

**A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES 2010-2011 WAS HELD
AT 5PM ON 17 APRIL 2012 IN THE BOARD ROOM.**

18 April 2012

BT-123-M1

MINUTES

Present: Michael Pearson (Chair), Rebecca Bridger, Lucy Padolsey, Lincoln Chan, Mark Dunkley, David Haines, Michael Ita, Zoe Lloyd, John Palmer, Andrew J Pyatt, David Tingle, Caroline Walker.
In attendance: Andy Parsons, Louisa Allen.

1. **Apologies.**

James Goldburn, James Carroll.

2. **Register of interests.**

Form to be sent around to be done once per year and updated annually for the record.
Please fill in the form and return to Louisa Allen once complete.

3. **Minutes of the previous meeting BT-122-M1 and matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda.**



BT-122-M1.docx

The minutes were approved.

Matters Arising:

Elections review – It is in progress. Deferred to next meeting (JC).

PMSC – MD, DH, AJP, LC, ZL wanted to stand. MD was selected and LC and AJP elected by draw. LA to set up a meeting this term.

F&MSC – elections will take place next Wednesday at Council, a meeting will be set up for very soon after.

4. **To receive and approve a report from the Executive.**



BOT 17-04-12.pdf

RB presented the report.

ZL: not clear that more than one person can be nominated for LEAs, can that be made explicit? RB stated that last year's winners and the reasons for their selection will be put up to assist with this.

5. **To receive a financial report including Management Accounts.**



Mar12MgmtReports
.pdf



Financial
commentary mar12.d

LP presented the report.

DH asked about Label; AP stated that we expect them to overspend. In the past we have cut issues where there is a lack of advertising revenue, but we are unlikely to do that. Our position on print

media will be reviewed for next year. The online version is going well with increased numbers of hits. AJP suggested a proper digital version (such as iBooks) would be a better use of the budget.

AP has not yet sent around the full management accounts as in their current presentation they are unwieldy; he will have more time now to prepare something more useful.

JP asked what the survey shows – is it a method of communication which is worth subsidising (ignoring the advertising revenue)? The print version is in decline in use generally. ZL stated that the online version is not at its best and more work needs to be put into that if it is to replace the print version.

AJP asked who hosts it – MSL is the company which provides our website. We are intending to move over to NUS Digital which should be a much more slick version. There is a presentation NUS supplied on Digital and AP will send the link round. NUS have invested approx £2m to develop this system, and the first release has been very impressive.

Advertising revenue is difficult to analyse on online versions. The journalism is however no-cost (as it is volunteer-produced).

ZL works in Bars and stated that she does not believe enough is switched off at night. AP agrees and this is in the plan to improve energy consumption figures.

6. To receive a report on the Research Project (following the day's meetings with Alterline and Redbrick on the Research Brief).



Research Project
Brief and invitation to

AP and JP met with Alterline and Redbrick today. Both were impressive but Redbrick was the better pitch. Their speciality is young people/students. There are some timeline issues and the project manager was not in attendance – the managing director attended the pitch.

Members of the Board will be involved with working up the full brief in the next couple of weeks, with the fieldwork following immediately after. They will then present their findings to a group of stakeholders including the Exec-Elect, plus staff and Board members. We can then develop brand messages from those findings, to feed into Freshers information. The new visual identity will be launched after that.

AP asked the Board to approve c£10,000 to conduct the research initially. The University may be asked to join in the follow-up projects on the new fee regime etc (this has gone into the Plan which went to the university).

The Board approved the proposal.

7. To receive an update on the Union's Charity Registration.

LA stated that we are now a registered charity – number 1146696.

8. To receive an update on the Union Lawn Project and other capital developments.



Easter Capital
works.docx

AP presented the update. Starbucks branding will be up within the next two weeks. We will be 'proudly serving Starbucks' – we are not a franchise and cannot advertise the coffee shop as Starbucks outside the venue. We will be among the first Union outlets able to sell frappuccinos. We anticipate increased revenue, with a minimal initial outlay under the NUSSL deal.

LP suggested a survey of customers in the first few weeks to see if it has attracted more customers. ZL suggested publicising the improved daytime area more – AP stated that it will be launched properly in the new academic year once the cafe is operating properly and we have experimented with the furniture layout.

Hey Ewe will be going ahead with entry as normal through the front doors, with the fence moved back.

AP still needs to bid for the University's contribution to the Security parts of the redevelopment and will do this once the figure required is finalised.

CW noted that the 'crowded place' risk assessment completed by CBC, the Police and Home Office needed to be complied with or it would affect our status as a licensed premises, so we have had little choice but to make a substantial effort to mitigate the risks.

MD asked if the University has been subject to the same type of compliance. CW stated that lots has been done for other security issues but not a 'crowded place' situation.

The launch will go ahead as planned at the Freefest weekend (even if some things are not completed; the grad gift area will be complete).

The Board approved the proposed spending.

9. To receive an update on the Union's Key Performance Indicators.

AP stated that this is a work in progress. It is not as straightforward as first thought. It is not just about how many people are involved, but how well that feeds into our objectives. Things that are easy to measure are not necessarily the best things to measure.

AJP suggested retention rates – from enthusiastic fresher to committee member, etc, and if this happens more in certain sections.

DH suggested hall focused measures – whether hall residents are more engaged than town residents.

ZL suggested 'belonging' and how students feel about the union. LP stated that this may exclude people who only use the union for eg Voice.

The things we measure as part of the research project should be things we will continue to measure.

AJP suggested the new Community DO could be integral to measuring hall and town involvement. We can tell whether students are in hall or in town (as a 'snapshot'), but following them through their involvement 'career' could be more meaningful. We can measure it via MSL/NUS Digital.

ZL suggested some form of alumni analysis to see if Union involvement has benefited students' careers.

MD agreed that 5 or 6 longer term measurable indicators would be useful to the Board for monitoring long term performance of the Union – monitoring alumni would be a good one. There could then be further 'sub-levels' of performance indicators beyond those main indicators on a department-specific level.

AP suggested that we could ask Alumni 'what do you remember?' so it is more qualitative but this would still be useful.

We can drill down to find out how many international students, postgrads etc there are involved (we already know they are under-involved compared to home undergrads).

We can also focus annually on the wider list and on fewer indicators on a more regular basis – for example the ones we are doing less well in could be discussed strategically by the Board.

MP stated that we need to avoid alienating groups of people who are not in our focused areas.

A 'strategy' item should be included on the agenda in future so the Board can look at an area in more depth, possibly involving presentations from key members of staff on risks, innovation, external factors, long-term strategy. Suggestions: Commercial Activity, Democracy.

We should come up with a schedule for next year's Board meetings to plan in advance which will be discussed.

ACTION: AP to prepare a more detailed report on Commercial Activity for the next meeting.

ACTION: AP to prepare a list for the schedule of the forthcoming Board meetings.

10. To receive an update on the Union's Risk Register.

The Board identified an issue with the high risks involved in Club & Society activities and AP has looked at mitigating those risks. It is a difficult compromise between mitigating risks and unduly restricting activities. We can ensure paperwork is completed but we are uncertain whether the measures are carried out as written.

The higher risk the society or the activity, the more training/coaching we give to the committee and participants. There is guidance on the website.

MP stated that staff involvement can be helpful. AP stated that all activities are supported by a sabbatical and a staff member. However, even in a section such as the AU which is highly staffed, we are still unsure whether clubs comply.

ZL suggested spot checks by club chairs. DH stated that coaches are generally present for AU clubs.

MI suggested a self-assessment after the event, perhaps a survey of members rather than the organisers. AP stated that the issue is we do not know which clubs are just going through the motions. We could send a staff member out to audit them but this infringes on autonomy. Issues have been brought to the surface before via complaints.

ZL stated that students are not obliged to complete a survey so that might not be effective. Asking volunteers to complete audits might prove ineffective. More members of the committee should be trained, particularly the chairs who have to sign off risk assessments.

MD stated that societies could audit each other. Training should be offered to more people.

AJP asked if there are standard templates for risk assessments. There are guidelines but it is important for clubs to analyse their activities themselves.

AP stated that we want to avoid imposing sanctions – it is about supporting clubs in doing the right thing. The immediate feedback from training is good but they tend to forget before they come to use the knowledge. Training should be spread throughout the year to ensure knowledge is sustained. DH stated that he felt there was too much ‘team building’ exercises in training and not enough content. AP stated that the feedback from sessions is that those sort of exercises are liked; it is difficult to make a dry subject like risk assessments ‘fun’. We should certainly offer people different methods of learning eg online.

Volunteer training needs to be reviewed – it will be one of the topics for the strategic review section.

11. To receive proposed guidelines on the Bribery Act (to go with the proposed Bribery Act Policy).



bribery guidelines for
clubs socs students.d

The Board felt that the examples should be first. There is no issue with, for example, social secs being given free entry or free drinks *if* they attend a nightclub in town, but if there is a ‘deal’ where the nightclub benefits monetarily on a regular basis, this tips it over into bribery. Hall committee training takes place this weekend so some of these guidelines can be incorporated into the training. The guidance will be available on the website.

ACTION: LA to revise the guidelines to make them clearer and a one-page document.

12. To receive a report from the Union Director.



Union-Directorrep.do
CX

AP presented the report.

DT asked if the new tenants in line for the Jom Makan unit would be paying the same rent. One of the two said it was too high, which suggests a sensible approach. We may get c£35K with a profit share from them. The other said they would agree to the full amount, which is in a way concerning. We need someone who will make it a success and has a pragmatic approach to a longer term operation. The audited accounts are for the period up to 31 August.

The QAA report will be published at the next Programme Reps Conference in a few weeks’ time.

13. Institutions.

College had their Principal interviews which PC attended.

The University have appointed the new Vice Chancellor, start date 1 Sep 2012.

14. To consider any items referred to the Board by Union Council, and vice versa.

ZL expressed concern over the way Council is run and that some councillors don’t understand the

procedures. An open forum may be more effective. Students do not feel that they can contribute or argue their points at the moment.

AP stated that select committees are a more approachable way for students to raise their concerns, and exec members can then take those concerns to Council.

DH also expressed concern over the Constitution as it is very long. Supplying food and drink may make the atmosphere different which may help. AP agreed that this was a cost cutting measure during our period of austerity; it may be time to reinstate the refreshments.

The Board noted the concerns and offered its members to sit in on a meeting with Councillors if required to assist in facilitating discussion (JP and RB will facilitate).

CW suggested that the councillors on the Board encourage those who feel unable to speak to participate.

15. Any other business.

a) **Vice President Education**

Jayde has resigned her position as she has a permanent job. She leaves on 5 May. The Board wished her the best of luck in her new position. The VP Education Elect has to graduate before he can take up the position.

There is a lot of work to be redistributed though we are ahead on a lot of issues thanks to Jayde. There is a new member of staff in Voice who can assist with Programme Rep Conference.

16. Date of next meeting –Tuesday 19 June 2012 in the Board Room.