

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



Student Officer Committee Meeting

5 pm, Thursday, 13 February 2014 in Room 1.31, Union House

Agenda

FORMAL AGENDA ITEMS

- 1128 Membership**
- 1129 Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January** (See pages 3-9)
- 1130 Minutes of the emergency joint meeting with the GSA held on 31 January**
(See pages 10-15)
- 1131 Matters Arising**
- 1132 Action Log** (See page 16)
- 1133 Officers on Livewire Union Show**
Officers to appear on the show for the following week.
- 1134 Election Timetable**
To formally confirm the election dates as agreed earlier after being circulated by the Deputy Returning Officer via Facebook). (See page 17)
- 1135 Referendum Report**
A verbal report from the Deputy Returning Officer on the Full Time Officer Structure Referendum.
- 1136 UUEAS Restructure**
A discussion topic from the Ethical Issues Officer on the ongoing staff restructuring of UUEAS.
- 1137 Management Minutes**
The minutes of the meetings held on 10 December and 14 January. (See pages 18-21)
- 1138 Any Other Business**
- 1139 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
30 January 2014
Summary

Key Discussions

- Showing the Winter Olympics on TV in the Bars
- Proposal in the Referendum to abolish the GSA place on SOC
- Legal status of affiliations to external organisations
- Procedure for reviewing implementation of policies passed by Union Council

Key Actions

- Awareness-raising about the Winter Olympics to take place in the Bars during the first week of the Games and then the matter of a TV ban in the Bars would be put to Council.
- Scheduled a joint meeting with the GSA the following day to address the GSA's concerns and to discuss about the proposed abolition of the GSA place on SOC. Referendum to be deferred until this meeting.
- Agreed to send the matter of affiliations to external organisations to Council and to the Trustee Board for consideration.

Union of UEA Students Purpose:

“To enrich the life of every UEA student”

Minutes of the Student Officer Committee 30 January 2014



Voting Members present:

Daniel Delargy (Students with Disabilities Officer), Ella Gilbert (Non Portfolio Officer), Eunice Opare-Addo (Ethnic Minorities Officer), Bintu Foday (Community and Student Rights Officer), Louise Withers Green (Academic Officer), Rosie Rawle (Communications Officer), Kimberley Hirst-Jones (Postgraduate Officer), Emma Silk (Environment Officer), Tu An Ngo (International Officer), Sebastian Bachelier (Non Portfolio Officer), Lauren Sloan (Ethical Issues Officer), Rachel Knott (Women's Officer), Joe Levell (Finance Officer).

Non-voting Member

Jim Dickinson (Chief Executive).

Chair

Joe Raynes (Non Portfolio Officer).

In attendance:

Tony Moore (Representation Support Worker)

1119 Minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2014

The minutes were agreed.

1120 Matters Arising

There were none.

1121 Action Log

R Rawle reported, on the ambiguity of referendum item, she was awaiting replies from the Constitutional Review Group. She would also be advertising the CRG to Councillors as some members of the group had recently left.

R Rawle noted she had arranged an exit interview with T Killeen. She reported that the Democracy and Representation Working Group would be meeting, for the first time, later in the day.

Chair noted that the question about not showing the Winter Olympics in the Bars had not been put to Council and he wondered how SOC wished to proceed as, normally, this would be a matter for Council but he wondered whether SOC might make a decision based on existing LGBT+ policy. SOC noted that there had been a big reaction from the wider membership over the ESSA boycott; even though this had been based on policy.

SOC noted that the Games would start a week before Council met and agreed that there would be awareness-raising on the issue in the Bars during that week and then the matter would be put to Council.

1122 Officers on Livewire Union Show

K Hirst-Jones, J Levell and J Raynes to take part, the following week.

1123 Full Time Officer Structure Referendum

B Foday, as DRO, noted the General meeting would take place the following Monday.

B Foday noted to L Sloan that if Proposal 1 fell and Proposal 2 passed then Proposal 2, as it was an amendment to Proposal 1, could not be adopted and this would need to be explained to voters.

SOC noted that members should be encouraged to vote on both questions.

SOC noted that there had been questions raised as to whether a two-thirds majority was needed for both proposals or whether because the second proposal was an amendment to a Constitutional Amendment it would only require a simple majority.

J Dickinson advised that there was a difference of opinion on this matter that would be needed to be settled before the count and that this should be sent to the Trustee Board for a ruling. He noted that there was the question of whether the Returning Officer might be involved as they were charged with interpretation of the election regulations or whether this was a wider constitutional matter and, thus, within the remit of the Trustees. He advised that he would be contacting the Trustees shortly.

K Hirst-Jones noted that SOC had agreed that the Part Time Structure would remain unchanged but when the proposed new structure had been published it included the abolition of the Postgraduate Part-Time Officer post.

Chair believed the assumption had been that the role would change from part time to full time.

K Hirst-Jones believed that the effect would be that the GSA would no longer be represented at SOC.

J Levell noted that SOC could still invite the GSA President SOC.

K Hirst-Jones noted that this would still mean they were not official voting members of SOC.

L Sloan argued that this problem illustrated why it would have been prudent to consult the GSA before deciding their future. She, further, noted that the consultation had always been billed as not changing the PTO structure and the new proposal had contradicted this assertion.

J Levell noted that change to the PTO structure had been in the proposal that SOC agreed at its last meeting.

K Hirst-Jones noted that SOC had only been given the new proposals a few minutes before the last meeting.

J Dickinson advised that SOC had two possible courses of action: to withdraw the Referendum or to adjust the proposals after the Referendum in conjunction with the GSA. He noted there was much work to be done in supporting the GSA's recreational and social services as well as putting in place staff support for them.

K Hirst-Jones believed the Referendum process should be paused until

after the consultation with the GSA had taken place.

J Levell believed there had been plenty of opportunities for different constituencies to make their views known during the consultation and he would oppose any pause.

R Rawle noted the only reference to the abolition of the PTO position in the proposal put to the last meeting had been a reference to deleting a number of Bye-Laws, and as Officers did not have the Bye-Laws to hand they did not fully comprehend what they were voting on.

TA Ngo agreed and noted this would have affected the way she had voted.

J Dickinson advised that the PTO position was not being abolished; the proposal was that half the role would become full time whilst half would exist in the GSA; the only thing missing was the link between SOC and the GSA. He advised the latter could be easily rectified immediately after the Referendum and could be published as an intention before the voting.

L Withers Green argued that if the Referendum was cancelled and the changes did not go through for next year both PG and UG students would suffer as a result.

B Foday believed matters should be clarified before the Referendum went ahead.

J Levell suggested making a written guarantee to the GSA on the future invitation to the GSA President to sit on SOC and to take this to Council as at its next meeting.

L Sloan asked that an emergency joint meeting of SOC and the GSA Committee be called. She would not feel comfortable, herself, unless the GSA's role on SOC was written in the Constitution.

Chair thought that the matter might be easily remedied by a minor change to the proposal which would formalise an invitation to SOC for the GSA President.

K Hirst-Jones believed there needed to be a detailed discussion as to the role and the wider relationship between the GSA and UUEAS.

Chair believed that UUEAS was embarking on a set of changes and issues like this would no doubt come up during this process and could be addressed as they arose. He believed that a meeting with the GSA would be able to resolve the issue; if it could not, then a decision on the Referendum could be made after the meeting.

E Opare-Addo wondered whether it would be possible to delay the Referendum for a week in order for further consultation to take place.

J Levell noted that SOC had agreed a timetable for consultation last semester and that any delay to the Referendum would make the General Elections unworkable. He believed that minor tweaks to the structure could be made to suit everyone involved without this delay.

L Sloan believed the logical outcome of J Levell's position would be that students would be asked to vote on a question the meaning of which SOC were unsure of.

R Knott noted the concerns over the consultation but believed the GSA had had plenty of notice to feed in their views. She noted that UUEAS was often criticised for only letting students know about decisions at the last minute and she believed that cancelling the Referendum at this stage would confirm this view and make UUEAS look ridiculous.

TA Ngo argued that UUEAS would look even worse if it, in effect, said to a

hard to reach group of students: sorry we have not got time to talk to you and we are going to make a key decision on the way you are represented without consulting your Committee.

K Hirst-Jones agreed as to the time the GSA had been given but she noted the meagre resources, as a full time student and PTO, with which she had been expected to consult with all PG students. She felt that students would not think UUEAS to be a joke for taking the time to properly consider issues raised by the GSA.

R Rawle argued that the issue was not about the length of the consultation it was about the fact that the GSA had only just been made aware that the PTO post would be abolished.

SOC examined and noted the difficulties in pushing the General Election back another week due to postponing the Referendum dates.

L Sloan reiterated her call for an emergency meeting with the GSA.

R Rawle believed it perfectly possible to have a quorate joint meeting, the following day.

SOC agreed to schedule a joint meeting with the GSA the following day to address the GSA's concerns and to discuss recommendations to the DRO as to any required changes to the Referendum. SOC noted that any decision on postponing the Referendum would be deferred until this meeting.

1124

UUEAS Affiliations

R Rawle drew SOC's attention to her written report on the affiliations to external organisations, where no fees had, as yet, been paid.

J Dickinson advised that he had reviewed the affiliations and he would advise that affiliation to Stop The War would be unlawful as affiliations had to be compatible with a charity's objects and UUEAS' objects were educational and related to students as students.

He advised that it would be perfectly permissible for a group of like-minded students to form a Stop The War Society which could then, as a Society, make an affiliation.

He advised that, even without an affiliation fee being paid some affiliations might result in a legal challenge.

He advised that SOC alert Union Council to this problem and ask Council to decide a course of action.

SOC agreed to send the matter of affiliations to external organisations to Council and to the Trustee Board for consideration.

1125

Policy Passed by Council (including new Code of Conduct)

J Dickinson advised, as to the new Code of Conduct, that it was really important, if Officers became aware of any misconduct occurring under the auspices of UUEAS, to encourage members to not try to resolve matters through social media but through the formal Code. He noted that for the first time, UUEAS would have a formal code that covered the behaviour of Full Time Officers, as well as ordinary members. He noted the Code did not cover poor political performance; it was purely about FTO's personal conduct. He advised that questions about cases that fell in between these two areas would be referred to a supervising Trustee and

their decisions would be reported to Council.

B Foday, on University rents, noted the University had agreed that in future there would be some form of consultation but that they would not be changing their stance on the rent increase as they believed a 4% increase to be reasonable.

R Rawle noted the University had during the discussions asked how the Officers expected the estate to be maintained, which included refurbishing Union House, without a rent increase.

L Sloan noted, that if a member of University staff had spoken about a direct link between the rent rise and the funding of the refurbishment of Union House, she would like her disquiet recorded in the SOC minutes that money had been taken from students for the redevelopment of Union premises.

SOC noted the need for the twin track of lobbying and campaigning.

SOC noted that the Relationship Agreement with the University policy was a long term one and no actions, as yet, had been taken.

SOC noted the changes to the Staff Protocol without comment.

R Rawle asked how SOC wanted to review policies for implementation; she wondered whether SOC wanted her to just bring the most recently passes policies to future meetings or did Officers want her to review the entire body of policies and recommend associated action points. She thought it best that a group of Officers did this rather than she, alone. Chair felt that individual Officers should look through the policies and identify action points.

R Rawle noted the Union Council Action Log Committee had taken on the task of identifying action points in the policies and now that the Committee had been disbanded there would be no body undertaking this task; she believed this to not be good in terms of accountability. Chair noted that a decision had not been made as to this matter; it was to be decided upon after the group, meeting to explore a decision making matrix, had reported.

Chair agreed to a suggestion from R Rawle that this left the process in limbo.

L Withers Green wondered whether SOC could simply ask the proposers of each resolution to lead on their implementation as policy.

R Rawle believed this would be fine for recently formulated policy but would be problematic for older policies.

L Sloan proposed that the Union Council Action Log Committee should meet until the decision making matrix report had been received.

Chair noted that the Committee could meet as often as they wanted.

L Sloan noted that the Committee were under the impression that SOC believed the Committee's efforts were useless and the Committee should not meet.

R Rawle felt that it would be insulting to the Committee for SOC having told them it was not interested in the Committee's work and then to later tell them that they could meet but with the rider that SOC would not pay any attention to the Committee's recommendations; whilst SOC was still not prepared to do the work that the Committee had undertaken.

Chair disagreed with this depiction of the decision. He noted that SOC had been concerned, partly, about the constitutionality aspect and,

partly, about how to best implement policy. He did not believe that anyone had expressed the view that the Committee's work had been useless or that SOC did not care about the recommendations the Committee had made.

R Rawle noted that, for her personally, it was a difficult situation as, after the discussion at SOC, she had left the matter in abeyance and simply not called any meetings of the Committee. She further noted that the Committee had often spent three hours a week trying to structure policy implementation and she was disappointed that Officers were not prepared to take over this work.

1126 Any Other Business

J Levell noted that the Activities Manager had asked that when Officers arranged events that involved Clubs and Societies they should let the Activities Team know beforehand.

T A Ngo reported that she would be organising the international celebration of the Chinese New Year in the Blue Bar for the following day. SOC noted that D Delargy would be attending NUS students with disabilities conference and that this was an entitlement and did not need to be a funding request.

L Sloan wondered what the position was with regard to Management Committee minutes as the last that SOC had received had been from 27 November and she assumed there had been meetings since as, constitutionally, the committee was required to meet every two weeks. J Dickinson advised there had been a meeting earlier in the day and there had been another meeting prior to this; the meeting earlier in the day had failed to approve the minutes of the earlier meeting.

L Sloan noted her understanding was that unapproved minutes would come to SOC.

J Dickinson advised that his understanding was that SOC would be given a verbal update.

R Rawle noted that the understanding had been that SOC would receive both a verbal update and unapproved minutes.

J Dickinson advised that he had not realised this.

R Rawle noted there would be a protest against the Privatisation of Student Debt, an issue that would affect every student. She noted the event was on the Thursday of the following week and she urged Officers to join the protest. She noted that only one or two Officers had joined the solidarity with the UCU industrial action and she hoped for more Officer involvement in the following week's event.

1127 Time, Date and Place

At R Rawle's request, due to the timing of the Student Debt event, at the earlier time of 4 pm, Thursday, 6 February in 1.31, Union House.

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



**Minutes of the joint meeting of Student Officer Committee
and the Graduate Students' Association Committee
24 January 2014**

Summary

**The meeting agreed to add the following points to the draft agreement
between UUEAS and the GSA**

- If due to the changes to FTO structure, the GSA have to take on more non-academic services, this will be made known to the University so changes might be made to the allocation of funding.
- The GSA will remain independent
- The GSA will provide social and recreational services to postgraduates
- The current changes will not override any previous agreements between the GSA and UUEAS
- The GSA President will remain on Union Council and as a voting member of SOC
- The agreement between UUEAS and SUSS will only be changed by mutual agreement
- Position of graduands wishing to stand for office to be clarified and taken to Union Council as a proposed Constitutional Amendment
- Draft agreement with the changes made at the current meeting to be made publically available before the Referendum and to be circulated to the GSA Committee, SOC and Union Council.
- Agreed that the Referendum would go ahead as planned but that changes would be made to the background information regarding the changes to the proposal as to the Part Time Officer structure.

Union of UEA Students Purpose:

“To enrich the life of every UEA student”

Minutes of the joint meeting of Student Officer Committee and the Graduate Students' Association Committee 31 January 2014



SOC Voting Members present:

Eunice Opare-Addo (Ethnic Minorities Officer), Bintu Foday (Community and Student Rights Officer), Daniel Delargy (Students with Disabilities Officer), Louise Withers Green (Academic Officer), Rosie Rawle (Communications Officer), Tu An Ngo (International Officer), Lauren Sloan (Ethical Issues Officer), Joe Levell (Finance Officer).

GSA Members present:

Kimberley Hirst-Jones (UUEAS Postgraduate Officer and GSA President), David Cutting (GSA Committee Member), Leonie Dackhan (GSA Committee Member), John Taylor (GSA Quizmaster).

Chair

Joe Raynes (Non Portfolio Officer).

In attendance:

Tony Moore (Representation Support Worker)

Emergency Meeting

J Raynes took the Chair of the joint meeting and thanked the GSA Committee members for attending.

Chair noted the emergency meeting had been called after the Postgraduate Officer had raised concerns at the previous day's meeting of SOC concerning the Postgraduate Academic Officer FTO role and the abolition of the Postgraduate PTO role as proposed in the forthcoming Referendum.

J Levell noted that, since that meeting, the Chief Executive and the GSA President had met and the Chief Executive had drafted proposals, circulated to the present meeting, which it was hoped would address the GSA's concerns.

K Hirst-Jones noted that a key concern of the GSA had been over the splitting of the present Postgraduate Officer role; the academic aspect of the role had been adequately catered for by the creation of the FTO role but the wider aspects of the role had been left to the GSA. She believed that for the GSA to cater for non-academic services it needed adequate financial support and its own designated social space and this needed to be guaranteed before they could agree to the axing of the PTO position.

She stated that, if the GSA represented postgraduate students, it had to remain independent of UUEAS. She noted the GSA position that agreement to the proposals on the Referendum would not override any current formal agreements between the GSA and UUEAS.

D Cutting welcomed the agreement in the paper that the GSA President would be invited to SOC but noted that, currently, they had an ex officio place on Union Council and the GSA would like this to remain. Chair clarified that the arrangement would be that the GSA President would be a voting member of SOC with a place on Council.

J Taylor noted that the GSA held representative roles within the University and that any agreement between UUEAS and the GSA would not alter the relationship between the GSA and the University as, although UUEAS was proposing to alter its own Constitution, the GSA Constitution would remain unchanged. He believed the proposed changes to postgraduate representation were the most radical in UUEAS' history and it would have been desirable for postgraduates, at large, to have been consulted about how they wanted to be represented but they had not been given that opportunity. He argued that the proposal in the Referendum was only one of a whole swathe of possible options for postgraduate representation and that postgraduates, themselves, would not be deciding how they were represented as, electorally, they were vastly outnumbered by undergraduates. He noted that, even if every postgraduate voted no in the Referendum, it might still be passed. He wondered whether the postgraduate question might be separated from the main Referendum.

B Foday, as DRO, noted these concerns and her wish that she had had the impact on postgraduates laid out as clearly as this before SOC had voted to call the Referendum.

K Hirst-Jones noted that the GSA was not against the extension of PG representation with the new FTO position; their problem was with the way the question had been framed and the process in general.

J Level noted that there was agreement in the room as to the following: the GSA President to be a voting member of SOC with a place on Council and that there should be no changes to any previous agreements between UUEAS and the GSA. As to whether postgraduate representation should be the subject of a separate referendum question, he noted this was a matter for the DRO but he did not see this as a problem.

Chair noted that, for the future, how the GSA represented PGs alongside UUEAS would be a matter, solely, for the GSA to decide and this would no doubt be worked out as the new roles became active.

J Taylor noted that it was not just the GSA and UUEAS involved in these matters, the University was also involved. He noted there was a triangular relationship and any change to the balance of the relationship would have to include the University. He noted, for example, if due to the changes the GSA took on more non-academic services, this would need

to be made known to the University so changes might be made to the allocation of funding.

Chair noted that there was agreement that this should be the case and that this would be added to the actions listed in the Chief Executive's paper.

J Taylor noted that the current agreement between the GSA and UUEAS' subsidiary company should not be changed without the agreement of both parties and he asked that this be minuted.

The meeting agreed that:

The GSA will remain independent

The GSA will provide social and recreational services to postgraduates

The current changes will not override any previous agreements between the GSA and UUEAS

The GSA President will remain on Union Council and as a voting member of SOC

The agreement between UUEAS and SUSS will only be changed by mutual agreement

T A Ngo asked how the proposed changes would affect the GSA's representation on University Committees.

K Hirst-Jones noted that this had been discussed and some of the positions might be better filled by the new PG Academic Officer but this would be a matter for the GSA Committee to decide.

D Cutting noted that the intention was for the new PG Academic Officer to be invited to sit on the GSA Committee.

T A Ngo wondered whether taking out the academic representation part of the Officer role would affect GSA funding.

L Withers Green noted that the University were acutely sensitive to the issue of the Block Grant and it was highly unlikely they would cut the £6,000 funding to the GSA.

D Cutting noted that just because the PG Academic Officer post had been created did not mean that GSA members would cease to be involved in academic matters.

L Sloan noted the paper envisaged more staff support for postgraduate services; given the UUEAS budget constraints, she wondered how feasible this would be. She also wondered how realistic the statement was that the University would not cut GSA funding.

K Hirst-Jones noted it would be good for UUEAS to place in writing its commitment to provide more PG support and this could be included in the Chief Executive's paper.

Chair noted that there had always been the understanding the new FTO roles would come with increased staff support and there was no reason why the PG role would be any different.

J Taylor noted that UUEAS could not decide on the GSA's funding; this was a matter for the GSA and the University; though he welcomed UUEAS' funding of the PG post.

D Cutting welcomed the extra funding for the PG post.

K Hirst-Jones noted that the freeing up of the GSA President's time by the taking away of the academic part of their duties would mean a huge increase in resources available for work in other areas.

J Taylor noted there had been concerns raised over the space the GSA currently occupied in Union House, known as the Grad Bar. He asked whether any changes were planned as to how the Grad Bar was run as a result of the FTO restructuring.

J Levell noted this was not in the document as the matter was totally unrelated. He further noted the GSA President was a member of the building redevelopment focus group and the group would be looking at better PG provision.

Chair noted that a key message from the What If? Consultation had been the desire of students to keep the Grad Bar.

J Taylor believed there was an error in the document as to the position of graduands wishing to stand for office and the position would need to be resolved by an amendment to the UUEAS constitution.

Chair noted that this would be taken to the next meeting of Union Council.

J Taylor noted this would also need to be changes in the preamble to the Referendum question; as the changes to the Part Time Officer structure as, given the agreement, reached earlier in the meeting, would need to be deleted.

Chair noted the Chief Executive's document with the changes made at the current meeting would need to be made publically available before the Referendum.

R Rawle noted the changes would have to form part of all the publicity material for the Referendum.

L Withers Green noted to J Taylor that to have a separate question in the Referendum on the PG role would mean postponing the whole process for a week which would have a knock-on effect with the General Election which would mean, as a consequence, any changes to the FTO structure would be postponed for another year.

The meeting discussed the question of postponing the Referendum and concluded that this would be impractical if the intention was for the result of the Referendum to change the FTO structure in time for the General Election

J Taylor reiterated his belief that the PG role was just a footnote to wider questions in the Referendum and had been decided upon without proper consultation. He believed the consultation with PGs had been minimal as only three PG students had taken part.

J Levell believed this to be a harsh statement; PG representation was not a footnote it was an integral part of the whole restructure. As to the consultation, he noted the dates had been sent to the GSA in the final weeks of the previous semester and there had been offers of help to the GSA for planning and organising consultation with their members. He noted that these offers had not been taken up and he believed that this should be acknowledged by the GSA. He noted the GSA had agreed how important the new post was and urged them to get involved in the Referendum campaign. He noted the Constitution was a mutable document and any changes that the GSA thought were necessary could be put to Council at an early stage.

K Hirst-Jones asked that her concerns over the consultation be minuted as to expect one Part Time Officer to hold extensive consultations with a quarter of the student population whilst keeping up their own academic work commitments was absurd. She reminded the meeting that her fellow Part Time Officer, the Mature Students' Officer, who had taken a leading role in the consultation, had recently resigned because he felt the lack of support from UUEAS in trying to fulfil his duties had affected his academic work. In future consultations, she concluded that UUEAS must learn from this experience and work closely with the GSA. She believed, however, that despite these issues, the advantage to PG students of having the new PG FTO role was so great that the GSA Committee would support the Referendum going ahead as planned.

D Cutting believed the case for a PG Officer to be compelling and noted lessons from the consultation process would need to be taken on board but that the GSA Committee would be actively taking part in the Referendum campaign.

The meeting agreed that the Referendum would go ahead as planned but that changes would be made to the background information regarding the changes to the proposal as to the Part Time Officer structure.

The meeting agreed that the Chief Executive's paper with the agreed changes would be circulated to the GSA Committee, SOC and Union Council.

The GSA members left the meeting.

B Foday, as DRO, asked SOC to consider two questions regarding the Referendum.

Firstly, she noted questions had been raised as to whether Question 2 which was an amendment to a Constitutional Amendment should require a simple or a two-thirds majority of members voting.

Secondly, she noted that there were no specific regulations within the Bye-Laws for the conduct of campaigns during a Referendum. She proposed that she would transpose rules concerning candidates in the Election Regulations to campaigns in the Referendum.

SOC agreed that the first question would be referred to the Trustee Board and that the second would be referred to the Returning Officer.



SOC ACTION LOG (POLICY/University)

Date Commissioned	Action Required	Status	Assigned To:	Date to be actioned by:
19 Sep 13/14 Nov 13/ 16 Jan 14	Ethical Banking	☹️ new motion to be on Council agenda	Rosie	29 November/13 Feb

SOC ACTION LOG (Internal Process)

Date Commissioned	Action Required	Status	Assigned To:	Date to be actioned by:
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
5 Dec 13	R Rawle to consult with Chair of Council over guest speakers	Consultation taken place	Rosie	17 January
5 Dec 13	Management Committee agenda papers to be circulated to SOC	To be included in future SOC agendas	Jim/Tony	January
12 Dec 13	Formative meeting of Democracy and Representation Review Working Group	First meeting took place	Rosie	January
12 Dec 13	Open sub-committee of Council to create a strategy for increasing the Block Grant to be convened	To be convened and to meet	Joe Levell/Freddie	January
16 Jan 14	informal committee to support mature students/ exit interview with Mature Students Officer to be held	To be convened and exit interview arranged	Rosie/Bintu	End of January
16 Jan 14/23	Legality of subscriptions to external organisations to be discussed at Council	Actioned, an agenda item	Rosie	End of January
16 Jan 14/30 January	Question as to whether the Olympic Games would be shown on the TVs in the Bars to be brought to Council.	To be asked at Council	Holly	23 January

Elections Timetable

24 th February – 5 th March 2014	Election Nominations Open
6 th & 7 th March 2014	Candidate Training
10 th – 17 th March 2014	Campaigning
13 th -17 th March 2014	Voting

**Union of UEA Students
Management Committee MINUTES
10/12/13**

1. Minutes, Apologies, Matters Arising

SECTION A: UPDATES/REPORTS

2. Operational Updates

No physical meeting this week so written updates:

Retail

Week ending December 8th 2013

- 2012 - Total sales excluding VAT £ 88,574 GP 31.53% Profit
£27,924
- 2013 - Total sales excluding VAT £91,799 GP 34.09% Profit
£31,293 + £3369 on last year
- 2013 Budget Total Sales ex: VAT £97,032
£5233 down on forecast budget
- Bakery /night hatch Total sales £ 7094.92 - Now over £7000 for the first time
(growing week on week)

Comms

- Hive Refurb all to print
- Peer Support flyer nearly done
- NUS Digital timeline agreed

This week:

- NUS Digital training and start migration
- Talking with RR about Comms strategy
- NUS Media Working Group in London
- Home Run Housing list publicity

Bars

- A busy 2 weeks for the Bars, taking £111k despite a cancelled Gig.
- Net Promoter Score – We have spoken to 666 customers in the Hive and Pub over the last week, and will be looking at the results to see where we can make improvements and meet our customers' requirements.
- Chris Berry has been with us now for 4 weeks and has been shown all our procedures and is now ready to supervise shifts on his own.
- The Bars and Ents Depts are looking towards next semester with regards to events and promotions, discussing LCR themes and cocktails.
- We are re-launching 'Wednesday Sports Nights' in the Blue Bar next semester after getting some input from various Sports Socs

Finance

- Finance Office staff continue to be busy doing their normal activities, but are looking forward to that slackening off once term ends.
- I'm trying to tie up loose ends, identify and redirect stuff that comes directly to me, and draw up some guidelines for a handover to Declan who is coming to spend time with me next week.

- Also working with the Financial Adviser to provide information for Pensions Auto Enrolment which kicks in for us after Christmas.

SSS

- Met with Norwich City Council (NCC) planning department (at my request) to discuss their strategy for student housing. They don't have one.
- I had arranged this meeting as I had concerns about the proposed student purpose built blocks which will both add 200 bed spaces to the student market. Offering a choice and range of types (and cost) of accommodation is good for students but flooding a market where demand is already satisfied is not good.
- Gen REGS – update . We are waiting for a second meeting to be arranged by UEA.
- Lettings – progressing well. Visits to potential properties have taken place. Landlords have signed up to the service.

- Hundreds of landlords are re-registering for accreditation and advertising for next year's list release on January 17th.
- Housing Info stalls and Q&A sessions went well, the last session is taking place on Friday 13th @ECB.
- RRR – Reduce Reuse Recycle – a smaller Christmas initiative is taking place for students here for only 1 semester (UEA ACCOM has emailed students)

**Strategic Management Team
(Management Committee)
Away Days**

This was held in lieu of the 14/1 meeting

Note re MC: As a result of Trustee Board decisions late last year, a considerable amount of responsibility has now been devolved to Directors/Managers/Sabbs. Thus Management Committee will now be necessarily therefore be less **operational** in focus.

So as of now we have slimmed down the meeting's attendees to include just the sabs and the strategic managers- Jim, Toby and Alex. The meeting will focus on the delivery of the improvement plan. Other senior managers will be invited to attend as and when. Minutes will still be distributed around to everyone, and we will hold regular all day meetings of the wider management team throughout the year.

MC

- Joe Levell, Finance Officer
- Rosie Rawle, Communications Officer
- Bintu Foday, Welfare Officer
- Louise Withers Green, Academic Officer

In attendance- SMs

- Jim Dickinson, CEO
- Toby Cunningham, Deputy CEO
- Alex Wyatt, Director Social Enterprise

Away Days- Notes

Reviewing Term One

The team reviewed what went well and badly and identified actions and learning for term 2

Tour of Trent

The team got a tour of Trent SU and met with the officers and senior managers

Building the team

Activities to build the new Strategic Management Team

Various Discussions/Presentations

- UUEAS Finances (Jim)
- Students' Union Quality Model (Jim)
- Commercial Initial Thoughts and Approach (Alex)
- Opportunities & Infrastructure Term Ahead (Toby)

Break

Planning Term Two

Team focus on term two, examined standard booked events and activities, proposed actions in the improvement plan and any anticipatable "pinch points"

AGREED ACTIONS

- Alex to contact NEDs to discuss commercial areas
- Alex to progress Coffee proposal for formal consideration at Comm Board
- Alex to progress discussions with external providers over aspects of event management
- Alex to sketch milestones for Jan-June by end of month to go to Commercial Boards
- Alex to sketch out ideal structure by mid month
- Alex to work on Tuesdays from "School Play"/1st years perspective
- All to ensure presentation of Financial picture to SOC/Council
- Jim to arrange additional departmental meetings for staff mid term 1
- Jim to brief Tony on Commercial Boards/meetings
- Jim to convene Freshers Meetings from late Jan onwards
- Jim to do paper on "New SUEI" to TB
- Jim to progress (all) managers days (1 per term)
- Jim to progress discussions re core grant and pension deficit contributions
- Jim to progress incorporation implementation asap
- Jim to progress Tony convening process to determine "what goes where" between SOC and TB
- Jim to work "New SUEI" issues into next stage of Block Grant proposals
- Jim: 2 x "school trip" visits for staff to be organised
- Jim: Budget priorities to include staff resource to support Campaigns and Policy functions
- Jim: Finance prioritising clarity on balance sheet
- Rosie to take basic week by week planner to SOC for bolstering
- SMs to meet on Mondays after MML.
- Commitment to finding team time when Bintu returns.
- Toby to consider HR support options
- Toby to progress move of student opportunities and IT procurement
- Toby to progress work on the overall planning process
- Toby: Chloe to be directed to work on comms support for change processes in Term 2
- Toby: Comms plan for 14-15 to include each week being taken over by a key event or theme
- Jim: Tony to email dates of meetings plus papers deadlines as Outlook requests