

Trigger Warnings: None required

Item No.	Item Title	Meeting Notes	Actions
----------	------------	---------------	---------

<p>1</p>	<p>New Group Proposals</p>	<p><u>Omani Society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: can't identify any risks apart from financial support. Want to be a cultural group. Shortened to OSSB. 15 names of people interested shared. Group needs to charge a £3 membership fee. Does anyone have any thoughts? • JS: lots of cultural groups. Student body and cohort changes every year- groups like this seem to be more at risk of de-recognition statistically. Just a point to note • JC: seems to be a trend around de-recognition within cultural groups. We need to be consistent in our decision making though • JS: there are 71 Omani students at UOB • JC: no one else has any other concerns/comments to make? <p>Committee agree to unanimously conditionally approve the proposal based on the following condition:</p>	
----------	-----------------------------------	---	--

		<p>1) To increase membership fee to a minimum of £3. If want to increase beyond £3 for this increase to be approved on Chair's Action</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p> <p><u>Dancing Street Society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: group want to help people learn to street dance. Main risk is just injuries from dancing. £8 membership fee • GA: we have reached out to BUDS for feedback in the last week but haven't heard back yet • JC: I think we need to hear back about crossover before we approve. How long do we give them? It is their show week this week. Do we give it another 2 weeks? • SM: could suggest a Chair's Action decision pending what BUDS say 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>or bring it back to Activities Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: constitution seems fine- nothing alarming. I agree with suggestion of Chair's Action once we hear back from BUDS <p>Committee agree to seek further information about crossover, with a decision to be made on chairs action based on the following criteria being met:</p> <p>1) That BUDS do not have any concerns around crossover with their society.</p> <p>If concerns are cited then for the constitution to come back to be reviewed on Chair's Action</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p> <p><u>Mantality Society</u></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: discussion based meetings around masculinity. Open to new ideas, inviting guest speakers to campus. Lots of social events- want to be fairly casual for discussion and learning. Mantality looks at men's mental health as a national organisation- have spoken to the national organisation too. Want to keep conversations positive and not toxic. Want to affiliate to mentality. Peoples thoughts? • GC: think it's very positive. Do we need to be careful about what category they are in? • SM: indoor isn't a category anymore- would be interest or activity. You can decide this as a committee • JS: reads as a mental health society for men- we rejected Breathe for being a mental health group • JC: in objectives they don't talk about mental health. Mediated space to talk about masculinity 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GC: they don't have a group or page. Interest post on fab & fresh • GA: would likes given be an equivalent to a post? • SM: possibly less commitment from those liking it • JC: I think it's an interesting group • AS: what would be the reason you wouldn't approve? • JC: can't think of one/ Need to prove their interest levels though. Otherwise seems fine • SM: for quoracy will need to get someone else to agree outcomes on email • JC: I think we should give conditional approval based on proving 15 people interest level <p>Committee unanimously agree to conditionally approve the group based on the group meeting the following condition:</p> <p>1) To prove they have a minimum of 15 people interested in becoming part of the group. For this to be proven by collecting</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>15 signatures of students or through people following a dedicated UOB Mantality Society group page</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p> <p><u>Rivercourt Church Birmingham</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC: religious group- want to win souls. Develop relationship with God. Want to change lives on campus- speakers, bible study and retreats. Recognise there would be a crossover with PENSA. Believe main difference would be around Bible study and different activities. Chaplaincy have a lot of concerns. Already have a Pentecostal group- chaplaincy question their intentions GA: First Love had no issues with crossover. We haven't heard anything back from PENSA 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM: have we reached out to GIFT as the chaplaincy reference them in their feedback • GA: I would need to check but if we haven't we can do • JC: zero pound membership fee. What are people's thoughts? Don't think we should ignore the advice of the chaplaincy. Objectives are also very general • GC: looked at their Instagram- they want to use Birmingham group as a springboard as a whole rather than just for students. Describe themselves as for West Midlands. Can't prove interest of students directly • SM: showing 15 interested students is a criteria. There is also a potential crossover of aims with other religious groups that should be looked at • JC: could be a crossover within general objectives. Let's revisit objectives • JS: you could look at all Christian groups and lots of them would probably have similar objectives 	
--	--	--	--

- FA: all of the people following their Instagram page look like they are from London and affiliated to the London church there
- JC: I think we may need more information from them before looking at this again
- SM: would suggest you look at getting feedback from PENSA and GIFT and look at other group constitutions to consider crossover
- GA: do you want to attach a timeframe on a response time on this from the groups?
- JC: yes- three weeks?

Committee unanimously agree to go out for further information in regards to this new group proposal before making a decision. For the information to be sourced to be as follows:

- 1) To gain feedback from PENSA and GIFT around potential crossover. For these groups to be given 3 weeks to respond to that information request**

		<p>2) For GIFT, PENSA and First Love constitutions to be checked for potential crossover directly by dedicated Coordinator</p> <p>Once information is sourced, for new group proposal to return to Activities Committee for consideration.</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p> <p><u>Emirati Society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: want to operate for Emirati students and run lots of social events and also cultural events. This group is coming back to Activities Committee- group don't want to remove affiliation so this is part of the reason it is coming back to Activities Committee. £0 membership fee • GA: group are happy to work on other bits just had issues with the affiliation 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: you can't affiliate to only one person • GC: European parliament boycotting UAE on basis of human rights concerns was a point raised last time and that was the biggest concern. We do have a campus in Dubai though • AS: EU have done that but we aren't part of the EU anymore. Country has close relations with UAE. Don't know enough about affiliations process for us as a charity. All students should be able to contest affiliations. Definitely couldn't affiliate to a political/terrorist organisation. Could approve in principle but then sense check whether we can affiliate to a foreign government • AS: quite prestigious/sense of home to link back to country of origin for cultural groups. Could approve in principle pending investigation on affiliation • JC: I brought this up in FTOG- everyone agreed that if it was legal it should be allowed 	
--	--	---	--

- AS: what did Jo say?
- JC: said it seemed fine- didn't have any instant concerns
- SM: The attache is a post, rather than a department
- JC: can you affiliate to a position?
- AS: bit weird- affiliating to a department would make more sense
- JC: there is no guidance in the student groups' policy about affiliations either. If it is legal, and doesn't contravene Charity laws, I think we should allow the affiliation as long as other changes are also agreed

Committee unanimously agree to conditionally approve Emirati society based on the following conditions being met:

- 1) For affiliations to be allowed so long as ones listed are legal and do not contravene any charity laws. For this to be clarified by Josephine Conway or Adam Sheridan**

		<p>2) For the other changes agreed at the last meeting to still be met. These changes are as follows:</p> <p>1) changing membership fee to a minimum of £3</p> <p>2) Removing the duplicate Chair</p> <p>3) defining committee roles so that people have listed responsibilities</p> <p>4) Secretary to be listed as Secretary and not Vice Chair</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p>	
--	--	---	--

2	Chairs Actions Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC: CSS want to host an AGM in a different time period which was agreed to. <p>Railway Society also want to hold their election on a different date and this was agreed to as well</p> <p>Metal society- added a social sec role and have been asked to move their constitution onto a more updated template</p> <p>Sign language- fundraising and campaigning role and more onto a more updated template</p> <p>Mountaineering grant query resolved</p> <p>No concerns/issues raised by Activities Committee.</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p>	
---	--------------------------------	--	--

<p>3</p>	<p>Emergency Grant Applications</p>	<p><u>Malaysian Society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: Malaysian society have over £1,000 in their account. Are they asking for £300? • GA: they are asking for £100 • JC: want the £100 for the EGM for snacks and drinks. Want to entice more members to come. I don't think we should approve • GC: I agree we shouldn't approve • SM: reason would need to go in line with grants procedure • JC: do we need to reference a specific point from grant • SM: need to make a decision based on how you think you would handle future requests • JC: I think we should reject as this is not in line with objectives <p>Committee unanimously agree to reject emergency grant request based on items being requested not being in line with their constitutional objectives:</p> <p>GC: No</p>	
----------	--	--	--

		<p>JC: No JS: No FA: No</p> <p><u>Anime and Manga Society</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC: want £400- say they lost this money due to email outage at the time. Think that emails caused the issue of the payment and miscommunication/service issues from the student group account. Want the money to pay for a bookcase and equipment for storage. <p>I have met with Anime society and discussed this. The emails were down for 2 days. Group didn't try to contact the team via other methods. Have already received money from us for a bookcase. Cancelled venue without contacting us. What are other peoples' thoughts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GC: what would the grounds be for not giving money- that we dispute the information provided? 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM: Emails were down. Payment was made to the venue and part of the reason they cancelled was because they were nervous it wouldn't be paid • JC: we have limited money. Don't think it warrants us paying them back. They could have called, messaged on social media. They cancelled themselves and we have already given them money for bookcase. <p>Committee unanimously move to reject the grant proposal based on the following reasoning: that while it is acknowledged emails were down, other forms of communication were available that weren't explored before a decision was made to cancel the activity planned, and because grant has already been provided towards a bookcase. If the group are struggling financially then they can apply for grant as part of current allocation set to close on 4th April.</p> <p>GC: No</p>	
--	--	--	--

		JC: No JS: No FA: No	
--	--	----------------------------	--

4	<p>Constitutional Changes</p>	<p><u>Action Against Homelessness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC: action against homelessness new roles. All roles approved in full- no issues raised <p>Committee vote to approve all changes requested in full:</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p> <p><u>Friends of Nightline</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC: Friends of Nightline- 4 new roles they want to vote in. All approved in full- no issues raised <p>Committee vote to approve all changes requested in full:</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p>	
---	--	---	--

		<p><u>Panto Soc</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: Panto soc- group have added in new points around inclusivity. Discussion had about stake system developed. Discussion also about sharing drum kit between GMTG & Panto soc. Thoughts on fair casting contract? • GC: do GMTG know this is going into their constitution? • GA: I believe so • SM: If they put things in aims then it is much more stringent. Think these are more operational points rather than something that should be listed within their aims. Issue with contract terminology being used too • JC: agreement to be used as a word instead? • SM: if no one signs though what is the recourse after that? • JC: that is a good point. ABBA point isn't necessary to include. 2.1.7 change to agreement rather than contract? Should it come out of the constitution? 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FA: something they want to achieve • SM: reads as a way in which to support committee members with how to run production team • FA: sounds like they want to tick a box with putting this into their constitution • AS: points the group have raised are covered elsewhere within guild policy • JC: go out for further information to support? Isn't necessarily a rejection just want to understand further • JC: 2.1.10 seems very strict and not necessary • JS: do the committee know that people could make complaints against them if they don't do these things? • AS: might be worth going out to the group to check their understanding of what putting something in their constitution actually means. Concerns raised around 'living memory' point • SM: specify 3 years in constitution 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS: isn't clear within wording however. Members have voted on a change though • JC: for it to be approved on Chair's Action once we go out for further information to the group • JC: not sure of relevancy • SM: point says well known, doesn't have to be ABBA. This may be another one to query with the group to check their understanding • JC: same outcome to be agreed as above • JC: three strike rule section- this section could be messy. Group needs to make sure they are following the Guild's complaints procedure • JC: for 2.5.1 to remove wording that references GMTG lower store room but otherwise all fine • JC: 10.1.3 can be approved without issue <p>Committee reach the following conclusions in relation to Panto soc constitution:</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>1) All of point 2.5 approved without issue</p> <p>2) For 2.5.1- for the reference to the lower GMTG store room to be removed. Once removed can be approved</p> <p>3) Three strikes section: for the whole section to be removed, and for the group to be informed about following Guild complaints procedure and be supported to find alternative ways to implement practices within their group via a discussion with their dedicated Coordinator</p> <p>4) 2.1.7, 2.1.10 and 2.1.11- more information required before a decision can be made. Once further information has been provided, for points to be approved on Chair's Action</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p>	
--	--	--	--

5	<p>Affiliations Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC: affiliations- there is no current policy in place. I brought this up in FTOG and would be happy to do some more work on this. Does anyone have any thoughts? • JS: lots of affiliations are just to a national organisation e.g. Bloodsoc. Do affiliations lead to funding or sponsorship? • SM: some are affiliated to shops for example. Don't think affiliations being approved here are being shared elsewhere. A procedure needs to be written- would be good to get thoughts on where these should be approved from you • JC: I will do some work on this and come back to the committee with my findings <p>Additional action: for Josephine Conway to conduct research on affiliations, and how they operate in other Unions, and to bring this information back to another Activities Committee before July 2022</p>	
---	---------------------------------------	---	--

<p>6</p>	<p>AOB</p>	<p><u>Pharmacy Society Debt</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SM: group were de-rec'd and started up again this year. Due to COVID a debt wasn't recognised at the time and the venue has since closed. The group is really struggling as a consequence of this debt. Can we cover this debt from the de-rec pot to help the group at all? Helped other groups in a similar way in the past. JC: I think we should be fair and consistent and this would be a good reason to use funds <p>Committee unanimously agree for the debt to be paid off from the de-recognition pot:</p> <p>GC: Yes JC: Yes JS: Yes FA: Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JS: I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the student 	
----------	-------------------	--	--

		<p>groups team for Guild Awards, it was a great night!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• JC: yes we have received a lot of great feedback so thank you.	
--	--	---	--

Date & Time of next meeting: TBC