

[Please feel free to delete rows as necessary]

Trigger Warnings:

Item No.	Item Title	Meeting Notes	Actions
Start			
1	Welcome & Introductions		

<p>2</p>	<p>New Group Proposals</p>	<p><u>Social Worker student society</u> IL: There is potential crossover there. *Briefly reads out aims* JW: This was submitted multiple times but they couldn't prove they had 15 members. IL: Lots have registered interest. FC: Some interested only left a first name. GD: The valid ones have a student email address. IL: Lets look at the constitution. No affiliations, normal membership price, only three committee members though. IL: Is crossover an issue? JW: They're fairly different from Labour soc. IL: We will need to check. Can approve. Any concerns?</p> <p>Unanimous approval</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unconditional approval • Voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IL: Yes ○ FC: Yes ○ JW: Yes 	
----------	-----------------------------------	---	--

- VC: Yes
- LJ: Yes

Israel society

IL: *Listing aims* They could be asked to specify whether its for Birmingham students and those interested in the culture.

JW: They have specified.

IL: The constitution works, it eliminates my concerns. Any issues with committee members?

SM: Has anyone mentioned co-chairs?

IL: They want them to be at the same level like vice-chairs.

JW: They have one chair.

IL: All approve?

Outcome:

- Unconditional approval
- Voting:
 - IL: Yes
 - FC: Yes
 - JW: Yes
 - VC: Yes
 - LJ: Yes

Nepalese society

		<p>IL: They have a mix of activities planned. Looks fine. They may need to add 'and students interested in Nepalese culture'.</p> <p>FC: Are they going to be doing outreach?</p> <p>VC: Thai was approved and they stated they were going to include moving support.</p> <p>FC: Nepalese students need moving support. I'm happy with it because of point 2.1.1.</p> <p>IL: 2.1.4 should be split into two points. They should also change the wording of 2.3.1 because convey is used twice. A couple wording changes but no major issues.</p> <p>Unanimous approval</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conditional approval, pending changes to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 2.1.4: Should be split into two objectives○ 10.3.1: alter wording to make grammatical sense• Voting:	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IL: Yes ○ FC: Yes ○ JW: Yes ○ VC: Yes ○ LJ: Yes 	
5	Chair's Action Summary	<p>IL: Type I diabetes want to take over insulin to save it. Indonesian made the changes requested, same with Korean. Filipino gave further info for their grant application. Gin were awarded £120 towards the trip based on further info given. Animal welfare was approved as a society. POLSIS met conditions and have had their group proposal approved – this was the same for Japan, Greek and Cypriot, and Taiwanese societies.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No objections from committee 	

<p>6</p>	<p>Grant Further Actions Requests Summary</p>	<p>IL: Further info was requested. GD: 10 groups were emailed for further info, 1 withdrew, and 3 responded</p> <p><u>ELSA</u></p> <p>IL: ELSA responded. They originally requested £800 for a competition. We needed an exact cost breakdown and the number of expected attendees. They said there would be 2-4 participants per negotiating side, so up to 8 students would benefit. They would spend the funds on the prize (£100) and the rest on operating costs. I'm not quite on board.</p> <p>JW: Relatively standard. IL: £100 is a lot. JW: The prize maybe shouldn't come out of a grant. IL: There's been a limit on prizes set before. JW: How much money do they have? We've given them lots already. IL: Here's the grant request. They requested £1000 for a court</p>	
----------	--	--	--

		<p>competition. There's 118 members and their bank balance is £3000.</p> <p>JW: Where would the £700 go.</p> <p>IL: A trip scholarship for one person.</p> <p>JW: I want to say that they should pay for it out of their own balance. We don't give this much for prizes especially to societies with thousands already.</p> <p>FC: Is it in their constitution? If they expect it from members they will need to finance it.</p> <p>IL: I'm not giving £100 for a prize for one student. Scholarships cover two students, but the grant can't be used to only benefit two people for almost £400 each.</p> <p>FC: Is it a main objective in their constitution?</p> <p>IL: They still have money anyway. They've given a budget. They're expecting to pay £29,649 and welcome 189 people. I'm confused about this bit.</p> <p>FC: Agreed.</p> <p>JW: They may have money from sponsorships.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>IL: Its probably in the excel document. They're not funding flights so some may not be able to afford it anyway.</p> <p>JW: It doesn't benefit all members. They've had a lot already and there's not much left.</p> <p>FC: Agreed.</p> <p>Unanimously rejected for scholarships</p> <p>JW: I say no to the prize money. It doesn't help everyone.</p> <p>IL: None for them?</p> <p>FC: Is it an incentive to work harder at law? The group tries to further interest for law. It's only £100.</p> <p>JW: They were already awarded £350.</p> <p>IL: We could give £25.</p> <p>FC: I would be down but I agree we've already given lots.</p> <p>VC: I'm leaning towards nothing – we should be all or nothing.</p> <p>IL: Okay, nothing then.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Unanimously rejected for prize money</p> <p><u>Outcomes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarship request: £0 allocated • Voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IL: Yes ○ FC: Yes ○ JW: Yes ○ VC: Yes ○ LJ: Yes • Prize money request: £0 allocated • Voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IL: Yes ○ FC: Yes ○ JW: Yes ○ VC: Yes ○ LJ: Yes <p><u>Investment</u></p> <p>JW: Investment is asking for smaller amounts.</p> <p>IL: If they're part of campus league we will give £150. But they've only asked for £145. For the social session they'll have to charge members.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>JW: Paying for a social session is fair because it's not campus league. IL: £65.60 is required for equipment. There's a weekly Sunday social for one hour – that's too much to fund. Happy to pay £145 for campus league and £65.60 for badminton stuff. Gemma, how much is in the pot? GD: I'll run a check on the papers. IL: They have no planned charity events.</p> <p><u>Outcomes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus league request: £145 allocated • Voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IL: Yes ○ FC: Yes ○ JW: Yes ○ VC: Yes ○ LJ: Yes • Badminton costs request: £65.60 allocated • Voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IL: Yes ○ FC: Yes ○ JW: Yes ○ VC: Yes 	
--	--	---	--

		<p style="text-align: center;">○ LJ: Yes</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>BUDS</u></p> <p>IL: They've asked for £3000 for the annual show, and £2000 for squad costs. We've asked for a price breakdown. They're planning to make £12,000 from ticket sales and £8000 from show fees. They didn't give the info needed. It's a no.</p> <p>JW: They regularly get this much to support them. Tech costs mean performance societies get a lot. We should contribute to tech costs as its extra expensive this year.</p> <p>IL: I thought this year was cheaper because there's no rental costs.</p> <p>JW: I think Gemma said they're more expensive this year.</p> <p>SM: Last year they didn't receive much, more information was required and limited funds were available. Everything has gone up in costs.</p> <p>IL: They didn't get much because they didn't give much info.</p> <p>FC: I have sympathy for them. We should explain grant breakdowns</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>more clearly in the next handover. We can't give £3000 for tech if it costs £1500. IL: I think we can. FC: I think we should give them something. SM: Will they get tech through venues? IL: Yes. SM: It should be less then. IL: About £1000 is usually given to performance groups. JW: Like GMTG. IL: Infinity maybe. JW: I think we gave some money to other performance groups. GD: Yeah, we did. JW: How much in the pot? We should make it clear that we want to know exactly where the money is going. GD: £46,000 was allocated generally but that doesn't account for everything. Make decisions as it you have however much money, and then we can revisit. IL: I think we give about £1000.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>JW: Sounds appropriate but if we've not got it, we've not got it.</p> <p>IL: We should give them a grant request breakdown explanation.</p> <p>FC: Agreed.</p> <p><u>Outcomes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BUDS costs request: £1000 allocated• Committee suggests guidance given to group on what information to give in grant requests• Voting:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ IL: Yes○ FC: Yes○ JW: Yes○ VC: Yes○ LJ: Yes	
--	--	---	--

<p>9</p>	<p>AOB</p>	<p>GD: Next meeting should be late January/early February.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AOB</u></p> <p>JW: What's happening with external memberships?</p> <p>IL: HR are dealing with it.</p> <p>JW: Is it going through Acacia?</p> <p>IL: I'm unsure.</p> <p>FC: We've had an unclear answer. Keep your ears open.</p> <p>JW: Eventually it'll get decided.</p> <p>FC: HR must have a reason for passing it.</p> <p>IL: With the way it is done, bylaws are an issue. Acacia is getting lots of emails.</p> <p>JW: Its costing groups hundreds, and the guild.</p> <p>FC: Tell the groups to continue as normal.</p> <p>JW: Some alumni don't pay but do the same jobs. It means societies are losing hundreds.</p> <p>FC: I don't know what to advise.</p> <p>JW: I want to suggest a change to bylaws instead of going through the president.</p>	
----------	-------------------	--	--

		<p>JW: Bylaws should be changed to make it practical and get good engagement and sponsorships.</p> <p>FC: Let's take it to the wider committee and tell you when we know.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned</p>	
--	--	--	--

Date & Time of next meeting: Late January/Early February