

Union of UEA Students Mission 2009-13

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

30 May 2013

Summary

Key Discussions

- Relationship between UUEAS and the University
- UUEAS app

Key Actions

- Funding request to send two delegates to the National Coalition Against Fees and Cuts conference agreed

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

30 May 2013

Voting Members present:

Daniel Delargy (Students with Disabilities Officer), Joe Raynes (Non Portfolio Officer), Rachel Knott (Women's Officer), Sam Clark (Community and Student Rights Officer), Joe Levell (Finance Officer), Eunice Opere-Addo (Ethnic Minorities Officer), Lauren Sloan (Ethical Issues Officer), Freddie Meade (Non-Portfolio Officer), Sebastian Bachelier (Non Portfolio Officer).

Chair

Matthew Myles (Communications Officer), initially, and Tu An Ngo (International Officer), for the latter part of meeting.

In attendance:

Tony Moore (Representation Support Worker), Lisa Williams (Assistant Registrar), Prof Nigel Norris (Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Academic).

Apologies:

Kimberley Hirst-Jones (Postgraduate Officer), Holly Staynor (LGBT+ Officer), Emma Silk (Environment Officer), Ella Gilbert (Non Portfolio Officer), Josh Bowker (Academic Officer), Trevor Killeen (Mature Students Officer).

969 Pro-Vice Chancellor Academic

Chair (M Myles) introduced Lisa Williams and Prof Norris to SOC and noted the purpose of their visit to SOC would be to examine the relationship between the University and UUEAS and to discuss how the relationship might develop.

Prof Norris noted that, like the Officers, he had, himself, been an undergraduate at UEA and, thus, a member of UUEAS; he had during his time as a student worked on the student newspaper. He reported that he and Lisa Williams had recently toured Union House and this had brought back many memories of his time as a UUEAS member. He noted this was his second time in the PVC role and it was a real pleasure to be working, again, with UUEAS. He believed his experience

of UUEAS had been a thoroughly positive one. He noted, however, that it would be fair to say that, for a number of years, the University and UUEAS had not enjoyed the best of relationships and that the easy communication with UUEAS that he had enjoyed, this year, had not been characteristic of the way in which the University and UUEAS had related to each other in the past. He believed that the nature of the relationship, he had just described, had been confirmed in his discussions with the present Officer team in their reflections on how the relationship had been described to them when they took office. He believed that this position had not been a good one for either the University, UUEAS or for UEA students. Prof Norris believed it would be useful for Officers if he outlined the context within which the University was currently operating and some of the goals to which the University was working in a challenging political environment. He believed the Officers would be well aware of the present political challenges and the fact that the UK Government had substantially withdrawn from the funding of university teaching. He noted that the Government, also, did not have any significant plans for the funding of capital developments in universities. He noted that this situation meant that the University had had to make long term provision for the development of the teaching and research estate and, in order to achieve this; the University had developed a capital plan for funding over the future five or more years. He noted that the plan committed the University to fund new buildings for teaching, teaching and research and for teaching and enterprise; as well as the refurbishment of teaching space and, wherever possible, laboratory space. He believed these would be of direct benefit to all students. He noted there was, also, a major space re-engineering project situated in the Street and that this project would provide UUEAS with a space for extended commercial activity. He noted this project was important to the University for two key reasons: to improve the appearance of the Street, he hoped this would be on the same scale of improvement as was achieved by the refurbishment of the Square, and to provide scope for commercial activity which would earn income for UUEAS. He noted that the investment by the University, in the latter, would be around half a million pounds. Prof Norris noted that in order to fund the above developments the University was committed to borrowing significant sums of money and needed to generate a substantial surplus in order to fund its borrowing. He noted this had meant that the current year had been an exceedingly tough one for non-academic departments when they had made bids for University funding for increases in their budgets. He noted that UUEAS, along with departments such as IT, the Library and Estates had failed to gain additional funding. He noted that he had attended the Full Time Officers' presentation of UUEAS' bid and it had been of good quality and had been presented with conviction. However, he noted it had not made the top of the priority list which comprised bids that were deemed to be absolutely business essential. Prof Norris noted that the Full Time Officers (FTOs) had been extremely disappointed and that he understood their disappointment. He noted

that he had informed the FTOs that this was not the end of the matter and that, as a member of the University's Executive Team (ET), he would work with UUEAS to achieve a more sustainable, stable and more realistic financial model for the future and this might well include the University providing more financial support. He noted that the form in which that support came would need to be decided upon and then presented to the Executive Team and, if it involved additional expenditure, would need to be approved by University Council. He believed it was necessary, as part of this process, that the University developed a more productive and collaborative relationship with UUEAS and for UUEAS to do the same with the University. He believed it important in this process for UUEAS to build on its strengths, the activities it undertook especially well, such as the advancement of education and the student experience at UEA. In this context, he noted the achievement of number one in the Times Higher Education survey reflected in very positive ways on UUEAS' activities and its contribution to the University. He reflected, however, that being number one meant there was only one direction of travel. However, he noted that a leading position was something that the University would wish to sustain, if not in the Times Higher, then in the National Student Survey or other similar assessments and it would seek to gain further accolades. He believed that, in this field, UUEAS had an important role to play and that it was important that he and UUEAS worked to articulate that role so that it worked productively with the rest of the University.

He confirmed to Officers that his position as PVC was an interim one and that his successor would be Prof Neil Ward, Dean of Social Sciences but that he would continue in his post until a successor had been found for Prof Ward as Dean of SSF. He stressed that, as long as he remained in post, he would regard his work with UUEAS on the articulation of its role as a significant and major project and he would hand this on to his successor whilst Lisa Williams would ensure there would be continuity during the transition. He hoped that in this way UUEAS would maintain its successes and build upon them.

Prof Norris noted he would welcome any questions from Officers.

Chair (M Myles) wondered, other than an increase to the Block Grant, what other options Prof Norris would envisage for the University further supporting UUEAS; in terms of UUEAS being able to maintain its activities and to grow as an organisation.

Prof Norris believed that the principle area around growth would be for the University to help UUEAS develop sustainable commercial activities. He noted that, for decades, UUEAS had been primarily known for its provision of the best university live entertainments in the region. He further noted that, during this time, UUEAS had made its money from alcohol sales which provided a consistent revenue stream that meant that UUEAS could, effectively, ignore the University. He noted that this model was no longer sustainable. He believed that that one should conclude that having strong commercial activities

would give UUEAS independence and a stable financial base whilst providing important services to the student community, as well as the wider University community, on campus. He noted that this formed the reasoning behind the University's funding of UUEAS' commercial expansion in the Street.

On his tour of Union House, he had noted the need for refurbishment and he did not know the extent of support the University would be able to provide but this would be an area that would be worth exploring as this might help UUEAS to provide better, more pleasant services.

He noted his interest in looking at options for 'categorical funding': funding that was earmarked for very specific projects. He thought it possible that some discussion might be had around start-up funding for projects that would need initial funding but which would go on to fund themselves. He noted his willingness to consider proposals that had a clear and positive contribution to both the quality of the wider student experience and admissions and recruitment.

J Raynes believed the above statement to be all well and good but noted his worries concerning what he believed would be the damage to admissions if the University continued down its present path and, consequently, UUEAS was unable to continue with its present level of activities.

Prof Norris noted that this was, in part, why he had agreed to work with UUEAS to build a stable, sustainable and realistic financial model and that the present task was to work out what this might look like.

J Raynes noted that he had another issue: that of ring-fenced funding and, in particular, when it came with conditions attached. He noted that extra money for the refurbishment of premises had been offered by the University but had come with the proviso that the bars be made student only. He believed it was difficult for offers of money to be well received when an agenda was pushed alongside the offers.

Prof Norris believed it fair to say that he had explored with the FTOs, at some length, the link with the student only bar issue and that he had confirmed he would listen to all practical and financial concerns that UUEAS might have in further discussions. He noted he had heard from the FTOs some very compelling arguments, including financial ones, as to the impracticability of, swiftly, implementing the student only bar proposal. However, he noted his concerns about student safety, the security of students on campus and reputational damage to the University; if what was, by and large, a very peaceful campus was not, in future, perceived to be so by the wider community.

He noted that £40,000 had been secured in extra money and this had, originally, come with rather stringent requirements which, after discussions with the FTOs, the University had realised could not be met in a straightforward way. He noted that the University had listened and the money had been released; whilst UUEAS had agreed to address the University's concerns around student safety, around having

student only club nights and, in principle, to the consideration of the implications of a student only bar. He noted that he was satisfied that UUEAS was taking the issue of student safety seriously and, therefore, the way forward would be for UUEAS and the University to hold open discussions to resolve this matter. He noted his certainty that his concerns over student safety were, indeed, warranted but he had come to realise that there were other ways of addressing the issue. He noted that undesirable people could get extremely intoxicated and visit campus and that he was very concerned to reduce the risks to students in general and the provision of a safe place for students to drink and party was an important part of this.

Chair (M Myles) believed there might be a problem in the offering of ring-fenced projects, which the University had decided upon, as this might make it difficult for UUEAS and its members to democratically set the agenda for and the direction of the organisation. He believed this might lead to UUEAS only being able, in future, to undertake activities that the University wanted it to undertake.

Prof Norris noted he was not proposing that the Block Grant in general should be treated in this way. He noted that the University's investment in the Street would give UUEAS the ability to raise income from commercial activities and this income would be under UUEAS' control. However, he believed there would be projects that both the University and UUEAS would agree would be in the interests of the University and students at large that UUEAS could help to undertake and which the University would provide the support for. He assured SOC that these were not matters that the University would determine for UUEAS but which would be determined jointly between UUEAS and the University and he believed this approach to be definitive of a partnership. He noted for example that UUEAS might bring a proposal to the University and the University might respond that it was not remotely interested and UUEAS might respond in the same way to a proposal from the University; there was no compulsion involved. He noted that, if one looked at the situation realistically, beyond the funding of UUEAS' commercial activity which would, hopefully, generate income for UUEAS, any significant additional sums of money would need to be argued for in relation to very specific projects.

J Raynes believed he was not challenging the University's good faith but that it was not inconceivable that there would be an element of compulsion introduced by the University.

Prof Norris agreed that it was not inconceivable but he noted that all student unions were dependent on their Block Grants and, essentially the University gave the Block Grant and could take it away; this was a brute fact of life. He noted the help that having their own commercial operations gave to student unions as this gave them a degree of independence. He believed it would not be in the University's interest to use compulsion or to take away the Block Grant. He thought it just conceivable that the relationship between the University and the

student union would deteriorate to such a degree that the University would withdraw the Block Grant but he believed it to be an extremely remote possibility.

F Meade noted, with regard to the Block Grant, that the University's contribution was far below that given by other top twenty ranking universities to their student unions and that this forced UUEAS to depend on commercial activities and, he believed, this meant UUEAS had to create a surplus from money spent by students on what, one might argue, were expensive services.

Prof Norris believed F Meade was welcome to construe the situation in those terms.

F Meade reiterated his belief that UUEAS was forced into making money from its members rather than providing activities and support for them. He believed the role of UUEAS had become to provide an entertainment hub rather than acting as a body that would defend students against fee rises and cuts to services. He believed that UUEAS was stuck in a situation where there was not a real partnership with the University as the relationship was imbalanced with one side having the power. Given this situation, he wondered what gains UUEAS would make by not being antagonistic in its relations with the University; what concrete gains would be made by maintaining a cordial relationship.

Prof Norris believed two of the things gained were: the capacity to properly represent students across the University and having a voice that was listened to. He noted, as an example of these that UUEAS, for a number of years, had consistently asked for feedback to students on examinations and UUEAS had demonstrated that there was widespread support amongst students for better assessment feedback. He noted the University had responded directly to this call. He saw this as an example that demonstrated that when UUEAS represented a widespread view on an issue concerning teaching and learning and when it was possible to do so, given any practical limitations, the University would respond. He believed that UUEAS, at its best, did this kind of thing very well. However, he believed that, if UUEAS did not enjoy a reasonable relationship with the University and if channels of communication were not open and trusted, it would be very difficult for UUEAS to represent the ordinary, everyday interests of students around the quality of teaching and learning and the student experience.

He believed that everyone at the table had an interest in the University being a high quality, well-funded institution and that this interest also extended to future and past students; in the case of the latter, this was because the place where one got one's degree had become increasingly important and would continue to be so. He urged caution as, had happened also in the past, students grievances, which actually were with the Government, were expressed vehemently against the institution that students happened to be registered with. He believed that this did not do much good to

the institution or for students, in general. In his view, if one had a political issue, one should take it up with the Government as it was Government that had raised tuition fees not universities.

TA Ngo wondered if the above advice applied to international students.

Prof Norris thought that it did as it had been a previous Government that had decided that there could no longer be any difference between full cost and the fee charged to international students.

J Raynes argued it was up to universities to shape their response to Government decisions.

Prof Norris agreed but noted that their response was shaped in a highly competitive environment in a very difficult economic climate which imposed serious constraints. He believed it impossible for a single institution to determine its own future because of the forces to which it was exposed to, one of which was internationalisation.

TA Ngo noted, from an international student perspective, that international students paid a lot of money to come to study at UEA. She understood why they had to pay more than home students but not the amount they presently had to pay. She noted that, to some extent, UUEAS was dependent on the revenues from the bars and entertainments but that international students, mostly, did not use the bars, the Waterfront or go to LCRs. She felt, in view of this, that it was unfair that international students had to spend so much money to obtain a degree at UEA. She believed UUEAS should provide activities, such as Go Global, and to help Societies that catered for international students; she failed to see how UUEAS could do this when, as at present, it did not have enough money. She noted she had just met with the International Advisory Team and that the team was quite small and spent 70% of its time on helping with visa applications when it might, if it had more resources, be helping international students with activities, with learning support, advice on volunteering and help on living in the UK. She wondered how Prof Norris would address the issue that UUEAS did not have enough money to support international students to have a good student experience when, at the same time, they had to pay such high fees to come to the University.

Chair (M Myles) noted the above situation was the precise reason why the funding for a Diversity and Inclusivity Co-ordinator had formed part of UUEAS' bid.

Prof Norris believed that TA Ngo had outlined an excellent argument and he asked that she capture it on paper and advance it. He advised not to categorise this as Diversity and Inclusivity as he believed it was not under that remit: it was simply support for international students and the argument behind it was that they brought a lot of money to the University.

He found TA Ngo's observations, about the time spent on visa applications, interesting and he believed it illustrated his earlier observation of an institution being shaped by external forces. He noted were it up to the University, they would be advising the Government to, as the present Vice-Chancellor had done on many occasions, remove students from migration tiers and that the UK should have a more rational approach to this problem. However, he noted that the University was stuck with a Government policy that put British universities at a disadvantage in the international market and which made international students' lives more difficult than they should be. He thought these constraints had meant that the University had to spend so much time on visas when it could be using this time to better support students and enhance their learning and student experience.

He noted that the Dean of Students had been asking for more social space for international students that would be agreeable and not dominated by the provision of alcohol and, he believed, that this was a subject worthy of further consideration.

L Williams noted that the Registrar had indicated that he was eager for proposals to be brought forward on this issue as it was one that the University would like UUEAS to pursue, especially with regard to activities and events for international students that did not involve alcohol.

S Clark noted that, over the summer, UUEAS would be holding social events every Thursday to target INTO, postgraduate and other students whose course of studies were not based around the standard academic year.

Prof Norris noted that the University had asked for an account of these activities from UUEAS. He noted that one of his aims was to make the wider community more aware of the things that UUEAS did that both students and the University took for granted; so that everyone might get a clearer sense of the contribution that UUEAS made to student life in general. He noted that, often in summer, the campus seemed like a ghost town despite the fact that there will still many students studying and the activities that UUEAS would be providing for them were an excellent example of the contribution that UUEAS could make.

Chair (M Myles) noted that F Meade had raised the question of what kind of relationship UUEAS had and what relationship it wanted with the University.

Chair believed one might categorise the relationship between a university and a student union into three different types:

there could be a relationship of dominance, whereby a university dictated what a union did because of the union's dependence on Block Grant funding;

there could be a relationship of reciprocity, whereby both bodies did things for each other which were mutually beneficial;

or, there could be a relationship of communality, whereby both bodies would be continually making joint proposals, managing their expectations of each other and working together in a true spirit of community and partnership.

Chair believed that it was difficult to say whether UUEAS' and the University's relationship fitted any of these descriptions; he was tempted to describe the relationship as at 'battle stations'.

Prof Norris believed he would not characterise the relationship so strongly as 'battle stations'. However, he believed it fair to describe the relationship, until recent times, as 'stand-offish'. He believed there was a lot of work ahead to build up through the models of relationship described by the Chair and that, before one reached a relationship of communality, one would have had to have spent some time in a relationship of reciprocity as there needed to be a build-up of trust on both sides with an understanding of the realities of each side's position. He noted that UUEAS had active members to whom the Officers were accountable whilst the University had a responsibility to safeguard the long-term future of the institution in an immensely complicated and difficult political climate which would not improve and was likely to worsen, even under a change of government. He believed that governments, understandably, had to meddle in higher education to fulfil short-term requirements; whilst universities had to look to the long term. He noted that this meant the University had to constantly deal with very difficult situations in order to fulfil the goal of the provision of higher education, worthy of the name 'higher' into the future whilst ensuring the sustainability of the institution in the long-term and the generation of new knowledge.

Chair (M Myles) wondered if UUEAS was to pursue a relationship of reciprocity with an ultimate goal of communality and, by the end of 2013, if the infrastructure of Union House were starting to decay with, for example, the resultant collapse of the LCR stage, or if the commercial services had a particularly bad autumn term and this led to UUEAS having to cut provision of student services then there would, consequently, be a large group of angry students. He believed that the Student Officers would then have to justify to the membership a set of tactics and a strategic relationship which the membership would view as having failed. He asked Prof Norris what would be his expectations of the Student Officer Team, if that situation were to arise.

Prof Norris believed it would help enormously if the current Team began, and handed over to their successors, a Risk Register of Activities that was realistic and included a SWOT analysis of strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats. He believed it not to be in anyone's interest for there to be any surprises. In the context of ET having asked him to work with the Officers towards building a more sustainable financial model for UUEAS, he noted that it would take some time for new developments in the commercial activities to come to fruition and, with the proposed building work, there would be

some disruption of trade; the University was, thus, aware that there were some choppy waters to negotiate. He believed the first task to be assessment of risk and then, if problems did arise, for the Officers to talk to the University, calmly, factually and with no hyperbole. He would advise that the Officers should let the facts speak for themselves and not make overinflated claims. He asked that, as soon as any problems arose, that Officers immediately contact him or his successor, informally.

Prof Norris asked, as an aside, if the LCR stage was, in fact, dangerous as this was an obvious health and safety issue and, if so, how much would it cost to replace.

J Levell noted he did not know of any issue as to it being dangerous but that it had been flagged up as in need of replacement. He noted he would find out the costs and let Prof Norris know.

Prof Norris believed that the invitation to Lisa Williams and himself to tour Union House had been very beneficial as, without any hectoring from the Officers, they had been able to see for themselves the condition of the building and the need for repairs. He believed the condition of the building did no favours to either the University or UUEAS. He noted the improvements to the bar area and, he believed, they demonstrated that UUEAS had the ability to design good new spaces. He noted he could not make promises as to any decision but that he would certainly help Officers to argue their case to the University for funding on improvements to the building.

Chair (M Myles) asked the new Officer Team what, if the situation he had described were to arise, they would expect from the University.

J Levell believed there would need to be a collaborative effort between the University and UUEAS with honest and frank discussions about actions to be taken with both sides making clear statements as to their future plans. However, he believed if clear and open communications between Officers and the University were to be maintained then this might prevent the situation arising. He, also, believed it important to be able to demonstrate to UUEAS members that an active and dynamic partnership with the University was showing results.

Prof Norris noted he could not promise that the University would substantially increase the Block Grant owing to the significant financial challenges that the University was facing.

J Levell believed that there were ways that the situation that had been outlined could be avoided without an increase in the Block Grant.

Prof Norris agreed and reiterated the importance to UUEAS of successful commercial operations which would enhance its independence. He noted he would be keen to work together to try

make some developments happen that would need to be clearly of benefit to UUEAS members and would be centred around the Union. He believed that, thereafter, success would depend on the maintenance of good financial balances. He noted that University Council had now sanctioned the loans for the new campus buildings and the task would be for the University to retain sufficient funds to repay the loans and make surpluses to achieve other goals. He noted he would rather be in a different situation, in a sense similar to the one the Officers wished for between UUEAS and the University, where the Government increased the Block Grant to the University and let it go about its business. However, he reflected that those days were long gone.

J Raynes believed that students had an expectation of a more rational approach than the one outlined by Prof Norris; in that, if the University acted to the detriment of UUEAS, and that included by neglect, it acted to the detriment of itself.

Prof Norris agreed that any harm to UUEAS was not good for the University.

Chair (M Myles) noted his belief that Prof Norris would put forward UUEAS' case and try to promote its reputation amongst his colleagues but wondered what would happen if he were unsuccessful in this as, as a result, he believed that the Officers would have differing expectations of Prof Norris and the University.

Prof Norris asked Officers to accept his assurance that the Vice-Chancellor and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor were not, in any way, deaf to UUEAS' concerns. However, as Officers would know from their experience, expenditure had to be prioritised within an organisation and the University could not fund everything it wanted to fund. He noted his own desire to fund the refurbishment of laboratories which had been built in 1966 and the Teaching Wall but he accepted that there was, simply, not the funding available. He drew Officers' attention to the astronomical costs of refurbishing teaching space. He noted that, given these constraints, he could not guarantee to be successful but he could guarantee that he would work extremely hard in putting UUEAS' case to the University.

Chair (M Myles) believed that, if the scenario that he had outlined did come to pass, he would not be expecting to have to make justifications on behalf of the University; he would want the University to come and explain the situation to students.

Prof Norris agreed that this was a reasonable position to take. He noted the importance of Officers getting their ideas and proposals across and pitched correctly as the International Officer had done earlier in the meeting.

J Raynes wondered whether the strategy should be for Officers to try

to demonstrate why UUEAS should be a higher priority for the University than, for example, Estates or the Library.

Prof Norris thought this would not be the right course as the University had had to make such horrendous choices as to where to take risks on whether to replace computer hardware or fund a new laboratory for the new School of Psychology, for example.

S Clark believed the lack of general funding for the Diversity and Inclusivity Co-ordinator to be particularly disappointing as their work would have impacted on the areas of concern outlined by the International Officer. He noted, however, that one University department had now provided half the funding for this position

Prof Norris stressed that, although, UUEAS had failed in the CUBS bid, this did not mean overall failure as future proposals would be considered by the University.

L Williams emphasised that it was important for the Officers to continue to talk to the University and to keep open the lines of communication so that the University might understand the Officers' position and the Officers might understand the pressures on the University.

Prof Norris asked if the Lettings Agency was included in the UUEAS Budget.

J Levell confirmed that it was and he would be sending the Budget details to Prof Norris in the near future.

J Levell thanked Prof Norris and L Williams for their attendance at SOC and invited them to attend a meeting in the autumn semester.

Prof Norris thanked SOC for their invitation and noted that he had been asked by ET to prepare a report on developments with UUEAS and this would be on the agenda for next meeting of ET.

Chair (TA Ngo) distributed home-made muffins.

966 Minutes of the meeting held on 16 May 2013

The minutes were agreed.

967 Action Log

J Levell noted outstanding actions had been collated into the Summer Action Log and this would be reviewed at Residential Training and at the first autumn meeting.

J Levell noted he would email the uniform sizes to Officers

Action

968 Matters Arising

There were none.

970 Chief Executive Recruitment

J Levell reported that the process was now complete and appointment had been made and the name of the successful candidate would be announced the following Monday. He thanked those Officers who had attended the presentation.

L Sloan thought it would have been helpful if Officers had been given a Job Description so that they would have, possibly, known better how to assess the candidates.

J Levell noted he would be compiling a report for the Trustees on the recruitment process and would include L Sloan's recommendation in the report.

671 Any Other Business

F Meade drew Officers attention to his funding request which had been circulated and would be added to the agenda papers. He noted it was for two members to attend the **National Coalition Against Fees and Cuts conference** which was a network of students and workers fighting for the principle of free education which was backed by UUEAS policy. He noted the conference would explore the future of student unions, how students could organise in support of free education and discuss the future of NUS.

He proposed sending two delegates by rail with railcards for a cost of £54.

SOC approved the funding request and that C Corkery and F Meade, who had expressed interest in attending, should be UUEAS delegates.

Action

S Bachelier noted that in his manifesto he had put forward the idea of a **UUEAS app** which might have an interactive map of Norwich and list of UUEAS activities. He wondered, given Prof Norris' comments, whether this might be proposed to the University with a view to funding as it would benefit the wider community.

J Levell believed this could be developed in-house with the new website provider.

M Myles reported that he had met with senior University staff concerning the **new Constitution** and they had suggested some minor changes and these would be made by the ad hoc committee of Union Council and the Constitution would be finalised.

SOC briefed L Sloan on the procedures that had been agreed for the approval of **LCR Theme Nights**.

972 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting

5 pm, Thursday 26 September in the Student Officer Centre and the Board Room.