

# agenda

Meeting:	Student Officer Committee
Date:	Thursday 28 January 2015
Time:	6 pm
Location:	Bookable Room 2, Union House
Code	1 ST 16

**1521 Departmental Presentation: Clubs and Societies**

A presentation from J Raywood (Sports Development Coordinator)

**1522 Chair Update**

**1523 Attendance and Apologies**

**1524 Minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2015/Matters Arising/Action Log**

(See pages 3-14, page 15)

To note that the January 14 meeting was postponed due to staff support unavailability/

**1525 Funding Requests**

**Light Up Campus** (See page16)

**NUS Women in Leadership Conference** (See pages 17-18)

**Nothing Rhymes with Orange (Muscular Dystrophy)** (See page 19)

**Stand By Me** (See page 20)

**Students not Suspects** (See page 21)

**Light Bulbs** (See page 22)

**1526 DRO Appointment, Timetable and Election Campaigning Rules**

Proposal from the Returning Officer. (See pages 23-25)

**1527 Items for Discussion**

Discussion topics from the Chair:

Term of office for Part Time Officers

Starting times for this term's meetings of SOC.  
From the Environment Officer:  
Good Energy charity affiliation. (See link below)

<http://www.goodenergy.co.uk/your-business/become-a-partner>

From the Ethnic Minorities Officer:

Equality and Diversity Committee

Process for using/processing the funding of the liberation officers

Statements on behalf of the Ethnic Minorities Caucus

**1528 Finance: Estimates Steering Discussion**

**1529 Projects, Campaigns and Policy Reports**

Snooker: Policy Implementation Report  
(See page 26)

**1530 Policy passed by Union Council on 3 December meeting**  
(See pages 27-28 for draft implementation scheme and pages 29- 48) for policies in full.)

**Policy passed by Union Council on 21 January meeting**  
(See pages 49-66.)

**1531 Management Committee notes from 1 December meeting**  
(See pages 67-68)

**1532 Revised Cycle of Business**  
(See pages 69-70)

**1533 Any Other Business**

**1534 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting**

To note the next meeting will be held at a time to be confirmed on Thursday 18 February in Room 2 Union House.

# Minutes

Meeting:	Student Officer Committee
Date:	Thursday 26 Nov 2015
Paper:	SOC 5 15-16
Author:	Tony Moore
Purpose:	Record of Decision Making

## Key Discussions

- Funding for alcoholic drinks at Union campaign events
- Car parking and the special needs of mature students
- Club and Society publicity in Union House
- Union finances

## Key Actions

- Noted report that Management Committee had elected L McCafferty as Lead Delegate to NUS National Conference
- Approved funding requests for:  
Light up Campus (funds to come from SOC Projects)  
Opposing Prevent  
'Health Students, meet your Student Officers' with proviso that another venue be sought  
Celebrating Arab Culture
- Deferred funding request for #StandByMe until more detailed break-down of costs circulated
- Approved 'fayre' type event for mature students from January nursing cohort
- Set up working group on transport in general with a special focus on parking permits for students with special needs
- Policy Implementation Review to be held in early January

**Union of UEA Students Purpose:**

“To enrich the life of every UEA student”

**Minutes of the Student Officer Committee**

**26 November 2015**

---

**Members present:**

Voting Members Present: Aaron Hood (Students’ with Disabilities Officer), Theo Antoniou Phillips (LGBT+ Officer), Tom Etheridge (Non-Portfolio Officer), Sam Jones (Environmental Officer), Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer), Philippa Costello (Non-Portfolio Officer), Cameron Mellows (Non-Portfolio Officer), Jack Robinson (Non-Portfolio Officer), Paul Erasmus (Mature Students’ Officer), Alex McCloskey (Ethical Issues Officer), Hussam Hussein (Ethnic Minorities Officer),

Non-Voting Members Present: Jim Dickinson (Chief Executive)

**Chair:**

Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy)

**In attendance:**

Tony Moore (Democracy and Governance Coordinator).

**1492 Departmental Presentation: Operations**

Presentation given by C Alexander (Head of Operations)

P Costello commented that there should be channels for all staff to have meetings with colleagues from other departments so that they could flag up issues of common concern.

C Alexander left the meeting.

**1493 Chair Update**

Chair noted that, after their reading of the minutes from 5 November, they hoped for a more cordial meeting.

**1494 Attendance and Apologies**

Chair noted apologies from: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer), Yinbo Yu (Activities and Opportunities Officer), Beth Smith (Women's Officer), Jo Swo (Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer), Ting Ni (International Officer Officer).

**1495 Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2015/Matters Arising/Action Log**

T Antoniou Phillips apologised to SOC for not having remained impartial whilst chairing the discussion on the NUS Lead Delegate Election and noted formal personal apologies to L McCafferty.

Chair noted, as to the Climate Change demo, that external legal advice had been sought and that, in line with the advice, there had been an imposition of a small charge for transport; this had minimised costs to the extent required.

T Etheridge wondered whether there had been a result for the NUS Lead Delegate election as it seemed to have taken an inordinate amount of time to count five votes.  
Chair noted that a vote had taken place at Management Committee and that L McCafferty had been elected.

J Robinson asked as to the arrangements for the drop off point for clothing donations to the Solidarity with Migrants Campaign. Chair noted that arrangements were being made to transport the stockpile of donated clothing to Calais and once this had been done a drop off point would be put in place.

**1496 Budget Spending Update**

Chair noted that the figures in the agenda papers were only approved and not actually spent and that for some campaigns there were significant underspends.

H Hussein asked for a column in the papers to show the actual spend. H Hussein asked for an explanation of the difference between General Campaigns and SOC Special Projects.

Chair noted that the difference was: one covered campaigns and the other individual events. Chair noted that, in future, figures on actual spend would be provided.

**1497 Funding Request**

SOC noted prior online approval of requests for:  
**Student Assembly Against Austerity**

## **NUS Black Winter Conference Food Bank.**

**#StandByMe:** SOC asked for a more detailed breakdown of costs to be circulated before approval.

**Light up Campus:** T Etheridge asked that future funding requests be more specific in regard to numbers of students benefiting as it was hard to see how the distribution of 250 torches would directly benefit 4,000 students. SOC approved the request with the funding to come from SOC Special Projects.

**Opposing Prevent:** SOC approved the funding for publicity in relation to the day of events on 7 December.

**Health Students, meet your Student Officers:** T Antoniou Phillips noted that the government spending review had abolished bursaries for nursing students and that it was imperative for the Union to deepen its current support for HSC students and this event would help develop the relationship. L McCafferty noted that there had been concerns expressed the previous year where the, then, Mature Students Officer had spent their entire Campaigns Budget on alcohol and that SOC should consider how appropriate it was to approve the spending of large amounts of campaign funds on alcohol. H Hussam noted that many of their constituents would feel uncomfortable attending an event in the Blue Bar and that facilities should be made available in a non-alcoholic space.

P Erasmus noted that an item later in the agenda might usefully be combined with the current proposal as the welcome for the mature students in the January nursing cohort could take place alongside this event.

SOC agreed P Erasmus's proposal for a 'fayre' style event on 6 January to welcome mature students in the January nursing cohort.

Chair noted that two specific concerns had been raised as to the original 'meet your officers' event: the location in a bar and the amount of money to be spent on alcohol.

J Robinson noted that the money specified was a maximum.

P Costello noted it was for money behind the bar and only represented a spend per head of £2.15.

H Hussam welcomed a suggestion from T Antoniou Phillips that the event might be held in the Hive with students being given tokens for drinks from the bars or from Unio.

SOC approved the funding request for 'Health Students: meet your Student Officers' with the recommendation that another venue should be sought.

**Celebrating Arab Culture:** Chair apologised for the late submission but noted this would be a SOC Project in line with Union policy against islamophobia.

H Hussein noted the events would be part of the fight against islamophobia campaign and would raise awareness of Arabic culture.

J Robinson welcomed the proposal but wondered why it had come to SOC rather than being a request by a Society for a grant.

H Hussein noted that this was because the events would play a key part in Anti-Islamophobia Month and in implementing Union policy.

T Antoniou Phillips wondered whether the funding should come from the Ethnic Minorities Officer's individual budget.

H Hussein believed funding should come from SOC because the initiative was a part of the anti-islamophobia campaign and was a faith issue not one of ethnicity.

P Costello wondered why this was just an Arabic initiative. H Hussein noted that not all Arabs were Muslims and the initiative was designed to demonstrate Arab solidarity against Islamophobia; H Hussein noted it would be good to also involve ISOC and other faith societies.

L McCafferty noted that SOC had failed to undertake the campaign on anti-Islamophobia that it had been mandated to do by Council and it was helpful that a Society was prepared to do this on SOC's behalf.

SOC agreed to the funding request.

**1498**

## **Items for Discussion**

### **Car Parking**

P Erasmus (PE) drew attention to his discussion paper on car parking and the heavy impact car parking fees had for mature students.

PE noted thanks to J Swo for the successful work on improving the Park And Ride facility but argued that something needed to be done to help local students from long distance, whose only transport option was the car, obtain parking permits.

PE asked also to draw attention to another matter of concern, particularly to mature students: the Nursery. PE noted absurdly long waiting lists, astronomical fees and, similarly to car parking, preferential treatment for staff over students.

S Jones noted meeting with the University's Transport Coordinator and that the University was committed to looking to improve the Park And Ride services.

PE welcomed this initiative but noted that the core problem for mature students was access to parking on campus and its cost.

S Jones believed that improving Park And Ride services would help to alleviate the pressure for car parking places.

T Etheridge reminded SOC of the Union policy on car parking which mandated Officers to lobby the University to obtain fair and equal treatment for students.

J Robinson believed the main issue to be the cost of car parking for students and wondered whether it would be an attainable goal to reduce prices and what was the balance between lower prices and better access to permits.

Chair noted that the main problem centred on the number of students from Norfolk whose only option was to use a car for transport to campus.

L McCafferty (LM) noted the matter was exceptionally complicated politically as the University had proposed building a multi-storey car park about six years ago and the Union had campaigned against this proposal on environmental grounds. LM believed that the University would argue that there was simply not enough parking available on campus and that, consequently, strict criteria had to be met to gain a parking permit. LM believed that the University would, also, argue on environmental grounds that car journeys should be reduced.

PE argued that for many mature students access to parking was a necessity: some students had to travel over fifty miles, after dropping off children at school and be on campus to attend a 9 am lecture and could not obtain a permit. PE contrasted the treatment of these students with that of staff who, automatically, received parking permits.

J Robinson suggested that, rather than lobby for permits for all students, the Union should argue for specific permits, for example, for mature students travelling from distance.

S Jones (SJ) believed there to be two separate issues: the need for certain students for parking permits and then the level of car parking charges. SJ believed the University policy that refused permits for students with pressing needs whilst giving them to all staff was ridiculous. SJ argued that there was, however, a need to discourage anyone who did not need to drive to campus from doing so and parking charges played a key role in suppressing demand. SJ noted feeling uncomfortable about any campaign that would seek to reduce parking charges across the board.

LM believed that SOC should investigate the wider issues around transport with the possibility of improving public transport services. LM also believed that the details of the criteria for awarding parking permits should be looked at. LM suggested that after these had been reviewed SOC should consider the possibility of proposing that Union policy should be amended to enable Officers to lobby the University for preferential access for certain groups of students with specific needs.

SOC agreed that L McCafferty would lead an open working group, to include the Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer, which would examine the whole issue of transport that would have a remit that would include the question of parking permits for particular groups of students. At the Chair's suggestion, the

remit would include better promotion of the University's car share scheme.

### **Policy Implementation Review**

Chair believed that SOC needed to take a strategic review of the policies passed over the autumn term which would then inform its report back to Council on the progress on policy implementation.

SOC agreed to Chair's suggestion to meet as a group, provisionally, on Friday, 8 January.

**1499**

### **Policy Implementation**

SOC approved the following allocation of Officers and staff to lead on the implementation of policy passed by Council on 19 November:

1789 Don't Judge the Jury	Jo Swo/Lucy
1790 Access to Personal Assistants/Carers' tickets	Aaron/Jo Swo/Paul I
1791 Wheels on Campus – making UEA more accessibility friendly	Aaron/Jo Swo/Josh/Chloe
1792 HIV and Sex Education	Theo/Josh/Jack
1793 Student Mental Health – from Service to Strategy	Aaron/Jo Swo/Josh/Liam
1794 Students who stutter	Aaron/Jo Swo/Josh
1795 No to Norfolk County Council Cuts	Chris/Liam/Josh
1796 Let's Stand with Our Junior Doctors	Connor/Chris/Josh
1797 Automatic voting registration on campus	Alex/Chris/Josh
1798 Make opposition to the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) a Union campaign	Chris/Sam/Josh
1799 Come Fly with Me! (Air flights for Clubs and Societies)	Yinbo/Sam
1800 Campaigning for a Title IX equivalent in the UK	Jo Swo/Beth/Jim

**1500 Union Council Open Discussion: Clubs and Societies**

T Antoniou Phillips noted that there were continuing problems with the website as it took as many as thirteen clicks to navigate to where you could join a Club, for example.

J Robinson noted the Clubs and Societies part of the site was still difficult to navigate.

Chair noted they would lead on liaising with staff to investigate how to improve the Clubs and Societies area of the site.

J Robinson believed there should be a physical presence and a dedicated space for Clubs and Societies with pigeonholes and noticeboards.

T Etheridge believed a downstairs blackboard with sports results would be a great way to raise Clubs' profiles.

L McCafferty thought there was a difficulty as to the separation of commercial and non-commercial publicity.

SOC agreed that Management Committee would discuss the issue of the prioritisation between commercial and non-commercial publicity in Union House and a report would be made back to SOC.

J Robinson requested a more comprehensive description of what SAM pays for be posted on the website.

On the open discussion initiative, itself, SOC thought it was working well.

T Etheridge thought that Officers might give instant feedback, when items were raised in the discussions, as to whether they had them on their agenda and if they were already taking action to address them.

T Antoniou Phillips suggested that, as the discussions split into groups, Officers could assign themselves to help facilitate the discussion across the groups.

Chair noted the encouraging changes to the gender balance of the total number of speakers at Council that the open discussions had brought about.

J Robinson suggested that facilities should be available for Councillors to provide written contributions to the discussions.

Chair noted that they would feedback Officers' thoughts on the open discussions to the Chair of Council.

**1501 Projects, Campaigns and Policy Reports****Priority Campaign Report**

T Etheridge commented that the response to Save Our Union had been quite pathetic with only thirteen responses collected

and perhaps other ways for engaging students in the campaign should be tried.

L McCafferty noted that the FTOs had discussed this and they had concluded that there was a problem over fixing a clear campaign message and how to create a sense of urgency without compromising the FTOs position as lobbyists.

Chair noted they would relate T Etheridge's concerns to Y Yu.

P Erasmus noted that an email had been sent out to all students over twenty-four years of age and there was uncertainty as to the reliability of the data base and how many of the present mature students this had reached.

Chair noted they would investigate how many recipients the mail-out had reached using the functionality that Union Cloud provided.

T Antoniou Phillips asked as to the position with regard to PTO Champions.

L McCafferty (LM) noted that the concept had been agreed earlier in the year and that FTOs had sketched, into the campaign planning, PTO Champions for each sub-section and they had based this on Officers manifesto commitments. LM hoped that they had got it right and asked any Officer who wanted to change campaigns to contact him.

T Etheridge asked that the Honesty Project be included in the general Well-Being campaign.

Chair noted that after the Policy Implementation Review a revised version of the Report would be sent to Council.

### **January Nursing Welcome for New Students**

Covered in previous discussion.

### **Calendar of Activism Events/Actions**

Noted.

## **1502**

### **Finance Update**

J Dickinson (JD) noted that the Union's overall financial model had undergone some changes in the past few years and the process was not fully complete.

JD noted the old model had been one of a small unincorporated charity with two massive trading arms where all the reserves were kept at arms' length from the democratic part of the organisation.

JD noted that the new financial model aimed at massively increasing spending on charitable outcomes. The model aimed to increase spending by: cutting costs of administration through efficiency gains, transferring some services including IT and

cleaning to the University, running the commercial operations as social enterprises and running them as efficiently as possible. JD noted the requirement of last year's Budget had been that commercial services were run well and that costs in the charity were kept in line. JD reported that the latter had been achieved with ease but there had been significant problems in commercial services which had been largely due to poor control of casual staff costs and had led to a negative performance against budget of £350,000. JD noted that in the main problem area, ENTS, revenue generation was fine; the problem lay with control of costs.

JD noted that the negative performance against budget had become apparent in the run up to the Trustee Board meeting in September and it also had become apparent that the current year Budget would have to be revised.

JD noted as part of the Budget revision some headline savings had been designed and implemented in commercial operations and some discretionary spending in the Charity had been held back pending developments in the autumn term.

JD noted that, as part of its strategic development, UEASU would be moving to a more developed financial model during the current financial year.

JD noted that the old financial model had hoarded money for capital investment; however, this had changed between 2008 and 2014 when alcohol sales fell precipitately.

For context, and to illustrate the need for a move toward a more sophisticated model, JD reported that UEASU was now the most commercially leveraged SU in the country. JD noted that UEASU's position was quite anomalous as it was able to have both bars and retail on campus and this exclusivity was seen, to some extent, by the University as a grant in kind. JD noted a key problem with the current model was that the University had a standard inflation rate to cover all its departments including the grant to UEASU. JD noted that a major problem caused by the assumption of a universal rate was that any inflation above this rate in the Charity would have to be covered by increased profits from the commercial operations and, over the last few years, this had proved impossible given the limited capacity in the Shop and the LCR.

JD noted that there would have to be change as, over the coming years, UEASU's financial position would become untenable.

JD characterised the relationship with the University as good and was hopeful that the University would come to see the need to treat UEASU differently from other departments in application of the inflation rate.

JD noted that there was scope for positive conversations with the University on areas such as student participation in the local voluntary sector where UEA scored extremely low in comparison

to its competitor universities and out of such conversations the University might see the need to increase the grant.

JD noted there was also further scope for rationalisation over IT infrastructure such as software licenses.

JD noted that the current increase in student numbers would not generate increased revenues from commercial operations as this, again, would be stymied given the limited capacity of the present infrastructure.

JD pointed to three significant financial pressures. JD noted that, as membership services now took up more of Union House and less space was devoted to trading, there was less ability to reclaim VAT. JD noted that, secondly, there was the historical legacy of the old NUS final salary pension scheme and that with increased adult longevity the pension deficit would, inevitably, continue to grow. JD noted that, thirdly, in the refurbishment of Union House, there had been no real costing of what was, in effect, the running of a social learning space for over eighteen hours a day in term time; JD believed there would have to be a conversation with the University as to this real cost.

JD noted UEASU would, simultaneously, be looking at how its balance sheet was structured in terms of the treatment of depreciation of fixed assets.

JD summarised the thrust of the Union's approach to future discussions with the University as:

- Apply the University inflationary rate to our expenditure rather than our grant
- Real conversations over student experience funding
- Money-saving collaboration on back-office functions
- Exploring possibilities of increasing retail outlets on campus
- Exploring different balance sheet treatment of depreciations and capital write-offs with regard to the building

As to the Waterfront, JD noted that, coming up to the renewal of the lease, there were substantial unplanned refurbishments required and, if the lease were extended, continuous upkeep of the building would have to be factored in to future budgeting.

In conclusion, JD outlined the recommendations that had been sent the Finance Committee of the Trustees:

1. Write down of assets replaced by the recent refurbishment
2. Seek clarification from the University on capital investment going forward
3. Restructure the balance sheet in light of 1 and 2
4. Create and actively manage an appropriate investment fund for future expenditure on membership goals

S Jones asked whether the new approach would mean that the cash reserves would be considerably lower than in the past.

JD noted that they would but, in comparison with the great majority of SUs, UEASU would still have an extraordinarily healthy cash reserve which could then be matched with future risk.

T Antoniou Phillips noted the drive to cut costs in commercial operations but also there was a need to provide a service for members and cited the running of Unio at weekends; they wondered whether this type of service would be cut to lower costs.

JD noted different staff ratios had been set for these type of services and the only requirement of them was that they should break even and not be loss making.

**1503      Cycle of Business**

Noted

**1504      Any Other Business**

There was none.

**1505      Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting**

To note the next meeting will be held at 5.00 pm on Thursday 14 January in Bookable Room 2, Union House.

## SOC Action Log for 14 January

Date Commissioned	Action Required	Status	Assigned To:	Date to be actioned by:
16 October 14	Public statement to be made on DSA Cuts in collaboration with NUA and City College	<b>Liaising with University over joint declaration with NUA/City</b>	Jo, Aaron, Chris	Ongoing
26 February 15	Proposed amendment on the Referendum Bye-Laws to be brought Council.	<b>To be brought to Council</b>	Chris	16 Apr 15
17 September 15	Investigate location for breast feeding space	<b>Report to be made</b>	Jo Swo	December 15
5 November 15	Recommendation for staff member to be appointed as DRO	<b>Actioned: agenda item</b>	Josh	December 15
26 November 15	Actual spend figures to be added to budget updates	<b>To be added to future budget updates</b>	Josh	Spring term
26 November 15	Transport working group to be formed with special focus on parking permits	<b>Group to meet and bring policy proposals to Council</b>	Liam/Jo Swo	Spring term
26 November 15	SOC Policy Implementation Review to be held	<b>To be held and report made to Council</b>	Chris	Spring term
26 November 15	Liaison with staff to improve Clubs and Societies area of the website	<b>Discussions to be held – report on any improvements to be made</b>	Chris	Spring term
26 November 15	Management Committee to discuss prioritisation of non-commercial and commercial publicity in Union House	<b>Initial discussion to be held; final outcome to be reported to SOC</b>	Liam	Spring term
26 November 15	Chair to feedback SOC's comments on the running of Council Open discussions to Chair of Council	<b>Feedback to be given to Chair of Council</b>	Chris	21 January 16
26 November 15	Chair to discuss Save Our Union campaign with other FTOs	<b>Discussions to take place: results to be fed back to T Etheridge</b>	Chris	14 January 16
26 November 15	Chair to check email groups and whether mail outs were reaching recipients	<b>Investigation held: no issues found</b>	Chris	14 January 16

**Project/Campaign Title: Light Up Campus**

**Amount of money requested: £49**

**Budget requested from:**

**Details of project (500 words max)**

We can only make campus safer by listening to those who feel unsafe on it. Light Up Campus is a campaign that is based off a survey created for students and staff who use the facilities on campus during the darkest hours. Based off of these results and investigations, we will lobby the University to 'light up' the areas that are dark and make students feel unsafe.

**Funding break down:**

**1000 A5 leaflets printed 1 side = £49**

**How will this benefit our members? (300 words max)**

This campaign will give students a channel to communicate which areas on campus they feel least safe on, and an opportunity for us to engage with those students and make a real change. This will make our students feel safer, and a part of the decision making processes of the Union.

**Number of members directly benefited: 4,000**

**Number of members benefited by extension: 15,000**

**How will you ensure this benefits hard to reach/liberation/underrepresented groups? (300 words max)**

We will make sure we engage with students in 'hard to reach' areas (e.g. Edith Cavell), and we will advertise to those students who feel most vulnerable at night (e.g. women, woc, poc, pof, international students and international women, mature women, lgbt+ students etc).

**Jo Swo (Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer)**

**Project/Campaign Title: NUS Women in Leadership Conference**

**Amount of money requested: £395**

**Budget requested from: SOC Projects**

**Details of project (500 words max)**

NUS recognises that there is a lack of women in leadership roles throughout society. Although women are overrepresented in the student movement itself, when it comes to positions of power and steering the movement, women fair less, especially women from liberation backgrounds. This is why we are committed to recognising intersectionality in our work.

The overarching aim of the conference (which takes place on 26<sup>th</sup> January) is to enable women to understand the importance of women's leadership and provide leadership tools to women officers and staff to enable them to reach their full leadership potential.

This conference has been designed as an unrivalled opportunity to network with like-minded women that will give you the chance and space to:

- explore the importance of women's leadership in the student movement;
- hear from an inspiring keynote speaker Laura Bates;
- develop leadership skills through a range of workshops; and
- provide strategies to overcome barriers for women in leadership.

**Funding break down:**

**£79 per delegate**

**One delegate space is reserved for a delegate who self-defines as a Black Woman (inclusive term to represent those from African, Arab, Asian, Caribbean and South American communities)**

**How will this benefit our members? (300 words max)**

Delegates are not just for Officers, our members can run.

The event is for women who are:

- Full time officers
- Part time officers
- Women's officers
- Student representatives (course reps, clubs and societies, union council, etc.)
- Permanent staff
- CEO or GMs
- Trustees
- Any women who are aspiring to pursue leadership roles in the student movement

**Number of members directly benefited: 5**

**Number of members benefited by extension: 15,000**

**How will you ensure this benefits hard to reach/liberation/underrepresented groups? (300 words max)**

The conference was created to enable under represented and oppressed groups (women, especially women of colour and/or faith) and to give them the tools and conference to pursue roles of leadership.

**Jo Swo (Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer)**

**Project/Campaign Title: Nothing Rhymes with Orange**

**Amount of money requested: £31.48**

**Budget requested from:**

**Details of project (500 words max)**

Nothing Rhymes with Orange is a policy passed in Council regarding Muscular Dystrophy, an umbrella term for muscle wasting conditions. Union was mandated to run an awareness campaign on 22<sup>nd</sup> January, which we are currently organising, and this funding request is for resources to promote the campaign.

**Funding break down:**

**Orange felt - £4**  
**Safety pins - £5**  
**Brown boxes - £2.48**  
**A2 posters - £20**

**How will this benefit our members? (300 words max)**

Statistics show that 1 in 1,000 people have Muscular Dystrophy, and whilst our own statistics show that only 4 students at UEA have identified as having Muscular Dystrophy, there is no doubt that a campaign from the Union will have an enormous impact. It will also seek to spread awareness about the disease to able bodied students. The Union will be working to support CHRONIC who are raising money for MD UK, a charity that supports people who have these conditions and their families.

**Number of members directly benefited: 200**

**Number of members benefited by extension: 15,000**

**How will you ensure this benefits hard to reach/liberation/underrepresented groups? (300 words max)**

The campaign seeks to spread awareness, break down stigma and provide support for people directly or indirectly affected by Muscular Dystrophy – all events will be accessible for non-able bodied students.

**Jo Swo (Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer)**

**Project/Campaign Title: #StandByMe**  
**Amount of money requested: £159**  
**Budget requested from: General Campaigns**

**Details of project (500 words max)**

#StandByMe is a NUS campaign created by Susuanna, Women's Officer. The campaign is targeted at increasing awareness not only of sexual harassment/assault/rape on campus, but also the support services that are available, and the support services on campus that student survivors need and deserve. The campaign seeks to tackle the cultural issues of victim blaming and shaming that have forced survivors into isolation and silence, but not anymore. #StandByMe seeks to bring together survivors and non-survivors to campaign for better preventative measures on campus, and services. It seeks to demand the University take responsibility for student's welfare, tackle welfare cuts that effect services such as Rape Crisis and establish peer support groups in every student union so survivors have a dedicated safe space. This will be a year long campaign, so the funding request pre-empts unforeseen costs such as speakers or sending students to conferences/speakers relevant to the campaign. The launch is on the 25<sup>th</sup> November.

**Funding break down:**

**£44 for 2,000 double sided flyers**  
**£40 for 20 posters (a2)**  
**£75 for banner**

**How will this benefit our members? (300 words max)**

This campaign will change our culture on campus, giving safe, dedicated spaces to student survivors and changing the environment so student survivors feel comfortable talking about their experiences instead of hiding them. It will also be beneficial to non-survivors, with running consent classes and discussions, educating students on their rights and the services available to their survivor friends. It is also important to note that not all survivors are female or women-identifying, and we need to make sure that these members feel properly represented and supported as well.

**Number of members directly benefited: 6,000**

**Number of members benefited by extension: 15,000**

**How will you ensure this benefits hard to reach/liberation/underrepresented groups? (300 words max)**

Peer support groups will be set up for survivors, but we can also create peer support survivor groups specifically for liberation groups at request. It is also important to note that not all survivors are female or women-identifying, and we need to make sure that these members feel properly represented and supported as well. We also acknowledge that this subject can be very triggering for both survivors and non-survivors and we shall make sure that at all events there will be the option of a quiet safe space, and trigger warnings are used.

**Project/Campaign Title: Students Not Suspects Tour**

**Amount of money requested: £44**

**Budget requested from: General Campaigns**

**Details of project (500 words max)**

UEA is hosting part of the NUS Students Not Suspects tour, raising awareness of the dangers of Prevent and what impact it can have on students. This funding request is just so we can advertise the event and make it accessible to our students. The event will consist of a panel of speakers (TBC).

**Funding break down:**

**£44 for 2,000 double sided flyers**

**How will this benefit our members? (300 words max)**

Two policies were passed in 2015 (No to Islamophobia on Campus and Anti- Counter Terrorism Bill), as well as statements released from the Union, which supports the theory that this is a subject that students are interested in and would like to hear other perspectives. It will also be of particular interest to students who identify as Muslim and students who are pursuing law.

**Number of members directly benefited: 6,000**

**Number of members benefited by extension: 15,000**

**How will you ensure this benefits hard to reach/liberation/underrepresented groups? (300 words max)**

Whilst the location is yet to be confirmed the venue will be accessible to students. We will also put suitable safeguards in place depending on the type of speakers that are confirmed.

**Jo Swo**

**Project/Campaign Title: Go Green Week Bulb-Swap**

**Amount of money requested: £150**

**Budget requested from: SOC Projects**

**Details of project (500 words max)**

As party of my broader aim to promote and increase efficiency off-campus through HomeRun etc, I'm thinking of holding a BulbSwap event as part of Go Green Week. Students can bring their old bulbs (probably incandescent) bulbs from their houses, and swap the for LED bulbs which are between 1/6<sup>th</sup> and 1/8<sup>th</sup> of the energy of ordinary incandescent or halogen bulbs, and will help our students save both electricity and money in the long run, helping both the environment and our members.

**Funding break down:**

**£140 for bulbs (mixed fittings)**  
**£10 flyers, posters, promotions etc.**

**How will this benefit our members? (300 words max)**

The problem with bulbs is that student's landlords buy the bulbs, and students pay the bills, and that since usually a term of lease is only 1 year, bulbs are rarely changed, and students pay 6 to 8 times the electricity cost of an LED lit house. Students don't want to be the ones to spend £50 on a new set of bulbs, because they'll only be in the house for a year, and so the problem persists. Swapping these bulbs for energy efficient ones will help reduce student's energy bills far more than the initial investment (an average LED bulb lasts 10-12 years).

**Number of members directly benefited: 100**

**Number of members benefited by extension: 1,000**

**How will you ensure this benefits hard to reach/liberation/underrepresented groups? (300 words max)**

Wide ranging promotion online thorough social media, flyering etc and promotion across campus.

## UEASU Returning Officer- Timetable and Election Campaigning Rules

My name is **Joe Cooper**- I have been formally approved by the Registrar of the University of East Anglia as UEASU's Returning Officer. I am CEO at Imperial College London SU and am a former regional official at the National Union. I have extensive experience of regulating and adjudicating on disputes in SU Elections.

Ahead of the main election I am required to:

- Recommend a **Deputy Returning Officer** to the Student Officer Committee
- Set out an **election timeline** having taken advice
- Publish a list of **main campaigning rules** having taken advice

### Student Officer Committee

It is normal practice to clearly state the term of office of a position and we noted last year that the constitution and bye laws are silent on the issue for PT officers. I am aware that there is precedent but with Easter falling particularly early this year I would advise that you formally settle this issue at Union Council as soon as possible.

### NUS Conference

For whatever reason the NUS Conference election was not held last term and my view is that it is now not practically possible to hold a separate election for delegates ahead of the main election so I am intending that this be carried out alongside the main election.

### Deputy Returning Officer

This year I am intending to improve the delivery of this role by splitting it. The element that provides training and support to candidates will be split from the formal regulatory role of the DRO to provide enhanced support to candidates, and enhanced consistency and focus to any rulings or disputes. The support role will be delivered by members of the staff Campaigns and Policy team; the formal DRO role "shall be appointed by the Student Officer Committee and cannot be an ordinary member of the Union". This is usually therefore a full time member of Union Staff.

I have asked your CEO to identify a suitably qualified person with the appropriate credibility and approach. My formal recommendation is therefore that **Mike Hill**, an experienced Advisor in your Advice team, be appointed by you to the role.

### Timetable

In making the following recommendation I have taken into account multiple representations and factors including feedback from previous candidates and input from SOC. The key issue this year is the relative early timing of Easter.

Date	Main Officer Elections
11 <sup>th</sup> January	Nominations Open
19 <sup>th</sup> February	Nominations Close Midday
19 <sup>th</sup> February	All Candidates Meeting 4pm
22 <sup>nd</sup> February	Training Week
25 <sup>th</sup> February	Manifestos Deadline
29 <sup>th</sup> February 9am	Campaigning Begins
1 <sup>st</sup> March – noon	Voting Opens
8 <sup>th</sup> March – noon	Voting Closes (results to candidates early evening; announced at DG)
12 <sup>th</sup> March	NOTE First day of Easter Break

### Campaigning Rules

These are appended at Appendix A. They have been simplified and take into account feedback from candidates and staff involved in last year's process as well as best practice advice from NUS.

### Hustings

The rules require that an "opportunity ... be provided to members to ask question to the candidates standing in the election". This year this will take the form of a recorded Podcast debate between candidates in each election that will be distributed to all members; and (if the Chair and council permit this) a slot at the March 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of Union Council. Rules governing these processes will be distributed nearer the time.

**Joe Cooper**  
UEASU Returning Officer

## UEASU Election Rules 2016

### From the Bye Laws:

1. The Returning Officer and the Deputy Returning Officer will publish election campaigning rules ... in advance of the close of nominations for an election.
2. It is the role of the Returning Officer, and Deputy Returning Officer, to ensure these principles and the subsequently adopted rules are upheld.
3. Where it is felt that these adopted rules are not being upheld by a candidate the Returning Officer, on advice from their Deputy, make take the following action:
  - the disqualification of a candidate or candidates from the election;
  - that promotional materials (including but not limited to posters, flyers and online materials) contravening the regulations be removed;
  - that publicity be displayed at any fixed Union polling stations and online giving details of an infringement;
  - order a re-election, starting the election process at any stage;
  - order a re-vote, which shall mean all the election stages which follow completion of nominations, and shall not include the reopening of nominations;
  - order the non-payment of a campaign expenses claim.
4. The Deputy Returning Officer has the power, devolved from the Returning Officer, to issue warnings to candidates in the election and should set out in these warnings the action which shall follow if they are not heeded which could be any of the above.
5. The Deputy Returning Officer has the power, devolved from the Returning Officer, to suspend a candidate from the election pending the outcome of an investigation into an alleged breach of rules. During this period, the candidate is not permitted to actively campaign or discuss publicly the reasons for their suspension.

### Rules: Context

1. It is important to remember that during the election campaign you continue to be bound by sets of rules that, whilst not strictly election rules, still have a bearing on your conduct.
  - **Union Rules/Policies:** This includes abiding by the Equal Opportunities Policy and Union Code of Conduct. Candidates should be aware that breaking Union rules may result in disciplinary action.
  - **University Rules:** For example, the bullying and harassment code, damage to University property and buildings, the policy on acceptable use of computers and e-mail etc. This is all outlined in the University Calendar. Breaking University rules can result in a University disciplinary.
  - **The Law:** For instance laws protecting the defacement of property and the Data Protection Act. Breaking the Law can result in a civil action or criminal prosecution.
2. Any of these outcomes may put a candidacy in jeopardy and all of the above rules are enforceable by the Deputy and Returning Officer as election rules.

### Rules: Conduct

1. Campaigners must take reasonable steps to ensure that their supporter's actions comply with the campaign rules at all times and must be able to demonstrate this in the event of a complaint against them. In the event of a dispute as to whether an individual was under the control of a candidate the Deputy Returning Officer's ruling will be final.
2. Candidates and their Campaigners may only alter, move or remove their own campaign materials.
3. Candidates and their Campaigners may use email lists but only where lawful to do so. In most cases this will require the consent of the members on the list to use their details.
4. Candidates and their Campaigners may seek endorsements and support from anyone but Candidates may not endorse or support any other candidate in their or any other election.
5. The bylaws outlaw bullying or intimidating a member into voting for a particular candidate or preference. As a result Candidates and their Campaigners must allow voters to cast their ballot freely and must not communicate with voters in any way once they have begun to complete their ballot. If Candidates and their Campaigners can see how a voter is expressing preferences and voting, they are in breach of this rule.

### Campaigning & Expenditure

1. Campaign expenditure is defined as expenditure in pursuit of promoting a candidature and can be further defined from time to time by the returning officer.
2. Candidates in all elections have a maximum amount they can spend on their campaigns once the nomination has been confirmed, for which they can be reimbursed by the union upon production of receipts. All expenditure must be accounted for on a form we will provide. Candidates are required to produce receipts of their expenditure by the relevant deadline.
3. Any expenditure must be both that which all candidates have had the **opportunity** to carry out, and that which is **replicable** by all other candidates in a given election.
4. "Labour Costs" are **not** counted. Hire, materials production and materials or distribution of consumables **is** counted.
5. Where there is a question as to the extent to which it is reasonable to believe that the use of a tactic or resource was open to all, the deputy returning officer's decision is final and so advice should be sought first.
6. Whereas candidates may well adopt similar policy stances and use similar publicity materials to other candidates, no candidate shall use publicity to promote another candidate, in the same or other election.

**Campaigning & Expenditure Principle 1- Reasonable:** In determining whether the use of a resource needs to be charged to campaign expenditure, the RO/DRO will use the "reasonable" test. For example- it is reasonable to assume

all candidates own shoes. Thus the wearing of shoes does not need to be accounted for. It is not reasonable to assume all students own a tiger costume. Thus anyone using one as a feature of their campaign should account for costume hire. If in doubt candidates should consult first.

**Campaigning & Expenditure Principle 2- Replicable:** Actions must be replicable by anyone else in the election. For example- if you tell jokes to students outside the union shop, anyone else could do the same. But If you won a blimp in an ebay auction for 25p it is not likely that someone else could buy a blimp for 25p.

**Some Examples:**

1. Your father owns a printing firm and gives you 500 swizzles sweets for free. You would have to declare a cost equivalent to 500 swizzles sweets at a commercial rate within your expenditure.
2. You and 3 other candidates share purchasing of lollipops and therefore get a bulk buy discount for 2,000. Your cost declared would be the cost of 500 lollies without the bulk buy discount rather than a quarter cost of 2,000 lollies.
3. You own a pen and write "vote Jimmy" on existing posters. The pen does not count as expenditure as it is reasonable to assume that all students can access a pen.
4. You borrow a blimp and paint on it "vote Jimster". This is not allowed as it is not reasonable to assume that all students can access a blimp.

**Complaints**

1. Complaints about the conduct of Candidates and their Campaigners must be sent to the Deputy Returning Officer detailing the allegation(s), the rules broken and any evidence.
2. All complaints regarding the conduct of Candidates and their Campaigners must be received within an hour of the close of polling.
3. All complaints must be resolved to the satisfaction of the Returning Officer before the count can commence.

## **Policy Implementation Report from Yinbo Yu (Activities and Opportunities Officer)**

### **1814 Provide the correct on campus facilities for Pool and Snooker club**

#### **Union Resolves:**

- 1. To support the club in finding a suitable room and location to provide the club with similar facilities that had previously existed.**
- 2. Ensure that the location that would be provided would be safe from such events that have previously happened, if something similar was to happen then the club would receive a similar location to continue the club.**

Since the policy, Lynne has again

- Contacted UEA Sport who are unable to offer any space.
- Contacted Rom Bookings- spoke with Nigel Shed to ask for any ideas, and thoughts on space. Nigel was unable to find anywhere, and he has to comply with UEA Space management, so even if he had thought of a venue, he is not able to give permission.
- Contacted Space Management and Rachel Brown- Rachel said that space was at a premium and all available space was used for teaching. Lynne asked regarding Chrome Court Common room as this had been discussed in a conversation between myself and Nik, the President of the club. This room is also using for teaching, so is not available for a snooker table.

Nik – president of Pool and Snooker Club is aware of the above. His last suggestion is the Nap Nook as this is the perfect size for the snooker table. He is aware that there is a policy in place regarding the nap nook and that it is used. He would request that the snooker table is moved to the nap nook and then nap nook moved to another room possibly the dance studio.

Nik went to see Neil Ward on the 20.01.16 regarding this issue, and Neil has said he will see if there is anything he could do. However it appears that he said that space outside Union house is at a premium for teaching, speaking to Nik re the plans for the teaching wall etc. He also told Nik that he can't influence what happens within Union House re the Nap Nook.

### Policy Passed by Council 3 December Implementation

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Resolves</b>	<b>FTO</b>	<b>Staff</b>
<b>1812 Hepatitis C Awareness</b>	1. To mandate the Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer to run a Hepatitis C awareness campaign across campus and for the Union to publicise the dangers of Hepatitis C and the treatments available to students on an ongoing basis.	<b>Jo</b>	<b>Lucy</b>
<b>1814 Provide the correct on campus facilities for Pool and Snooker club</b>	1. To support the club in finding a suitable room and location to provide the club with similar facilities that had previously existed. 2. Ensure that the location that would be provided would be safe from such events that have previously happened, if something similar was to happen then the club would receive a similar location to continue the club.	<b>Yinbo</b>	<b>Lynne/James</b>
<b>1815 Guarantor Scheme</b>	1. To lobby the University to find more effective ways of informing international students and LGBT+ students who are estranged from their families on housing and guarantor issues. 2. To lobby the University to investigate running a pilot guarantor scheme for students who fail to meet the criteria for a guarantor through private landlords and letting agencies. 3. To ensure that AdviceSU is well equipped to offer practical advice to students who struggle to find guarantors, including but not limited to, the offer of external companies that provide guarantor service until the University agrees to the guarantor scheme.	<b>Jo</b>	<b>Jim/Lucy</b>
<b>1816 SWP off our campus</b>	1. To mandate the Student Officer Committee to write a letter of condemnation to the Central Committee of the SWP and the Norwich SWP branch, expressing in strongest terms our dismay with how the above allegations were handled, and to demand that the organisation disassociate itself from the individuals involved. 2. To ensure that all publicity distributed by external organisations at union-supported events is in line with our beliefs and values, and to ensure that those distributing materials are not doing so in a manner that is alarming/distressing to students.	<b>Chris</b>	<b>Jim</b>
<b>1818 Response to the HE Green Paper</b>	1. To release a statement responding to the HE Green Paper based upon the beliefs as outlined above. 2. To lobby the Vice-Chancellor to publicly state their concerns as to the consequences of the HE Green paper. 3. To oppose and actively campaign against the implementation of the Teaching Excellence Framework. 4. To oppose any move to further embed graduate attributes, employability, or any other mechanism that attempts to subject learning and teaching outcomes to the needs of employers into course or module design. 5. To request that Norwich South MP, Clive Lewis, write an open letter to the Universities Minister Jo Johnson outlining concerns about the future of HE as outlined in the Green Paper. 6. To convene a working group with the staff unions – UCU, Unison, and Unite – to develop a joint policy document on the green paper and the state of the sector, addressing key issues such as staff workload and assessment and feedback.	<b>Connor</b>	<b>Jim</b>
<b>1819 Nothing Rhymes With Orange</b>	1. To assist Chronic in running an awareness campaign on 22nd January 2016	<b>Jo</b>	<b>Lucy/Josh</b>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. To advertise the campaign and get as many students and staff to get involved, wear orange and donate money</li> <li>3. To assist Chronic in raising money on 22nd January 2016</li> <li>4. To consult any students with muscular dystrophy about what can be done to improve their university experience</li> <li>5. To consider any further action that can be taken to raise funds/awareness of muscular dystrophy.</li> </ol>		
<b>1820 Amendment to the Bye-Laws: Part-Time Trans and Non-Binary Officer</b>	Change relevant section of the Bye-Laws	<b>Chris</b>	<b>Tony</b>
<b>1821 NUS lead delegate – let's improve our democracy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To mandate the proposer and the Campaigns and Democracy Officer to convene a meeting with current members of the Democratic Procedures Committee to consider alternative ways of electing an NUS lead delegate that is consistent with the above beliefs. The meeting will consider the positives and negatives of several options and bring its conclusions to a meeting of Union Council before the end of the academic year.</li> </ol>	<b>Connor/Chris</b>	<b>Josh</b>
<b>1823 Support HSC Students – keep the National Health Service bursary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To mandate the Undergraduate Education Officer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sign and share the petition to parliament which opposes these changes</li> <li>• Support UEA student societies in their involvement in the action to oppose these changes</li> <li>• Publicise the importance of supporting HSC students in their action against these changes</li> <li>• Encourage all students to individually lobby their home and university MPs in support of keeping the NHS nursing bursary</li> <li>• To write a statement on behalf of the Union on this issue</li> <li>• To continue to consult HSC students on action on this issue and provide support where appropriate</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<b>Connor</b>	<b>Bridget</b>
<b>Emergency Resolution - Don't Bomb Syria</b>	To release a statement with immediate effect including the above, condemning the decision to join the bombing of Syria, and expressing our solidarity with the Syrian people.	<b>Chris</b>	<b>Lauren</b>

## Policy passed by Union Council 3 December 2015

### 1812 Hepatitis C Awareness

passed 3 December 15

Proposer: Louise Rudd (Postgraduate SU Committee)

Seconder: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

#### Union Notes:

1. A campaign called "Going Viral" found that hepatitis C prevalence figures for the tested population were 4.5 times higher than the reported prevalence for hepatitis C for the UK and six times the national average in the in 25-55 year age group.
2. Hepatitis C is a blood born virus which remains active in blood outside the body for several weeks, therefore it can be transmitted through sharing personal items such as tooth brushes or razors, through intra nasal drug use as well as intravenous drug use, tattooing and piercing and through medical treatment carried out in developing countries.
3. Up to 500,000 people in the UK have Hepatitis C, but only about 20% have been diagnosed.
4. There is no vaccine, but there is effective treatment available. The sooner it is treated the better the outcome.
5. Left untreated Hepatitis C can cause liver fibrosis, cirrhosis and cancer. <sup>1</sup>

#### Union Believes:

1. Hepatitis C is a hidden epidemic that, because of its links to drug use, remains taboo.
2. The various means of catching the virus, and the lack of knowledge about it means that the virus is a potential hidden threat to the student population.
3. Knowledge is power. This life threatening virus can be cured so testing it vital for anyone who thinks they may have been exposed to it.
4. Prevention is better than the cure. Students need to be taught how to keep themselves safe from the virus.
5. That we have a responsibility to inform all students about Hepatitis C.

#### Union Resolves:

1. To mandate the Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer to run a Hepatitis C awareness campaign across campus and for the Union to publicise the dangers of Hepatitis C and the treatments available to students on an ongoing basis.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.hepctrust.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/Are%20you%20at%20risk%20leaflet%20-%20June%202011.pdf>

## **1814 Provide the correct on campus facilities for Pool and Snooker club**

Passed 3 December 15

Proposer: Thomas Bulley (Pool and Snooker Union representative)

Seconder: Samuel Fletcher (UEA Ballet Union representative)

### **Union Notes:**

1. UEA Pool and Snooker club has held a location on campus housing two snooker tables since the University was established in 1963, this year is the first year in the history of UEA that those facilities have not existed.
2. With the postgraduate area redevelopment plans put in place last year and executed over the summer, the existing snooker room was to be removed, the agreement was that one Snooker table would remain in the postgraduate area, as it would be a main facility of the Pool and Snooker club. The snooker tables would be taken into storage until the new area would be ready to have one installed.
3. On the 8<sup>th</sup> of September UEA Pool and snooker club received notification that the agreement between the Student Union and the club had fallen through due to miscommunication between Project Management of the new Postgraduate area and our Student Union. Meaning that there would not be any suitable facilities for the club to practise on campus.
4. At the beginning of this academic year the club received notification that the snooker tables could no longer be kept in storage; one had previously been given away to a member of the public and the second has now been destroyed.
5. The recent loss of the facilities for the club members has significantly affected the club financially, and also affected the number of members in the club with a 45% decrease since last year, while also playing standards are affected and club members' morale.
6. With UEA competing in both BUCS team events in Snooker and Pool for the first time in recent years we feel that we have been affected by the loss of our facilities. Our teams can now not practise on campus and are forced instead to head off campus to practise at a third party facility.
7. The club currently has the BUCS England captain representing the university at Snooker Home nations (England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland universities play each other with a winner announced after two days of play) for the next two years and has lost the facilities to train and coach our members – with another member that could potentially be representing England in the foreseeable future.
8. Last year the facilities offered an opportunity for female players to try our sport away from an alcohol drinking environment, something that they had identified as key to their involvement.

9. Our weekly practise session has decreased dramatically in the form of participation because of the state of Pool tables that are in the bar, the lack of room that the tables are positioned in also hinders playing.

**Union Believes:**

1. The ability of the club to engage with students on campus has decreased dramatically from the loss of the clubs facilities.
2. Our loss of members has greatly reduced the likelihood of full and effective representation of UEA at both Pool and Snooker BUCS championships in future years.
3. The club has lost the chance to provide participation opportunities to existing and potential members, via competitive practice standards on campus.
4. The club has lost a key opportunity to inspire new members through coaching by our highest standard player ever to represent UEA. Something that was used last year to help inspire our women's and men's teams.
5. The loss of our facilities has impacted on the ability of the club to provide to a diverse audience with regard to gender. Last year UEA having its first ever Women's pool team, this year that team has already suffered a loss because of facilities and to have another Women's team is something that is in the balance to make another team this year.
6. With the loss of such a vital facility, it is very hard to see a positive future for the club, with a disproportionate amount of members this year who are from the previous year.

**Union Resolves:**

1. To support the club in finding a suitable room and location to provide the club with similar facilities that had previously existed.
2. Ensure that the location that would be provided would be safe from such events that have previously happened, if something similar was to happen then the club would receive a similar location to continue the club.

## **1815 Guarantor Scheme**      passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Theo Antoniou-Phillips (LGBT+ Officer)

Secunder: Ting Ni (International Students Officer)

### **Union notes:**

1. To secure a tenancy in the private sector as a student, landlords and letting agents are increasingly including requirements that student tenants must have a UK based guarantor.
  2. For someone to act as a guarantor they must fill certain criteria, although this can vary. They must be UK based, earn over a stipulated amount per year and/or pass a credit check.<sup>2</sup>
  3. International students and LGBT+ students who are estranged from their families are faced with additional barriers of securing a property due to the difficulty in finding a suitable guarantor.
  4. The government scrapping of the housing benefit for 18-21 year olds has adversely affected LGBT+ young people as they cannot always rely on their parents/guardians to accept their identity leading to family estrangement. In extreme cases this leads to youth homelessness, and according to the Albert Kennedy Trust a quarter of the UK's homeless youth are LGBT+<sup>3</sup>.
  5. Due to the Immigration Bill, which was enacted on the 14<sup>th</sup> of May<sup>4</sup>, requiring landlords to check the Visa status of any international tenants, there is less incentive for landlords or letting agencies to relax guarantor restrictions to accept an international student tenant.
- 5(a) That the government refusal to remove international students from the target net migration figures has meant that their unfair targeting of immigrants has also unfairly hit international students. International students already face additional financial pressure due to the introduction of NHS 'health surcharge'<sup>5</sup> and higher tuition fees.
6. Some international students that are unable to find a UK based guarantor are often requested to pay for 6 months rent up front.
  7. There are external companies who can act as a guarantor to student tenants, such as Housing Hand<sup>6</sup>. This company requires the equivalent of

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.leaders.co.uk/pages/tenants-faq#q3>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.akt.org.uk/2/spg545/albert-kennedy-trust-helping-young-lgbt-people/can-you-help/youth-homelessness-matters-day.aspx>

<sup>4</sup> <http://services.parliament.uk/bills/2013-14/immigration.html>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-introduces-health-surcharge>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.housinghand.co.uk/>

one month's rent as payment for use of their service. If, at the end of the tenancy, the student has not defaulted or is not in arrears they receive 20% of this sum back.

8. That the University of East Anglia continues to increase the cost of on-campus accommodation, meaning some students are priced out of student halls. This means that returning students that struggle to find a guarantor cannot afford to fall back on University accommodation.
9. There are a number of universities that have responded to the needs of international students and LGBT+ students who are estranged from their families. These include: Cardiff University<sup>7</sup>, Edinburgh University<sup>8</sup>, Goldsmiths University<sup>9</sup>, UCL<sup>10</sup> and York University<sup>11</sup>.
10. UCL has had a guarantor scheme running for fifteen years guaranteeing rent for, on average, 180 students a year. A £50 administrative fee is charged to the students requiring the service, which is capped to mitigate risk. Only two students have failed to reimburse the University after a rent default during the 15 years that the scheme has been running, ultimately meaning the scheme has been profitable for UCL.

**Union believes:**

1. That every student has the right to affordable and accessible housing during their time at university regardless of their family situation, economic background or student status.
2. That risk of a guarantor scheme can be mitigated with consideration for:
  - a. a mandatory budget training session for students through AdviceSU of the Dean of Students;
  - b. a maximum rental figure set;
  - c. restricting the scheme to returning students only (non-final years);
  - d. requiring a reference from previous landlords
  - e. the guarantee to be restricted to the fixed term of the agreement and to be used exclusively for rent.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://blogs.cardiff.ac.uk/studentlifecu/guarantor-scheme-for-care-leavers-and-estranged-students/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://eusavps.wordpress.com/2014/11/07/rent-guarantor-scheme-pilot-not-just-a-flight-of-fancy/>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.gold.ac.uk/student-services/guarantor/>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/medphys/prospective-students/international/living>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.york.ac.uk/students/housing-and-money/accom-help/guarantee-scheme/>

**Union resolves:**

1. To lobby the University to find more effective ways of informing international students and LGBT+ students who are estranged from their families on housing and guarantor issues.
2. To lobby the University to investigate running a pilot guarantor scheme for students who fail to meet the criteria for a guarantor through private landlords and letting agencies.
3. To ensure that AdviceSU is well equipped to offer practical advice to students who struggle to find guarantors, including but not limited to, the offer of external companies that provide guarantor service until the University agrees to the guarantor scheme.

**1816 SWP off our campus**                      passed 3 December 2015

Proposed by Charlotte Earney (Postgraduate Assembly)

Seconded by Juliet Donaghy (HSC Year 1)

Amendments from: L McCafferty (PG Education Officer)

**The Union notes:**

1. The Socialist Workers' Party (SWP) have had numerous allegations raised that they have a systematic problem of rape, rape cover-up, and rape apologism in their party.
2. The SWP frequently sell their newspaper on campus, both in the square and outside some political events on campus, for example the Norfolk and Suffolk Mental Health Services Campaign held in LT1 recently.
3. The NUS and our union is conducting multiple campaigns around the prevention and safety of sexual assault survivors, such as Never Ok and Stand By Me.

**The Students' Union Believes**

1. The Union should take a stand against organisations that make survivors feel unsafe on campus
2. The 'Socialist Worker', the official newspaper of the SWP, should not be sold on campus, as its content is highly troubling and upsetting.

**The Students' Union Resolves**

1. To mandate the Student Officer Committee to write a letter of condemnation to the Central Committee of the SWP and the Norwich SWP branch, expressing in strongest terms our dismay with how the above allegations were handled, and to demand that the organisation disassociate itself from the individuals involved.
  2. To ensure that all publicity distributed by external organisations at union-supported events is in line with our beliefs and values, and to ensure that those distributing materials are not doing so in a manner that is alarming/distressing to students.
-

Proposer: Philippa Costello (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Seconded: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

**Union Notes:**

1. The government recently released its 'Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice' green paper, outlining its plans for the future of Higher Education in the UK.
2. The government's recent Comprehensive Spending Review also contains plans to retroactively change student loan conditions to "raid the paychecks" of graduates on low and middle incomes.
3. That National Campaign against Fees and Cuts (NCAFC) has claimed that combined reforms of the HE Green paper and the Comprehensive Spending Review amount to 'full marketisation', and completely devastate and undermine the principle of publicly funded education.<sup>12</sup>
4. The key proposals in the HE Green paper are as follows:
  - a) Teaching Excellence Framework: The paper outlines plans to introduce a TEF, which includes an inflationary rise in fees for those passing "TEF 1". In Year 2, higher levels be introduced and financial incentives differentiated according to the levels. Future tuition fee rises could be imposed by ministers without a vote in Parliament, opening the door to unlimited, unaccountable fee rises.
  - b) The Office for Students: HEFCE & OFFA are to be merged to create a new body that will be in the interest of students.
  - c) Widening Participation: There will be additional targets for widening participation and a new Social Mobility Advisory Group.
  - d) Private Providers: A private provider could get degree awarding powers in less than four years and university status in less than five.
  - e) Student protections: There will be increased protections for students if a course or institution fails.
  - f) Students' unions: A question is asked about how we can improved our transparency and accountability.
  - g) Sharia compliant loans: After years of joint work between NUS and FOSIS, the government are introducing Sharia compliant loans.
  - h) Research: HEFCE will no longer allocate research funding and the research councils are to be reformed.

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.independent.co.uk/student/news/national-campaign-against-fees-and-cuts-urges-students-to-save-education-by-demonstrating-following-a6749026.html>

5. That the government has already announced plans to convert the maintenance grant package into a means-tested loan scheme.
6. The government has already removed the cap on student numbers, generating competition amongst institutions for a limited number of students.
7. That the union has existing policy that resolves to campaign against any further marketisation of higher education. <sup>13</sup>

### **Union Believes:**

1. That these reforms represent the final piece in the jigsaw to implement of a fully, marketised system to Higher Education in the UK.
2. That students should be partners in education, not passive consumers.
3. Access to Higher Education should be based on ability, and not ability to pay.
4. The Teaching Excellence Framework is based upon the Research Excellence Framework, which was described by Peter Scott, Professor of Higher Education Studies at the Institute of Education, as “a Minotaur that must be appeased by bloody sacrifices”.
5. That the REF is an unmitigated disaster. It is expensive, ineffective gesture that discourages genuine innovation and restricts academic freedom subjecting research to set of arbitrary metrics aimed at generating competition between institutions. <sup>14</sup>
6. The TEF will use employment destination data as a metric for student outcomes. This will, in effect, measure teaching and learning on the basis of what benefits our future employers rather than what is best for us as students.
7. That education should not be subjected to the demands of business. The Green paper mentions ‘what employers want’ 35 times and ‘value for money’ 27 times. Students should be able to explore a diverse and intellectually-stimulating curriculum in an environment of academic freedom – instead of one where teaching outcomes are externally imposed and subject to the interests of employers.
8. That quality teaching is often subjective and difficult to measure: and much innovative practice occurs at the grassroots level. Introducing a national framework threatens to strangle pedagogical innovation where it occurs.
9. The TEF will estrange students from academics, and further encourage students to engage with education as ‘value for money’ and to put

---

<sup>13</sup> 1605 No to the Marketisation of Education (The Future of Undergraduate Funding)

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2014/dec/15/research-excellence-framework-five-reasons-not-fit-for-purpose>

pressure on already over-worked academics through increased reliance on implementing consumer feedback via the National Student Survey (NSS).

10. That the recent changes to the student maintenance package to a means-tested loan system will already deter many poorer students from attending university. Combined with a tier system for fees as proposed in the TEF, this will make it drastically more difficult for students from widening participation backgrounds to reach those institutions and worsen the BME attainment gap.
11. That the proposed Social Mobility Advisory Group will be largely ineffective in tackling the access issues that will be exacerbated by recent policy changes.
12. That the proposed link to increase in fees will create a two-tier education system, whereby elite institutions are only accessible to those who can afford it.
13. Increased competition for limited student numbers will lead to most institutions focusing on those subjects immediately profitable, which in practice may lead to huge cuts to school and courses amongst middle-ranking institutions.
14. That plans to make it easier for institutions to 'exit' the sector and easier for private providers to enter. This is effectively indicating the planned collapse of our publicly-accountable institutions in favour of those from the private sector.
15. That questions on the transparency and accountability of students' unions is a direct threat to the autonomy and effectiveness of students' unions to represent their members.

#### **Union Resolves:**

1. To release a statement responding to the HE Green Paper based upon the beliefs as outlined above.
2. To lobby the Vice-Chancellor to publicly state their concerns as to the consequences of the HE Green paper.
3. To oppose and actively campaign against the implementation of the Teaching Excellence Framework.
4. To oppose any move to further embed graduate attributes, employability, or any other mechanism that attempts to subject learning and teaching outcomes to the needs of employers into course or module design.
5. To request that Norwich South MP, Clive Lewis, write an open letter to the Universities Minister Jo Johnson outlining concerns about the future of HE as outlined in the Green Paper.
6. To convene a working group with the staff unions – UCU, Unison, and Unite – to develop a joint policy document on the green paper and the

state of the sector, addressing key issues such as staff workload and assessment and feedback.

---

**1819 Nothing Rhymes With Orange** passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Kate Snape (Students with Disabilities Caucus Physical Disabilities & Mobility Issues Rep)

Seconded: Aaron Hood (Students with Disabilities Officer)

Union Notes

1. Muscular Dystrophy is the umbrella term for muscle wasting conditions
2. 70,000 people or more have Muscular Dystrophy in the UK alone
3. 1 in 1,000 people have Muscular Dystrophy
4. There are students at UEA who have a form of Muscular Dystrophy
5. Muscular Dystrophy UK (MD UK) is a charity that supports people who have these conditions and their families  
(<http://www.muscular dystrophyuk.org/>)
6. MD UK offers peer support, advice, advocacy and experience
7. The MD UK Trailblazers are a branch of MD UK that conduct studies on common issues for disabled people in the UK and try to combat those issues
8. Trailblazers have conducted studies on Higher Education which have been reported by the BBC (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-29373506>)
9. MD UK is working to improve access to education, opportunities and proper health care for disabled students
10. "Go Orange!" day will take place on 22<sup>nd</sup> January  
(<http://www.muscular dystrophyuk.org/events/go-orange/>)
11. MD UK would like people to wear orange for a day
12. They are aiming for 10,000 people to get involved and £10,000 to be raised
13. This is to raise awareness of Muscular Dystrophy and the campaigns Muscular Dystrophy UK are running

Union Believes

1. Students should feel supported at university
2. Young people with disabilities should be able to access Higher Education as easily as other young people
3. That all disabilities should be given parity of esteem by the Union and the University
4. We should be a union that puts effort into supporting all disabilities
5. That muscular dystrophy may not have previously been given the attention it deserves

Union Resolves

1. To assist Chronic in running an awareness campaign on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2016
2. To advertise the campaign and get as many students and staff to get involved, wear orange and donate money
3. To assist Chronic in raising money on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2016
4. To consult any students with muscular dystrophy about what can be done to improve their university experience

5. To consider any further action that can be taken to raise funds/awareness of muscular dystrophy.

## **1820 Amendment to the Bye-Laws: Part-Time Trans and Non-Binary Officer** passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Elliot Folan (Students with Disabilities Caucus)

Seconded: Theo Antoniou-Philips (LGBT+ Officer)

### **Union notes:**

- 1) That on 17<sup>th</sup> November, the LGBT+ Caucus endorsed a call from its Trans and Non-Binary Caucus for a part-time officer position to be introduced that would be reserved for transgender and non-binary students;
- 2) That the Union of UEA Students is committed to supporting trans and non-binary rights, as per policy 1740 ("A Transgender and Non-Binary Students Policy for UEA");
- 3) That the above policy commits the SU to supporting the introduction of a reserved Trans Students Officer for the National Union of Students;
- 4) That the position of LGBT+ Officer has only ever been held by a cisgender individual.

### **Union believes:**

- 1) That trans and non-binary students as a Liberation Group deserve their own specific representation within the structures of the Union of UEA Students;
- 2) That this representation should not, however, split trans and non-binary students off from the broader LGBT+ community or movement, as this would weaken the ability of trans and non-binary students to fight for their rights;
- 3) That the LGBT+ Officer role should be split into two positions of "LGBT+ Officer (Open Place)" and "LGBT+ Officer (Transgender and Non-Binary Place)", each with their own vote on SOC;
- 4) That trans and non-binary students are equally capable of representing the interests of cisgender LGBT+ students, and so any reserved position should give them equal authority to an open role.

### **Union resolves:**

- 1) To delete bye-law 4.14 and replace with:

**4.14 The LGBT+ Officer (Open Place) shall:**

4.14.1 Represent the interests of LGBT+ students and be their voice on the issues they face as LGBT+ students at university;

4.14.2 Engage with the University and other relevant organisations to achieve improvements for LGBT+ students on the issues they face as LGBT+ students at university;

4.14.3 Jointly convene and co-ordinate the Union's LGBT+ Committee;

4.14.4 Liaise with the members of the relevant clubs, societies or peer support groups; and

4.14.5 Be the Union's delegate to the NUS LGBT Conference.

2) To add new bye-law 4.15 and renumber accordingly:

**4.15 The LGBT+ Officer (Transgender and Non-Binary Place) shall:**

4.15.1 Represent the interests of LGBT+ students and be their voice on the issues they face as LGBT+ students at university;

4.15.2 Engage with the University and other relevant organisations to achieve improvements for LGBT+ students on the issues they face as LGBT+ students at university;

4.15.3 Jointly convene and co-ordinate the Union's LGBT+ Committee;

4.15.4 Liaise with the members of the relevant clubs, societies or peer support groups; and

4.15.5 Be the Union's Trans Place delegate to the NUS LGBT Conference, as well its delegate to the NUS Transgender Students Conference.

**3.43** The LGBT+ Caucus shall act as the primary accountability body for the LGBT+ Officer (Open Place) and the LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary Place). As such, the LGBT+ Caucus shall have the power to pass motions of censure and commendation in the LGBT+ Officer (Open Place) and the LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary Place).

3) To delete bye-law 3.43 and replace with:

**4.21** The LGBT+ Officer (Open Place), the LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary Place), Women's Officer, Students With Disabilities Officer, Ethnic Minorities Officer, International Students Officer, Mature Students Officer and Postgraduate Officer shall be considered Equal Opportunities Officers and shall be elected by ordinary members who self-define as members of the constituency that the Equal Opportunity Officer represents.

4) To delete bye-law 4.21 and replace with:

5) To delete bye-law 8.7 and replace with:

**8.7** The Equal Opportunities Committee consisting of the Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer, LGBT+ Officer (Open Place), the LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary Place), the Students with Disabilities Officer, the Women's Officer, the Ethnic Minorities Officer, the International Officer and the Mature Students Officer along with the member of the Union's Senior Management Team responsible for HR will annually review and make recommendations to update and evaluate the implementation of these regulations.

---

**1821 NUS lead delegate – let's improve our democracy** passed 3  
December 2015

Proposer: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)  
Seconder: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer)

**Union Notes**

1. Each year the National Union of Students holds its annual democratic conference.
2. Like every other union we get to send a delegation of students, the bulk of which is elected by cross-campus ballot.
3. Under NUS' rules one delegate is allowed to be appointed by a Union as the "Delegation leader".
4. Most unions use this to send their President.
5. UEA doesn't have an SU President.
6. UEASU by law 15 states that "One Full-Time Officer, appointed by the Management Committee, may be appointed to the position of lead delegate for NUS National Conference".
7. In 2013 and 2014 this power was delegated to the Student Officer Committee for wider input and involvement.
8. In 2015 Management Committee decided not to do this.
9. Thus the practical application of the current constitutional position has been mixed.

**Union Believes**

1. Students consistently tell us that they want a more open, transparent and democratic Union and we should be as democratic as possible.
2. That five people deciding who leads our delegation to conference to represent our 15,000 students is profoundly undemocratic.
3. That any member, with appropriate support, can lead our delegation to NUS National Conference and we should be empowering students to play a greater role in both our Union and our national movement.

**Union Resolves**

1. To mandate the proposer and the Campaigns and Democracy Officer to convene a meeting with current members of the Democratic Procedures Committee to consider alternative ways of electing an NUS lead delegate that is consistent with the above beliefs. The meeting will consider the positives and negatives of several options and bring its conclusions to a meeting of Union Council before the end of the academic year.
-

## **1823 Support HSC Students – keep the National Health Service bursary**

Passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Ruth Stone (UEA Edith Cavell Society)

Seconder: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Amendments: J Donaghy (HSC YR I UG)

### **Union Council notes:**

1) In 1968, Parliament gave the Secretary of State for Health the power to provide training for people considering employment in the National Health Service (NHS), and to pay allowances to people who have accepted places on these courses. These allowances are known as NHS Bursaries.

2) In the 1990s reforms to nurse education, commonly termed "Project 2000" were implemented, with the academic level of training established at a minimum of a higher education diploma.

3) In the year 2012 all nursing courses became degree level.

4) Allied Health Professions, Midwifery and other Health Science (HSC) courses are also supported by NHS bursaries.

5) The government have now announced that HSC bursaries are to be scrapped and replaced by student loans.

### **Union Council believes:**

1) HSC students should continue to be in receipt of the current NHS bursaries.

2) That future HSC students at UEA would be negatively affected by these changes.

3) That this may lead to other healthcare students having their funding changed in a similar way in the future.

4) That these changes would discourage a large number of potential students from training to become nurses and other healthcare professionals in the future.

### **Union Council resolves:**

1) To mandate the Undergraduate Education Officer to:

- Sign and share the petition to parliament which opposes these changes
- Support UEA student societies in their involvement in the action to oppose these changes
- Publicise the importance of supporting HSC students in their action against these changes
- Encourage all students to individually lobby their home and university MPs in support of keeping the NHS nursing bursary
- To write a statement on behalf of the Union on this issue

- To continue to consult HSC students on action on this issue and provide support where appropriate

**Sources:**

*The Department of Health:*

*[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/457030/2015-16\\_NHS\\_Bursary\\_Scheme\\_New\\_Rules.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/457030/2015-16_NHS_Bursary_Scheme_New_Rules.pdf)*

*The petition:*

*<https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/113491>*

*A brief history of pre-registration nursing education:*

*[http://www.williscommission.org.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0004/483286/Preregistration\\_nurse\\_education\\_history.pdf](http://www.williscommission.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/483286/Preregistration_nurse_education_history.pdf)*

---

## **Emergency Resolution - Don't Bomb Syria** passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Hussam Hussein (Ethnic Minorities Officer – on behalf of BME Caucus)

Seconder: Abbie Mulcairn (Women's Caucus)

### **Union Notes:**

1. Last night parliament approved a government resolution to extend UK airstrikes against 'Islamic State'/ISIS targets in Syria.
2. RAF crews have already begun bombing Syria.

### **Union Believes:**

1. British military interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya have left those countries in situations much worse than before the interventions.
2. The ongoing bombing of areas controlled by 'ISIS' by a range of countries, has led to many civilian deaths.
3. The political and social instability fomented by these military campaigns has led to the rise of groups like ISIS, and will further perpetuate a climate in which they, and mass political violence, can thrive.
4. There is no transparency regarding any long-term political or military strategy by this government concerning Syria as Britain is opposed to most players engaged in the complicated conflict.
5. Western military interventions have continually betrayed ulterior motives by these governments, as can also be expected of this move by the government to bomb Syria.
6. Bombing Syria is another clear case of the government prioritising warfare when it could be investing in education.
7. During the 2013 Commons vote NEC voted to adopt a stance of having 'no position' on British military intervention against Syria.
8. Such a position is untenable given the impact such a move would have on the political and social situation in the UK and on our membership, particularly international students and refugees.

### **Union Resolves:**

1. 1. To release a statement with immediate effect including the above, condemning the decision to join the bombing of Syria, and expressing our solidarity with the Syrian people.
-

## **Emergency Motion Saving American Studies** passed 21 January 2016

**Proposer:** Aliyah Rawat (BME LGBT+)

**Seconder:** Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

### **UNION NOTES**

1. There are proposed changes concerning degrees in the American Studies department (courses affected would include BA American Studies, American History, American and English Literature, English and American Literature, American Literature with Creative Writing and Film and American Studies) which would see the replacement of a very significant number of second year module options with two generalised compulsory modules and a significantly reduced amount of optional modules for second year study, thus significantly reducing the diversity and appeal of what is designed to be an interdisciplinary humanities course
2. These changes have been proposed in order to a) make the American Studies degree 'more streamlined' and b) as a cost-cutting procedure
3. These changes are set to be finalised in the immediate future, and will affect current first year American Studies undergraduates in their second year as well as future students
4. No current American Studies undergraduates have been consulted about these proposed changes and any information about these changes has been deliberately withheld from students until the proposed changes are entirely finalised
5. UEA's webpage advertising the degree boasts that it is number one in the country for American Studies and holds a 96% student satisfaction rate, and still currently lists that a large, diverse number of modules are available for second year study<sup>15</sup> for both current students and prospective students, which is false advertisement
6. It is a requirement of the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (CPRs)<sup>16</sup> that universities provide clear and correct information regarding courses, including course structure and module information. Under the CPRs, giving misleading or outdated

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.uea.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/degree/detail/ba-american-studies> [accessed: 15th January 2016]

<sup>16</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/415732/Undergraduate\\_students\\_-\\_your\\_rights\\_under\\_consumer\\_law.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/415732/Undergraduate_students_-_your_rights_under_consumer_law.pdf) [accessed: 15th January 2016]

information or a misleading impression constitutes what is known as a misleading action and breaches student's consumer rights.

7. There currently remains no information openly available about these changes to current students who are investing large sums of money into their undergraduate degree, nor is there information openly available to prospective students who will have made a misinformed choice with the 2016/17 entry UCAS deadline having been 15th January 2016. There is insufficient information provision which presents an issue under consumer law

## **UNION BELIEVES**

1. The current variety of module options available for second year American Studies undergraduates is hugely varied and allows for specialisation into specific topics which is highly beneficial in preparing students for their dissertations, in allowing students to advance and broaden their intellectual knowledge, in providing representation outside of the canon, and for allowing staff who have done significant amounts of research on these fields to teach their specialisation
2. The proposed module changes for second year American Studies would negate all of the benefits stated above
3. Students should have been consulted in regards to these changes and should have openly been made aware that these were set to happen, and should not have to wait until the changes are finalised and cannot be actively opposed to be told about these
4. UEA's American Studies department is currently ranked as first in the country with a very high student satisfaction rate, and much of this is due to the diversity of the course, its options for specialisation, and that it is taught by professors who have done research in the fields many of these modules are about. Reworking the course in this way, which many students may oppose, may lead to UEA losing its number one status and lowering its student satisfaction rate

## **UNION RESOLVES**

1. The information regarding the proposed changes to American Studies courses should be openly published on the university's website for all students, potential students, staff members, potential staff members and members of the general public to have access to

2. Current American Studies undergraduates and teaching staff should be consulted on these changes, and should be made aware of the routes they can take to oppose these changes, both before they are finalised and after they have been finalised if they are taken forward
3. Current first year American Studies students (including those on joint degrees) and incoming first year American Studies students should be directly informed of these proposed changes to their degree. Although the details of these changes are still being worked upon on a week-to-week basis, current undergraduates who this will affect should be kept updated on a week-to-week basis and should not have this information deliberately withheld until the changes are finalised

## **1835 Supporting the Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) scheme**

Proposer: Hussam Hussein (Ethnic Minorities Officer)

Seconder: Connor Rand (UG Education Officer)

Union Council notes:

1. That the Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) is a structured mentoring system in which first year undergraduate students are mentored by students in higher years. The aim of PAL is to mentor first years through the transition into higher education.

2. Mentors provide academic support – and some pastoral support - by sharing the experience and skills they have gained.

3. PAL is being introduced into UEA to benefit both the recipients and deliverers of PAL. Interacting with mentors helps first years understand university processes and requirements as well as develop good study habits. Mentors and officers develop key skills that should aid in their future employability and career development.

4. PAL mentors provide mentoring to small groups of first year students. Working in pairs or trios PAL mentors prepare and attend regular sessions to facilitate discussion around academic subject material. PAL mentors plan each session, taking into account students' learning needs. Advice and guidance is based on the mentors' own experience and university guidelines.

5. Mentors are supported and guided by PAL officers (usually Postgraduate UEA students). PAL does not replace existing teaching or academic and pastoral support. Instead, it ensures that there are additional opportunities for students to learn from each other. PAL is run by students for students.

6. PAL has been in place as a pilot project at UEA since January 2013, it is now in its 4th phase , and has been confirmed only until the end of this academic year. No decision has been made so far on renewing it.

7. In its 3rd phase (2014-2015), about 650 mentees and 145 between mentors and officers have benefited from the PAL scheme.

8. Currently, the PAL scheme is operational in 8 schools: AMA, CHE, CMP, DEV, ENV, HSC, MED; and NBS.

9. Research has shown that students of marginalised backgrounds have strongly benefited from the PAL scheme as it provides them a supportive tool to adapt and familiarise with a new academic and/ or cultural environment.

Union Council believes:

1. That PAL has been having a valuable positive impact on both mentees, mentors and officers since January 2013.

2. It is important to provide students with opportunities to learn new skills from other peers in a structured programme like PAL.

3. PAL is an important tool for providing mentors and officers with skills and work experience on mentoring and teaching, which is valuable for improving students' CVs, employability and future work opportunities.

Union Council resolves:

1. To mandate the Undergraduate Education Officer and the Postgraduate Education Officer to lobby the university to maintain and further support the PAL project.

2. To mandate Council representatives and Officers on the relevant committees, including Learning and Teaching Committee, to put the issue of PAL's long-term existence on the agenda and to strongly support and voice the students support for the PAL scheme.

3. To mandate the Undergraduate Education Officer to write an email to the Vice Chancellor and all others concerned in expressing the position of the SU in support of the PAL scheme and demanding its continuation and support for the next year, within a week of the approval of this motion.

4. To mandate the Undergraduate Education Officer to write an email to the PAL administrators thanking them for their work and expressing SU support for the continuation of the scheme for the next year, within a week of the approval of this motion.

5. To advertise and raise awareness about this unique opportunity of peer support learning during Welcome Week.

## 1836 Better educational support for sexual assault victims

Proposer: Emily Cutler (Refuge)

Seconder: Jo Swo (Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer)

### Union notes:

- One in five women aged between 16 and 59 have experienced some form of sexual violence since the age of 16. <sup>17</sup>
- Nearly half a million adults are sexually assaulted in England and Wales each year.<sup>1</sup>
- Approximately 90% of those who are raped knew the perpetrator prior to the offense.<sup>1</sup>
- Where the age is known, those aged under 24 represent 25% of service users.<sup>1</sup>
- 1 in 7 Hidden Mark survey respondents has experienced a serious physical or sexual assault during their time as a student.<sup>2</sup>
- One in four victims of serious sexual assault stated that their studies had been affected by the incident. <sup>18</sup>
- One in seven victims of serious physical assault reported that their attendance had suffered.<sup>2</sup>

### Union believes:

- Being a victim of rape; sexual assault; domestic violence or revenge porn has a large impact in your life.
- No one should have their education impacted upon because of sexual assault.
- University students are particularly vulnerable to being a victim of rape; sexual assault; domestic violence or revenge porn.

### Union resolves:

- To lobby the university to make being a victim of rape; sexual assault; domestic violence or revenge porn an allowable extenuating circumstance.
- To mandate the Student Officer Committee, led by the Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer, to write a letter to the Vice-Chancellor appealing for a separate pot of funding for counselling for victims of rape; sexual assault; domestic violence and revenge porn.
- To campaign for the university to train all advisors in basic techniques of what to do if your advisee is a victim of rape; sexual assault; domestic violence or revenge porn.

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://rapecrisis.org.uk/statistics.php>

<sup>18</sup> [http://www.nus.org.uk/Global/NUS\\_hidden\\_marks\\_report\\_2nd\\_edition\\_web.pdf](http://www.nus.org.uk/Global/NUS_hidden_marks_report_2nd_edition_web.pdf)

## **1837 Amendment to the Byelaws: Removing Prohibitive Referendum Rules**

Proposer: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns & Democracy Officer) –  
[Christopher.jarvis@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Christopher.jarvis@uea.ac.uk)

Seconder: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer) –  
[l.mccafferty@uea.ac.uk](mailto:l.mccafferty@uea.ac.uk)

### **Union Notes:**

1. The current constitutional framework surrounding referenda is outlined in byelaws 1.3-1.6
2. This framework requires a General Meeting to take place prior to the voting period of the referendum for the purpose of discussion, but not voting.
3. The General Meeting is required to have a quorum of 80, if it does not reach this, the referendum will not go ahead.
4. In two instances over the last year, an adapted version of these referendum rules – for Postgraduates and Ethnic Minority students failed to reach the required quorum for the respective General Meetings, therefore meaning the issues did not go to a ballot and the question was left undecided.
5. There currently does not exist a formal constitutional provision for a ballot of sub-sections of the membership of UUEAS.
6. There are currently no provisions for referenda that amend the byelaws or articles of association, meaning that in previous such referenda (as was the case with the 2013 officer roles referendum), decisions on the required majority have been taken by the returning officer.
7. The meeting of Union Council on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2014 heard a proposal from the Democratic Procedures Committee regarding General Meetings that has not yet been enacted into the byelaws.

### **Union Believes:**

1. Student attendance at a General Meeting is not necessarily reflective of their willingness to debate, weigh up the pros and cons of, and ultimately vote upon a matter in their Student Union.

2. While it is important for UUEAS to provide a forum for free and fair debate outside of the traditional campaigning methods, enforcing prohibitively high quorum rules on this is unhelpful and in fact hinders debate and student democracy, rather than strengthening it.
3. Byelaws 1.3-1.6 are messy and are a combination of constitutional frameworks intended for the provision of referenda and simultaneously for general meetings of students outside of the referendum context.
4. UUEAS should have clear and effective governing documents that give fair provision for open and democratic processes.
5. In order to allow for autonomous decision making of liberation groups, and of specific groups of students such as Postgraduates, international students and mature students, a framework for referenda of these groups is necessary.

**Union Resolves:**

1. To amend byelaw 1.3-1.6 to read as follows:

1.3 A Referendum may be called on any lawful issue, in accordance with the Articles of Association and these Bye-Laws, by:

1.3.1 A resolution of the Trustees

1.3.2 A resolution of the Student Officer Committee

1.3.3 A majority vote of Union Council; or

1.3.4 A Secure Petition signed by at least on thirtieth of the ordinary members within 30 calendar days of its formation. A Secure Petition shall be defined as "a written request to the Union from ordinary members, which shall be fixed in a pre-arranged place or places or held securely on-line, and shall state the name, school and year of each signatory".

1.4 Subject to Clause 72 of the Articles of Association, a resolution may only be passed by Referendum if at least one thirtieth of the ordinary members cast a vote in the Referendum and a majority of the votes cast are in favour of the resolution.

1.4.1 If a resolution being decided upon by referendum includes an amendment to the byelaws or articles of association, a two thirds majority of votes cast must be in favour of the resolution in order for it to be passed.

1.5 Referenda shall be conducted in accordance with the Articles of Association and Bye-Law 5: Election Regulations Pursuant to the Articles of Association, with the addition that after campaigning has begun but before voting is open, a General meeting must be held for the purpose of debate, but not to vote, in accordance with the following conditions:

1.5.1 The meeting shall be chaired by the Chair of Union Council or in their absence by an ordinary member appointed to do so by the Student Officer Committee;

1.5.2 The Returning Officer shall be responsible for choosing the venue or venues to be used for the general meeting.

1.5.3 A general meeting shall be called by at least 7 clear days' written notice. The notice calling a general meeting shall specify the place, day and time of the meeting and the business to be transacted.

1.6 Every ordinary member shall have the right to attend and speak at general meetings. Subject to Clause 58 of the Articles of Association the ordinary members may set Policy by Referenda. Policy set by Referenda may overturn Policy set by the Union Council.

2) To add new byelaws 1.7 and 1.8 and renumber accordingly:

1.7 Should a referendum be held in which only subset of the membership shall be eligible to vote, the rules in byelaws 1.3-1.6 shall apply, save for the following adjustments:

1.7.1 Only ordinary members of the relevant subset of the membership will be eligible to vote in the referendum

1.7.2 Only ordinary members eligible to vote in the referendum will have the right to attend and speak at the General Meeting for that referendum.

1.7.3 A turnout requirement proportionate to the number of students who are part of, or who self-identify into the respective subset of the membership shall be determined by the Returning Officer.

1.8 A referendum of a subset of the membership may be called where only the following students are available to vote:

1.8.1 Self defining LGBT+ students

1.8.2 Self defining women students

1.8.3 Self defining disabled students

1.8.4 Self defining ethnic minority students

1.8.5 Mature students

1.8.6 International students

1.8.7 Postgraduate students

1.9 A referendum of a subset of the membership may be called by Union Council on recommendation from the relevant caucus or assembly

3) To mandate the campaigns and democracy officer to draft a constitutional framework for the provision of general meetings as was discussed at the meeting of Union Council on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2014 for discussion at a meeting of Union Council this term.

## **1838 Mummy's Ill- making life easier for those with illness in the family**

Proposer – Emily Cutler (Refuge)

Seconder – Jack Robinson (Non-Portfolio Officer)

### **Union notes:**

1. If you have a parent who is termly ill or has a long-term illness, you have added stress, which can harm your academic and social experience at university.
2. There is no list on the university's website that states exactly what evidence counts towards extenuating circumstances for students with significant adverse personal/family circumstances.
3. Having an ill parent can cause anxiety, sleep problems, depression as well as a range of other emotional, physical and mental health problems.
4. The delay in receiving counselling support from the Dean of Students means students with ill parents often face struggles with their academic work.

### **Union believes:**

1. Students with unwell parents should not have their education put at risk because of bureaucracy.
2. Students with unwell parents deserve special consideration with regard to deadlines and extensions.

### **Union resolves:**

1. To lobby the university to provide a clearer list into what constitutes as evidence for extenuating circumstances.
2. To mandate the Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer to develop support in the Advice Centre for those who need advice about what to do when it comes to issues related to parents being terminally ill or having a long-term illness.

3. To lobby the university to enhance support towards students whose parents suffer from long term illness, including increased funding towards support services.

## **1839 Stand By Me – Standing in solidarity for survivors of sexual violence**

Proposer: Jo Swo (Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer)

Seconder: Jack Robinson (Non-Portfolio Officer)

### **This Union Notes**

1. 1 in 7 women students (14%) has been the victim of serious sexual assault or serious physical violence while at university or college.
2. Approximately 85,000 women and 12,000 men are raped in England and Wales alone every year; that's roughly 11 rapes (of adults alone) every hour
3. The NUS Lad Culture Audit report revealed that there's lack of clarity around the complaints and disciplinary procedures in universities across the country.
4. In The NUS 2015 lad culture and sexism survey 61% of students stated that they were not made aware of any codes of conduct and 66% stated they were not aware of the procedure to report these incidents.
5. ueasu conducted their own survey and found that:
  - a. 78% had experienced unwanted groping, pinching or touching in a sexual manner
  - b. 50% were not aware of how to report an incident on harassment or assault on campus outside of Union settings
  - c. over 70% said "I didn't think any action would be taken" as a reason for not reporting incidents
6. The Zellick Report was created in 1994 to give guidance to universities about how to deal with sexual assault cases. It tells universities not to investigate cases and not to go through disciplinary procedures until the victim had gone through the police system.
7. Evidence shows that 82% of rapes are never reported to the police and of these, only 1 in 5 results in court proceedings. For the few cases which do enter the court system, the average length of the court process is 1 year and 4 months from report to verdict – at which point many victims may no longer be studying at the university. This means in practice, the

majority of victims of sexual violence would see no action taken by their university.

8. Approximately 75,000 men are victims of sexual assault or attempted assault a year according to data from 2012/13 while 9,000 men are victims of rape or attempted rape each year according to figures released in 2013, yet police figures show fewer than 3,000 offences of male rape or sexual assault were recorded in 2013/14.
9. NUS has launched a campaign called #StandByMe which calls for the repeal of the Zellick guidelines and for a national consultation which listens to the student movement and specialist services in order to develop new reporting and disciplinary guidelines and survivor support.
10. Neither Rape Crisis England & Wales nor any of their local member Rape Crisis centres has any central government funding confirmed beyond March 2016.

### **This Unions Believes**

1. The quality of University reporting procedures and support services across the UK are inconsistent and inadequate.
2. That Universities need to have a clear, preventative strategy with dealing with sexual violence
3. That Universities need to fund and support support services for survivors
4. The Zellick Report is out of date and campuses provide proper support for survivors of sexual assault when institutions base the procedures on this guidance.
5. Universities should have accessible reporting procedures for sexual assault and provide access to specialist support for victims during their time at university.
6. Rape Crisis Centres provide vital support services for survivors of sexual assault.
7. The cuts to Rape Crisis centres are fatal and these organisations deserve to be fully funded through government money.

### **The Union Resolves**

1. To support the NUS #StandByMe campaign calling for better support for all survivors on campus and sustainable funding for services across the country.
2. To call for the repeal of the Zelic Guidelines and for a national consultation to develop new reporting and disciplinary guidelines and survivor support.
3. To lobby the Vice Chancellor to support the statement and call for change at a national level.
4. To lobby the University to reveal and clear and comprehensive preventative strategy towards eliminating sexual violence at UEA
5. To lobby the University to fund and support student-led support services for survivors, as well as improving their own support services
6. To look into forming a partnership with our local rape crisis centre.

## **Student Sport at UEA Composite Resolution 1840/1841**

### **Main Motion**

Proposed: D Morales (TAEKWONDO)

Seconded: Yinbo Yu, Activities and Opportunities Officer

Amended by L McCafferty

### **Union Notes**

1. That the Sports Development Team is heavily utilised by Clubs as a first point of contact.
2. Motion 1560 was passed by Union Council on 20 March 2014 by a majority of 43-6
3. Motion 1560's aim, according to the proposer (Joe Level, Finance Officer), was to put all sides round the same table for discussions to take place to improve sports for all students. 1560 mandated the formation of a joint University/Union partnership group on sport at UEA. Its aims were to:
  - a) Ensure a joint strategy for external funding for sport, and a joint Union-University capital expenditure plan for sport.
  - b) Strive to enhance the student sport / physical activity programme through improved promotion and coordination across campus, working closely together on participation targets.
4. The sport partnership group (SPG) had only had 1 meeting in July 2014 to set up the working relationship before the Union passed Motion 1587.
5. The sports executive team (2015/16) carried out a sports review without the knowledge of the SU or UEA Sport.
6. The summary results showed that the majority of the clubs are unhappy with the current management and organisation of sport.
7. 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.
8. The university Department of Sport (based at Sportspark) is responsible for student sport activity, including the 'Ziggurat' challenge and intra-mural programmes.
9. A further motion that year (1587) was passed that reaffirmed working in partnership but placed a limit on it, namely that we would rule out a takeover of Sports Clubs by the University.
10. Motion 1560's aim was to focus on reducing any duplication of effort between the Union and University, maximising the use of students' money.

### **Union Believes**

1. That the links with the University, particularly the Sport Department, are essential to the successful running of sports at UEA.
2. One of the core parts of the Students' Union mission to provide student opportunities is to support and fund Sports Clubs.

3. That the results of the summary carried out by the sports executive team demonstrate that the sports presidents and their committees wish to have a complete review of sport.
4. The University has explicitly stated that if it takes over Sports Clubs "that no extra funding will be available".
5. Around the UK a number of Universities are attempting to take over student sport or have already done so.
6. There are a myriad of successful partnership approaches (for example Leeds) where students enjoy the benefits of being supported by both the Union and University rather than having to choose.
7. The Union is explicitly democratic- students make the decisions, student elect the Activities & Opportunities Officer, and students make grant funding decisions.
8. The current support for Sport that the Union offers is not perfect because the Union is dramatically underfunded.
9. Taking part in Sport at UEA is expensive because the Union is dramatically underfunded.
10. Where this has happened students report a dramatic loss of control and autonomy.
11. This is a coordinated attack on student autonomy and democracy that we have a responsibility to resist at UEA.

#### **Union Resolves**

1. To continue to work in partnership with the University, as per Policy 1560, and hold open discussions between the University Sport Department and the Union, with student involvement, to make improvements to sport that students want.
  2. To continue to work together on the Sports Partnership group to deliver better support for Sport, including joint governance, budgeting and planning
  3. To lobby for increased funding from the University for Sport
  4. To reaffirm the value and benefits of Student Sports Clubs being part of the Union in any partnership group meetings
  5. As part of the University/Union partnership group on sport at UEA, to rule out moving the control of Student Sports Clubs to the University.
-

## **Management Committee notes**

**1<sup>st</sup> December 2015**

### **1. Minutes, Apologies, Matters Arising**

- Apologies from Yinbo Yu and Jo Swo

### **2. Operational Updates**

- Chris: University Council strategy day which was all about the Lasdun wall redevelopment
- Jim: Board papers
- Toby: Numbers
- Connor: Junior Doctors
- Liam: nothing to report

### **3. Key Relationship Updates**

- Jim: Annie Grant's last day on Thursday, he and Jo are attending
- Chris: meeting with the VC on Thursday with Fossil Free campaign about Divestment – quietly optimistic

### **4. Social Enterprises Updates**

- Toby: main details will be in the board papers for next week. Key headlines are:
  - Shop is trading strongly (took an extra £3k on Black Friday)
  - Unio trade is picking up but staff costs are still too high
  - Tuesdays and Saturdays remain strong
  - Gigs are proving hard to compare. 3 self-promoted shows so far this year which have performed well.
  - VMS quarterly report ready for testing and Toby is meeting them this week, can expect some full VMS analysis after Christmas
  - Generally turnover is good
  - Student Staffing is under control
  - Bars GP is ok

### **5. LCR Student Opinion**

- This paper has been to the Venues team meeting and the development & oversight board. FTO's were happy with the process. There is the an issue as to on to disability access but Jim has this is hand and is working with affected students.

### **6. LGBT+ LCR Night**

- Jo's agenda item but Jo sent apologies.
- Agreed to take the policy away and consider various options. Jim/Toby to speak to venues about engaging with pride, LGBT+ Officer and the caucus to see what we can do to make this happen so all are satisfied.

### **7. Non Commercial Advertising space**

- We need space for clubs and societies to advertise their events/activities.
- Jim: we can locate three spaces and give them to C&S for them to use.
- Concern about the spread of non-commercial information among our other poster boxes
- Jim: hopefully this will be resolved with the recruitment of the new Marketing Coordinator
- Poster boxes for C&S doesn't solve the problem caused by no longer having pigeon holes. For example: the ability to be able to leave flyers for another group of society members to hand out.
- Jim: we can explore this as part of the solution to club and society post in general

### **8. Staffing**

- Staff speaking at external events should run the event past Management Committee.

Closed session

## SOC Proposed Cycle of Business

Each Meeting (format agreed earlier):

- **Chair Update**
- **Departmental Presentations and Strategic Exercises**
- **Issue Presentations**
- **Items for discussion**
- **Policy Implementation**
- **Projects, Campaigns and Policy Reports**
- **Management Committee Report**
- **Funding Requests**

<b>Semester One</b>	
Week 2	Departmental Presentation: Marketing and Business Development Annual Elections Schedule Appointment of DRO Zone Conferences: Agree Attendance Review of Welcome Week
Week 5	Departmental Presentation: Advice Union House 2015: Feedback on the new building Finance Update
Week 7	Departmental Presentation: Campaigns and Policy NUS National Conference Delegate Leader Election
Week 8	Departmental Presentation: Operations Reports from Zone Conferences Finance Update
Week 10	Departmental Presentation: Opportunities (Clubs and Societies)
<b>Semester Two</b>	
Week 1 Jan 14	Departmental Presentation: Retail Finance: Estimates Steering Discussion

Week 3 Jan 28	Departmental Presentation: Opportunities (Clubs and Societies)
Week 6 Feb 18	Departmental Presentation: Housing
Week 9 Mar 10	Departmental Presentation: ENTS/Waterfront Finance: Estimates 15-16 Proposal
Week 10 April 14	Departmental Presentation: Venues
Week 12 April 28	Departmental Presentation: Opportunities (Volunteering & Enterprise)
Exam week 2 May 19	Departmental Presentation: Review (Find and Fix) Finance Update