*Devansh Jhamnani – Activities and Employability Officer*

**Activities Committee Sub Group**

26th February 2025

*Lara Parker – Sports Officer*

*Student Group’s Representatives:*

*Benedict Morgan*

*Jacob Dyke*

*Matthew Widdop*

*Supporting Staff Present*

*Harriet Berrington-Hughes – Senior Student Group’s Co-ordinator*

*Samantha Macbeth – Student Activities Manager*

**Trigger Warnings:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item No.** | **Item Title** | **Meeting Notes** | **Actions** |
| **Start** |  |  |  |
| 1 | **Welcome & Introductions** | LP chairing today |  |
| 2 | **Constitutional Changes** | **Debating**  JD: Declares conflict of interest  LP: One new role, renaming of another one, any thoughts?  BM: Both seem fine  LP: Agreed, everyone happy to approve  **LP, DJ, BM, MW, vote to approve constitutional change**  **LARP**  BM: Declares conflict of interest  LP: introduction of the vice chair, any thoughts?  MW: looks fine  DJ: agreed  LP: approved then  **LP, DJ, MW, JD, vote to approve constitutional change**  **Cheese**  LP: new soc this year so no surprise they want new roles, did they just have the core before?  BM: yes believe so  LP: brill looks fine  DJ: yep  MW: happy  JD: I don’t like the wording but fine if everyone else is happy  LP: noticed that but not problematic wording  MW: gets the message across  **LP, DJ, BM, MW, JD, vote to approve constitutional change**  **Meal Prep**  LP: adding new roles, are they new soc?  MW: reasonably new, responsibilities are a bit brief  LP: yes, bit brief, but they have referenced signposting. They say “speak about any issues”, do we have issue with that?  MW: I think having signposting in there is enough  SM: consider whether it should be “any issues relating to the society”, is it a lot to put on a volunteer to invite all issues?  LP: think its approvable but could get clarification and go back for a chair’s approval, or we can approve it?  LP: change wording and then approved  **LP, DJ, BM, MW, JD, vote to approve constitutional change** |  |
| 3 | **New Group Proposals** | **Ihsan**  JD: basically, like a group for Sunni Islam  HBH: there is crossover feedback  MW: first group we’ve seen using tiktok, 4000 followers  SM: how do you know they are UoB students?  LP: it’s called UoB on the page but not sure about the followers  MW: following someone on tiktok is very different to Instagram  LP: yes agreed, don’t think it’s the same  MW: did try to find an Instagram but couldn’t. Not against it but think it’s interesting  HBH: shares conflict of interest  MW: I feel like it is different to the Christian groups as this doesn’t seem to be a different denomination to Islam  JD: Disagree as not all different Christian groups are denominations so surely this should be allowed  SM: we have done a lot of work with Christian Union and they are quite specific in the doctrine that they follow and so they don’t seem to cover all Christian faiths, so other groups are needed in their case  BM: Sunni Islam is a denomination but it is the biggest one, so it will have the most crossover with Isoc compared to the others  JD: Christian Union does take an evangelical take but it does have a lot of other viewpoints attend  LP: understand but I think SM is talking more about the constitution and what they intend to do, rather than who attends  DJ: they have mentioned how they are different but I think they are not different enough  MW: can we see Isoc’s constitution  LP: they have tried to explain their differences but I don’t think it demonstrates enough real substance. Historically we have tended to lean towards the current group and respecting their crossover feedback  HBH: shares Isoc constitution  BM: seems they think isoc is more about having a community rather than individuals  MW: to be fair that is what their constitution says, about community Islamic activities. Their main difference is that Isoc do big things, and they want to do small things. I can see people may want this but not sure if it’s enough to do another group  LP: yeah I agree  BM: looks at context of Sunnah Islam and assumes both groups are of the same denominations  JD: is there a specific reason they may have proposed this group?  LP: I would assume they’ve seen a gap in the market. I’m split as there is a lot of crossover but we do also have a lot of faith groups who arguably crossover a lot but we don’t have this with Islamic  HBH: mentions there are two other faith groups related to Islam  SM: did we reach out to chaplaincy?  HBH: ZB confirms she reached out but they didn’t reply  MW: not sure about this, can we think and come back?  Discussion is continued later in meeting  **Feminist**  LP: were these SAS?  MW: no new group. Is this related to the motion that was put on the website, re IFA not representing womens issues and needs  BM: just found it, they said IFA was LGBTQ focused and not focused on womens issues  LP: when was this?  BM: 21st Feb last year  MW: may not be related at all  BM: don’t think it’s related  JD: I think as its year ago I don’t think its really relevant. I can see why they want this society as they haven’t been able to contact IFA and want the society  BM: like the term of space for ‘women and non-men’  MW: has this been brought up with IFA and these options discussed?  SM: yes ZB has reached out, general thought is it seems unfair to make these students wait, we are still looking into what to do with IFA as they are not replying but thought we would progress with it separately  BM: they haven’t posted anything this entire year  JD: can we not get DJ to force an EGM?  SM: we can do an ad hoc audit but there is a process where we have to give them every chance to respond etc so consider whether it may be best to progress with the students who are interested now  MW: can we see IFAs objectives as if they crossover then we may not be able to approve anyway  HBH: shares IFA constitution  MW: I think that clashes quite a lot personally  JD: they have failed most of the objectives though as they don’t do anything  MW: this is irrelevant as being active is related to audit and not new groups  LP: we have a group of students who currently can’t do anything if we don’t approve, and then a group who aren’t doing anything, so it’s a weird stalemate where it doesn’t benefit any students  JD: I agree as it brings confidence in guild down if people can’t do things due to beurocracy like this  MW: it is bad but I think if it conflicts I don’t think we can approve it due to policy  SM: policy says no other group can exist with similar objectives or aims  JD: Don’t we technically have groups who have similar aims in general anyway, e.g board games and sober socials. So even though it is in the policy it is different in practice  MW: there tends to be a difference between aims in the constitution and what groups actually do but that’s a different discussion. In my opinion we still can’t approve as it is as it’s against the regulations  LP: the objectives of the new group are just awareness etc  MW: but I think those are all covered in the IFA  LP: I just feel like we should be trying to reach a point where we can support this  BM: could we go back and say the aims are too similar, suggest they think about their objectives  LP: their objectives are super vague so surely will crossover with anything  MW: I am more keen to bounce back with new objectives. You can vote differently to approve if you like  LP: I just don’t think it would cause any issues if approved  SM: You may want to consider other groups you may have and could reject, so that you are not cherry picking and are being consistent  LP: Thank you, I would back my decision here based on the context  JD: agree with LP due to the inactivity of the IFA  MW: the conflict exists and so if we approve its against the policy but I am happy for you to vote  LP: anyone else have any more questions, concerns, comments? Okay, put that to a vote  FOR: LP, BM, JD, DJ  AGAINST: MW  **Majority vote (4:1) is for new group to be approved**  **Young Adult Fellowship**  LP: any crossover feedback?  HBH: no crossover, chaplaincy were asked but no response  JD: concern that this says it is for Chinese and Asian students only  BM: can we see Chinese Christians objectives?  HBH: pulls up constitution  MW: they all have to be open to all anyway  LP: think it’s a valid point but there are others like this so think its fine  BM: it’s in the byelaws that any students can join?  MW: yes, and in the constitution  BM: this is a similar situation to Isoc and Ihsan soc  LP: okay so Chinese Christian didn’t get back to us? What’s everyone’s thoughts?  MW: I think it’s difficult, but not too concerned  LP: do we have a Methodist group?  BM: as far as I can see we don’t have a Methodist  SM: I think Methodist is covered in other Christian groups  HBH: yes not explicitly  LP: yes I think the difference here is the existing group haven’t expressed any concern so I would be happy to approve?  **LP, DJ, BM, MW, JD, vote to approve new group**  **Start Up**  DJ: declares conflict of interest  HBH: shares constitution for this and context about potential crossover which the group have attempted to address, and business seem happy with this  HBH: shares business constitution as well  LP: what is an incubator in this context  MW: believe it is support for a start up  MW: they do seem quite different  Lp: think they’ve done a good job with avoiding crossover  JD: biggest concern I had was no one looking after the sport, no committee role  LP: so many groups have a sports team so can’t really consider that  Mw: don’t think they need an explicit committee role. They have changed template?  HBH: added to it rather than changed  LP: done a good job, think they’ve worked well with business to address conflict  SM: just had a look at their Instagram and it is very generic followers, a lot of campaigning groups  HBH: shares small business owners constitution  MW: more similar than the other one but still quite different  LP: happy with that? What about expression of interest?  BM: seems like they have 15 actual people so seems fine  **LP, BM, MW, JD, vote to approve new group**  DJ leaves the meeting  **Alternative Investment**  LP: any crossover feedback?  HBH: Shares crossover from BIFs who feel there is a lot of crossover  LP: I think that’s fair  MW: proposal says they were unhappy BIFs for not covering types of investment but BIFs say they do cover this  HBH: shares BIFS constitution  MW: to be fair the objectives are more different than expected  BM: a lot of them are just what societies do generally  LP: my thoughts are that if we are leaning towards approving this then that principle may apply to the isoc group, for consistency  Mw: think I’m leaning towards rejection  JD: too similar in my opinion  Lp: agree I think it’s a bit too similar, think BIFS are capable of running these things within their own objectives  BM: if they need more committee members to do these things then they can add them  **LP, BM, MW, JD, vote to reject new group**  **Ihsan**  LP: return to discussion  MW: still on the side of no personally  LP: yes me too. My only thought is the size of isoc but don’t think I should base my decision on this. So on that I think not approve  MW: agree, think that too.  LP: I know I would find it helpful if chaplaincy could make a comment, can we push for this  **LP, BM, MW, JD, vote to reject new group** |  |
| 4 | **AOB** | **Grant Extensions**  Students for Life  HBh: shares email  LP: only extra month, happy with that  **Grant request to be extended until the end of March**  Hookers & Stitchers  MW: what is it for?  BM: requested £100 for pizza for AGM  LP: can always give them until last Friday of term,  MW: give them until the end of april  **Grant request to be extended until the end of April**  Debating  JD: declares conflict of interest  HBH: pulls up grant details and explains they have entered a new competition  LP: no problem with this, reallocate funds from Manchester  **Grant funds that were allocated to Manchester competition to be re-allocated to Queen Mary**  **Paper – Constitution Change**  HBH: shares paper and explains reasonings  LP: all good  **LP, BM, MW, JD, agree to paper to change constitution template**  HBH: all AOB from me  LP: anyone else?  MW: have heard about emergency grant being denied by groups  HBH: explains situation, those applications were not emergencies so were guided by staff  LP: wouldn’t want those coming to AC to take up time anyway  MW: cool just wanted to check  **Everyone says goodbye and meeting ends** |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | |
| 6 |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |

**Date & Time of next meeting:**