

**Union of UEA Students Purpose:**  
"To enrich the life of every UEA student"



## **Student Officer Committee Meeting**

5.00 pm, Thursday, 12 December 2013 in Room 0.13 Congregation Hall

Please note: the meeting will be followed at 6 pm by a joint meeting with the Trustees.

## **Agenda**

---

### **FORMAL AGENDA ITEMS**

- 1088 Minutes of the meeting held on 5 December** (See pages 2-8)
- 1089 Action Log** (See pages 9-10)
- 1090 Matters Arising**
- 1091 Elections**  
Election of DRO for the General Elections.
- 1092 Cops Off Campus**  
A funding request from F Meade (Non Portfolio Officer). (See page11)
- 1093 Allocation of Campaigns Budgets 2014-15**  
An advisory paper from the Chief Executive. (See page12)
- 1094 Emergency Motion: Revised FAQ" report to Council**  
A discussion topic from the Chair. (See pages 13-14)
- 1095 Management Committee Minutes**  
The minutes of the meeting held on 11 November. (See pages 15-17)
- 1096 Any Other Business**
- 1097 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting**

**Union of UEA Students Purpose:**  
"To enrich the life of every UEA student"



**Minutes of the Student Officer Committee**  
**5 December 2013**  
**Summary**

---

**Key Discussions**

- Guest Speakers at Union Council
- Reporting from Union Council Action Log Committee
- Implementation of Fair Treatment of UUEAS Staff policy
- Consultation on future Full Time Officer structure
- Management Committee Report to Council

**Key Actions**

- Individual Officers to be given £200 campaigns' budgets
- Improvement Plan to be widely circulated once publication approved by the Trustees
- Reporting template for individual Officers to Council agreed

**Union of UEA Students Purpose:**  
"To enrich the life of every UEA student"



**Minutes of the Student Officer Committee**  
**5 December 2013**

---

**Voting Members present:**

Louise Withers Green (Academic Officer), Rosie Rawle (Communications Officer), Kimberley Hirst-Jones (Postgraduate Officer), Ella Gilbert (Non Portfolio Officer), Eunice Opare-Addo (Ethnic Minorities Officer), Lauren Sloan (Ethical Issues Officer), Emma Silk (Environment Officer), Sebastian Bachelier (Non Portfolio Officer), Daniel Delargy (Students with Disabilities Officer), Freddie Meade (Non-Portfolio Officer), Tu An Ngo (International Officer), Holly Staynor (LGBT+ Officer), Trevor Killeen (Mature Students Officer) joined the meeting later.

**Non-voting Member**

Jim Dickinson (Chief Executive).

**Chair**

Joe Raynes (Non Portfolio Officer).

**In attendance:**

Tony Moore (Representation Support Worker)

**Apologies:**

Bintu Foday (Community and Student Rights Officer), Rachel Knott (Women's Officer), Joe Levell (Finance Officer).

**1075 Minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2013**

The minutes were agreed.

**1076 Action Log**

**Union Council Action Log:** L Sloan noted this item should have been part of the agenda papers; she asked Officers to update any of their actions on policy implementation.

**Local Mental Health Services/UCU Industrial Action:** R Rawle reported she had written the health service open letter and she had discovered a second, more comprehensive, existing policy on industrial actions. SOC agreed these items would be struck from the SOC Log.

**1077 Matters Arising**

There were none.

**1078 Elections**

In view of the absence of both DRO candidates; consideration of this item

was postponed.

### **1079 Guest Speakers at Union Council**

L Sloan noted, at the last meeting, a guest speaker had taken up 30 minutes and the meeting had not been able to consider all its agenda items. She proposed that guest speakers should, in future, be invited to an open meeting for all students which would be widely publicised rather than to Council.

T A Ngo believed that guest speakers at UUEAS should be better publicised

S Bachelier noted concerns as to the possible low turn-out at open meeting.

R Rawle noted she would, at SOC's suggestion, ask the Chair to consult Council on the matter.

#### **Action**

### **1080 Individual Officer Campaigns Budgets**

L Sloan noted her disagreement with the proposal not to bring funding requests to meetings; she also noted her concerns as to where any extra money, referred to in the proposal, would come from.

L Withers Green felt that it was an inappropriate use of SOC's time to examine individual funding requests for small amounts of money.

R Rawle argued that there was no structure to discuss other areas of UUEAS' finances at SOC and that the campaign budget was one area it had control of and that this should be retained.

L Withers Green noted these concerns but noted she believed SOC should be looking at the wider financial direction of UUEAS.

R Rawle believed a compromise would be to have small individual budgets alongside the general budget. She noted that there was a need for caution as the current year had been unusual with no big expenditure items such as coaches to national demos.

J Dickinson advised that the NUS divided campaigns budgets into guaranteed, negotiated and priority categories. SOC agreed J Dickinson would bring an advisory paper to a future meeting to inform future budget planning.

#### **Action**

T A Ngo suggested splitting the personal and general budgets 50/50.

E Gilbert suggested a personal budget allocation of £200 per capita.

L Sloan highlighted a problem: the Ethical Careers Fair had not been in her manifesto but she had been mandated by Council to implement policy and organising the Fair would take up all and more of her entire personal campaigns budget.

S Bachelier thought a solution to the problem would be that any spending on actions mandated by Council would come from the general budget and not the personal budgets.

SOC voted by 9 votes to 3 to T A Ngo's proposal that Officers would be given £200 personal campaigns budgets. Chair noted he would prepare a paper, detailing the changes, for the next meeting.

#### **Action**

## 1082 **Union Council Action Log**

R Rawle noted this was a live Google Document that Officers could access and update. Key reports were:

**Postgraduate work space:** K Hirst-Jones reported she had met with the Library concerning their plans for postgraduate workspace. She noted that the Library had plans to provide separate postgraduate study space and separate Ph.D. space as well as lockers and that the conversion work would take place in summer 2014.

**Students as partners:** L Withers Green reported she was submitting jointly with the University two HEFCE Catalyst funding bids and would be presenting a workshop on partnership at the University Teaching and Learning Day.

**Terms of Reference for SOC, Council and the Trustee:** J Dickinson advised that this would be the focus for the joint meeting between SOC and the Trustees.

R Rawle noted that there had been questions as to why another Committee was needed but noted the UCALC meeting took over an hour and a half and this would be impractical to integrate into SOC meetings.. She understood Officers might have concerns over the lack of ownership of UCALC's recommendations but noted any Officer was very welcome to attend the meetings or to set up a separate SOC committee. She felt the work of UCALC to be important and ground-breaking. SOC agreed to receive fortnightly updates from UCALC.

## 1083 **Policy 1442**

Chair noted that this was to be considered by SOC as to the mandated actions in Resolves 3 and the references to the mandated actions prescribed by the earlier Policy 1254.

R Rawle confirmed to the Chair that the Trustees had not, as yet, considered Policy 1442.

R Rawle felt that the PTOs had not been made fully aware of the FTOs strategy on the Block Grant. She noted the following key innovative strands in the lobbying strategy:

The formal cycle of meetings between the FTOs and the University's ET.  
A presentation to University Council.

A presentation to over 40 key University decision makers.

L Withers Green noted a key element of the strategy had been to present to the University a well-thought out plan for what a better-resourced UUEAS might achieve.

R Rawle argued that formulation for a future strategy should come from SOC as a body.

L Sloan noted the progress so far had been to get small grants for specific projects which had very little effect on students' lives. She felt UUEAS was content to acquiesce to requests from the University on issues such as 'Members Only' in the hope of an increase in the Block Grant which she believed the University had no intention of agreeing. She believed under the present strategy UUEAS would gradually lose its autonomy.

F Meade believed there had been very little consultation with Officers or the wider student body as to the formulation of strategy.

L Withers Green argued that it was important to maintain a relationship with the University that was based on partnership not confrontation. She

noted that this is why she had brought the Students as Partners Policy to Council.

L Sloan believed that very few members had understood this policy.

T Killeen noted that the decision by the University to spend £6 million upgrading Union House was more about appearances and maintaining the University's place in the THE table than real support for UUEAS.

E Gilbert argued for a two pronged approach: on some issues one had to work in partnership with the University whilst, on some, UUEAS had to demonstrate that it 'meant business' and could take a stand.

T Killeen believed the policy to be very clear: SOC must publish the lobbying strategy and then take action to increase the Block Grant. He believed that, at present, UUEAS should take steps to get its Own house in order and, in the meantime, ensure that the lobbying strategy was well publicised. He argued that the University would not pour money into an organisation that was bleeding money.

R Rawle noted that the University had intimated that there would be no hope of an increased grant until UUEAS had demonstrated improvements to its operations. She noted UUEAS Trustees believed that all options over the lobbying had been exhausted and that the requirements of Resolves 1 had been fulfilled. However, she believed, as a member of SOC, that there was a possibility that all options had not been exhausted.

T Killeen noted the importance of publicising the Block Grant figures so that the entire UUEAS membership knew how derisory the grant from the University actually was.

L Sloan believed that, in this instance, Council had set clear policy but that this had been twisted and policy implementation had not been brought to SOC for consideration.

F Meade agreed that UUEAS had to get its house in order but believed that decisions had to take place with accountability and through the democratic process.

T Killeen noted that full discussion on staffing matters was precluded by the Staff Protocol.

L Sloan noted that Council had already discussed the matter of making cuts to staff and had decided there should be no cuts; unfortunately, Council's wishes had been ignored.

T Killeen believed there was a link between efficiency and the Block Grant negotiations.

L Sloan argued that 'efficiency' was the key word and that Council had not taken the word to mean the necessity to sack people.

T Killeen argued that, essentially, Council had asked SOC to lobby for an increase in the Block Grant to subsidize UUEAS' inefficiencies; he believed this approach to be misguided. He noted that this did not mean he was in favour of redundancies; he would rather see staff deployed elsewhere in the organisation.

Chair believed SOC should look at another aspect to the question: who did students think was looking after their best interests in this matter: the University or UUEAS. He felt it would be hard for UUEAS to answer any charge by the University that it was not acting in its members' best interests when it continued to waste money in its commercial operations.

J Dickinson advised that it was important to remember that the FTOS had given full detailed reports on the Block Grant lobbying campaign to a

previous meeting of Council and that open, accountable processes had been followed.

T Killeen believed lessons should be learnt in terms of SOC's communications and organisation as failures in these areas had caused many problems. He noted this had been demonstrated by the rushed consultation exercise over the future of the FTO structure. He believed SOC should be far more pro-active in communicating with students and should be making the membership aware of the fact that the University would not supply UUEAS with members' emails.

Chair asked that the full comparator Block Grant charts and information be posted on the Blog and that a statement on the lobbying campaign should be posted on the SOC Facebook page for approval before being posted on the Blog.

R Rawle believed that Council really needed to see a plan for both the Block Grant and efficiencies and that the ideal vehicle for this would be the Improvement Plan that had been sent to the Trustees.

SOC agreed that the Improvement Plan would be circulated to Councillors once the Trustees had agreed to its publication.

#### **Action**

#### **1081 Full Time Officer Structure**

T Killeen believed that J Levell had taken on board the critique of the consultation in that SOC had had no opportunity to feed into the proposals for the new structure that had been sent out for consultation. He believed the consultation would have to be better planned and to would have to engage a wider number of students. He felt there would be no problem in putting back the election and calling the referendum at the meeting Council in January.

#### **1084 Reporting Template**

R Rawle drew attention to the proposed template which she believed to be reasonably clear and would aid transparency and reporting to Council.

SOC agreed to adopt the template and that the template would form the basis of reports to Council from the start of the next semester. SOC noted that the Reports would be presented to Council as an appendix to the main agenda.

#### **Action**

#### **1085 Management Committee Minutes**

L Sloan noted that she continued to be unhappy about the format of the minutes as SOC had been informed that they would be presented in far more detail. She noted that there was still no discussion included in the minutes and how decisions had been reached.

J Dickinson advised that for most of the items there had been no substantive discussions as these had taken place prior to the meeting.

J Dickinson noted he did not realise that SOC did not receive the Management agenda papers as these provided more context for the minutes. He noted that SOC would, in future, receive the agenda papers.

#### **1086 Any Other Business**

T Killeen reported that he had arranged the Mature Students' Forum for 28 January which would be an all-day event.

E Opare-Addo reported that Signature Ministries Society had wanted to organise a worship night but had been told by both the University and UUEAS that they could not hire rooms for this purpose.

T Killeen believed that this information was inaccurate and that there would be no problem as to the Society hiring one of UUEAS' private rooms. H Staynor noted she was organising the 'Big Pride Discussion Forum' which would take place the following week; she invited Officers to attend.

F Meade wondered what views Officers might have on the Management Committee Report that had been submitted to Council. He noted that in the Report the FTOs had concluded that the negotiating process had been exhausted. He noted that this was the first he had heard of this conclusion. He asked whether the report had been written by the Chief executive.

A Moore advised that he had received the report by email from the Chief Executive and, under time pressure to publish the Council agenda, he had assumed, mistakenly, that it was an advisory report to Council when, in fact, it was a report from the Full Time Officers.

L Sloan noted that R Rawle had disassociated herself from the Report. Chair noted that the MarComm Manager had asked that SOC be informed that the UUEAS Annual Survey would be starting the following Monday. Chair asked Officers to help in the promotion of the Survey. SOC agreed they would help to promote the Survey the following week. T Killeen asked that students taking the Survey should be encouraged to sign up for E-Rabbit.

**1087 Time, Date and Place**

T A Ngo suggested having 'bring a dish' refreshments at the following meeting.

SOC noted the joint meeting with the Trustees scheduled for 6 pm, and agreed to meet beforehand at 5 PM in a venue tbc.



### SOC ACTION LOG (POLICY/University)

Date Commissioned	Action Required	Status	Assigned To:	Date to be actioned by:
26 Sep 13	Discussions to be held with University over role of student representatives on academic appeals panels	☹ discussions to take place	Louise	End of Term
19 Sep 13/14 Nov 13	Ethical Banking	☹ new motion to be on Council agenda	Rosie	29 November

### SOC ACTION LOG (Internal Process)

Date Commissioned	Action Required	Status	Assigned To:	Date to be actioned by:
3 Oct 13	Chief Executive to include decision making matrix in November plan with terms of reference of Management and SOC	☹ to be incorporated into wider review of Management, SOC, Council and Trustees ☹ to be discussed at 12 Dec joint meeting of Trustees and SOC	Jim	20 Nov 13/12 Dec
10 Oct 13/14 Nov 13	Officers to have their campaign goals notes available to be collated into the overall strategy Outline goals and action plans to be completed.	Reporting Template agreed and to form basis of reports to Council	All	5 Dec
7 Nov 13	Separate volunteer and representative training budget to be included in next year's budget	☹ to be part of next year budget planning	Jim	2014
14 Nov 13	Ambiguity of referendums: how to ensure they do not contain a leading question when a whole policy is sent by Council to referendum to be investigated	☹ to be sent to Constitutional Review Group for investigation and report	Rosie	End of January
14 Nov 13	Cost of personal Campaign Cards for Officers to be investigated	☹ cost to be reported	Joe Levell	End of November
14 Nov 13	Personal Campaign Budgets to be allocated to each Officer	Officers allocated £200 personal budgets Chair to draft paper on changes to next meeting	Chair	5 Dec 12 Dec
5 Dec 13	R Rawle to consult with Chair of Council over guest speakers	Results to be reported to future meeting	Rosie	17 January
5 Dec 13	Advisory paper on allocation of campaign budgets to be drafted	Drafted and on SOC agenda	Jim	12 Dec
5 Dec 13	Detailed information on the Block Grant to be published, statement on lobbying page to be posted on SOC Facebook for approval Improvement Plan to be circulated	To be published and reported to future meeting Approval from Trustees to be sort for circulation	Rosie Jim	12 Dec 12 Dec

5 Dec 13	Management Committee agenda papers to be circulated to SOC	To be included in future SOC agendas	Jim/Tony	January
----------	--	--------------------------------------	----------	---------

## Cops off Campus

Hey SOC, I'd like to make a funding request from the union for students wishing to attend the "#copsoffcampus" demonstration on (called by National Campaign against fees and cuts) as a response to the increase in police brutality and to defend the right to protest.

"In the past week, police have violently evicted, beaten, and arrested students from peaceful occupations in London and sent undercover police officers to spy on students, arresting 3/4s of the union sabbatical team. They have attempted to recruit students to act as informers against fellow student activists in Cambridge, and attacked protests against outsourcing in Sussex. Across the country, managements are using injunctions and violence to suppress dissent; at Birmingham, students were threatened with £25,000 court costs."- from the event on facebook.

This is in accordance to motion 1183 'Defend the Right to Protest' (23 Feb 2012), and with Elliot Folan's indicative vote in Union Council last night to express solidarity to those defending their right to protest. I think students who wish to show solidarity/support should be covered ! We will head up by megabus, a return journey is £10 each, boris bikes once we're there are £2 each.

Per person: £12

Total: estimated around £120 (estimated 10 people)

Not sure whether this should come from the central pot/campaigns budget- thoughts? I'll email this to Tony as well, does anyone have any objections to this?"

## Allocation of Campaigns Budgets 2014-15

Paper to Student Officer Committee December 2013

**Purpose of Paper:** This paper outlines a proposed process for the allocation of campaigning budgets in 2014-15. It also recommends some categories for budget allocation and recommends a process for allocating a priority campaign "pot" in this period. It contains several outline recommendations for approval.

### Background

This year the SOC has had direct oversight and control of a campaigns budget of circa £10k. Student Officers have been required to apply into this pot in order to fund attendance at events and run projects and campaigns related to their role.

Separately there has been a training budget that has tended to cover training and other events, and when travel and other costs have exceeded expectations we have tended to dip into the central admin budget.

### Analysis

Issues with this system include:

- A lack of clarity about the boundaries between the training and campaigns budgets
- A sense that there should be some autonomy for student officers over some funding
- Many events are expected to be attended constitutionally or in role profiles but officers have to bid to secure funding
- There seems to be little planning
- The overall pot is arguably too small in this context and generally for a union of our type

### Proposal

It is therefore proposed to adopt the following system for 2014-15

- Retain the Officer Training Budget but base on a clear analysis of need and previous spend. Agree training plan at start of year.
- Create a Conferences and Events budget for **automatic** use by officers in attending role related events and conferences against agreed plan.
- Retain SOC fund and divide into two areas- projects and campaigns agreed by SOC in a plan at the start of the year, and an amount for ad hoc projects and campaigns arising out of policy mandates.
- Allocate a dedicated amount for Priority Campaigns, which will be allocated by the SOC based on an analysis of proposal arising out of manifestos and mandates at the end of the summer.
- Create a separate Liberation, Equality and Diversity budget for use on projects related to this area. Plan this spend at start of year.
- Seek to significantly increase the overall spend on these areas in 14/15.

## **Revised FAQ” report to Council**

Proposer: Freddie Meade (Non-portfolio officer)

Seconder: Ella Gilbert\_(Non-portfolio officer)

### **Union notes**

1. Byelaw 6.2 states that "Central to the resources of the Union are the employed staff who provide for continuity, long-term planning, professional advice, managerial expertise and day-to-day operation and implementation of policy."
2. Byelaw 6.6.4 states that the constitution shall "protect the Union from any interference in the conduct of its policymaking by employees"
3. Byelaw 6.8 states that "In order for the Union to remain truly student-led, staff are not allowed to be involved in the process of government."
4. Byelaw 6.10 states that "Staff are expected to provide professional advice to elected student representatives on any matters within their area of work but shall not seek in any other way to unduly influence the policy making process of the Union"
5. Contained within the agenda for the Union Council meeting of 5<sup>th</sup> December 2013 is a report from the Chief Executive regarding changes in the retail outlets. This comes after last Council where a policy was passed which resolved to halt the process of job losses until such time as proper consultation had occurred and the possibility of acquiring a higher block grant had been fully exhausted.
6. This report states that students have been consulted and one of the main pieces of evidence cited in support of this claim is policy 1395 b) 'Union Commercial Services' passed on 24th October 2013. This motion requires that the unions commercial services are "run efficiently, to a high standard, and generate a healthy surplus that can be ploughed back into the union".
7. A formalised block grant strategy has not been presented to Council for consideration.

### **Union believes**

1. The section of policy 1395 quoted in Notes 6 is used to reject the implications of a subsequent policy. If the two policies are, as is being suggested, mutually exclusive then a transparent interpretation of policy should take place. That interpretative process should be conducted by students through the Union's democratic structures.
2. The "improvement plan" developed by the Board of Trustees has not been communicated to students. Nor has Union Council or the wider membership had a chance to feed into its production.
3. Before Union Council is asked to accept a report stating the possibility of acquiring a higher block grant has been exhausted unless major changes take place, it is necessary to Councillors to be presented with a formalised block grant strategy for consideration.

### **Union resolves**

1. To reject the report and convey serious concerns about the process through which it was produced

2. To create an open sub-committee of Union Council tasked with the creation of a strategy for increasing the block grant which will then be presented to Council for consideration

**Union of UEA Students**  
**Management Committee MINUTES**  
**27/11/13**

Joe Levell: Chair Person (minutes, apologies, matters arising)

R: Would it be possible to see the unapproved minutes to enable SOC to see the minutes before hand and discuss this, due at present they could be facing a delay of up to 3 weeks? (Management meeting minutes currently approved after the meeting). Yes.

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

Minutes include 11/11 meeting and extraordinary 19/11 meeting

**SECTION A: UPDATES/REPORTS**

**2. Operational Updates**

Each manager and sabbatical officer should update on their area of work (60 seconds max each) (ALL)

- Fran: Meeting on Friday with the women who has been appointed for the retail consultancy, who have come back with a lot of facts and figures, should be coming back to us with more detail. Also (yesterday) we met with the interviewees selected for Commercial Director post.
- Lesley: Managing and producing accounts which will be discussed later, and reporting and returns and other statutory stuff that has to be done on a day to day basis.
- Paul: Surveying students for LCR's Tuesdays and Saturday, which we have received some really good feedback
- Rosie: Get your vote out campaign - Russell Brand video, 3 launches committees sub action log committee and sub constitutional action log committee and have been currently working through 9 amendments at present. RO for the Masters rep, Bintu has been working on this project. Met with Charles Clark, and the interviewees for Commercial Director Post.
- Jim: Successfully recruited a Commercial Director, formal announcement out later today confirming details of when they will start etc, feedback from staff have been helpful in making the final decision on the new member of staff, good field came down to two.
- Chloe: Sort out data to send to retail consultants, press release snow board national champion, sending and sorting stuff for the hive refurbishment over the Christmas period, helping Joe plan for the Roles review consultation, ethical approval for 1st attempt the consultation goes out on the 9th December until 17th January. Helping Bintu with elections, sorting out the lettings booklet, Friday will be working from home for comms planning etc.
- Louise: Organising courserep conference, with attendees of about 40, attending meetings, catching up on other things.
- Jo: Housing (Home Run): First viewings of potential lettings, someone from fire service, environmental, health. Emma is finalising for terms of cost etc, whether our requirements meet that of the landlords, or whether the landlords will require us to do something for their properties. Housing info week, been in the hive and tips and advice, presentation to about 40 students and ongoing this week with other presence around the university.
- Joe: Roles review, commercial stuff, UEA London on Friday.

**3. Key Relationship Updates**

Any contact with the University should be reported here with any issues or upcoming meetings considered (ALL)

- Conduct of the University – event on Thursday, presentation, believed to be received really well and positive

- University have sent a quote which confirms plan to invest in the building, and broadly will start next summer on the exterior and next instalment the following summer, announcement for concrete to carry this, if we can get them to carry it. Working group is now being set up to discuss with architects, build and design people.
- Will they be planning using a large proportion of the investment for cladding the outside of the building with wood.
- They are currently exploring options in terms of cost, the cheapest option is to just clean the concrete, alternative clean and paint it etc, other options including cladding, lighting, but lots of the barriers surrounding this will be the planning options that will be required for this which they are exploring at present.
- Various meetings have been held on the General Regs with Neil Ward, Annie, Rosie, Louise, etc looking at the some things that were implemented without discussion, so another meeting will be held to look at regs.
- Extend the exchange students, so correspondence with Amsterdam university as they are encouraging.
- Tunitin, is in discussion as they feel plagiarism is on the increase, so they feel that if students are provided the option they may be able to check work before submission.
- JSM agent advertiser with home run as there has been lots of complaints, given a timescale of 1 year to resolve this before they are not allowed to advertise.
- No longer a development outside the waterfront for student accommodation, but there is planning to build a 200 bed accommodation seen as a big problem and research suggests purpose build can be cheaper than that of council and normal street accommodation, Norwich city council are due to have a meeting but they have just approved without visiting other areas such as Nottingham or Leicester.
- NUS – services that have been affecting students, growing issues amongst welfare etc
- Stephen Donaldson- is looking at finance office and how things are run

#### **4. Trading Updates**

To consider verbal updates from shops, bars and ents on trading (TC)

- Shops- Full report later on trading figures, not achieving budget, profit is up £2500 a week as it stands at present, once shop is right we should get back on track.
- Gigs, showings are up, staff costs are heavily reduced, but good show all round.
- R: Should be an update on sections and reports for action logs, useful if there were a hyperlink to access this, although there is nothing to decide

### **SECTION B: KEY PROJECT REPORTS**

#### **5. MegaShop Development**

To receive an update on progress (TC)

- Nothing to report

#### **6. Catering Review**

To receive a verbal report (JD)

- Nothing to account at present

#### **7. Trading Figures/Management Accounts**

To receive a report (LH)

- 3 page summary of the union and commercial (this will be discussed further with the directors next week). Operational directors will too give their views next week.
- The union is good and on budget but principle things in savings ongoing redundancies and staff in the summer, we haven't spent on website and because we haven't done some

things this is why we have been on budget. SUS has been on budget, October in Ents was vibrant November has not so we should be back.

- Toby- now being commercial, whether his salary will be moved or into other departments etc in terms for the budgets, or communications etc
- New budget for the New Year will hopefully see everything in the right place.
- Bars, Ents doing well and outside promotions have helped to be up on budget in the end of October.
- Proposals and Issues
- Interim cover, what, when and broadly assumption some economies of scale and expertise out of the firm leading review on the function, rather than an interim finance manager, to keep down costs.

## **SECTION C: PROPOSALS & ISSUES (OPEN SESSION)**

### **8. Finance Review**

To consider a proposal re Finance Manager interim cover (JD)

- Approved

### **9. NUS Digital**

To consider a proposal re Union Web provision (CA)

- MSL and NUS digital and UEA will not talk to MSL on data sharing so that is currently a no go area and suggest we move forward with NUS digital as we expect to have something up and running by next autumn. Road map document, may suggest that we bring forward elections.
- We have two charges in the box office which we could possibly look into, with using NUS digital.
- NUS is on amazon is something we are now concerned, however large amounts now do not require data approval etc, so it's a bonus to have the data sharing however in the likely event where communications break down with the university the money has not been wasted.

### **10. Catering/Coffee**

To consider three proposals re the Coffee/Catering exercise agreed with the University

- 3 lots of people who believe they can carry out the work, it would suggest that voting is not being taken and no decision has been made by the university either, so suggested to postpone 2 weeks time. (Restrictions on selling food to students)