

agenda

Meeting:	Student Officer Committee
Date:	Thursday 14 January 2015
Time:	5.00 pm
Location:	Bookable Room 2, Union House
Code	1 ST 16

- 1506 Departmental Presentation: Retail**
A presentation from W Storey (Head of Operations)
- 1507 Chair Update**
- 1508 Attendance and Apologies**
- 1509 Minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2015/Matters Arising/Action Log**
(See pages 3-14, page 15)
- 1510 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)
- 1511 DRO Appointment, Timetable and Election Campaigning Rules**

 - Proposal from the Returning Officer. (See pages 20-22)
- 1512 Items for Discussion**

 - Discussion topics from the Chair:
 - Term of office for Part Time Officers
 - Starting times for this term’s meetings of SOC.
- 1513 Finance: Estimates Steering Discussion**
- 1514 Projects, Campaigns and Policy Reports**

- 1516** **Policy passed by Union Council on 3 December meeting**
(See pages 23-24 for draft implementation scheme and pages 25-44 for policies in full.)
- 1571** **Management Committee notes from 1 December meeting**
(See pages 45-46)
- 1518** **Revised Cycle of Business**
(See pages 47-48)
- 1519** **Any Other Business**
- 1520** **Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting**

To note the next meeting will be held at a time to be confirmed on Thursday 28 January 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	Liaising with University over joint declaration with NUA/City	Jo, Aaron, Chris	Ongoing
26 February 15	Proposed amendment on the Referendum Bye-Laws to be brought Council.	To be brought to Council	Chris	16 Apr 15
17 September 15	Investigate location for breast feeding space	Report to be made	Jo Swo	December 15
5 November 15	Recommendation for staff member to be appointed as DRO	Actioned: agenda item	Josh	December 15
26 November 15	Actual spend figures to be added to budget updates	To be added to future budget updates	Josh	Spring term
26 November 15	Transport working group to be formed with special focus on parking permits	Group to meet and bring policy proposals to Council	Liam/Jo Swo	Spring term
26 November 15	SOC Policy Implementation Review to be held	To be held and report made to Council	Chris	Spring term
26 November 15	Liaison with staff to improve Clubs and Societies area of the website	Discussions to be held – report on any improvements to be made	Chris	Spring term
26 November 15	Management Committee to discuss prioritisation of non-commercial and commercial publicity in Union House	Initial discussion to be held; final outcome to be reported to SOC	Liam	Spring term
26 November 15	Chair to feedback SOC's comments on the running of Council Open discussions to Chair of Council	Feedback to be given to Chair of Council	Chris	21 January 16
26 November 15	Chair to discuss Save Our Union campaign with other FTOs	Discussions to take place: results to be fed back to T Etheridge	Chris	14 January 16
26 November 15	Chair to check email groups and whether mail outs were reaching recipients	Investigation held: no issues found	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 26th 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 22nd 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)

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 th January	Nominations Open
19 th February	Nominations Close Midday
19 th February	All Candidates Meeting 4pm
22 nd February	Training Week
25 th February	Manifestos Deadline
29 th February 9am	Campaigning Begins
1 st March – noon	Voting Opens
8 th March – noon	Voting Closes (results to candidates early evening; announced at DG)
12 th 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 3rd 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 Passed by Council 3 December Implementation

Policy	Resolves	FTO	Staff
1812 Hepatitis C Awareness	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.	Jo	Lucy
1814 Provide the correct on campus facilities for Pool and Snooker club	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.	Yinbo	Lynne/James
1815 Guarantor Scheme	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.	Jo	Jim/Lucy
1816 SWP off our campus	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.	Chris	Jim
1818 Response to the HE Green Paper	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.	Connor	Jim
1819 Nothing Rhymes With Orange	1. To assist Chronic in running an awareness campaign on 22nd January 2016	Jo	Lucy/Josh

	<p>2. To advertise the campaign and get as many students and staff to get involved, wear orange and donate money</p> <p>3. To assist Chronic in raising money on 22nd January 2016</p> <p>4. To consult any students with muscular dystrophy about what can be done to improve their university experience</p> <p>5. To consider any further action that can be taken to raise funds/awareness of muscular dystrophy.</p>		
1820 Amendment to the Bye-Laws: Part-Time Trans and Non-Binary Officer	Change relevant section of the Bye-Laws	Chris	Tony
1821 NUS lead delegate – let's improve our democracy	<p>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.</p>	Connor/Chris	Josh
1823 Support HSC Students – keep the National Health Service bursary	<p>1) To mandate the Undergraduate Education Officer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	Connor	Bridget
Emergency Resolution - Don't Bomb Syria	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.	Chris	Lauren

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. ¹

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.

¹ <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 8th 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.²
 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+³.
 5. Due to the Immigration Bill, which was enacted on the 14th of May⁴, 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'⁵ 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 Hand⁶. This company requires the equivalent of

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

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

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

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

⁶ <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 University⁷, Edinburgh University⁸, Goldsmiths University⁹, UCL¹⁰ and York University¹¹.
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.

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

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

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

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

¹¹ <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.
-

1818 Response to the HE Green Paper passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Philippa Costello (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Seconder: 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. ¹²
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.

¹² <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. ¹³

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. ¹⁴
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

¹³ 1605 No to the Marketisation of Education (The Future of Undergraduate Funding)

¹⁴ <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.musculardystrophyuk.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 22nd January
(<http://www.musculardystrophyuk.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 22nd 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 22nd 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 17th 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

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

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.
-

Management Committee notes

1st 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

Semester One	
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)
Semester Two	
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