

## Committee Name: Activities Committee

**Date & Time:** 03/12/2021

**Present:** (see below)

In attendance	Apologies	Absent without apologies
- Josephine Conway (Activities and Employability Officer) [Chair] - George Christian (Sports Officer) - Jacob Wilson - Timon Burford  - Gemma Allport (Senior Student Groups Coordinator) - Sam Macbeth (Student Groups Manager) - Abigail (Student Groups Coordinator)	- Frances Atkinson - Adam Sheridan (Director of Engagement) - Munira Eid - Shalabh Sivanand - Zeyu Li - Yihan Si - Jules Singh (Education Officer)	

No.	Item for discussion	Questions/Comments/Voting Decision From Discussion	Action
1	New Group Proposals	<p><u>Spanish Society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JC: talks through proposal provided and the different types of activities the group wants to run. The group want to do monthly meetings and practice language skills. There are lots of plans and things they want to do</li> <li>JC: do we have a modern foreign languages society?</li> <li>SM: yes we do</li> <li>JC: so that would include Spanish?</li> <li>SM: yes</li> </ul>	

- JC: but another society doesn't exist that is specifically Spanish?
- JW: academic not cultural
- JC: crossover very limited with other groups
- JC: when Student Groups were liaising with the group it was questioned the use of hispanic over spanish. The group came back with feedback though and want to keep it as spanish
- JC: not sure what they mean within their objectives where they say 'provided by the Guild'
- JW: I think they mean to make sure they don't offer a duplicate service
- JC: can keep amount of roles small and build on those
- JW: looks good
- JC: do we think the wording of the constitution is fine?
- TB: probably just mean cultural context
- JC: ok all good

No objections raised. Spanish society proposal unanimously approved:

JW: Yes

TB: Yes

JC: Yes

GC: Yes

#### ISTEM Society

- JC: they have listed cultural and international as their category- is this suitable for this
- JC: ISOC originally had no issues but have got back with others since
- GA: ISOC have been in touch and said that they do now have issues with crossover where activities may overlap with one another and the demographic of their groups with appealing directly to

		<p>Islamic students. They also raised a point about potential crossover with other STEM subjects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: OSTEM also have issues with the name of the group. They have a focus on engineering within their group and an Intent to work with EPS</li> <li>• JC: lots of interest in their group on social media. Want to engage with graduates and alumni as well as affiliating with EPS. Have societies affiliated with EPS before?</li> <li>• SM: some groups work with EPS but you can't affiliate. EPS aren't responsible for these groups though in a legal sense</li> <li>• JW: I know of several societies in that position with EPS</li> <li>• JC: have a lot of additional roles. Want to have a Co-President and a Vice President, Charity REP, Sports REP, Industry REP, Postgrad REP. Want to have male and female versions of roles</li> <li>• JW: I can't see the logic behind non-mixed events</li> <li>• JC: main concern is of crossover with ISOC</li> <li>• TB: ISOC got back after initial papers. I believe we should advise to incorporate members of committee that could represent STEM within ISOC. Overlap will likely otherwise be an issue</li> <li>• JC: really good idea. Had since realised there were overlap issues</li> <li>• JW: If they can hold events separate to ISOC that are drawing interest then that shows there is scope for this</li> <li>• JC: ISOC are big aren't they? Would be difficult to currently accept this proposal. Lots of opposition from ISOC and OSTEM</li> <li>• SM: ISOC have 350 members</li> <li>• JW: compared to ISTEM 160. 30 to 60 people may be turning up to events</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TB: proposal shows they have interest in engineering. Would need to account for students in STEM outside of engineering</li> <li>• JW: Maths already exists for example</li> <li>• SM: I recommend you go back to the policy and work from this</li> <li>• JC: must charge a minimum £3 fee- this is reflected. No other group can exist with the same name or aims is a big one here.</li> <li>• JC: 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9 are all fine within the groups' policy. The issue is 3.4</li> <li>• JW: there is IFA and Women in Science in Engineering. There are lots of overall societies and sub-groups</li> <li>• JW: associations exist and their women's societies separately</li> <li>• SM: need to follow policy and be consistent</li> <li>• JC: quite a tricky one</li> <li>• JW: would be best to reject on the grounds of crossover but encourage them to collaborate with crossover groups</li> <li>• TB: agree with this- discussion with ISOC to get them working together too</li> <li>• JC: would be happy to facilitate a meeting between the two groups. If we rejected and then they came back would that be fine?</li> <li>• SM: yes</li> <li>• JC: meet and try to make It more specific and clarify differences is also an option</li> <li>• JW: likely to run even if we reject them. Suspect they will do what they want regardless and then the Guild get membership income</li> <li>• JC: shall we take a vote to make a decision</li> </ul> <p>ISTEM group proposal unanimously rejected:</p> <p>JW: No TB: No</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>JC: No GC: No</p> <p><b>Reason for rejection:</b> not approving on the basis of article 3.4 due to significant crossover with ISOC. For this group to be encouraged to speak to ISOC to see how they can work together to deliver ISTEM aims</p> <p><b>Other actions:</b> for JC to offer to facilitate a meeting between ISOC and ISTEM if the two groups would like this support</p> <p><b><u>Cryptocurrency Society</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: participating in discussions and trips based on cryptocurrency</li> <li>• GA: Investment society came back and said that they had no issues around crossover with this society and their group</li> <li>• JC: information provided on potential affiliations. Abbreviating to CSB rather than CSS to avoid crossover with CSS. Affiliations linked in with constitution. Corporate relations officer role. Looks good- only concern is around affiliations</li> <li>• SM: we did have a cryptocurrency and fintech society that was derecognised due to a lack of interest</li> <li>• JW: both affiliations don't seem wise or well researched</li> <li>• JC: I agree. If we decide to approve should ask them to remove affiliations. Has it been over 12 months since they were derecognised?</li> <li>• SM: You can still consider it if audit is why they were derecognised. They were deleted in August 2020 so over a year ago</li> <li>• JC: Have 32 members on their group. Seems quite active with organising events. On the 18th November they</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>reached 20 members. I would be happy to approve with removal of affiliations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TB: investment said they were fine so I am good with this</li> <li>• JW: wary of Cryptocurrency- risky area for people to get into. Being part of the Guild wouldn't change that though. Bits of their constitution would need tidying up.</li> <li>• JC: approve and tidy up</li> <li>• JW: work out which category they should be</li> <li>• GA: suggestion of activity or interest and appreciation</li> <li>• JC: I would suggest interest and appreciation</li> </ul> <p>Cryptocurrency group proposal unanimously conditionally approved based on the following conditions:</p> <p>1) removing both listed affiliations 2) Tidying up their constitution (i.e. CSS reference and where they say they are uncertain)</p> <p>JW: Yes TB: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p><b>Other actions:</b> for support around tidying up their constitution to be picked up via the groups' dedicated Coordinator</p> <p><b><u>Canadian Society</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: £30 membership. Want to be an association. Discussion around types of activity they would want to do. Careers based activities. Would need financial support. Want to bring Canadians</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>together to build friendships. Cross culture events. Have reduced membership fee to £20 within their constitution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GC: not sure they can use abbreviation of CS</li> <li>• JC: price is a problem</li> <li>• JW: most people go for £3-£5</li> <li>• JC: are cultural more than liberation</li> <li>• JW: mini-forums don't match up with the categories actually available</li> <li>• GA: we are sorting this as a team</li> <li>• JC: second aim needs tidying up. Do we have a North American society?</li> <li>• GA: No</li> <li>• JC: would be happy to approve but they would need to make significant changes</li> <li>• JW: need to just go off their constitution for this decision</li> <li>• JW: can we approve the idea and delegate responsibility for changes to Chair's Action?</li> <li>• SM: could go back for more Information and then Chair's Action to make a final decision as their constitution isn't clear and you have questions about it</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously decide to go back to the group with a request for further Information.</p> <p>Once further information has been provided then for an updated constitution to be approved on Chair's Action and agreed on via email correspondence with the group.</p> <p>Items which require further Information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) price</li> <li>2) objectives</li> <li>3) name abbreviation</li> </ol> <p>JW: Yes</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>TB: Yes  JC: Yes  GC: Yes</p> <p><b>Other actions:</b> if the group requires help re-writing their constitution for this support to be provided by a member of the Student Groups Team.</p> <p><b><u>Alternative Dispute Resolution Society</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: we have now got the further information to consider this application with as this proposal came to a previous meeting</li> <li>• JC: crossover information to be considered. ELSA came back with crossover concerns. Don't want to block them but would be Interested in onboarding the aims of that group instead</li> <li>• JC: Women in Law have no issues. Law for non-law no issues on crossover but mention about competition for contracts. Events Officer and Social media officer for additional roles</li> <li>• JW: if ELSA think there is a crossover and they are happy to absorb them this sounds like a good approach</li> <li>• JC: concerns about longevity raised</li> <li>• TB: agree with this and that merging with ELSA would be a good idea</li> <li>• JC: rejecting based on crossover</li> </ul> <p>Alternative Dispute Resolution group proposal unanimously rejected:</p> <p>JW: No  TB: No  JC: No  GC: No</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><b>Reason for rejection:</b> not approving on the basis of article 3.4 due to significant crossover with ELSA. For this group to be encouraged to speak to ELSA to see how they can work together to deliver Alternative Dispute Resolution aims</p> <p><b>Other actions:</b> for ELSA group Coordinator to help facilitate a conversation between these two groups</p> <p><b><u>Sri-Lankan Society</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: overview from their proposal to be known as Sri-lankan society. Inclusion of three additional roles</li> <li>• TB: are their membership likely to be specifically Sri Lankan students. Does the Guild have a Tamil society and pose any crossover issues with that or Indian society?</li> <li>• GC: Bengali society too. Is a large region. Thought Tamil was predominantly mainland India. Lots of cultural differences between the two countries/regions. There probably is enough disparity for difference in cultures</li> <li>• SM: did there used to be a Sri-Lankan society?</li> <li>• GA: I believe so</li> <li>• TB: if they have co-existed together in the past then this is probably fine</li> </ul> <p>No objections raised. Sri-Lankan society proposal unanimously approved:</p> <p>JW: Yes  TB: Yes  JC: Yes  GC: Yes</p>	
--	--	---	--

2	Emergency Grant Proposals	<p><b><u>BALADS</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: expecting to use most of current account balance</li> <li>• JC: how much are they asking for?</li> <li>• JW: £200</li> <li>• JC: asking for money for late entry fees. Are we aware of any late entry fees?</li> <li>• JW: felt that an early fee was too early for them to have made a decision on the competition</li> <li>• JC: seems they were aware of costs to be made</li> <li>• JW: figures provided don't match up</li> <li>• JC: they have money in their account to cover this. Money being requested is in line with their objectives</li> <li>• JC: money towards making costs cheaper might be reasonable? Are people happy to provide money towards £3 late entry fee</li> </ul> <p>Committee decision to award £102 towards £3 per person late entry fee.</p> <p>Not awarding £98 for the other their costs as the group have enough money in their account for that and the costs are not unforeseen.</p> <p>Unanimous approval of this decision:</p> <p>JW: Yes  TB: Yes  JC: Yes  GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>Community Challenge</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: unable to award funding as no costs provided. Unspecified costs make this request Ineligible</li> </ul> <p>JW: Yes</p>	
---	---------------------------	--	--

		TB: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes	
3	Constitutional Changes	<p><b><u>Wayfarers</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SM: does this make this role required to have a certain type of qualification. You might expect this from the title</li> <li>• JC: previously had someone doing the safety checks regardless</li> <li>• JW: just changing name and not the role</li> <li>• SM: risk conversation should probably take place with the group</li> <li>• AG: happy to have that conversation with the group to discuss managing risk.</li> </ul> <p>Unanimous approval provided of the requested constitutional change:</p> <p>JW: Yes TB: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>KASE</u></b></p> <p>Unanimous approval provided of the requested constitutional change:</p> <p>JW: Yes TB: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>Business Society</u></b></p> <p>Unanimous approval provided of the requested constitutional change:</p> <p>JW: Yes TB: Yes JC: Yes</p>	

		<p>GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>Civsoc</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: are committing themselves to running the respect scheme but that isn't in core objectives</li> <li>• SM: up to two roles is this ok?</li> <li>• JC: all medsoc societies have up to 2</li> <li>• SM: ok</li> <li>• JC: do we want them to remove respect scheme</li> </ul> <p>Unanimous conditional approval of changes based on removing respect scheme.</p> <p>JW: Yes TB: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p>	
	<p><b>Transaction Fees Discussion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: prices attached to ticket sales</li> <li>• SM: explanation of this to be provided</li> <li>• JW: will be being added to the training</li> <li>• SM: yes</li> <li>• JW: can make things confusing for members. Is encouraging societies to sort things outside of the Guild but adds risk</li> <li>• GA: we have had some feedback from the finance manager which explains where this money goes and the costs it covers</li> <li>• JW: TLDR costs a lot of money so this seems fair</li> <li>• GC: if training is getting updated then does this sort out that problem?</li> <li>• JW: group has to mitigate the extra costs</li> <li>• SM: option of what you can do is submit a student idea about how to change this system or make it different. Would be mandated to discuss</li> <li>• JW: not sure what the solution would be</li> <li>• JC: is part of the problem that people aren't sure how to pay?</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: when charging different pricing for different activities and events it makes it difficult to approach with members</li> <li>• JC: could we look into providing an online calculator?</li> <li>• SM: not sure who would have capacity for this. Including in training will help. Short of finding funding elsewhere not sure what the answer is</li> <li>• JW: can ticket request form be changed to make this clearer?</li> <li>• SM/JC: I agree with this</li> <li>• JC: if these actions don't work then we can revisit this conversation</li> <li>• JW: only other solution could be a tax on membership potentially. For several groups the booking fee makes selling tickets through the Guild less appealing</li> <li>• JC: glad you have raised this to try and make things better</li> </ul> <p><b>Actions to be taken:</b></p> <p>1) for the CANVAS training for committee members to be updated to make transaction fee process clear to societies. For this to be picked up by the Student Groups Team</p> <p>2) for the ticket request form to be updated to make transaction fees clear also. For this to be picked up by the Student Groups Team</p>	
	AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: external membership situation is now going to all student vote as the all student meeting wasn't quorate</li> <li>• SM: vote is next week</li> <li>• JC: meeting with submitter of that idea to discuss if it is no charge or reduced charge as there were lots of queries about that at the all student meeting</li> </ul>	
