

agenda

Meeting:	Student Officer Committee
Date:	Thursday 14 April 2016
Time:	7.00 pm
Location:	Bookable Room 5, Union House
Code	SOC 17 ST 04

1567 Departmental Presentation: Events

Zoe Phillips, Student Events Coordinator, will be presenting on the work of the Department; please liaise with your constituents and feedback to Zoe any ideas/suggestions for events.

1568 Chair Update

1569 Attendance and Apologies

1570 Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January/Matters Arising/Action Log
(See pages 3-14)

Please note the meetings of 18 February, 25 February and 10 March were inquorate.

1571 Funding Requests

Housing Co-operative
(See pages 15-16)

Please note: funding for Never OK! New posters, EU Referendum Debates and Transitioning at UEA Guide were approved online. The first two requests are detailed in the 10 March agenda papers, please see p 15 for details of the Transitioning Guide request.

1572 Items for Discussion

Officer Handovers

1573 Policy Implementation
(See index page 17)

Policy passed at Council 11 February. (See pages 18-34)

Policy passed at Council 3 March. (See pages 35-42)

1574 Projects, Campaigns and Policy Reports

1575 Management Committee

To receive the notes of the meetings held on 26 January and 23 February. (See pages 43-46)

1576 Cycle of Business

To note the Cycle of Business for 2015-16. (See page 47)

1577 Any Other Business

1578 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting

To note the next meeting will be held at 6.00 pm on Thursday 28 April, Union House

minutes

Meeting:	Student Officer Committee
Date:	Thursday 28 Jan 16
Paper:	SOC 7 15-16
Author:	Tony Moore
Purpose:	Record of Decision Making

Key Discussions

- Provision of funding on campus
- Caucus hustings and election rules
- PTO term of Office
- Number of attendees that each Caucus can send to NUS democratic events
- Financial estimates
- Possible location of a snooker table in Union House

Key Actions

- Approved funding requests for:
Stand By Me
Students not Suspects
Light Bulbs
Reclaim the Night
- noted the DRO Appointment and receipt of the Election Timetable and Election Campaigning Rules and made comments to be passed on to the RO
- To propose to Council that PTO term of office should start on 1 July each year
- Agreed to join a commercial partnership with the green energy companies concerned as a charity affiliate
- Agreed no space for snooker table: options are to lobby Sportspark for space and/or to secure a better deal from Riley's Snooker Hall in the city

Union of UEA Students Purpose:

"To enrich the life of every UEA student"

Minutes of the Student Officer Committee

28 January 2016

Members present:

Voting Members Present: 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), Alex McCloskey (Ethical Issues Officer), Hussam Hussein (Ethnic Minorities Officer), Jo Swo (Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer), Yinbu Yu (Activities and Opportunities Officer), C Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

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

Chair:

Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy)

In attendance:

Tony Moore (Democracy and Governance Coordinator), J Raywood (Sports Development Coordinator).

1521 Departmental Presentation: Sport

J Raywood (Sports Development Coordinator) sketched a background to the current landscape of provision for sport at UEA.

JR emphasised that UUEAS staff in Opportunities worked well with their colleagues in the Sports Department. JR noted that the

work of the University Sports Department consisted of building participation events such as the Ziggurat Challenge and allocation of space at Sportspark and Colney.

JR reported, as to metrics, that, in recent years, the numbers of Club members had been increasing and performance had been improving and the budget had not been able to keep pace with this demand.

JR advised that the reality of the situation was that, because of the low level of block grant, sport at UEA was grossly underfunded and this had led to expressions of dissatisfaction from Club members as to the resources available.

JR reported that, in the summer of 2014, the Sports Partnership Group had been formed with the Activities and Opportunities Officer, UUEAS staff, student representatives and University Sport staff as members and chaired by the PVC Academic. JR believed that for a year the Group's meetings had not been productive but noted that faced with the lack of progress the PVC Academic had asked group members to visit other universities to find out how they ran sports. JR noted the visits had now taken place.

JR noted the PVC had recently attended a Sports Presidents meeting and made two clear position statements: there was no extra money available for sport and that sport would be better managed under a central identity as this would provide more leverage when seeking funds from alumni and external sponsors. As to the former, JR noted the possibility that the PVC had since changed position as the University had now mentioned the possibility of Sports Scholarship provision.

JR noted that UUEAS policy 1587, which had called for a partnership approach, had been met with an uncompromising attitude from University Sport which had rejected any idea of partnership unless overall control was handed to the University. The UUEAS team, bound by policy 1587, had, in turn, had to reject the University's demands.

JR noted listening to the Council debate the previous week where the majority of representatives had reaffirmed support for the partnership model. JR advised that the members of Sports Executive who had brought the motion to repeal 1587 had been disappointed that the motion had been rejected; JR noted puzzlement as to this sense of disappointment as the Sports Executive members had emphasised that they did not want a total shift to University control, they needed UUEAS input and they wanted a partnership.

JR reported meeting with the members of Sports Executive to address their concerns by stressing that UUEAS policy would allow everything to be put up for discussion, including funding, pooling of resources and working in partnership, but would keep the bottom line safeguard of ruling out the transfer of control of Clubs.

JR advised that the next meeting of the Sports Partnership Group would be the following week. JR advised that the best possible course would be to follow the Leeds University approach which had had consultative meetings with interested students and all stakeholders to work out how to maximise the sporting opportunities offered and to meet the demands of students. JR noted there was a debate to be had as to whether all operational sports staff should be based in the same space which would be a more complex operation to effect than it first seemed. JR noted, however, that this centralisation as well as a deepening of the partnership might be accomplished without seismic changes in governance, staff employment status or ownership of assets. JR advised that, if a successful partnership were to be formed, there could be a creation of a Sports Board for strategic and financial decision making and a real attempt could be made to ascertain what student autonomy should look like. JR noted that both UUEAS and Sports Executive had conducted surveys which had produced differing results with students wanting autonomy and the ability to run their own Clubs yet wanting tasks like engaging a new coach to be done for them. JR believed that as fees have risen students have had less time to devote to outside activities and were less willing to spend time on the organisation of their Clubs or Societies and wanted UUEAS to have more input.

JR concluded the presentation by advising that one of the first tasks of a successful partnership would be to identify what inputs students wanted and what tasks they would like to be left to undertake themselves.

Chair thanked J Raywood for the presentation.

1522 Chair Update

There were none.

1523 Attendance and Apologies

Apologies from B Smith and A Hood noted.

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

J Swo (JS) clarified that the funding request for torches was part of a wider campaign which would benefit the totality of students

this was why the number given was more than the specific number of torches; JS added that the funding included publicity leaflets.

H Hussein (HH) noted their name had been misspelt on one occasion in the minutes.

HH noted that as to the 14 January meeting the minutes gave the reason for cancellation as staff unavailability whilst Officers had been informed via Facebook that it had been cancelled due to the failure to make quorum; HH asked for clarification. Chair noted it had been a combination of both factors and they, personally, had made the call to cancel the meeting.

1525 Funding Requests

SOC noted prior online approval of requests for:

Light Up Campus
NUS Women in Leadership Conference
Nothing Rhymes with Orange (Muscular Dystrophy)

Stand By Me

J Swo noted the policy had been approved by Council and that the request had a full breakdown of costs.

SOC approved the funding request.

Students not Suspects

J Swo noted the NUS Tour would be coming to campus in February and the funding would be for publicity materials. JS noted that the speakers for the event had not, as yet, been confirmed. JS noted, to a query from T Etheridge that SOC had already funded earlier publicity for Prevent and the present request was for extra materials.

C Rand noted no problems with the funding but asked that events be fully scoped before they were brought to SOC.

SOC approved the funding request.

Light Bulbs

S Jones noted that the plan would be to buy £140 of light bulbs in bulk. SJ argued that a problem was that landlords bought the bulbs and students paid the bill. SJ noted that the bulbs would save £1250 for students over the life of the bulbs. SJ noted the bulbs would be given away as a promotion at the Go Green stall that would highlight ways to reduce energy use.

SOC approved the funding request.

H Hussein asked as to the recording of how much money had been spent by SOC in the different budgets.
Chair noted that the information had been posted on the SOC Facebook page but noted that there was some time lag due to the processing of payments.

Reclaim the Night

J Swo (JS) reported this would be the first march of its kind at UEA and would be intersectional. JS reported that the main speakers were from NUS and they were confident the other speakers would be non-controversial.

J Swo noted that there were ongoing negotiations with First Buses to try to secure a bus for free but the funding request covered the cost of a coach if the negotiations fell through.
H Hussein asked as to the plans for the start of the march at the Flaunt venue. JS this would be activity related and not alcohol related.

L McCafferty wondered as to policing arrangements and road closure. JS noted talks with the police were ongoing.

J Dickinson wondered what rules would be set about participation by allied individuals or groups. JS noted the event would be totally intersectional.

Chair thought that mini-buses might be an alternative to a coach. JS thought this might prove complicated and a coach could make several journeys.

SOC approved the funding request.

Chair noted that the funding request for Go Green Week that had been missed off the agenda would be circulated online.

1526

DRO Appointment, Timetable and Election Campaigning Rules

Chair noted that the DRO appointment had been made online.

T Etheridge noted that the previous year there had been a ban on campaigning at Union Council and it seemed somewhat contradictory to now podcast the hustings to Council and also whether this would be unfair to candidates who were not Councillors.

SOC discussed procedural issues around having a mini-hustings at Council and whether these would include PTOs as well as FTOs.

SOC moved on to discuss the ramifications of caucuses holding their own hustings.

J Dickinson advised that it would be important to decide whether hustings called by caucuses were informal or formal meeting subject to supervision by the RO.

SOC noted the question would be investigated by the RO.

T Antoniou Phillips believed that if the hustings were ultimately outside the control of the caucus members then it would be best not to continue with them.

J Dickinson advised that, at NUS caucus hustings, the chair was often a non-subscribing member of the campaign.

SOC noted the DRO Appointment and receipt of the Timetable and Election Campaigning Rules and that the Chief Executive would pass on the above comments to the RO.

1527

Items for Discussion

PTO's Term of Office

Chair noted there was no formal start time for PTOs and it was a matter of debate when the best time should be; Chair noted the matter had come into focus due to the extraordinary length of the spring term occasioned by the vagaries of the system for fixing the date for Easter.

SOC discussed the benefits and disadvantages of the idea of PTOs starting at Easter or in July.

SOC agreed that a better option would be start the PTO term of office on 1 July and to bring a proposal to Council to formalise this in the Bye-Laws.

Starting times of SOC meetings

Chair noted SOC had reached prior agreement to have 6 pm starts for the rest of term.

Good Energy Affiliation

S Jones argued the proposal for affiliation to what was, essentially, a commercial partnership would benefit students financially as well as UUEAS whilst at the same time promoting green energy.

Chair noted this would not be a formal affiliation that would need to be approved by Union Council.

SOC agreed to join a commercial partnership with the companies concerned as a charity affiliate.

Equality and Diversity Committee

H Hussein wondered as to why the Equality and Diversity Committee (EDC) had not, as yet, met.

J Swo that, as EDC Chair, they would be setting up the first meeting for the following week and the Committee would be looking at its role and remit.

Chair noted that the EDC was a sub-committee of the Trustee Board without an explicit remit and the future discussion would be as to whether the committee might play a wider role across the organisation.

Process for using/processing the funding of the liberation officers

H Hussein asked for more clarity as to the accessing of funding for liberations officers and whether this needed approval from the EDC.

Chair clarified that the budget given to liberations officers was owned by SOC and not by the EDC and was just signed off as correct by staff or an FTO. Chair noted it was also circulated to members of the EDC for comment not for approval.

Statements on behalf of the Ethnic Minorities Caucus

H Hussein (HH) noted being mandated by caucus to ask about the NUS Black Students Conference. HH noted that in the past UUEAS had sent one delegate and one observer, usually the incumbent and the incoming officer. HH noted that in the current year it was only budgeted to send the present EM Officer and the Caucus had been surprised and dismayed by this and had asked that four members be sent and budgeted for. HH noted that the allocation for the Caucus compared unfavourably with that of other caucuses.

Chair noted that the numbers of attendees for each conference reflected the allocation made by NUS; for example for LGBT+ conference UUEAS would have seven delegates, and this was down to the internal politics of the NUS.

JD advised that SOC earlier in the year had pre-authorized funding for all voting delegates to attend NUS democratic conferences with an assumption made that funding for observer places would be dependent on separate requests to SOC. JD advised there might be scope for pre-authorization by SOC for additional places for ethnic minorities and disabilities events in next year's budget.

1528

Finance: Estimates Steering Discussion

J Dickinson (JD) noted the democratic framework for finance with the overall financial estimates being approved by the final Council of each academic year being followed by detailed budget planning over the summer.

JD noted an example of the way the finance estimates worked was that if there was a shortfall in income from Social Enterprises this would be reflected in reduced spending in the charity.

JD noted that the Block Grant would be £555,000 which compared unfavourably with comparator SUs.

JD advised that under the Improvement Plan UUEAS was committed to controlling costs in the Charity whilst driving efficiencies in the Social Enterprises. JD noted an important development with the proposed restructuring of the balance sheet to reflect more realistically any financing of replacement of fixed assets in order to free up more funding for membership surveys.

JD advised that developed from officer feedback the priorities that would be fed into the estimates would be:

- Staff support for campaigns
- Staff support for students who wanted to run events
- To clear capital backlog in sports
- More support for a joint approach on student representation.

JD asked Officers if they had any additional priorities for feed them into the process.

L McCafferty asked as to the process for the funding of student representation. JD advised this was envisaged as a lobbying effort to persuade the University to fund its commitments contained in the Code of Practice.

L McCafferty asked as that in the estimates campaign funding should not get lost in other wider representation funding.

Chair asked as to the funding for PTO support whether this would be purely staff support. JD advised that the details had not been worked up at the current stage it had been just identified as a problem area.

1529

Projects, Campaigns and Policy Reports

Snooker: Snooker: Policy Implementation Report

Y Yu noted that UUEAS staff had investigated all possible venues for a snooker table on campus, including Sportspark, in line with policy and had drawn a blank. Snooker Club had since proposed moving the Nap Nook and placing the table there.

L McCafferty noted there was no direct mandate to place a table in Union House and that SOC was only bound to look into the possibilities. LM noted disappointment that University Sport were attempting to take control of Clubs yet at no time had they offered any of the vast open spaces in their leisure centre to the Snooker Club.

SOC held an extensive discussion as to any possible spaces for placing a table in Union House.

The utilisation of and location of the Nap Nook were examined.

T Antoniou Phillips suggested several locations for the table including the downstairs Green Room.

J Dickinson advised that the latter location was, at present, the only bookable public space available to certain wheelchair using members.

Chair summed up the discussion that there was a consensus, excepting T Antoniou Phillips, that there was no practical space in Union House and that the two options remaining should be pursued, these were:

- To strenuously lobby Sportspark to place a table there
- To work directly with Riley's, the external provider in the city, to gain an improved deal for the Snooker Club

1530 Policy passed by Union Council on 3 December and 21 January

SOC approved the previous allocation of Officers and staff to lead on the implementation of policy passed by Council on 3 December and the following allocation for policy passed on 21 January:

Emergency Resolution on Course Closures in AMS	Connor/Josh
1835 Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) scheme	Connor actioned
1836 Better educational support for sexual assault victims	Connor/Jo
1837 Referendum Amendment to the Bye-Laws	Chris/Tony
1838 Better extenuating circumstances for students with family illness	Connor/Jo
1839 Solidarity with victims of sexual violence	Jo/Jack
1840 Composite Motion on Sport	Yinbo

1531 Management Committee notes from 1 December meeting

Noted without comment.

1532 Revised Cycle of Business

Noted

1533 Any Other Business

Chair noted that a Councillor had requested written reports be submitted by PTOs.

1534 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting

To note the next meeting will be held at 6.00 pm on Thursday 18 February in Bookable Room 2, Union House

SOC Action Log for 14 April

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.	Actioned	Chris	16 Apr 15
17 September 15	Investigate location for breast feeding space	Report to be made	Jo Swo	December 15
26 November 15	Actual spend figures to be added to budget updates	Actioned – google doc live	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	Ongoing	Chris	Spring term
26 November 15	Management Committee to discuss prioritisation of non-commercial and commercial publicity in Union House	Ongoing	Liam	Spring term
26 November 15	Chair to feedback SOC's comments on the running of Council Open discussions to Chair of Council	Actioned	Chris	21 January 16
26 November 15	Chair to discuss Save Our Union campaign with other FTOs	Actioned	Chris	14 January 16
28 January 16	PTOs term of office to be formalised and fixed at 1 July	Actioned	Chris	February 16
28 January 16	Agreed to join a commercial partnership with green energy companies as a charity affiliate	Agreement to be reached	Sam	March 16
28 January 16	Snooker Club space	Lobby Sportspark for space or better deal at Riley's	Yinbo	March 16

Project Title: Norwich Student Housing Co-op - Registration as an Industrial and Provident Society

Proposer: Chris Jarvis / Norwich Student Housing Co-op Working Group

Amount of money requested: £375

Budget requested from: SOC Projects

Details of project (500 words max)

The Norwich Student Housing Co-operative (NSHC) is a politically engaged not-for-profit organisation offering affordable accommodation to students in Norwich. We believe that profit-driven landlords, lettings agents and university management exploit students. We aim to reduce their control over the student housing market by empowering students to collectively manage, maintain, and eventually own the properties they live in. We believe in creating an alternative based on shared ownership, community and autonomy. All tenants of the co-op will be members, and all members will be tenants. NSHC aims to make its properties available and accessible to students in Norwich regardless of gender, age, sexuality, class, race, religion, or disability, provided they agree to the aims and values of the co-operative outlined in the NSHC mission statement. (find the mission statement here, final draft currently being voted on:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/12PjacwS7TeSODeP-7rqpX9unzrWooVgmyci-N5IxF9s/edit>)

We aim to work closely with the UUEAS, considering our shared aims of supporting and empowering students, and are keen to develop this relationship to the benefit of both parties. We request funding for the registration of the co-op with the Financial Services Authority (FCA) as an Industrial and Provident Society. Registration is necessary for a co-op to start trading and fundraising and is an essential next step.

We propose to pay Catalyst Collective to take us through the registration process. The £375 is the cost Catalyst Collective charges for this process, including the necessary fees to the Financial Services Authority. More information on the Catalyst Collective can be found here: <http://www.catalystcollective.org/>

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

Once complete, the project would provide student owned, student run affordable accommodation for students. While the initial number of students to benefit from the project will be small, the group aims to expand their model of housing to establish other co-operatives, building on the Seven Principles of Co-Operatives.

Number of members directly benefited: 10

Number of members benefited by extension: 40

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

As a co-operative, we would be a member-led, member-run organisation. Housing co-operative projects across the country tend to have significantly lower rents for their tenants, as the rent is set and decided by the tenants themselves. As such, the project will be to the benefit of students from lower economic and working class background.

The project would also particularly seek accommodation that was suitable for disabled students, or else work to make modifications to properties that are not.

Project Title: Transitioning at UEA Guide

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

Amount of money requested: £149

Budget requested from: General Campaigns Details of project (500 words max)

For the last few months I have been working alongside the LGBT+ Officer and LGBT+ Caucus to facilitate a guide for transitioning at UEA for trans and non-binary students. The guide covers pronouns, gender neutral toilets, health care, communication with teachers and links to the community.

Breakdown of the Funding Request

200 A6 coloured booklets = £149

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

The aim of the guide, which will also be available online for easier access, is to provide information for those transitioning, and information and confidence for those considering or thinking about transitioning.

Number of members directly benefited: 100

Number of members benefited by extension: 500

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

The guide will be accessible online for students who can't (or for personal reasons choose not to) use the physical version of the guide. The physical version of the guide will be available in areas on campus such as the Advice Centre, DOS, local GP and in public areas such as Scholars Bar and red/blue bar.

Policies Implementation: Policy passed by Council on 11 February and 3 March

Policies	Officers
1848 Policies sent to NUS National Conference	
1854 Amendment to the byelaws: Union Democracy	
1856 Why is my curriculum white?	
1857 Amendment to Byelaws - PTO Terms of Office	
1858 We are not unicorns	
1859 It's Time to Talk about Costs on Campus	
1860 Amendment Bye-Laws: NUS LGBT+ Conference Delegates	
1873 Unnecessarily gendered products	
1874 Hidden course costs are still a problem	
1875 Save Our Human Rights Act	
1876 Protecting LGBT+ Refugees and Asylum seekers	
1878 Amendment to the Byelaws –Caucuses and Assemblies changing their names	
1879 Lads in the Lab, Sexism in the Seminar	
1880 Reclaim the Night in Norwich	

Policy passed by Union Council 11 February 2016

1848 Policies sent to NUS National Conference

Council voted to send three motions within the 1400 word limit

Motion: NUS Conference Welfare Zone

5 Prioritise Student Mental Health. Now! (322 words)

Proposer: Jack Robinson (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Seconder: Daniel Wrigglesworth (UEA Labour Students)

NUS Believes

1. NUS surveyed 1,093 students in further and higher education in November and December 2015
2. Eight out of 10 students (78%) say they experienced mental health issues in the last year.
3. A third (33%) also said they had had suicidal thoughts.
4. Among those who did not identify as heterosexual, the figure was higher at 55%.
5. More than half (54%) of respondents who reported having experienced mental health problems said they did not seek support.
6. A third said they would not know where to get mental health support from at their college or university if they needed it, while 40% reported being nervous about the support they would receive from their institution.

NUS Further Believes

1. That over the past year NUS has barely mentioned the single biggest Welfare issue facing UK students today.
2. That whilst most Colleges and Universities have well-meaning, overstretched services, almost none have coherent, comprehensive strategies in relation to mental health and wellbeing. This is unacceptable.
3. That too many focus on cure instead of prevention

4. That mental health and wellbeing services in every FEI and HEI should be adequately resourced and the operation and capacity of services should be regularly assessed in relation to demand and effectiveness.
5. That robust arrangements should be put in place for any student with mental health difficulties who are required to undertake a period of time studying off campus, including those studying or working abroad.

NUS Resolves

1. To prioritise mental health in the Welfare Zone in the year ahead.
 2. To lobby BIS, AoC and UUK to form a national student mental health task force, with student representation
 3. To campaign for a specific student wellbeing duty to be placed on Colleges and Universities as a condition of funding.
 4. To ensure that Universities and Colleges consult and collaborate with SUs and student groups when formulating and implementing student mental health-related policies
-

Motion: NUS Conference HE Zone

Stop doing over our Nursing Students (327 words)

Proposer: Ruth Stone (UEA Edith Cavell society)

Second: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

NUS Believes

1. There are huge problems with academic failure and lack of support for nursing students, across all institutions
2. NSS scores consistently track lower for Nursing and Midwifery courses against the average
3. Many nurses and midwives are on placement for half the year and as a result they are very unlikely to be involved with their Unions, societies and sports clubs.
4. Nursing placements are often some distance from the institution therefore increasing isolation and reducing the amount of contact time for face to face support with their institution to a minimum
5. Students on nursing courses are often mature, with dependants and many institutions fail support those with these and other additional needs.

6. Nursing failure and drop-out rates are at epidemic levels
7. Whilst on placement there is the added pressure to meet the demands submitting and preparing for assessments leads to academic failure, misconduct and stress
8. Nursing students can be course terminated through the means of 'fitness to practice'.

NUS Further Believes

1. Nursing bursaries have been scrapped with barely a whimper from NUS' education zone
2. Year after year NUS passes motions on Nursing and Midwifery that never seem to go anywhere
3. The last NUS Charter for Nursing and Midwifery students was published 21 years ago
4. The NMC's standards for Nursing and Midwifery education (like the QAA for these courses) fail to mention student support, student representation or social activity
5. These students need NUS and our campaigning work now more than ever

NUS Resolves

1. That any review of NUS' governance should address nursing and midwifery students as a specific area
2. To look at integration of nursing across many Unions and their campuses to increase nursing representation
3. To work with trade unions to protect placements and future jobs for current nursing students
4. To hold a national summit on representation of Nursing and Midwifery students in conjunction with Unison, the RCN and the RCM
5. To lobby the NMC and other bodies to improve the standard of student representation, student social facilities and student wellbeing delivered by HEIs
6. To carry out research into the student experience of students on Nursing and Midwifery courses
7. To create a national charter for Student Nursing and Midwifery education

Solidarity with Migrants and Refugees (451 words)

Chris Jarvis (Campaigns & Democracy Officer)

Hussam Hussein (Ethnic Minorities Officer)

Conference Believes

1. The rhetoric around immigration in the UK is toxic, with politicians from all parties lining up to attack migrants.
2. The current Government's position is that the UK should accept 20,000 refugees over a period of five years, which is a failure of its moral duty for the country to act as a place of safety for people fleeing conflict, oppression, the effects of climate change and other factors which may force people to seek asylum.
3. Ongoing conflict in Syria will heighten the refugee crisis, with more people taking more dangerous action in order to attempt to find safety.
4. The continuing climate crisis will increase the number of refugees and environmental migrants.
5. Across Europe, anti-immigrant policies are being introduced, including the seizure of valuables from migrants in Denmark.
6. NUS has a long and proud history of standing in solidarity with the oppressed.

Conference Further Believes

1. As the referendum on EU membership looms, the rhetoric used by the national media and political figures will become more and more hostile.
2. The United Kingdom can and should accept many more refugees than the current UK government is doing.
3. Western military intervention in Syria will only exacerbate the refugee crisis.
4. Climate change is already disproportionately affecting people in the Global South, as its worst effects will naturally affect these countries hardest, but also because these countries are least well equipped to adapt to a changing climate as a result of a long history of Western imperialism and capitalist exploitation.
5. Migration brings benefits both to the migrants themselves and to the country they are migrating to.
6. Arbitrary national borders that prevent certain people entering a certain country are morally problematic and perpetuate racism and conflict between people, and that freedom of movement should become the norm, not just across Europe but across the Globe.

Conference Resolves

1. To express full solidarity with refugees and migrants.
2. To lobby the UK Government to accept more refugees for as long as the current crisis continues.
3. To condemn the aggressive anti-migrant policies of European governments.

4. To re-affirm our position against British military intervention in Syria.
 5. To ensure that in NUS campaigns on climate change, the explicit link is made between it and the effect this has on people in the Global South.
 6. To support migrant solidarity actions wherever possible by:
 - a. Aiding Student Unions to run collections and organise solidarity runs to the Calais jungle.
 - b. Working directly with migrant solidarity groups that seek to improve conditions in detention centres, combat fascist organisations, resist deportations and other actions in solidarity with migrants.
 - c. Supporting national demonstrations in solidarity with migrants and refugees.
-

1849 Policy Lapse

1398 Council voted to keep the decision not to offer for sale the Sun or Star in Union retail outlets

1579 Council voted to lapse the policy on PG Representation with a commitment that a new policy would be brought to a future Council

1724 Council voted to keep the policy on Council accessibility

1854 Amendment to the byelaws: Reforming Union Democracy

Proposer: Theo Antoniou-Phillips (LGBT+ Officer)

Seconder: Ruth Stone (UEA Edith Cavell Society)

Amendment from C Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer)

Union Notes

1. Union Policy is defined in the constitution as “statements which describe that which is in the best interests of students”.
2. The Union’s principal Policy formation body is Union Council which is also the principal method of holding SU Officers to account.
3. The Democratic Procedures Committee is “responsible for development of and promotion of the Union’s democratic procedures, with particular reference to ... Union Council”
4. The Student Officer Committee is “responsible for representation and campaigning work... and the implementation and interpretation of Union Policy”
5. The DPC has not met this year.

Union Believes

1. We should be proud that UEASU is one of the few unions left with a vibrant, functioning representative council of students.
2. Our pride should not leave us blind to the problems with our current structure and set up.
3. Many participants are worried about access - yet there has been little progress on making council more accessible since Union Council mandated important work on this last October (Motion 1769B).
4. Comments and scores in last year’s SU Annual Student Survey suggest that few students know who the SU officers are, few know about Union Council, few feel that the union is democratic and few feel consulted when important decisions are made.
5. A survey of Union Councillors showed very few Councillors felt Union Council was representative and very few felt that students knew about Union Council or the decisions it made.
6. Students on Health Sciences courses and placement courses are particularly underrepresented in our current democratic structures and these are often students who need our support most.

7. Speaking at council is highly gendered- participation of women and non-binary students speaking in motions debates has been routinely around half that of those defining as men last term.
8. National research from NUS suggests that most students do not want elected representatives to make decisions or act on their behalf without consulting them first.
9. In addition the research suggests that the majority of students do not feel comfortable running in an election to make decisions themselves. This is especially true for those defining as women.
10. Improvements this year such as the introduction of less formal sessions, training and better communication have been helpful but do not sufficiently address the issues.
11. Our form of policy making is inherently oppositional and only tends to involve councillors at the last minute when a policy has already been developed. This approach prevents most of us from feeding in ideas and thoughts at the development stage.
12. Union officers are rarely held to account in a meaningful way. This is similarly the case for trustees of the Student Union.
13. A healthy democracy has a plurality of feed-in points, offering different mechanisms through which different students can feed in, recognising the diverse needs of our student body and the means that are available to them.
14. Democratic models are not a one-size-fits all. Different systems and structures will be more effective for different organisations at different times, and therefore keeping our democracy under review is vital to ensuring it serves its purpose and delivers for our members.
15. Looking at Union Council in isolation from the rest of our democratic structures and processes will not be as effective as keeping our entire democracy under holistic, continuous review.
16. Significant problems exist not only within Union Council itself, but also with the way in which its agendas, decisions and debates are communicated to the student body more broadly.
17. Democratic reform should not be viewed as a one-off, revolutionary overhaul, but instead as an ongoing, evolutionary process, where new models can be trailed without discarding the old and existing democratic processes can be complimented by new additions.
18. The current model for DPC currently does not work – electing students to stand for two year terms, which leads to them holding office after they have graduated is problematic and does not lead to an effective committee.

Union Resolves

1. To mandate the Campaigns & Democracy Officer to bring to the next meeting of Union Council a revised constitutional framework for electing the Democratic Procedures Committee.
2. To hold elections to the Democratic Procedures Committee as soon as is feasible possible.
3. To amend byelaw 2.37 to read:

“Bye-Law 2 must be reviewed by the first Union Council alongside a broader review of democratic processes once a term on consideration of recommendations made by the Campaigns and Democracy Officer in collaboration with the Student Officer Committee and the Democratic Procedures Committee.”

4. To ensure that in the process of reviewing Byelaw 2 and wider democratic processes takes into account an assessment of the following:

- Accessibility of the meeting
- Different mechanisms through which to improve the communication of democratic structures and processes
- Ways to improve the communication between councillors and their constituents
- Investigating ways to involve more students in the development of policy rather than just the debate of it
- Investigating ways to ensure that council’s membership is more representative of the wider student body
- Investigating ways to improve the accountability of officers and trustees

5. To ensure that a plurality of information and data are used to inform this process including:

- National Student Survey results
- Student Union Annual Student Survey results
- Annual Union Council survey results
- Open discussions at Union Council
- Focus groups
- Discussions at liberation caucuses and equal opportunities assemblies

6. To ensure that as part of the ongoing process of reviewing democracy, the full diversity of our student body is included, so as to ensure fair representation. In doing so, efforts shall be made to consult the following groups of students:

- Postgraduate students
- International students
- Mature students

- LGBT students
- Women students
- Ethnic Minority students
- Disabled students
- Students from all faculties and all schools
- Care leavers
- Students with caring responsibilities
- Students on both the East and West campus
- INTO students

1856 Why is my curriculum white?

Proposer: Asia Patel (BME Caucus)

Seconder: Julian Canlas (BME Caucus)

Union Notes

1. That a lot of schools (especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences) teach from a colonialist perspective
2. That most of the reading lists set by schools has a white eurocentric focus, even when discussing non-European countries
3. That relevant literature written by non-BME people that is relevant to course topics exists
4. That the UCL Student's Union set up a 'Why is my curriculum white?' campaign in 2014

Union Believes

1. That having reading lists which rarely feature content created by non-BME people provides a very biased and partial version of history and of opinions that are unrepresentative of the whole picture
2. That having content on reading lists for topics based around a different countries' history written by people not from that country is not a fully inclusive portrayal as content created by people who are
3. That all students should be represented, even in academia

Union Resolves

1. To mandate the Campaigns and Democracy Officer and the Ethnic Minorities Officer to conduct a campaign based on the UCL Student's Union campaign 'Why is my curriculum white?' to encourage more diverse reading lists from a post colonialist background
2. To lobby the university to change their reading lists to include more content created by non-white people

1857 Amendment to the Byelaws - Part Time Officer Terms of Office

Proposer: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns & Democracy Officer)

Seconder: Theo Antoniou-Phillips (LGBT+ Officer)

Union Notes:

1. The term of office of Part Time Officers is not defined in the byelaws.
2. The term of office of Full Time Officers is defined in the byelaws.
3. Decisions have been made in the past to determine the term of office of Part Time Officers on an ad hoc basis, based on convention, rather than on formal rules.

Union Believes:

1. Students standing for election should have clarity on the terms of office of the role they are to be elected to.

Union Resolves:

1. To add new byelaw 4.22 and renumber accordingly: "Part-Time Officers shall begin their term in office on July 1st and end it on June 30th the following year. A handover period will be organised with the previous office holder in the period between their election and their taking of office."

1858 We are not unicorns

Proposer: Tasneem Nawaz (Students with Disabilities Caucus's Invisible Disabilities Rep)

Seconder: Kate Snape (Students with Disabilities Caucus's Physical Disabilities and Mobility Issues Rep)

Union notes

1. Invisible disabilities cover a wide spectrum including such things as, ADHD, HIV, Asperger Syndrome, Autism, Behavioural disorders, Cancer, Chronic Fatigue, Diabetes, Dyspraxia, Dyslexia, Epilepsy, IBS, Learning Disabilities, Mental Health Issues, Sensory Disabilities and many more
2. 18% UK population is disabled (Census, 2011)
3. 1 in 4 people will have a mental health issue in the UK every year (Mind, 2013)
4. Around 1.5m people in the UK have a learning disability, this means they can have difficulty: understanding new or complex information, learning new skills, coping independently (NHS, 2015)
5. It is thought that up to 350,000 people have severe learning disabilities. This figure is increasing (NHS, 2015)
6. Disabilities do not discriminate through age, class, religion, sexuality, gender and race
7. Many students with invisible disabilities are not aware that they are classed as disabled and are entitled to help
8. Invisible disabilities do not receive the same amount of discussion and recognition as visible disabilities
9. They often do not receive as much accessibility adaptations as visible disabilities
10. People with invisible disabilities also face obstacles – such as being accused of misusing accessible toilets, disabled parking spaces and other facilities, as well as challenging misconceptions about their conditions
11. There is serious stigma around invisible disabilities

Union believes

1. Union believes in equality for all
2. Union believes everyone should be included and adaptations should be made for people to be included

3. Union believes everyone should be able to access all the same resources
4. Union believes in tackling stigmas, prejudice and discrimination
5. Union believes in raising awareness of important issues that are not commonly understood or discussed

Union resolves

1. Union resolves to support and organise events surrounding students with invisible disabilities
2. Union resolves to campaign to raise awareness of invisible disabilities
3. Union resolves to lobby the university to ensure better help is given to people with invisible disabilities in relation to receiving the support they are entitled to (for example the use of DOS in providing a disability adviser, tutoring for learning disabilities, DSA and mentors)
4. Union resolves to mandate the Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer to ensure we provide sufficient support for students with invisible disabilities within our advice service

1859 It's Time to Talk about Costs on Campus

Proposer: Philippa Costello (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Seconder: Finn Northrop (1st Year LDC)

Union Notes:

- 1) That student feedback, such as that found in the Union's Annual Student Survey (ASS), consistently reports dissatisfaction with the costs of retail outlets on campus.
- 2) Likewise, last years' 'The Real Costs of Study' report highlighted concerns that many hidden course costs were unaffordable and presenting a significant financial hurdle for many students.
- 3) That many educational costs, such as those offered by the university's central services, have become increasingly expensive against a stagnant student maintenance package.
- 4) Some students, such as those in HSC, incur substantial further costs for example through placement.
- 5) Essential costs from external providers, such as transport, are also increasingly expensive, with students expressing dissatisfaction with the quality and price of the service currently offered.
- 6) Many students cannot afford to eat on campus, and those that do opt for cheaper, less nutritious options.

Union Believes:

- 1) That previous work to highlight hidden course costs has been largely successful, meaning the priority should now be tackling how 'unhidden' costs are presenting a barrier to study and having a negative impact on both student attainment and wellbeing.
- 2) That students should not be expected to pay for items that are essential to their core study.
- 3) That the current rate of fees for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught programmes are more than sufficient to cover all costs incurred through duration of study and should be inclusive of those costs.
- 4) That the university could do more to influence external providers, such as First Bus, to ensure that the service they provide is affordable and of an acceptable quality.
- 5) As per its charitable objectives, the union should strive to provide an affordable offer for students in its retail outlets.
- 6) Although progress has been made to offer cheaper options in both union and university catering outlets, these are options are by and large significantly less nutritious.
- 7) That a balanced, healthy, diet is crucial to the attainment of students.

- 8) That the combined effect of these costs on campus: upfront course costs, transport costs, and other essential costs such as food and drink, are representing a significant squeeze on student finances.
- 9) That the accumulative impact of the increasing costs are leading to many students feeling forced to work an increasingly number of hours, which has a proven effect on attainment.
- 10) That this will hit students from poorer backgrounds the hardest.

Union Resolves:

- 1) To research the impact of these accumulated costs through producing a 'Costs on Campus' report – providing a comprehensive review of the kinds of costs encountered by students, the effect on their overall finances, and the potential impacts on attainment. This should include a set of recommendations on how the university can make these costs more affordable, and include a commitment to move towards all course costs being inclusive of fees.
- 2) To produce a key set of objectives on how pricing in our retail outlets can be adapted to meet the needs of our students.
- 3) To explore offering healthier, affordable options in union-operated retail outlets to complement the current hot food offer.
- 4) To lobby for the creation of a Student Forum whereby students can provide feedback on the university's catering outlets.
- 5) To lobby First Bus to implement a 'Student Fare' – similar to the Young Persons Fare currently offered for those under-20.

1860 Amendment to the Bye-Laws: NUS LGBT+ Conference Delegates

Proposed by: E Folan (Students with Disabilities Caucus)

Seconded by: T Antoniou-Phillips (LGBT+ Officer)

Union notes:

- 1) That at the LGBT+ Caucus on 20th January, members voted to have all NUS LGBT+ Conference delegates directly elected by the voters;
- 2) That the Caucus rejected the idea of having the LGBT+ Officer(s) be automatic delegates to the conference, and that the Trans and Non-Binary Caucus rejected the idea of the newly elected LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary place) going automatically;
- 3) That the Bye-Laws currently state that the two LGBT+ Officers are automatic delegates.

Union believes:

- 1) The LGBT+ Officers' job descriptions should reflect the wishes of the LGBT+ Caucus;
- 2) Council should formalise this decision and clear up the constitutional inconsistency.

Union resolves:

- 1) To delete byelaws 4.14.5 and 4.15.5;
- 2) To add new bye-law 13.6:

NUS LGBT+ Conference Delegation

13.6 The entire UEA delegation to NUS LGBT+ Conference will always be directly elected in a manner determined by the LGBT+ Caucus. The LGBT+ Officer (Open Place) and LGBT+ Officer (Transgender and Non-Binary Place) will not have any automatic right to a delegate place.

13.6.1 All NUS LGBT+ Conference delegates are required to vote in line with policy passed by the LGBT+ Caucus, unless that policy mandate contradicts a manifesto pledge that a delegate has explicitly made.

All policy passed 3 March 2016

1873 Unnecessarily gendered products

Proposer – Amira Izeboudjene (Womanist)

Secunder – Jack Robinson (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Union notes:

- That concerns have been raised about gendered pricing differences within Union commercial services.
- That a study conducted by The Times concluded that on average products marketed at women are 37% more expensive than the male counterparts. (The Independent)¹
- That products specifically within the beauty industry often charge more towards men for the same products. (The Independent)¹
- That gendered products reinforce the gender binary.

Union believes:

- That we should spread gender equality throughout all of our commercial services.
- That charging different prices for the same products on the basis of gender is unfair and against our values.
- That pointlessly gendered products reinforce unwelcome stereotypes.
- That gendered products often depict the female gender as being weaker to that of the male gender and come from an ideological patriarchal society in which we live.

Union resolves:

- To ensure that in all of our commercial services we do not charge different prices for the same products that are gendered and that any uncertainties surrounding similarity of products are dealt with by the Women's Officer in conjunction with the Chair of Management Committee.
- To review the purchasing of products that are inherently gendered when a gender neutral option may be available.
- To encourage purchasing of gender neutral products within our outlets where possible.

¹ <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/women-paying-more-than-men-for-everyday-product-thanks-to-unacceptable-gender-price-gap-a6820816.html>

1874 Hidden course costs are still a problem

Proposer: Cameron Mellows (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Seconded: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Union notes:

1. Policy 1859 It's Time to Talk about Costs on Campus.
2. The Union's 'The Real Costs of Study' report which highlighted concerns around major costs on courses that students were unlikely to know of or budget for.
3. The previous Union policy on hidden course costs has now lapsed.
4. That many students still incur major costs on their course, for instance Health Sciences students.
5. That some of these costs are now listed on the University's website at <https://www.uea.ac.uk/about/legalstatements/finance-and-fees/additional-course-fees>
6. These additional costs include reassessment fees; Disclosure and Barring Service checks (for Counselling, Physical Education, Medicine, PGCE, Pharmacy and Social Work students); membership of relevant professional bodies (required for Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy and Speech and Language Therapy Students, as well as BSc Midwifery students); field trips and courses; placement costs; textbooks; printing coursework assignments and a UEA branded PE kit for Physical Education students.
7. Student feedback consistently shows concerns with costs and financial matters.
8. Hidden course costs has been part of the Union's 'Cost of Living' priority campaign and the National Union of Students' 'Cut the Costs' campaign.
9. Last year the University agreed to provide free lab coats and safety goggles for all new first year SCI students.

Union believes:

1. Students remain extremely concerned about financial costs and some are struggling to make ends meet.
2. Students should not be expected to pay for compulsory course costs – the University should fund these costs.
3. Putting course costs on an obscure part of the website should not be seen as a solution to tackling hidden course costs.
4. These costs remain largely unknown about by students until the cost is incurred. Therefore they are difficult to budget for and hit students from poorer backgrounds hardest, damaging access, widening participation and student retention.

5. Lobbying the University on financial costs and hidden course costs should remain a UEA SU priority in the future.

Union resolves:

1. To continue to raise the issue of hidden course costs with the University at all relevant meetings and committees including Learning and Teaching Committee, Student Experience Committee and Faculty Learning Teaching Quality Committees.

2. To make clear our view to the University that all compulsory costs should be covered by the institution.

3. To include a section on hidden course costs in any 'Costs on Campus' report.

1875 Save Our Human Rights Act

Proposer: Amy Rust (Debating Society)

Seconder: Chris Ball (Psychology Society)

Union Notes

1. The Human Rights Act was put into UK Law in 1998 by the last Labour Government.
2. The Tories want to attempt to scrap the Human Rights Act and replace it with a 'British Bill of Rights'.

Union Believes

1. The Human Rights Act to be one of the greatest achievements of the last Labour government.
2. Any attempt by the Tories to scrap, weaken or water down the Human Rights Act is an attack on the Human Rights of us all.
3. That Human Rights are universal, and should not be defined by a country or vary from state to state. That the Union should loudly and vociferously oppose any attempt to scrap or replace the Human Rights Act.

Union Resolves

1. To campaign against any attempt to scrap the Human Rights Act.
2. To encourage NUS to campaign to protect the Human Rights Act on their campuses to build a national student campaign to protect our Human Rights Act.

1876 Protecting LGBT+ Refugees and Asylum seekers

Proposer: Sharmin Hoque (LGBT+ Caucus Women's rep)

Seconder: Chris Ball (Psychology society)

Union Notes

1. That since the outbreak of the Syrian Civil War an estimated 9 million have been forced to flee their homes.
2. Millions more have fled the region since the conflict with Daesh began.
3. LGBT people are frequently killed for their sexuality by both Daesh and the Syrian government.

Union Believes

1. That Britain's support for LGBT Human Rights shouldn't stop at our border.
2. That LGBT people are fleeing persecution by cruel parties who would execute them for their sexuality.

Union Resolves

1. To campaign for the government to extend asylum to LGBT refugees fleeing homophobic persecution.
2. To lobby the government to use the department for international development to promote LGBT human rights worldwide.

1878 Amendment to the Byelaws – Allowing Caucuses and Assemblies to Describe Their Membership How they Wish

Proposer: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns & Democracy Officer)

Seconder: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

Union Notes:

1. The 2015/16 academic year was the first that we formally wrote into the constitution the ability for liberation groups and specific demographics of students who have specific needs or problems to self organise, set their own policies and hold the officers they elect to account
2. The framework within the constitution for these is rigid and was designed to reflect existing language used in relation to the respective officer role that coincides with the relevant group of students.
3. A number of these bodies have expressed the wish to change the language used to describe the groups of students that they are the democratic fora for and how they wish to define themselves.

Union Believes:

1. These bodies should be autonomous to take decisions not only on their policies but also on the way they wish to describe themselves and who they wish to permit to attend their meetings.
2. Language can be fast changing, and so rather than bringing a series of constitutional amendments over the years to alter the descriptions of these bodies, we should instead allow greater flexibility about how they choose to describe themselves.

Union Resolves:

1. To add new byelaw 3.8 and renumber accordingly.

Terminology

"3.8 The above caucuses and assemblies may choose how they wish to describe their membership and the terminology they wish to use to describe their meetings."

1879 Lads in the Lab, Sexism in the Seminar

Proposer: Philippa Costello (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Seconder: Abbie Mulcairn (Women's Caucus)

Union Notes

1. Many women and non-binary students, as well as students who are wrongly misgendered as being women, report experiencing gender-based discrimination within learning and teaching environments.
2. Sexism within 'Lab Culture' has been particularly well-documented, typified by recent comments by Nobel-Prize winning scientist Sir Tim Hunt, who was quoted stating "Let me tell you about my trouble with girls ... three things happen when they are in the lab ... You fall in love with them, they fall in love with you and when you criticise them, they cry." He added that he was "in favour of single-sex labs" but "doesn't want to stand in the way of women." ²
3. Discrimination against women students is not just limited to STEM subjects. Women in other subjects, such as those within Humanities, often report feeling belittled and patronised in seminar discussions and workshops. This is also reflected in the disproportionate numbers of women academics as a whole. ³ Students who are perceived as women, even if they are men or are non-binary, can also face sexism.
4. Casual sexism is still prevalent within many aspects of academia, and the proportional decline through levels of study suggests that some academic cultures are often perceived as unwelcoming for women & non-binary students.
5. Women's Caucus noted that sexism in academia and a lack of female professors is a particular problem at UEA. ⁴ They resolved that Women's Caucus councillors should make tackling academic sexism a particular focus this year.

Union Believes

1. That although substantial work has taken place on tackling non-academic gender discrimination, more work needs to be done to tackle experiences of gender discrimination specifically within teaching and learning environments.

Union Resolves

1. To conduct a research exercise into self-identifying women students' experience of sexism within learning and teaching spaces on campus, and to include students who are perceived as women in this research exercise.
2. That a consequent report should be released including recommendations on how to tackle chauvinistic attitudes within academic culture, improve career progression rates for women, and deal with sexual harassment.
3. That a campaign should be launched along the lines of 'Never Okay' to raise awareness and encourage students to report incidences of discrimination and encourage them to seek support.

² <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/womens-business/11664986/Tim-Hunt-science-sexism-row-Women-do-cry-in-labs-but-men-weep-too.html>

³ <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/mar/27/university-politics-seminars-are-a-breeding-ground-for-chauvinism>

⁴ Women's Caucus Minutes 28/09/2015 <<http://www.ueastudent.com/main-menu/democracy-reps/liberation-caucuses-and-assemblies/women-s-caucus>>

1880 Reclaim the Night in Norwich

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

Seconder: Asia Patel (BME Caucus)

Union notes

- 1) Women and liberation groups face danger of harassment and violence on nights out based on their appearance
- 2) Whilst Norwich is one of the safest cities in the UK, Prince of Wales Road has been rated as one of the most dangerous streets in the country
- 3) The Union has received training from HollaBack! To provide a 'Good Night Out' venue status against sexual harassment in its venues
- 4) The Union has established its own anti-sexual harassment campaign, Never OK
- 5) 90% of British women report experiencing their first harassing before turning 17 year old
- 6) One in three UK female students experience sexual assault or abuse on campus

Union believes

- 1) The Union holds a responsibility to its students even when they're off campus
- 2) Every student deserves the right to a fun, safe and harassment free night out
- 3) We live in a victim-blaming culture that needs to be addressed and challenged
- 4) No individual is responsible for being harassed, the responsibility lies on the person who is harassing

Union resolves

- 1) To facilitate and support in the organising of annual Reclaim the Night events, that focus on intersectionality and student empowerment on nights out
- 2) To mandate the Welfare, Community, and Diversity Officer and the Campaigns and Democracy officer to organise an annual Reclaim the Night event
- 3) To continue to campaign for a safer city for students, by working with night time venues to focus on student safety instead of squeezing student money out of them

Management Committee notes

26th January 2016

1. Minutes, Apologies, Matters Arising

- Apologies: Connor Rand (attended from halfway through)
- Matters Arising: to discuss list of points from SMT January residential at next Management Committee particularly around part time officer support from staff.

2. Operational Updates

- Yinbo: we are individually meeting the chair of Council in March
- Chris: with regard to News|SU, we now have a review report and we have a series of actions in place to act on the review. Chris is working with the relevant staff to improve the content and distribution.
- Jo: new monthly catch ups with Jane Amos and DOS have started and seem to be going well.

3. Key Relationship Updates

- Chris: estates restructure isn't as large and wide reaching as we thought
- Jim: concern is that there is still no Estates forum
- Yinbo/Jim: SPG next week – the ball is in the University's court. We have suggested adding an agenda item about progressing the partnership but the agenda has yet to come out.
- Connor: meeting arranged with the VC on Thursday to discuss student members of ET groups and SPG

4. Social Enterprises Updates

- Toby: verbal update based on most recent management accounts and ahead of written report due to go to finance committee next week. Main headlines are:
 - Bars are fine
 - Ents is up on budget but down on last year (however there are some anomalies in the accounts with regard to show files and wages and overheads). Needs some more work with Finance Team ahead of Finance Committee
 - Unio had a bad month due to opening over Christmas. There was also some overspend on consumables which highlighted some errors in processes for purchasing these. Therefore GP isn't where we thought it was
 - Retail has also had a bad month (£40k adjustment for stock) at the moment unclear of the reason but it might be because of deliveries being accepted twice accidentally. Therefore the previous GP reported, isn't accurate. Needs further investigation and may need help from an external stock taker.
 - Ratios up due to opening at Christmas with little custom.
 - Lettings are fine and reported accurately
 - Waterfront ticking along nicely; slightly behind of last year but more or less on budget.
- We're working with the Council and Estates to establish whether the Waterfront lease renewal should be recommended.
- We're also recruiting a new Coffee Shop Manager for Unio.

5. AOB:

Reviewing Officer Roles

- Liam asked for an update on the SOC roles review
- Jim: Not sure it has gone anywhere
- Chris: Josh was going to look at this after the Annual Student Survey analysis

- Connor: surely we can't amend the jobs now that we've opened nominations
- Jim: revisit after elections

Toilet Frames

- Jo asked if we could put some poster frames up on the back of toilet doors
- Jim: Toby will speak to Marketing and Business Development Team about putting A4 frames on the back of toilet doors

GSA Update

- Liam asked where the GSA negotiations had got to with the University
- Jim: the University should be sending out a statement of intent to interested parties. Jim will chase this.

Caucuses

- Liam: How are caucuses being actioned?
- Jim: from the find and fixes we need to make sure things are channelled in the right way i.e. through the complaints procedure or reporting to the appropriate officer and copying in relevant SMT.
- Also a discussion around how caucuses spend allocated budgets and the process by which the spend is signed off.

Talking to the media

- Jim: reminder to FTO's of the rules around speaking to the media. Refer media enquiries to Chloe first, and if Chloe isn't in or it's out of hours direct to Jim. Officers not to talk direct to the media

BME attendance stats

- Jim: had a request to look at the stats of attendance by BME students at our events.
- This is difficult and time consuming to do using the current cloud system. The website asks for self-disclosure, we only have data on who actually purchases the ticket, we don't measure how long people stay in the venue or how much they liked it and we only have data on club nights. The majority of UEA's BME students are in PG/Int courses. We know our club nights are predominantly attended by home UG students.
- We don't receive ethnicity data from UEA. Our self-collated data differs from that of UEA's profile.
- This is why we deliberately set up separate engagement strategies for PG/Int students and a separate PG bar.
- We get between 12.5 -14.5% BME attendance across the term whereas Home UG BME number is less than 10%. Therefore suggests the A-list is disproportionately diverse.
- Information for Damn Good hasn't been calculated yet.
- Liam: good discussion to have at SOC.
- Jim also presented some data around E&D figures for sport engagement

6. Staffing

- Closed session

Management Committee notes

23rd February 2016

1. Minutes, Apologies, Matters Arising

- No apologies
- Brief update on the progress of News|SU
- Brief update on future of GSA, it's going to next university council
- Toby to follow up on A4 clip frames action

2. Operational Updates

- Chris: go green week saw 400 students taking part in a variety of events, seemed to go well. Started to review and plan for next year. Planning a series of debates around the referendum.
- Toby: on a/l last week. Looking at external trustee recruitment. Investigating an issue with student staff recruitment emails, looking at forecasting for next 6 months.
- Connor: 2 heads of HUM schools about module changes. Meeting about induction. Usual working groups and committees. Interesting meeting with Jane Amos about training for advisors and also intercalation.
- Jim: prep for the board
- Yinbo: SPG, Chinese New Year Gala, prep for derby day and go global
- Jo: Opened a sexual health and contraceptive clinic in Kings Lynn. Open day to the Harbour Centre. Reclaim the Night. Working with medicine society to create a fair where students can sign up to donate things. Jo and DOS are creating an intercalating students working group.
- Liam: cost of living stuff and pricing in the shop as well as our funding model. Foodbank food drive and looking to launch a food cycle on campus using waste from the shop.

3. Key Relationship Updates

- Met with Executive Team of UEA, which went very well. Talked through segmentation and Quality Conversations.
- Connor: senate confirmed the university have found a way to borrow more money by taking out a bond. Money will be used to build a new science, technology, engineering and maths building.
- Jim: Sport Partnership Meeting didn't make any progress.

4. Social Enterprises Updates

- Toby presented January figures. General headlines are; bars up, unio down, ents (operationally) down, ents (overheads) up, retail had a good month compared to budget. Overall in January we're £15k behind budget, YTD £85k behind budget.
- Unio: more or less on budget. Doing some work on GP in comparison to other coffee shops. £23k behind budget on the year. In reality, this is year one for Unio as it is the first year operating as a sole entity.
- Retail: £31k behind budget for turnover, although year on year it's around 2% up. GP has been rectified from last month, currently still 3% behind budget. Need to bear this in mind for the forecasting of the next 6 months. Student staff costs are under budget.
- Bars: £107k above budget (approx. £50k is Scholars). GP is good, 1.1% better than last year. Student staff costs are under control. Permanent staff costs are higher, due to a mix up in the allocation of staff costs between bar/ents.
- Ents: got costs tightly under control. Door staff costs are definitely under control too. Some issues still around GP to be worked out now that staffing costs are under control.
- Applications for Coffee Shop Manager look promising.
- Charity managers have forecasted all of the budgets they're responsible for

- Still working on Waterfront
- Jim: steering discussion on estimates is due to go to Union Council a week on Thursday before the final estimations are delivered at final council of the year.

5. Caucus Minutes

- Liam: no immediate actions
- Jim: need to chase the actions from Union Council, which haven't come to management committee yet.
- Jim: presented Ethnic Minority participation stats to BME caucus which went down well.
- Chris/Toby: It seems that the caucus and assembly programmes seem to have made a difference to the number of candidates for relevant elected positions

6. Action points from Residential

- Two remaining red actions
- This is to come back again to the next meeting

7. Staffing

- Closed session

8. AOB

- Liam: we need to revisit the terms of reference for Management Committee once a year, which we haven't done. Jim to look into.
- Jo: can we have monthly reports from bars with regard to Never OK and safe taxi. Toby and Jo to set up.
- Yinbo: would like funding for international conference attendance – Jim to look at where the money can be budgeted
- Jim: RAIWP.com – free printing for students on campuses funded by adverts on the printing. Relatively low risk and expenditure. They will write into the contract that they will comply with our advertising policy. Agreed by all, providing controls are in place.

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 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