

Trigger Warnings: None required

Item No.	Item Title	Meeting Notes	Actions
1	<p align="center"><b>Activities Sub-committee Minutes Approval</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: welcome everyone. Does anyone have any questions about the previous minutes which require approval?</li> <li>• [no questions raised]</li> <li>• JC: I am happy to approve</li> </ul> <p>No objections raised. Minutes from the following Activities Sub-Committee Meetings unanimously approved:</p> <p>3rd December 2021            16th December 2021            20th January 2022</p> <p>JW: Yes            YS: Yes            TB: Yes            ZI: Yes            JS: Yes            JC: Yes            GC: Yes</p>	

2	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Belief and Commitment Renewal</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: for context- the belief and commitment up for renewal relates to Jobs and Employability. Please have a read through and share any comments you may have</li> <li>• JW: what is the meaningful effect of the 16 hours point- wording isn't clear</li> <li>• JC: good point- does anyone know the answer to this?</li> <li>• SM: amount of hour's looks at student circumstances and what is going on study wise. Some weeks at the Guild/University are busier than others and they can work more hours if they want to during those times</li> <li>• JS: have been looking into this. University actually says 15 hours. Wording is now just Student VISA. Outside of term time students can work as many hours as they like. Things to consider would be research based work where there are more hours available in one week over another so it</li> </ul>	
---	---	---	--

		<p>can be flexible where required. VISA restrictions may actually be 20 hours so the threshold is set lower as a safety net</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: is the main issue around legalities then?</li> <li>• JS: for home students if they wanted to work more hours elsewhere they could do this and we wouldn't know but there would be consequences for International students</li> <li>• JC: do we want to amend the wording in any way?</li> <li>• JW: wording seems a little convoluted</li> <li>• JS: suggest to change it to 15 hours and remove the wording of tier 4</li> <li>• JW: do we need to double check the VISA bit?</li> <li>• JS: have already double checked this so that new wording would be accurate</li> <li>• JC: if everyone is happy then let's take this to a vote</li> </ul> <p>Group vote to unanimously change the wording of the belief</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>and commitment to read as follows:</p> <p><b>The Guild believes that Full-Time students should not be required to work more than fifteen hours a week, or no more than is allowed under Student Visa restrictions, but that when regulating the part-time work of students both the Guild and the University need to be flexible and properly recognise that many students can or need to work longer hours. The Guild is committed to working with the University to make it as simple as possible for students to apply for temporary jobs on campus.</b></p> <p>JW: Yes          YS: Yes          TB: Yes          ZI: Yes          JS: Yes          JC: Yes</p>	
--	--	--	--

		GC: Yes	
--	--	---------	--

<p>3</p>	<p><b>New Group Proposals</b></p>	<p><b><u>Algorithm Group</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: going through new group proposal</li> <li>• SM: unfortunately the group don't meet the minimum requirements for interest levels- they only have 4 people interested on the Facebook page provided and would need a minimum of 15</li> <li>• JC: yes we need 15 people before we can consider them so they will have to be rejected</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously move to reject the proposal due to lack of interest in the group:</p> <p>JW: Yes  YS: Yes  TB: Yes  ZI: Yes  JS: Yes  JC: Yes  GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>British Red Cross on Campus</u></b></p>	
----------	-----------------------------------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: people learning and gaining new experiences. Group wants to raise awareness and also do work under the commonwealth. Can't identify any risks right now</li> <li>• JC: concerns raised around interest levels due to Facebook link not working properly. Want to affiliate to British red-cross. Had 0 for their membership fee on proposal but £3 on their constitution</li> <li>• GC: doesn't conflict with any other groups- don't see any issues with it</li> <li>• SM: group have an Instagram- fairly old account- last post was in 2021</li> <li>• JC: can confirm that we would just work from constitution on membership fee so it would be £3. My recommendation is that if they meet 15 people threshold we would approve on Chair's Action</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously approve the new group proposal</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>for a British Red Cross on Campus society:</p> <p>JW: Yes          YS: Yes          TB: Yes          ZI: Yes          JS: Yes          JC: Yes          GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>Telugu Society</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: group want to celebrate culture, organise lots of different types of events. Main risks are just financial. Want to bring together Telugu student community. Crossover issues raised with Indian society</li> <li>• GC: we have a Tamil society that is also prominent in India. Have had other groups with similar crossover concerns that have been approved in the past</li> <li>• JC: this is a good point. Looking at constitution- want to affiliate with</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--



		<p>Telugu Youth association. Two additional roles in extra roles section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: need to detail responsibilities of roles. Group are similar to Tamil</li> <li>• JC: it is important that we are consistent in our approach. We have reached out to Indian society but haven't heard a response. With the Youth Association- is this an affiliation risk?</li> <li>• SM: might need to look into this further as would be affiliating to the Guild as a whole</li> <li>• JS: there is no reference to working with kids in their constitution</li> <li>• JC: I think I would be happy to approve as long as the role responsibilities are amended</li> </ul> <p>Unanimous conditional approval of this proposal based on the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group need to update the responsibilities of their</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>additional roles within their constitution. For final approval on this to be agreed on Chair's Action</p> <p>JW: Yes          YS: Yes          TB: Yes          ZI: Yes          JS: Yes          JC: Yes          GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>Banking and Finance Society</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JC: helping people break into the financial industry. Running skills workshops and careers events. Main risks are to do with finances. Want to develop skills. Talk through objectives of the group- £3 membership. Vice President and Public Relations roles included as extra positions</li> <li>JW: 16 interested people on social media- is the number of interested people 15 or 20?</li> <li>GA: can confirm it is 15 people</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GC: have run a poll with over 50 people interested as part of that page too</li> <li>• JC: do we already have an accounting and finance society?</li> <li>• EP: accounting society is on the save a society scheme and we have had people contact us expressing interest recently</li> <li>• JS: what are the groups that wanted to merge which was raised previously?</li> <li>• SM: those groups were business and accounting. There would definitely be crossover with Accounting if they came off the Save a Society scheme</li> <li>• JW: do we know the make-up of the business college to help with this decision around crossover?</li> <li>• JS: both elements fall within the remit of the business school</li> <li>• JW: if strictly within department of finance this could work and would line up</li> <li>• EP: definitely haven't had any feedback from</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Investment society that would assist with crossover concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TB: does this society have explicit links with their department? If a group of like-minded students it would probably work better for them to merge with Investment</li> <li>• JC: that is a really good point</li> <li>• JW: they didn't list their department as an affiliation. Should there be an audit of business school societies to figure this out? Do they fit under an already existing group or are they actually separate?</li> <li>• JC: do we need more information before we can approve?</li> <li>• GC: Yes I think we do</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously agree that they are unable to make a decision at this time, and wish to request further information to make their decision.</p> <p>Information required:</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>1) Understanding of the Business School Structure so that it is clear whether this group would fit within a certain department</p> <p>2) Crossover concerns with Investment society to be clarified in communication with the group</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes TB: Yes ZI: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>Blood Donation Society</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: read through application and objectives. No fee and no extra roles</li> <li>• JS: did we have a Bloodsoc group that we derecognised last year</li> <li>• SM: we have one in Medsoc but we wouldn't class that as a crossover</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• JS: looks like we derecognised this group in the past</li><li>• JW: looks like a good society</li><li>• JC: group has enough members. Can't see any issues. Any other comments?</li><li>• SM: were removed from MSL in Summer 2021 but this is just when the change was administrated on the system</li><li>• JC: are people happy to approve?</li></ul> <p>Committee unanimously approve new group proposal for Blood Donation Society:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes TB: Yes ZI: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>UoB Girl Gamers Society</u></b></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: weekly gaming sessions- likeminded group of people and collaborating with existing societies. Create safe space for mutually self-defining students. Crossover concerns cited from esports and they would like them to become a part of their group/s instead. Would be a more collaborative approach. Computer and video games society have recognised that they have predominantly male memberships and this could be off putting</li> <li>• JS: am starting to see a theme here where people want to do things that other groups do but specifically for a women and Non-binary demographic. We have approved other groups in this way but there wasn't resistant from other groups towards those proposals. Could computer and video games society do women and Non-binary specific sessions to accommodate this need?</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: a risk of this is that it could make CVG the boys society and cause enforced gender segregation</li> <li>• GC: I liked what esports said. It was measured feedback. Can we go back to Girl Gamers and ask them if they would be open to being a segment within an existing society? that would bring stability to their initiative too</li> <li>• JS: they have 135 interested people on their social media. If all showed up to activities there would be a strong women and Non-binary presence. Need to work to make groups more inclusive</li> <li>• TB: good idea to appoint a Women and Non-Binary Officer on the committees of these groups to help with inclusivity</li> <li>• JW: could we sit down a REP from esports, CVG and Girl Gamers to talk this through and ask them to consider integrating a women and</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--



		<p>Non-binary rep into their group?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: would be difficult for us to approve right now but can look to coordinate and support. Interest is there for this</li> <li>• JS: approach further about making environment more inclusive generally</li> <li>• JC: would be happy to meet with the three groups and relevant Coordinator to discuss inclusivity and collaboration</li> <li>• JW: normally do a formal email around rejection- can we invite the group to a meeting first? Would help to avoid issues that have taken place with other groups in the past around communication</li> <li>• SM: if you are rejecting a group then the policy needs to be clear. We could put in a call first but the outcome would still need to be clearly communicated</li> <li>• JW: can we conditionally reject?</li> <li>• SM: would you approve if they aren't happy with the</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>outcome of a meeting with esports and CVG?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: probably</li> <li>• SM: I would recommend that you go out for more information instead and bring this back to the next meeting for discussion</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously agree that they are unable to make a decision at this time, and wish to request further information to make their decision.</p> <p>Information required:</p> <p>1) For a meeting to take place between Girl Gamers, Esports Society and Computer and Video Games society. For this meeting to be facilitated by the relevant Groups Coordinator and AEO.</p> <p>The purpose of the meeting would be to discuss whether Girl Gamers could Integrate with one or both of these societies rather than exist separately.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>JW: Yes          YS: Yes          TB: Yes          ZI: Yes          JS: Yes          JC: Yes          GC: Yes</p> <p>Additional actions: for          Coordinator team to help          arrange meeting.</p> <p>If meeting does not reach a          conclusion where the groups are          happy to collaborate, for the          new group proposal to come          back to the next Activities          Committee meeting for further          discussion.</p> <p><b><u>Pilates Society</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JC: talk through activities              group wishes to run.              Feedback from Yoga              society has been shared.              Group wants to charge              £5 membership. Inclusion              of a social secretary</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• GC: seems very straight forward to me</li><li>• JC: good activity and would be popular</li><li>• JS: is there definitely no crossover concerns?</li><li>• GC: yoga and pilates are distinct from one another</li><li>• JW: 70 followers on social media</li></ul> <p>Committee unanimously approve new group proposal for Pilates Society:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes TB: Yes ZI: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>4</p>	<p><b>Chair's Actions and Constitutional Changes</b></p>	<p><b><u>Refunds student request discussion</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: refunds situation</li> <li>• JW: what is existing policy</li> <li>• GA: we have reached out to the relevant groups directly ourselves several months ago and have heard back from 4 out of the 6. Of the remaining 2 they have been contacted a few times with no response and the student is waiting for a return of funds. Standard procedure is that the committee have to approve for a refund to be issued but due to the timeframe, that is why this is being flagged here</li> <li>• JW: what if groups query missing money?</li> <li>• JC: am personally happy. We have given the group lots of time to get back to sort independently and no response</li> <li>• SM: Airsoft's account is financially inactive and the student is unlikely to have benefitted from their membership</li> </ul>	<p><b>Additional action:</b> for it to be raised as an agenda item at the next meeting that the committee discusses composing some guidance around how refunds can be awarded for student group memberships</p>
----------	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JS: is it worth putting some conditions together for allowing a refund as part of next meeting</li> <li>• JC: Yes agree this is something that needs to be looked into further</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously approve for the student to be given a refund for their membership from International Development Society and Airsoft and Paintball Society.</p> <p>JW: Yes  YS: Yes  TB: Yes  ZI: Yes  JS: Yes  JC: Yes  GC: Yes</p> <p>Additional action: for it to be raised as an agenda item at the next meeting that the committee discusses composing some guidance around how refunds can be awarded for student group memberships</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b><u>Enactus Constitutional Change</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: increasing membership fee to £10</li> <li>• JW: are they asking members to pay the difference at this point in the year?</li> <li>• SM: can't get members to top up who have already purchased a membership</li> <li>• JC: seems like a lot of money compared to other groups</li> <li>• SM: fee is increasing from £3</li> <li>• GA: there is nothing in their minutes around reason for increase</li> <li>• SM: 22 voted for the change, none voted against</li> <li>• JW: this implies that a good level of people are fine with this. Could the increased fee make the society seem more exclusive though?</li> <li>• SM: the group has 38 registered members currently. I would suggest you refer back to the</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>policy when making this decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: would this be considered a significant disadvantage for members?</li> <li>• JC: if that is what members want and they are happy to pay this is probably fine</li> </ul> <p>Committee vote to approve decision to amend membership fee to £10, with 1 abstention:</p> <p>Votes Yes</p> <p>JW: Yes          YS: Yes          TB: Yes          JS: Yes          JC: Yes          GC: Yes</p> <p>Votes No</p> <p>ZI: No</p> <p>Majority vote means membership fee change is approved.</p>	
--	--	--	--



		<p><b><u>Islamic Society Constitutional Changes</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: inclusion of First Year REP- can't see any issues with this</li> <li>• JW: with removing the clause- they should be following the AGM/EGM process properly</li> <li>• JC: I am happy that that clause should be removed</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously approve the inclusion of the new role and to remove the clause around elections process due to it not following correct AGM/EGM process as outlined within Guild election regulations:</p> <p>JW: Yes  YS: Yes  TB: Yes  ZI: Yes  JS: Yes  JC: Yes  GC: Yes</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p><b><u>Mountaineering Society</u></b> <b><u>Constitutional Changes</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: reads through new role responsibilities</li> <li>• GC: do we share this group with UB Sport?</li> <li>• SM: yes but only 3 or 4 students compete as a part of BUCS and so majority of activity is run through us</li> <li>• JW: phrasing of depot sessions might be a bit confusing</li> <li>• JC: are people happy to approve?</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously approve requested constitutional changes:</p> <p>JW: Yes YS: Yes TB: Yes ZI: Yes JS: Yes JC: Yes GC: Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: generally do Islamic society have a lot of</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

		<p>positions split by gender and is there a reason for this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SM: yes</li><li>• JS: in the chaplaincy they pray separately and so this is part of the reason why</li></ul>	
--	--	---	--

5	<p><b>Additional Grant Approvals</b></p>	<p><b><u>BUDS grant request</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: might need to up ticket prices- expenses seem out of proportion with how much they are intending to spend</li> <li>• GC: how much money is available in the grant pot at the moment?</li> <li>• SM: the committee has already allocated around £35,000. 5% of the money in the pot is supposed to exist for emergency grant. It is Important to note that this request came in around the same time as the others. It isn't unheard of that we over-allocate but if you award this then you might not have any money left over at the Easter allocation</li> <li>• JW: why is there such a high tech cost increase?</li> <li>• SM: Guild tech is currently experiencing some staffing shortages and so they are outsourcing some of their services at the moment. Tech specifications for BUDS also tends to be very high</li> </ul>	
---	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: the total amount being asked for is almost double what we have awarded for other groups already</li> <li>• JC: would people be comfortable with giving a contribution towards this seeing as we can't afford £5,000</li> <li>• JS: are there any alternative funding opportunities available at the university the group could benefit from?</li> <li>• JW: there is the alumni Impact fund</li> <li>• GC: might be worth trying to reach out to them about this</li> <li>• JS: someone who is an alumni themselves might want to fund</li> <li>• SM: was there anything you gave money towards for a similar activity as part of the January/December committee meeting?</li> <li>• ZI: Could they get sponsorship funding for the event?</li> <li>• GC: we have allocated large amounts of money to religious groups</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JS: these have been for different types of events though</li> <li>• JW: good idea to look into sponsorship</li> <li>• JC: shall we award £1,000?</li> <li>• GC: reason we can't award the rest is due to budgetary restrictions</li> </ul> <p>Committee unanimously approve to award the group £1,000 towards their tech show cost fees:</p> <p>JW: Yes          YS: Yes          TB: Yes          ZI: Yes          JS: Yes          JC: Yes          GC: Yes</p> <p><b><u>Conditional Approvals</u></b>  <b><u>Deadline discussion</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GA: grant outcomes were emailed out to student groups prior to the Christmas break, with a deadline set of getting</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>back on additional information by January 19th.</p> <p>This deadline has now passed and so it would be good to know if you are happy that the Student Groups Team would notify anyone who gets in touch at this stage that their request is no longer valid</p> <p>Committee unanimously votes to approve that no further conditional grant requests should be considered for approval now that January 19th deadline has passed:</p> <p>JW: Yes          YS: Yes          TB: Yes          ZI: Yes          JS: Yes          JC: Yes          GC: Yes</p>	
--	--	---	--

6	AOB	<p><b><u>Elections queries and elections regulations</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW: is the quoracy numbers a hard boundary that groups have to follow?</li> <li>• SM: yes it is. Quoracy is set by the student groups' policy.</li> <li>• SM: elections regulations have been updated and generally these follow the Guild's overall elections regulations. This document is being shared with you for information and is procedural. Let us know if you have any feedback</li> <li>• JS: Officer Elections are open now. If you want more information you can speak to anyone in the Officer team</li> </ul> <p>JC: anyone here would be a great addition to the Guild!</p>	