***Present Committee Members***

*Student Group Representatives:*

*Jacob Dyke*

*Matthew Widdop*

*Oishi Datta*

*Benedict Morgan*

*Payal Garg*

*Officers:*

*Alex Keen – Education Officer*

*Lara Parker – Sports Officer, Co-chair*

*Supporting staff members:*

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

*Samantha Macbeth – Student Activities Manager*

**Activities Committee Full Committee Meeting]**

20th November 11am

**Trigger Warnings: none**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item No.** | **Item Title** | **Meeting Notes** | **Actions** |
| **Start** |  |  |  |
| 1 | **Welcome & Introductions** | LP: invited all to give a brief introduction  LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG introduced themselves with their names, course/role details  HBH: you will need to cover delegation points before meeting  HBH: shares screen with last year’s delegation points  SM: explains the delegation points as written in the document.  SM: It can be revoked at any time if you agree you no longer want subcommittees  MW: Would we have to have a full committee meeting to decide that?  SM: Yes, could be done on email  LP: do we all agree?  LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG agree to implement delegation points  **Result: delegations agreed, full details saved in Activities Committee folder** |  |
| 2 | **Constitutional Changes** | LP: Now on to constitutional changes  **Planning**  LP: membership fee change, happy, any questions?  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change  **Nursing**  LP: Adding wellbeing officer, is this a new role?  Alex: think wording is good, not too much responsibility  LP: important that they’ve added it is to signpost, happy with that  BM: wording needs clarification, they refer to the role differently in places  LP: pick the term they want to use and then can be approved?  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change once wording is clarified  **Hindu**  LP: amending sampark co-ordinator, can anyone provide context?  AK: also adding social media, seems fine. Outreach officer seems fine  LP: Vice chair seems fine too  LP: are they adding 2 sampark co-ordinators?  MW: constitution just says 1  AK: yes just one  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change  **MMA**  LP: membership increase  JD: have issue with £10 increase as it could exclude some members financially  LP: do they have any reasonings?  HBH: increasing costs of their activity  MW: has gone through EGM and so their members have voted and agreed  LP: yes I think they will have looked at all of that  JD: fair enough  BM: likely just affect people next year anyway  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change  **Hookers and Stitchers**  LP: add extra wellbeing role  AK: is there a slight issue with wording?  BM: it does reference signposting so think it is similar to the role discussed before  AK: okay, no major issues  LP: yes, think it’s all okay  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change  **Indian**  LP: wanting to add an affiliation, has anyone checked this?  HBH: I have had a look through website and looked okay, affiliated with lots of other uni groups  LP: also want two sports reps and head of acts  AK: it says x2 for head of acts  SM: previously there has been an Indian dance society who have reached to us separately, so head of acts could impact if another group came forward. May need to think about how this decision may affect that  BM: does that group not exist?  SM: we believe it is no longer with Indian soc  HBH: there is a Bollywood new group coming for review later, so this could impact that  SM: it could be that they feel they are already doing it, and they are adding it in here to formalise it  BM: have they said they are already doing it?  HBH: yes believe so  OD: have both groups said it is Bollywood or is there different types of dances? Should take that into consideration  LP: that’s helpful, I think approve this new role and affiliations  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change  **Women in Finance**  JD: concerned about no responsibilities  HBH: you may be looking at the wrong document  AK: essentially removing positions and replacing with new roles  MW: think this is fine  BM: think its reasonable coming off SAS  LP: agreed, so they will have 3 core roles and vice pres rather than the previous additional members, seems sensible  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change  **Politics**  HBH: has come back to the committee as requested previously, to add in responsibilities for charity role  AK: sounds good  MW: reasonable  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change  **Women in Law**  LP: change membership fee, up by £5 and add vice president instead of co-chairs which were previously rejected  SM: think they have messed with the template, have changed the layout of committee role. Consider picking that up with them  JD: know they are a big society so think they would do well with the increase in the rate. Wanted to check co-chairs?  AK: we rejected the co-chairs and they have come back with vice pres  BM: I am only aware of associations with co-chairs  MW: and BUDS, it is a bit mixed  SM: there was work on this, custom of practice so far has been to reject until policy work is complete. Appreciate some may have snuck in previously  BM: was the template messed with before?  HBH: would have to check that  LP: membership and vice president, I’m happy to approve but not on basis that template has been changed. Shall we go back and ask to put it into the proper template?  Ak: happy to approve if it can be on the proper template  MW: in past we have had issue with similarity of president and vice president which seems to be the case here, would be tempted to ask for the roles to be distinct  LP: good point, they do reference ‘the presidents’ which goes against what we said previously  MW: partial approve for membership fee changes?  LP: yes and bring back vice president? Happy to approve fee change? Then to make clear that the roles need to be distinct  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG partially approve constitutional change for membership fee increase  Send back for further information to ask for clear distinction between President and Vice President, and to return template to normal.  **OStem**  JD: Queries about subcommittee  HBH: I think you are looking at the wrong one, that is for Tamil  MW & BM: shares page number  JD: my bad  LP: Changing aim, is everyone happy?  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change  **Tamil**  LP: Jacob did you want to add your thoughts here? Everyone else to read summary  HBH: the info in summary document was sent to me on email after further information was requested about how exactly the subcommittee worked  LP: let’s have a read then discuss  JD: There‘s no mention of how subcommittee is decided, not sure if I am missing it?  BM: no mention of how it is decided  JD: scares me that it may be unfair as it is unclear if they are elected  BM: LGBTQ association had a subcommittee and there were numerous issues as they were not elected and still had access to soc documents etc  JD: recommend to reject  MW: don’t like subcommittees at all and struggle to understand how they intend to work the subcommittee as they won’t have access to dashboard etc. only thing I can think is they may for people to be on hand for events but I don’t think that needs to be in the constitution.  BM: you wouldn’t need an official role for that  LP: agreed, good points, in agreement to not approve  SM: remember your reason to reject must link back to policy  Lp: any advice on what it could be rejected on?  MW: data protection act?  SM: amendments are not consistent with guild policy or law?  BM: encouraging unelected people to have power within society  SM: unsure what policy that would come under. Could say they may not meet new group criteria anymore as unelected people would have access to data.  Result: LP, JD, MW, AK, BM, OD, PG reject constitutional change as it would mean the group no longer meets the new group criteria.  *AK left the meeting.*  **IBM Z**  LP: add committee members  MW: two of the same roles, seems fine to me. Don’t like the way it’s written but that’s fine  LP: agreed, otherwise fine  Result: LP, JD, MW, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change    **Somali**  LP: change sports rep to events, remove outreach, adding 2 vice chairs and charity rep – quite a big one  JD: unclear wording for vice chairs, do other soc have 2x vice chairs?  MW: they can, I think its fine. Agree don’t like wording, but I think roles are fine. Could change wording for them to amend it to x2 vice chairs  LP: agreed, everyone okay with other roles?  BM: they have called it both rep and officer, choose one?  LP: are we happy with what the role is?  BM: there is also a typo but that is minor  LP: also says officers when there’s only one  Mw: we can correct that for them  LP: do we want any clarification around ensuring they stay in line with guild charitable objectives?  MW: I don’t mind either way, think it’s fine without  BM: they are asking charity rep to do advertising rather than social rep, which would be typical  MW: I’m keen to trust they know what they’re doing with that, if that’s what they want. Realistically they will share work anyway  LP: okay happy to approve the four roles with minor grammatical changes  Result: LP, JD, MW, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change once minor corrections are made  **Kickboxing**  JD: vice treasurer, never heard of this before, is it taking away from one of the core roles. Why is it necessary?  HBH: explains group context around tickets and how they feel they need another role to help with this  LP: think it’s well-reasoned  JD: on that note, could the name be changed to tickets officer or something to stray away from the core role?  MW: how is it going to be different to vice chair though?  Lp: they’re not messing with the core roles  BM: just adding someone to specifically support the Treasuer. Think its decent as treasurer is responsible to collect payments, having someone else there for that is helpful  LP: think its well-reasoned and can imagine someone is already filling that so might as well be in the constitution  Result: LP, JD, MW, BM, OD, PG approve constitutional change |  |
|  | **Goodbyes** | Full committee meeting ends  Continued in Sub Committee on the same date |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | |
| 6 |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |

**Date & Time of next meeting: 3rd December 3-4pm**