" Woolloff

Seconded: Catherine "Go ahead, make my day" Lough

AW said that this was part of the campaign for ethical investment. All college funds currently go into a tracker account and the fund manager chooses how they are invested. There were no ethical restrictions currently imposed on this tracker but there were such ethical trackers

available. She and Catherine Lough (CL) felt that RSCA members would like an ethical investment policy for college and the domestic bursar would be more happy to discuss it if there was a petition demonstrating this support. RM asked if we would use another University's ethical investment policy as a template for our own. AW said it would be more college specific, and would be worked out in conjunction with the bursar. LFS asked what "ethical investment" actually meant? AW replied that it imposed certain restrictions e.g. no arms companies. Specific investments would still be up to the fund manager. CL said there were different ethical accounts available. LFS asked if we were just voting for them to go and talk to the bursar. AW clarified that the bursar would be much more willing to spend time and effort developing a potential policy if we demonstrated support for it in principle beforehand. DB asked if the RSCA has an ethical investment policy. PW said we do. LFS said we should vote to give our support to an ethical investment policy in general, but also vote on the specific policy we have developed it.

JC invited the meeting to vote on motion c):

For: 24

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion c) duly passed.

d) Budget Reform

RCSA Notes:

1. The RSCA receives the majority of its funding from college.
2. Recent discussions between the RSCA Treasurer, Finance Bursar and Chief Office Clerk have suggested that the way college currently provides income for the RSCA is not efficient.
3. The RSCA currently holds a large quantity of so-called 'reserves', which are essentially unspent funds from budget years past, but are not allowed to hold such a stockpile of funds for no particular purpose.
4. Around half of the 2008/09 Budget has been allocated to pay rents for various sports facilities, the bills for which are passed onto the RSCA from college.

RCSA Discusses:

1. The possibility of giving some of the current reserves to the college bursary scheme.

RCSA Believes:

1. Letting college pay the bills for sports facilities rent (as outlined in the addendum) would prevent any future increases in these rents from detracting from the budget available for other purposes e.g. allocations to clubs and societies.
2. That having a 'student development sinking fund' would be a suitable alternative to the current system of 'reserves', and one which has the backing of the Finance Bursar.
3. That this student development fund would act in much the same as the current reserves, except that any allocations drawn from the fund would have to be justified as in some way falling under the category of 'student development'.
4. Having this fund would remove the need to 'get rid' of a large quantity of the funds that currently constitute the 'reserves'.

RCSA Resolves:

1. That from the Budget for the year 2009/10 the rent for Queens' Sports Ground, LMBC Boathouse, the squash courts and the badminton courts will be paid directly by college.
2. That the 'student development sinking fund' is implemented from the 2009/10 Budget year, and the base level of this fund set at £40,000.
3. The use of any funds surplus to this level should be considered at a later Open Meeting (for example for use in JCR refurbishment after the cost of this has been worked out).

Proposed: Barnaby Mollett, Budget the Little Helicopter

Seconded: Rahul Mansigani

BM said that since this motion had been adjourned from the last meeting, he would attempt to address directly the objections last time. The objection about the MCR budget was not relevant as the "capitation fee" referred to in the RCSA constitution was not defined anywhere, so it was entirely up to us what it was. Currently it was taken as the proportion of grad students out of total students. Secondly, the finance bursar had clarified the legal implications of sinking funds, in that there were no legal restrictions. He had agreed with finance bursar that the budget be restructured to allocate £15,000 for the current round of JCR renovations, £20,000 for underwriting society activities (mainly the May Ball in case it makes a loss, but also others e.g. Brickhouse) and £10,000 for open meeting claims and bills that we were unable to pay until we received the next budget allocation. This would leave £15,000 unallocated, this was mainly as the last time this motion had been brought this money had been allocated to future JCR refurbishment. However the Finance Bursar had said proposed that the College could give the RCSA £4000 per year for the next four years, which could be spend on JCR refurbishment after this time. RL asked about the base level for the new restructuring of the accounts, as last time it had been suggested as £40,000. BM confirmed it would now be £30000. RL asked what would happen to the rest of the money if the motion passed. BM said that they would be less inclined to take this money if we actively restructure the budget. RM clarified we lose no money, and we get a bonus of 4K a year. BM said at the last JLC college authorities had claimed that the JCR had been recently refurbished and were therefore unlikely to contribute to this round of refurbishment. BH asked if it was a good idea to make sure a contract gets signed ASAP regarding future JCR development, and especially before the end of BM's term. BM replied that it would probably be prudent. PW asked why we had to give the Finance Bursar any control over the account at all. Even if we couldn't have a large amount of reserves it was still our money. BM said he doesn't have any control, but the current situation is technically illegal. College probably wouldn't get bailiffs in, and the Finance Bursar just wanted to help us get the budget into better shape. TK asked about the bursary scheme mentioned in the motion. BM said that the Finance Bursar had suggested setting up a bursary with the spare £15000. BM wanted a rough opinion. BH asked how much of the college Bursaries fund is used as it is? He pointed out that there was no point increasing the bursaries if they aren't currently fully used. BM said he didn't know but doubted it was 100% efficient. If we had an RCSA bursary people might be more aware of it. RL asked if we could specify how the bursary was allocated, as people from low income families already get a lot. BM said that this would be up for discussion. LS said he would be wary of giving money to the bursary as we should use the spare reserves money for something from which all members of the RCSA could potentially use. LFS asked if we couldn't set up our own bursary

entirely independently of the college bursary system and then we could set our own allocation rules. BM said the problem would be deciding who gets it since it might require a dedicated panel. RM said there shouldn't be any RCSA involvement in the bursaries scheme as the access officer already does what's needed on our part. The RCSA having a bursary could lead to conflicts of interest. BM said that there was a possibility that the £15000 might go towards something that would benefit current students more than future students. We needed to make sure that future students benefit just as much from the money and if anyone had any other ideas that would be fine. IB asked if we could find out more about the bursaries before we decide on that part of the motion but added that we should vote now on the sinking fund. BM said we don't need resolves 2 or 3, this motion was really just to restructure and to get the contract signed with the Finance Bursar. IB said it was hard to get a figure this year as to how much money we would actually get from college for the budget. BM said this would be clarified, and College would agree to cover any deficit in future years (within reason) as long as unallocated funds went to them. BH said bursaries were for all members of college as people's circumstances change, thus potentially a bursary was for everyone. LS clarified that his point was that they are not for everyone as at point in time there are people who are necessarily excluded. BH said you could say that about a lot of RCSA things. LS disagreed. DSH yawned. LS asked about the college endowment, shouldn't it rise each year in line with inflation? BM said it was really done on guess work as their finance year starts in April and so they don't really know how much they would be able to give us when they allocated our funds. He would ask for it to be adjusted next year but the main increase in our outgoings this year had been sports grounds, which in future would be paid directly by college. PW pointed out that the motion didn't mention ethical investment. We were going to change to a college investment account, which as we had already established was not an ethical one. BM said that the money would still be kept in the same account. BM amended the motion to remove resolves 2 & 3. He also added another: "that the RCSA would agree to the proposed restructuring of the accounts with £15,000 for the current round of JCR renovations, £20,000 for underwriting society activities and £10,000 for open meeting claims and bills that it was unable to pay until it received the next budget allocation." He reminded the meeting that this would leave £15,000 unallocated. DB asked if this motion should be brought as a new motion with a report if it was allocating funds from the reserves. RB pointed out that the main purpose of that clause was to ensure that there was enough notice given so that RCSA members could discuss the allocation. Since this motion was adjourned from the last meeting we had effectively given 4 weeks notice. BM added that we ought to pass the motion now if we wanted the Finance Bursar to sign a contract about the future JCR renovations.

JC invited the meeting to vote on motion d):

For: 23

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion d) duly passed.

e) Wii all over Robinson

THIS MOTION REQUIRES TWO THIRDS ASSENT TO PASS.

RCSA Notes:

1. The lack of a Wii and the presence of a TV in the JCR
2. The inherent fun factor of a Wii to many people
3. The cost effectiveness of a Wii compared to a bouncy castle (£176+£130 for games and "shit" = unlimited FUN!)
4. The Amazon home page notes that a Wii is in stock!
5. We have a LOT of reserves

RCSA Believes:

1. There should be a Wii in the JCR
2. It is a good use of the money set aside for spending at open meetings
3. We should almost certainly get a Wii if
4. We can work out some way to lock it down
5. We can work out a sign-out system with the plodge
6. Wii would like to play!

RCSA Resolves:

1. To spend £306 from the reserves to buy a new Wii, four controllers and a couple of games to be stored in the JCR

Proposed: Duncan "Noel Edward" Stibbard Hawkes

Seconded: Grace "Wii haven't got silly names" Parker

GP said basically college would benefit from a Wii. It would be fun, cost less than a bouncy castle and might increase fitness. DB asked whether it was to be RCSA policy that all future budget allocations would have to be cheaper than a bouncy castle. Tanuj Bhojwani (TB) asked about the sign out system. DSH said he had asked the porters and they had given consent for the remotes to be stored in the plodge. RL asked about the locking systems. DSH said it would be a Kensington lock.

JC invited the meeting to vote on motion e):

For: 26

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion e) duly passed.

f) CD Library

RCSA Notes:

1. That there are a lot of CDs in the library that are unused currently and gathering dust instead of providing a light melodic accompaniment to life.
2. A lot of the music available is about 10 years old or more.
3. There are no current members of the society within college.
4. No one so far has come forward to take on the role of reopening the CD library.

5. Tom Grimble has expressed interesting in running the CD library for the benefit of RCSA members.

RCSA Believes:

1. Reopening the library would be of benefit to all members of college particularly in exam term when you need to relax to some nice music.
2. There would be a lot of interest from college members if some of the latest music releases were added to the collection.

RCSA Resolves:

1. To appoint Tom Grimble to the post of President of the CD Library and allow him to appoint suitable persons to the other committee positions to allow the society to reopen. Selection could be done by interview if necessary.

Proposed: Tom Grimble, CD-lightful

Seconded: Barnaby Mollett, The Vinyl Frontier

Tom Grimble (TG) said that this had been an ongoing project and he had been looking into it since last year. TG would like to take over and get a new committee together. RM said there was a constitutional procedure. BM said the CD library was supposed to have elections every year but obviously hadn't, we would have to vote TG in as the new president or it never would again. RB asked whether this would make TG the only member of the CD library, meaning that future votes as to new committee members would effectively be entirely up to him. TG said that no one else had come forward to be president. LFS offered to be the new president, but quickly rescinded as he was already committed to a different presidency. BH said that TG had put the effort in and we should just let him do it. IB asked how TG planned to stop people sleeping in the CD library. TG said it was too small for people to sleep in. IB said that it hadn't stopped Brandon Green. PW said this was evidence of corruption in the previous committee as Brandon was also president. LS asked if we couldn't just have a digital library instead? TG said maybe, but there were legal issues. TB said Jesus had a p2p network. TG replied that College had banned p2p. Jim Arnold said that that was because of network traffic and not legality. DB asked for the motion to be amended so that TG would be made temporary chairperson of the next meeting of the CD Library, which meeting would elect a new committee. TG accepted the amendment.

JC invited the meeting to vote on motion f):

For: 24

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion f) duly.

g) Garden Sculptures

RCSA Notes:

1. That the recent acquisition of sculptures has had a profound impact on the visual impact of the college.
2. That no undergraduates were involved in the selection process of the statues.

RCSA Believes:

1. That the sculptures are an important part of college life.
2. That as such, undergraduates should be involved in their selection.

RCSA Resolves:

1. To mandate the RCSA Green Officer to lobby college authorities to create a “junior member” position on the college visual arts committee.

Proposed: Lucas Fear-Segal, regal in stature

Seconded: Rob Beagrie, statuesque

LFS said that there were three new sculptures in the college grounds. They were quite nice, but he wanted to know what had been rejected. He noted that College must spend 1% of any new building work on sculptures and other arts and further that the Visual Arts Committee and Fine Wines Committee were the only ones without representatives from junior members. RM asked if the two committees met at the same time, and if so whether this might explain some of the sculpture choices. LFS said he had nominated AW as she was on the Garden Committee.

JC invited the meeting to vote on motion g):

For: 26

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion g) duly.

h) Swimming Pool

RCSA Notes:

1. That Robinson is a college without a swimming pool.
2. That Clare Hall is a college with a swimming pool.

RCSA Believes:

1. That Robinson members would benefit from the use of a swimming pool.

RCSA Resolves:

1. To mandate the RCSA Catering & Amenities officer to enter negotiations with Clare Hall college with the aim of securing use of Clare Hall’s pool for Robinson members.

Proposed: Lucas Fear-Segal, a fish out of water

Seconded: Sam Oxley, drinks like a fish

LFS said that he didn’t want a long protracted discussion about this motion. All it entailed was RL going to ask Clare Hall if we could use their swimming pool. JC ceded the chair to RM and said it was quite a small pool and they are quite strict about people using it. We had 400 undergrads and wouldn’t all fit in the pool at the same time. RL said that Clare Hall charge members a termly fee. He guessed they would make the RCSA pay a lump sum and then any individual who wanted

to use the pool would also have to pay an equal termly fee. LFS said we should investigate nevertheless. BH said we should vote on the motion, as it was just investigatory.

RM invited the meeting to vote on motion h):

For: 26

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion h) duly passed.

i) Astronomical Society

RCSA Notes:

1. There is currently no astronomy society in Robinson College.
2. Using the university astronomical society telescopes is a bit inconvenient for students with only a moderate or glancing interest in astronomy.
3. Members may use equipment that they already own to get the society going.
4. Investing reserves in a moderate amount of astronomical equipment could be worthwhile.

RCSA Believes:

1. An astronomical society would provide a facility of intellectual, recreational and social value to its members, and encourage applications to Robinson for the physical sciences.

RCSA Resolves:

1. To form the Robinson College Astronomical Society (RCAS), which shall agree to be bound by the Constitution of the RCSA.
2. The objects of RCAS shall be:
3. To promote astronomy at Robinson College.
4. To organise astronomy-based activities and social events for its members.
5. RCAS shall adopt the Schedules as its initial constitution, and that a democratically elected and representative Committee be responsible for their due amendment.
6. RCAS shall be open to any member of Robinson College.

Proposed: David Bewicke, thinks the moon is made of cheese

Seconded: David Trethewey, superstar (gazer)

DB said that there weren't currently any science societies at Robinson. He wanted to investigate the chemical composition of the moon and additionally it might be a nice social thing. DSH asked if DB knew of anyone else who would join it: DB did. RM asked why DB had decided to name it the "Astronomical Society" instead of the "Astronomy Society". DB said he could investigate the correct nomenclature and adjourn the motion until the next meeting. RM indicated that this would not be necessary.

JC invited the meeting to vote on motion i):

For: 24

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion i) duly passed.