

**A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES 2011-12 WAS HELD
AT 5PM ON 16 OCTOBER 2012 IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE.**

31 Oct 2012

BT-131-M1

MINUTES

Present: Michael Pearson (Chair), Ellie Read, Rory Mitchell, Caroline Walker, David Haines, David Tingle, Mark Dunkley, Andrew J Pyatt, Lincoln Chan.

In attendance: Andy Parsons, Louisa Allen.

1. **Apologies and to note that JG, JC and MI are no longer members of the Board. DH is now attending as Chair of Council in place of JC.**

Zoe Lloyd.

2. **To approve the minutes of the previous meeting and to deal with matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda – BT-123-M3.**



BT-123-M3.docx

There were no matters arising. The minutes were approved.

3. **To receive and approve a report from the Executive – ER, to include key financial and trading – RM.**



Exec report
16Oct2012.pdf



F&T update.pdf

ER presented the Executive report. AJP congratulated the exec on their progress this year.

RM presented the financial/trading report. AP stated that if we are aggressive with our promotions and offer very specific incentives then that should improve the situation with Venue. However with Shops we may have to do some further investigation to find out what is going on. This is the reason we don't budget very tightly until we see these figures. CW noted we are approx 400 students down this year (half undergrads and half postgraduates) and these students are the first to have the very large loans, so it may well be attitudinal.

AP noted that the wholesaling has gone well and though we may be losing a certain amount of discount from the supplier it is still worth doing. CW queried the legality AP clarified that it was not in breach of any supply agreement we have signed and the company we are supplying is a reputable pub chain/function company. The trading needs to go through Loughborough Student Services Ltd, with the profits going back to the charitable organisation through gift aid. We are paid before our customer takes the stock away from the premises. The profits on this activity are worth approx £100,000 to us There is a working party at NUSSL discussing the issue. AP will prepare a full report for the next board meeting.

4. **To receive and approve the Statutory Accounts 2010-2011 – AP/RM.**

- a) Final Accounts



Final accounts
2010-11.pdf

- b) KIM



KIM Loughborough
Students Union.pdf

- c) Management Commentary



Management
commentary on the a

d) To approve the steps being taken to establish stronger control and management systems. AP reported that the accounts present a reasonably stable and satisfactory picture for the union; however, our trading position continues to slip. One difference to the Charitable SORP is that all income/expenditure has to be listed, which accounts for the larger figures that previously we have only had to show the net effect of (eg clubs and socs raising their own money to spend on kit etc). Unrestricted funds are what we would traditionally think of as 'union money'. The loan restructure has since taken 100k off the current liabilities. Stock increases are due to the opening of the second art shop, plus buying advantageously and then storing alcohol. Though we are also improving stock holding levels to reduce unnecessary stock (such as clothing, cigarettes and spirits). Grant Thornton should be in to audit the 2011-12 accounts in approx 3 weeks. The university are also assisting with interim audits. Our issue in the past has been that the balance sheet was not directly connected to the Exchequer system. This has now been corrected and more work will be done to ensure control in the future. The accounts went to University Finance committee this week and they appreciated the narrative.

5. **To receive a financial report on the financial year 2011-2012 – AP/RM.**

- a) Management Accounts



Copy of
July12MgmtReports

- b) Commentary



Commentary on
Loughborough Studer

- c) To confirm appointment of auditors – Grant Thornton – and to note their fee proposal.

AP stated that he is not satisfied with the way the figures are currently presented to the Board and intends to improve this in future, now we have satisfactory basis on which to make changes. It is important to give enough detail without overwhelming with information. AP hopes to present the accounts differently by the next meeting.

The nightbus costs approx £500 per month to rent. We have looked extensively at owning against renting and it is not cost effective. Previously the bus was rented from Rag so it was an internal transfer.

Within all of the totals figures is an amount for depreciation which creates a pot of cash to spend on replacing equipment.

ACTION: AP to prepare a different format of the accounts for the next meeting for comment and further development.

The Grant Thornton partner will be presenting the accounts to the Finance Committee. If we are satisfied with them, AP would like for the Board to give power to the Finance Committee to sign off the accounts. AP has discussed their fees with them several times; they state that their fee was based on a straightforward audit, which this has not been.

CW requested that if the auditors are late in starting their audit, AP will inform the Board via email.

The Board accepted and approved the proposal to explicitly delegate power to the FMSC to accept and authorise the accounts.

The Board accepted and approved the proposal to appoint Grant Thornton as auditors for 2011-12 on this basis.

6. **To receive a report on the Research Project – AP.**

a) Final report



Redbrick report.docx



Redbrick-implication.docx

b) Proposals on actions arising.

AP presented the report.

DT asked where this is being shared. AP stated that we need to look at the rollout. It needs to be shared widely but not just the raw report, which could be confusing. Methods of distribution are being discussed. 'Passive participants' are now known as 'flow goers'; 'studious solos' are 'academic individualists'. The executive discussed ways of reaching these groups at their awayday.

AP pointed out that students do not currently see us as a 'quality' organisation, and they would like to, so we need to address this. They did however see the Union as overwhelmingly positive.

MD noted that trying to make the Union more attractive to one tribe could alienate the others. ER stated that we need to communicate our offerings better to those tribes who currently feel we don't serve them correctly – we do have a huge range of activities that would be suitable for them and we need to get that across. The Academic Individualists are the hardest group to reach; they do not like the 'Lufbra' culture. We have activities which that tribe would enjoy, including academic representation, and we need to communicate that in a way they will engage with and are comfortable with (for example less Facebook, more LURN). DOs are key for this.

Conscientious Carers are another group we need to make an additional effort with.

DH stated that some students may feel alienated by the description of the tribes they are allocated to. AP noted that the categories were originally defined by students who identified themselves as such – they would not necessarily see the description as derogatory. Though this is the report, our actions will not be taken directly from the report.

Redbrick recommend 5 'golden questions' which will assist us in provisionally categorising our students. It won't preclude people from receiving certain promotions, but it will assist in initial engagement. Then we can work on helping students make the most of the Union. We need to be sure that the message is 'we want to serve you better'; therefore we will be transparent about what we are doing. The question will be 'does this sound like you?' rather than 'you are a ...'.

An example of the use of this data is where students choose to live – for example, 'party people' may well prefer to live in halls.

The question is how do we serve the 10% who are not currently satisfied with the Union's service without detriment to the 90% who are? The answer is targeting. Improvements on this should be reflected in the NSS results.

The report also shows that we think students know the full range of what we offer, and they don't. Although the research says that students are not dissatisfied with our branding, it does not mean that we shouldn't refresh it, given the opportunity, so we are looking at that (will ask JP's advice) and will produce a more detailed specification to the next Board meeting. DH suggested using students from the Design School rather than paying for an external consultant. ER stated that we need to be sure

not to compromise on quality. As students were involved and consulted for the Redbrick project, it is inevitable that students will be involved and consulted for the branding project. AP stated that experienced professionals are required on this issue.

DT and LC stated that the report states that students require quality, so we need to be sure that we will get this as a result of this exercise.

AP stated that we have worked with the company that re-branded Loughborough Sport and they will be one of the companies to tender for the work, with one other. We will have an informal conversation and then write up a bid for the Board to approve, before inviting them to tender.

AJP left the meeting.

7. To receive an update on the Union's Key Performance Indicators – AP.



KPIs-2010-2011-Statistic-breakdown.xlsx

AP presented the report. The red items are the areas of concern.

DH stated that there is some concern over Council at the moment and this needs to be addressed.

8. To review the Union's Risk Register – AP.



Union-risk-registeroct12.pdf

The revised risk register was noted by the Board including the risk concerning the functionality of Council which is being addressed urgently by the VP Democracy and Chair of Council.

Commercial trading is on the downturn for nearly all unions Loughborough remain part of a group of about 25 unions for which commercial income is important; we need to ensure that NUSSL continues to operate in our interests.

9. To receive a report from the Union Director – AP.



Union-Director-Reportoct12.docx

a) Staff appointments

b) Leases

To confirm that we are pleased to have in place the following leases:

Cara Edwards T/A Sensique Beauty Salon

Term to 2 Aug 2014 - Rent £7,500

WEIS RESTAURANT LTD (2) and WEI CHAO LIU and ZHI WEI WU (3)

Term to 1st Aug 2017. Premium £30k, Rent £41,500 p.a.

All the Union premises are currently occupied which is a real achievement in the current climate.

We have also renewed our lease for the Purple Onion with the University as follows:

Loughborough University for use of the Ground for the Purple Onion shop and fast food for a 12 month term at a peppercorn rent.

c) NSS results.

10. To consider any items referred to the Board by Union Council and vice versa – DH.

The Remunerations Committee has not yet met – DH will check. The issue could fit into the PM&HRSC. The members are MP, CW, AP (attending), 3 student members of the Board (elected internally).

We need to elect two members of the board to the Branding Project Team. DH and DT will attend. Council issues will be addressed.

11. Institutions.

ER has met with the College Principal. Relations are good at the moment, lots of presentations at the college, the committee is up and running.

12. Date of next meeting – Tuesday 4 December at 3.30pm.