

Minutes

Subject:	Management Committee Minutes: 17 September 2018
Produced by:	Tony Moore
To:	Management Committee
Action:	To approve
Status	Open
Paper:	MC 12.18 6

Present: Georgina Burchell (GB), Martin Marko (MM). Jenna Chapman, Oli Gray (OG)

In attendance: T Cave (TCV), Lou Chiu (LC), Tony Moore (TM), L Aspey (LA) (Head of Advice and Students Rights)

Chair: Sophie Atherton (SA)

Apologies: Toby Cunningham, Martin Marko

Decisions and Action Points

- *Agreed to close Home Let, to bring Housing back into Advice and a new departmental staff structure to include two managers: one for Advice and one for Housing*
- *The Committee had no political objections to a move away from NUSL if a cheaper supplier were to be found*
- *Agreed to send a Code of Conduct case against a Sports Club to a disciplinary hearing and to share the investigation report with the University*
- *Agreed that a representative should take part in the TEF subject level pilot and that JC and staff would work on how to communicate decision to members*

MC40	<p>Housing Review</p> <p>LA summarised the written paper. LA advised that the drivers for the review had been: a request at Staff Residential for more clarity as to the future structure of the department and concerns from management as to whether the present Advice structure was best shaped for serve members' needs.</p> <p>LA highlighted the key finding and recommendation: to not spend any more money on Home Let and to close it at the end of the current academic year. LA advised that Home Let's problems could not be fixed and that, given the changeability of the local housing market, any further investment would be throwing good money after bad. LA</p>
-------------	---

advised that the original intention behind Home Let had been to drive up housing standards but this had failed to happen. LA noted that the Union had not been able to establish a presence at key City Council meetings.

LA advised that there were three staffing options at the end of the paper; their strong recommendation would be to go for Option 1. LA noted that all the options were predicated on:

- Staff time being invested in to development of Home Run
- Developing relationships so that the Union had a voice at the table and influence any decisions that affect the local housing market
- To take Home Run back to basics and to drive student housing standards up

LA advised it was proposed to take Housing away from the commercial arm and back into Advice: this would increase its effectiveness and increase staff morale.

LA advised that the recommended Option 1 would introduce a new layer of staffing with the creation of two manager posts: one for Advice and one for Housing. LA noted this option would allow for greater staff progression and free up the Head to focus on strategy development and set the groundwork for bringing positive change for the members.

SA wondered what would happen to present Home Let tenants and properties.

LA advised that students and landlords would be given plenty of notice and access to advice.

GB believed that Option 1 would be the best. GB argued that Home Run standards had gone down and that, because of Home Let, staff had not had resources available to provide adequate support for Home Run. GB noted that Home Run was no longer trusted by students. GB queried the concentration on and hyperbole around list releases which caused stress to students.

LA agreed and noted that list release was an outdated concept and they would be discussing with the Officers alternative approaches.

JC wondered as to any future Home Run price increases.

LA advised that prices had only increased by £20 over several years and that there was a balance to be struck between cost to members and fair value for the service and that price options would be looked at.

The Committee unanimously approved the paper's recommendations and agreed to Option 1 for a new staffing structure.

MC41 Minutes, Apologies, Matters Arising

Minutes agreed. Apologies noted.

Reports on Action Points

GB noted that, on the acting CEO's advice, student sexual misconduct would not be added to the Risk Register as this did not present a reputational risk for the Union: any risk would lie with the University.

MC42 Operational & Key Relationship Updates

LC

- Student Transformation Weekend
- Freshers' Rota organisation – still blank spaces in some key slots
- Meeting with Concrete
- SOC residential
- Press queries
- Papers for SEC

JC

- Library Forum
- LTQC presenting on Inclusive Curriculum
- LT spaces group
- Tech learning good for Lecture Capture
- SCI LTQC coming up and then convenor training

TCV

- Will be attending SUSS pension meeting along with other SU's with liabilities in the scheme

GB

- Holiday
- HR shortlisting
- Accommodation meeting
- Student experience logos

OG

- Uni Comms meeting about blogs now to be written in news format
- University Finance Committee
- Sports Take a Stand – water bottles and marketing
- Meeting on Colney Lane redevelopment and problems it has encountered
- Training on initiations
- Upcoming meeting with Ian Callaghan

SA

- Student Transformation Weekend
- SOC residential
- Meeting with Estates – will lead on bus strategy
- Upcoming Park and Ride meeting

MC43 Social Enterprises Updates

<p>MC44</p>	<p>TCU absent - no report. Committee noted the Shop refurbishment completed and re-opening of the Shop. OG reported that Fidelity had been looking at problems with the tills in the Shop. OG noted there had also been problems with the tills in the Bars: those supplied had been found to be not waterproof.</p> <p>Chief of Staff Recruitment</p> <p>To be discussed at Board.</p>
<p>MC45</p>	<p>NUSSL as a supplier</p> <p>SA noted that this had been discussed at Board but that the Committee should come to a collective political stance on the matter.</p> <p>SA believed that NUSSL had treated the Union badly and noted that other SUs had left the consortium and not encountered any problems. GB argued that NUSSL had rejected the Union's attempts to work together.</p> <p>JC noted concerns that smaller SUs might suffer if another large Union pulled out but that if a lower cost supplier were to be available then the Union should go with it.</p> <p>OG agreed with JC.</p> <p>JC wondered whether pulling out of the consortium entirely might affect the wider relationship with NUS.</p> <p>LC advised that it would not: the NUS Charity and Union Development arms were separate from NUSSL.</p> <p><i>The Committee unanimously agreed that they had no political objections to a move away from NUSSL if a cheaper supplier were to be found.</i></p>
<p>MC46</p>	<p>Code of Conduct Case</p> <p>SA noted that, after the last meeting, the FTOs had met outside the Committee had had decided to send the case to a disciplinary hearing and to share the investigation report with the University.</p> <p>OG reported that a separate incident involving the Club at Derby Day was currently being investigated by the University.</p> <p><i>The Committee unanimously agreed, with OG abstaining, to send the case against the Club to a disciplinary hearing and to share the investigation report with the University</i></p>
<p>MC47</p>	<p>Availability of Management Committee minutes from previous year</p> <p>Chair noted these were now available.</p>
<p>MC48</p>	<p>Five Year Financials</p>

TCV highlighted the issues confronting the Union over the next five years.
TCV advised that profits would come under increased pressure and the main driver would be the inexorable rise in staff costs with the imminent rise in permanent staff wages and the Living Wage rising above inflation. TCV further noted that increased utility costs would also be a factor. TCV noted that, if inflation rose, this would hit Shop margins as increased costs might be difficult to pass on to the members. TCV noted that the forecast for the current year profits was bullish but this would be impossible to repeat year after year.

TCV noted, on capex, that the spending needs to keep trading operations were about three times the amount annually budget for.

TCV reported, on legacy pension liabilities, that these would not go away and there was still the unresolved legal issue with SUSS reported to Board that might have negative implications.

TCV concluded that the above pressures meant that the Union would not hit the reserves target set by the Board and would be, eventually, in deficit.

TCV advised that the above situation would need to be presented to the University; TCV thought that the University might be amenable to help with capex as this would involve a small part of the University's own overall expenditure.

Committee members noted the rise in student numbers and the increased demand on the Union's services.

OG wondered whether the Union might be able to lengthen the period of payment of the pension liabilities.

TCV advised that this would be unlikely due to the Regulator's need to balance the interests of all concerned parties.

The Committee noted receipt of the report.

MC49 TEF and Student Representation

JC noted that the University were taking part in the TEF subject level pilot exercise and had asked for a student representative to be involved. JC expressed a concern that, if the Union did not agree to be involved due to the current policy against TEF, the University would go ahead and recruit a non-Union representative and the Union would lose the ability to influence the process.

GB agreed with JC's concerns and also noted the FTOs should make the situation clear to members and present their reasoning to Union Council.

SA noted that policy resolves stipulated that the Union should fight against TEF and it would be extremely important to justify the involvement of a Union rep.

LC advised that the matter could be communicated to members as a report to Council or as a public statement.

	<p>.</p> <p><i>The Committee agreed that a representative should take part in the TEF subject level pilot and that JC and staff would work on how to communicate to members.</i></p> <p>MC50 Staffing (closed)</p> <p>Back Pay Request</p> <p><i>The Committee agreed to the request.</i></p> <p>MC50 AOB</p> <p>OG reported that Ian Callaghan had asked about the University's request to have a representative on the Trustee Board; OG had noted that the Union had not yet received the University's formal proposal and would consider it when it was received.</p> <p>LC reported progress on building the Union's links with the University's partner institutions including the proposed link with Temple University in the USA.</p> <p>MC51 TDP of next meeting</p> <p>9 am Room 2 October.</p>
--	---