

agenda

Meeting:	Student Officer Committee
Date:	Thursday 16 October 2014
Time:	5.00 pm
Location:	Committee Room 1, The Council Chamber
Code	SOC 1276

- 1276 Departmental Presentation: Advice**
A presentation from Lucy Scott
- 1277 Minutes of the meeting held on 2 October**
(See pages 3-12)
- 1278 Matters Arising**
- 1279 Action Log**
(See page 13)
- 1280 Officer Trustee Election**
To note the resignation of T Antoniou-Phillips as an Officer Trustee and to hold an election by the Part-Time Officers from amongst their number of a new Officer Trustee.
- 1281 NUS Conference Lead Delegate Election**
To elect a lead delegate to conference.
- 1282 Union House 2015: Consultation**
- 1283 Union Council Review**
Review policy passed at the 9 October meeting.
(See pages 14-22)
- 1284 Officer Go Around/Reports**
- 1285 Reports on Priority Campaigns/Projects**
- 1286 Any Other Business**
- 1287 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting**

To note the next meeting will be held at 5.00 pm on 23 October at a venue to be confirmed.

Minutes

Subject:	Student Officer Committee Minutes
Date:	Thursday, 2 October 2014
Paper:	SOC 1256

Key Discussions

- Welcome Week events
- Spending on TUC demonstration
- Provision of services for PG students
- Campaigns Budget proposal
- Sports Park Charges
- Deferral of NUS Conference lead delegate election

Key Actions

- Approved policy implementation proposals
- Increased funding for attendance at TUC demo to £2,200
- Received draft proposals on PG service provision
- Agreed with some alterations the Campaigns Budget
- Agreed to set up a working group to examine the complexities of Sportspark's charges and to build a campaign for a better deal for students.
- Voted to defer election of lead delegate to NUS National Conference
- Appointed J Clare as DRO for forthcoming elections

Union of UEA Students Purpose:

"To enrich the life of every UEA student"

Minutes of the Student Officer Committee

2 October 2014

Voting Members present:

Oliver Steward (Postgraduate Officer), Josh Wilson (Ethical issues Officer), Dolly Ogunrinde (Women's Officer), Tom Southerden (Non Portfolio Officer), Max Levene (Students with Disabilities Officer), Liam McCafferty (PG Education Officer), Connor Rand (UG Education Officer), Yinbo Yu (Activities and Opportunities Officer) Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer), Stela Glakousaki (International Officer), Freddie Redfern (Ethnic Minorities Officer), Tom Etheridge (Non Portfolio Officer), Iain Goddard (Environment Officer), Dan Wrigglesworth (LGBT+ Officer)

Chair

Holly Staynor (Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer)

Non-Voting Members present:

Jim Dickinson (Chief Executive)

In attendance:

Tony Moore (Democracy and Governance Coordinator), Alex Wyatt (Director of Social Enterprise), Paul Ingleby (Entertainments Coordinator), Zoe Phillips (Entertainments Assistant)

Apologies:

Liz Cody (Non Portfolio Officer), John Taylor (Mature Students Officer) Theo Antoniou Phillips (Non Portfolio Officer),

1259 Departmental Presentation: Entertainments

SOC received a presentation on the current ENTS programme and future ENTS strategy from P Ingleby.

P Ingleby asked if: Officers had enjoyed Welcome Week and if they had any suggested improvements to make, they liked the changes to Club Nights and what sort of events they would like and which would attract the hardest to reach members.

Chair thought it would be beneficial if Liberations events could be more integrated into the Welcome Week programme rather than as an add-on.

Z Phillips advised that she was currently looking at how to use the extra room now available to integrate these type of events into the general programme throughout the year.

O Steward noted the problem of integrating PG students with their variable start times into the traditional Welcome Week; he believed that a 'Welcome Period' would be more inclusive of PG students.

Z Phillips advised she would be glad to discuss the particular needs of PG students with him and how to square this with the needs to cater for the huge numbers of UG students and for the hard to reach groups.

A Wyatt advised that there was a compelling commercial rationale to extending the Welcome Week to cover International, nursing and PG arrivals. He noted the extensive positive feedback about the Welcome events and the paucity of negative social media comments.

J Wilson thought the events had been bigger and better and had attracted excellent feedback.

S Glakousaki believed Welcome events should be staged throughout the year.

D Ogunrinde noted her friends had been involved in Bass Matters and she asked that student-led events be wider publicised.

Z Phillips advised she worked with a great many student DJs and ENTS would be looking at how to publicise student-led events and to involve students in production more generally.

T Southerden asked that students be made aware how easy it was to get tickets for A-list events after Welcome Week as some students had asked about this and had offered to pay a premium for tickets online when they could actually walk in to the Box Office and easily buy one at face value

Z Phillips advised she was looking at how to improve publicity for ticket sale arrangements and noted the formation of the Street Team with their prominent brand.

T Southerden noted that Society Ticket Reps were no longer in place.

Z Phillips advised that they could play a part in ticket sales for Wednesdays.

Chair thanked P Ingleby and Z Phillips for their contributions.

1256 Minutes of the meeting held on 18 September

C Jarvis noted that the minutes had incorrectly referred to the GSA President having sat on University Council when they had, in fact, sat on Senate.

With the above change, the minutes were agreed.

1257 Matters Arising

There were none.

1258 Action Log

J Dickinson advised UUEAS had issued a statement that its intent was to maintain zero hours contracts for staff that wanted them whilst providing seven or eight hours to 15 hours contracts for those that wanted them. He noted that the matter would be discussed with the recognised trade union or, possibly, unions and/or with the student staff discussion group.

J Dickinson advised, on trade union recognition that UUEAS was in discussion with student staff and the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), Norwich Branch as to recognition of the IWW. He noted that, in the interim, UUEAS would be asking student reps to come forward from each of the work areas to take part in the consultation process.

Chair noted that the question of Faculty Convenors' position on Union Council had been referred by the DPC to the Student Engagement Department for consideration.

Chair noted that she had informed Liberations groups as to changes to delegate elections.

Chair noted that the changes to the Opportunities Department Budget had been considered by Management Committee.

1260 Policy Implementation

C Jarvis noted he had integrated SOC's suggested changes into the document with a definition of time sensitivity and a clarification on convening emergency SOC meetings virtually, or in person.

C Rand expressed his concern that, in the proposal, a meeting of the FTOs could replace a meeting of SOC without consultation with SOC.

SOC agreed to amend the proposal by inserting: 'to take into account the views of PTOs through due consultation.'

C Jarvis confirmed to S Glakousaki that any consultation would not take place via Facebook but by telephone.

Chair confirmed to O Steward that Facebook would only be used for basic arrangements and would not be used for political discussions.

1261 Updated Funding Request for the TUC Demo

L McCafferty noted that SOC had agreed the funding in principle but had asked for further details on costs. He noted that the cost of coach hire had risen since the previous year so consequently he would be requesting not £1,650 but £2,200 to cover three coaches and publicity. He reported that the first coach had been booked and

ticket booking details were on the website with a £5 deposit requirement repayable on boarding the coach.

He noted the key themes to the publicity would be taken from the Priority Campaigns; he noted the event's main theme was: 'Fund Our Future'.

L McCafferty noted to C Rand that bookings would be monitored closely in the event of booking extra coaches and there would, therefore, be no danger of booking an unneeded coach.

SOC agreed to spend, in principle, the revised figure of £2,200 on publicity and coaches for the TUC demo and to the associated Action Plan for the event.

1262 Transforming the Postgraduate Student Experience at UEA

L McCafferty believed that for some time UUEAS' delivery of service to PG members had been poor with a wilful, negligent lack of responsibility for PG students. He noted that on taking up his post as the first FTO responsible for PGs he had seen a huge need in terms of PG representation and social provision. He noted that the GSA was entirely staffed by volunteers and had a nugatory budget. He noted the present model was that PG services were only provided if the Grad Bar made money and that this was not a fair or workable model. He noted that discussions as to how to rectify this situation had triggered a lot of ideas as to how responsibilities would be divided between the GSA and UUEAS. He noted that a further driver to the formation of the paper had been the plans for a PG Study Centre in Union House and the need to decide the function of the space and who would manage it. He noted he had undertaken consultations and focus groups and with the GSA President had produced the current document which summarised a potential way forward for both organisations. He asked SOC to consider the proposal and provide feedback. He noted that the paper was being constantly updated and he would provide a revised version at the next meeting.

T Etheridge wondered, as an undergraduate who was the first member of his family to go to university, why there should be a separate space for PG students as, he thought, UUEAS' facilities were meant to be open to all members.

L McCafferty noted that 30% of UUEAS' members were PG students and they were often mature or international and had different needs and experiences from their UG colleagues. He believed that, if UUEAS' services did not reflect this diversity of needs, it would be failing this particular group.

O Steward noted his personal position had changed from that in his manifesto where he had pledged to maintain the independence of the GSA from UUEAS; he had now come to realise that the GSA did not have the resources to deliver an acceptable level of services for its members. He noted that there would be the first ever Graduate Assembly, the following week, and the Assembly would consider the

document and it would then go out for the widest possible consultation with the GSA membership.

J Dickinson advised, as to timescale, that the broad objectives for the PG Study Space would need to be finalised by late October.

L McCafferty noted that a final version of the paper would need to be approved by SOC and brought as an enabling motion to Union Council. He asked that Officers, particularly, Liberations Officers, should consult widely with their PG constituents as to the contents of the paper.

I Goddard left the meeting.

O Steward noted that he had issued a statement in an earlier version of the agenda but that it need not be tabled as it was, essentially, covered by the comments he had made earlier in the current discussion.

1263 Campaigns Budgets

Chair noted the proposed budgets in the agenda papers and asked if Officers had any major concerns over the allocations.

S Glakousaki believed the £4,000 allocated in total to all the Priority Campaigns to be too low.

J Dickinson advised that SOC was being asked to approve the project plans not the detailed, individual costings.

Officers pointed out several typo errors in the document and the need for clarity over the allocation of Lead Officer. C Jarvis suggested that the relevant departments could help designate who would be leading.

M Levene volunteered to lead on DSA Cuts.

SOC agreed to Y Yu's request that the success criteria for the International Fees Campaign be changed to reflect recent research on deposit fees.

Chair noted the increased autonomy for the Liberations Officers, the International Officer and the GSA President whose autonomous campaigns had been allocated £500 each.

Y Yu supported S Glakousaki's earlier point that the Priority Campaigns Budget was too low.

C Jarvis noted the rationale for the allocation had been that the Priority Campaigns were locally based and their costs were relatively low in contrast to the wider, general campaigns. He noted that there needed to be a contingency fund for issues and events that might arise later in the year.

L McCafferty wondered why the SOC Projects were so expensive and what the role of Lead Officers for the Projects would be.

C Jarvis noted that an example of a SOC Project would be the Mental Health Awareness project which lay outside the traditional campaign paradigm.

Chair noted that the Lead Officer role would be to be the point of contact for staff and members.

J Dickinson advised that SOC had approved a twin track approach where UUEAS departments would have a small budget to spend on campaigns and SOC, itself, would have two budgets: one on campaigns and one on wider projects. He noted the present proposal followed this approach.

C Rand noted it was very near to the forthcoming General Election and this should be factored in when looking at the funding available.

L McCafferty asked that a clear process be defined so that when future funding requests were made they clearly specified what was and what was not a SOC Project.

C Jarvis noted that he would produce a template and guidelines for funding requests that would address this issue.

SOC agreed the Campaign Budget proposal, with the above proviso, with the above alterations and with typo errors to be rectified.

1264 Black History Month

Chair noted that the focus of the campaign would be on inspirational individuals. She asked that Officers submit a few words about individuals that had personally inspired them.

Chair asked Officers to sign up to take part in the making of a promo video the following day with UEA TV. Chair noted that an extra session would be arranged for the following week.

1265 Officers on Tour

Chair hoped these would be better organised with a consistent theme to communicate to members. She noted the key themes the following week would be signing up members for the TUC Demo and promoting Mental Health Awareness Day working with Operation Beautiful.

Chair asked Officers to sign up via the Facebook page.

Chair hope that OOT would be a core part of Officers work as representatives.

L McCafferty noted that a Timetable would be produced and it was hoped that each Officer could commit to doing at least two slots per semester.

D Ogunrinde noted the importance of having slots to connect with students outside office hours.

Chair noted that she would build a timetable and plan for the semester and circulate.

1266 Sportspark

Y Yu believed it was iniquitous that students with cards could not use the facilities at peak times without paying extra and he noted the pricing bias against part-time students.

S Glakousaki noted the extra 60p payment that PG students had to pay.

T Southerden wondered there might be one hour student-only sessions that might be worked out with Sportspark.

Y Yu noted the 80/20 split between the community and the University that governed Sportspark's provision of services.

T Southerden wondered whether Sportspark were really giving students 20% of the access to facilities. He believed students were now increasingly attending the 24 hour gym in the city and that there was a commercial case for Sportspark retaining student customers who might continue to be customers when they left University.

L McCafferty believed that Sportspark's strategy discriminated against PG students who could not make use of the facilities in off-peak times. He believed this attitude to be unacceptable and that this was a political issue.

Y Yu asked Officers to canvass their constituents for their opinions and to collect evidence for input into a campaign.

SOC agreed that Y Yu would set up a working group to examine the complexities of Sportspark's charges and to build a campaign for a better deal for students.

1267 General Election Strategy

SOC agreed to defer this item to the next meeting as the results of an application for external funding were due to be received the following week.

1268 Annual Elections Schedule

Chair noted it was the time to elect a lead delegate to NUS National Conference who would have to be a FTO.

C Jarvis noted this should be done at the present meeting but could be done at the meeting in week 4.

L McCafferty noted that he and Y Yu both believed they had not had enough notice of the election.

C Jarvis noted it had been discussed at the previous meeting.

L McCafferty thought the election should have been a clear separate agenda item.

SOC voted to defer the election to the next meeting by seven votes for, three against with one abstention. The item will be clearly marked as an election.

1269 Appointment of DRO

SOC appointed J Clare, Head of Student Engagement as DRO for the NUS delegate elections.

J Dickinson advised that regarding the appointment of a RO, NUS' RO services were now provided by NUS Charitable Services, a separate charity with no political input from NUS Officers and that retention of this organisation's services would fulfil the mandate embodied in the policy passed in the spring to change the provision of RO (Returning Officer) services.

1270 Attendance at Zone Conferences

Chair noted the costs of attendance were covered in the budget.
Chair noted she would post conference details on the Facebook page.

SOC agreed to a week long deadline for Officers to sign up to express an interest in attendance.

T Etheridge asked that it be fed back to NUS that scheduling the Conferences during the working week discriminated against current full-time students.

1271 Review of Welcome Week

M Levene reported that he had received feedback that there had been not enough non-alcoholic events.

Chair noted that there had been progress in diversifying the events but there was still work to be done.

A Wyatt advised there would be a development of non-alcoholic events throughout the year which would then feed into next year's Welcome Week to provide a strong diversified programme.

T Southerden apologised for not running a quiz during the Week.

L McCafferty asked for volunteers to join the UUEAS team in the GSA quiz.

1272 Officer Go Around/Reports

J Wilson: scheme to develop sales of cycle helmets on campus

T Southerden: attendance at Societies Committee, looking to work with Societies sub-committees

C Rand: focus on assessment and feedback working group, learning technology, student representation system, working with the Hubs

L McCafferty: Graduate Assembly agenda, collecting testimony of PGRs who teach, TUC demo organisation, LTQC attendance, PG inductions and socials

F Redfern: liaising with all the ethnic minority Societies, introducing himself to Presidents and Councillors

S Glakousaki: Union Council training, working on Asian Day and INTO induction talks

M Levene: work on the DSA researching other SU's campaigns
C Jarvis: Priority Campaigns, Freshers' General Meeting, DPC meeting, training over 60 Councillors
T Etheridge: working and training volunteers with Livewire, attendance at SSLC, speaking to potential reps
Y Yu: attended University Council training but not the associated banquet, SOC Mart and Sports Mart, induction talks with INTO
T Etheridge: Training Livewire volunteers, attendance at SSLC, recruiting student reps
H Staynor: Black History Month publicity, Priority Campaigns development, organising Mental Health Awareness Day and a Time to Change event
D Ogunrinde: attended Sexual Assault Awareness Committee, developing campaign with BHM called 'Black Girl with Red Lips' liaising with the Foreign Office about a campaign concerning travel abroad called 'No before you go'.
O Steward: organising the Graduate Assembly and GSA constitutional arrangements, attendance at PG welcome events

1273 Reports on Priority Campaigns/Projects

SOC noted this had been covered earlier.

1274 Any Other Business

1275 Time, Date and Place

5. 30 pm, 16 October at a venue to be confirmed.

SOC ACTION LOG

Date Commissioned	Action Required	Status	Assigned To:	Date to be actioned by:
8 May 14	Student staff to be consulted on 0 Hours Contracts	Actioned	Jim	End of October
5 June 14/2 October	Constitutionality of reserved places on Union Council for Rep Organisers to be investigated	DPC referred to Student Engagement Department	Tony	16 Oct
18 September 14	Chair to inform Liberations support groups about changes to delegate elections	Actioned	Holly	October
18 September 14	Changes on recommendations for proposal for Policy Implementation to be drafted	Actioned	Chris	Next meeting
18 September 14/ 2 October	Final version of UEA PG Student Experience paper to be approved	To be future agenda item	Liam	End of October
18 September 14	Changes to budget for Opportunities Department to be sent to Management Committee	Actioned	Jim	October
2 October 14	Template/guidelines for funding requests to be drafted: must clarify whether request is for a SOC project	To be circulated	Chris	End of October
2 October 14	Officers to submit test and sign up for video for BHM publicity	Actioned	All	October
2 October 14	OOT Timetable to be circulated	Actioned	Holly	Next meeting
2 October 14	Sportspark working group to be set up	To be established	Yinbo	October
2 October 14	General Election Strategy deferred	Agenda Item	Tony	Next meeting
2 October 14	NUS Lead Delegate Election deferred	Agenda Item	Tony	Next meeting
2 October 14	PTOs to register interest in attendance at NUS Zone Conferences	Actioned	All PTOs	October

POLICY PASSED BY COUNCIL 9 OCTOBER 2014

Ethical Steering Group

Proposer: Chris Jarvis – Campaigns & Democracy Officer

Seconder: Iain Goddard – Environment Officer

Union Notes

1. That we have a substantial amount of policy relating to ethical and environmental issues, a large proportion of which is yet to be effectively implemented.
2. That of this, much relates to the internal practices of UUEAS
3. That policy 1395 b) – Union Commercial Services - states that we should be an exemplar regarding ethical practices and purchasing
4. That policy 659 – Ethical Investment and Labelling calls for the establishment of a working group to develop the Union's ethical investment, advertising and labelling policy further.
5. That at present there is no formal mechanism for regulating the practices of UUEAS in relation to their ethical and environmental performance

Union Believes

1. That the lack of implementation of ethical and environmental policy has, in part, been a result of there being no existing structure for its implementation, and therefore an undue onus being placed on Part Time Officers
2. That the time and energy students exert in writing, debating and passing policy should not be put to waste as a result of institutional inertia
3. That effective communication between staff and students increases the effectiveness of policy implementation

Union Resolves

1. To establish an Ethical and Environmental steering group whose membership shall be: a. The Campaigns & Democracy Officer b. The Ethical Issues Officer c. The Environment Officer d. Two students elected by Union Council e. Staff within UUEAS responsible for procurement, advertising or commercial partnership. And whose remit shall be: a. To oversee the implementation of existing UUEAS policy on ethical and environmental issues b. To monitor procurement, advertising and commercial partnership, to ensure that it fits within our existing ethical and environmental parameters c. To proactively seek to improve the ethical and environmental performance of UUEAS

UUEAS: A Democratic Workplace

Proposer: Josh Wilson (Ethical Issues Officer)

Seconder: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer)

Union Council Notes

1. The Union employs over 350 staff.
2. The Trustee Board consists of no employees apart from the Full Time Officers.
3. The Union currently has no democratic processes in place when it comes to employees other than for the Full Time Officers and the proposed election of student staff onto the commercial boards of the Union's companies. 3. UUEAS has the core values of, a) Collectivism - The people collectively, for the benefit of the people as a whole. b) Democracy - Government by the people; power resides in the people as a whole, and is exercised either directly by them or by officers elected by them.
4. Workplace Democracy is becoming increasingly common and can arguably increase employee engagement and productivity*

Union Council Believes

1. Democracy should be at the core of all the Union's endeavours.
2. Workplace Democracy can be positive for both the employee and the employer.
3. Staff Protocol is in place to protect staff that don't have a right to reply in the democratic process and this should not be eroded.

Union Council Resolves

1. To mandate the Campaigns and Democracy Officer with the Democratic Procedures Committee to run a consultation with staff about ways the Union can become a more democratic workplace and report back to Union Council with findings and proposals.

*<http://money.usnews.com/money/careers/articles/2008/04/24/why-workplace-democracy-can-be-good-business>

Amendment to the Byelaws: Delegation to NUS Conference

Proposer: Holly Staynor – Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer
Seconder: Chris Jarvis – Campaigns & Democracy Officer

Union Notes:

1. At NUS National Conference 2014, an amendment to the NUS constitution was passed relating to the delegate rules that Student Unions must follow for electing their delegates.
2. This amendment required all Student Unions to provide a gender balanced delegation, and elect their delegates accordingly.
3. This has meant that Student Unions must send a delegation, of which at least 50% must be self-defined women.
4. As such, an amendment to our byelaws is necessary to adjust our election process accordingly.

Union Believes:

1. That the new NUS rules mean that students who do not identify within the socially constructed gender binary are more restricted in their ability to get elected to NUS conference delegations.
2. That the move towards improving women's representation in conference delegations is positive, but that improving representation of women should never come at the expense of disenfranchising transgender students and those who do not identify within a gender binary.
3. That the new NUS rules are therefore trans-exclusive.

Union Resolves:

1. To adopt new byelaw 14:
Bye Law 14: NUS Conference Delegation

Background

Each year the Union offers the opportunity to elect delegates to Conferences of the National Union of Students. 1. NUS requires that unions register a delegation that includes at least 50% women.

Process

NUS will inform the Union of the number delegates it is entitled to send to Conference each year.

One Full-Time Officer, appointed by the Management Committee, may be appointed to the position of lead delegate for NUS National Conference. 2. The election should be conducted in accordance with the standard election by laws, save that:

The nominations process will include a process for self definition of woman status. a. Two separate counts will then be run, using the same ballot papers. b. In the first count, all candidates who are not self-defining women will be excluded.

c. A number of candidates to equal 50% of the delegation size rounded down will be elected in this count. d. Where the delegation leader is a woman this calculation will be amended appropriately. e. When counting, any preferences expressed for the excluded candidates will be passed over, so that votes are only reallocated to the reserved candidates. f. In the second count, all candidates will be reintroduced and preferences examined, save for preferences for those who were elected in the first count.

Failure

3. Where the required number of Women is not elected through this method a by election will be held. Where this also results in a failure to elect the correct number of women, an application will be made by the Returning Officer to the NUS Democratic Procedures Committee for an exemption.

Other Elections

This bye law details the procedures for the appointment of delegates to the National Conference. These principles of "fair representation" will also be used by the Returning Officer for other conferences where there are multiple delegates.

2. To write to NUS expressing our concerns about the trans-exclusivity of these regulations and state our position on this matter publicly.

Postgraduate Representation on Union Council -an Amendment to the Bye-Laws

Proposer: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

Seconder: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns & Democracy Officer)

Union Notes:

1) Close to 30% of the student population are registered as postgraduates. 2) Just over 5% of union councillors last year were postgraduates. 3) That the President of the GSA currently sits on Union Council, but the other members of the Graduate Students Association (GSA) do not. 4) That students based at the Norwich Biosciences Institutes (NBI) do not currently have representation on Union Council.

Union Believes:

1) Union Council should be representative of all students at UEA. 2) The proportion of postgraduate students on Union Council should reflect the proportion of postgraduates in the student community as a whole.

Union Resolves

1) Amend 1.18.10 of the Constitution from 'President of the Graduate Students Association' to the 'Committee of the Graduate Students Association. 2) Delete 1.18.09 and renumber accordingly 'One representative from UEA London elected by their peers.' 3) Add 1.18.11 'One representative elected from the John Innes Centre Student Voice Committee (SVC) and the Institute for Food Research Student Forum (IFR SF) respectively.'

A Democratic Framework for Finance

Proposer: C Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Seconder: C Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer)

Union Notes

Last year Council resolved to make the process of budgeting in the Union more accountable and easier to get involved with We mandated that a new Bye Law be created to this end

Union Resolves

To amend Bye-Law 10 from

Bye-Law 10:

The Budget 10.1 The Chief Executive and senior staff members shall annually review the Union's Budget with: 10.1.1 consultation with the Management Committee; 10.1.2 consultation with Student Officer Committee; 10.1.3 the approval of Union Council or a Referendum; 10.1.4 the approval of the Trustee Board; and 10.1.5 the approval of the Registrar & Secretary for the University. 10.2 The Chief Executive shall be responsible for annually producing a timeline for this process for approval by the Trustee Board in the first semester of the academic year.

To: Bye-Law 10: Union Finance

Definitions 1. Budgeted Contribution- this is the net amount that each commercial area is expected to contribute to the budget and the amount will be proposed to the Union Council each year. 2. Estimates- is a policy that is proposed to and approved by Union Council annually and will be the amounts that each activity of the union will be expecting to raise and spent (on a net basis). 3. Detailed Internal Budgets- this will be the detailed day to day budgets and cash flow projections that the Trustee Board sets for each department in pursuit of the estimates and are managed by union staff and officers through Management Committee. 4. A report on expenditure & income against the estimates will be presented to union council at least twice per term on a cycle approved at the first Union Council of the year. 5. At the beginning of each academic year, the Student Officer Committee will approve a timetable for budgetary involvement from the Union Council and students that includes: a. Input from user groups in the commercial areas b. A formative discussion at union council that allows councillors to ask questions and suggest ideas c. A summative Estimates proposal that council will formally vote on as a policy 6. Council will have the opportunity to make amendments to the budget and Councillors will have time to consult their constituents on the amended budget. 7. That in the event of the rejection of the Estimates by Union Council an amended budget addressing the concerns of Council will be resubmitted at the earliest opportunity. 8. That if estimates are passed by the Union at the start of the new financial year there will be no change in the funding allocated in the previous Estimates passed by a majority vote of Council until such time as a fresh set of Estimates are passed by the Union. 9. That the Management Committee will be required to report to the next council in the event that it becomes aware of deviations from the Estimates arising from performance of different areas of the union.

An Amendment to the Bye-Laws: Criticism of Staff by members

Proposer: C Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer) Seconded:
C Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer)

Resolves 1:

Delete Clause 6.17 of the Bye-Laws and replace with the following Clauses numbered 6.17.1-8

- Should there be any occasion when a member of UUEAS wishes to raise a criticism of a member of staff, a group of staff or "the staff of UUEAS" this procedure should be followed:
- The matter should be raised with the Chair of the Trustee Board, who will then refer the matter for initial investigation to the Chief Executive. In the event the matter relates to the Chief Executive, the matter will be referred to an external Trustee or external Trustees for initial investigation.
- The CEO or External Trustee as appropriate will be responsible for ensuring that the matter is discussed through the established structures with the staff member(s), in consultation with the staff trade union where appropriate.
- Where the initial investigation reveals that a disciplinary matter may have occurred, the normal disciplinary procedure will apply.
- A reply to the member will be conveyed through the Chair of the Trustee Board.
- If the member remains dissatisfied with the reply, an appeal can be lodged with the Board of Trustees.

- Only after the exhaustion of this procedure may a member raise the issue in the democratic forums of the Union, in the context of debate on the Management Committee's handling of personnel matters. The member shall not refer to the member of staff by name or position and shall not use this as an opportunity to go over the details of their original complaint.
- Given that contractually, staff do not have a right of reply in public or democratic forums, where members fail to abide by this procedure, the matter will be dealt with via the code of conduct and shall be considered as harassment.

The 2015 General Election and a Chance for Students to Shape Their Future

Proposer: Dan Wrigglesworth (LGBT Officer)

Seconder: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Council notes:

1. The General Election is to be held on Thursday 7th May 2015. 2. At the 2010 general election, just 44 per cent of those aged 18 to 24 voted, compared 76 per cent of the over 65s. 3. The introduction of individual voter registration (IER) threatens to further reduce the number of students and young people voting. 4. Evidence from Ipsos Mori public opinion polling shows more than two thirds of people believe the UK government does not adequately consider future generations in the decisions it makes today. 5. Young people and students' prospects continue to worsen due to rising unemployment, underemployment, casual employment and living costs. 6. That Norwich South is a marginal seat, with a Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament and a majority for that Party of just 310 votes.

Council believes:

1. Continued attacks on the prospects of students, their education and their communities represents a whole generation let down by those with power.
2. A feeling of powerlessness and precariousness is increasingly common amongst young people, squeezed by a worldwide recession and biting financial pressures, creating uncertainty about the future.
3. We too often feel let down by politicians who fail to speak on our behalf or stick to their promises in a world in which it feels the odds are already heavily stacked against us.
4. The gulf in voting levels between the young and the old effectively leaves young people losing out in policy terms.
5. That it is through students working with communities that we stand the best chance of achieving a new deal for the next generation.
6. That our Union's approach to the general election needs to be both local and national, supporting students to win locally and on a national level. To win for students we will need public support, and this is best achieved through working together with people in the communities we live in and finding common cause.
7. That the political context of the Norwich South Parliamentary constituency means we have an ideal opportunity to fight locally for a good deal for students and highlight many of the key issues affecting students.

Council resolves:

1. To support the NUS in campaigning for a new deal for the next generation.
2. To use the opportunity of the next General Election to win for students both locally and nationally.
3. To work with local and national external allies and partners to maximise voter registration and electoral participation among young people and students to ensure their voices are heard.

4. To use the NUS tools around a general election hub to develop, as a Union, our own election strategy, taking into account the political context of the Norwich South Parliamentary constituency.
5. To empower students and to connect student communities with wider society, including through community organising work.

Save the Disabled Students Allowance

Proposer: Max Levene – Students with Disabilities Officer

Seconder: Holly Staynor – Welfare, Community & Democracy Officer

Union Notes:

1. The Disabled Students Allowance offers non-medical help and support for over 90,000 disabled students in UK Higher and Further Education.
2. That in 2012/13, 7.7% of UEA students were in receipt of DSA.
3. Earlier this year, the government announced plans to make significant changes to the way support for Disabled Students is funded.
4. The majority of these changes mean that individual Universities will be expected to make provisions for disabled students, rather than funding being provided centrally.
5. Since then, Greg Clark, the current Minister for Universities and Science has announced a deferral of the majority of changes to DSA and a cancellation of some.
6. That the Union of UEA Students have participated in campaigning to stop the cuts to DSA.
7. One of UUEAS's priority campaigns for 2014/15 is to stop the cuts to DSA.

Union Believes:

1. That the Disabled Students Allowance provides a vital support to ensuring that disabled students have access to Higher and Further Education.
2. There is not yet evidence that Universities are willing or even capable of matching the support offered by the Disabled Students Allowance
3. That significant changes to the way DSA is funded are likely to act as a barrier to disabled students' access to Higher Education
4. The alterations that have since been made to plans for Disabled Students Allowance funding are not significant enough. The announcement made by Greg Clark constitutes a deferral, not a cancellation.
5. That as a result of a high profile and well co-ordinated campaign run by NUS and individual Student's Unions which has put significant pressure on government, ministers have been forced to adjust their plans.
6. That further campaigning on this issue has the potential to secure funding for Disabled Students into the future.

Union Resolves:

1. To condemn cuts to Disabled Students Allowance
2. To continue campaigning against Disabled Students Allowance cuts
3. To liaise with the University, particularly the Dean of Students office, to ensure that if cuts to DSA go ahead, that alternative provisions are made which directly replicate the current support.

Assessment and Feedback

Proposer: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Seconder: Theodore Antoniou-Phillips (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Union notes:

1. That the 2014 National Student Survey (NSS) reported that whilst UEA students' overall course satisfaction is 8th out of 203 UK HEIs, UEA is 111th for the assessment and feedback category and 146th out of 203 for promptness of feedback.
2. That in the 2014 NSS the proportion of students agreeing that feedback on their work had been prompt was below 50% in a large number of Schools (MED, FMT, HIS, LCS, LDC, MUS, PSI, BIO and DEV).
3. That students have raised the quality and timeliness of feedback as a key issue at SSLCs, through comments in the NSS, as part of the Union's 'What If' consultation and directly to Union Officers.
4. That upon receiving the Union's 2013 Student Experience Report the University made a commitment to explore measures to ensure feedback was returned in timely manner.
5. That the University's current policy of a maximum 20 working day turnaround period for feedback is frequently not met, and that for many schools, the average turnaround period is in fact greater than 20 days.
6. That the 2012 NUS Report Student Experience Research showed that amongst 1994 Group institutions, only 14.4% of students had an average wait of more than four weeks for feedback.

Union believes:

1. That timely and quality feedback is an essential component of learning.
2. That all students have the right to receive feedback on their work in sufficient time to act on it in their next piece of work.
3. That detailed, constructive feedback should be provided on all forms of assessment, including examinations.
4. That feedback encompasses more than just comments on assignments and students should receive continuous verbal, written or email feedback throughout their course.

Union resolves:

1. To campaign for the implementation at UEA of the NUS's principles of student feedback as shown in appendix 1, including that:
 - a. Students are empowered and given the tools and support to co-design their assessment methods in partnership with academic staff.
 - b. Assessments are planned across programmes to avoid clustering, including for joint honours students and that deadline dates are made available at module selection.
- 50
- c. Assessments are planned so that all programmes have their workload spread fairly across the year, with a calendar of deadlines available before module selection and on-going discussions with students throughout the year.
- d. Submission is electronic where possible, and feedback is provided online.
- e. Feedback is returned within three weeks, including on summative assessments. Feedback timeliness above an institutional minimum standard is agreed in partnership between staff and students in Schools.
- f. The opportunities to receive feedback are clearly explained to students at the start of the course, and students can choose the format in which they would like to receive feedback.
2. To campaign for the implementation of a new pilot scheme for examination feedback.

University/Union partnership group on sport at UEA

Proposed: Yinbo Yu, Activities and Opportunities Officer

Seconded : Liam McCafferty, Postgraduate Education Officer

Union Notes

1. The union operates and supports student run Sports Clubs at UEA through the Union Sports Association, providing help and advice to Union clubs and ensuring they operate safely, as well as holding their funds and running an insurance scheme through the SAM card.

2. The university Department of Sport (based at Sportspark) is responsible for student sport activity, including the 'Ziggurat' challenge and intra-mural programmes.
3. Last year Union Council passed a motion that mandated the formation of a joint University/Union partnership group on sport at UEA.
4. Its aims are to
 - a. Focus on reducing any duplication of effort between the Union and University, maximising the use of students' money.
 - b. Ensure a joint strategy for external funding for sport, and a joint Union-University capital expenditure plan for sport.
 - c. Strive to enhance the student sport / physical activity programme through improved promotion and coordination across campus, working closely together on participation targets.

Union Believes

1. One of the core parts of the Students' Union mission to provide student opportunities is to support and fund Sports Clubs
2. This year the SU's integrated Sports and Societies offer won the WhatUni best Clubs and Socs of the year award
3. We will shortly open an amazing new space to support people running Clubs And Socs in the middle of campus in Union House, easily accessible by students
4. The Union is explicitly democratic- students make the decisions, student elect the Activities & Opportunities Officer, and students make grant funding decisions
5. The average National Student Survey score for Unis where Sports Clubs are run by the University is 11% lower than our score
6. UEA Sports Clubs, a part of the SU, won the Varsity against Essex last year
7. Whilst it is important to work in partnership with the University on things like Capital Expenditure, Participation targets and Planning, there must be no implication that this might mean moving Sports Clubs under University control

Union Resolves

1. As part of the University/Union partnership group on sport at UEA, to rule out any shift of Student Sports Clubs to the University Sport Dept
2. To nevertheless continue to work together on the Sports Partnership group goals
3. To reaffirm the value and benefits of Student Sports Clubs being part of the Union in any partnership group meetings

Amendment to the Bye Laws: Student Activity events and groups

Proposed Yinbo Yu, Activities and Opportunities Officer

Seconded Chris Jarvis, Campaigns and Democracy Officer

Union Notes

1. A number of clubs and societies exist at UEA that are not a part of the Union (or University) procedures
2. Work over the summer identified that the two key tests that the union/university would usually use to protect students' interests (are finances being operated securely/effectively, and how is health and safety/risk being handled to minimise risk) were therefore not being met.
3. That the Union Officers agreed over the summer to try to work with UEA to put in place adequate support to all students that want to run groups
4. This has involved working with SportsPark and Estates (Events) to ensure that students that want to organise things are supported on a practical basis.
5. Bye Law 9.11 states: "The Union produces information for any individual or group of individuals who wish to form a club, society or peer support group of the Union. Any member may obtain a copy of this information from the Student Activities and Opportunities Officer. No Club, Society or Peer Support Group can be formed when the activity they wish to undertake is already directly provided by a current club, society or peer support group"

6. And Bye Law 8.20 states: "The Union requires that all members of the Union are able to join any of the Union funded clubs, societies and peer support groups"

Union Believes

1. In order to recognise and properly regulate (for example) medical sports clubs, the wording needs to change.

Union Resolves

1. To amend the wording of bye laws as follows:
2. 9.11 No Club, Society or Peer Support Group should usually be accredited when the activity they wish to undertake is already directly provided by a current club, society or peer support group, unless the aim of the proposal is to regulate and support a group of students that wish to undertake that activity within a particular school, faculty or mode of study. Funding procedures and principles will reflect a priority on cross university activity

A Better Deal for Postgraduates that Teach

Proposer: Liam McCafferty (PG Education Officer)

Seconder: Thomas Withers (Fell)

Union Notes:

- 1) That a recent NUS report found that the 'experience of postgraduates who teach differs widely between institutions as well as internally between departments.'
- 2) Almost one in three postgraduate teachers did not receive a contract.
- 3) One in five postgraduate teachers receive no training or induction before they start in their role.
- 4) The average postgraduate teacher will work almost twice the hours they are paid for.
- 5) Almost one in three postgraduates who teach earn below the minimum wage.
- 6) Several Postgraduates at UEA have indicated they do not feel current contracts reflect the actuality of the work commitments they are expected to fulfil.
- 7) Furthermore, some postgraduates feel they do not have the same access to teaching opportunities as others.

Union Believes:

- 1) That teaching is often essential to postgraduate research students. Both financially and in terms of the experience it provides.
- 2) That all postgraduates that teach should be offered a contract that properly reflects the work they are expected to do.
- 3) That the recruitment process for postgraduates should be fair, transparent and equitable.
- 4) That postgraduates should receive a fair rate of pay for all hours worked.
- 5) That the university should take measure to implement a fair and consistent process for the recruitment and training of postgraduates in a teaching capacity.

Union Resolves:

- 1) To call on the university to adopt the Postgraduate Employment Charter.
- 2) To mandate the Student Officer Committee to set up a regular working group with the University College and Lecturers Union (UCU), to discuss how better to represent and campaign on behalf of postgraduates that teach.