

Committee Name: Activities Committee

Date & Time: 20/01/2022

Present: (see below)

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

No.	Item for discussion	Questions/Comments/Voting Decision From Discussion	Action
1	Chairs Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC: Chair's Action document. These are actions that me and George have approved prior to this meeting JC: Vale Fest- awarded £150 rather than £500 with costs they were tied into JC: battle re-enactment- changing money request as requested JC: international development society has been moved onto save a society JC: devil's advocate- changes to constitution approved JC: social work society added onto the save a society scheme 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: benchball new roles • JC: powerlifting- new roles approved • JW: all looks good to me <p>No objections raised. Chairs Actions unanimously approved:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes SS: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p>	
2	New Group Proposals	<p><u>Darts Society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: £3 membership. Registered as part of midlands league. Conducting activity at pubs in Selly Oak. Required to travel on darts circuit and paying entry fees. Recreational and competitive category. Social secretary as an extra role. What are peoples' thoughts and opinions? • JW: seems good and well thought through application • JC: definitely a strong application • SM: they have existed as a group at the Guild before • JW: why were they derecognised? • SM: due to a lack of interest <p>No objections raised. Darts society proposal unanimously approved:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes SS: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p>	<p>Hide and seek society group proposal actions: for conditional approval to be communicated to the group and agreement of conditions to be confirmed before new group can be established</p> <p>HR society group proposal actions: for conditional approval to be communicated to the group and agreement of conditions to be confirmed before new group can be established</p>

Hide and Seek Society

- JC: students to gain greater knowledge and understanding of campus. Don't have massively concerns over seasons. Making sure people act responsibly and what to do if people get lost. Working with events team and campus security. Abbreviation to HAS soc, no affiliations and £3 membership fee. Events Officer and Social Media Officer. Peoples thoughts?
- JW: definitely a serious application?
- GC: think it all looks fine
- JW: will they be able to sustain interest?
- SM: reached out to campus security and they were fine with it but want to work with the group on a suitable risk assessment
- JW: might want to remove the once a week reference in constitution
- SS: seems fine to me
- YS: seems good to me too

Unanimous conditional approval of Hide and Seek society:

JW: Yes

YS: Yes

SS: Yes

JS: Yes

JC: Yes

GC: Yes

Conditions of approval: removing 'once a week' reference from objectives within constitution

HR Society proposal

- JC: description of group proposal. Talk through aims. Group don't want any affiliations and have added an outreach

		<p>officer and undergrad officer role. Would they need to remove the reference to the undergrad role in constitution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JS: could they rephrase to say 'expected' instead? • JC: agree it could be an option to say 'expected' instead? or should we ask them to remove it entirely? • JS: I don't think It necessarily needs to be there • GC: lots of schools have HR departments and they don't have many undergrads. No undergrad courses specific • JC: expected might be ok? • SM: agree this wording would be ok • JC: couldn't see anything else that might be a problem • JW: implies an affiliation that isn't listed in affiliations for the Charter Institute • JC: promoting connections between businesses • GC: a lot of courses are affiliated with CIPD • JC: add in an affiliation? • JW: agree this <p>Unanimous conditional approval of HR Society:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes SS: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p>Conditions of approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • change wording of undergrad position to say that person running for the role would be 'expected' to be a graduate • add In Charter Institute to affiliations section of constitution 	
--	--	---	--

3	Additional Grant Approvals	<p><u>Sitcom Society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: £140 requested. £30 for advertisement and £110 for snacks. What are peoples' thoughts? • GC: is snacking part of their core activity? this is a lot of money • JC: agree it's a lot of money for snacks • JW: feels like it should come out of membership money • GC: think the advertising part is fine. For scale of society amount on snacks is unlikely to be needed • JC: a subscription would be more in line with society aims so this is a bit different. Should we give them any money towards it? advertising seems fine • JW: have allowed for advertising before • SM: they have 52 members currently • JS: a small number of members may be gluten free • GC: there are lots of cheaper gluten free alternatives on the market • SM: important to consider ineligibility criteria. Are the group part of the 'interest' category? • GA: yes • SM: we don't have records for them. As an action- need to make sure we have a constitution on file for them? • JC: approve £30 but on Chair's Action approve £110 if snacks are in their constitution. If not in constitution reject as not in line with objectives <p>Unanimous conditional approval of Sitcom society grant request:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes SS: Yes JS: Yes</p>	<p>Sitcom society grant approval actions: for it to be investigated as to whether snacks are in the groups' constitution by relevant Coordinator and feedback provided on Chairs Action.</p> <p>For an up to date constitution to be sourced for the group via dedicated Coordinator.</p> <p>Dentistry society grant approval actions: for research to be conducted on consistency of previous approvals of grant requests of this nature by relevant Coordinator. For this research to be shared with Chairs once complete to make a final decision</p>
---	----------------------------	--	--

		<p>JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p>Conditions of approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• £30 for publicity awarded in full- no conditions• £110- approve if snacks are in their constitution but if not, reject as they are not in line with objectives <p><u>Kabaddi society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• JC: what is dojo?• GA: is the name of a space at UB Sport• JC: seems fair <p>No objections raised. Grant request of £300 towards dojo booking costs unanimously approved in full:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes SS: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p><u>B-eat society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• JC: costs amounting to £190. Want to do a large order of socks• GC: is a big campaign of theirs• JW: seems like a lot of money for socks• SM: usually its ok because it's the campaign of the society in regards to charity law• JS: couldn't do this last year because of COVID• JC: I'm happy to approve- think it's a great campaign• JW&JC: agree with you	
--	--	---	--

No objections raised. Grant request of £890 towards sock it week expenses unanimously approved in full:

JW: Yes

YS: Yes

SS: Yes

JS: Yes

JC: Yes

GC: Yes

Dentistry society

- JC: want money for a speaker and for pizzas. Is in line with their constitution- nature of the speaker seems fine
- JW: is a lot of money for a speaker. We rejected a poetry society request for £400 approximate previously because we thought it was a lot
- JC: shall we award them half funding
- JW: they seem set on £600
- GC: have a lot of money already
- GA: not for long due to dental ball
- SM: speaker is very high profile which would explain cost
- JC: would be a good use of money
- GC: could they go to the school of dentistry for some of this funding?
- JW: will they be left with much money after their ball?
- GA: no not really
- JC: if we rejected would it follow any ineligibility criteria
- SM: would need to look at this in terms of consistency. Can choose to say not to fund whole amount but would need to be fair
- JC: am not sure about approach applied before. Could we work to approve on Chair's Action?
- JW: could pay for it themselves if they needed to

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GC: am looking into consistency on speakers • SM: as long as consistent within same allocation I think its fine • JC: would people be happy to approve on Chair's Action based on research on consistency being completed? <p>Unanimous conditional approval of Dentistry society £600 grant request for speaker expenses and pizza costs:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes SS: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p>Conditions of approval: to work to approve on Chair's Action based on research on consistency being completed for previous approvals of grant requests of this nature</p> <p><u>Redbrick society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: I think we granted other societies money for laptops previously. Would want to be in line with this • JS: agree we have awarded elsewhere with Burn FM • JW: what is the actual change here between previously awarded money and new request • JC: we asked If they could buy a cheaper alternative • SM: make sure it goes through IT and Nick as capital expenditure if approving • GA: sure no problem <p>No objections raised. Grant request of £1,300 towards a new desktop unanimously approved in full:</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>JW: Yes YS: Yes SS: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p>	
	<p>AOB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JW: on committee hub there is a treasurer report section. What is this? • SM: this is an MSL finance module but we are awaiting integration with current system. Back end systems are being worked through to enable this • JC: elections period window. Officer elections opens soon. Would encourage you to apply especially for AEO where you would get to Chair Activities Committee • JS: education officer position is good too • JC: any further questions get in touch with Officers directly • JC: recommendation for student groups' elections period is February-April. Does this seem reasonable to everyone? <p>No objections raised. Election period window set as February-April 2022.</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes SS: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p>	<p>Elections period action: communicate this to groups so that they are aware of elections timeframe</p>

