

Guild Officer Group Minutes

Voting Members Present: **Reece Roberts** (President) [RR], **Adam Goldstone** (Education Officer) [AG], **Simon Price** (Sports Officer) [SP], , **Jo Park** (International Officer) [JP], **Jess Rutland** (Co-LGBTQ Officer) [JR], , **Alif Trevathan** (Co-Women's Officer) [AT], **Holly Battrick** (Co-Women's Officer) [HB], **Janiece Jackson** (Anti-Racism & Anti-Fascism Officer) [JJ], **Robyn Macpherson** (Activities and Employability Officer) [RM], **Jules Singh** (Commuter Students Officer) [JSI], **Kate Chard** (Ethical & Environmental Officer) [KC], **Jess Small** (Postgraduate Officer) [JS]. **Finn Humphris** (Trans Student's Officer) [FH]

Also In attendance: **Sam Jones** (Campaigns Coordinator, GOG Secretary) [SJ], **Lucy Gill** (Student Voice Manager) [LG]. **Adam Sheridan** (Director of Engagement)

Absent with Apologies: **Izzy Bygrave** (Welfare and Community Officer) [IB], **Josie Hyde** (Co-LGBTQ Officer) [JH].

Absent without Apologies: **Damilola Oyeleke** (Ethnic Minorities Officers) [DO],. **Lauren Kennedy** (Mature & Part-Time Students Officer) [LK].

The meeting commenced at 17:30

No	ITEM FOR DISCUSSION	MATTERS DISCUSSED	ACTION
1	Welcome and Introductions	RR opened the meeting, welcomed all present and read out apologies.	Noted
2	Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising	No matters arising, minutes of the last meeting approved.	Approved
3	Reclaim the Night	<p>HB gave an update on RTN, that they were still looking at various options for funding and sourcing additional money. Projected costs had gone up significantly, and they had submitted a campaigns pot application</p> <p>AT reported that the speakers were all sorted, and that around 1000 people had stated they were 'interested' on Facebook.</p> <p>RR asked if they had reached out to other Birmingham SU's</p> <p>HB replied that they had.</p> <p>RR asked if there were enough stewards now signed up.</p> <p>HB replied that they were nearly there, and should have enough with the support of Trade Unions. There will be a briefing for stewards ahead of RTN.</p>	

		<p>AT added that a new speakers had been confirmed, who was one of the organisers of the women's march in London.</p> <p>HB asked if the officer team would support a week of events leading up to Reclaim the Night.</p> <p>The officer team agreed.</p> <p>JP suggested a 'we believe her' banner on the Guild bridge.</p> <p>JSI suggested a banner and placard making workshop.</p>	Noted
4	NUS Whitepaper and Guild Response	<p>RR gave an intro to the NUS white paper and NUS's current financial difficulties. NUS are proposing significant restructuring of the democratic structures, having already made large-scale redundancies in its staff team. The Guild was working closely with NUS to look at its financial position and feedback.</p> <p>RR explained the support that the Guild received from NUS on campaigns, policy and through the buying consortium, and explained the proposal for an 'opt-in' NUS services model.</p> <p>AS added that Student Unions are members of NUS, not students.</p> <p>RR explained the consultation; that NUS were looking for input Su's on the restructure, and the Guild was compiling a response. RR asked what GOG's opinion of the Whitepaper options was.</p> <p>RR read out the 1st question for SU's in the Whitepaper;</p> <p><u>Q1: What should the elected full-time officer roles be?</u></p> <p>RR explained the context of each proposed option.</p> <p>RR said that he was in favour of option 1 (as outlined in the whitepaper), as it prevented one liberation group being prioritised over another.</p> <p>JS said that she was very unhappy that the PG campaign was being completely defunded – losing its £2,000 budget, and since this was such a small amount of money, this seemed unnecessarily disruptive.</p> <p>FH reflected that the Trans campaign funding was also being removed, even though the campaign had only existed for 4 years. Trans conference last week was completely against the reforms, and the changes had been done with no input from trans people in a very undemocratic manner.</p> <p>FH reflected that it was insulting and despicable for a democratic body to behave in this way, with no consultation of students.</p> <p>JR said she felt conflicted, that it made her sick that positions had so</p>	

	<p>quickly been axed, but she agreed that if some liberation positions had to go, all should.</p> <p>FH said that they supported options 3 or 4, as some trans representation would remain, and some continuing liberation representation was preferable to none.</p> <p>AG asked why RR supported option 1. Wasn't it better to have some representation rather than none?</p> <p>RR replied that it was a very complex issue, and the holder of a general 'liberation' role would always have an innate bias towards one liberation group or another. Option 1 offered a fresh start.</p> <p>FH said that they did not support one position for all groups, as one person cannot represent all groups effectively. There were much better places to cut funding than liberation groups.</p> <p>JS supported option 3 – cuts should be less.</p> <p>In a vote, two officers supported option 1, one officer supported option 2, 5 officers supported option 3, one officer supported option 4, and two officers abstained.</p> <p>RR moved onto question 2:</p> <p><u>Q2: What should the membership model be?</u></p> <p>AS explained the value of NUS's commercial services buying consortium. Currently unions can be a member of NUS and not use the commercial services, and pay the same affiliation fee as a union who does. This system currently gives the Guild a good discount on goods.</p> <p>LG added that Student Voice received valuable support from NUS on national policy, research and staff development.</p> <p>JR asked if the Guild used all of NUS's services currently.</p> <p>AS replied that it did, however smaller unions often didn't</p> <p>AG added that his understanding of the reason most SU's left NUS, and/or re-joined was political, rather than commercial or due to the affiliation fee.</p> <p>AS added that breaking down the affiliation fee would open up NUS services to the free market.</p> <p>FH said that there was a risk of less money for the political side if unions only opted for the commercial side of affiliation.</p> <p>In a vote, six officers supported option 1, 5 officers supported option 2, and 1 officer abstained.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---------------------------

		<p>RR moved onto question 3:</p> <p><u>Q3: Is the balance of deciding V's doing right?</u></p> <p>RR explained the current pension deficit for SU's and NUS, and the older defined benefits scheme which had significant shortfalls in assets.</p> <p>AS explained the 'last man standing' model of NUS pension scheme – i.e. SU's would have to pick up deficit if NUS collapsed. Currently NUS is able to cover those costs, but if it didn't in the long-term, it could cause a domino effect.</p> <p>JR asked if the NUS folded, would the University step in to stop the Guild closing down?</p> <p>AS said that there was no formal commitment to say that it would, but the expectation of legal precedent and previous situations at other SU's meant that it was likely, but would be a very negative outcome for the Guild.</p> <p>RR added that the financial reforms still had to pass at NUS National Conference.</p> <p>AG said that option 3 was better than 1 and 2, as it poses benefits in the long term.</p> <p>FH replied that they believed option 3 was not viable, as it didn't resolve any financial issues, and e-voting would be a welcome change.</p> <p>FH stated that merging liberation conferences together would be a very bad outcome, as would reducing 2 –day conferences to 1 day. These were very beneficial to liberation groups and would be a significant loss.</p> <p>RR agreed that networking is very beneficial to liberation groups in terms of forming national working relationships.</p> <p>FH said that the accountability process for officers was vague in options 1 and 2.</p> <p>JS said that option 2 looked best, and she was very sceptical of the 'informal organising' of conferences suggested in option 1. NUS should not be ignoring PG, parents and carers and international students sections.</p> <p>In a vote, two officers supported option 1, nine officers supported option 2, and no officers supported option 3.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	---------------------

5	Buddy Meeting Updates	<p>There were no updates on buddy meetings.</p> <p>RR actioned all FTO's to organise a buddy meeting in time for the next GOG meeting. Officers would be asked an interesting fact about their buddy next time as a test.</p>	
6	"Your Ideas" /Mandate Update	<p>RR ran through newly passed Your Ideas mandates and GPDG policies.</p> <p>RR added that some ideas were going up on Monday for 2 weeks of voting, and officers should promote the cycle.</p>	Noted
7	Officer Accountability/ OQT	<p>RR reminded officers that the next OQT was now in March, at the end of term 2.</p> <p>RR gave an update on scrutiny panel progress, for which the dates are now finalised.</p>	Noted
8	Campaigns Pot	<p>SJ gave an update on the remaining funding in the campaigns pot.</p> <p>1) Application for £50 for LGBTQ Survey from Jess Rutland</p> <p>JR explained the survey the experience of LGBTQ students in lectures, to breakdown good and bad experiences by school. They are working with Sammy Li at the university and hoping to use the student reps system to promote.</p> <p>The group unanimously approved £50 for voucher incentives from the General Campaigns Pot.</p> <p>2) Application from HB/AT for £1050 for Reclaim the Night stage.</p> <p>SJ gave an update on the stage, the set up for Reclaim the Night in Victoria Square.</p> <p>HB said they had checked with WANBA, who were happy for them to use money from the Women's history month pot also for this application.</p> <p>The group unanimously approved £1050 for RTN, £700 from the Womens History Month pot, and £350 from the General Campaigns Pot.</p> <p>3) Application from Izzy Bygrave for £136.25 for Moon Cup Giveaway.</p> <p>The group unanimously approved £136.25 for a Moon Cup giveaway from the FTO Campaigns Pot.</p>	Approved
9	FTOG/GPDG Update	<p>RR gave an update on a proposed ban of police in the Guild which had been discussed in FTOG, and deemed to be impractical due to the Guild's on-going partnership with the police through the community wardens scheme.</p>	Approved

10	AOB	<p>AG gave an update on the upcoming Race Equality focus groups, and encouraged officers to get in touch if they were interested in participating.</p> <p>RR gave an update on the upcoming launch of the Harm Reduction campaign.</p> <p>JR gave an update on LGBTQ history month.</p> <p>RR closed the meeting at 18:50.</p>	Closed
-----------	------------	--	---------------

The chair closed the meeting at 18:50

Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 6th March, 17:30 in Harvey Milk