

1. To create positive change in matters relating to the education of UEA students
by effectively representing their collective views.



Minutes of the Student Officer Committee

8 November 2012

Summary

Key Discussions

- Desirability of NUS demo as exclusive focus for GOATing
- Issue of charities collecting in Union House
- Proposals on LCR Chill Out Room and Safe Room
- Implementation of the Emergency Resolution on funding away events for Societies
- Funding for attendance at affiliated organisations' events

Key Actions

- Proposal for Bill Wilson Room to be known as LCR Chill Out Room, that for Snooker Room to be known as Safe Room
- Coordination between coach companies to be requested, if more than one company hired
- GOATing briefing on by elections and NUS demo to be prepared
- Schedule of key times for shout-outs to be prepared
- Check on whether UUEAS staff need CRB checks for NUS demo
- Briefing on NUS demo preparations to be circulated to Officers
- Draft regulations on Charity Collections in Union House to be presented at next meeting
- Informal SOC group to meet and draft plan for Safe Room in Union House which will then be considered and any decision made will form part of the SOC Report to Council
- Deferral of any decision on the implementation of the Emergency Resolution on funding away events for Societies until figures, context and information are available
- Attendance Monitoring SOC Sub-Committee to be formed
- Self-definition of faith to be interpreted in widest sense in implementation of Faith on Campus Resolution
- Possibility of date of birth on campus cards to be investigated
- University Counseling Service funding to be investigated
- Earlier notification of and flexibility of timetable of Officer Training to be in Future Action Log

- Finance Officer to meet with Environment Officer and Ethical Issues Officer over actions to take on Green Impact
- Policy Lapse Review to be made available to Officers
- Verbal funding request to attend a Stop the War event refused but with proviso that it could be considered retrospectively at the next meeting, if submitted in writing
- People and Planet to be asked to submit a written funding request for attendance at a conference with the understanding that it can be considered retrospectively
- Skills Event to be publicised
- Officers' email addresses to be made available on the UUEAS website

1. To create positive change in matters relating to the education of UEA students
by effectively representing their collective views.



Minutes of the Student Officer Committee

8 November 2012

Voting Members present:

Jess Lewis (Non-Portfolio Officer), Bintu Foday (Non-Portfolio Officer), E Fallows (Non Portfolio Officer), A Forsyth (Non Portfolio Officer), Josh Bowker (Academic Officer), Sam Clark (Community and Student Rights Officer), Joe Levell (Finance Officer), Rosie Rawle (Ethical Issues Officer), Benjamin Brown (Environment Officer),

Non-Voting Members present:

Richard Laverick (LGBT Officer), T Killeen (Mature Students Officer), K Jenkins (Students with Disabilities Officer), T Gilder-Smith (Women's Officer), D Bowden (Chief Executive), A Heidemann Simonson (International Officer), John Taylor (Post Graduate Officer).

In attendance:

T Moore (Representation Support Worker).

Chair

Matthew Myles (Communications Officer).

741 Minutes of the meeting held on 25 October

The minutes of the 25 October meeting were agreed.

742 Action Log

SOC noted the completed actions. B Brown noted this was now in production, he was just awaiting a resolution image to include. On tweeting and videoing, Chair noted that it was an online petition not exhibition as logged and he would be tweeting this. On Black History Month tweets, he noted that the African Caribbean Society had not contacted him as to events. B Foday noted that the ACS had put on several events, including a debate on interracial marriage that she had attended.

Chair reported that he had not, as yet, heard back from Y Balboul on arranging an exit interview.

J Taylor noted that his briefing on PG issues was in preparation.

Chair noted, on GOATing, that the Chill Out Room, had not been GOATed. S Clark believed this should be left until after the National Demo. R Laverick noted the confusion born by the twin proposals for Chill Out Rooms.

SOC agreed that the proposal as to the Bill Wilson Room would be known as the LCR Chill Out Room and that for the Snooker Room as the Safe Room.

Action

J Levell reported that the liaison with Estates over gender neutral facilities would be a long term project and would be reported on when developments occurred. D Bowden advised that he had recently visited a school that had installed gender neutral toilets as an anti-bullying measure.

S Clark noted that the set down and pick up posts for coaches to the NUS National Demo had now been confirmed. J Bowker noted that only two coaches were available from the company that UUEAS had hired coaches from for previous demos. R Laverick asked that if UUEAS needed to hire an extra coach from another company that the two companies be asked to coordinate set down and pick up arrangements.

Action

Chair reported he had met with the Pro-VC concerning the consultation over faith on campus and he had also presented the findings of UUEAS' Faith Committee to the University which expressed concerns over the potential quality of the consultation and over the communication of any results of the consultation. Chair believed that the University were moving on this matter by investigating other institutions' approaches to faith matters and by agreeing to consider the appointment of an independent charity to look over the results and to provide recommendations.

S Clark reported that the Matthew Project had begun to use the facilities in Union House.

J Levell reported that a concept of provision of experiences rather than cash was at the development stage in the overall approach to the Loyalty Card Scheme and he would be organising some focus groups to explore this idea.

743 Matters Arising

R Laverick reported that the application for funding from the NUS to develop interfaith relations had been unsuccessful. He noted, however, that the NUS would be willing to provide some free resources and support.

Chair noted that there had been a statement that was minuted that there had been no training for Union Council reps. He asked that it be minuted that this was erroneous: a total of 35 reps had been trained during a series of well attended sessions.

744 Student Officer Action Plan Update

T Killeen reported he had Congregation Hall booked, provisionally, for

3 December for a Mature Students Forum. He had contacted DOS to try and ascertain whether there was a dedicated mailing list for mature students. He noted that, if he failed to obtain one, he would need some support from Officers to promote the Forum and communicate with a traditionally hard to reach group. He noted that he would be on placement in Suffolk for some time and he would keep SOC up to date and be contactable via Facebook.

J Taylor reported that the GSA was now funding every week until the end of March five different sports for PG students at Sportspark. SOC congratulated J Taylor on his success in organising this provision.

J Taylor reported that about 150 members had attended the Quiz Night which had included a round designed to raise awareness of the Tarsands issue. B Brown noted that had linked well with the signature collecting for the petition and consciousness raising on the issue.

745 Items for Tweeting and Items for Videoing

A Forsyth voiced her concern as she thought that tweets were not being sent as the last tweet displayed was very long out of date. Chair apologised and noted that the tweets were being sent but not displayed on what he characterised as the nightmarish website.

T Killeen – Mature Students Forum

J Taylor – PG Sportspark Events (five a side football, outdoor netball, indoor volleyball, squash and badminton)

J Bowker – Report on Exam Feedback campaign momentum

R Rawle – Questionnaire on what food students buy to help planning for the start-up of the Food Cooperative

E Fallows – would be making a promo video for the elections

Action

746 What We Have Been Doing Diaries

E Fallows asked what preparations had been made for the elections. Chair noted that he had been setting up the blog, organising DRO training and preparing nomination forms and working on the possible implementation of combined paper/online voting.

747 GOATing Topics

Chair suggested a focus on the NUS Demo.

A Simonson believed that concentrating almost exclusively on SOC's work on the demo might suggest to the membership that this was all that Officers were doing and that other parts of SOC's work should be reflected in the GOATing.

S Clark believed that although Officers GOATed on a central issue they were receptive to issues that students raised and that students learnt about the whole range of SOC's work through this interaction.

T Killeen noted the importance of the Chill Out Room but pointed out the importance of the imminent by election.

SOC agreed to Chair preparing a briefing on the by elections and the NUS Demo.

Action

748 Planning for NUS National Demo

J Bowker reported that he had finalised arrangements with NUCA and City College over coach sharing and jointly using City College's Facebook site.

S Clark noted that City College had arrangements in place to meet the legal requirements for taking under-18 year old students. He noted that personalised messages had been sent to Presidents of Clubs and Societies.

A Simonson raised the issue that some students might be disappointed if they attended hoping to draw attention to a particular issue but their message was lost in a generalised call for wider societal change. S Clark believed the march was not about individual campaigns or pieces of legislation but about uniting the student movement around wider political action.

A Simonson noted her worry that, with an umbrella organisation, smaller issues tended to be ignored and that there had been frustrations in the past, including those of international students at the lack of communication from the NUS.

B Brown suggested that a bloc comprising international students could be formed within the march.

Chair noted he would post a link to resources that each Officer would be able to use for their constituency for planning involvement in the march.

Action

Chair wondered if Officers would like to use shout-outs in the demo publicity.

SOC agreed that S Clark would distribute a schedule of key times when large groups of students would be gathered and individual Officers could then present the shout-outs at times to suit.

Action

S Clark noted, on the advice of D Bowden, that UUEAS staff would, after consultation with their line manager, be able to attend the demo in work time and that it would not count as annual leave. He noted that staff would be able to travel on the UUEAS coaches so long as there were places available.

SOC agreed that a check should be made as to whether UUEAS staff would require a CRB check as under-18s might be on the coaches.

Action

SOC agreed that there would be a placard and banner making session on 16 November for the demo.

T Killeen asked that a briefing on times for this and other parts of the demo preparations be circulated.

Action

749 Criteria for Placing of Charity Collection Boxes

Chair noted that, at present, there was no fixed policy on how to access which charities might place charity boxes in Union premises. He reported that, in the UFO, staff decided themselves as to which boxes to accept whilst the Hive did not allow any boxes, whatsoever.

He believed there should be some consistency. His draft plan would ask charities to make a request at Reception who would then ask the manager of the commercial outlet. The box could then be placed so long as there were enough space and the objects of the charity did not contravene UUEAS policy.

S Clark wondered whether this meant UUEAS would have no control over which boxes were to be placed.

Chair noted that if SOC wanted to put in place a process where it would consider each individual charity on its merits this could be done. However, he did not see many problems arising as UUEAS would be considering requests from registered charities.

R Laverick noted that he could envisage objections being raised, there was at present a controversy over the fundraising of Child Reach on campus as to how much of the funds actually reached the intended recipients.

J Taylor believed the matter would be self-regulating as if students did not put money in boxes, the charities concerned would not ask for space.

B Brown believed there should be a formula to vet the charities as there might be some that some groups of students might find offensive.

S Clark noted that the question of how long a box might be in place would have to be addressed.

T Killeen reported on the general topic of charity collection that he had been approached by charity collectors four times in an hour whilst sitting in the bar; he thought this to be unacceptable.

SOC agreed for the Chair to draft regulations on acceptable methods of charity collection in Union House that would include bucket collections and boxes; the draft to be presented to the next meeting.

Action

750 A Chill Out Room in Union House

R Laverick explained the proposals for the two concepts: an LCR Chill Out Room to be in the Bill Wilson Room and a Safe Room to be in the present Snooker Room. He believed the aim of the Safe Room provision would be to offer to members a safe space; he believed that this might appeal especially to liberations groups.

T Gilder-Smith asked that SOC be careful over the use of the phrase "safe room" as students might confuse this with the former Safe Room previously provided by the University but which had been withdrawn.

K Jenkins, proposing a Safe Room, argued that the Snooker Room was used infrequently and only catered for a maximum of four students at a time. She believed that this was at a time when students were missing on campus a place where they might eat, drink and chill out in a quieter space. She felt the Hive was too busy later in the day to fulfil this function.

R Laverick believed this would offer an ideal base for peer support groups.

J Lovell argued that the Snooker Room was used regularly by a core group and that there was a deep and widely felt interest by some members on this issue; so there should be an alternative space

provided for this group. However, he noted that he agreed in principle with the proposal. His ideal solution would be to create a mezzanine floor by demolishing the Snooker Room to create a highly visible space which would include the FTO's office and a coffee bar with comfortable furnishings.

K Jenkins believed that this would just replicate the Hive with the same ambience and noise levels.

J Taylor noted that he had been trying to obtain a non-alcoholic space for post-grad students as this was a need highlighted in every post-grad survey particularly in responses from international taught students and older research students. He believed that this facility should include IT presentation facilities and would not necessarily be exclusive to postgrad students. He asked that the needs of post grad students be considered in any changes to the building. He believed that an informal space for research students to share the results of their work across faculties would fulfil members' needs.

S Clark believed that the Library's I-Lab already went some way to providing this space.

J Taylor believed this would not provide a relaxed and informal social space. He noted that at present post grad students had only a small room in Union House to meet the needs for a social space of 20% of the student population.

R Laverick noted that there were no rooms dedicated to the needs of liberations groups and students with disabilities.

J Taylor agreed and noted that he did not believe post grad students were any more or less important than other student groups.

T Gilder-Smith argued SOC should first establish what kind of room was needed.

Chair agreed and asked SOC to consider firstly what kind of room was needed and secondly, in order, to make things happen whether SOC believed that the matter should be place before Council or whether SOC, itself, could make the decision.

T Killeen suggested that SOC would not be able to decide on this issue at the present meeting. He asked that the interested parties produce a proper plan which SOC could examine and then go on to decide on the best way forward to implementation.

SOC agreed that concerned Officers should meet as an informal group to decide on what kind of room was needed and to produce a plan for SOC to consider. J Levell agreed to contact Officers to arrange a meeting.

Action

J Taylor argued, as to whether SOC should take the plan to Council as a policy, that Council had the power to overturn a decision made by SOC as part of its role to scrutinise SOC's actions; so SOC should simply present its plans to Council.

SOC agreed that any proposals would be included in the SOC Report to Council and would not require a new policy proposal.

Action

Chair noted an Emergency Resolution had been passed to extend funding for accommodation at away events to Societies and to treat them in the same way as Clubs.

R Rawle stated that she had brought the resolution to redress a situation when many Societies could not send the members to key conferences which formed the focal point of their year.

J Levell asked why could these Societies not follow the standard procedure and submit a grant request.

R Rawle noted that, in her own Society, the number of members wishing to attend a conference far exceeded the grant that had been allocated.

R Laverick suggested that a new comprehensive policy which considered the various costings should be proposed to replace the Emergency Resolution.

J Taylor wondered if anyone had conducted any costing of the implications of the resolution, based on previous years, because he believed that these might be minimal and might not necessitate a new draft resolution.

J Levell believed that this was a new situation that one could not compare to previous years; now that all Societies had the right to send members to any conference, the cost implications could be immense.

A Gilder-Smith wondered whether the policy would cover the Cocktail Society, for example, going to an event.

A Simonson argued that every Society had been approved by Council and had the same legitimacy as any other Society. She believed therefore that all Societies should have equal rights and access to funding.

A Forsyth believed the policy should be reviewed as there would be a huge potential for abuse.

R Rawle noted she agreed with the above points and she believed that was a need to define "events".

J Levell believed that, with over 200 Clubs and Societies, the cost implications were extremely serious and he wondered where the money would come from to cover the commitment.

T Killeen noted he did not play sports and he believed members of Societies should have the same rights to funding of their activities as sports players.

J Levell noted that a proportion of the University Block Grant was given, specifically, to fund sports activities. He further noted that the money received from Sports Association Membership went directly to funding for sports.

T Killeen asked that SOC receive the detailed figures on funding and expenditure before any further decisions were made. He agreed that if the funding for Sports away events were found to be coming from SAM then this would change the nature of the debate.

J Levell agreed that Societies were hideously underfunded. However, at present, the funding was inevitably skewed by the SAM contribution which made up the shortfall in the University funding.

K Jenkins wondered whether there could be a tier system with low risk sports paying lower SAM fees than high risk sports.

Chair believed that a tier system could be introduced but he would

not want it based on risk criteria.

S Clark argued that charging more for only high risk sports would mean that only rich kids would be able to participate in these.

A Forsyth noted that the original policy amended by the Emergency Resolution had been specific to BUCS and BUCS events played a huge part in University sport. She understood the fairness argument but thought that any future policy should incorporate the specific link to BUCS.

S Clark stressed that SAM paid for not only insurance but the whole infrastructure that enabled Clubs to function.

R Rawle believed UUEAS should campaign for the University to subsidise the cost of SAM.

J Levell believed that any subsidy of SAM should form part of the general conversation with the University as to an increase in the Block Grant.

R Laverick believed that in implementing the Emergency Resolution, SOC would have to check whether a Society had attendance at events as part of their Constitution.

A Simonson argued that for many Societies social events were a crucial part of their activities and SOC would have to accept this.

D Bowden advised that SOC should review the established policy as to what it precisely covered as to costs and where the funding came from and why it was constituted in the way it had been and then debate how it might be improved or made fairer and then proceed to analyse the financial implications. He noted the importance of establishing the context.

SOC agreed to defer any decision as to the implementation of the Emergency Resolution until figures, context and further information were available.

Action

S Clark noted the new Attendance Monitoring policy allowed Officers to support attendance monitoring when it was used to support pastoral care but not when it was employed to impose punitive measures on students. He noted the new policy would give him flexibility in working with the University. He noted that recent discussions he had taken part in at Senate had revealed how ill prepared the University were in using attendance monitoring to provide support for students experiencing difficulties.

J Taylor congratulated S Clark on his telling contribution to the debate at Senate.

T Killen noted the discrepancy across Schools in attendance monitoring and argued that the quality of teaching in sessions that students were required to attend should be addressed.

J Taylor noted that CMP had used attendance monitoring to identify modules which were problematic and had retrained lectures teaching in those modules and this had led to a dramatic increase in teaching quality.

SOC agreed to a suggestion from J Bowker that an Attendance Monitoring Sub-Committee be formed to put together a concrete set of proposals to take to the University. Chair asked Officers to express

their interest via Facebook.

Action

On the We Are Norwich policy, J Bowker noted that he would be speaking at the anti-English Defence League rally. SOC noted that, as the policy affiliated UUEAS to We Are Norwich, J Bowker could speak in both a personal and official capacity.

Chair noted that the Faith on Campus policy committed UUEAS to supporting some kind of provision for faith on campus.

A Simonson wondered whether the insertion of "self-defining" into the policy might raise problems: for example, if a group of adherents of Scientology asked for facilities. She wondered whether UUEAS would set any limits within the policy.

SOC agreed that self-definition should be interpreted in its widest sense: if just one individual self-defined as having their own religious faith and asked for facilities then the policy bound UUEAS to support them.

Action

R Laverick noted that in the LGBT Report there was a commitment to support Out on Campus. He noted that Out on Campus was no longer viable in the form envisaged and he, therefore, proposed to have it as a monthly supplement in Concrete. He noted that Concrete had agreed to this and it did not have any funding implications and that he would be reporting the change to the next meeting of Council.

On reports from Representatives and the issue of date of birth on campus cards, S Clark reported that he had had discussions with DOS and a possible survey of students' views on the matter had been mooted. He noted that he would pursue the matter with the University. J Lewis suggested that students might be given the option of having a date of birth included when they applied for their campus cards. SOC agreed that S Clark and J Levell would investigate further. SOC noted the report that drew Council's attention to the University room bookings policy which limited each Society to the use of a lecture theatre only once a term. SOC agreed that J Levell would investigate further.

Action

SOC noted the report that drew Council's attention to shortage of funding that was impacting on the University counselling service. SOC agreed that S Clark and K Jenkins would investigate further and lobby the University.

Action

752 Training for SOC and Union Council

T Killeen noted that several Officers had not been able to attend residential training and had, therefore, not received any training. He noted that there had been some sort of attempt during the last week to redress the situation but he believed it, still, to be a matter of

concern. He believed plans should be put in place to prevent this situation arising in the future and this could be integrated with the plan to have a pre-meeting of Council. He noted that it was particularly difficult for FMH students to attend training and that the training schedule should be more flexible to reflect this: with training being offered at the weekend, for example.

SOC agreed that earlier notification and flexibility of timetables for training would, alongside the organisation of a pre-meeting of Council, be entered into the Future Action Log, for next year.

Action

753 Campaign Sub-Committee Updates

J Levell noted that he would be putting T Gilder-Smith in touch with the NUS Women's Officer concerning a future visit to UEA.

R Rawle reported that People and Planet would be planning an action on campus to raise awareness of some of NatWest's activities and she wondered what UUEAS' position would be on this.

J Lewis noted that there should be no problem about a peaceful protest.

J Levell reported he had been working on the KPIs for UUEAS' Green Impact and he would propose that he establish a Green Impact Sub-Committee of SOC, open to all interested Officers.

R Rawle noted her concerns over the burgeoning number of groups on green issues. J Levell noted he would arrange to meet with B Brown and R Rawle to discuss the actions to be taken on UUEAS' Green Impact.

Action

T Moore advised that, with policy lapse, due to be considered by Council, now would be an opportune time for Officers to consider any policies relevant to their concerns or portfolios.

Chair noted he would place a Policy Lapse Review on the SOC Facebook page.

Action

754 Budget and Spending Update

J Taylor asked if the rise in the cost of NUS affiliation had been queried.

J Levell noted that the Finance Manager was currently investigating this matter.

755 Conference Expenses

Chair noted that if individual Officers had particular questions about past expenditure on conferences they should take these directly to the Membership Services Manager or the Finance Manager.

756 Management Committee Minutes

SOC received the minutes without comment.

757 Any Other Business

J Levell reported that he had been contacted by C Corkery concerning a Stop the War Coalition event in London, Media and

War: Challenging the Consensus. He noted that the event would be free but that C Corkery had requested funding for transport for UUEAS members to attend as it was an event put on by an affiliate organisation to UUEAS. J Levell noted that the request had been made the week earlier but the SOC meeting had been postponed. J Levell proposed that SOC should approve the request, decide how many members might attend and ensure applications were open to all UUEAS members.

Chair noted it was good practice for all funding requests to be made in writing. J Levell apologised for his oversight and noted that he had made the verbal request as the event was due to take place before the next meeting of SOC. He noted that the requested money would come from the Campaigns Budget as it should be deemed that Stop the War was a campaign by an affiliated organisation.

R Laverick suggested that a limit of two members be sent.

A Forsyth noted her concern that approval of the request would set a precedent that SOC would then have to grant approval for funding attendance at any event held by an affiliated organisation.

J Levell noted that money had been allocated to People and Planet for attendance at their conference last year; so a precedent had been set.

Chair noted that SOC had concluded that this decision had been made in error and that this funding would not be repeated in the future as SOC had not put a limit on the number of members who could be funded to attend.

B Brown noted that there would be a London Climate Change demo in December and he wondered as to SOC's position on promotion and funding for attendance at this event.

J Lewis believed that this would be different to the Stop the War event as UUEAS was affiliated to a campaigning body and, therefore, part of the campaign.

R Rawle noted that UUEAS was affiliated to a number of organisations that had commitments to campaign on environmental issues.

J Bowker noted that, as part of the Fees and Cuts Campaign, members had attended the Festival of Dangerous Ideas and UUEAS had funded transport by minibus.

S Clark believed that setting a limit on numbers was not a solution as there would be so many events of affiliated organisations that SOC would be bound to agree to, if a precedent were set.

J Taylor believed that, if UUEAS had the money, it would be wonderful to send members to any affiliated event. However, this was not the case, he argued that SOC should set criteria for funding and this should not be based on precedent. He believed SOC should either consider each individual case on its merits or should set a cap on the overall funding available. He noted he would prefer the latter option.

J Lewis argued that what was the point of being affiliated to an organisation if UUEAS did not take actions that were based on that affiliation; she believed this would just be tokenism. She noted that Stop the War were a Society and wondered whether they could have obtained funding as a Society.

J Levell noted that this was possible but the Society would need to

submit a request by noon the following day.

J Taylor noted that Stop the War could undertake their own fundraising for the event but, he believed, the financial burden should not rest on UUEAS.

Chair argued that the reason UUEAS democratically approved affiliation with Stop the War was that it approved of their campaign. T Gilder-Smith noted that because of financial constraints UUEAS were limiting Officers attendance at outside events and that there had to be some limit on the events that UUEAS funded members to attend. R Laverick suggested that Stop the War members might be funded to travel by Megabus and that they be asked to bring back a report about the event to justify the expenditure and to feed into future UUEAS campaigns.

J Levell asked how the funding had been approved for People and Planet attendance at their conference the previous year. R Rawle noted she had taken her request to the previous Finance Officer who had approved based on the precedent of attendance at previous years' conferences. She noted she had laid out the money herself and it had taken five months for UUEAS to reimburse her.

B Brown argued that, even if People and Planet were denied campaign funding to attend their conference, he and R Rawle should be funded, in their capacity as Officers, to attend.

J Bowker suggested that in future as part of a funding request there should be a short statement of what benefits to UUEAS attendance at the event would bring so that SOC would have some criteria to base a decision upon and that they, after attendance, submit a report.

Chair noted that the discussion had become intertwined between consideration of attendance at the Stop the War event and the People and Planet Conference. He, therefore, suggested that SOC decide on the number of members to be sent to each.

J Taylor believed that the default position for considering a funding request for attendance at an affiliated event should be no, unless a compelling case was made.

SOC proceeded to examine the Stop the War website for information about the event under discussion. T Moore advised that this was the second meeting in a row where items had been examined on the internet and had not been included in the agenda papers. He advised that this was a worrying development as this information would not be available to Council or UUEAS members when they reviewed the proceedings of SOC.

Chair noted the advice and proposed, because of the time constraints, that SOC should consider the proposals for attendance at both the Stop the War and the People and Planet events at the next meeting when more information would be included on the agenda. However, he noted the time constraints involved and suggested that there would be a proviso that retroactive funding could be approved at the next meeting.

S Clark proposed that SOC agree to fund two places for attendance at each event and that it should be made clear that, in future, SOC would only consider funding requests that were accompanied by a written submission on the reasons for attendance and the benefits

attendance would bring to UUEAS. He voiced his concerns that SOC were leaning toward giving special treatment to C Corkery's request because they knew him and respected his work as an activist. J Taylor submitted that SOC draft a clear policy to guide consideration of the relationship with affiliated organisations. SOC requested D Bowden's advice. He advised that there should have been a written request but because of the circumstances of this particular case, SOC could consider a retrospective funding request. J Levell apologised, once more, to SOC that he had not requested a written funding proposal from C Corkery. Chair noted that the process for making funding requests for campaigns be made clear to Council at its next meeting and that the template for funding requests would be made available to Councillors.

Action

Chair proposed to move to a vote on whether to approve the verbal funding request for transport for two UUEAS members to attend the Stop the War event. SOC voted by 2 votes for, 3 votes against with 2 abstentions to not approve the funding request. On the advice of D Bowden, SOC agreed that a retrospective funding request should be considered if submitted.

Action

SOC proceeded to request that People and Planet be asked to submit a written funding request to the next meeting with a proviso that their funding request be considered retrospectively.

Action

J Taylor noted that he could not discern any difference between this request and the request from Stop the War that SOC had just voted to refuse. SOC agreed to J Bowker's request that it be publically made clear to UUEAS members that retrospective funding requests would not be considered in future. Chair noted that this would be published on the blog, the next day.

Action

R Rawle asked that the Skills Share event, the following Wednesday, be publicised.

Action

J Taylor noted that there was no list of Officers' email addresses currently on the UUEAS website. Chair noted that this would be rectified and a list be posted.

Action

758 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting

SOC agreed to consult over the best day and time for the next

meeting to be held and noted that T Killeen would be working away on placement